The European Union's 10th EDF Pacific Regional Initiative Programme

Framework Contract Beneficiaries 2013

Lot 6 – Environment

Specific Contract No. 2017/385217

Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU 10th EDF Pacific Hazardous Waste Management Programme

04 June 2017

Final report

This project is funded by the European Union

CONSORTIUM SAFEGE FWC-Lot6

A project implemented by Consortium SAFEGE

CONSORTIUM
SAFEGE FWC-Lot6

Report Control Path

Project title: Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU 10th EDF Pacific Hazardous Waste Management Programme

Specific Contract No: 2017/385217

Country: 15 Pacific ACP Countries (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

Framework Contractor: Consortium SAFEGE

Address: Gulledelle 92 – B-1200 Brussels Belgium

Tel: +32-2-739.46.90

Fax: +32-2-742.38.91

E-mail: fwc6@safege.be

Specific Contract Implementing Party: SAFEGE/SUEZ

Address: Gulledelle 92 – B-1200 Brussels Belgium

Tel: +32-2-739.46.90

Fax: +32-2-742.38.91

E-mail: fwc6@safege.be

Date of the Report: 04/07/2017

Reporting Period: Final Report

Author of Report:

Dr. Ioannis P. GKLEKAS, Tom CLARK 29/06/2017

Specific Contract Implementing Party – Responsible Person:

Irem METIN 07/06/2017

Framework Contractor:

SAFEGE Consortium Lot 6

Date 07/06/2017

This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by Consortium Safege (Suez Consulting). The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 6

2. INTRODUCTION 9

2.1 Report purpose and scope 9
2.2 The PacWASTE Programme 9
2.3 Evaluation method 11

3. FINDINGS ON PROJECT PERFORMANCE 12

3.1 Introduction 12
3.2 Relevance 12
3.3 Efficiency 13

1. Management efficiency 13

a) Funding and contractual arrangements 13
b) Organisational arrangements and capacities 13
c) Coordination with other donors 14
d) Planning, ... 14
e) Financial management and budgeting 14
f) Implementation 14
g) Project coordination 14
h) M&E mechanisms 15
i) Visibility 15

2. Availability of cost effective alternatives 15

3.4 Effectiveness 15

1. Overall achievement of objectives and purposes 15
2. Effectiveness of project strategy 16
3. Satisfaction of beneficiaries 16
4. Level of unintended outcomes 16
5. Realisation of assumptions 16
6. Relation of resources to results 17

3.5 Impact 17

1. Actual v planned results and beneficiaries 17
2. Level of change to objectives 18
3. Unanticipated results 18

4. Lessons learnt 18
5. Success factors 19
6. Level of insight 19
7. Comparison with previous evaluations 19
8. Recommendations 20
9. Risk management 20
3.6 Sustainability 20
1. Level of acceptance and ownership 20
2. Appropriateness of technology 20
3. Institutional and management capacity and commitment 21
4. Sustainability of benefits 21
5. Sustainablity strategy developed and implemented 21
3.7 EU coherence and added value 21
1. Coherence with other EU interventions 22
2. Complementarity with other donor interventions 22
3. EU added value 22
3.8 Cross cutting issues 22
1. Gender equality 22
2. Environment 22
3. Good governance 23
4. Youth, elders, outer islands 23
5. Climate change adaptation 23
3.9 Rating of project performance 23
4. OVERALL ASSESSEMENT 24
5. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS 24
5.1 Limitations 24
5.2 Conclusions 25
5.2.1 Conclusions against Results 25
5.2.2 Conclusions against evaluation criteria 25
5.2.3 Main conclusions 26
5.3 Recommendations 26

Table of Acronyms

DEPC Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (Vanuatu)
DoE Department of Environment (Fiji)
EDF11 European Development Fund 11
EPC Electric Power Corporation (Samoa)
EU European Union
FSM Federated States of Micronesia
GEF Global Environment Facility
GEF-PAS Global Environment Facility Pacific Alliance for Sustainability
GIZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Development Agency)
JICA Japan International Cooperation Agency
J-PRISM Japanese Technical Cooperation Project for Promotion of Regional Initiative on Solid Waste Management in Pacific Island Countries
MNRE Ministry for Natural Resources and Environment (Samoa)
NGO nongovernment organisations
OCT Overseas Countries and Territories
PACWASTE Pacific Hazardous Waste Management
PICT Pacific Island Countries and Territories
PNG Papua New Guinea
SPC Pacific Community
SPREP Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
SUEZ Consulting (SAFEGE),
ULAB unwanted lead acid batteries
UNEP United Nations Environment Programme
USP University of the South Pacific

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Purpose and scope

The EU Delegation for the Pacific based in Fiji commissioned Consortium Safege to perform a mid-term evaluation of the PacWASTE Project (the Project). The evaluation presented in this report aims to provide the relevant external cooperation services of the EU, the Partner Governments[1] and, when appropriate, the wider public with sufficient information to:

- Make an overall independent assessment about the performance of the intervention, paying particular attention to the results of the Programme against its objectives; and
- Recognising the late stage of the Project, identifying key lessons and propose relevant recommendations to feed the current Programme and the development of future actions, in particular the formulation of the upcoming 11th EDF Regional Waste Management Programme.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) are appended to this report **(Appendix 1).**

1.2 The PacWASTE Programme

The **Pacific Hazardous Waste Management Programme (PacWASTE**), funded under the 10th EDF Pacific Regional Indicative Programme, is a EUR 7.85 million contribution agreement implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The overall objective of the Project is to contribute to building a healthy, economically and environmentally sustainable Pacific for future generations. The specific objective is to support Pacific ACP countries' efforts to adopt cost-effective and self-sustaining priority waste management systems by focusing on three hazardous waste streams (asbestos, e-waste and medical waste) and integrated atoll waste management.

The Project has 4 key result areas:

Result 1: Pacific regional hazardous waste status and management options are assessed and prioritized.

Result 2: Best available practices in priority hazardous waste management implemented in demonstration Pacific countries.

Result 3: Enhanced capacity and appropriate policies and regulatory frameworks in place to mitigate and better manage hazardous waste streams achieved in Pacific island countries.

Result 4: Improved Regional collaboration and information exchange on hazardous waste management practices.

Within these four results areas are 19 objectives (see Main Report).

The Project which started on 17/05/2013 and will end on 31/12/2017 covers 15 Pacific ACP countries (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu).

1.3 Evaluation method

In accordance with the monitoring and evaluation framework of EU, the evaluation was guided by the criteria of: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, EU added value and consideration of cross cutting issues, as specified in the ToR (**Appendix 1**). The evaluation team consisted of two people **(Appendix 2).** Opinions and information were collected through document review, face to face interviews with key personnel and stakeholders, telephone and e-mail survey and country visits to Fiji, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu. Project performance was evaluated against the 7 main criteria and 47 sub-questions (**Appendix 1**) translated into performance indicators (**Appendix 3).**

The evaluation of the Project results was done through the application of rating criteria to a number of pre-selected indicators directly related to the Project's objectives. The rating criteria are as follows, considering shortcomings of the Project in the achievement of its objectives against the criteria:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): The Project had no shortcomings.
- Satisfactory (S): The Project had minor shortcomings.
- Moderately satisfactory (MS): The Project had moderate shortcomings.
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): The Project had significant shortcomings.
- Unsatisfactory (U): The Project had major shortcomings.
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had severe shortcomings.

