Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	878
GEF Agency project ID	72076
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-2
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	ADB
Project name	Protected Areas and Wildlife Conservation Project
Country/Countries	Sri Lanka
Region	Asia
Focal area	Biodiversity
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	3- Forest Ecosystems
Executing agencies involved	Department of Wildlife Conservation and the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
NGOs/CBOs involvement	through consultation
Private sector involvement	through consultations
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	7/12/2001
Effectiveness date / project start	09/17/2001
Expected date of project completion (at start)	12/31/2006
Actual date of project completion	12/31/2008

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.33	N/A
	Co-financing	N/A	N/A
GEF Project Grant		10.20	7.90
Co-financing	IA/EA own	12.00	12.20
	Government	8.60	8.20
	Other*	4.00	2.00
Total GEF funding		10.53	7.90
Total Co-financing		24.60	22.40
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		35.13	30.30

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	11/01/2010
TE submission date	N/A
Author of TE	N/A
TER completion date	12/27/2013
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	MS	S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	L	L	L
M&E Design	N/A	MU	MS	MS
M&E Implementation	S	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	S	S	S
Quality of Execution	S	S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			S	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project helps conserve the country's natural resources and biodiversity for the well-being of current and future generations and assist the Government in meeting the country's international commitments and other policy goals for conservation of biodiversity.

Sri Lanka's protected areas (PAs) contain some of the most species-rich and endemic-rich ecosystems in Asia, and include key catchments for major hydro-power and irrigation facilities. PAs provide (i) global benefits by maintaining ecosystems, endemic lineages, species, and higher taxa that are under threat elsewhere, and (ii) national and local benefits by maintaining biodiversity resources and all the use, option, bequest, and existence values associated with them. The protected area system is central in conserving wildlife biodiversity, and in supporting rural economies. It adds to the country's economic and cultural values by providing recreational, ecotourism, scientific, and educational opportunities.

Sri Lanka's high population density, levels of poverty and unemployment, and widespread dependence on subsistence agriculture exert considerable pressure on the country's protected areas. The PAs in Sri Lanka are also surrounded by some of the poorest people in the country. Demand for land, tenure insecurity, and lack of income all make the poorer and more marginalized members of communities close to PAs particularly likely to use protected ecosystems for subsistence resources, in particular farmland, cattle grazing, and fuel wood. The institutions mandated with PA management have not yet developed an effective capacity to respond to this situation, so the wildlife and floral resources of PAs are threatened. Continually increasing demand outside PAs implies that protected ecosystems will be increasingly under pressure in the future.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The goal of the project as defined in the project framework is "enhanced protected area and biodiversity conservation for the benefit of current and future generations". The project document identified three performance targets: (1) sound management achieved by year 3; (2) improved welfare in surrounding communities; and (3) reduced illegal activity. Additionally, the project completion report states that the planned impacts are to (1) enhance the management of the

protected area and the conservation of wildlife resources and biodiversity, and (2) reduce poverty in communities adjacent to seven pilot protected areas.

This project is designed on the premise that these PAs and the services and benefits they provide are not effectively protected due to weak institutions, inadequate resources, lack of managerial skills, low technical capacity throughout sector institutions, and the lack of cooperation between conservation agencies. Greater interagency cooperation is fundamental in strengthening these institutions and developing a strategic approach to addressing conservation priorities. Allowing local communities to be involved in planning their future and interacting with government agencies and the private sector are requisites for effective and sustainable protected area management. Part of this vision involved low-impact use of protected areas and communities and the private sector capturing benefits through ecotourism development.The project comprises the following four components:

(1) strengthening the Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWC) to become a decentralized, credible, and effective department fully able to manage its policy development and operational responsibilities with results; enhancing the DWC's technical capacity to be able to plan and implement complex conservation strategies; establishing ecotourism capacity and services; and establishing informed decision making with effective monitoring and evaluation at all levels.
(2) strengthening the management of seven pilot protected areas by revising management plans and subsequently implementing adaptive management systems, by providing supportive infrastructure and equipment to enable the staff to complete their work effectively, and by expanding ecotourism services and products.
(3) developing collaborative inter-sectoral planning through the preparation of the Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan (BCAP), a conservation system review, and endangered species management.
(4) establishing the Protected Area Conservation Trust, a sustainable financing mechanism for community-conservation inter linkages outside government.

