

# Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4514	
GEF Agency project ID		GFSAF 11004 – GFSAF11A04 – GFSAF11B04	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Greening the COP17 in Durban	
Country/Countries		South Africa	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CCM-1; CCM-3; CCM-4	
Executing agencies involved		The Department of Environmental Affairs, Government of South Africa and Energy Office in Durban Municipality ( eThekweni Municipality)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		One of the beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		5/11/2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		7/1/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2012	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.00	0.97
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.95	
	Government	0.40	
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		1.00	0.97
Total Co-financing		1.35	1.46
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.35	2.43
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/30/2012	
TE submission date		09/30/2013	
Author of TE		Mr. Gcobane Quvile	
TER completion date		07/02/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	HL	L	L
M&E Design	N/A	HS	HS	S
M&E Implementation	N/A	HS	HS	S
Quality of Implementation	N/A	HS	S	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report				MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of this project is to reduce the carbon footprint of the COP17 in Durban, and to extend its results to others events. This project will use COP17 as a vehicle for demonstration of low carbon approaches to events, transportation, etc. that could be replicated in the future with other projects.

In line with global efforts to combat climate change and promote green economy, the Government of South Africa through its Department of Environment (DEA) has developed comprehensive National Greening Framework and Guidelines in 2010, which aim at assisting host cities to mitigate environmental, social, and economic impacts of organizing international / global events. In line with these guidelines, during the 2010 FIFA World Cup, a Green Goal programme was implemented that primarily focused on promoting clean energy technologies; low carbon urban transport and mobility; landscaping and biodiversity; green building, sustainable lifestyles and responsible tourism; and green goal communications. This Green Goal programme, that was funded by GEF and implemented by UNEP, contributed to the reduction of the environmental footprint of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. It was further expected that activities under this programme would influence greening of future large international events, besides acting as a catalyst for national greening strategy and promoting the value of responsible environmental management. The results from the evaluation of key activities implemented under the Green Goal programme were very encouraging, and led to the commitment by the South African Government to partner with GEF and UNIDO to promote and scale up some of the activities under the National Greening programme during the COP17. According to the PD, this programme forms an integral part of South Africa's response to the challenges of global climate change and its pursuit of a more sustainable growth and development agenda. The Government of South Africa is particularly keen to engage other stakeholders, in particular the private sector, in efforts to green COP 17. In this connection, the Government of South Africa approached UNIDO to assist with the development of a GEF MSP project to assist in the greening of COP17 in Durban.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Greening the COP17 Project implemented through UNIDO targets interventions in and around the City of Durban as the hosting venue for COP17 and intends to showcase best practices under the

National Greening Programme and the South Africa–GEF partnership in line with current national development priorities and policies. The main intended outcome is that COP17 will not only build on initiatives developed and experience gained during the Greening of the FIFA 2010 World Cup, but also will emphasize South Africa’s national priorities and GEF’s commitment to promote them through renewable energy (RE) and energy efficiency (EE) technologies as measures to reduce the carbon footprint of the COP17 event. The project will also demonstrate, through this international forum, South Africa’s commitment to climate change mitigation and adaptation and the value of its partnership with GEF in this respect. This will be achieved through the raising of awareness on low carbon technologies and green practices among COP delegates and local communities in and around Durban as well as for the country as a whole.

There are two clear and well-articulated broad objectives underpinning the project:

- (1) Lowering the ecological footprint of the COP17 in Durban, South Africa and
- (2) Showcasing targeted activities under the National Greening Programme and the South Africa–GEF Partnership.

To achieve these objectives, the project has four distinct components:

- Component 1: Communications and Awareness Raising
- Component 2: Innovative Technology Competition for Small and Medium Enterprises
- Component 3: Low Carbon Public Transportation
- Component 4: Solar Water Heater Emission Offset to Support Health Clinics

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

There were changes in the original project design with regards to Component 4. This component originally entailed the supply and installation of SWHs only in rural clinics. However the supply of stoves and LED lighting was incorporated into the design of the project, including two schools as beneficiaries. According to the TE, this was to showcase possible solutions relevant for the rural households in line with the SWHs that were being retrofitted onto community health facilities. That increased the interest and awareness of the people in climate change issues.