1.4 Findings

The evaluations are summarised in **Section 3** of this report and further detailed in **Appendix 3**. A summary table is presented below. It shows that the overall performance rating is satisfactory and that it provides a solid foundation for EDF11. However there have been deficiencies in certain areas, particularly the sustainability of Project benefits and certain aspects of organisation, resourcing and planning.

The overall ratings against the seven performance indicators are as follows: Highly satisfactory for Relevance and for EU Coherence and Added Value; satisfactory for Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and for Cross Cutting Issues; unsatisfactory for Sustainability.

Results have been mixed across waste streams and result areas: overall highly satisfactory for asbestos, satisfactory for healthcare waste and the atoll waste pilot but unsatisfactory for e-waste; highly satisfactory for adding to data on the current status, and implementing best practice but unsatisfactory oncapacity building.

1.5 Conclusions

1. The overall conclusion is that PacWASTE has been a worthwhile and highly relevant project with positive and beneficial results.
2. The project has generated strong, links, networks and synergies with regional organisations and activities, and was instrumental in such initiatives as the Clean Pacific Roundtable.
3. It has been delivered overall efficiently and effectively, especially in the areas of technical assistance for asbestos and HCW, but could have been better organised and resourced to increase local ownership and communication.
4. The project has been extensively documented and reported, although this documentation was not made readily available and accessible during the evaluation. While general decision-making and approval processes have been appropriate and documented, the evaluators were provided with high level documents to clearly demonstrate approval of project changes against original objectives and plans only at a later stage of the allocated evaluation period;
5. The e-waste component has not been cost effective.
6. While recognising sustainability challenges out side of the project's control, and the achievements of the project, the sustainability of solutions is weak and benefits are unlikely to be maintained without further support.
7. The lessons from the findings as well the conclusions strongly support EDF11.

1.6 Recommendations

Strategy and focus

1. Building on the successes of PacWASTE, both in national implementation programmes and regional collaboration/information-sharing, and tailoring solutions to countries' needs;
2. Maintaining and building on regional links and networks created will be essential for a successful EDF11.
3. Focus on the stated priority waste streams, including asbestos, HCW and e-waste; also disaster, wastewater, bulky and other waste as stated;

4. Blending waste stream program elements including waste streams and actions that could potentially have positive financial impacts (generation of income, job creation, recovery of resources);
5. Focusing on assisting to develop / enhance effective legislative waste management framework, since it is essential to achieve sustainability;
6. Continued efforts in asbestos removal, assessing the significance of water pipe and other ACM waste not included in PacWaste;
7. Increased emphasis on capacity building including:
   a. asbestos: public awareness and training for local competent authorities staff, contractors, or other stakeholders; but removal work should be under the supervision of external licensed persons until local capacity and regulation is developed;
   b. HCW: awareness of management along the waste chain of disposal;
   c. e-waste: public awareness and training in handling and management;
   d. training for environmental, customs and other officers;
   e. a move from ad hoc to purposeful and competency based/certified training;
   f. emphasis on train the trainer and training hubs for increased efficiency of resources and enhanced sustainability;
   g. stronger involvement of the Academia and vocational systems of the region in the training and the consulting activities in the areas where there is proven expertise
8. Increased emphasis on disaster waste;
9. Developing optimal tailored solutions for managing e-waste and other wastes: requires government support, appropriate regulation and instruments and stakeholder support;
10. There is a need for innovative, sustainable solutions, including repurposing of waste in the Pacific context (low waste volumes, distance from markets, long and expensive logistic chain);

Organisation and resources

11. Stronger national cooperation among stakeholders: use of a different model of national coordination (compared to the National Contact Point adopted in PacWASTE), eg. engage already existing national waste /environmental management institutional arrangements in each country, which include the major stakeholders; establishing project national coordinators.
12. More active national oversight roles and involvement during the implementation of the project phases, to increase the feeling of ownership of the project;
13. Building on existing processes, regular updates to the countries' stakeholders on project actions planning and progress;
14. Sustainable financing to ensure PacWASTE initiatives are sustainable;
15. Continue good donor collaboration at regional and national levels; maintain and develop networks;
16. Ensure wider visibility of the new Project early from the beginning: e.g. organise PacWASTE Plus Info Days in each country inviting a wide range of stakeholders;
17. There is a need to develop project management skills of the stakeholders involved in the project;
18. Ensuring sufficient resources for an appropriately qualified, skilled and supported project team;
19. Optimal location for the project team (in practice Fiji);
20. Ensuring staff resource planning to meet needs for efficient and effective delivery, including specific waste management, project management, communication and administration

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	Rating	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	Rating
1. RELEVANCE		**4. IMPACT**	
1. Alignment with national/regional priorities	**HS**	1. Results v plans	**S**
2. Relevance to addressing problems	**HS**	2. Level of change to objectives	**MU**
3. Internal coherence	**HS**	3. Level of unanticipated results:	**S**
4. Coherence of Logical Frameworks:	**HS**	4. Lessons learnt	**S**
5. External coherence	**HS**	5. Success factors	**S**
6. Support for priority needs of target groups	**HS**	6. Level of insight	**S**
7. Alignment with perceived needs	**S**	7. Comparison with previous evaluations.	**U**
8. Relevance of EU financing	**HS**	8. Recommendations.	**S**
Overall for Relevance	**HS**	9. Risk management	**MU**
		Overall for Impact	**S**
2. EFFICIENCY			
Management efficiency		**5. SUSTAINABILITY**	
a) Funding and contractual arrangements:	**S**	1. Level of acceptance and ownership	**U**

b) Organisational arrangements and capacities:	**MU**	2 Appropriate Technology or services: a) *Appropriateness of technology*	**MU**
c) Coordination with other donors	**HS**	b) Level of assistance still needed	**U**
d) Planning	**S**	3. Institutional /management capacity and commitment	**U**
e) Financial management and budgeting	**HS**	4. Sustainability of benefits	**U**
f) Implementation	**S**	5. Sustainability strategy	**U**
g) Project coordination	**S**	*Overall for Sustainability*	**U**
h) M&E mechanisms:	***S***		
i) Visibility:	***S***	**6. EU COHERENCE AND ADDED VALUE**	
2. Availability of cost-effective alternatives:	***S***	1. EU coherence	**HS**
Overall for Efficiency	***S***	2. Complementarity	**HS**
		3. EU added value	**HS**
3. EFFECTIVENESS		*Overall for EU Coherence and Added Value*	**HS**
1. Achievement of objectives and purposes	**S**		
2. Effectiveness of project strategy	**S**	**7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES** 1. Level of consideration	
3. Satisfaction of beneficiaries	**HS**	a) Gender equality	**S**
4. Level of unintended outcomes	**S**	b) Environment	**HS**
5. Realisation of assumptions	**S**	c) Good governance	**HS**
6. Relation of resources to results	**HS**	d) Youth, elders, outer islands, etc	**S**
7. Staff appropriately qualified	**HS**	*Overall for Cross-Cutting Issues*	**S**
Overall for Effectiveness	**S**		
		Overall for Project	**S**

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Report purpose and scope

The EUD at Fiji commissioned Consortium Safege to perform a mid-term evaluation of the Pacific Hazardous Waste Management Programme (PacWASTE) (also referred to as the PacWASTE Project). The evaluation presented in this report aims to provide the relevant external cooperation services of the EU, the Partner Governments[2] and, when appropriate, the wider public with sufficient information to:

- Make an overall independent assessment about the performance of the intervention, paying particular attention to the results of the Programme against its objectives; and
- Identify key lessons and propose relevant recommendations to feed the current Programme and the development of future actions, in particular the formulation of the upcoming 11th EDF regional waste management programme.