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

Some changes were made to the project in 2001 before loan effectiveness:

(1) The Project Management Unit (PMU) was to be headed by the director general of the DWC to ensure the department's close involvement. A government request that the PMU be headed by a project director outside the DWC was approved.
(2) The protected area conservation trust would have operated in perpetuity with endowment funding. Because the Government of the Netherlands could no longer contribute to such a trust, it was replaced by a fund, the Protected Area Conservation Fund that would fulfill the same project objectives but offer financing only during the project's life.
(3) The third component of the project that sought to develop collaborative inter-sectoral conservation planning was expanded to strengthen the Biodiversity Secretariat with additional consultancy, equipment, and training.

Apart from the major changes approved before loan effectiveness, others were incorporated during implementation:

(1) In December 2002, ADB agreed that in lieu of preparing the Biodiversity Conservation Action Plan (BCAP), addenda would be made to the existing BCAP.

(2) During 2003, the technical assistance consultant inputs were phased to match the DWC's limited absorption capacity.

(3) ADB approved additional project activities in 2003 and 2006 in the Kaudulla and Yala protected areas.

(4) In 2004, the project management reverted to original design, with the director general of the DWC as project director. An Additional Project Director was also appointed.

(5) The mode of procurement for the proposed head office building for the DWC was changed in June 2004 from international competitive bidding to local competitive bidding.

(6) Because the government did not favor recruiting international NGOs for the biodiversity surveys, in 2004, ADB, the GEF, and the Government of the Netherlands agreed to a major change that allowed the TA consultants to undertake the surveys. The 3-yearly repeat survey was abandoned as the lapsed period would be too short to evaluate biodiversity changes.

(7) The DWC was unable to find suitable national NGOs to implement the Protected Area Conservation Fund, therefore consultancy firms were recruited for three Pilot Protected Areas but outputs were unsatisfactory. In 2005, a DWC proposal to engage facilitators to work with Pilot Protected Areas staff on the Protected Area Conservation Fund outreach program was accepted by ADB, effectively internalizing the program.

(8) In 2007 June, recognizing that the project was making good progress, ADB extended it to 31 Dec 2008.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The project is highly relevant to the government's policies on environmental conservation and commitments to international conventions. It conforms to national policies and ADB's country operational strategy for Sri Lanka.

According to the TE, the project was relevant to ADB's 1998 Country Operational Strategy, which included improved management of the natural resource base to ensure long-term sustainability. The project objectives were in line with the 2001 Country Strategy and Program Update, which aimed at sustainable reduction in poverty including the promotion of community-based natural resources management. The project has remained relevant to ADB's Strategy 2020, which espouses natural resource management and environmental protection to sustain long-term economic growth and reduce poverty.

The project is also consistent with the following government policies: (1) the 1995 National Forest Policy, which listed conservation of forests as one of its three main objectives, and (2) the Sri Lanka Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2002), which underscored the importance of conservation and empowering local communities and civil society to play a greater role in natural resource management as an element for poverty reduction.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The effectiveness of the project is rated as satisfactory. The TE mentions that the project achieved the target outcome of strengthening protected area management and developing operational partnerships with local communities and other stakeholders to reduce illegal use of park resources. The project had a slow start, but built momentum from 2004 onwards. Eventually, a stronger organizational structure within the DWC was established to manage protected areas across the

country, although not all newly created posts had been adequately filled by project closing. Delegation of management responsibility to protected areas improved decision making at the field level and contributed to a greater commitment from staff. Almost all proposed outcomes were achieved. Exceptions were the minimal success in engaging the private sector and NGOs in visitor services and ecotourism activities, poorly developed monitoring systems, and the DWC's reluctance to recruit staff from outside the department.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

Overall the project efficiency is rated as satisfactory. According to the TE, financial disbursements were 91% of those foreseen at loan effectiveness. Budgets benefited from exchange rate changes and higher-than-expected community contributions. In the financial analysis, the economic internal rate of return (EIRR) is calculated at 22.5%, compared with 18% at appraisal. This is based on future visitor revenues accruing to the Pilot Protected Areas and does not attempt to include the numerous other positive but unquantifiable biodiversity conservation and other effects generated by the project.