#### **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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The Project was relevant in that it tied well with South Africa government's climate change imperatives and interventions, as well as UNIDO's and GEF's Focal Areas.

The Project was made to complement and integrate into the South African policy frameworks and interventions that were underway to combat climate change and promote the green economy. Therefore, the Project was relevant to South Africa in that it aligned to relevant policies and interventions.

The Project was relevant to UNIDO in that the organization "is a specialized agency with the mandate to promote [sustainable] industrial development in the world's developing and least developed nations". UNIDO supports patterns of energy use that mitigate climate change and are environmentally sustainable, and promotes access to clean energy for productive activities. This effort involves promoting energy efficiency and energy management standards, as well as supporting the adoption of renewable energy sources in the industrial sector. Moreover, the Project was aligned to the UN's Secretary General's flagship initiative *SE4ALL* that envisages universal access to sustainable energy.

The project was relevant to GEF because the funding organization was established as "the largest public funder worldwide of projects aiming to generate global environmental benefits, while supporting national sustainable development initiatives" and because the funding agency was already in partnership with South Africa. Since joining the GEF, South Africa received GEF grants totaling US\$108,138,421 that leveraged US\$725,859,645 in co-financing resources for 31 national projects. These include 16 projects in biodiversity, 12 in climate change, two multi-focal area projects, and one in persistent organic pollutants. Some of these were even showcased during COP17 as part of Component 1.

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The effectiveness of the project is rated Satisfactory as the objectives and planned results of the Project were achieved.

The statements by policy makers, e.g., Minister of Energy on the GEF-SA partnership and Minister of Environmental Affairs on the Greening project, do show that the greening COP17 project served as a platform for showcasing the GEF-SA partnerships and the achievements by the various projects. The feedback from both the public and private sectors was positive. In particular, the general public in KZN fully appreciated GEF efforts under the SWH component, in particular the fact that efforts to address global environmental issues do also bring local and direct benefits through the SWHs, improved cook-stoves, etc. Communities in KwaDukuza also came to realize that GEF partners with South Africa in addressing their local issues, i.e., the efforts of GEF are in line with local sustainable development needs.

The key beneficiaries of the project were as follows:

- The government benefitted from the technical assistance provided by UNIDO through the project, pilot projects that can be replicated and scaled up, capacity and knowledge base gained that will lead themselves to future events;
- Small enterprises benefitted through the Cleantech Competition in the form of prize money (for the winners) and technical support through mentorship and advice;
- The rural clinics and schools benefitted from the installation of SWHs, LED lighting and knowledge and appreciation of Climate Change
- The community at large benefited through knowledge gained as a result of awareness-raising on Climate Change, jobs that were created through the projects (employment created in the installation of SWHs, etc), capacity building (training of volunteers, etc.), and the cycle infrastructure.

Whilst all four Components were constrained by time, Component 2, the Cleantech Competition, was the most affected. Unlike the other three components that complemented already ongoing interventions and strategic frameworks, the Cleantech Competition was a new initiative that very much needed enough time to take root; needless to say the Component earnestly began in August 2011 culminating in the Award Ceremony in December 2011 (5 months – translating to minimal time to invite entries and sponsorship). In comparison, the Cleantech International Competition on the other hand starts in March, culminating in November (10 months). However, despite these shortcomings, the only target that was not met was attracting private sector sponsorship. Component 4 results are positive in that the targets as set out in the project design were exceeded – additional 2 schools were added as beneficiaries of SWHs, and up to 30 households in the vicinity of Groutville Clinic were equipped with smokeless cook-stoves and Solar LED lighting.

