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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5040	
GEF Agency project ID		120227	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Investment Promotion on Environmentally Sound Management of Electrical and Electronic Waste in East Africa with Focus on Ethiopia	
Country/Countries		Ethiopia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		POPs	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CHEM-3	
Executing agencies involved		Ethiopia Environmental Protection Authority; Ministry of Communication, Information and Technology	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		PAN Ethiopia	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		07/30/2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		07/30/2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		07/30/2014	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1	0.99
Co-financing	IA own	0.06	n/a
	Government	0.88	n/a
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector	.02	n/a
	NGOs/CSOs	0.99	n/a
Total GEF funding		1	0.99
Total Co-financing		1.95	1.95
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.95	2.94
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		April 2018	
Author of TE		Mr. Rudolf J. Stefec and Ms. Bezawit Eshetu Gizaw	
TER completion date		December 2018	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objectives of the project is to ”contribute to the overall objective of achieving the sound management of chemicals throughout the life-cycle of electrical and electronic equipment in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment.”

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the CEO Endorsement Document, the overall objective of the project is ‘to promote and up-scale the management of e-waste activities in Ethiopia’. The project had three components to achieve these objectives:

Component 1: Policy and regulatory support – specific outputs included project integration in the national stakeholder process; legal and policy frameworks; verification of studies and a data base of future e-waste flows and dissemination of e-waste management strategy to other African countries.

Component 2: Enlargement of current operations – specific outputs included design and implementation of an effective e-waste collection scheme; a business model for the Demanufacturing (DMF) facility; improvement and adjustment of operations at Akaki DMF so that the facility can serve as a regional training center and model in East Africa; raising general awareness of e- waste; promotion of the collection scheme. Cooperation with international smelters.

Component 3: Evaluation and Monitoring- specific outputs included regular monitoring and external evaluation of project.

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

None.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE assessed the relevance of the project to be 'highly satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the available reports and documents, this TER assessed the relevance of the project to be 'satisfactory'.

Given the growth of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) sector and the situation of e-waste generation in Ethiopia, the activities under the current project were designed to build upon initiatives taken by the Government of Ethiopia in past. In line with their national obligation towards the international environmental conventions (Stockholm Convention and Basal Convention), the government decided to focus its efforts on revitalizing and defining environmental and sustainable development policies on the sound management of e-waste. The Environment Protection Authority of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia (EEPA) involved PAN-Ethiopia, an NGO contracted to survey the e waste situation in the four cities of Ethiopia and drafted e-waste legislation, to which the current project also provided the inputs to, indicating its commitment to address and prevent hazards to human health and environment posed by electrical and electronic waste in Ethiopia. The project was also designed to contribute to the Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) initiative taken by the government. Other initiatives taken in the past also included, support to the Demanufacturing (DMF) Facility that was to be up-scaled to the regional level through the current project and the Ethiopian government recent mandate that required all used government computers to be sent to DMF.

The project was designed as part of GEF -5 Sound Chemicals Strategy – to promote chemical safety in the area of e-waste and to strengthen the political framework for chemical management within Ethiopia. The project specifically contributed to CHEM-3 focal area outcome of contributing to the strategic approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) of achieving the sound management of chemicals throughout the life-cycle of electrical and electronic equipment in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and environment.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately unsatisfactory**

The TE notes that the project was 'no more than moderately effective, plagued by problems' but assigned it a rating of 'moderately satisfactory' (TE, Pg 36). Based on evidence in the TE against achievement of the project components this TER rates effectiveness as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. While the project was successful in providing useful inputs to the formulation of an e-waste legislation, this legislation was still pending approval at the time of the evaluation. The effectiveness of another critical output, the Akaki Facility that was upgraded through the project interventions for the treatment of the e-waste, was no more than moderately effective due to incomplete civil construction, no electric power connection towards the end of the project, issues related to finding suitable markets for some of

the components after dismantling and weak ownership by the facility management as well as the government.

Component 1: Policy and regulatory support **– Moderately satisfactory**

The TE didn't assign ratings to the individual components. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assigns a rating of 'moderately satisfactory'. The expected outcome under this component was the establishment of national e-waste strategies, including necessary legislative and policy measures on the sound management of e-waste. As per the TE, the project provided technical inputs to the draft E-waste legislation that was still pending approval at the time of the evaluation. The TE notes 'reports and studies produced in the course of the project were used by other partners to further develop sustainable solutions for e-waste management in Ethiopia' (TE, Pg 32) but the details to support this claim are missing from the evaluation report. The project and its objectives were promoted at an international level. The project was presented at several international meetings and conferences to raise awareness about the current situation in Ethiopia and UNIDO's interventions to improve it. The outreach at an international level helped to raise awareness and connect to neighboring countries to explore options for cooperation. The TE didn't report on whether the studies or database projecting the flow of e-waste in the future were conducted.

