

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3695	
GEF Agency project ID		1100001455	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Project for Market and Pasture Management Development	
Country/Countries		Mongolia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CC-SPA	
Executing agencies involved		Mongolian Society for Rangeland Management; Agricultural Rural Development Mongolia	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Mongolian Society for Rangeland Management; Agricultural Rural Development Mongolia; Union of Mongolia Production and Services Cooperatives	
Private sector involvement		Commercial banks	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		12/23/2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		8/26/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		9/2016	
Actual date of project completion		9/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.125	.044
	Co-financing	.125	
GEF Project Grant		1.5	1.5
Co-financing	IA own	11.48	2.519 ¹
	Government	.898	.236
	Financial Institutions	2.656	
	Private sector	1.663	
	Beneficiaries	.168	1.637
Total GEF funding		1.625	1.544
Total Co-financing		16.865	4.392
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		18.45	5.396
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Not dated	
Author of TE		Dr. Random Dubois	
TER completion date		12/20/2018	
TER prepared by		Cody Parker	

¹ Note: The At Completion values presented here reflect co-financing for Component 2, as information on actual co-financing for Component 1 is not available.

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Sohn
--	------------

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S ²	S		S
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML		ML
M&E Design		MS		MS
M&E Implementation		MS		MS
Quality of Implementation		S		MS
Quality of Execution		S		S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

There is no Global Environmental Objective specifically outlined in project documents. The environmental goal of the project was to improve climate adaptability among pastoral herders in rural Mongolia; the benefits to be accrued were mostly local rather than global.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was to reduce poverty and improve livelihoods of poor herder and *soum*- [district] and *aimag*- [province] center households in the project area. This was to be achieved through two project components:

1. Market and rural finance development,
2. Pasture management (2.1) and climate change adaptation (2.2).

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

There were no changes to the project's objectives during implementation. However, several outputs were dropped or changed for various practical reasons which are discussed below in Section 4.2. After the MTR, funding allocation was also slightly adjusted, but no substantial changes were made to the project structure.

² This reflects the PIR ratings for Implementation Progress and Development Progress (both Satisfactory).

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 TE rates relevance as Satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as Satisfactory. The project was aimed at reducing poverty and increasing livelihoods through both market-oriented development and improved natural resources management; the GEF-funded subcomponent (2.2) focused specifically on climate change adaptation. Given the high level of climate vulnerability faced by Mongolia's pasture ecosystem, and the consistency of the project goals with Mongolia's Comprehensive National Development Strategy and the adaptation priorities of the SCCF, project relevance is rated Satisfactory.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates effectiveness as Satisfactory. The adjustment and dropping of several outputs makes assessment challenging, but this TER rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. While the project had a clear and positive impact on herders' livelihoods and sustainable pasture management overall, important output targets were not met.

The project consisted of two components: 1. Market and rural finance development; and 2. Pasture management (2.1)/climate change adaptation (2.2). **The first component was not funded by GEF and is not addressed substantively in the TE or the PIRs, so this TER will focus on Component 2.**

Several project activities had to be dropped for various reasons; for example, the construction of winter shelters and assistance with seasonal mobility were not approved by the government, and an activity to support poor households with renewable energy was discarded due to another World Bank project which overlapped with this goal (TE, p. 38). The well-digging activity had to be adjusted upon realization that the envisioned shallow wells were unsuitable for the local water table, but the revised target (48 engineered wells) was exceeded (64 constructed). One activity, the creation and management of fodder and hay reserves, lacked a quantified target, making assessment difficult, but progress towards impact was made (16 established). Of the evaluable targets, 120 of 115 planned herder groups were established and set up pasture management plans, 12 *soums* allocated budgets for direct support to pasture management plans (in accordance with the MTR revised targets), and the awareness/capacity building output was a particularly bright spot, exceeding or meeting all targets.

The final PIR points out some considerable achievements of the project not included in the initial logframe targets. For example, livestock loss decreased to 1.1% from 3.7%; average live weight of livestock increased, as did milk production; the number of herders with insurance increased; each of the 120 herder groups was provided with a tractor and other equipment making hay production more efficient; overall income increased; etc. (PIR 2007, p. 8). Taken together, these improvements paint a picture of significant and positive impacts on beneficiaries.

However, there were some shortcomings. Only 24% of the targeted 80% of Pasture Management Plan land was treated by improved management practices by the end of project. Likewise, there was only 35% women's participation in the herder groups, compared with a target of 50%. Despite these, it is clear that overall the project had a substantial impact on the livelihoods and adaptation capacity of beneficiaries.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	----------------------

The TE rates efficiency as Satisfactory, but its efficiency section is essentially just a repetition of the incremental cost analysis from the CEO endorsement request, and does not examine actual outcomes in relation to inputs. This TER rates efficiency as Satisfactory.

