

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		01/27/2010
GEF Project ID:	2237		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	85	GEF financing:	1	1 *
Project Name:	Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation Through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya (CIP)	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Kenya	Government:	0.25	0.25
		Other*:	2	2.2
		Total Cofinancing	2.25	2.45
Operational Program:	Forest Ecosystems (OP3)	Total Project Cost:	3.25	3.45*
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	ICIPE, Forestry Department, NEMA, IFAD, Viking Limited	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		6/16/2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: 7/31/2008	Actual: 12/31/2008
Prepared by: Tommaso Balbo di Vinadio	Reviewed by: Ines Angulo	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 52	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 4
Author of TE: Oliver Chapeyama		TE completion date: 06/2008	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months):

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	NA	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	S	NA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	S	NA	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	NA	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

* It should be noted that at the time when the TE was conducted the project was not finished yet and there was a positive balance in the GEF expenditures

Yes. The TE is clear, and evidence-based.
 It should be mentioned that in the TE the achievement of objectives is rated HS in one table but S in another one.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
 There is no mention of such instances in the TE.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the project document, the project global environmental objective is “to improve the conservation of national protected area system of forest reserves in Kenya”, which will be achieved “through improved incentives for real collaborative forest management with communities”

As per the information provided in the terminal evaluation report, there were no changes in the global environmental objective of the project during project implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

The development objective of this project was “to demonstrate in three different forest sites that the biodiversity of Kenya’s forest protected area system can be maintained through collaborative management systems using incentives based on income from commercial insects”. According to the project document this generic objective was made of two different but complementary outcomes:

1) “The conservation of forest-protected areas is supported through improved buffer zone management with the involvement of local communities.

2) Methodologies and capacities to improve the livelihoods of forest adjacent communities that are based on commercial use of insect resources are developed, linked to forest habitats and scaled-up”.

According to the TE, there was no change in the project objectives.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
The project is consistent with the objectives related to the GEF Biodiversity focal area (OP3 - Forest Ecosystems). It is also consistent with COP guidance under the CBD1 by promoting capacity building, especially the local communities, generating off farm employment, creating local business capacity through construction of hives, rearing cages, and related appliances for rearing and harvesting of silk moth and honeybees.	

¹ Including new guidance from COP 7 (Malaysia 2004) on Protected Areas and on Sustainable Use.

According to the TE, the project is relevant to Kenya as it was designed in response to major problems that were affecting the conservation of forest resources. The project addresses in fact pertinent national conservation priorities as identified in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, which stresses the value of natural closed forests for both biodiversity and for ecological services.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

According to the TE, “the project has contributed to the improvement of the management and conservation of critical ecosystems in the three focus areas in Kenya. This process has resulted in increased realization of both national and global environmental benefits”.

The main development objective was achieved as the project was able to demonstrate in the three different forest sites that the biodiversity of Kenya’s forest protected area system can be maintained through collaborative management systems. The TE states that in all the three project sites community groups are reducing their dependence on forestry resources resulting in improvements in selected biodiversity indicators. Incomes from the use of commercial insects such as wild silk moth and African honeybees have increased and that provides a major incentive to community groups encouraging them to desist from exploiting the forest resources. Moreover, communities have committed themselves to working with forestry management authorities to rehabilitate degraded forests through tree planting activities. On-farm tree planting programs have also been embarked upon resulting in the creation of effective buffer zones around protected forests.

It should be noted that a major project shortcoming was the lack of baseline data against which the achievement of objectives should be assessed. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence that the project achieved its main objective and the forest adjacent communities at the three project sites are involved in the silk and honey production technologies and their capacity are continually being built for sustainability. According to the PIR08 “the success of the approach is witnessed by the high number of local people who are participating in the initiatives and the related forest management activities”. The PIR08 notes that project has met the majority of its targets and, in some cases has very significantly exceeded the targets – particularly with regard to capacity building.

The following are the specific achievements regarding the first outcome listed in 3.1 b:

- Forest resource surveys conducted in Kilifi with 20 VDFCCs in place. Dida draft management plan (Arabuko) in place. Mabuwani Group in Arabuko has raised more than 38,000 seedlings for planting. Mapping also done in Mwingi, and planting of up to 10 hectares of forest land in Nnu and Muthaito areas. It should be noted that even though the project target for this objective was to draft 3 management plan it is not clear from the TE whether that was achieved completely. However, the PIR08 states that finalization of the Forest Management Plans, the formal registration of the 11 Community Forest Associations are underway.

Other activities related to the first outcome were: wild silk moth and bee surveys conducted in all three forest areas and data published in technical reports and international journals.