This evaluation was conducted in accordance with the terms of reference (ToR) set out in **Appendix 1** by the evaluators presented in **Appendix 2.**

The main part of this report provides a summary of PacWASTE, the evaluation method, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Supporting documents are provided in the Appendices.

It should be noted that although termed a mid-term evaluation, the Project was 6 months from completion at the time of evaluation. The focus is accordingly on lessons and recommendations.

2.2 The PacWASTE Programme

PacWASTE was funded by the European Union (EU) through the 10th EDF Pacific Regional Indicative Programme (EDF10). EDF10 has aimed to contribute to building a healthy, economically and environmentally sustainable Pacific for future generations.

[1]The primary users of the evaluation will be the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (as the Regional Authorising Officer of the 10th EDF Pacific Regional Programme), the EU Delegation for the Pacific, the implementing agencies and the 15 beneficiary countries.

PacWaste has aimed to support the efforts of 15 Pacific ACP countries[3] to adopt cost-effective and self-sustaining priority waste management systems by focusing on three hazardous waste streams (asbestos, e-waste and medical waste) and integrated atoll waste management.

A Financing Agreement was signed between the European Commission and the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat. The EUR 7.85 million contribution agreement is implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) between May 2013 and December 2017.

PacWASTE anticipated four key results (R) as presented in **Table 1.**

Table 1: PacWASTE Key Results

R1. Pacific regional hazardous waste status and management options assessment and prioritisation.
1. A thorough assessment of the status (flows, with reference to currently employed treatment technologies and disposal routes) of solid hazardous waste in the Pacific islands and atolls was proposed to be carried out. 2. The analysis would take stock of existing data that would be reviewed and validated, for the prioritisation of key areas for intervention. 3. Best-practices for the management of three waste streams, ie. asbestos, e-waste and medical waste woulbe identified and adapted (as necessary) to the specificities of Pacific islands and atolls for the development of regional guidelines.
R2. Best available practices in priority hazardous waste management to be implemented in demonstration Pacific countries.
1. Cost-effective and sustainable hazardous waste management solutions would be implemented in line with contemporary best practices (adapted to the particular island and atoll environments) on the basis of the guidelines and priorities identified in the framework of activities included in the Result Area 1. The identification of the specific interventions to be implemented would take account of countries' most urgent needs and priorities and of an assessment of the potential impact that can be achieved at country and regional level in the given sector through the envisaged interventions. In addition, it would be ensured that the appropriate policies and regulatory framework are in place before specific demonstration activities would be approved. The EU Delegation would be actively involved in the site selections and requested to provide explicit approval. 3. Proposed medical waste management solutions will be adapted to the national health care situation in demonstration countries. The selected interventions will include the purchase and commissioning of appropriate technology for medical waste treatment and disposal and the provision of adequate training to local staff. 4. Asbestos-containing materials will be stabilized in prioritised occupied buildings in demonstration countries, with the demonstrable objective of minimising long term community health impacts. Priority will be given to public buildings (e.g. including schools and hospitals), account taken of occupation factors. 5. Reception facilities of Pacific ports exporting hazardous waste will be upgraded to use best practices and state-of-the-art technologies, including monitoring and detection systems, facilities and equipment for the safe handling and temporary storage of hazardous waste and IT tools for the traceability of the waste. 6. End-of-life electrical and electronic goods (e-waste) and asbestos-containing waste stockpiles will be treated as appropriate (including immobilisation of asbestos fibres), collected and stored in safe, dedicated medium-term storage facilities prior to recycling or export for safe disposal, following the implementation of the above port upgrading measures. 7. A model integrated waste management system will be established in a demonstration Pacific atoll country. 8. The project will pay for the initial stockpile shipments (asbestos and e-waste). Management structures (i.e. waste management utilities) derived from the project will then pay for ongoing waste shipments via the user pays principle backed up by legislation developed through the project, in line with the priorities expressed by the Pacific countries and reflected in the Pacific Regional Solid Waste Management Strategy 2010-2015. 9. Ongoing shipments will be managed at the national level based on approved regional asbestos and e-waste management strategies that devolve down to a national level with a national strategy (which mirrors the regional strategy). Regional oversight of hazardous waste shipments will be maintained via the Basel and Waigani Conventions which are coordinated by SPREP. These ensure that the waste is permitted for export and also has the correct receiver paperwork including environmental permits and additionally that the waste is being received by an accredited facility (secure landfill site in New Zealand for asbestos as an example; Simms metals Australia recyclers for e-waste as another).

[3] Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

R3. Enhanced capacity and appropriate policies and regulatory frameworks in place to mitigate and better manage hazardous waste streams are achieved in Pacific island countries.
1. Training in hazardous and solid waste best management practices will be provided and integrated as a core requirement for all relevant local personnel at demonstration sites, with a focus on women where these are more at risk of exposure. 2. Options for legal and institutional financial measures to prevent the recurrence of e-waste stockpiling through improved life-cycle management of electrical and electronic products will be proposed and guidelines drafted as a core component of the project. This must include a careful assessment of the manufacturers' return options and the elaboration of a model (user pays) tariff or deposit system to cover the eventual costs of re-exporting, proper recycling and/or disposal at the end of products' life. 3. Such guidelines will be the basis for the improvement of national regulations to which, inter alia, the implementation of demonstration actions will be conditional. Technical advice will be provided to national authorities to this effect. 4. National Customs and Environment Officers will be trained in the requirements of the Basel and Waigani Conventions for trans-boundary transport of hazardous waste.
R4. Regional collaboration and information exchange on hazardous waste management practices is improved.
1. A methodology that encourages the effective exchange of best practices (twinning like arrangements) within Pacific ACPs and between Pacific ACPs and OCTs will be established. The aim of these partnership arrangements is to provide an interactive and collaborative two-way information exchange on common problems and solutions (best practices) for hazardous waste management, among similar Pacific communities and to promote exchanges and lessons learned between Pacific ACP and OCT countries. 2. Similarly a network of Pacific waste recyclers will be established to promote exchange of best practices, and dissemination of lessons learned at the regional level will be achieved through the organisation of a regional workshop showcasing demonstration projects including the atoll waste management and port infrastructure upgrade interventions. 3. Finally, upon completion of the project, a major regional workshop will disseminate information and technical details arising from the major outcomes of the above activities. Special attention will be given to ensure the equal participation of women in all the above activities.
Cross-cutting issues Cross cutting issues proposed to be addressed included: 1. New or enlarged hazardous waste steams such as lead acid batteries, as a result of the anticipated greater penetration of RES technologies in order to mitigate climate change impacts (sea level rise) in the area; 2. Minimizing risks from ACM for women and young children (focusing on public community structures and school buildings in particular); 3. Customization of training activities taking the various gender issues into account

Based on initial surveys and reviews, these results areas were translated into specific planned activities and outcomes for the participating countries as set in **Appendix 5.**

Country profile documents were produced as communication documents setting out national programmes.

2.3 Evaluation method

In accordance with the monitoring and evaluation framework of EU, the evaluation was guided by the criteria of: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, EU added value and consideration of cross cutting issues, as specified in the ToR (**Appendix 1**).