An economic crisis in 2014 and severe drought in 2015 caused the delay of some project activities (PIR 2016), which may have impacted the slow disbursement which led to the one-year extension discussed below; another explanation is the change of government counterparts as a result of elections in 2012 (TE, p. 28). By project close (September 2018), however, 100% of funds were set to be disbursed. The project's delays were largely due to external factors and given the considerable impacts the project produced within budget and nearly on time, efficiency is rated as Satisfactory.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE rates overall probability of sustainability of project benefits as Moderately Likely, as does this TER.³

Financial: The revolving funds established by the project act as a buffer for herder groups in the face of market downturns. All but 6 of the herder groups formed have retained the revolving funds, and interviews indicate that they are pleased with them. The government is also supportive and has appointed auditors to oversee their use (TE, p. 22). Despite recent economic downturns negatively affecting agricultural prices and jeopardizing some of the gains made, there is no specific indication that this will affect the long-term sustainability of the revolving funds. Financial sustainability is therefore moderately likely.

³ The TE words this conversely, rating "risks" as "moderately unlikely".

Sociopolitical: The project beneficiaries appreciate the increased knowledge exchange and stability provided by the formation of herder groups. There are no apparent risks to the sociopolitical sustainability of project outcomes.

Institutional and governance: Herders make up the largest socioeconomic group in the country, so there is little impetus for the government to reverse or hinder the gains made for them as a result of the project. Furthermore, the herder groups are emerging as a potential political force which should further enhance their long-term sustainability (TE, p. 20). During project design, there was a draft law on pastures expected to be passed by the Government, which would support the outcomes desired by the project; however, the law was withdrawn, and another one with a similar aim is pending; the uncertainty here poses a slight risk to sustainability of project benefits. Overall, Institutional/governance sustainability is rated as moderately likely.

Environmental: There are no apparent environmental risks to the sustainability of project impacts.

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 TE reports that of an anticipated \$602,000 in co-financing from the Government of Mongolia (for Component 2), only \$236,000 materialized, giving an unclear explanation as to why ("due to a series of construction works in support of rural communities and local companies that are VAT free and the exemption of agricultural machinery and equipment that are also free from VAT and import taxes", p. 30). However, this represents less than 5% of total co-financing and is not mentioned as negatively impacting the project. On the other hand, co-financing from beneficiaries ended up as \$1.6M as opposed to only \$168,000 anticipated, which reflects monetization of labor carried out by beneficiaries for project construction (TE, p. 30). The TE does not report any financial details for Component 1, including co-financing.

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?

An economic crisis in 2014 and severe drought in 2015 caused the delay of some project activities (PIR 2016). The closing date was extended by a year in order to provide an opportunity to use the large portion of funds that were still undisbursed, and to ensure the consolidation and sustainability of activities and institutions carried out and established by the project. This appears to have been effective, as by the time of the TE the project was on track for full disbursement of funds by close. The project's overall outcomes and sustainability are not indicated as having been negatively affected by the

delays or extension, and the project has secured additional (non-GEF) financing for an additional five-year extension to consolidate and scale up the project's successes (TE, p. 29).

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 was fairly high. The TE rates government performance as satisfactory, highlighting close cooperation with local (*soum*-level) authorities, rapid response to supervisory mission recommendations, and compliance with financial management and other covenants (TE, p. 27). There were, however, some unexpected difficulties in accessing financing from two government partner funds (Employment Generation Fund and SMEs Development Fund) due to overly stringent eligibility conditions (MTR, p. 21).

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 rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory.

Overall, the project's M&E design was fairly robust, to consist of regular reports and process monitoring by the PMU for the overall project; participatory monitoring by selected groups involved in the project; internal and external reviews and workshops for stock-taking and learning; studies on specific issues raised within components and to document best practices and lessons learned; and a baseline household survey and a completion project impact study (CEO Req, p. 4).

Yet there were fundamental flaws in the project's results framework; for instance, targets and indicators being mixed, indicators being subjective rather than SMART (e.g. "Pasture management plans implemented satisfactorily"), discrepancies between the framework and the text of the PDR, and a general lack of understanding and application of the framework as a tool for measuring achievement of results. Furthermore, indicators leaned too heavily towards socioeconomic outcomes at the expense of biophysical ones, such as actual measurements of pasture health, which may have been more appropriate, although difficult to adequately assess within the short lifespan of the project (TE, p. 24).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E implementation as Moderately Satisfactory.

