

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization:  Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-00892

Procedure Department: CO - Libya - Tripoli

Procedure Type: Closure

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(1)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00105858	CO - Libya - Tripoli	Operationally Closed	00104158	5/1/2017	9/17/2023

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-10-18 13:38:19	Approved	Nora Ellafi
Approval Request Submitted	2023-10-16 02:51:23	Started	Eman Elmasri

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Highly 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)

The project proactively identified changes in the external environment and incorporated them into its strategy. The project was affected by security situations, local disputes, and the COVID-19 pandemic, which impacted the pace of

implementation of civil works, delivery of equipment, and trainings.

In response to these challenges, UNDP rolled out its business continuity plan and closely monitored the situation on the ground. After the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, UNDP launched its business continuity strategy to ensure the safe, effective, and timely completion of project activities. In line with the recommendations of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), UNDP established mechanisms to ensure compliance with travel regulations and local government decisions.

Anticipating that these situations might further affect the pace of implementation, no-cost extension requests were discussed with the EU, resulting in two approved requests that extended the implementation period to 5 July 2021. Furthermore, UNDP identified lessons learned throughout the project period. These lessons emphasized the importance of local level service delivery in national stability, the need to view local dynamics in the context of national political context, and the significance of strengthening area-based approach. These insights show that the project was responsive to changes in its external environment and adapted its strategy accordingly.

Additionally, one INGO (PCI) was selected to provide a conflict sensitivity analysis. These analyses served as information sources in the external environment changes, that posed both posing challenges and opportunities for this project.

Evidence is the final report Pg 70.

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)

The Resilience and Recovery project aligns with the Strategic Plan and the outcome in the CPD, which calls for enhancing societies' capacity to recover from shocks and disasters. Furthermore, the objectives of the project line up with the strategic Plan.

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 systematically engaged its targeted groups, particularly those marginalized, vulnerable, and left further behind, to ensure that no one was left behind. The project was implemented by UNDP from 2017 to 2021 and aimed to respond to conflict and human-induced challenges that negatively impacted citizens' access to basic services, economic opportunities, social cohesion, and security.

The project targeted twelve municipalities across Libya, which were identified based on their location along

migration routes and main departure points to Europe, their potential for economic development, and the impact of conflict, internal displacement, and return on these areas.

The project worked in close coordination with the EU, Ministry of Local Government, Municipal Councils, local partner organizations, contractors, and sector working groups to improve access to essential services, create jobs and livelihoods, promote social cohesion, and enhance community security.

Amidst the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and widespread lockdown and curfew restrictions, the supported municipalities responded to the challenges posed by COVID-19 using the renovated infrastructures and essential equipment delivered by the project in several sectors, including health and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). The project filled many gaps in terms of rehabilitation of essential infrastructure in a number of key service areas (notably health, education, water and sanitation) as well as in the development of an inclusive municipal platform that brought together the various groups living in the municipalities to develop a conflict-sensitive mechanism to identify municipal priorities. This shows that the project was responsive to the needs of its targeted groups and adapted its strategy accordingly. Evidence final report pg. 69 and Pg 9

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 generated knowledge and lessons learned, which informed management decisions. Key lessons include managing expectations, recognizing the growing potential of the start-up ecosystem in Libya, brokering access to capital in livelihood interventions, acknowledging societal and cultural norms that discourage young women from engaging in economic activities, and the importance of regular field monitoring. The project also identified the need for longer-term development programming to complement stabilization efforts and the importance of creating and strengthening an entrepreneurial culture. These insights have guided the project's approach to managing risks and ensuring the quality of its outputs. Evidence final report Pg. 70

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.

Under Output 2, the project leveraged existing partnerships with EUBAM, UNSMIL, under the leadership of the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Justice. These partnerships informed programming under UNDP/UNSMIL Policing project which would ultimately continue and scale up implementation of Rule of Law activities at a national level.

Under Output 3, partnerships with Tatweer and Toyota expanded the community of practice on entrepreneurship in Libya. The SLRR Top Up project will build on this foundation and scale up these partnerships, as well as support

systemic change through capacity building of local authorities to create entrepreneurship hubs, centres and business incubators.

