

No.

Date

Comment on
BiRA Technical Workshop

15-19 Feb 2016, OSP

By TNMC

W. W. W. W.

wasted
d
experts.

5. The order of the presentation is not appropriated for example the explanation of the important details such as how to selected focus area, what is the criteria to select indicators should have start at the beginning.

6. The ~~DRIFT~~^{National} consultants need to know some background about the DRIFT before play the response curve for giving better recommendation.

7. How to make sure that the Member Country can use the DRIFT on their own effectively in the future.

8. There are too much activities in the short period its make participants confuse and tired.

9. The training ~~math~~ material not enough
~~and~~ information to follow for practise
step by step.

10.

Comments

- 1, TNMC is still having some reservations on the development of the indicators and the response curve for FA 1, 2 and 3 since the whole process is based on mainly the general secondary data and very few specific information for FA 1, 2 and 3.
- 2, TNMC also concerns and has reservation on the newly proposed "ECO - LMB"
- 3, TNMC has strong opinion that the name of FA 1, 2 and 3 shall be modified to reflect to ^{as} indicated the join boundary between the two riparians.
- 4, MRCs / the BiORA team shall provide all NMCs, the new / additional reference and data as compiled by BiORA Team.

No.

Date

Additional Comment, TMC strongly requested
Secretariat to remove an existing and
planned irrigation project to avoid
misunderstanding, such as the MRC
water structure map from historic experts.