

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		347	
GEF Agency project ID		634	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Biodiversity Conservation and Resource Management	
Country/Countries		Papua New Guinea	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 3: Forest Ecosystems, and OP 4: Mountain Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS, with some support from the GoPNG's Nature Conservation Division within the Department of Environment and Conservation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		(October 1994 – Agency approval date)	
Effectiveness date / project start		10/7/1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		July 1998	
Actual date of project completion		July 1998	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.0	5.0
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- / bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		5.0	
Total Co-financing		1.8	Not reported
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.8	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 1998	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Graham Baines, John Duguman, Colleen Peacock-Taylor	
TER completion date		July 2014	
TER prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	U
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project, as stated in the Project Document (PD), were to strengthen protections for, and management of, landscapes harboring globally significant biodiversity in Papua New Guinea. A substantial proportion of global biodiversity (at least 5%, PD, pg 2) resides in Papua New Guinea’s rainforests and coastal ecosystems. According to the PD, these globally significant biological resources are under increasing threat from population growth, development of extractive industries – primarily unsustainable commercial logging – and the growth of a cash economy (PD, pg 5).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project, as stated in the PD, was to expand the conservation system of Papua New Guinea to provide for biodiversity conservation, through the use of an Integrated Conservation and Development Approach (ICAD). According to the PD, the ICAD approach involves eliciting the commitment of customary landowners when establishing conservation areas, and gaining their support for maintaining and managing these areas on a long-term basis through the provision of ongoing incentives that meet community needs (PD, pg 4).

To achieve the broad development objective shown above, the PD defines the immediate objectives and outputs shown below. The PD states however that “given the project’s innovative and experimental character and the vital importance for further project development by the mid-term evaluation to be held 24 months after the start of project implementation...” (PD, pg 23) the outputs and immediate objectives provided below only cover the first two years of the project.

1. **Objective 1** – to develop innovative methodologies for conservation of biodiversity through the establishment of pilot ICAD sites. Under this objective:
 - a. Two ICAD project sites will be established, and close working relationships will have been established with local communities, based on a shared awareness of conservation values.
 - b. Sociological studies, inventories of natural resources, Participatory Rural Appraisal studies, and other data will be undertaken or obtained.

- c. An ICAD planning and decision-making process that address social service needs and a planned benefit delivery program will be established for both sites.
 - d. Piloting of development support programs in social services, agriculture, alternative forest products, tourism, and other development program options will be undertaken.
2. **Objective 2** - *To establish a Conservation Resource Centre (CRC) within the GoPNG's Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) that will provide the technical and managerial skill training necessary for expanding the conservation system and for contributing to national and provincial biodiversity conservation policy and planning.* Under this objective:
 - a. A CRC will be established.
 - b. Technical inputs and orientation and training programs for national ICAD project personnel will be provided by the CRC, and CRC will facilitate NGO involvement in the ICAD projects and build a network on ICAD matters with Papua New Guinea with other government agencies and throughout the world with donor agencies.
3. **Objective 3** – *To establish institutional, legal, financial, and policy frameworks for the expansion and future maintenance of the conservation system.* Under this objective:
 - a. A conservation trust fund will be established with resources from international donors, and the Government.
 - b. A National Conservation Council (NCC), as envisioned in the Conservation Areas Act of 1980, will be established to guide the development of a conservation system.
 - c. Strengthen the development of the Government's executing capacity by specifying capacity-building needs and drawing a timetable for the transfer of execution functions to the Government.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

Yes. Although there was no change to the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives of the project, after the mid-term review of the project in December 1996, the following recommendations were put forward, that refer to changes/additions in activities:

- The outputs of immediate objective 1 be revised so as to accommodate an incremental approach to the establishment of a conservation regime in Bismark-Ramu, the program's sole ICAD site.
- The overall program design be presented in logframe format with more clearly worded activities and with a set of success criteria suitable for review.
- A new and more systematic approach to programme management be developed, with clear delineation of management structure, definition of roles and responsibilities, channels of communication and measures for problem solving.
- Given the special circumstances of PNG, the GEF Secretariate should provide technical backstopping for UNDP/PNG in monitoring this project.