Despite challenges such as security situations, local disputes and COVID-19 affecting the pace of implementation, the project managed to benefit people in 52 municipalities across all phases. This phase 1 covered only 12 municipalities, equivalent to almost 50% of all Libyan municipalities. The project also focused on the human-development nexus and developing the sustainability and peacebuilding capacities of local government agencies and civil society organizations. This shows that the project was sufficiently at scale and has potential for future scaling up. Evidence final report Pg. 75 and 79

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's measures to address gender inequalities and empower women were both relevant and effective. The project leveraged societal and cultural norms to encourage young women's participation in economic activities. It also implemented a gender-sensitive approach in its needs assessment and prioritization process, ensuring inclusivity and participation from all relevant stakeholders.

The project's efforts to build an entrepreneurial culture among youth, particularly in the innovation, technology, and digital economy sectors, have shown promising results. This initiative not only created direct employment opportunities but also contributed to closing existing market gaps. The project's implementation of the SLCRR Top-Up project, which focuses on women's empowerment in universities, incubators, and career centers, is a testament to its commitment to gender equality. Also, policewomen at the model police station, and involvement of women municipality council members.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation, the project demonstrated satisfactory performance, particularly in terms of effectiveness and relevance. Regular field monitoring and progress review visits were integral to the project's success, enabling the detection of challenges and implementation of corrective measures in a timely manner. Overall, the project's measures have been successful in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. The potential for future scaling up of these efforts is evident. Gender-disaggregated data for all activities and donor reporting requirements were routinely gathered and reported by the project, and the identification of needs, involved a gender-sensitive approach to ensure that the unique needs of both women and men are met through a participative development strategy. Evidence final report

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)

Social and environmental screening was carried out with a low-risk classification overall. However, Risks were constantly tracked and recorded. Evidence risk log attached

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)

SLCRR had mechanisms in place to address grievances and mitigate any perceived harm. The project was managed efficiently as per the current administrative set-up, with partnerships leveraged with EUBAM, UNSMIL, Ministry of Interior, and Ministry of Justice. These partners were engaged throughout the process of needs assessment, prioritization, and developing job descriptions, training plans, and standard operating procedures. The project also demonstrated a high absorption capacity of funding, leading to the decision to start the second phase ahead of schedule as works and activities were advancing at a good pace. A thematic review on "Do-No Harm (DNH) and Conflict Sensitivity" showed that UNDP operates according to a strong set of policies, procedures, and processes that mitigate DNH risks. However, it is noted that there were some coordination challenges with municipalities during the initial project discussion. While UNDP staff in Libya had close contact with municipalities to define priority projects once the project was being implemented on the ground, it is not entirely clear if there were coordination relays through the municipal groups created by PCI.

Overall, while there were some coordination challenges, the project appears to have mechanisms in place to address grievances and ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated. Moreover, the main partners and contractors contacted directly UNDP staff and consultants. In addition, in terms of affected people, users and beneficiaries, M&E team has conducted post monitoring and pre-post training evaluations using Kobo online survey and phones interviews for more systematic data collection and analysis of beneficiaries' feedback. Evidence Evaluation report and final report.

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 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's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan was effectively implemented. The evaluation process was participatory, involving a documentary review and analysis phase, and an in-country field data collection phase in Libya. Key Informant Interviews (KII) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) were used as primary sources of qualitative data collection. Also, had EU's ROM and thematic DNH evaluations. Files here - UNDP Libya Intranet - SLCRR_Resilience and Recovery\RR 1\EU Monitoring & Evaluation (for EU Funded projects)

In the project agreements with the EU, the M&E plans were included and agreed upon. Furthermore, the project received monthly external third-party monitoring from the EU (Altai). This additional layer of monitoring ensured that the project was on track to meet its objectives and that any issues were promptly identified and addressed. Evaluation report is attached.

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)

SLCRR project's governance mechanism functioned as intended. The project board meetings, which included representatives from the Ministry of Local Government (MoLG), EU, and UNDP, took place in December 2017, August 2018, July 2019, and November 2021. These meetings served to review and discuss the project's strategic direction, progress, results, challenges, risks, and ways forward.

In addition to these meetings, a two-day technical workshop was organized in March 2018 to discuss project objectives, plans, and results to date in detail. This meeting allowed stakeholders from different areas to meet and discuss various topics in person.

The project also participated in a technical meeting on EU-UNDP cooperation in supporting Stabilization, Recovery and Resilience in Libya held in Brussels on 27 March 2019. This meeting served to discuss the EU-UNDP cooperation and highlight the impact of the joint work.

Furthermore, progress reports were issued on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis. These reports documented the progress and outcomes of the project. Overall, these measures indicate that the project's governance mechanism was effectively implemented. Evidence the final report Pg. 69 and the last project board is attached.