Opinions and information were collected through:

- Desk review of key documents and websites;
- Discussions with the PacWASTE Project Manager, the SPREP team, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS), and EU Delegation;
- Consultations with the beneficiaries and other stakeholders and partners;
- Discussions with project consultants;
- Visiting selected project localities and discussing the project with project personnel, government officials, community members and other stakeholders and beneficiaries;
- Visiting asbestos removal and disposal sites, incinerators and recycling facilities;

- Seeking the views and aspirations of local stakeholders.

The evaluation was based on document review, semi-structured face to face and telephone/skype interviews and visits to 5 participating countries. The evaluation method (including questions) is described in more detail in **Appendix 3**, key documents in **Appendix 8**, and interviewees in **Appendix 7.**

The evaluation of the Project results was done through the application of rating criteria to a number of pre-selected indicators directly related to the Project's objectives. The rating criteria are as follows:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): The Project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives against the evaluation questions;
- Satisfactory (S): The Project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives against the evaluation questions;
- Moderately satisfactory (MS): The Project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives against the evaluation questions;
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): The Project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives against the evaluation questions;
- Unsatisfactory (U): The Project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives against the evaluation questions;
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives against the evaluation questions.

Summaries ratings are provided for each of the findings in **Section 3**. Details are provided in the Evaluation Matrix in **Appendix 4.**

3. FINDINGS ON PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Introduction

Using the evaluation methodology introduced above and further detailed in **Appendix 3**, Project Performance has been evaluated and rated against the stated questions in the ToR. In doing so each question has been translated into an indicator as tabulated in **Appendix 3** and in the detailed evaluation matrix in **Appendix 4**. The evaluation matrix provides detailed findings, evidence and detailed ratings against every question and indicator.

3.2 Relevance

This part of the evaluation considered the question "*To what extent has the project design been consistent with country requirements and EU priorities?"*

Taking each question and indicator in turn, the evaluation confirmed that the Project has been relevant and consistent with all stated criteria and priorities:

1. **Alignment with national and regional priorities**
   - The Project has been well aligned with national and regional priorities as evidenced by strategy and other documents listed in **Appendix 4** and discussions with stakeholders.

2. **Relevance to addressing problems**
   - The project strategies, methodologies and overall approaches are relevant to addressing problems, including baseline surveys and technical and capacity building interventions.

3. **Internal coherence**
   - Internal coherence of the Project has been well formulated.

4. **Coherence of Logical Framework**

- The Logical Frameworks are coherent (see **Appendix 5**).

5. **External coherence**
   - The external coherence of the project is strong. No other donor has been addressing hazardous waste and there are good linkages to other waste and sustainability activities by PACP governments, the EU and other donors which are directly or indirectly linked to The Project.
6. **Supporting priorities of target groups**
   - The project has helped support the priority needs of target groups by gathering baseline data, technical interventions, capacity building, and increasing networking and sharing of information.

7. **Alignment with perceived needs**
   - From interviews and country reports there has been overall good alignment with the perceived needs and priorities of beneficiaries, although there is a perceived need for more training and awareness , especially in HCW, to complement technical solutions.

8. **Relevance of EU financing**
   - EU financing was overall sufficient and relevant to reach the specific objectives through efficient allocation and use of resources and flexibility in allocation, subject to the comments under Efficiency below. However, the fall in the value of the Euro against the USD significantly affected the project budget and need for hedging or other financial mechanisms.

Performance against element 8 is rated as SATISFACTORY and all of the others HIGHLY SATISFACTORY. The overall rating for Relevance is judged to be HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

3.3 Efficiency

This part of the evaluation considered the question "*How efficiently has the project been implemented in order to achieve planned results at regional and national levels?"*

Taking each sub-question and indicator in turn, the evaluation found that the project has been generally implemented efficiently but there are concerns in some areas.

1. Management efficiency

a) Funding and contractual arrangements

- Overall funding and contractual arrangements have been satisfactory using established mechanisms for SPREP projects;
- Commercial tendering, procurement and contractual arrangements have been appropriate and subject to EU and SPREP controls.

There have been some funding issues e.g. insufficient funding resources for asbestos surveys in bigger countries and some contractual issues e.g the MoU with RMI, the LOA for e-waste in Tonga and some supplier issues e.g with Inciner8; also the timing of project staff being in place.

Funding and contractual arrangements are overall rated as SATISFACTORY

b) Organisational arrangements and capacities

Organisational arrangements and capacities have been sufficient for achieving most of the planned activities

- With support from SPREP the project team has consisted of a Project Manager, Project Officer (since departed without replacement), Communications Manager, a Technical Advisory Panel (meets quarterly), and a Project Steering Committee (meets annually and agrees on annual programme);

- Extensive use has been made of consultants and contractors for delivering project activities;
- Those involved appear to have appropriately qualified overall. The evaluation cannot comment on personal performance issues or which may have affected project efficiency

However, the project appears to have been under-resourced with respect to the planned tasks, with a large load on the project team and a lack of assigned country coordination. This, and the Samoa location appears to have affected communication and ownership at national level.

Organisational arrangements are overall rated as MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY

c) Coordination with other donors

- Coordination and communication with other donors has been good during the project, especially with JPRISM where there was overlap in atoll waste management and close collaboration to avoid duplication as well as sharing of information and effort. Coordination is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

d) Planning,

- The Project has involved many activities, including timetables and phasing of implementation activities. Planning for these appears have been sufficient apart from delays to the small incinerators and slow starts to e-waste programmes (more of a national than project implementation issue);
- There was extensive documented higher level planning in the earlier stages of the project and regular progress reports have been produced.

The PM failed to provide documentation showing planning and tracking or change management documentation showing management decisions on changes from original plans. However, the project planning is rated as SATISFACTORY.

e) Financial management and budgeting

- The Project has been subject to established financial and budgetary controls and these have been well managed by the project team and SPREP to achieve value from suppliers and efficient allocation of resources according to priorities for target waste streams.

Financial management of available resources is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

f) Implementation

- Project implementation, including quality, quantity and timing of technical assistance, training and other project outputs, has overall been implemented very efficiently and cost effectively;
- Most asbestos work has been completed and the small incinerator programme is on track for completion after delays;
- Other outputs have been achieved as planned;
- The overall quality of outputs has generally been as planned.

The main deficiencies relate to failure to achieve e-waste programmes in most of the pilot countries and a limited scale of PPE/equipment provision (although some further PPE activity has been scheduled). Delays in incineration installations and commissioning made impossible the monitoring of the incinerators operation, within the project timeframe. However a no-cost extension of the project has been approved to fill this gap. Implementation is overall rated as SATISFACTORY (HIGHLY SATISFACTORY for asbestos, SATISFACTORY for HCW and UNSATISFACTORY for e-waste)

g) Project coordination

- Project coordination, including with government stakeholders, civil society, has been good in some areas but team resources have been too limited for a high level of national coordination and stakeholder engagement including having dedicated project team members with national responsibility;

- There has been minimal overlap or conflict with other projects/programmes and effective collaboration e.g with JPRISM on atoll waste, EDF11 Tuvalu Waste Project (bilateral), NZ MFAT Kiribati Waste Project and others.

Considering the importance of coordination at national level, national coordination is rated as MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY. Overall project coordination is rated a s SATISFACTORY.

h) M&E mechanisms

- M&E mechanisms have been established including reviews by the Steering Committee, the ROM and this present evaluation;
- Key indicators were established after the baseline surveys

M&E is overall SATISFACTORY

i) Visibility

- Project visibility has been achieved in a number of areas through technical assistance and communications activities, regional collaboration, capacity building, media coverage and international presentations. It has included a direct budget of 93,000 Euros in the Pro Doc.