Revision of objective 1 was considered necessary and more reflective of the situation on the ground, in which the types of changes being proposed, i.e., establishment of a conservation regime, were seen as

requiring much more time to develop. Time would be required to develop trust among community members and project staff, capacity and knowledge among community members regarding what in fact was being proposed, as well as consensus to move forward on this objective – all of which were found to be lacking by project staff (TE, pg 8). Recommendation 1 was acted upon, however the others were not sufficiently addressed, for unknown reasons. These actions are discussed further in the section on project execution below.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project is relevant for PNG and the GEF. For PNG, relevance is seen in the adoption by the GoPNG of a National Forestry and Conservation Action Programme, one goal of which is “ensuring that Papua New Guinea’s forest resources are managed in an ecologically sound and sustainable way, and the country’s diverse ecosystems and biota are adequately protected” (PD, pg 2). Moreover, the country’s Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) produced a Strategic Plan in 1992 calling for a series of major ICAD projects – in-line with the strategy proposed by the project. At the same time, as is elaborated in sections below, the experience of the project calls into question the degree to which project proponents accurately assessed the extent of support among stakeholders – both within and outside the GoPNG – for the approach taken by the project. For the GEF, the project is aligned with Operational Programmes 3 and 4, which focus on conservation of globally significant biodiversity found in Forest and Mountain ecosystems, respectively. PNG is well known to harbor some of the most biologically rich and diverse ecosystems in the world – many of which are under increasing threat of degradation (PD).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	-------------------------------

The project had major shortcomings with regard to the effectiveness in achieving expected outcomes, much of which can be attributed to poor project design. Project had unrealistic timetables and insufficient resources to execute the proposed strategy. As stated in the TE, “the Prodoc states ‘a range of benefits will be provided to landowners on an ongoing basis, in return for development rights forgone

in conservation agreements’...yet, apart from a \$66,000 allocation for a consultancy to investigate economic development options there was no financial provision at all for economic or social development” (TE, pg 12). This serious omission, coupled with the “naïve expectation of early firm landowner commitment to conservation” (TE, pg 12), clearly limited the extent to which expected outcomes were attained. Progress is detailed below under the three immediate objectives defined in the PD:

1. **Objective 1** – *to develop innovative methodologies for conservation of biodiversity through the establishment of pilot ICAD sites.* While 2 prospective ICAD sites were identified, as called for in the PD, conservation objectives were deemed unachievable at one site (LAK), and activities at this site were terminated in August 1996. At the second site, Bismarck-Ramu, the project has engaged with the local community, but project management finds that the establishment of an ICAD, if it were to occur, will be through a “gradual incremental process,” that has only begun (TE, pg 35). At the same time, TE finds that valuable lessons on approach and methodology have been learned from the project’s failure in LAK, which have been well documented and publicized in a book entitled “Race of the Rainforest”(TE, pg 34).
2. **Objective 2** - *To establish a Conservation Resource Centre (CRC) with the GoPNG’s Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) that will provide the technical and managerial skill training necessary for expanding the conservation system and for contributing to national and provincial biodiversity conservation policy and planning.* According to the TE, a CRC has been established and has produced a large amount of data. However, most of the CRC output has been designed for academics and is of little use for other stakeholders in PNG (TE, pg 35). More significantly, the acceptance and integration of the CRC within the Department of Environment and Conservation has faced opposition and setbacks throughout the project, and there are significant concerns with regard to the CRC’s sustainability post project (TE, pg 36).
3. **Objective 3** – *To establish institutional, legal, financial, and policy frameworks for the expansion and future maintenance of the conservation system.* The goal of establishing a Conservation Trust Fund (CTF) by project’s end was not achieved. TE reports progress on developing a proposal for a CTF, but overall, no clear strategy was put forward in the PD for achieving this goal, and one did not emerge during project implementation. In addition, no action was taken to advance the goal of establishing the National Conservation Council (NCC), although TE states that “this is not viewed by the Mission as being as significant a lapse as the project designers would have envisioned,” (TE, pg 36) since the experience of the project has been that local communities will be the ones to determine the success of conservation efforts in the immediate to medium-term. Lastly, under this objective, some capacity building of DEC was to have occurred. TE finds that “circumstances in DEC have not been good for capacity building and there has been no discernible overall improvement” (TE, pg 38).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unsatisfactory
----------------	-------------------------------