Component 2: Enlargement of current operations **– Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The overall expected outcome under this component was that the existing infrastructure (Akaki Demanufacturing sector) to treat e-waste was reviewed and up-scaled in order to operate higher volumes, according to environmental and health standards and be sustainable. The TE reviewed the effectiveness of this component to be 'moderately satisfactory', while this TER assessed it to be 'moderately unsatisfactory'. The Akaki Demanufacturing (Akaki DMF) sector facility was not fully operational due to incomplete civil construction and there was no electric power connection towards the end of the project period when the automation machinery was delivered. The TE also reported a conspicuous shortage of electric hand-held tools and absence of special dismantling jigs and fixtures in the manual de-manufacturing section and weak ownership by facility management. Moreover, as per the TE, Akaki facility had outlets for some of the less valuable components (steel, aluminum, copper; some printer cartridges) but not for the most valuable PCBs (PWBs) and difficult-to-disassemble hard disk drives and the glass from computer monitors and plastics. The TE notes that main focus of the project, 'in both design and implementation, was on upgrading the dismantling facility at Akaki which was used for the collection and disposal of used PCs, with less focus if any on recovery and processing of the waste'. All the other activities linked with the improvement of Akaki DMF could also not be completed, due to which this TER has rated the effectiveness of this component as 'moderately unsatisfactory'.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately unsatisfactory**

The TE assigned rating to the efficiency of the project as 'moderately satisfactory' but based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assessed it to be 'moderately unsatisfactory'. One of the main outputs of the report was to upgrade the existing infrastructure to treat e-waste, which was not handled efficiently. As per the TE, the equipment supplied to upgrade the facility, worth USD 220,000, arrived late owing to UNIDO procurement delay followed by its delayed installation as the new facility building was also not ready on time. Civil construction scheduled for setting up the new building was delayed for reasons not clarified to UNIDO by the Ministry of Communication Technology (MCIT). As per the reports,

when the building was almost completed at the time of project intended termination in July 2016, the power installation was still not in place, limiting the operation of the new facility to treat e-waste. Furthermore, the change of key members of project steering committee further delayed the process even though the Government and the project steering committee members provided their inputs on time.

This shows that the project management didn't have systems and processes in place to make use of assets created in an efficient manner.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately unlikely**

The TE rated sustainability of the project to be 'likely' based on the likelihood of risks to sustainability. However, for the purpose of this TER, risks are assessed and rated on the basis of likelihood of sustainability, which this TER has reviewed to be 'moderately unlikely'. While, the project was successful in generating overall awareness on e-waste and with some success at the international fora, sustainability of the project interventions depends upon factors such as attaining a smooth, streamlined workflow at the Akaki facility, its potential profitability, approval and enforcement of e-waste legislation in support of the e-waste collection and treatment in Ethiopia. Unless these factors are addressed, the sustainability of the is assessed to be 'moderately unlikely' as elaborated along four dimensions of sustainability below:

Financial – Moderately unlikely

The TE assessed the likelihood of risk to financial sustainability to be 'unlikely' but provided no basis to support this rating. This TER has revised the rating to 'moderately unlikely' based on the available evidence in various reports. While the project interventions served as a medium to enhance awareness of the e-waste issues in Ethiopia, the sustainability hinges upon attaining a smooth and streamlined workflow at the Akaki facility created to treat e-waste and its potential to generate profits in future. Unless the issues related to the financial viability of e-waste collection, transportation, treatment and disposal are addressed, the risk to sustainability of the facility is considered 'moderately unlikely'. The profitability of Akaki facility is dependent on available national and foreign downstream markets, prices, business conditions and regulatory framework. According to study conducted in 2015 and reviewed by the TE, while the steel, aluminum and copper had the potential market in Ethiopia, neither local nor regional markets were identified for PCBs and plastics, that 'kept piling up with no sustainable solution in sight' (TE, Pg 19). Access to international markets was also difficult for a number of reasons, economy of scale being a major factor. According to the TE, 'the reviewers' over-all view of project sustainability was also not very positive, owing to the risks preventing the facility from attaining a sustainable mode of operation' (TE, Pg 26).