Visibility is overall SATISFACTORY

2. Availability of cost effective alternatives

- Considering the broad scope of the project and previous lack of surveys and implementation for the target waste streams the project has been broadly cost-effective. There were no significant alternative approaches for asbestos and HCW. Alternative approaches could have been adopted for e-waste e.g as discussed in the e-waste country assessments for TAP (recognising the limitations with all approaches);
- The project identified best practice options for interventions that are cost-effective, sustainable and appropriate for Pacific island communities, subject to the provisions for sustainability considered below;
- Incineration was proposed as the preferable HCW treatment technology, as economically feasible under the socio-economic conditions present in the region. Proper sitting, proper operators training and proper maintenance programs are the main prerequisites to ensure there is no risks to the environment or health of humans and other species.

The project is rated as overall SATISFACTORY against this question (HIGHLY SATISFACTORY for asbestos and HCW, SATISFACTORY for e-waste).

3.4 Effectiveness

This part of the evaluation considered the question "T*o what extent have the project's objectives and purposes been achieved for managing hazardous and other waste?"*

Taking each sub-question and indicator in turn, the evaluation found that the project has been generally implemented effectively but there are concerns in some areas.

1. Overall achievement of objectives and purposes

- The Project has significantly contributed to understanding of the regional status and management options for the target wastes (R1);
- Best available practices have been implemented in target countries through specific TA (R2);
- The Project has contributed to enhanced capacity and the development of regulatory frameworks (R3);
- The Project has contributed to regional collaboration and information exchange (R4);
- On cross-cutting issues, the Atoll Project involved women and the asbestos programme prioritised children and women in public buildings

Some specific objectives have not been achieved which were outside of the control of the Project, such as implementing regulations and establishing a recyclers' network. Achievements for e-waste have been disappointing although the budget was much less than other areas.

Overall achievement is rated as SATISFACTORY.

2. Effectiveness of project strategy

- For asbestos and healthcare the project's strategy has been broadly effective in the short term i.e. to undertake a baseline survey and identify and implement technical solutions with operator training;
- Undertaking a pilot project in atoll waste management in RMI has provided a useful model for implementation elsewhere

For e-waste the project strategy of collection for shipment has been less effective. At the time of the evaluation there had been mixed and generally limited achievement against objectives and limited prospects for major improvement by project close.

The effectiveness of any market-based strategy for e-waste is inherently limited by the low value of most e-waste materials except for a few e.g. ULAB. Successful initiatives e.g Cook Islands highlighted the importance of government support and regulation in providing incentives for commercial recyclers.

Performance is rated as SATISFACTORY.

3. Satisfaction of beneficiaries

- From the interviews and visits the beneficiaries have been highly satisfied with the results, especially for asbestos and HCW, with few cases of dissatisfaction.

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

4. Level of unintended outcomes

- For the project as a whole the level of unintended outcomes, positive or negative, and unintended beneficiaries has not been high;
- There has been more provision of HCW incineration than originally intended and more asbestos removal compared to treatment than originally intended;
- Disaster waste management became an issue both in highlighting asbestos risk and in the assistance provided for Bouffa Landfill, Vanuatu when JICA had run out of project funds;
- The Project resulted in some cases of asbestos not found in the survey e.g subsequently exposed and addressed at the express risk of countries

Performance has to some extent reflected the flexible nature of the project and is rated as SATISFACTORY.

5. Realisation of assumptions

- The project results have been broadly in line with the assumptions regarding problems and project purposes;
- The problems and solutions have been generally clear but the timescales for change may have been underestimated in project formulation e.g. regulatory change and capacity building;
- The project highlighted that asbestos is a significant problem across the region and removal contributed to a solution. However:
  - the lack of regulation and licensing on removal limits the effectiveness of training contractors unless there is effective supervision;
  - across the region continuing import of ACM and lack of prohibition legislation reduces the effectiveness of removal

- The project highlighted that e-waste collection and shipping will not be effective without economic support and incentives for recyclers.

Performance is rated as SATISFACTORY.

6. Relation of resources to results

- The Project's resources (TA, personnel, equipment, training, research etc) have been substantially and directly related to project results;
- The research and TA (asbestos removal and incinerator programmes) have been especially effective and accounted for a large proportion of the budget.

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

7. Staff appropriately qualified

- Project staff have been appropriately qualified. The PM was found to be highly knowledgeable on waste and other issues with good all-round project management skills. The Communications Manager and PO have been well qualified;
- The TAP and Steering Committee have been appropriately qualified for their roles, with an appropriate balance of skills and knowledge;
- Consultants and contractors have been appropriately qualified. The asbestos crews have been outstanding and well chosen;
- There has been limited national involvement in implementation but coordinators have been appropriately qualified

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

3.5 Impact

This part of the evaluation considered the question "W*hat are the project's foreseen and unforeseen impacts?"*

Taking each sub-question and indicator in turn, the evaluation found that the project has overall has a very positive impact compared to the scenario before the project.

1. Actual v planned results and beneficiaries

The project is not yet complete but activities are all completed or budgeted for the remaining 6 months. Actual and planned outcomes are set out in detail in **Appendix 10 – Annex3.**

- As noted above the Project has had a range of positive impacts, including
  - Addressing data gaps and provision of information;
  - Contributing best practice management for the various wastes;
  - Contributing to capacity building and policy;
  - Demonstrating management in action through pilot projects
- Although having some flexibility (with activities depending on survey results) the Project has been subject to significant change to plans in some areas as noted above, with less training and awareness and more technical assistance (see 2.4 **Section 2**);
- The main immediate beneficiaries are those now facing reduced risk from asbestos exposure or unsafe handling and disposal of HCW, as well as wider communities benefiting from atoll waste and e-waste activities;
- Wider beneficiaries are decision makers and other stakeholders benefiting from improved knowledge and information

Opportunities missed as a result of the poor performance of the e-waste component, include: valuable material recovery, reduction of POPs emissions in the environment as a result of e-waste burnt at landfills, development of the private recycling industry in the region.

Issues arising during the Atoll Waste Management Project (eg. prepaid plastic bag system at Marshall Islands v Marshall Islands program to ban the use of plastic bags; conducting of adhoc activities outside of the agreed programme) illustrated the need for good communication with stakeholders and policies to avoid ad hoc shifts.

Overall performance is rated as SATISFACTORY

2. Level of change to objectives

- As noted above while the higher level objectives remained constant, the relative emphasis changed during the life of the project, with more technical assistance and less training and awareness than originally intended, and, in the case of HCW, less PPE and equipment supply;
- The reasons for these changes was not clear through documented project decisions or stakeholder consultation although the fall in value of the Euro relative to USD had a major impact on the project budget;
- The impacts of these changes is uncertain: In the case of asbestos removal reduced risk from priority sites but there remains ongoing risk from lack of public awareness; in the case of HCW reduced downstream risk from unsafe disposal but ongoing upstream risk from unsafe handling where there is lack of awareness and equipment..