Regarding the second outcome, the following are the major achievements:

- Forest Associations formed in all target villages and
- Most community groups visited are beginning to realize income from commercial insects and realizing the value of protected forests

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: S

The project was to be implemented over a four-year period with a project completion date of August 2008. A no cost extension for the project to December 2008 was approved in March 2008.

According to the TE, the project yielded very impressive results in the past four years. At the time when the TE was completed the project had also an overall positive balance of 108,253 in the GEF expenditures.

It should be noted that the success achieved by the project attracted additional funding during the course of implementation. The Toyota Environmental Activities Grant Programme contributed a total of US\$ 149,424 towards Capacity Building for Organic Certification in Mwingi District over the period January 2007 to December 2008.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

In terms of long-term results on the ground the TE states that it takes a long time for biodiversity improvements to be realized from project interventions. “The four year timeframe that the CIP has been implemented over is hardly adequate for the determination of direct and quantifiable benefits on the ground”.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1=

Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
<p>One of the lessons learned according to the TE is that projects like this one that are implemented over short time periods run the risk of being unsustainable over the long term as funding usually comes to an end before results are institutionalized. There is therefore a need for original project proposals for such projects to build in provisions for support beyond projected project lives to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>The financial risk is mentioned several times in the TE as potential risk if the project does not find alternatives to ensure the continued flow of resources. However, the TE states that Kenya has already a number of financial mechanisms that are available to support various sectors of the community.</p> <p>Moreover, all community groups that have started receiving benefits from project activities have confirmed that they will be willing to continue with their project activities without support from outside. Therefore, the provision for communities realizing economic and social benefits that enable them to reduce their dependence on forest goods and services will also contribute to the sustainability of this initiative.</p> <p>The project was able to maintain markets due to the high quality of its products through linking producer communities with the market through Viking Limited and also working towards certification of the silk and honey products.</p>	
b. Socio political	Rating: ML
<p>A potential threat to the project is the fact that not all community members are participants in the project activities that are currently under implementation. According to the TE, there is therefore a socio-political threat to the sustainability of these projects that emanates from the potential for non-participating community members claiming their rights over the common resources. It is important therefore that benefit-sharing mechanisms that adequately compensate all community members are designed and implemented in the project areas. Yet, the TE states that this threat is being mitigated through the deployment of trainers to work with non-participating communities.</p>	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
<p>The TE states that there is a need of an exit strategy, which will allow organizations that are better placed to work with community groups to finalize the process of product certification as well as develop markets for the products.</p> <p>In this regard, the project appears to have already established local level project management institutions that are run by community groups themselves to manage project activities. All the project sites visited demonstrated local ownership of processes with a number of communities displaying capabilities for the design and management of meetings, visitor tours and projects in general.</p> <p>Those activities are complemented by training in project management and organizational development that prepare community groups to take over the management of programs into the future</p> <p>According to PIR08 ICIPE should retain the role of technical advisors.</p>	
d. Environmental	Rating: L
<p>The environmental sustainability seems to be likely. The TE notes that as a result of the implementation of the project, the incentives the project is providing to participating communities and the benefits they are realizing have engendered increased concern for conservation of biodiversity among these communities</p>	

4.3 Catalytic role

a.. Production of a public good
<p>This project aims at creating new knowledge and technologies for the generation of incentives for communities to reduce their dependence on biodiversity resources of the forests at the three project sites. Farmers were trained on management of apiculture and sericulture technologies, conservation of forests and improvement on their local environment through tree planting and sustainable utilization of locally available natural resources</p>
b.. Demonstration
<p>This project was able to demonstrate in three different forest sites that the biodiversity of Kenya's forest protected area system can be maintained through collaborative management systems using incentives based on income from commercial insects. Therefore, the link between the provision of incentives and improved biodiversity conservation has been shown.</p>
c.. Replication
<p>According to the TE, the project has now been replicated at both local and regional levels and presents huge potential for up-scaling. Already, there is evidence that community members that have not participated in projects before are making enquiries as to how they can join successful projects or form their own. Project management needs to follow up</p>

on these and incorporate them into the larger initiative. Already, ICIPE has started implementing similar projects in Uganda and southern Sudan.

d.. Scaling up

Although there were no examples of scaling up during implementation, the TE mentions that this project presents huge potential for it.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

According to the TE, GEF contribution and additional co-financing was essential as otherwise the project objectives would not have been met. Specifically, GEF funded the creation of Forest Associations and capacity building activities resulting in the creation of strong institutions that are now contributing to the improved conservation of forest reserves thereby contributing to the achievement of global environmental benefits.