Although the high EIRR suggests that the project was highly efficient, the project efficiency rating is only satisfactory because (1) the high revenue projections are not attributable to project interventions, but to the end of a civil war and the projections for increased tourism; and (2) the efficiency at the executing agency level was initially impaired. The complexity of the project initially exceeded the relatively weak capacity of the DWC, which was understaffed. This contributed to poor performance. References to privatization in the RRP and the involvement of international NGOs were contentious for Sri Lankan wildlife activists and led to a protracted court case, that subsequently led to a 2 year project extension. The project design had set ambitious time targets for complex institutional and legal reforms, and did not recognize that the necessary bureaucratic procedures would be lengthy. All this contributed to a slow start and required several design amendments.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Likely**

The project sustainability can be rated as likely. According to the TE "the project directly strengthened the capacity and resources of the DWC as the agency was better equipped and amenable to implement best practices". The Project Completion Report described in the TE added that many of the project's interventions have been institutionalized within the DWC, including (1) structural reform, (2) devolved management, (3) improved protected area planning and management, (4) regular biodiversity studies, and (5) enhanced visitor services. Such interventions have already had a positive impact on other protected areas. The new DWC head office building

envisaged under the project, but canceled because of legal objections, was later constructed with government funding. This demonstrated government commitment and support. The government's approval for the deposit of 50% of protected area revenues in the Wildlife Preservation Fund for conservation activities was expected to further strengthen field activities, if institutionalized.

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?

Unable to Assess. Apart from the amount of co-financing, no information is available in the TE and final PIR.

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?

Many activities were delayed by up to 2 years. Completion of the project was made possible thanks to an 18-month extension. According to the TE, public interest in and the potential for controversy over wildlife policy and the activities of the DWC were underestimated at the design stage. Antipathy to participation by international NGOs and fears of biopiracy and park privatization generated intense media pressure at the start, encouraged by a minority of vocal wildlife activists. This led to a court case that nearly ruled out a project extension and caused great uncertainty and delay. Compliance with several covenants was delayed. These compliance delays were mainly related to (1) recruitment of cadre, for which the design allowed 6 months from effectiveness but which was achieved only after 4 years; (2) institutional reforms; and (3) preparation of the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance amendments, which took 7 years rather than the 1 year envisaged in the project design. The late project start contributed to those compliance delays but most were not within the DWC's control. The projected time frames were unrealistic and did not anticipate how long it might take to gain approvals at each stage and from each institution. The ordinance revisions entailed a lengthy, iterative process and frequent changes to accommodate strong public interest and opinions. Each amendment had to be referred to the legal draftsman's office and took several months to be endorsed. Partial compliance of covenants in some cases is due to inconsistencies between government recruitment procedures and those expected by the covenant.

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:

Among the many issues the project sought to address were institutional reform, protected area management, ecotourism, community outreach, research and biodiversity baseline surveys, and scientific outputs on national biodiversity. This complexity initially exceeded the relatively weak capacity of the DWC, which was understaffed. Early changes in ministerial responsibilities, in the DWC staff, and in the government's project management arrangements contributed to a lack of

ownership by the DWC and poor performance. The changes in the DWC's host ministry and the posting of a project director from outside the department disrupted efforts in the early years and enhanced the lack of ownership. However, with time the DWC, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, and the Biodiversity Secretariat took more ownership of the project and learned ADB's procedures which allowed them to have better performances.

Additionally, sharing tourism revenue with the government and the Wildlife Preservation Fund (WPF), as encompassed in a loan covenant, has helped encourage a sense of ownership among important stakeholders. Moreover, designating WPF resources to benefit communities in surrounding areas has given them a further sense of involvement.