According to the TE, the successful organization of the SA Cleantech competition, the uptake of green Passports, the use of bicycles during the COP17, the many high-level events organized during COP17 with high number of participants and media from around the world, etc. resulted in great impact of the project outputs not only within South Africa but around the world.

This positive impact has been instrumental in the development of two new projects in South Africa; GEF UNIDO Cleantech Programme for SMEs in South Africa and Promotion of Energy Efficient and Low-Carbon Transport Contributing to Low-Carbon Cities Initiative of South Africa

4.3 <b>Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The efficiency of the project is rated as Satisfactory because the activities were achieved within the planned timeframes despite the time constraints placed on the Project. This was largely due to ownership, commitment, and cooperation of stakeholders.

General feedback from key stakeholder informants to the Terminal Evaluator was that the Project was constrained in terms of time available for implementation. However, feedback from the anchor counterpart department (the DEA) is that resources had been tied up in the project closing activities of the FIFA 2010 World Cup, which continued well into 2011. As such the planning for the Project could not have started earlier as the resources would have had to be migrated to the COP17 projects. Despite the time constraints, the key informants lauded the support of the National Project Manager and the DEA and the cooperation of local authorities in achieving the deliverables under these challenging circumstances. In fact these factors (support and cooperation) proved to be the key success factors of the Project as attested by all the stakeholders.

Overall the project objectives were achieved within set timeframes and budget.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Likely</b>
--------------------	-----------------------

The project aimed at greening the COP17 in South Africa. The sustainability of this project can be rated based on the lessons learned and the replication possibilities. To be sustainable this project has to ensure that the lessons learned will impact future events, through information and knowledge sharing. Overall, the sustainability of the project is rated as Likely, with little risk to project outcomes.

Financial risks: The Project was linked with existing government interventions and policies. Government departments have budgets in place to implement projects that fall under their specific mandate. GEF and UNIDO have shown interest and are engaging with various government departments and other stakeholders in implementing legacy projects. There are other funding/donor agencies like KfW that have shown commitment in working with government on sustainable integrated transport infrastructure.

Socio-political risks: The government has legislation, various policies and strategic frameworks under which the project should be implemented. The drivers for these are not just environmental factors but also sustainable social redress. Political support seems to be strong. However, the socio-economic conditions in South Africa are not always favorable for the promotion of sustainable transport solutions that work elsewhere.

Institutional framework and governance risks: There are various implementation agencies of government that can implement the various legacy projects from the specific Components. There is also legislation that underpins the mandate and funding instruments of these institutions.

Environmental risks: There are none envisaged. The very nature of the legacy projects would be address environmental concerns.

## **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?

Key partners of this project included the German KfW Development Bank on the non-motorized transport programme and IndaloYethu on the development of the Green Passport. Furthermore Phillips sponsored the cook-stoves and LED lights. The cooperation from all partners on the greening programme led to the successful implementation of greening COP17. It also led to the hosting of three successful side events and print media publications.

The only co-financing expectation that was not met was the private sector sponsorship of the Cleantech Competition for reasons previously outlined (time constraints). However, this did not affect the outcomes or sustainability of the project as there are discussions (post-COP17) by relevant stakeholders on the relevant sustainable model for promoting clean technology innovation amongst SMEs in particular.

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?

According to the TE, although the Project was constrained by time, the deadlines for deliverables were met owing to excellent integration, stakeholder involvement and ownership.

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:

According to the TE, the success of these activities hinged upon the full support of the project by the Government of South Africa. Having hosted the FIFA 2010 World Cup and taken stock of the public support thereof, the government was extremely keen to make the greening of COP17 part of the activities to make the COP17 a "People's COP". The anchor counterpart government department, Department of Environmental Affairs, chaired the Project Steering Committee meetings thereby ensuring that the Government was on top of the project implementation process. As such the uptake and ownership was extremely high. In particular, the integrated planning between the national government, the provincial government and the local government arms ensured that the various interventions are in line with the very needs at the local level. The PSC was inclusive of stakeholders from the point of views of decision-making, implementation, and progress monitoring. The roles of

stakeholders were also spelt out very well in the PSC Rules. Over and above this, stakeholder interaction and collaboration protocol was adhered to.

