1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3472	
GEF Agency project ID		3512	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		SLEM/CPP: Integrated Land and Ecosystem Management to Combat Land Degradation and Deforestation in Madhya Pradesh	
Country/Countries		India	
Region		South Asia	
Focal area		Land Degradation, Biodiversity, Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Land degradation: SO1, SP1, SP2 Biodiversity: SP 4 Climate Change: SO8	
Executing agencies involved		Government of Madhya Pradesh Partner: Madhya Pradesh Forest Department	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 18th, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		January 23, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 22, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 12, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.34	-
	Co-financing	0.25	-
GEF Project Grant		5.77	5.77
Co-financing	IA own	-	-
	Government	95.52	114.61
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-

	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		6.10	5.76
Total Co-financing		95.77	114.61
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		101.88	120.38
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		February 12, 2016	
Author of TE		Andrew Laurie and Pradeep Kumar Mathur	
TER completion date		January 24, 2017	
TER prepared by		Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MU	MS	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	-	MU
M&E Design		MS	-	MS
M&E Implementation		MU	-	MU
Quality of Implementation		MS	-	MU
Quality of Execution		MS	-	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environment Objective is "to promote sustainable land management and use of biodiversity as well as maintain the capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services [benefitting local livelihoods] while taking account of climate change" (PD pg 24).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective is "to promote community-driven sustainable land and ecosystem management at the landscape level through integration of watershed management, joint forest management, and sustainable livelihoods development so as to balance ecological and livelihood needs" (PD pg 24). The objective will be achieved through three outcomes (PD pg 24):

Outcome 1: Creation of an enabling environment for climate-resilient, sustainable land and ecosystem management;
Outcome 2: Community-driven, climate-resilient approaches for sustainable land and ecosystem management are demonstrated in 4 micro-catchments; and
Outcome 3: Capacities for adaptive management, learning and replication of project lessons are developed.

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

There were no changes in the objectives or activities of the project during implementation.

4. GEF IEO 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 consistent with Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management Country Partnership Program which was approved by GEF Council in 2007. The project's objective is aligned to three GEF focal areas, namely, land degradation, biodiversity and climate change (PD pg 23). Under the land degradation focal area, the project fits well with Strategic Priorities 1 and 2 of Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management, and Sustainable Forest Management in Production Landscapes. For the biodiversity conservation focal, the project is aligned with Strategic Priority 4 on "Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity in productive sectors and landscapes" (PD pg 24). The project's work on developing adaptive capacity is consistent with Strategic Priority on Climate Change Adaptation. In regard to country eligibility, the project is relevant to India's National Action Programme to Combat Desertification of 2001 and also, aligned with Madhya Pradesh's work in forest management (PD pg 40, TE pg 27).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE assessed the project's effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory and the TER gives the same rating. The project moderately achieved two out of three outcomes which had planned to create a climate-resilient framework and approaches for sustainable land and ecosystem management and also replicated the lessons learnt. The project did impressive work in training community members and creating alternative livelihood options but it neglected monitoring of impacts and establishing a policy environment in the state.

Achievements under the planned outcomes are listed below:

<u>Outcome 1: Enabling environment for climate-resilient sustainable land and ecosystem management:</u>
This outcome only partially achieved its aim of ensuring that policies on forest and agriculture were aligned to principles of climate resilient sustainable land and ecosystem management. Its first output related to making changes to state policies on forest, agriculture, animal husbandry, watershed management, and tribal welfare. One of the activities was to undertake studies to review state sectoral polices that incorporate Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management (SLEM) guidelines however, this

activity was not completed and was still in progress at the time of evaluation. In terms of policy changes, the only policy that was addressed was "clarification of the legal basis for individuals and JFMC's to be given the proceeds of bamboo sales" which was settled insufficiently (TE pg 18). For output 2 on training community-based organizations and government staff, the project had impressive results in training 400 members from 40 joint forest management committees on forestry and livelihood skills. It also trained 789 families on bamboo harvesting and protection of bamboo forests (TE pgs 24 & 18). However, the project did not train any government officials and it seems many of the training sessions were too short in duration lasting for less than one day.