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 was 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)

SLCRR effectively monitored and managed risks. The project faced numerous challenges, including security situations, local disputes, and the COVID-19 pandemic. In response, UNDP implemented its business continuity plan and closely monitored the situation. When these situations threatened to further affect the pace of implementation, no-cost extension requests were discussed with the EU, leading to two approved requests that extended the implementation period. Regular field monitoring and progress review visits were conducted to detect challenges and implement corrective measures promptly. When security concerns or COVID-19 restrictions limited access to project sites, alternative monitoring methods were adopted. The project risk log was updated regularly to keep track of potential risks and their management strategies. Open discussions about difficulties and evolving circumstances affecting project activities were held with national colleagues based in the field. These measures ensured that risks to the project were adequately monitored and managed. Evidence the final report

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 project had sufficient resources to achieve the intended outcomes. Evidence the final report attached.

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 inputs were procured and delivered in a timely manner to efficiently contribute to the results. However, there were unique challenges encountered when local authorities requested emergency responses such as Covid19 and IDP influx related equipment. These specific requests required additional time for procurement to ensure they fit within the UNDP mandate and operation pace. Despite these challenges, the project maintained regular follow-up discussions with procurement colleagues and updated timeframes and milestones accordingly. This proactive approach improved project delivery drastically. While there were delays in these specific instances, the experiences have provided valuable lessons for future projects to improve responsiveness and enhance procurement processes. The Matrix 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 database with financial information is regularly updated. Cost efficiency of activities was analyzed and visualized on project Power BI pages. Also, the project team has weekly meeting to update Matrix where all the database with estimate budget and actual contract amount is there. Moreover, there was regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results. The project demonstrated a high absorption capacity of funding, leading to the decision to start the second phase ahead of schedule as works and activities were advancing at a good pace.

Moreover, regular field monitoring and progress review visits were integral to the project's success, enabling the detection of challenges and implementation of corrective measures in a timely manner.

The project risk log was updated regularly to keep track of potential risks and their management strategies. Open discussions about difficulties and evolving circumstances affecting project activities were held with national colleagues based in the field. These measures ensured that cost efficiencies were regularly monitored and recorded. Moreover, regular financial reports submitted to EU - quarterly and annual, also audits. The Matrix and the final report 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)

Yes, the SLCRR project was on track and successfully delivered its expected outputs. Despite facing challenges such as Covid-19 and security issues, the project managed to stay on course and achieve its targets effectively. This was made possible through robust planning, regular monitoring, and adaptive management strategies. The project's focus on human-development nexus, capacity building, gender-sensitive approaches, and support for the start-up ecosystem in Libya were particularly effective in ensuring the timely delivery of outputs. Therefore, the project demonstrated satisfactory performance in line with its objectives.

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)

There were regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results. These reviews allowed for timely detection of challenges and implementation of corrective measures, ensuring that the project remained aligned with its objectives. If course corrections were needed, they were informed by these regular reviews.

In addition to these internal reviews, the project's indicators and progress were assessed quarterly with the EU and

budget modifications were made where necessary to ensure the projects reaches the desired results. This process ensured the project's effectiveness and relevance in achieving its desired results. Furthermore, regular reports were provided to the EU and the project database was updated with all indicators. This ensured transparency and allowed for real-time tracking of progress. The project also underwent corporate mid-year and annual reviews, which provided additional opportunities for assessment and course correction. In conclusion, through regular internal and external reviews, reporting to EU, updating of project database with all indicators, and corporate mid-year and annual reviews, the project was able to stay on track and deliver its expected outputs. The final report reflects this effective management and successful delivery of results.

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)

SLCRR systematically identified and engaged its targeted groups, particularly those marginalized, vulnerable (IDPs and migrants), and left further behind (LNOB), to ensure that no one was left behind. The project was implemented by UNDP from 2017 to 2021 and aimed to respond to conflict and human-induced challenges that negatively impacted citizens' access to basic services, economic opportunities, social cohesion, and community security. Also, the project targeted twelve municipalities across Libya, which were identified based on their location along migration routes and main departure points to Europe, their potential for economic development, and the impact of conflict, internal displacement, and return on these areas.

The project worked in close coordination with the EU, Ministry of Local Government, Municipal Councils, local partner organizations, contractors, and sector working groups to improve access to essential services, create jobs and livelihoods, promote social cohesion, and enhance community security.

Amidst the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and widespread lockdown and curfew restrictions, the supported municipalities responded to the challenges posed by COVID-19 using the renovated infrastructures and essential equipment delivered by the project in several sectors, including health and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH).