Overall performance is rated as MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY

3. Unanticipated results

There were no major but some specific unanticipated results in implementation:

- Beneficial
  - Suva International School asbestos assessment;
  - Seven disaster waste pilot projects. The experiences and lessons learned from these projects have been documented and serve as useful guides for best practice response;
  - Contributing to Fiji National and Regional Disaster Waste Management Guidelines;
  - 10 extra stainless steel incinerator stacks were provided for existing 'Mediburn Units'
- Harmful
  - The Samoa project team location and lack of national coordination contributed to under performance in some areas;
  - Contractual issues reduced efficiency and effectiveness and may have affected results

Overall performance is rated as SATISFACTORY

4. Lessons learnt

Organisation and planning for efficient delivery

- Ensure staff resource planning to meet needs for efficient and effective delivery, including specific waste management, project management, communication and administrative support skills; including timing to have early presence of PM and other key staff;
- National (local) coordination between the different stakeholders is a key factor for the project success;
- Ensure effective national communications, including national oversight roles (normally in environment departments);
- Involvement of all stakeholders at the initial stages of the project proposal preparation, to identify their priority needs and requirements will increase the feeling of project ownership and stakeholders active participation during the implementation of the project;
- Ensure continuous evaluation of project progress and achievements with an efficient evaluation process;
- The Technical Advisory Panel provides objective, strategic scientific and technical advice, increasing the legitimacy of the project actions design and planning.
- Project management could be more efficient if PM team was based at SPREP Office at Fiji;
- Allow flexibility in allocating funds, according to and responding to the needs;

Planning and design for effectiveness, impact and sustainability

- Ensure project components and actions take into consideration the existing national strategies and initiatives.
- Capacity building at country and regional level provides a sustainable waste management solution for the region;
- Effective management of e-waste will require national government (including regulation and financial instruments) as well as national and regional infrastructure to mobilise private sector action and public support; material values are generally too low for collection without incentives;
- Transportation freight costs from small and dispersed island countries must accurately be factored into the project budget.

Overall performance is rated as SATISFACTORY, with lessons being overall positive and no significant harm

5. Success factors

Various factors contributed to success or failure:

- Successes
  - Wide national coverage with national as well as regional benefits;
  - Focus on wastes not covered by other donors;
  - Clear and tangible problems and technical solutions in the case of asbestos and HCW;
  - Good research and information, especially for asbestos;
  - Effective PM in implementing technical programme delivery;
  - Very good collaboration with other donors;
  - The flexible nature of the budget allocation has been positive in allocating funds efficiently according to and responding to need;
- Failures
  - Generally weak coordination among the national stakeholders. The absence of National Steering Committees for all project components except Atoll Waste Management was a possible a handicap for the smooth project implementation;
  - The Samoa location of the Project Management Team, and the lack of local coordination between National Focal Points and Stakeholders appear to have reduced communications and feelings of ownership at national level;
  - Staff resourcing and timing

Overall performance is rated as SATISFACTORY.

6. Level of insight

The Project:

- Shed new light on the extent of problems and risks, especially on asbestos but also HCW;
- Contributed to capacity and knowledge in asbestos management and incinerator operation and maintenance;
- Contributed to developing innovative solutions for e-waste and atoll waste management

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

7. Comparison with previous evaluations

Table 2 shows a comparison with the ROM 2015 evaluation. It shows:

- The present evaluation is in line with ROM 2015 with respect to all comparable criteria
- Overall Efficiency performance is rated Satisfactory, but organisational arrangements and capacities and planning sub-criteria are rated as unsatisfactory. This was the case in the previous ROM assessment and indicates that no progress was made for this aspect;
- Sustainability performance (see below) remains unsatisfactory. Sustainability at national level was not explicitly included in Project objectives

Table 2. Comparison with previous evaluations

	ROM 2015	Mid Term Evaluation

Relevance	Good / Very good	Highly Satisfactory
Efficiency	Good / Very good	Satisfactory
Effectiveness	Good/Very good	Satisfactory
Impact		Satisfactory
Sustainability	Serious deficiencies	Unsatisfactory
EU coherence and added value		Satisfactory
Cross cutting issues		Highly satisfactory

Since issues raised in the ROM have not been addressed, while recognising the sustainability challenges outside of the project's control, performance is rated as UNSATISFACTORY.

8. Recommendations

Addressed in **Section 5** of this Report. This aspect is rated as SATISFACTORY. The recommendations follow from lessons being overall positive and no significant harm, and significant opportunities in EDF11.

9. Risk management

- There is limited evidence that formal risk management strategy or processes (eg. the LogFrame Matrix) were applied to project plans and options and to changes through the life of the project, although risks were considered to some degree in contractor and equipment selection, contracts and supply;
- There is no evidence that SPREP identified the timeline and activity challenges that ultimately contributed to e-waste poor results, and the delays related to the installation of the incinerators (now being addressed);
- These challenges contributed to the failure to achieve anticipated project outcomes for the e-waste component, and the monitoring and follow up evaluation of the operation of the incinerators. However this is covered with the no-cost extension of the project duration;
- It is likely that asbestos removal and HCW incinerator installation, as well project communication and other activities, will be completed by Project close provided staff resources will be available;
- It is unlikely that most e-waste collection and shipping targets will be achieved.

Performance against risk management is rated as MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY.

Overall performance for Impact is rated as SATISFACTORY.

3.6 Sustainability

1. Level of acceptance and ownership

There is acceptance of technical and other solutions but:

- Weak feelings of project results ownership;
- A perceived lack of coordination, engagement and consultation at national level although there was general communication through agreed project processes (a project resourcing issue as well as reflecting possible organisational issues at national level);
- Training, awareness and capacity building activities did not come up to the stakeholders' expectations;
- Consulting activities were of very short duration, reflecting the project budget, scale and geographical coverage.

Performance is rated as UNSATISFACTORY.

2. Appropriateness of technology

a) Correspondence to capacity;

- The HCW incinerators have been received but there remain user concerns regarding ongoing fuel and other operating costs (although 3 years' operational support will be provided under contract conditions); NB formatting error corrected here

- Almost 25,000 m^2 of asbestos was removed out of the estimated 190,000m^2 present in non-residential buildings. ACM are still imported in the region. However significant work has been done by PacWaste through a SPREP paper for a regional ban on new asbestos imports, through high profile cleanups of new asbestos (Gizo Hospital fire) and through support to Pacific islanders at International events (Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm) to support bans and call for the listing of crysotile on the Rotterdam conventions.
- e-waste project had very poor results and did not correspond to the capacity and needs of the target groups;
- Atoll waste management program seems to have good results, and can serve as a good example for the rest of the Atoll countries

Overall rated as MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY

b) The need for further assistance is high:
   - Legislative frameworks exist only in a small number of countries, whilst enforcement mechanisms are absent;
   - Lack of local resources;
   - Lack of ongoing, general local expertise and training in hazardous waste management

Overall rated as UNSATISFACTORY

3. Institutional and management capacity and commitment

Issues include:

- Lack of funds and expertise as above;
- Funding of operating costs;
- The total cost of asbestos removal is far beyond the PICTs Governments' financial capabilities; A common related issue is that ACM is still imported in the region but PacWaste, through SPREP has done considerable work in investigating a regional ban;
- E-waste recycling programs are very expensive due to the small quantities that are generated and the high freight costs due to the distance. This makes the sustainability of the e-waste program without external contribution highly doubtful;
- The assistance to establish a regulatory framework for the three hazardous waste streams was not undertaken.

Overall rated as UNSATISFACTORY

4. Sustainability of benefits

Considering the preceding sustainability evaluation it is highly doubtful that the benefits can be maintained without further support.

Rated as UNSATISFACTORY

5. Sustainability strategy developed and implemented

- There is no evidence that a sustainability strategy was developed and implemented;
- Concerns raised in the ROM of 2015 have not been addressed

While recognising sustainability challenges outside of the project's control, and the achievements of the project, overall performance is rated as UNSATISFACTORY

3.7 EU coherence and added value

This part of the evaluation considered the questions of coherence and complementarity with EU and other donors' development programmes and to what the extent the Programme has added value to EU interventions.

