

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization: ● Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-01167

Procedure Department: CO - Libya - Tripoli

Procedure Type: Closure

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(3)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00112158	CO - Libya - Tripoli	On Going	00094616	2/29/2016	12/31/2023
00127766	CO - Libya - Tripoli	On Going	00094616	1/1/2021	12/31/2023
00098720	CO - Libya - Tripoli	On Going	00094616	2/29/2016	12/31/2023

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-10-31 00:54:00	Approved	Nora Ellafi
Approval Request Submitted	2023-10-11 05:52:16	Started	Eman Elmasri

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project had identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into its operations in the past. The project was a multi-donor initiative that aimed to support the Libyan Government of National Accord (GNA) in restoring essential services and improving livelihoods in conflict-affected areas. It operated under the overall governance structure of the SFL Project Board, which provided strategic direction and oversight to the project and ensured that it aligned with agreed priorities.

The project also had a "Donor Technical Working Group (DTG)", a sub-committee of the Project Board that met regularly to discuss any relevant changes in the external environment and adjust the project accordingly. For instance, when the COVID-19 pandemic broke out in the region in early 2020, the DTG approved reprogramming some available resources to support the COVID-19 response plan. This demonstrated that the project was capable of identifying and responding to a major change in the external environment that affected its objectives and beneficiaries.

Furthermore, the project followed the 'Organizational Process Assets (OPAs)' of UNDP, which were processes, policies, and procedures that supported project management and delivery. These included quality standards, risk management, reporting structure, decision-making process, and communication approach. These OPAs helped the project adapt to the internal environment of the organization and ensure compliance with UN operating standards. All evidence attached.

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

SFL project responds to SP area 3 and includes SP indicators in its IWP. Also, the SFL adopts the second signature solution "Governance for peaceful, just, and inclusive societies". Evidence in the ProDoc attached shows that the project aligned to the SP Outcome 6, and the Output 6.2 and 6.4.

Relevant

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

3. Are the project's targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for them?

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project followed a human rights-based approach (HRBA) which puts people at the center of the evaluation as rights holders. The evaluation also assessed the extent to which the needs of vulnerable and marginalized populations (e.g., persons with disabilities, tribal groups) have been addressed in order to ensure the principle of Leave No One Behind in accordance with the 2030 Agenda. Also, the project improved access to public social services (such as health and education), which reached the population with limited income (since the richer citizens

tend to go to private services). Furthermore, the participation of CSOs in the consultation workshops which selected and prioritized the activities limited the tendency of elite capture. In some municipalities, these consultations helped to change the initial selected locations that benefitted more the municipal council members and less the wider population within the municipality. Moreover, the project conducted research and monitoring that were inclusive in terms of capturing the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized part of the Libya population, vulnerable for incitement of conflict. The project also engaged civil society and youth in a way that was able to include and reach the most vulnerable and marginalized part of the Libya population, vulnerable for incitement of violence. Evidence the final evaluation report Pg. 23

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project used knowledge and lessons learned from context analysis, people involvement, and coordination mechanisms to inform management decisions and ensure relevance, quality, and risk management. Furthermore, the project conducted iterative community consultations, considered cross-cutting issues, recruited and trained appropriate staff, increased integration and coordination within SFL and with other UN entities, and reported on lessons learned in annual reports.
Please find the lessons learnt Pg. 42. at the final report.

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was sufficiently at scale, and there is potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change. This can be evidenced by the following points:
The project supported some municipalities to create a "crisis unit" to carry out monitoring of activities and to attract funding from other sources, including oil companies, to scale up activities. Also, stimulated the private and public sector to fund additional departments in a hospital and to establish a central pharmacy that serviced neighboring municipalities with medical supplies and equipment.
Furthermore, the project created a demand for scalability by neighboring municipalities that requested that the SFL implement activities also in their localities. For example, in Benghazi, an extra consultation session – which was not originally planned - was organized in the Nahr district after other Local Councils expressed their interest and willingness to hold similar meetings.
Additionally the project has been scaled up from stabilization to resilience peace building structures under the new Country Programme.
The project was suppose to ends on 31 Dec 2021. However, a no-cost extension was submitted to the donor for

eight months to allow the project sufficient time to complete the ongoing activities.
Evidence final report and the evaluation report Pg.50.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project had some date evidence on the relevance to measure gender inequalities for example, the project ensured that the gender inequalities issues are addressed through the community consultations, of which at least 30% of the participants were women. However, the final evaluation addressed some aspects. This can be evidenced by the following points. The evaluation also found out the project achieved modest results in gender equality and social inclusion, by rehabilitating some infrastructure for women, conducting a gender review workshop, enhancing women's voice and agency, and ensuring community consultations with women. The project developed a Gender Action Plan in 2021 to guide the gender mainstreaming opportunities and actions. The plan is attached. The project was assigned a Gen 2 marker. The project conducted a Gender and Security Assessment covering Benghazi, Sirt and Ubari, which provided a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of gendered conflict drivers, inclusion and exclusion dynamics, and gendered needs and priorities for stabilization in each location. Based on this assessment, a Women and Youth Grants scheme was launched in 2019 in these three municipalities, which encouraged projects for funding activities that would strengthen local conflict management and social accountability mechanisms; contribute to social cohesion; improve service delivery; and provide livelihood opportunities.

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project is categorized as low risk as per the assessment carried out during the design stage. However, the project continuously monitors the infrastructure projects to ensure that any social and environmental risks are

timely identified and mitigated. All the risk logs during the life cycle of the project are attached in the evidence folder.