Socio-political – Moderately likely

The TE assessed the likelihood of risk due to socio-political factors as 'unlikely' without providing evidence to support it, which this TER has revised to be 'moderately likely'. As the TE acknowledges, the project initiated a dialogue and 'adequate reflection of the current needs in the area of WEEE' (TE, Pg 36). But the legislation of e waste was still pending approval at the time of the TE. The commitment of the government of Ethiopia to adopt the e-waste policy and promulgate necessary regulation to ensure the enforcement, is a major factor determining the sustainability of the project interventions. The recommendations from the four studies conducted to streamline operations at Akaki facility were yet not implemented at the time of the TE. The TE also notes that the project experienced delays due to

'lack of involvement and ownership of the government' (TE, Pg 34). However, the TE reported frequent meetings with government towards end of the project to discuss the recommendations of various studies and to follow up on the draft of the e-waste legislation, is likely to keep the government involved on this issue, due to which the socio=political risk is assessed to be 'moderately likely'. The government of Ethiopia is also a signatory to a number of international conventions and agreements and is likely to continue its efforts towards e-waste management, also evident through its full co-financing contribution towards the project.

Institutional – Moderately unlikely

The TE rated the likelihood of risks from the institutional factors as 'moderately unlikely'. This TER assessed institutional environment/factors and rated the likelihood of sustainability as 'moderately unlikely'. According to the TE, approval of the legislation and directives laying out details to be implemented within the legislation were drafted and pending approval from the government. The approval of the legislation would be essential in streamlining operation of the Akaki Demanufacturing facility upgraded during the project for e-waste processing. The project imparted training to the staff of the Akaki facility on various aspects. However, some of the trainings, such as dismantling the equipment more efficiently, was not perceived useful by the staff who had 'hoped to know more about the new machinery but was focused on manual dismantling' (TE, Pg 20). The TE recommended other training modules for the facility workers, such as on depollution techniques, value maximization techniques as well as storage guidelines for equipment containing hazardous materials, to improve the capacity of the staff to process the e-waste in an environmentally sound manner. Moreover, the project was expected to emphasize a regional approach to e-waste management in East Africa in long term. The Akaki facility was expected to be scaled up and be established as a regional training center, in cooperation Basel Convention Coordinating Centre (BCRC) and existing National Cleaner Production Centre (NCPC). However, it seems that the Akaki facility needs improvement, both in terms of the capacity of its staff and other measures required to streamline its operations, before it could be used as a training center at the regional level.

Environmental – Likely

The TE doesn't point out to any environmental risk to the sustainability of the project.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The status of total co-financing that realized at the end of the project is not clear from the TE due to lack of consistency in the evidence in the report. According to the information in the TE (Pg 14), the project realized full co-financing to be $ 1,955,555. However, in another section in the TE (Pg 56), the project reported an exceptionally high contribution from the government in cash with the total amount of $5 million. The TE doesn't provide a break up of the co-financing from different stakeholders as well as the impact of a higher amount of co-financing on the progress or level of achievements of outcomes under the project.

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 information in the TE, the project actual end date was 12/31/17 as compared to the end date originally planned for 07/30/2014. The project completion date had to be extended mainly due to delay in the procurement process for obtaining the recycling equipment as the required specification of the machines were changed frequently and delay in the construction of the new facility building. Moreover, as per the PIR (2017), the frequent change of key members of the project steering committee (Government representatives) further delayed the process of decision making with regard to project progress. As the main facility was not ready on time, most of the activities linked to it could also not completed, as a result of which the project failed to achieve one of the main outputs of upgrading and streamlining operations at the Akaki facility.

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:

As per the TE, the lack of involvement and ownership by the government delayed the execution of the project. The lack of government involvement led to delays in construction work at the Akaki Demanufacturing Facility (DMF) due to which all the other activities linked to the function of Akaki DMF could also not be completed in time. However, the TE also reports and it's worth noting that the government contributed its full co-financing amount, although the funding was delayed. The project progress was also affected by frequent changes in the steering committee members due to which most of the recommendations from the advisory committee or other committees could not be implemented in timely manner. Moreover, the requisite e-waste legislation, to which the project contributed through providing inputs, was also still pending approval from the government, that has implications on the sustainability of Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) actions in Ethiopia.

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: **Satisfactory**

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the M&E design at entry as 'satisfactory'. The project document included a results framework which was quite comprehensive as it spelled out 'SMART' indicators for each of the outputs, defining means of verification and the assumptions. The project had also earmarked separate budget for the operational function of M&E. The Prodoc also recommended constitution of various committees to review the progress of the project periodically.