M&E implementation was strong overall. The TE notes that RIMS and output surveys were conducted using the methodologies required by IFAD, and when the first PIR identified a need for better pasture monitoring, the executing agency responded appropriately (TE, p. 24). There were no specific issues noted with M&E implementation in the PIRs. However, despite issues being raised by IFAD supervision missions with the project's logframe and a revision of the logframe undertaken during the MTR, it remained problematic throughout the life of the project (TE, p. 25). Therefore, overall M&E implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory.

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 Satisfactory
--	--

The project's implementing agency was IFAD, whose overall performance the TE rates as Satisfactory.

This project was designed based on a combination of two previously proposed projects: the Market Access for the Rural Poor Project, and the Community Development for Pasture Management Project, the latter of which eventually integrated the GEF-funded adaptation subcomponent (TE, p. 7). At the request of the Government, the two projects were combined through a design mission in January 2010; a GEF/SCCF consultant joined that mission and subsequently wrote the Request for CEO Endorsement which was approved in December 2010. The TE blames the short timeframe on the project's redesign for a lack of synergy between the two components of the project (TE, p. 26), but also notes that the minimal integration of the two components may have been more of a blessing than a curse by keeping project design simple and avoiding spillover of problems affecting Component 1 to Component 2 (TE, p. 20). To the extent that there may have been missed opportunities due to lack of synergy, the blame falls on IFAD's project design; it remains unclear, however, whether this was a problem, as the TE does not outline specific issues or shortcomings due to this.

Only \$44,000 of GEF's \$125,000 project preparation grant were utilized, and appear to have been used mainly to hire a consultant to develop the Request of CEO Endorsement rather than being utilized more fully to produce robust baseline data (TE, p. 26). The reasons for this are unclear.

The logframe suffered from problems throughout the life of the project. Targets were conflated with indicators, leaving some indicators without any targets, some indicators/targets were not quantified, and some indicators contained subjective wording (PD, p. 75). Perhaps most fundamentally, it was constantly adjusted, and hence used more as a framework to “retrofit project outputs and evidence of outcomes” rather than as a true M&E tool (TE, p. 22). There were also in some cases discrepancies between the logframe and the text of the project document (e.g., the target number of herder groups to be formed, 120 or 135.) These issues suggest that more oversight should have been provided by IFAD in project design. After the issue was raised in initial supervision missions, IFAD apparently gave up on attempting to improve the use of the logframe as a monitoring tool (TE, p. 25). Also, IFAD’s Quality Assurance was overly focused on Component 1 and failed to identify certain issues in the design of Component 2 (TE, p. 26). Overall, however, IFAD’s implementation support to the project was fairly strong overall, with regular supervisory missions and associated support when necessary, and project implementation is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	----------------------

The project was executed through a variety of government ministries (Labor, Industry and Agriculture, Finance, Economic Development, Environment and Green Development) and NGOs. The main executing agencies for Component 2 were the Mongolian Society for Range Management (2012-2014) and Agricultural Rural Development Mongolia (from 2013).

The TE assigns a rating of Satisfactory, although it barely comments on the performance of these two agencies beyond noting that interviews with beneficiaries indicated approval of their performance (TE, p. 27). While little specific mention of executing partners’ performance is made in the TE or PIRs, implementation progress in PIRs is consistently rated as satisfactory, and progress against Annual Work Plans & Budgets is commended. Recommendations by supervisory missions were generally well responded to; for instance, as mentioned in the M&E section, a suggestion in the first PIR to implement photo-based monitoring of pasture health to improve knowledge access for herders and local leaders was carried out by the executing agency (TE, p. 27). Adaptive management was exhibited by the changing of some outputs when warranted; for example, when it was found that establishing guarded hay-making areas was more cost-effective than fencing in areas for this purpose, the activity was changed and the project ended up establishing 42,253 hectares of guarded hay pasture, compared to only 300 hectares of fenced areas targeted initially (PIR 2017, p. 7). Based on these considerations, executing agency performance is rated as satisfactory.

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.

This project was primarily focused on adaptation and included no CO₂ reduction targets. In fact, all of the indicators in the logframe are socioeconomic in nature, and do not refer specifically to environmental stress or status. Still, the project likely made at least a somewhat positive impact on the health of pastures and long-term sustainability of their use, through a variety of outputs including training/awareness raising on sustainable pasture use and the pasture management plans developed by herder groups. Another positive environmental impact of the project was the protection of water resources (TE, p. 30). No significant negative environmental impacts of the project were found, although the deep drilling of wells may cause local impacts on the aquifer (TE, p. 30).