## 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	-----------------------------

According to the TE, the M&E was well incorporated in the log-frame, there was a budgeted allocation specifically for Project Management and M&E. Best practice in project design requires objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) to be 'SMART' i.e. specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. The OVIs set out, while specifically not time bound, are implicitly so in terms of the time frame of the project. The means of verification for each of the indicators are well identified and defined.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------	-----------------------------

The implementation of M&E during Project implementation was done through the Project Steering Committee. According to the TE, the PSC implemented the M&E system in a satisfactory way. The TE also notes that "there is no indication that the mid-term evaluation on the project took place during the project implementation phase" (pg. 13). Most of the activities were concentrated in the early part of the project period, September to December 2011, during that period, the PSC convened three meetings that carried out detailed implementation progress reports of each of the components, therefore the TE states that those meeting might have replaced a formal MTE during implementation. The mid-term evaluation report was scheduled for July 2012, after the COP17 event.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

UNIDO was selected as the GEF Implementing Agency involved in this project and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) was the main client and local counterpart. According to the TE, the PD indicates that there was extensive engagement amongst UNIDO, GEF and the government in preparation of the Project. It also indicates that due diligence entailing stakeholder identification and roles, implementation risks and mitigation, etc. was conducted

The UNIDO PMU of the Project was deemed to have been supportive and effective by stakeholders. Project Management and implementation structure was such that it catered for the specific requirements of each Project Component.

Feedback from stakeholders, as reported by the Terminal Evaluation, overwhelmingly suggests that the National Project Manager's involvement and support in resolving challenges was appreciated. However, even though UNIDO led the planning of Legacy Projects, e.g., SE4ALL Pilot Projects in KZN, RIO+20 presentations, etc., there was disappointment that UNIDO became absent after the COP17 event. In fact there was eagerness that UNIDO's technical support would be beneficial in the implementation and up-scaling of legacy projects.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---	-----------------------------

As stated in the PD, a Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established under the Chairmanship of DEA. Its members were the Department of Energy, the Department of Trade and Industry, the eThekweni Municipality, and UNIDO. Representatives from institutions involved in the different project components such as NCPC-SA managed by and located at the CSIR, and the Local Government of the KZN Province, could be represented in an observer capacity. The GEF Focal Point for South Africa could also be represented in the PSC in an observer status. A Project Management Unit (PMU) consisting of National Project Manager (NPM) and a Project Administrative Assistant (PAA) under UNIDO acted as the Secretariat of the PSC and referred to as the Project Management Office (PMO). Operating as an entity, the PMO was responsible for the day-to-day management, monitoring and evaluation of project activities as in the agreed project work plan. The PMO coordinated all project activities being carried out by project national experts and partners. It was also in charge of the organization of awareness-raising, sensitization and the seminars and training to be carried out under Project. For each of the four project components, an advisory working group was established to ensure broad participatory approach.

The management of specific components of the project differed slightly from component to component depending on nature of the component and the foreseen post-COP17 event legacy projects. This also

depended on the level of commitment and the respective responsibilities of the counterpart government departments. The counterpart departments were therefore co-opted accordingly; the PSC, through the DEA, wrote to the departments and outlined their specific responsibilities:

Component 1 - There was more direct involvement of the PMU in the implementation of the activities of Communications and Awareness Raising component, especially the showcasing of the GEF-SA partnership. This could be cited as the highest level of PMU involvement in the management of a project component.

Component 2 - In the case of Innovative Technology Competition for Small and Medium Enterprises (Cleantech South Africa Competition) the PMU employed a Project Manager on a year's contract and seconded him to the hosting institution. The PMU was however still responsible for oversight and thus accountable for all the deliverables.