1. Coherence with other EU interventions

- There is strong coherence e.g.(see also Appendix)
  - The Cotonou Agreement, which requires sustainable management of natural resources and the environment, including climate change;
  - The EU Communication Towards a renewed EU-Pacific development partnership;
  - The 10th EDF Pacific Regional Indicative Programme (RIP), Priority Area 2: Sustainable Management of Natural Resources.

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

2. Complementarity with other donor interventions

There is good complementarity - see Q5 Relevance. Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

3. EU added value

EU added value has been high

Hazardous waste management capacity development

- PacWASTE focused on selected hazardous waste streams not addressed before and previously poorly managed and posing significant human health risks and environmental impacts.
- The Project has focused on both capacity building and technical infrastructure, as the appropriate approach ensuring that high priority issues (like dangerous healthcare waste treatment, asbestos removal and safe disposal) are addressed, whilst in parallel local capacity and expertise is developed to sustain such actions in the future.

Monitoring and reporting requirements

- The reporting and monitoring requirements were largely met by the progress reporting prepared by SPREP. These reports provide a relatively detailed record of project activities including project management.
- PacWASTE funding allocation requirements and rules allowed the Project Management Team to move through procurement processes more efficiently in some cases showing the required flexibility to address unanticipated issues, like disaster waste management.

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

Overall performance against EU Coherence and Added Value is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

3.8 Cross cutting issues

This part of the evaluation considered the degree to which the Project has considered cross-cutting issues, specifically gender equality, environment, good governance, youth, elders and people living in outer islands, and climate change.

1. Gender equality

- The importance of women and youth on waste and pollution management was fully recognised in the implementation of the Majuro Atoll Waste Management component with the active involvement of WUTMI.
- There were no other similar engagement in PacWASTE but WUTMI involvement showed what can be achieved with good organisation and local participation.
- The addressed gender issues were in line with the Pacific Leaders Gender Equality Declaration and the new EU Staff Working Document on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

Performance is rated as SATISFACTORY.

2. Environment

- The Project has had various environmental benefits, direct and indirect, as well as benefits for human health and safety. These were fundamental to the intervention objectives and design.

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

3. Good governance

Good governance has been considered and applied to project design and implementation, including:

- Increased awareness and transparency of hazardous waste issues for governments and other stakeholders to influence regulation and improved practice;
- Empowering local communities to improve waste management;
- Responsible technical assistance, minimising risks and harm (e.g. licensed asbestos service providers);
- EU and SPREP governance processes applied to project implementation.

Performance is rated as HIGHLY SATISFACTORY.

4. Youth, elders, outer islands

- There has been limited direct consideration or involvement of youth or elders except to the degree that the Project is beneficial to all members of the community;
- The asbestos removal programme prioritised schools in view of the risk to children and youth. The Atoll Project involved young people, and some e-waste projects targeted schools for awareness;
- The Project focused on the main islands as the main generators of waste but recognised the need for inclusion of outer islands, especially for e-waste, and provided small incinerators to islands with hospitals.

Performance is rated as SATISFACTORY.

5. Climate change adaptation

- Climate change and disaster waste management became prominent unanticipated areas of support in landfill cleanup and mitigating asbestos risk from building damage.

Performance is rated as SATISFACTORY.

Overall performance for cross cutting issues is rated as SATISFACTORY.

3.9 Rating of project performance

Table 3 summarises the ratings against each indicator, for the seven evaluation questions and for the overall project. Judgement is applied in combining ratings based on balanced consideration rather than rigid weighting

Table 3. PacWASTE Performance Rating

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	Rating	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	Rating
1. RELEVANCE		**4. IMPACT**	
1. Alignment with national/regional priorities	**HS**	1. Results v plans	**S**
2. Relevance to addressing problems	**HS**	2. Level of change to objectives	**MU**
3. Internal coherence	**HS**	3. Level of unanticipated results:	**S**
4. Coherence of Logical Frameworks:	**HS**	4. Lessons learnt	**S**
5. External coherence	**HS**	5. Success factors	**S**
6. Support for priority needs of target groups	**HS**	6. Level of insight	**S**
7. Alignment with perceived needs	**S**	7. Comparison with previous evaluations.	**U**
8. Relevance of EU financing	**HS**	8. Recommendations.	**S**
Overall for Relevance	**HS**	9. Risk management	**MU**
		Overall for Impact	**S**

2. EFFICIENCY			
Management efficiency		**5. SUSTAINABILITY**	
a) Funding and contractual arrangements:	**S**	1. Level of acceptance and ownership	**U**
b) Organisational arrangements and capacities:	**MU**	2 Appropriate Technology or services: a) *Appropriateness of technology*	**MU**
c) Coordination with other donors	**HS**	b) Level of assistance still needed	**U**
d) Planning	**S**	3. Level of institutional and management capacity and commitment	**U**
e) Financial management and budgeting	**HS**	4. Sustainability of benefits	**U**
f) Implementation	**S**	5. Sustainability strategy	**U**
g) Project coordination	**S**	*Overall for Sustainability*	**U**
h) M&E mechanisms:	***S***		
i) Visibility:	***S***	**6. EU COHERENCE AND ADDED VALUE**	
2. Availability of cost-effective alternatives:	***S***	1. EU coherence	**HS**
Overall for Efficiency	***S***	2. Complementarity	**HS**
		3. EU added value	**HS**
3. EFFECTIVENESS		*Overall for EU Coherence and Added Value*	**HS**
1. Achievement of objectives and purposes	**S**		
2. Effectiveness of project strategy	**S**	**7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES** 1. Level of consideration	
3. Satisfaction of beneficiaries	**S**	a) Gender equality	**S**
4. Level of unintended outcomes	**S**	b) Environment	**HS**
5. Realisation of assumptions	**S**	c) Good governance	**HS**
6. Relation of resources to results	**HS**	d) Youth, elders, persons living in outer islands, etc	**S**
7. Staff appropriately qualified	**HS**	*Overall for Cross-Cutting Issues*	**S**
Overall for Effectiveness	**S**		
		Overall for Project	**S**

4. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

The overall assessment of the Project is that its performance has been overall satisfactory and that it provides a solid foundation for EDF11 when considering:

- The detailed findings in **Section 3** and the summary **Table 3**;
- The conclusions set out in **Section 5.2** which synthesise the findings;
- The valuable lessons summarised in **Section 3.5** (4) which provide a basis for the recommendations in **Section 5.3**;

The overall evaluation is that:

- PacWASTE has been a worthwhile and highly relevant project with positive and beneficial results against Key Results;
- It has been delivered overall efficiently and effectively, especially in the areas of technical assistance for asbestos and HCW, but could have been better organised and resourced to increase local ownership and communication;
- The project has been extensively documented and reported, although this documentation was not made readily available and accessible during the evaluation. While general decision-making and approval processes have been appropriate and documented, the evaluators were provided with high level documents to clearly demonstrate approval of project changes against original objectives and plans only at a later stage of the allocated evaluation period;
- The sustainability of solutions is weak and benefits are unlikely to be maintained without further support.

5. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Limitations

This evaluation has been conducted within the allocated time and reporting constraints to provide a fair assessment based on information provided or obtained. Factual information from reports and documentation has been used wherever possible but in a number of areas this was sparse or not

forthcoming. This limited the depth of assessment for historic activities and countries not visited. Answers to a number of the questions have been necessarily based on interviews and judgements. These may be subject to amendment in the review process subject to provision of documentary or other evidence.