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.

Measurable improvements to the livelihood of project beneficiaries were documented by an IFAD outcome survey in 2016 and reported in the 2017 PIR as outlined above in Section 4.2. Increased livestock numbers and weight and decreased mortality led to a modest rise in income for beneficiaries, while improved hay/fodder storage facilities increased herders' resilience. As noted elsewhere, knowledge of climate change adaptation and general sustainable pasture management techniques were successfully communicated to herders. It is also noted in the 2015 PIR that more young people were being influenced to stay in their communities as herders due to project activities.

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 has successfully raised capacities among its beneficiaries. A variety of trainings on topics such as pasture management, veterinary care, and climate change adaptation, among others, were provided (PIR 2016), and under Component 2 of the project, a mass-messaging technology called Mobigator, originally devised as a news service to promote transparency in democracy, took on new use as an early-warning system to advise rural households of natural disasters, pest outbreaks, etc., increasing their ability to plan for these dangers (TE, p. 20).

b) Governance

The formation of Project Herder Groups has greatly facilitated knowledge exchange, and both herders and local government leadership exhibit greater awareness of sustainable pasture practices due to the project (MTR, p. 6).

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.

While the project delivered considerable benefits for those herders involved in the herder groups, these beneficiaries faced tension and occasionally conflicts with herders not involved in the project. This division also impacted the implementation of pasture management plans, which had to be approved by a vote that included non-project herder households. Although this issue was identified by supervision missions, recommendations to overcome it, including extending training and other benefits to non-herder-group households, were precluded by budgetary constraints (TE, p. 21).

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.

While outputs were not broadly adopted beyond the scope of the project by project end, the project has been approved for \$9M in additional financing from IFAD and a five-year extension, with a view toward scaling up the project's successful activities. The formation of Herder Groups and their associated pasture management plans and climate change adaptation training will be replicated in other areas of the country (TE, p. 29).

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.

- Planning vs. participatory implementation: The project document laid out a clear and logical outline for the formation of pasture management plans; however, once in the hands of the actual herder groups, a variety of approaches ended up being taken. Rather than undermine the plans' utility, this led to unexpected knowledge gain and lessons learned about how herders utilize spatial information and interact with one another as groups in reality (TE, p. 31).
- Flexibility: The revolving funds established by the project were based on investment in small tractors, which was useful for most herder groups, but some identified other investments that would have had more utility for them, and when the market was flooded with cheap tractors due to a government policy, all groups would have liked a broader menu of options for their funds (TE, p. 31).
- Inclusion: Attempting to spread benefits over as many *soums* as possible given the project budget meant that communities were divided between members and non-members of herder groups, which led to some problems (described above). Where a trade off is necessary, it is preferable to cover fewer areas (e.g. *soums*) more completely, rather than more areas less completely (TE, p. 32).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE's recommendations are aimed at the project's continuation under additional financing (TE, pp. 32-33):

- Continue to support existing herder groups.
- Conduct a start-up workshop with a facilitator to ensure the production of a robust logframe.
- Establish baseline data, including for biophysical indicators.
- Retain *soum* facilitators (who were essential in interactions between *soum* governors, herders, and EAs) after project life, possibly as consultants, trainers, etc.
- Integrate pasture management plans into the national land-use policy.
- Incorporate herder groups in the biophysical monitoring process.

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 adequately assesses project outcomes and achievements for Component 2 but does not address achievements and outcomes for component 1. Component 1 is rated as moderately satisfactory, but this rating is never discussed or justified.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Several sections are overly brief, and some (e.g. Efficiency) are not in line with TE guidelines. Also, the report is (as noted in the other comments) incomplete, and not always consistent; e.g., it suggests that the lack of synergy between project components was a problem, but never explains why, and in a different section says this was a good thing.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses project sustainability, but once again only for Component 2.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence but no lessons from Component 1 seem to have been drawn.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report contains expected and actual costs for Component 2, but Component 1 is completely ignored.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The evaluation of M&E systems is mostly adequate though not as substantial as it could be.	MS
Overall TE Rating	The TE focused almost exclusively on Component 2. It is unclear why this is the case, as even though GEF did not finance Component 1, it was still part of the overall project endorsed by the GEF CEO, and the ToR for the TE clearly indicate that an evaluation of the overall project was expected, not just Component 2.	MU

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

In addition to the TE, PIRs, and PD, the midterm report from 2014 was consulted in the preparation of this TER.