Outcome 2: Community-driven, climate-resilient approaches for sustainable land and ecosystem management are demonstrated in 4 micro-catchments:

The main aim of this outcome was to develop livelihood opportunities linked to each of four micro-catchments. But, the project design failed to define the term micro-catchment that "led to wider spatial dispersion of the project's field interventions than was intended" (TE pg 35). Despite this flaw, it is worthy to note that this outcome managed to achieve six out of seven outputs. The first output was the "backbone" of the project which intended to develop plans for rehabilitation and sustainable management of degraded bamboo areas in forest lands near target villages. The Forest Department with strong participation by joint forest management committees successfully rehabilitated bamboo forests in an area of 15,780 ha. From field visits, the TE observed that the bamboo clumps were in good condition and the beneficiaries used protective measures to reduce the level of illicit tree felling, livestock grazing, and fire outbreaks (TE pg 19). However, while some districts shared the net profit from bamboo harvests amongst the beneficiaries, other districts faced administrative issues in distributing income from sale of bamboo which caused a sense of dissatisfaction and trust (TE pg 20).

To reduce grazing on forest lands from livestock population, the project planted fodder species in an area of 210 ha, but the available fodder did not match the requirements of village communities and hence, as per the TE, this output was unlikely to decrease any grazing pressure. The TE also noted that "instead of forest lands (often Reserved Forest), degraded village pastures might have been more appropriate sites for fodder plantations" (TE pg 20). Further, to promote home garden-based conservation, the project distributed 600,000 saplings to about 60,000 families. There was a good response to this output as the villagers planted fruit trees in fields near their houses (TE pg 22). In terms of improving management of water resources at the level of micro watersheds, the project built small loose rock bunds (check dams), strengthened community ponds, and piped water from a gorge to irrigate crops. Although many villages benefitted from such activities, the TE noted that there should have been an overarching planning strategy to execute these efforts with proper impact assessment (TE pg 22). Lastly, one of the shortcomings in this outcome was that it used inappropriate strategy to establish fuelwood plantations. Some of the species chosen for fuelwood plantations, such as bamboo and Subabool, were not suitable for use as fuel on a sustained basis.

Outcome 3: Capacities for adaptive management, learning and replication of project lessons are developed:

Under this outcome there were two outputs that planned to establish a community-based monitoring and evaluation system as well as to document project lessons. For the monitoring aspect, the Forest

Division collected data on bamboo clumps, harvests and harvest sites. However, there was little "ecological data or socio-economic data that correspond with the indicators in the log frame or that could contribute to new indicators" (TE pg 22) and the project never established a community-led monitoring of indicators. Although the project prepared case-studies on the rehabilitation of degraded bamboo forest model by creating leaflets and producing films, documentation on the experiences and lessons learned were lacking. The MTR had recommended to appoint a full-time staff specifically for this output, but the project did not act on this recommendation (TE pg 27).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the efficiency of the project and noted that "at field level the efficiency was good" (TE pg vi). But the TER finds that the efficiency was not up to mark because of delays and financial issues. The project did remarkably well in rehabilitation of degraded bamboo forests demonstrations and overseeing involvement of communities, however, it had many delays during implementation. For instance, it delayed hiring consultants or technical advisors and in some cases it never hired staff for delivering certain outputs even though the MTR recommended it (TE pg 27). The TE noted "difficulties in communication and coordination between UNDP CO and PMU regarding project management and technical oversight led to delays and unnecessary expenditure on consultancies" (TE pg 39). There were also delays in getting government approval for distribution of profits in three districts which caused disappointment and loss of ownership amongst beneficiaries (TE pgs 35 & 20). Overall, the project was given a one-year no-cost extension.

In terms of cost-effectiveness, the project disproportionally allocated to the outcomes, for instance, at the time of closure there was over-expenditure of 130% on creating livelihood opportunities in outcome 2 and under-expenditure of 22% for outcome 1 and 42% for outcome 3 on policy building and monitoring indicators.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately Unlikely

The TE gave project's overall sustainability a Moderately Likely rating and noted that there were "normal risks of increasing population pressure and consumption patterns" (TE pg vi). However, the TER gives a Moderately Unlikely rating. Although the financial and sociopolitical risks seem low, there was a clear lack of institutional framework, and environmental sustainability.

Financial resources: The TE gave a Moderately Likely rating to financial sustainability while noting that "in order to replicate the bamboo model considerable capital outlay is required by government" (TE pg vi) and, as per documents, the project had not committed any follow-up funding. However, in terms of financial sustainability for beneficiaries, the income from harvests indicated increase in profits from second harvest year onwards. For example, in the Chhindwara circle, for the first harvest period the

income was between Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 17,000, but for future years the profit was forecasted between Rs 50,000 and Rs 100,000 per beneficiary (TE 28).

Sociopolitical: The sociopolitical risks to project benefits seem low because during the implementation there was considerable ownership and awareness of the project by stakeholders and beneficiaries. The state government was significantly involved in implementation as the executing agency and it received support from the relevant agencies such as the Forest Department and its joint forest management committees (TE pgs 9 & 27).

Institutional framework and governance: The project aimed to create an enabling environment for climate-resilient principles through state-level policy but it failed to make any changes to state policies (TE pg 18). Although the project received considerable support from government agencies such as Forest Department, the lack of a SLEM integrated policy environment is a shortcoming to governance sustainability.

Environmental: The environmental sustainability could have potential risks especially as the TE found that the project did not give importance to environmental safeguards in some of the proposals (TE pg 21).

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?

The actual co-financing amount of $114,614,000 was much higher than expected amount of $95,523,750. All the co-financing came from government sources, however, the TE does report on how the financing was used towards project activities (TE pg 16).

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?

The project faced delays because of late hiring of consultants and lack of technical oversight from UNDP. There were also some delays in getting approval from the government on harvesting and distribution of profits (TE pgs 25, 27 & 39). The project was given one-year no-cost extension until December 2015 (TE pg 2).

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:

The ownership of the project was high at national, state and district level. At the national level, the project was implemented as a partnership with GEF under the SLEM programme. On the other hand, the executing agency was the state government and its Forest Department. The project's model of rehabilitation of degraded bamboo forest gained much appreciation at district and village level where the project is "owned enthusiastically by the beneficiaries themselves in Chhindwara where there is talk of expanding to 40 ha per beneficiary and preparing for 28 the second year's harvest" (TE pgs 27-28). There were some reservations at some of the districts, but overall there was high-level of participation by stakeholders.

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: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as Moderately Satisfactory. The project included a baseline scenario and data in the logical framework. It also had provisions for inception workshop and report, periodic monitoring of progress, annual project report, project implementation review, quarterly reports, mid-term review and terminal evaluation with a total M&E budget at $205,000 (PD pgs 43-49). As per the TE, the project "included a major focus (Output 3.1) on community-based system for monitoring and assessment of impacts on the ecosystem and on people's livelihoods" (TE pg 16). The M&E groups were to be formed for mapping natural resources and documenting information on the impact of project interventions. Also, the impact indicators were to be tracked by subcontracting to qualified institutions. However, the indicators in the log frame were not sufficient enough for measuring impact as "too many lacked baselines for comparison before and after; and others were formulated to measure "process" (e.g. numbers of people trained (in O1.2), rather than "impact" (e.g. what difference the training made)" (TE pg 4). There were more indicators than needed and some indicators used vague language without "clear statement of what should be measured" (TE pg 8).

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The M&E implementation was inadequately done throughout the project implementation. The project implementation reviews were completed annually but in almost all cases the baseline data was missing. The indicators were not formulated sufficiently for measuring impact but there was no action taken to revise and improve the indicators. The quantitative data lacked information on sources of collection for reliability. The project document provided an annual ecological performance audit but, as per the TE, this was not implemented. Also the project never formed the community-based M&E groups to track impacts of the overall project according to objective and outcomes. Although the inception workshop was impressive, the annual workshops were not held at the same level as they lacked details and discussions (TE pg 16).

In regard to adaptive management, the project responded to very few of the recommendations given by the MTR. For example, the MTR recommended to hire consultants for documentation but there was no action taken on documentation for dissemination of project results. The TE notes "there is so much going on in so many activities of the project at field level, that it has been simply too hard for project management to call a pause and to rethink" (TE pgs 14 and 15).

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the quality of UNDP's implementation. The UNDP had issues in coordinating with the executing agency and also did not sufficiently steer project plans and actions to achieve the outcomes (TE pg 16). Although UNDP responded to the recommendations given by MTR, it "responded rather weakly to only four of those recommendations and gave deadlines for action that were really too late" (TE pg 13). It also recruited consultants very late in the implementation stage and, importantly, there were drawbacks between UNDP and project management unit in terms of communication and cooperation (TE pg 17).