Efficiency of project implementation was hampered by many factors, not all of which were under the control of project management. As stated in the TE, for much of the project, DEC staff did not perceive the CRC to be an integral part of their organization, which hampered the institutional strengthening components of the project (TE, pg 36). Moreover, there has been continuing uncertainty and low morale in the DEC itself, with the department's very survival under threat. TE states that while PD outlines 7 positions that were to function as project counterparts funded by DEC, only 3 were being funded at the time of the evaluation, and the budget allocation for DEC's execution of the project has "diminished from year to year" (TE, pg 33 – actual co-financing and project expenditures not provided in TE). Other factors cited in the TE that negatively affected project efficiency include the location of the project management base in the national capital, far from field operations, and frequent telecommunication difficulties that compounded the effects of this separation. Project field staff were actually held hostage for two days over a dispute with local communities regarding the location of a radio from which to communicate with project management in the capital. TE also states that project momentum was affected when the Chief Technical Advisor quit, resulting in a 9-month lapse before a replacement could be found, and a change in the DEC project manager. During this time, the project was sustained only through the efforts of 2 project staff (TE, pg 37). Other indications of project inefficiency are found in the recommendations that emerged from the mid-term review (see section 3.3 above). In particular, TE finds that though there were some improvements in project management efficiency following the 1996 review, many processes were still inefficient at some project sites (TE, pg 14). Lastly, TE notes that the need for technical backstopping of the project by UNDP was never addressed, which potentially could have addressed some of the management difficulties encountered throughout the project.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unlikely
--------------------	-------------------------

Sustainability of project outcomes faces severe risks. As the TE summarizes, "...it has to be observed that during the tenure of the Project the national basis for the conservation system has continued to degrade through the weakening of the PNG Department of Environment and Conservation, and through the systemic disrespect for the national Constitution and for laws and procedures established to bring order, and perhaps even sustainability, to the exploitation of forest resources" (TE, pg 37). Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

- *Environmental sustainability (U/A)* – No information is provided in the TE on the status of environmental threats to the sustainability of project outcomes.
- *Financial sustainability (U)* – As stated in the TE, national funds for the DEC and for conservation have diminished over the span of the project. In the most recent 1997 budget allocations, the Biodiversity Conservation and Management Programme was the only 1 of 3 programs in DEC which did not receive any allocation from PNG. While the TE states that proposals for a conservation trust fund have advanced as a result of the project, at project completion, no commitments of funding have been obtained.
- *Socio-political sustainability (U)* – The project experience provides little in the way of evidence that conservation objectives in PNG enjoys sufficient support either at the national or local level

to counter the short-term economic benefits to be realized from the clearing of forested resources.

- *Institutional sustainability (U)* – TE finds that both the CRC and the DEC face existential threats. Throughout the project, DEC staff did not accept the CRC as central to the role of DEC. At the time of the TE, the DEC was being downgraded from the status of a ministry to that of an office.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

TE does not provide any accounting of actual co-financing realized. TE does state that PNG funding for project counterparts in DEC has diminished from year to year, and that this affected project effectiveness and efficiency. However, no further elaboration of how or why this occurred is provided in the TE.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Some internal delays were noted during project completion, resulting from the need (not elaborated in TE) to find a replacement for the Chief Technical Advisor, a process that took 9-months, as well as a change in the DEC project manager. During this time, the project was sustained only through the efforts of 2 project staff (TE, pg 37). While TE states that this affected project momentum and activities, it does not elaborate on the extent to which they affected project outcomes or sustainability.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership for this project does not appear to have been high, and the lack of support limited the effectiveness of project activities, including institutional strengthening of DEC through the CRC, and the establishment of ICADs, which were not embraced by target communities as expected in the PD. Part of the reason for lack of community support for ICAD conservation areas is likely due to the failure of the project design to provide for any kind of remuneration in exchange for establishing ICADs. At the national level, the GoPNG has demonstrated little support for the project, as seen in its failure to fund DEC; failure to fund project counterparts in DEC; failure to embrace the CRC within DEC; demotion of DEC from a ministry to an office; and, as the TE summarizes, "...it has to be observed that during the tenure of the Project the national basis for the conservation system has continued to degrade ... through the systemic disrespect for the national Constitution and for laws and procedures established to bring order, and perhaps even sustainability, to the exploitation of forest resources" (TE, pg 37).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Project design makes no provision for monitoring and evaluation of Project activities, either internal or external, except to state that the project will be subject to review by the Government and UNDP at least once every year, and that a mid-term review shall be done 2 years after the start of implementation to allow for changes in project design. No timetable for execution or project activities is provided, nor targets other than the overall Development Objectives established in the PD (such as establishment of 2 ICADs), nor indicators for project performance. Among the recommendations of the mid-term review were that the overall program design be presented in logframe format with more clearly worded activities and with a set of success criteria suitable for review, as the lack of an implementation timetable and targets and indicators was clearly seen as a factor hindering project performance.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

While the project did undertake a mid-term review that generated several recommendations for revision of project activities including design and implementation of M&E components, no effective M&E system appears to have been established. Among other effects, the lack of a working M&E system limited the extent to which the TE was able to effectively evaluate the project at completion (TE, pg 15). One of the recommendations of the mid-term review was that the overall program design be presented in logframe format with more clearly worded activities and with a set of success criteria suitable for review. According to the TE, a draft logframe for 1-year's worth of activities (1997) at 1 ICAD site (Bismarck-Ramu) was developed at a 3-day gathering. However, TE finds that "there was no subsequent monitoring and evaluation using this draft logframe. For the most part, the indicators listed in the Bismarck-Ramu logframe are quantitative as opposed to qualitative, which poses problems when assessing a community development process" (TE, pg 23).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely

within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

TE finds that project implementation had major shortcomings, both with respect to weaknesses in project design, and in lack of adequate technical support during project implementation. Weaknesses in project design that are identified in the TE include (TE, pg 12):

- The PD state “a range of benefits will be provided to landowners on an ongoing basis, in return for development rights forgone in conservation agreements. These benefits may include, but are not limited to: health services, education and training services, employment, agricultural development programmes, business development programmes, resource management decision-making forums, boundary identification, resource monitoring and management systems” – yet, apart from a \$66,000 allocation for a consultancy to investigate economic development options there was *no financial provision at all* for economic or social development. This omission is particularly noteworthy given the relatively large size of the GEF grant (\$5 million);
- “Involvement of women” was listed as a special consideration, and yet no provision was made in the project design for activities which would serve to facilitate practical application of this issue;
- The 5-year span of activities designed to lead to the establishment of new conservation areas underestimated the time required for this on customary land, and there was a naïve expectation of early firm landowner commitment to conservation;
- There was no provision for M&E of project activities.

Along with these serious design flaws, support during project implementation from UNDP was inadequate. While UNDP provided for administrative backstopping, no technical support to the project was provided during implementation, which the TE finds was “a matter of particular concern” (TE, pg 7).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---	--

TE identifies several areas where project management was unsatisfactory. These include failure to follow up on many of the recommendations from the mid-term review, particularly development and implementation of a project logframe which was to be submitted to GoPNG for formal acceptance, and development of an effective M&E system. As TE notes, field management staff “did not respond as expected” (TE, pg 24). Project execution was clearly hindered by lack of government support for DEC and for the CRC in general, which are described in sections above. Moreover, TE states that project

momentum was affected by a need to replace the Chief Technical Advisor (no further elaboration provided in TE), resulting in a 9-month lapse before a replacement could be found, and a change in the DEC project manager. During this time, the project was sustained only through the efforts of 2 project staff (TE, pg 37). Other indications of problems with project management are found in the recommendations that emerged from the mid-term review (see section 3.3 above). One of the recommendations of the mid-term review was that the overall program design be presented in logframe format with more clearly worded activities and with a set of success criteria suitable for review. According to the TE, a draft logframe for 1-year's worth of activities (1997) at 1 ICAD site (Bismark-Ramu) was developed at a 3-day gathering. However, TE finds that "there was no subsequent monitoring and evaluation using this draft logframe Project management is rated as moderately unsatisfactory because the project was successful in documenting and publicizing many important lessons for the project (TE, pg 15), and many of the issues plaguing project execution, such as weaknesses in project design and lack of government support, were external to project management.

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

TE provides the following key lessons regarding conservation in PNG:

- While the State can, should, and does set guidelines for the development of the nation's land and sea resources, and establishes structures and procedures to facilitate such development, it is the resource owners themselves who decide on development and conservation. Operating in a modern world, they are poorly equipped with knowledge and skills to carry this responsibility. Poor political will at the national and provincial levels certainly frustrates conservation efforts, and much more could be achieved through improved government. However, the fact remains that since the power to determine the fate of biodiversity rests largely at the resource owner community level, it is at this level that the will for conservation needs continual assessment and support.
- When faced with a need to decide on a proposal for a large scale use of forests, for agriculture or timber extraction, landowners are pressured to make irrevocable decisions on the basis of:
 - Very limited information about options, benefits and costs;
 - An ignorance of laws and government procedures;
 - In circumstances where there is a depressing lack of basic medical and educational services;
 - And in the context of very attractive inducements of cash and goods proffered by those who seek to gain control of a resource owning group's timber rights.

The TE does not provide any further lessons but does point the interested reader to Chapter 5 of "Race for the Rainforest," that was written about the project experiences in Lak. TE states that this Chapter, "eloquently summarizes the complex situation at the community level and offers a clear and readable outline of the complex issues to be addressed in working with PNG landowner communities. It is highly

recommended that this chapter be closely studied by those who seek to properly understand the socio-political context in which the Project has had to operate” (TE, pg 41).

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

No recommendations are provided in the TE.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	TE does a good job of assessing the relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and achievement of objectives. The evaluation was limited by the failure of the project to establish an M&E system, and the lack of clear targets and indicators in the PD.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE provides no ratings, as these were not required of project evaluations at this time. Report is largely consistent and convincing. Shortcomings include the failure to adequately describe what happened in Lak (failed ICAD site), along with events that led to the resignation of the Chief Technical Advisor.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	While TE does not provide a rating on sustainability, the assessment of funding through the establishment of a conservation trust fund appears overly optimistic given that no donors have come forward yet with pledges of financial support. In other respects, TE does a good job of pointing out risks to project sustainability, particularly surrounding the viability of DEC and the CRC.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	TE provides only a few observations on the climate for biodiversity conservation in PNG and instead refers readers to a publication for more information. A summary should have been provided along with lessons and recommendations that emerged from the TE itself.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE provides no reporting of actual project costs and co-financing used.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE does note failure of PD to include any M&E design. TE also notes that this shortcoming limited the ability of the TE mission to effectively undertake its TORs. More should have been written on how lack of M&E affected project implementation.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE Rating = $(0.3 * (5+4)) + (0.1 * (4+2+1+3)) = 2.7 + 1 = 3.7 = MS$

10. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).