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, The project liaised with the end-users and beneficiaries through the project's local coordinators for feedback or any grievances shared by the local community and acted accordingly to address them. The local coordinators were responsible for ensuring that the project activities were responsive to the needs and priorities of the local population, and that any complaints or concerns were communicated to the project management and resolved in a timely manner.

The project also established local peace structures, such as the Social Peace Partnerships (SPPs) and the Coordination Working Group, which enhanced regular communication and coordination on stabilization issues and acted as social accountability mechanisms to monitor work delivered by the SFL and the local authorities. These structures also provided a platform for dialogue and conflict resolution among different social groups, including women and youth, and facilitated the adoption of the Fezzan Charter for Peaceful Coexistence and Social Cohesion in Sebha.

The project conducted a Gender and Security Assessment covering Benghazi, Sirt and Ubari, which provided a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of gendered conflict drivers, inclusion and exclusion dynamics, and gendered needs and priorities for stabilization in each location. Based on this assessment, a Women and Youth Grants scheme was launched in 2019 in these three municipalities, which encouraged projects for funding activities that would strengthen local conflict management and social accountability mechanisms; contribute to social cohesion; improve service delivery; and provide livelihood opportunities.

Management & Monitoring

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project allocated a budget for midterm evaluation that was started in May 2021 however it was not completed, due to quality of the quality of report produced by the consultant. A final evaluation was undertaken and completed in June 2022, attached. However, the project's M&E framework did not capture outcome level achievements, so it was not possible to determine the extent to which the SFL's outcomes contributed to the achievement of the intended impact (stabilization goal). The project focused mostly on monitoring Output 1 (rehabilitation of infrastructure), which was easier to count and quantify, than the other two Outputs (capacity building and social cohesion), which were at least equally important for achieving stabilization.

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project held regular meetings with the donor working group, where they discussed project strategy, approach, technical issues, challenges, and work plans with stakeholders. The project was overseen by its Project Board, which also guided its strategic direction. During Phase 1, the Project Board was co-chaired by the nominated Representative of the Presidential Council and the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General (DSRSG). However, with the decoupling of UNDP during Phase 2, the co-chair became UNDP's Resident Representative (RR). Major fund-contributing partners were also included as members of the Project Board. Additionally, a Donor Technical Group (DTG) was established, comprising representatives from all SFL donors, with the Government of Libya represented by the Ministry of Planning (MoP). The DTG was tasked with monitoring SFL implementation, providing advice on emerging themes in SFL outcome and impact, and identifying opportunities for mutual support and synergy. Final DTG is attached in the evidence folder.

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The risk log was monitored quarterly and updated where issues emerge. Special attention was paid to political risks and access constraints caused by security instability. Additionally, the implementation of project activities on the ground was informed by updated conflict analysis to ensure that the project adequately adheres to the NO HARM APPROACH. Risk logs are attached.

Efficient

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes
 No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Total amount mobilized since the onset for both SFL phase 1 & 2 is \$ 95.9 million. The amount utilized under Phase 1 was 28.4 million, leaving \$67.5 million for phase 2. The Total amount projected for phase 2 as per the project document is \$92.9 million; therefore, the funding gap as of October 2021 is \$25.4 million. The funding gap since 2020, caused a notable decrease in project activities where many planned investment projects (community infrastructures) and community consultations (Kufra and Ajdabyia) have been put on hold till the project's financial sustainability is more secured.

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project procurement plan was developed and approved in the first quarter of 2021. It has also been updated twice in the second and third quarters to reflect new priorities identified by the local communities. Also, during the revision exercises, the procurement plan has been adjusted based on the available resources and funding gap. the last procurement plan is attached.

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project kept track of unit costs by comparing them to historical data collected over several years related to infrastructure projects. Additionally, the office conducted an analysis of market prices to inform unit pricing and project costing exercises. Results framework in the final progress report is attached.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- Yes
 No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was on track in delivering the stabilization goals for most of the approved locations/municipalities. However, due to the funding gap, the implementation of stabilization interventions was put on hold for Ajdabiya. In addition, the priority investment lists for Tawergha and Sirte were only partially implemented. Evidence the project final report.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The DTG reviewed and approved the project work plan at the beginning of every fiscal year. The work plan had been revised to reflect new priorities as identified by the local communities, and also budget revision had been undertaken to address the funding gap.

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project used a human rights-based approach to evaluate and address the needs of vulnerable and marginalized populations, improved access to public social services for the population with limited income, and conducted inclusive research and monitoring of the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized part of the Libya population. Evidence final report and the evaluation report attached.

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP's digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)

- 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project focused on capacity building, fostering local ownership, and promoting environmental sustainability reflects its commitment to UNDP's standard sustainability practices and robust project risk management. The formation of a Social Accountability Team, collaboration with various organizations, and the implementation of a reverse approach in Phase II further highlight the project's dedication to sustainability. As a result, it can be affirmed that the project has effectively addressed specific technology and data risks as part of its closure. Evidence the final progress report attached Pg 39.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

19. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The UNDP Libya operates under the DIM modality. Thus, UNDP implements its procurement, monitoring, and evaluation operations and policies.

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements8 adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

SFL conducted, in 2019, an Organizational Capacity Assessment in Sirte to assess the capacities, policies, and procedures in areas of project management, human resources management, and financial management. The assessment intended to highlight strengths and weaknesses in the management capacities of local authorities to

perform their duties. In addition, SFL supported four municipalities to develop local development plans and resource mobilization strategies.

21. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project prepared and shared a phase-out plan with the DTG members to outline the ongoing and planned activities for the remaining period of the project lifetime along with the no-cost extension request for eight months in 2022 to allow sufficient time to complete the ongoing activities. Also, the project informed the DTG members on the project closure exercise intended for 2022. The new County Programme focuses on resilience as such the project transitioned to building resilience.