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**

According to the TE the project monitoring was undertaken by the Project Management Unit but a comprehensive M&E system was not developed at entry. Little information was found in the Project Document about M&E of the project. A lot of information was available about monitoring of the different outputs, indicators were defined (especially in Component A), but an M&E system to monitor and evaluate the project itself was not comprehensively developed. Therefore M&E design at Entry is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

According to the PD, the GEF grant was intended to contribute to the independent monitoring of project impacts on wildlife survival and ecosystem integrity. The GEF grant was supposed to support a monitoring and evaluation system that operates at the two independent levels of project specificity and PA specificity. As mentioned in the PD, monitoring systems are integral to the MIS, reporting arrangements, lines of accountability, and incentive mechanisms to be established by the project within DWLC. They generate a database of organized knowledge on the performance of all aspects of DWLC. Monitoring and reporting arrangements would be complemented by impact assessments every two years of the Project as a whole, with assistance from a consortium of two NGOs, one oriented to conservation and one to community development. Impact assessment would assess the status and trends applicable to all major resources of the pilot PAs, the suitability and sustainability of PA management and community strengthening and partnership-building arrangements, the integrity of PA managers and the degree of stakeholder participation in resource management decisions. A publicly available report would be prepared within two months of the end of each assessment.

The monitoring of the different outputs and impacts on the environment was mentioned and well defined. Each of the four components of the project includes a provision for monitoring and evaluation. For example, component A aims at "(iv) establishing informed decision making with effective monitoring and evaluation at all levels". Additionally, some of the components comprises a part called Strengthening Technical Capacity, that according to the PD aims at " (ii) establishing a strong monitoring and evaluation team that will focus on field operations and adaptive management of field programs" . Another sub component of component A is "Strengthening Wildlife Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation". This subcomponent would strengthen DWLC's capacity to systematically monitor biodiversity in the PAs under its mandate. A management-driven impact monitoring program, established under the project, was ultimately expected to track overall national trends in wildlife resources and their utilization through site-specific monitoring. Recognizing the complex interactions between human society, the economy, and the wildlife ecosystem, the monitoring program would concentrate on the generation of information that is directly applicable to the planning and management of PAs. Initially, the monitoring program would concentrate on developing appropriate monitoring and evaluation protocols in the pilot PAs and harmonizing these with the Project's management information system (MIS). Institutional development and DWLC staff training in the management of the wildlife monitoring and evaluation system were integral activities of this subcomponent. Assistance in implementing this subcomponent would be provided by a consortium of reputable international NGOs with expertise in conservation and community mobilization, and substantial field-based experience in Asia.

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

Little information is available on how the M&E system was implemented. The TE mentions that formal monitoring was carried out by 13 review missions, and that the Protected Area Conservation Fund regularly monitored the outreach program.

According to the TE, there is little mention of M&E in project reports over the early years of the project. However, the TE mentions a project report written in November 2006 indicating that "M&E, on the financial, physical, and process, needs to be strengthened. A participatory M&E system, involving the community, park staff, and other governmental agencies needs to be developed". This was rather late in the project period to be suggesting new systems. The M&E system was described in the PD, but may not have been detailed enough and therefore can be only rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

Baseline socioeconomic and biodiversity surveys were completed at project closure. Monitoring the effectiveness of environmental outputs was difficult in the short term because habitat mapping and the BBSs were completed for all the PPAs only 8 years after the project began.

The PACF unit of the PMU monitored the project activities continuously and submitted monthly and annual progress reports, which made use of inputs from the field facilitators. The PACF accounts

were audited annually. These provide a good indication of the status of each subproject. The regional grants review committees and the national grants review committee met regularly to process requests for grants.

According to the TE, the project would have benefited from regular updating of the design and monitoring framework and monitoring against framework objectives.

