

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Locked

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00135006
Portfolio/Project Title:	Libyan electricity & water sector stabilization support
Portfolio/Project Date:	2021-01-15 / 2023-12-31

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

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

Evidence:

The project was implemented in a dynamic environment where the fully integrated utility company, GEC OL, was struggling with multiple financial, logistical and political pressures to address an electricity supply deficit. To give the company time to make the requisite repairs to its fleet of turbines, a common load shedding schedule needed to be implemented. This was important as previous loadshedding created discontent between consumers resulting in damage to infrastructure, namely the disabling of the breaker system. By consulting the municipalities and the ministry of industry, the project was able to get buy in from the municipalities and the main energy consumers namely cement and steel to agree to a common load shedding schedule. This stabilized the grid allowing time to get through peak demand while repairing the turbines.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021AnnualNarrativeProgrammeReportingLESSTUNDPandUNEPFINAL_16431_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021AnnualNarrativeProgrammeReportingLESSTUNDPandUNEPFINAL_16431_301.pdf)	lojain.aboughrara@undp.org	4/19/2023 11:07:00 AM

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

- 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responded to Outcome 3/ Indicator 5 on the number of hours/day without electricity. This Outcome is part of the UN Strategic Framework for Libya 2019-2022 (UNSF) and is linked to SDG indicator 7.1.1 regarding the proportion of the population with access to electricity. The baseline for this outcome was 5-7 hours/day without electricity and the objective was to bring this down to between 0 and 1 and not more than 5 hours/day. Although there were variations on the number of hours per day that consumers were unable to access electricity, the situation improved significantly compared to the baseline.

The project also responded to the output 2: "National policy and governance is advanced in the electricity sector support (transition to sustainability)", where a National Sustainable Energy Strategy (NSES) is prepared, and Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS) and labelling for Air conditioners is prepared and approved from the government.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021AnnualNarrativeProgrammeReportingLESSTUNDPandUNEPFINAL_16431_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAForMDocuments/2021AnnualNarrativeProgrammeReportingLESSTUNDPandUNEPFINAL_16431_302.pdf)	lojain.aboughrara@undp.org	4/19/2023 11:08:00 AM

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained 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:

UNDP also conducted an analysis and survey of community concerns on the MMRA in the Fezzan region, namely among the Hassawna communities who felt marginalized due to the perceived preference given to power the MMRA. The assessment provided nuance as to the views of the community, particularly the linkage between electricity and the local water system. It also provided insight into how to best communicate and cooperate with the community by identifying the most influential leaders. These leaders were then contacted in order to solicit their insights and cooperation on this project and related projects.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

There were numerous lessons learned from this program. On the positive side was the fact that the success of the grid stabilization program was in layering the program with GECOL from the most urgent and feasible to the least urgent and complicated. The program had eight strategic priorities, only two of whom were implemented but this itself averted grid collapse giving time to implement the other priorities. The second lesson learned was the project was built on solid partnerships with NESDB, GECOL, REAoL, & MoP. It was the strength of these partnerships and the high level of communication which led to its success. Although the CS1 Project was completed it did not move forward due to its not reflecting the priorities of the MMRA. This engagement, however, served to strengthen the relationship with MMRA providing the basis for a future partnership on water security.

Although these and other lessons learned could be identified and expanded, they were not documented as yet.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TargetsandachievementsLESST_16431_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/TargetsandachievementsLESST_16431_304.docx)	lojain.aboughrara@undp.org	4/19/2023 11:10:00 AM

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:

The project reached a very wide number of beneficiaries as it aimed to improve the national electricity network, which is fully integrated and fully electrified. As such any improvement in the grid improves the lives of all Libyans. That said, during the period of this program, the grid remained divided between east and west.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1.ProgrammeDocument_LESSTLibyaSIGNED_16431_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.ProgrammeDocument_LESSTLibyaSIGNED_16431_305.pdf)	lojain.aboughrara@undp.org	4/19/2023 11:09:00 AM

Principled

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 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:

There was limited opportunity to integrate a women's empowerment component into this program. Nearly all national interlocutors, from GECOL to MMRA to Municipalities, were men and the beneficiaries, given the project worked on the national grid, were all citizens.