5.2 Conclusions

5.2.1 Conclusions against Results

Overall, the Project has been successful in achieving broad objectives, particularly against R1 and R2.It has:

1. **Improved data and information (R1)**
   - Improved data through surveys, status and management options assessed and prioritised, particularly for asbestos and HCW;
2. **Contribution to best practice (R2)**
   - Removed significant quantities of asbestos in priority locations, as well as implemented the HCW installation programme, atoll waste pilot, e-waste pilots and disaster waste project;
3. **Capacity building and policy/regulatory frameworks (R3)**
   - Built capacity through asbestos, HCW and e-waste training and awareness; contributed towards regional policy and regulation of ACM;
   - Created the environment for engagement of public-private partnerships and the improvement of public systems and processes;
   - Provided resources to demonstrate 'management in action' and contributed to further government complementary actions.
4. **Collaboration and information exchange (R4)**
   - Achieved good collaboration and information exchange on hazardous waste management practices, including collaboration and communication with other donors, national governments, educational institutions and other stakeholders. A good network has been built and The Project created working relationships with the Private Sector;
   - Demonstrated the feasibility of an exporting e-waste program, resulting in government support for additional exporting.

However:

- The anticipated level of awareness was not achieved;
- There was less contribution to national regulation development than intended;
- Results for e-waste have been unsatisfactory. However, budgetary allocation has been much less for this area and the results highlighted the difficulty of progress in this area without a regulatory and funding framework and national/regional infrastructure;
- Sometimes the implementation of the project components was in contradiction with established national practices, showing lack of communication with national stakeholders during the preparation of the project (eg. prepaid plastic bag system at Marshall Islands v Marshall Islands program to ban the use of plastic bags). This creates confusion among the public which might have an impact on the project success;
- In the cases where the project is in line and complementary to National Programs, the results are sustainable (eg. asbestos and e-waste components at Cooks Islands)

5.2.2 Conclusions against evaluation criteria

1. Relevance

- The intervention, including target waste streams, builds on lessons learned from previous programmes in the area, has been highly relevant against regional and national priorities, and coherent with EU strategy and other donor interventions

2. Efficiency

- The project has been overall efficiently planned and managed to yield the planned results;
- Organisational deficiencies, especially the lack of national coordination and communication, limited ownership at national level;

3 Effectiveness

- The project has been overall on track, effective in achieving the planned results, beneficiaries are broadly satisfied, quality outputs have been achieved and resources effectively directed to results.

However the strategy and results for e-waste have been unsatisfatory, as has been the generally reduced level of training and awareness compared to earlier plans.

4. **Impact**
   - The overall impacts of the project have been positive, especially for asbestos and HCW with tangible improvements;
   - The Atoll waste pilot has provided a useful model;
   - There have been significant contributions to knowledge and collaboration.

5. **Sustainability**
   - A major conclusion of the evaluation is that project benefits are unlikely to be sustained without ongoing support due to the nature of the problems, lack of regulation, lack of capacity and lack of resources.
6. **EU coherence and added vale**
   - The evaluation has concluded that there are high levels of coherence and value in the Project.

7. **Cross-cutting issues**
   - There has been consideration of all cross-cutting issues where relevant but practical considerations mitigated against inclusion of small islands.

5.2.3 Main conclusions

1. The overall conclusion is that PacWASTE has been a worthwhile and highly relevant project with positive and beneficial results.
2. The project has generated strong links, networks and synergies with regional organisations and activities, and was instrumental in such initiatives as the Clean Pacific Roundtable.
3. It has been delivered overall efficiently and effectively, especially in the areas of technical assistance for asbestos and HCW, but could have been better organised and resourced to increase local ownership and communication.
4.
5. The e-waste component has not been cost effective.
6. While recognising sustainability challenges outside of the project's control, and the achievements of the project, the sustainability of solutions is weak and benefits are unlikely to be maintained without further support.
7. The conclusions strongly support EDF11.

5.3 Recommendations

As noted in Section 2.1 one of the purposes of this report is propose relevant recommendations to feed the current Programme and the development of future actions, in particular the formulation of the upcoming 11th EDF regional waste management programme.

As the Proponent of EDF 11 and client for this Report, the recommendations are primarily provided for the EU Delegation. They also generally relevant to the many stakeholders in the Evaluation and a successful EDF11, including the Implementing Partner (SPREP), Beneficiary Countries and others e.g. other donors.

Recommendations arising from the evaluation to inform EDF 11 are:

Strategy and focus

1. Building on the successes of PacWASTE, both in national implementation programmes and regional collaboration/information-sharing, and tailoring solutions to countries' needs;
2. Maintaining and building on regional links and networks created will be essential for a successful EDF11.
3. Focusing on the stated priority waste streams, including asbestos, HCW and e-waste; also disaster, wastewater, bulky and other waste as stated;
4. Blending waste stream program elements including waste streams and actions that could potentially have positive financial impacts (generation of income, job creation)
5. Focusing on assisting to develop / enhance effective legislative waste management framework, since it is essential to achieve sustainability;
6. Continued efforts in asbestos removal, assessing the significance of water pipe ACM waste not included in PacWASTE;
7. Increased emphasis on capacity building including:
    a. asbestos: public awareness and training for local competent authorities staff, contractors, or other stakeholders; but removal work should be under the supervision of external licensed persons until local capacity and regulation is developed;
    b. HCW: awareness of management along the waste chain of disposal;
    c. e-waste: public awareness and training in handling and management;
    d. training for environmental, customs and other officers;
    e. a move from ad hoc to purposeful and competency based/certified training;
    f. emphasis on train the trainer and training hubs for increased efficiency of resources and enhanced sustainability;
    g. stronger involvement of the Academia of the region in the training and the consulting activities in the areas where there is proven expertise
8. Increased emphasis on disaster waste;
9. Developing optimal tailored solutions for managing e-waste. Effective management of e-waste requires:
    a. strengthening the legal and institutional framework;
    b. e-waste awareness raising and advocacy;
    c. setting up and functioning of e-waste market: e-waste handling, recycling and disposal infrastructure;
    d. strategic partnerships targeting e-waste;
    e. capacity building in e-waste management;
10. There is a need for innovative, sustainable solutions, including repurposing; the idea of a regional collection and processing ship for e-waste has been mooted as a possible collaboration with other donors.

Organisation and resources

11. Stronger national cooperation among stakeholders: use of a different model of national coordination (compared to the National Contact Point adopted in PacWASTE), eg. engage already existing national waste / environmental management institutional arrangements in each country, which include the major stakeholders;
12. More active national oversight roles and involvement during the implementation of the project phases, to increase the feeling of ownership of the project;
13. Regular updates of the countries stakeholders on project actions planning and progress;
14. Sustainable financing to ensure PacWASTE initiatives are sustainable;
15. Continue good donor collaboration at regional and national levels; maintain and develop networks;
16. Ensuring wider visibility of the new Project early form the beginning: e.g. organise PacWaste Plus Info Days in each country inviting a wide range of stakeholders;
17. There is a need to develop project management skills of the beneficiaty countries involved in the project

18. Ensuring sufficient resources for an appropriately qualified, skilled and supported project team
19. Optimal location for the project team (in practice Fiji)
20. Ensuring staff resource planning to meet needs for efficient and effective delivery, including specific waste management, project management, communication and administration