The project filled many gaps in terms of reconstruction of essential infrastructure in a number of key service areas (notably health, education, water and sanitation) as well as in the development of an inclusive municipal platform that brought together the various groups living in the municipalities to develop a conflict-sensitive mechanism to identify municipal priorities. This shows that the project was responsive to the needs of its targeted groups and adapted its strategy accordingly. Evidence final report

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)

SLCRR addressed technology and data risks, particularly in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. The innovation and technology ecosystem in Libya is nascent, and the project aimed to build a track for youth to engage in the innovation, technology, and digital economy. This was seen as a foundation for growing the start-up ecosystem, which creates direct employment opportunities and contributes to finding solutions to close existing market gaps. After the COVID-19 outbreak, interventions on local economic development, such as trainings on business and IT skills for youth, as well as mentorship sessions for start-ups, were adapted to allow for the continuation of their programmes virtually through online applications. This ensured that the project could continue its work despite the challenges posed by the pandemic.

Furthermore, supported start-ups like the e-learning platform "Panda" and "O-Class" provided distance learning tools and online classes respectively, facilitating the continuation of education during the lockdown. Another start-up "Tazia" continued production from home and used their online channels to build awareness and promote good practices during the pandemic.

These measures indicate that technology and data risks were adequately addressed for closure or continued use by partners or UNDP. Evidence final report pg. 58 and 74

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 project saw a broad range of stakeholder involvement at multiple stages. Project coordinators and engineers at the regional level liaised with local bodies, and capacity-building workshops were conducted to strengthen their skills. The UNDP collaborated with IOM, GIZ, and UNICEF, and maintained regular communication with the coordination with municipalities (mayors, municipal councils), and beneficiaries, also with Ministry of Local Government (MoLG). Project encouraged stakeholder participation to ensure the sustainability and ownership of interventions. Capacity enhancement was a key component of all interventions. Particularly for Output 1, UNDP made certain that stakeholders were involved in needs assessments for local recovery initiatives focused on basic service delivery. This strategy guaranteed stakeholder commitment and interest in maintaining the project's benefits. The project engaged with numerous stakeholders during its execution to review and identify needs. This was achieved through the project boards where MOLG, the project team coordinated with EU regarding project activities. Municipality councils also participated in the prioritization and selection of project activities through consultation meetings. The last project board is attached for reference.

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)

The project indeed ensured regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project. The implementation arrangements were adjusted according to changes in partner capacities. Despite challenges such as the COVID-19 pandemic affecting the pace of project implementation, UNDP rolled out its business continuity plan and ensured close monitoring of the situation on the ground. Alternative methods to monitor progress were adopted to ensure consistent oversight, including third party monitoring or using videoconferencing to connect remotely with local partners. Project was also subject to EU Results Oriented Monitoring in 2018, which acknowledged the relevancy of UNDP's programmatic approach. Regular field monitoring and progress review visits were undertaken by UNDP's technical teams to detect challenges and ensure that corrective measures are taken without negatively impacting project implementation.

Upon completion of the rehabilitation work and equipment provision, these are officially handed over to the relevant Libyan local authorities who become the custodian of the facilities in charge of their maintenance, while UNDP would continue post-completion monitoring. Moreover, the capacities and performance of prospective institutions were assessed using HACT micro assessments in 2021 for prospective partners such as Tatweer, Toyota, DRC, Reach/Impact, Acted. In addition to these measures, it's important to note that changes in local government administration, political and security dynamics were also taken into account. For instance, changes in municipality personnel were closely monitored and adjustments were made as necessary to ensure smooth project implementation. These changes often require a reevaluation of strategies and a flexible approach to ensure that the project objectives are met despite the changing landscape.

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 adjusted its transition and phase-out strategies based on progress, financial commitment, and capacity. It fostered ownership and sustainability through stakeholder engagement and capacity building. In Output 1, UNDP ensured stakeholder participation in local recovery initiatives. Post-completion, the project assets were handed over to Libyan local authorities for maintenance. Under Output 2, the project collaborated with EUBAM, UNSMIL, and others for needs assessment and other activities. Output 3 saw partnerships with Tatweer and Toyota to inspire youth and expand entrepreneurship in Libya. Also, project board meetings are among MOLG, EU and UNDP. The SLCRR Top Up project plans to scale up these partnerships and support systemic change. Given Libya's instability, a

gradual exit strategy for the project's investments is planned, with further investments needed for peace and sustainable development. Evidence Pg 75 final report.