In terms of project design, the TE notes that it was coherent and well-prepared, however the logical framework was too long and detailed (TE pg 7). Also, the indicators were deficient but the UNDP never

took action to revise them for better monitoring of impact (TE pg 17). Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating due to the many flaws in project implementation.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rated the project execution as Moderately Satisfactory because there were "good project implementation on the main aspects of the field interventions" (TE pg V). The Government of Madhya Pradesh coordinated well with UNDP and there was enthusiastic participation of Forest Department personnel in project implementation. The National Project Director oversaw operations with occasional field visits to project sites (TE pg 10). However, the project had frequent changes of the National Project Director and staff at the Forest Department staff in District and Division levels. The TE notes that the "government should have made provision for longer service periods for those most closely involved with the project" (TE pg 36) as the changes disrupted the continuity in oversight of the project.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes that the environmental stress reduction was very minimal but does not give any explanation (TE pg vi).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project helped in creating livelihood opportunities for the villagers such as initiating home-gardens, and small and medium enterprises (TE pg 25), however, the TE does not report impact of these initiatives.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change.

"Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities: the project trained 400 community members on forestry skills and covered 789 families on bamboo harvesting and management. The project also built watershed conservation infrastructure such as check dams, percolation tanks and small farm ponds (TE pgs 22 & 24).

b) Governance: The TE does not report of any governance changes.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not report of any unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There has been no broad adoption of GEF initiatives yet (TE pg 38).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

Key lessons learnt are (TE pg 38):

a) It is important to enable SLEM in other sectors beyond well-stocked bamboo/dense forest areas;
b) For coordination of pilot livelihood interventions, it is required to conduct a thorough site planning as well as environmental and social impact assessment;
c) Preparation of a good logical framework is necessary to measure progress towards outcomes for quarterly and annual reports;

d) Project documents should have clear definition of terms such as micro-watershed, and distinctions between words such as for degradation and degraded;
e) The project should start policy interventions early in the implementation stage;
f) The staff should be part of the project continuously, otherwise "frequent changes have deleterious effects on project implementation" (TE pg 38);
g) The project should strategically plan technical assistance and thoroughly review consultant's terms of reference; and
h) The decision making procedures should act in achieving the objectives.

Best practices:

a) The Madhya Pradesh Forest Department participated in the project in a comprehensive manner and it also had involvement from the joint forest management and self-help groups;
b) The project had a good gender balance "with almost a hundred per cent women in some activities and almost hundred per cent men in others" (TE pg 39);
c) The project management unit utilized the adaptive management approach and to disseminate results, the project was strategically placed as part of the SLEM programme;
d) The project is working with other government departments and projects such as "Chhindwara District the project manager is working closely with the field manager of the World Bank/GEF/GOI Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project (BCRLIP) which overlaps to some degree in its project sites" (TE pg 39).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations by the TE are (TE pgs 35, 37-38):

a) The project should have revised the log frame and indicators as they significant shortcomings;
b) The government needs to clarify its position on "legality of distribution of bamboo harvest income" (TE pg 37);
c) Strategy should be prepared for 10-15 years when the bamboo flowers start to shoot as a plan for relying on the income;
d) The state government should issue an order to facilitate completion of harvesting bamboo and distributing the income from the harvest to beneficiaries. A prompt action "would help to rebuild the trust of the villagers, encourage them to work again on the bamboo plots, and thus avoid bamboo clumps becoming congested again" (TE pg 37);
e) The Forest Department should allocate an additional 20 ha of bamboo plots to beneficiaries with or without additional monthly payments;
f) The project should form linkage with a new project that is about to start called the Ecosystem Services Improvement Project (ESIP) in Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Maharashtra. There should also be further collaboration with BCRLIP project;
g) The rehabilitation of degraded bamboo forest should be incorporated into other forest department programmes and the sites should consider contribution of habitat connectivity for biodiversity;

h) The state and National Bamboo Missions should be closely connected for maximum impact over a wide area and funds could flow from compensatory afforestation programme to provide for monthly payments; and
i) The project should prepare an exit strategy and a replication plan for the closing workshop.

10. 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 IEO 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?	The report thoroughly assessed the projects outcomes and also gave ratings and comments. However, the impact section lacked information and did not use any of GEF's criteria for assessment.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was consistent with assessing and rating outcomes, however, it gave inflated ratings sustainability criteria.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE lacked detail in assessing sustainability and gave inflated rating for environmental and governance criteria. The report states that the project did not formulate an exit strategy.	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are brief and provide no evidence for support.	**MU**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides costs per year and outcomes and also gives co-financing figures.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assessed and gave appropriate ratings for M&E design and implementation.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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

The TER did not use any additional sources.