The following are other sources of co-financing according to the TE:

- (a) ICIPE's in-kind contribution to the project is estimated at US\$ 200,000, which has provided training and research that has benefitted the project beneficiaries through positioning them to effectively manage project interventions.
- (b) Viking Ltd Kenya Viking contributed US\$ 100,000 to the project on the piloting of product marketing, and has developed linkages at Kakamega and Mwingi. Through the "Best of Kenya" marketing initiative, Viking has identified a market for 10,000 bottles of Mwingi honey through the Farmers Choice chain of stores.
- (c) IFAD provided US\$ 1,400,000 co-finance, towards the survey, documentation and testing of bee and silk-moth races, quality selection and testing, inputs to product quality and market development.
- (d) Nature Kenya (with funding via USAID) provided support to the community of the Arabuko-Sokoke Forests in nature-based enterprise (US\$ 150,000) and support to Participatory Forest Management and Management Plan implementation in Arabuko-Sokoke (US\$350,000). Nature Kenya also supported the conduct of assessments involving threatened species in Mwingi which has resulted in the area being identified as an Important Bird Area.
- (e) Government of Kenya provided in kind support (US \$ 200,000) through the forest, agriculture and environmental sectors of government, at both central and district levels. The in-kind contributions of the Government of Kenya have resulted in the involvement of staff from the various government entities that are assisting communities with project implementation.

The success achieved by the project also attracted additional funding during the course of implementation. The Toyota Environmental Activities Grant Programme contributed a total of US\$ 149,424 towards Capacity Building for Organic Certification in Mwingi District over the period January 2007 to December 2008.

b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was to be implemented over a four-year period with a project completion date of August 2008. A no cost extension for the project to December 2008 was approved in March 2008 (the TE does not mention the reason why it was extended).

The PIR states that the delays in the formal registration of the 11 Community Forest Associations were caused by the late gazetting and promulgation of the Forest Act 2005.

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

The Government of Kenya is a major stakeholder in this project and has been involved in the project through various institutions. The principal institution has been the Department of Forestry (now Kenya Forest Service), which has the responsibility to manage the forest reserves at the three project sites.

According to the TE the National Environment Management Authority is the national focal point for GEF projects in the country and therefore plays an important role in the implementation of the project.

As mentioned above the in-kind contributions of the Government of Kenya have resulted in the involvement of staff from the various government entities that are assisting communities with project implementation.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): MU
<p>According to the TE, the M&E system in place is appropriate and there are clear practical indicators in place. However, the TE mentions that a major weakness was the lack of biodiversity baseline data particularly with reference to forestry cover change and threatened species at project inception. Because of that it is difficult to assess the real progress that the project has made in achieving biodiversity targets.</p> <p>It should be noted that the PIR08 implies that there should have been a clearer M&E plan at the inception of the project. The reviewer agrees with this statement on the basis of the several major shortcomings in the M&E system at entry.</p>	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MU
<p>ICIPE has conducted M&E throughout the life of the project in collaboration with principal institutions such as the Project Steering Committee, the Forest Department, the participating Districts and the GEF Operational Focal Point at NEMA. M&E has also been conducted at local levels by communities. Despite the lack of baseline data, the Project Steering Committee has conducted constant monitoring of progress.</p> <p>According to the TE, the M&E procedures and processes that have been put in place under this project are effective and have allowed for continuous monitoring of progress with project implementation and administration. These indicators have provided the basis upon which changes in biodiversity trends as a result of the implementation of the project have been tracked.</p> <p>However, a major shortcoming related to M&E implementation is that an MTR was not conducted even though it was envisaged in the project document (it is not clear whether it was also budgeted). The TE states that this situation is now being addressed through the work of PhD students attached to ICIPE through which baselines will now be established for monitoring the abundance and distribution of honeybees and silkworm moths in Kakamega, Mwingi and Arabuko-Sokoke.</p>	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? UA	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? UA	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? UA. The TE states that feedback from M&E activities was used for adaptive management but it is not clear what it refers to also because a MTE was not conducted	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.	
No. There were two major shortcomings: lack of baseline data and no MTR conducted.	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS
<p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</p> <p>Despite the lack of baseline data, the project document correctly identifies the causes of the problem of the loss of forest resources as being due to poverty, poor institutional coordination, limited capacity for resource management, which resulted in the command and control approaches used by forest managers. Moreover, the project clearly identified project beneficiaries who were to benefit from capacity building activities that were intended to improve community capacities for conservation thereby enhancing their abilities to earn incomes from resources other than the forests that they have depended upon in the past.</p> <p>The TE states that the timeframe was not adequate considering that the project was addressing issues of biodiversity conservation and providing alternative livelihood options for rural communities, aspects of development which require longer term interventions than four years. Another project design shortcoming was the lack of a clear exit strategy that should have been envisaged.</p>

Overall supervision was smooth as UNDP conducted periodic monitoring visits to project sites to apprise themselves of progress with implementation.

According to the TE, there was a very close working relationship between UNDP and ICIPE through which they share information and guidance freely. As a result, project management has been smooth with reporting schedules being adhered to and financial management being streamlined.

According to the PIR08, the project has been well managed and an innovative approach to managing challenges is evident.

Candor and realism of PIRs are considered satisfactory.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies² (rating on a 6 point scale) S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

Overall project coordination rests with ICIPE, which is the beneficiary institution for all programme funds. ICIPE disburses these funds to participating institutions against approved work plans. At national level ICIPE works in collaboration with primary stakeholders such as the KFS, NEMA, IFAD and UNDP-GEF. During the course of the project ICIPE was in contact with several organizations involved in biodiversity conservation, and linkages with these institutions have been established through collaborative MOUs.

According to the TE, all project sites visited demonstrated the impact of the unique implementation modality adopted by ICIPE through support to value chain development for the various products. The central goals of this approach are poverty alleviation and employment creation, which result in biodiversity conservation. The TE also adds that previously conflictive relationships between community groups and park and forest managers have been replaced by collaborative management systems with some communities engaged in buffer zone reforestation projects.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

The key lessons listed in the TE are the following:

- The project has demonstrated that there is a direct link between conservation and livelihoods. Future projects should ensure that there is provision for local people to benefit from resources conservation programmes as this guarantees sustainability of such initiatives.
- Biodiversity conservation programmes are inherently expensive. These costs increase if a control and command process is adopted to implement such programmes. These costs are reduced considerably with the adoption of participatory methods of project management.
- The provision of benefits from conservation to community groups pre-supposes the presence of such values in the resources to be shared. There is a need for the implementation of comprehensive resource valuation processes that will help quantify the extent of benefits to be shared with community groups. This also calls for the incorporation of resource valuation processes into formulation.
- Conservation programmes that include the extension of benefits to community groups and the development of natural products provide a viable vehicle for the entry of local communities into the mainstream economies of African countries. There is a need to ensure that product quality is enhanced and efficient market linkages are developed to avoid frustrating participating communities.
- The project has demonstrated that natural resources conservation cannot be conducted outside of the context of overall national development planning processes. There is therefore a need to ensure that conservation programmes are integrated into these processes.
- The project has demonstrated that global environmental benefits can be realized from the implementation of local conservation initiatives. The identification of bird species of global significance in Mwingi District as a result of this local initiative is a clear case in point.

² Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

- Projects like this one that are implemented over short time periods run the risk of being unsustainable over the long term as funding usually comes to an end before results are institutionalized. There is therefore a need for original project proposals for such projects to build in provisions for support beyond projected project lives to ensure sustainability.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE lists some recommendations that should inform the design and implementation of similar projects in future.

- Future biodiversity management projects include a component of establishing baseline data at least in the first year of their implementation to ensure their sustainability. CIP can only point to anecdotal improvements in the quality of biodiversity after four years of implementation.
- Biodiversity management projects should include elements of resource valuation to enable programme managers to adequately establish the levels of benefits that can be provided to community groups. This will help avoid situations where community expectations are raised beyond the levels that can be met by the projects;
- Natural resources management policies should include provisions for community benefits to make them sustainable over time;
- The Lessons learnt from the implementation of CIP in the three project sites need to be documented for replication and up-scaling. The interest shown by community groups that are not currently involved with project implementation is an opportunity that should not be missed. Further, opportunities to influence similar programme developments in other parts of the region should be identified and built upon.
- CIP experiences should be disseminated to other parts of Africa so they can influence similar programmes that also promote community participation in natural resource conservation and development planning.
- High expectations have been raised among community groups participating in the project. Care should be taken to avoid frustrating these communities through failure to ensure that they continue realizing the benefits that they are realizing today. The elements that ensure sustainability of such initiatives that are discussed in this report should be followed up as the project reaches closure to ensure continuity into the future.
- ICIPE should design an exit strategy for themselves and identify institutions that could take over the growth of this initiative.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The TE contains a good assessment of the project objectives</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</p> <p>The TE is clear, and evidence-based.</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The report assess project sustainability and recommends some actions for a project exit strategy</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>Lessons are comprehensive and supported by evidence.</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>Yes (at the time when the TE was conducted the project was not yet completed)</p>	S
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p> <p>The report contains a section on M&E and mentions some shortcomings but the ratings seem to be higher than the actual quality of M&E system.</p>	MS

**7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION
REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.**