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

The TE assessed the rating of the M&E implementation to be 'satisfactory', which this TER has revised to be 'moderately satisfactory'. As is evident from the narrative in the TE, the project undertook various studies and constituted taskforces to review and improve the operations at Akaki facility. However, implementation of recommendations from most these studies was still due at the project completion. As per the TE, the M&E was adequate as 'many experts came and went, delivered their recommendation, but little action was taken', indicating that despite various studies and Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) conducted on time, the project failed to use the information/recommendations for adaptive management. The TE also notes that expert reviews were mainly focused on the progress of the Akaki Facility rather than on the project as a whole, due to which the M&E implementation is rated to be 'moderately satisfactory'.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately satisfactory**

The TE rated the quality of project implementation as 'satisfactory', but based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER revised the rating to 'moderately satisfactory'. According to the TE, the regional office of UNIDO was helpful in facilitating communication and coordination with the government counterparts. The main implementation issue highlighted in the TE was the delay in the procurement process conducted in house by UNIDO. This delay was mainly due to frequent changes of the focal points from the national counterparts involved in the finalization of the technical specification of the required machinery. The evaluation process of the technical and commercial offers received by UNIDO was also delayed, which had an impact on making the Akaki facility operational with implications on timely completion of other activities associated with the facility. The TE doesn't highlight any other issue.

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

This TER concurs with the rating provided by the TE to the quality of the execution as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project was to be executed by the Ethiopia Environmental Protection Authority (EEPA) and Ministry of Communication, Information and technology (MCIT). As per the TE and PIRs, the implementation of the project management structure agreed upon during the first joint Steering Committee meeting was full of challenges. The project constituted a National steering committee, advisory groups and Ethiopian E-Waste management working group to review the progress made and address outstanding issues. Counterpart funds, although delayed, were also provided by the government. Nevertheless, the lack of governmental involvement remained a challenge till project

completion as this also delayed the construction work at Akaki DMF, which was still not finalized at the time of the TE.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The project didn't bring about any environmental changes as the Akaki Facility upgraded through the project for the treatment of e-waste, was still not fully operational at the time of the TE.

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

The TE doesn't record any socio-economic changes brought about by the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project supported several trainings of the staff at the Akaki Demanufacturing Facility that was to also serve as regional training center and model in East Africa regarding international standards in e-waste management. Although the TE didn't provide any details it is unlikely that this Facility was not used as the regional training center as yet.

b) Governance

The project provided significant inputs for the development of e-waste legislation, which was still pending approval from the government at the time of the TE. The project also supported development of a national level e-waste management strategy.

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

None.

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

There is no information in the TE on this aspect.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The main lessons listed in the TE are listed below:

1. Complete success in the area of e-waste management cannot realistically be expected; the problem is daunting and its solution—paralyzed as it often is by the ever-increasing volumes of waste generated—will take decades, or even generations.

2. The valuable experience acquired by the UNIDO staff and project experts during the course of the project is worth exploiting further through an experts' conference where papers principally by those experts who produced the valuable specialized reports for the present project delivered to an international audience recruited from Ethiopia as well as other African countries.

3. Any follow-ups to the project which, whether or not supported by UNIDO and/or any other organization, ought to be regarded as inevitable by the Government and be included in Government planning—because the problem of WEEE will not go away but is bound to expand and become more urgent as time progresses.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations given in the TE are listed below:

1. Relevant Ethiopian Government Ministries endeavor to update the country's Electrical and Electronic Equipment (EEE) and Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) statistics to implement a nation-wide WEEE collection system with participation by both the public and the private sector.
2. The Akaki DMF facility should be expanded only after its workflow will have been streamlined, its technology fully used, and outlets found for all of its products.
3. UNIDO should be invited to put its wealth of experience to use in any future expansion, such as in dealing with other categories of WEEE; a possible shift of focus in the nature of the WEEE presently processed should be anticipated, probably away from PCs, toward mobile phones and, increasingly, towards optical devices.
4. UNIDO should maintain good contacts with the African WEEE scene, in order to foster a true international cooperation; and
5. The experience acquired by both UNIDO staff and the experts involved during the design and implementation of the Akaki DMF project be further exploited by taking an active part in an experts' conference to be held in cooperation with Ethiopia Government in 2018 and mainly in any subsequent expansion of the WEEE collection, dismantling, and recovery schemes in Ethiopia and elsewhere in Africa.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provided a comprehensive assessment of the relevant outcomes and impact of the project. While the TE included information from other studies/reviews during the project, evidence on some of the outputs was found incomplete or not covered adequately. For instance, it was unclear if the Akaki Facility was being used as a regional training center, or if the facility was equipped to be used as a resource center in the future.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was internally consistent with complete assessment, except in few cases, where the evidence was missing. For instance, it's not clear from the report if the data projecting future e waste flows in future verified or collected, which was one of the important outputs under the project.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The ratings assigned to sustainability are hard to comprehend and are not substantiated by adequate and convincing evidence. For instance, socio-political risk is assigned a rating of 'Unlikely' but no risks identified under this section (Pg 58)	**MU**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons listed are comprehensive and mostly draw from the main body of the report.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE didn't provide details on the co-financing break up from the various stakeholders.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The assessment of the M&E system was adequate.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

0.3(4+4)+0.1(3+5+4+5)= 2.4+1.7=4.1

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