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: **Satisfactory**

The project was implemented by ADB. The project was supervised by the Sri Lanka Resident Mission, which liaised closely with the implementation agency. In total, ADB sent 13 review missions over the 7-year implementation period, with two or more missions in most years, highlighting the ability of resident missions to provide close supervision. There were only two project officers over the entire project period, a significant benefit in terms of continuity. ADB was flexible in allowing changes to design, supported by its co-financiers. Disbursement of funds was managed efficiently and there were no disagreements with the executing agency

According to the TE, the borrower appreciated ADB's flexibility in permitting alternative strategies to overcome contentious differences over implementation that threatened project progress. However, ADB's performance had some shortcomings. According to the TE, (1) there was a need for more missions during the initial project stages and stronger technical inputs to help identify and resolve problems earlier, (2) a tight monitoring during the project's last 6 months slowed implementation; and (3) the initial adverse reaction to the project from the Sri Lanka NGO sector on what it said were major flaws in the project's design was blamed on ADB.

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

The project execution can be rated as satisfactory. The DWC was initially short of staff, subjected to three changes in its host ministry, and initially showed lack of ownership, which constrained project performance. The DWC failed to make office space available to consultants, which had a negative impact on their relationship. The performance of the DWC, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, and the Biodiversity Secretariat improved as they took more ownership of the project and learned ADB procedures. According to the TE, their performance was only partly satisfactory during the project's first 2 years, but by closure, it was satisfactory.

This lack of performance in the first years is due to a lack of support needed by DWC from its ministry to launch such a complex undertaking. In 2002, the MENR became the host ministry for all implementing agencies, facilitating collaboration between the DWC, BDS, and PACF. However, decision making and action remained slow, and in late 2003, ADB raised the possibility of loan suspension. The project management structure was changed as a result and progress improved dramatically from 2004 with field staff committed to the project and its objectives. The outreach program went smoothly after field staffing issues were resolved. It performed well under the MENR despite the failure to appoint a deputy director. Most covenants were complied with, though some were partial and some late, including the delayed appointment of managers and staff. According to the TE, poor performance over the first 3 years of the project is more than counterbalanced by improved performance from then to project closure.

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 TE identified the following lessons:

(1) Reference to international NGOs and public–private partnerships in the project documents provoked local wildlife activists and politicians, resulting in project delays. This could have been avoided by exerting wider efforts in pre-project public relations.
(2) Launching a complex project through the DWC, a small organization faced with structural reform, was overambitious. A two-phased approach would have been preferable.
(3) Loan covenants underestimated the time required for government to amend the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance and establish institutional reform.
(4) Introducing large numbers of TA consultants into an understaffed DWC resulted in inefficient use of consultancy expertise.

(5) The outreach program became more sustainable by being implemented by the executing agency's own staff than it would have been by recruiting outside NGOs, who would have left when the project closed.
(6) Delegation of powers to the field enhanced protected area management but also increased the importance of self-motivated protected area leadership.
(7) Government bureaucratic cultures and limitations should be recognized in setting up project implementation and monitoring mechanisms. Government institutional cultures are often not attuned to project needs. More emphasis could have been given to the staffing of the PMU, perhaps by including more individuals from outside government and, importantly, a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) specialist.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE gives a number of recommendations:

(1) The DWC should repeat the biodiversity studies in PPAs every 10 years from 2016 onwards to assess changes. The BDS is conducting the threatened species Red List studies every 5 years.
(2) The DWC should urgently fill the protected area management director post and the vacant facilitator positions to maintain the momentum of the community outreach program.
(3) Copies of relevant management plans should be retained in each PPA.
(4) The Ministry of Environment should urgently fill the vacant deputy director post at BDS.
(5) Further strengthening of the institutions involved in wildlife conservation is desirable.

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?	Outcomes and impacts are assessed in details in the TE. A lot of information and details are provided.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidence is complete and convincing. Ratings are also provided for each category.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is assessed, and references to previous documents and information are mentioned.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned mainly come from the Project Completion report, and are supported by the evidences given in the TE.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	There is little information on project costs per activity, and very little information on cofinancing and impact of cofinancing in the project performance.	**MU**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Very little information on M&E is available; however this is mainly due to a lack of M&E system in the project. The TE did not have much to describe.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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