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- Baseline Assessment (2015) 34 points
- Mid-term Assessment (2018) 78 points
- Final Assessment (2021) ???
Main Challenges according to mid-term assessment
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Thematic Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental indicator</th>
<th>DATA FLOW</th>
<th>Overall Performance Score Data Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2. Ambient air quality in urban areas</td>
<td>Annual average concentration of PM10 - validated</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Ambient air quality in urban areas</td>
<td>Annual average concentration of sulphur dioxide - validated</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Ambient air quality in urban areas</td>
<td>Annual average concentration of nitrogen dioxide - validated</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Ambient air quality in urban areas</td>
<td>Annual average concentration of ground-level ozone - validated</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. BOD and concentration of ammonium in rivers</td>
<td>Mean concentration of BOD5 in major rivers</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10. BOD and concentration of ammonium in rivers</td>
<td>Mean concentration of ammonium in major rivers</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Protected areas</td>
<td>Total protected areas (by IUCN categories)</td>
<td>68.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Challenges

- No user feedback is collected
- No any other data sources are available on the same topic
- SEIS Production Template is not used for the presentation of certain data flows
- Metadata of data flow does not contain information on data quality, rights, and with regard to certain data flows this information is not available in other languages
- Internationally agreed procedures in the production of the data flows are partly applied
- There are several breaks in the time series of the data flows
Lessons Learned from SEIS Progress Assessment Methodology
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**Positive**
- Useful tool to assess existing situation in the country
- Performance score does highlight areas that need improvement
- Important strategic communication tool

**Negative**
- Not an useful tool to measure trends as methodology of baseline and midterm reviews are different
- Still many important open questions that are not scored
- Conflict of interest during self-assessment
- Difficulties related to understanding some terminologies of the questionnaire
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On draft methodology

- Questions should be asked on the macro, thematic or data flow levels
- It’s better to contain all thematic areas (at least one data flow per indicator)
- Clear definitions are needed to fill the questionnaire taking into consideration country perspectives
- Both online tool and excel sheets should be applied

On Performance Scoring

- 3rd option for performance scoring is the best one
- New Performance Score should not be used in comparison with the baseline and midterm scores
Thank you very much for your attention!
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