Component 3 – With regards to the Low Carbon Public Transportation (Non- Motorized Transport) component, the hosting institution – eThekweni, took the lead whilst the PMU's role was reduced to monitoring and reporting progress as well as allocating resources that had been agreed, such as a consultant for the bicycle security and management systems as well as the bicycles themselves.

Component 4 - The Solar Water Heater Emission Offset to Support Health Clinics component was contracted to a service provider, but closely monitored by the PMU and counterpart, KZN Health Department.

## **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.

The lessons learned with respect to this project are as follows:

- Various renewable energy technologies can play a central role in increasing access to modern energy services;
- Renewable energy and energy efficient technologies can be effectively deployed in grid-connected areas thereby improving the quality of lives, delivering local and global environmental benefits, creating green jobs, etc.;
- Beyond the pilot, business models will have to be employed for the greater replication of this initiative, and
- The energy challenge is huge and it needs to be addressed with a high sense of urgency.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations reported in the TE are given per project's component:

### **Component 1**

- (1) The database of the trained Environmental Volunteers must be kept and maintained by the eThekweni Municipality so as to have them accessible for other upcoming events
- (2) Climate change publicity and outreach campaigns must continue beyond the event to ensure that awareness in this regard is maintained.
- (3) Government, in particularly the DEA and DoE, must work very closely with local government in ensuring that even at very local levels climate change finds its voice.
- (4) For the campaigns, social corporate responsibility programmes of various media organizations as well as non-media organizations may be tapped into for sponsorships.
- (5) Publicity campaigns targeting schools can be more efficient in that these will complement climate change content which is still in its infancy in curricula. Engagement with the Department of Education in this regard may lead to projects/programmes around climate change awareness-raising.

## **Component 2**

A viable and sustainable business model, together with the institutional arrangements, that can promote and support innovation in clean technologies must be explored.

## **Component 3**

- (1) The Mayoral Office of the City of Durban should take the initiative to determine the modalities of a bicycle hire system in the City and while the viability of this was showcased and proven during COP17, UNIDO could formulate a legacy project that will replicate the NMT to other settings while learning from the Durban experience.
- (2) The business model and modalities of the bicycle-hire system must be investigated with the aim of broader implementation in the City. It is recommended that UNIDO, together with potential funders like KfW, engage the City and the Department of Transport on how to take the bicycle-hire system forward.

## **Component 4**

- (1) A mechanism for rollout of SWHs, cook-stoves and LED lighting with any new housing schemes that are proposed must be considered. UNIDO and GEF should explore this possibility with the Department of Energy (DOE) and the relevant local government authorities responsible for human settlement and town planning.
- (2) UNIDO should indicate its role in the legacy projects like SE4ALL through committing human resources through the Service Summary Sheet (SSS) to pilot projects. The other partners seem to be ready to engage and have ready resources that they are willing to commit to a co-financing arrangement involving UNIDO and GEF.
- (3) New partnerships that bring on board various stakeholders that include the private sector, political leadership, multilateral organizations and funding mechanisms, local communities, etc., should be established in the global campaign to increase access to energy.
- (4) Beyond the pilot, business models will have to be employed for the greater replication of this initiative

- (5) Local industry should be brought on board to support the up-scaling of this idea by way of local manufacture of the technologies

## 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)

To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The outcomes and achievements are assessed in details. However some information is missing,	<b>S</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence is mostly complete and convincing. And the report is consistent. However as stated above, some evidence could be a bit more detailed e.g. the emission reduction amounts	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability of the project is assessed and justified. However, this part is very short and more details and evidence are needed.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are well described and detailed, however, some lessons are not strongly supported by evidence.	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Costs are listed in the annex, but there is no efficiency or cost effectiveness analysis.	<b>MU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	M&E system is assessed in detail. The TE describes the M&E system at entry as well as the implementation.	<b>S</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

TE rating =  $(.3*(5+4)) + (.1*(4+4+3+5)) = 4.3 = \text{MS}$

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