On the Legislative and Regulatory side, the strategy preparation committee and the energy efficiency committee include a number of Libyan female engineers

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 Substantial and 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 Substantial and 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, Substantial, 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:

No formal Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) was conducted for this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or 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:

Ample investments were made in ensuring that there was two-way communication and ample consultation with GECOL at both the operational and executive levels. This allowed for any grievance of concern to be registered and reacted to. Similarly at the community level with the MMRA, a mechanism was established with the Hassawna communities to listen to and react to their concerns.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

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:

As UNEP led on two of the main components of the project, UNEP provided most of the written reporting. UNDP, however, fed into these reports which were then reviewed during meetings of the JP Steering Committee. These meetings did not occur as frequently as anticipated but they were held at least twice during the program and once at the end of the program.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

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:

The projects governance mechanism of the Joint Steering Committee comprised of one representative from UNDP, UNSMIL, UNEP and the Government of Libya represented by the Ministry of Planning. Each donor, namely the EU and UK, also have one representative. This committee met one time formally during the project but then continued to meet informally throughout the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

A risk log was updated during the project as well as mitigative measures. These risks included the lack of agency and prioritization of Libyan government stakeholders. This risk was amplified by the fact that there were relatively frequent turnover in representation particularly between the GNA and GNU. It also included re-prioritization by government counterparts who often reassess priorities based on the own interests and needs. As such once the grid was stabilized and public pressure relaxed, so too did government willingness to continue to engage in more integrated electricity planning. This risk is amplified by the often fragmented nature of the government and the lack of integrated planning.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

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:

Funding for the outputs identified in this project was adequate.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

This project was composed strictly of technical assistance. The only procurement required related to the convening of consultative meetings. Much of this requirement became remote engagement.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

There was no need to re-evaluate costs for this project as it involved technical assistance.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

Outcomes 1,2 and 3 were achieved. Outcome 1 was achieved by assessing and prioritizing the repairs of the turbines and improving the maintenance schedules in combination with developing a common load shedding schedule. Outcome 2 was achieved as a National Sustainable Energy Strategy (NSES) is prepared, and Minimum Energy Performance Standards MEPS and labelling for Air conditioners is prepared and approved from the government. Outcome 3 was achieved as a completed feasibility study of the western MMRA distributed solar project CCS1 was completed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Annual reports were composed and reviewed by the Joint Programme Steering Committee. Very precise data on the performance of the electricity grid was also regularly collected through collaboration with LPF M/USAID who was a key partner throughout this project. A lessons learned exercise, however, was not conducted during the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups 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:

As Outcomes 1 and 2 focused on improving the national grid the benefits were for all users of the grid rather than specific groups.

For Outcome 3, however, the beneficiaries were those living alongside the western MMRA pipeline. These communities were identified through an indepth report which was reviewed and refined. This report identified the relationships between the communities as well as any inter communal tension that the project should consider.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

18. 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:

We have weekly meetings with the National partners (ESDB, Gecol, REAoL, and MoP) and they are monitoring the implementation of the project and taking jointly decisions.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ 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 may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Changes within the leaderships of most Libyan stakeholders occurred and new relations were established. Similarly, new government oversight and coordination mechanisms governing the electricity sector were established and efforts were made to establish a working relationship with them as well. Throughout the project regardless of changes in capacities, access to data remained positive and unchanged.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. 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:

This project aimed to stabilize the grid and developing electric power sector policies, including energy efficiency measures, and preparing a strategy based on sustainability, which it succeeded in doing. It also established relationship with national stakeholders including in GECON, REAoL, NESDB, MoP and the MMRA which endure beyond this program. The partnerships and conditions created during this project will now create the basis for the upcoming Energy Transition program. This program will take forward the unfinished objectives of this program as well as expand them based on the lessons learned.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments
