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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1. **Background and Purpose of the Evaluation**

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Libya commissioned an independent evaluation of Phase II of the “Towards National Reconciliation in Libya” project (TNRL). Phase I of the project was implemented in 2017 and 2018 in close collaboration with the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL). The successor three-year (2019-2021) Phase II project was designed to support and scale up local reconciliation processes, network mediators to support local reconciliation, and institutionalize reconciliation at the national level. Phase Two donors were Italy (USD 578,704) and the United States (USD 1,998,533.92). The project was extended in 2021 through 30 September 2022 through a no-cost extension (NCE) for a total duration of 3.75 years.

UNDP Libya articulated four purposes of the Final Project Evaluation - to:

* Review the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project and the development process;
* Assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, and cross cutting issues such as gender, conflict sensitivity, and human rights have been addressed;
* Assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum; and
* Recommend areas for improvement and learning.

The evaluation was conducted as the project ended to support learning. Intended evaluation users and the audience for the evaluation are UNDP/Libya, which reported that the Country Office (CO) was assessing whether and how to support reconciliation going forward. The evaluation report reviews the design of the project and its relevance and coherence with other initiatives before evaluating implementation and results through assessing effectiveness and efficiency. Cross cutting issues are also assessed. Accumulated findings lead to conclusions and recommendations for the future, which meets the purposes of the evaluation and provides information to support UNDP/Libya learning.

1. **Description of the Towards National Reconciliation in Libya Phase II Project**

Phase Two of the National Reconciliation Project started. in January 2019. The project built on the Phase I project through three outcomes:

Outcome 1: Space for local dialogue is created and maintained in key locations with potential to contribute to the national reconciliation process

Outcome 2: Mediation tools and conflict resolution mechanisms are strengthened to more effectively mitigate tensions and reach consensus at the community level

Outcome 3: Central and local governments are strengthened to support and operationalize reconciliation mechanisms based on a coherent strategy and solid legal framework

Phase Two has built on dialogue processes from Phase One. Dialogue processes were monitored, and two dialogue processes were initiated with conflicting parties. This project helped create a National Network of Local Mediators (NoLM). With UNSMIL sensitivities around efforts to build a national settlement, the project limited its efforts in 2019 to avoid potential distractions or disruptions. Then the resumption of conflict in Libya in 2019 and the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 impeded efforts, as did UNSMIL prioritising 2021 elections (which again led to deemphasising mediation and reconciliation efforts of the project).

Under Outcome 3, the project worked to have the PC create the High Commission for National Reconciliation in response to the initial roadmap issued by the Libyan Political Forum. The High Commission for Reconciliation was created in April 2021. UNDP supported a two-day workshop to evaluate their legal framework with partners

1. **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

In addition to the goals of the evaluation, UNDP Libya set specific objectives for the evaluation and developed a list of 48 evaluation questions to be answered through the evaluation’s fieldwork. Specific objectives were to examine the implementation strategy and design, identify factors that facilitated or inhibited achievements, and how the project responded to unexpected issues and towards cross-cutting objectives of gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE), disability, conflict sensitivity, and human rights (HR)/Leave No One Behind (LNOB).

1. **Evaluation Approach and Methods**

The evaluator developed a draft inception report for UNDP review and finalized the draft, addressing all comments, for UNDP approval before conducting remote fieldwork. The evaluation approach combined document review of project and UNDP materials with remote semi-structured interviews with UNDP, UNSMIL, donors, and beneficiaries. Explicit informed consent was obtained for all 12 interviews (three with women) conducted remotely in August and September 2022. Evaluation sampling was purposive focused on identifying the most relevant interviewees that could share the most information about project design, implementation, and results. The evaluator will address all comments on the draft evaluation report to finalize the evaluation, as well as present remotely on findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations to UNDP.

1. **Data Analysis**

Data analysis has been qualitative, comparing information from different documents and interviews as well as assessing trends (change over time). Limited quantitative data has been identified to assess output and outcome targets that were quantitative in the Project Document (ProDoc).

1. **Findings**

Findings are developed through the categories of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and risk, and cross-cutting issues (of GEWE, conflict sensitivity, disability, and HR/LNOB).

1. **Conclusions**

Phase II of the project remained relevant but was impeded by widespread conflict in Libya and COVID-19. Key stakeholders lost focus and were not attentive to the project, which hampered the leadership and push of the project over 2019-September 2022.

UNSMIL and UNDP as institutions provided coherence linking the project with other initiatives, with the Libyan state divided and unable to support coherence. Coherence had limitations in practice as UNSMIL, donors, UNDP, and Libyan authorities were not consistently active in implementation or links to other initiatives.

The ProDoc left ambiguities and inconsistencies in project management and metrics which were not addressed in implementation. The project was funded at lower levels than anticipated without realignment; the project did not manage to reach its objectives as developed in the ProDoc, leaving Libya still with unmet needs in reconciliation at local levels, in networking, and especially in institutions at the national level.

Limits to project’s efficiency came with limits to the leadership and insufficient focus and drive from UNSMIL leadership, UNDP leaders, donors, national authorities and project managers in the context of a return to violent conflict plus the COVID-19.

Sustainability of the limited project achievements in the challenging context of Libya in conflict and crisis and with COVID-19 is challenging. The TNRL project had limited effects in strengthening institutions – mostly through support for the NoLM as an organization. Support through the project for government of Libya institutions was modest and not seen as substantial enough to be sustainable. Achievements in GEWE and social inclusion are also of limited sustainability. Financial and economic resources are not in place to sustain project benefits and there are not mechanisms in place to carry forward GEWE, HR, and inclusion results. Lessons learned have only been documented to a limited degree and not shared widely.

The importance of cross-cutting issues of GEWE, conflict sensitivity, inclusivity, and human rights were recognized in the design and features of implementation (including for the disabled).

1. **Lessons Learned**

Conclusions suggest some lessons learned which are developed further as recommendations.

High-level sustained political engagement is needed to support UNDP projects in sensitive areas like reconciliation.

Proactive project management is needed to adjust and accelerate project implementation and address difficulties in implementation

Projects should have and use project boards to increase stakeholder engagement and support sustainability

Sustainability should be the focus of Phase II projects that engage for prolonged time periods with partners

UNDP’s technical project implementation needs to be closely linked to UNSMIL’s political engagement for political projects like TNRL in sensitive areas like reconciliation

Linking mediation and dialogue agreements with tangible support for implementation and development supports peacebuilding and consolidation

1. **Recommendations**

The conclusions of the evaluation and lessons learned suggest recommendations going forward to support national reconciliation and project delivery.

UNSMIL leadership needs to consistently focus on and support joint UN work in critical, sensitive political areas of Libya’s development like NR.

UNDP CO leadership needs to lead and support effective project implementation and coordination with UNSMIL and other UNDP projects.

UNDP needs to staff and manage projects towards effective and efficient delivery.

UNDP and UNSMIL should enlist strong partner government support and participation.

Substantial support should be devoted to following up on and supporting the implementation of national and local reconciliation agreements.

UNDP should strengthen CO and Project monitoring and reporting.

UNDP should consider substantial revisions of projects as appropriate in implementation as circumstances change.

UNDP should pursue a focus on GEWE as well as marginalized communities in implementation.
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# INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

**Background**

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office (CO) in Libya launched the “Towards National Reconciliation in Libya” project (TNRL) in 2017 to support the Action Plan of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) and further the Libyan Political Agreement and UNSMIL’s political dialogue strategy, which aimed to lay the foundations for national reconciliation in the country. The TNRL Project (Project ID 00103669) was funded with United States Dollar (USD) 2,935,425 by the United Nations (UN) Peacebulding Fund (PBF).

At the conclusion of the project, UNDP Libya developed a successor project. The Project Document (ProDoc) for the “Towards National Reconciliation in Libya” project (Project Number 00114463) notes Phase Two was based on the “need and demand for scaling-up reconciliation at the local level” and that “various Libyan interlocutors have requested increased support with convening more community-based dialogues while also institutionalizing these reconciliation efforts at the national level (p. 3).

Phase Two of the TNRL project began January 2019 with a planned duration of three years. Phase Two was funded by donors Italy with USD 578,704 and the United States (US) Department of State (DOS) with USD 1,998,533.92. The project was extended in 2021 through 30 September 2022 through a no-cost extension (NCE).

**Purpose of the Evaluation**

This evaluation commissioned by UNDP Libya in August 2022 covers Phase Two of the project from January 2019 through September 2022. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the international evaluator notes that the purposes of the Final Project Evaluation are to:

* Review the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project and the development process;
* Assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, and cross cutting issues such as gender, conflict sensitivity, and human rights have been addressed;
* Assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum; and
* Recommend areas for improvement and learning.

The evaluation was conducted as the project ended to support learning. Intended evaluation users and the audience for the evaluation are UNDP/Libya, which reported that the Country Office (CO) was assessing whether and how to support reconciliation going forward. The evaluation report reviews the design of the project and its relevance and coherence with other initiatives before evaluating implementation and results through assessing effectiveness and efficiency. Cross cutting issues are also assessed. Accumulated findings lead to conclusions and recommendations for the future, which meets the purposes of the evaluation and provides information to support UNDP/Libya learning.

The ToR provided a list of evaluation questions organized through the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) revised evaluation criteria of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability and Risk, plus cross-cutting criteria on gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE), whether and how the project was conflict sensitive. These criteria and questions were used to develop a draft and final inception report with plans to collect valid and reliable data to evaluate the project by the evaluator through document review and interviews. After UNDP approval of the inception report, the plans were implemented by the evaluator.

# DESCRIPTION OF THE TOWARDS NATIONAL RECONCILIATION IN LIBYA PHASE II PROJECT

The TNRL project was originally designed in 2017 to support of the SRSG’s 2017 Action Plan to further the Libyan Political Agreement and UNSMIL’s political dialogue strategy, which aimed to lay the foundations for national reconciliation in the country. Phase One of the project was funded by the PBF.

In Phase One of the project, UNDP held five local dialogues that created space for political processes and peacebuilding at the national level. The project also held several meetings that focused on the Southern region, a key hotspot resulted in the establishment of the Charter of Fezzan, signed by 120 community leaders from the South. It then issued five micro-capital grants conducted by 20 National Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) that created space for more Libyan-led local dialogue processes. Then the project held a media campaign to catalyze public support for national reconciliation across the country.

The second phase of the project that is evaluated here was developed at the end of the first phase in 2018. Phase Two has been funded by donors United States Department of State and Italy. The total budget was planned at a level of USD 4,963,266; donor contributions were less than the full amount, leaving an unfunded amount of USD 2,409,266 according to the 2020-2021 annual report of the project.

The Phase Two ProDoc for TNRL notes that the objectives of the project are “building upon the accomplishments and the good reputation of the ongoing PBF-supported TNRL project” (p. 3). The PBF-funded Phase One project was described as “currently assisting national and local authorities, civil society, and other partners in their effort to promote an inclusive vision for national reconciliation. Through a series of thematic meetings, dialogues and capacity-building activities, it seeks to empower various stakeholders to conceptualize and implement a comprehensive national reconciliation strategy, while also supporting local reconciliation initiatives fostering nationwide peacebuilding” (p. 1).

As the ProDoc summarized,

Community conflicts in Libya are often dealt with locally, through negotiation led by traditional leaders, building upon customary arbitration practices that occur outside of the formal justice system. These local peace efforts are important and Libyan-owned mechanisms for building stability within the country, ahead of efforts to address the structural causes of conflict and local and national levels. (p. 1).

Phase Two of the National Reconciliation Project started. in January 2019. The aim was to crystallize best practices and recommendations to enhance the effectiveness and legitimacy of future reconciliation efforts in Libya. The 2019 Annual Report of the project notes that the original plan of the project was to submit a strategy for national reconciliation to the government in early 2019, along with a work plan and technical support and advocacy to facilitate the institutionalization of reconciliation at the state and local levels.

The Theory of Change for the project was:

If local dialogue initiatives between key stakeholders are supported, and capacity is built for a network of local mediators and these initiatives are sustainable with the long-term help of central and local government, then there is potential to rebuild trust and confidence, and eventually restore lasting peace in Libya from the ground up.

This three-part theory set out objectives based on the key aspects of the ToC.

The Objectives of the Phase Two TNRL project were described in the ProDoc as they flow from the ToC. The three outcomes, sometimes reported on by the Phase Two project as outputs, were:

Outcome 1: Space for local dialogue is created and maintained in key locations with potential to contribute to the national reconciliation process

Outcome 2: Mediation tools and conflict resolution mechanisms are strengthened to more effectively mitigate tensions and reach consensus at the community level

Outcome 3: Central and local governments are strengthened to support and operationalize reconciliation mechanisms based on a coherent strategy and solid legal framework

The project document described and enumerated expected results under these outcomes towards the objectives of the TNRL project.

Phase Two has built on dialogue processes from Phase One. Dialogue processes were monitored, and two dialogue processes were initiated with conflicting parties. This project helped create a National Network of Local Mediators (NoLM) comprised reportedly of approximately 120 to 150 participants from across the country. Phase Two sought to partner with community leaders and peace actors that had experience in reconciliation, mediation, and social cohesion in support of local peace initiatives who could potentially participate in the project’s dialogue processes under the leadership of UNSMIL.

In the first months of 2019, UNSMIL concentrated its efforts on high-level political meetings to set the foundation for the National Conference. Due to sensitivities around proposed activities to advance and amend the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA), UNDP reported that the TNRL project was perceived as having risks that many of proposed inter-community dialogues could distract or inadvertently disrupt the national political process. Therefore, UNDP paused dialogue initiatives by the National Reconciliation Project (except for the bilateral meetings on Murzuq) during the first months of 2019 in an effort to not distract or disrupt these national processes.

Then the outbreak of conflict in Libya in the Spring of 2019 resulted in a suspension of the project’s efforts. Thus no dialogue initiatives were undertaken by the National Reconciliation Project other than the bilateral meetings on Murzuq) in 2019. In 2020, a ceasefire was reached between the competing de-facto Western and Eastern-based governments in August. A formal ceasefire was signed 23 October 2020, which brought an end to large scale national-level hostilities. Then the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum’s (LPDF), with the support of the UN, established a roadmap for elections and agreed on the formation of a new unified transitional Government of National Unity (GoNU) headed by Prime Minister Abdul Hamid Dbeibah, mandated to administer the country until the national elections, which were scheduled to have taken place on 24 December 2021. However discord about the elections led to not holding the polls in December as planned.

In 2019 under Outcome 1, workshops for mediators from the South, West and East brought together 120 participants that year. Under Outcome 1, in 2020 and 2021, the project supported health diplomacy; in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, the project helped bring together medical professionals and the government to support pandemic response. The network had practical experience in 2019 supporting dialogue in the diverse city of Murzuq.

For Outcome 2, the project team advanced the development of the network in 2019 and mentored active members of NoLM. A 2021 five-day training of trainers (ToT) course conducted in partnership with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) on advanced mediation benefitted 65 NoLM mediators. The TOT supported knowledge transfer and building, including by dedicating substantial efforts to women’s participation (reported both as 18 and as 21 out of the 65 participants). And the concept of gender mainstream was introduced in the training.

The project then supported on-line training in the context of a worsening COVID-19 epidemic and has prepared for a second TOT for the network. Eastern, Southern and Western branches of the network reportedly function. The second final TOT was reportedly held September 2022 at project close.

Under Outcome 3, the project worked to have the PC create the High Commission for National Reconciliation in response to the initial roadmap issued by the Libyan Political Forum. The High Commission for Reconciliation was created in April 2021. UNDP supported a two-day workshop to evaluate their legal framework with partners.

The main stakeholders active in the project were thus the Libyan authorities, UNSMIL, and the NoLM. Libyan authorities involved included the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum of the GNU and its High Commission for Reconciliation. These authorities have key stakes in national reconciliation and in building it. LPDF actors have been involved in the project as beneficiaries of activities; project materials suggest that they have been consulted by UNDP in project development and implementation. UNSMIL is a key stakeholder due to the UN’s key roles in consolidating the authorities of the country and building peace, including through national reconciliation. UNSMIL support for Phase I and II makes them partners in implementation; UNSMIL also benefitted from mediation-supported reconciliation through the project. Phase I created NoLM are key stakeholders and partners as the main actors that the TNRL project worked with to support reconciliation, particularly at the local level across Libya.

The Project is linked to UNDP’s CPD for Libya as well as global and regional frameworks. It contributes to CPD Outcomes 1 and 3. Outcome 1 is “By late 2022, core government functions will be strengthened and Libyan institutions and civil society, at all levels, will be better able to respond to the needs of the people (Libyans, migrants and refugees) through transparent, inclusive gender-sensitive decision-making processes abiding by the democratic principles of division of power and rule of law.” Outcome 3 is “By late 2022, relevant Libyan institutions improved their capacity to design, develop and implement social policies that focus on quality social services delivery for all women and girls, men and boys (including vulnerable groups, migrants and refugees) in Libya towards enhancing human security and reducing inequalities.” The project also contributes to UNDP Strategic Plan Component: Outcome 3. “Building resilience to crises and shocks, in order to safeguard development gains”, particularly “3.2.1. “National capacities strengthened for reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism in response to national policies and priorities.”

The project contributes to UNDP’s work towards SDG 16. The UN Libya Strategic Framework (SF) linked to SDG 16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions as a general goal to which all Outcome pillars contributed, and UNDP contributed to these pillars. However implementation of the SF has been highly constrained by Libya’s deeply rooted structural issues and how they have affected developments in the country (as well as programme and project implementation). UNDP in the CPD framed the main challenges “For Libya to progress along the path of sustained peace and increased prosperity, the theory of change suggests it will be necessary to overcome the lack of political, social and economic inclusion and cohesion. This will be dependent upon the emergence of a unified, legitimate governing authority which is able to exert control over institutions of governance, security and the economy.” The TNRL project focused directly on building inclusion and cohesion through reconciliation, including links with governance, that gets at the core issues towards building peace, justice, and strong institutions.

# EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

This evaluation commissioned by UNDP Libya in August 2022 covers Phase Two of the project from January 2019 through September 2022. The scope of the evaluation is to evaluate the entirety of the Phase II project, which was implemented across all of Libya and through engagement with governing authorities in Tripoli. The project approach consciously sought to work with mediators and network mediators from the East, West, South and Central regions of the country.

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the international evaluator noted that the purposes of the Final Project Evaluation were to:

* Review the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project and the development process;
* Assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, and cross cutting issues such as gender, conflict sensitivity, and human rights have been addressed;
* Assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum; and
* Recommend areas for improvement and learning.

Specific objectives and tasks of the evaluation from the TOR include:

* Examine the project theory of change by testing the relationship between activities, outputs, outcomes, and wider context
* Review the appropriateness of the implementation strategy and the overall performance of the project in achieving the intended outputs and their contributions to outcome level goals by providing an objective assessment of the intervention achievements, constraints, performance, results, relevance, and sustainability.
* Identify factors which facilitated or hindered the results achievement, both in terms of the external environment and those related to internal factors.
* Identify and assess the project’s response mechanisms and adaptability to unforeseen external and internal factors.
* Determine whether the project’s coordinated and area-based approach functioned as intended (building synergies across interventions and leveraging results for the success of others)
* Define the extent to which the project addressed cross cutting issues including gender, human rights, disability issues, and conflict sensitivity.
* Establish and document the positive impact and any negative or positive unintended consequences of activities and the relevance to the overall strategy, to validate results in terms of achievements toward the outputs; to examine to what extent interventions supported co-existence efforts, strengthened and empowered and enhanced participation of vulnerable groups particularly in decision making and resources sharing
* Document lessons learned, best practices, success stories and challenges encountered throughout the project design and implementation stages to inform future initiatives.
* Formulate clear, focused, and forward-looking recommendations to inform future UNDP Libya programming and internal coordination in the context of Covid-19 and continued political instability.

The ToR enumerated 48 discrete evaluation questions under five evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability and risk plus four cross-cutting issues of gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE), conflict sensitivity, disability, and human rights and leave no one behind (LNOB). Some questions are complex and ask about more than one thing at a time or have one or more sub-questions. Evaluation questions from the ToR were not changed or modified.

The specific evaluation questions answered under the relevant criteria are the following.

**Relevance**

1. To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, the country project’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?

2. To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country project outcomes?

3. Extent to which project initiatives such as awareness raising campaigns, capacity building initiatives and public information products were relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders?

4. To what extent does the project contribute to Leave No One Behind (LNOB), gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

5. Evaluate the extent to which Towards National Reconciliation in Libya implementation strategy has been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of other partners and stakeholders; and to the context of Libya’s emerging political and development scenario;

6. Evaluate whether project activities were relevant for the implementation of strategic and other plans of stakeholders?

**Coherence**

1. To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?

2. How well does the intervention fit?

3. How compatible was the project to other interventions in the country?

4. To what extent did the intervention support or undermine policies?

5. What synergies or interlinkages benefitted from this project within UNDP and externally? This includes complementarity, harmonization and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

**Effectiveness**

1. To what extent did the project contribute to the country project outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?

2. Were the project initiatives including institutional strengthening of institutions, gender mainstreaming and engagement with civil society, such as media, effective to achieve project outcomes?

3. Are the project outputs clear, practical and feasible?

4. To what extent have stakeholders such as Towards National Reconciliation in Libya remained involved in project implementation?

5. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to citizen’s needs?

6. To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and inclusion such as capacity building of Gender and other stakeholders for promoting political and electoral participation of women, and persons with disabilities?

7. Assess whether a gender and human rights perspective has been taken into consideration and has been effective for the targeted institutions and communities;

8. Assess how the programme components complemented each other to contribute to the achievement of programme objectives

9. Assess the level of effectiveness of the UNDP and Towards National Reconciliation in Libya oversight and management structures during the review period, in addition to quality and adequacy of programme monitoring and reporting?

**Efficiency**

1. To what extent have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective to achieve overall outcomes?

2. To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?

3. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?

4. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Sustainability and Risk**

1. How sustainable are the project initiatives in institutional strengthening of stakeholders?

2. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?

3. To what extent do mechanisms exist to allow stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and inclusion?

4. To what extent have lessons learned been documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared?

5. To what extent have sustainability measures been incorporated into UNDP interventions?

6. How likely do you think it is that project interventions are sustainable?

7. Are there social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and outcomes? If so, what are these social and political risks?

8. Has the project’s partnership strategy been appropriate, effective and contributed to sustainable impact?

9. What are the key lessons learned from the project and that can be used to enhance UNDP, donor, and government decision making and programming going forward?

**Evaluation cross-cutting issues**

*Gender equality and Women’s Empowerment*

1. To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?

2. To what extent did the project implement its Gender Action Plan?

3. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and empowered women? Were there any unintended effects?

4. To what extent were the resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular?

*Conflict sensitivity*

7. To what extent did UNDP adopt a conflict sensitivity approach in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?

8. Were there any unintended [positive or negative] effects on the peace and conflict context in areas of intervention as a result of this project?

9. To what extent is the project perceived to benefit one group over another (and reinforcing lines of division)?

10. How are UNDP hiring, partnership, and procurement practices perceived by different groups in the areas of intervention? Are there perceptions that hiring and procurement disproportionately benefit one group over another?

*Disability*

11. To what extent did UNDP consider the needs of people living with disabilities in project design and implementation?

12.What proportion of the beneficiaries were persons with disabilities?

13. What barriers did persons with disabilities face? Was a twin-track approach adopted by the project towards mainstreaming disability?

*Human Rights and ‘Leave No One Behind’*

14. To what extent was research and monitoring been inclusive in terms of capturing the situation of the

most vulnerable and marginalized?

15. To what extent have disadvantaged and marginalized groups (indigenous populations, unemployed or underemployed/ poor, Libyans with undetermined legal status, etc.) benefitted from this intervention?

# EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS

The evaluation approach was for the independent evaluator to understand the goals and purposes of the evaluation, develop systematic approaches to gather and analyse data to answer all of the questions articulated in the ToR that set the goals and purposes for the evaluation, and draft and finalize an evaluation report for UNDP Libya with useful conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations.

The evaluation was framed around UNDP’s Evaluation Guidelines and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria used by UNDP and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). Criteria used to organize the evaluation were relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability and risk, plus cross cutting issues of GEWE, conflict sensitivity, disability, and HR/LNOB. The evaluator developed a draft inception report, including an evaluation matrix, to outline planned methods for collecting and analysing data to answer all evaluation questions. The draft was revised based on UNDP comment and finalized for UNDP approval, with a full evaluation matrix part of this processes (attached as Annex 2).

The evaluation was undertaken by a single international evaluator working remotely. The aspiration to use mixed methods, collecting and analysing a limited amount of quantitative data (such as number of consultants hired) on the project, proved doable through the results framework. However, as expected, most data gathering and analysis focused on more readily available and larger amounts of qualitative data on the TNRL project from interviews and project reporting.

The evaluation combined document review methods (a list of documents reviewed is included as Annex 3) and remote interviews (a list of individuals interviewed is included as Annex 4). Remote semi-structured interviews with UNDP, UNSMIL, donors, and beneficiaries. Explicit informed consent was solicited and obtained for all interviews (see Annex 5 Introduction) that made it clear that all interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis, all information provided in discussions and interviews would not be linked to any specific person, and that all information provided would be kept confidential.

As part of being gender-responsive/gender-sensitive in the evaluation design and fieldwork, as well as to examine the extent to which the project was gender-responsive/gender-sensitive, when possible, the evaluation has considered and analyzed whether and how women or men interviewed in the fieldwork or discussed in the project’s written materials have similar or different perspectives.

The evaluator has triangulated findings from different data sources to maximize the validity and reliability of findings and conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations based on the analysis. The evaluation report answers all of the specific evaluation question from the ToR using the data collected and analyzed for the evaluation. Tools for data collection were soliciting documents from the project manager, reading and taking detailed notes on the documents towards answering all of the evaluation questions using the evaluation matrix (see Annex 2). Documents were in Microsoft Word and PDF; notes were taken in Microsoft Word. Tools for interviews were WhatsApp and Microsoft Teams. The evaluator used the interview protocol for all interviews and transcribed respondents answers to the questions asked, including follow up questions developed to gather more information or increase the clarity or response data.

The evaluation was conducted remotely in August and September 2022 through document review and English-language interviews. Sampling was used for interview selection as the evaluator worked remotely with limited time and resources. A purposeful sampling strategy focused on interviewing the most relevant informants to gather data on project design, implementation, monitoring, results, and sustainability, as well as on cross-cutting issues. The evaluator solicited a list from the acting Project Manager on the most relevant informants for interviews. Sampling was also attentive to gender; the evaluator interviewed some women beneficiaries. As the project and its Gender Action Plan noted, since Libyan politics and conflict actors and mediators are traditionally and preponderantly men, men were most of the individual stakeholders and beneficiaries within Libyan institutions and organisations, including within NoLM.

Figure 1: Data Collection Stages and Steps
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Interview data is from 12 key informants (three women and nine men, listed in Annex 4). Interviewees included six UNDP staff, four beneficiaries, and two stakeholders (one of whom was a donor). The evaluation was designed to be gender sensitive in insuring that the evaluator interviewed both women and men for the evaluation, and in asking specific questions about GEWE to interviewees.

The ToR set out four deliverables for the evaluator to deliver to meet the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. As the first deliverable, the evaluator delivered a final inception report 20 September 2022, following review of the draft inception report. The second deliverable, a report on collected data, was submitted 27 September 2022. This was followed by this draft evaluation report submitted 6 October 2022. Upon the receipt of comments through UNDP, the evaluator revised the report and submitted it as a final report, addressing and integrating all comments on the draft for UNDP approval. Revisions were tracked and noted through an Audit trail spreadsheet.

The evaluation had conventional limitations to the methodologies, data collection plan, and analysis plan for this evaluation. The evaluator’s ways to manage these limitations were also common ways to manage these risks to evaluation processes and the validity and reliability of data collection, analysis, and causal inferences. Limitations, and the way they were managed by the evaluator, were:

* Limited resources, which constrained the distribution and number of interviews, which was managed by focusing the interview effort on reaching the most informative interviewees.
* Limited ability to make causal inferences, as there are other factors affecting the magnitude and character of changes noted, which has been managed by assessing contributions rather than causation.
* Recall bias, as respondents may not mention activities conducted at early stages of the project compared to later ones, managed by inquiring specifically about earlier activities with respondents to gather adequate information about early Phase II activities.
* Acquiescence bias, with UNDP staff or beneficiaries tempted to tell the evaluator what they think he wants to hear, managed by asking follow-up questions to dig deeper into the challenges faced by the project.
* Evaluating activities in process or only recently ended, which challenge interviewees and the evaluator to assess sustainability and longer-term outcomes – managed by asking about and assessing expectations about sustainability and longer-tern outcomes.

The ToR also did not ask about the effectiveness of budget implementation or for financial analysis. Thus, no evaluation questions in interviews focused on the budget. And only limited financial data was made available on spending at the end of the project in the revisions stage. This may be considered another limitation of the evaluation.

The limitations did not prevent the evaluator from gathering and analysing more than adequate amounts of valid and reliable data to compile findings, draw conclusions, identify lessons learned and make recommendations that target the purposes of the evaluation. Mixed methods to gather evidence through purposive sampling and analysis and triangulation of data from different documents and interviews has enabled the evaluator to respond comprehensively to the purposes of the evaluation.

The draft Final Project Evaluation Report is a synthesis of the evaluator’s analysis drawn from many documents as well as interviews. Any quotations included to highlight particular issues do not include names or any other detailed descriptive information that could plausibly be used to infer the source of the remarks.

# DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis has been predominantly qualitative, as data gathering techniques focused on qualitative data and limited quantitative data was available in documents or identified in interviews (and used in Table 1 to summarize effectiveness using the results framework).

The data analysis has used comparison and trend analysis towards answering each evaluation question from the TOR. Comparison focused on analysing the data and similarities and differences in data from different interviewees and methods useful towards answering the evaluation questions. Trend analysis focused on understanding change over time based on the baseline from Phase I and the ProDoc using the data in documents and the views/data provided in interviews. Interview notes were generated by the evaluator from the interview transcripts, focused on data directly relevant to answering evaluation questions. Tools for comparative analysis and trend analysis used by the evaluator were the analysis of notes from documents and interview notes, done through Microsoft Word, and analysis of financial data through Microsoft Excel. Limitations are in the data and data gathering/availability, not in the analysis of the data obtained. Data analysis considered whether there were differences between women and men in findings; women interviewees were all concerned to a high degree about GEWE design, efforts, and limited results (as were several of the men interviewed).

A ratings scale was developed to assess and summarize accumulated findings under each evaluation criteria at the request of UNDP/Libya. This scale measured a general positive or negative answer for each specific evaluation question from the TOR and aggregated them within the criteria. The scale developed was: all findings positive; most findings positive (more than half); some findings positive (less than half); no findings positive.

Figure 2: Data Analysis Stages and Steps
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The Final Evaluation Report is a synthesis of the evaluator’s analysis of all documents and interviews

# FINDINGS

**Relevance**

Relevance addresses whether the intervention does the right things. Relevance is defined in the revised OECD DAC evaluation guidance (the source used for UNDP definitions and in this report) as “the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”[[1]](#footnote-2)

*Extent the TNRL project was in line with national development priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?*

Although as a country in turmoil since 2011, Libya does not have a formal national development framework, the UN has worked closely with national authorities to develop organizations such as the National Council for Planning to manage the processes of developing national development priorities. The UN is thus well positioned to support these priorities and has knowledge of them in development. Interviews with UNDP project managers noted that the TNRL project, as linked to these bodies, is thus in line with the country’s developing national development priorities.

The TNRL Project ProDoc links the project to the UNDP Strategic Plan’s Output 3 Strengthening Resilience to Shocks and Crises, particularly 3.2.1. National capacities strengthened for reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism in response to national policies and priorities. This clearly links the project to UNDP’s strategic plan, which connects UNDP to achieving the SDGs, here SDG 16. Project managers interviewed noted these links to the UNDP SP and SDG 16.

*Extent the project contributed to CPD outcomes*

The ProDoc linked the project to the Libya CPD Outcome 1: By late 2021, core government functions will be strengthened and Libyan institutions and Civil Society, at all levels, will be better able to respond to the needs of the people (Libyans, migrants and refugees) through transparent, accountable and inclusive gender sensitive decision-making and peacebuilding processes abiding by the democratic principles of division of power and rule of law. UNDP interviewees noted the clear links between the project and CPD in the ProDoc and how the TNRL project was designed to contribute to rule of law (ROL) outcomes, one of the major outcomes of the CPD. The CPD described the plans of the TRNL project within it (p. 6), making clear that the project contributed to outcomes. Contributions of the project are covered below in effectiveness.

*Extent project initiatives such as awareness raising campaigns, capacity building initiatives and public information products were relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders*

The ProDoc noted that the project’s activities were designed to meet the needs of Libyan partners and stakeholders for peace and national reconciliation. The ProDoc noted that Phase II flowed from Phase I, which had been developed through a consultative process including workshops with stakeholders and partners in 2016. The end 2017 baseline study data collected by the phase I project was also used to generate Phase II initiates, which was seen as making the project more relevant to their needs.

UNDP interviews noted how the project was based on the baseline study, from the first phase of the project, that gathered data on how Libyan’s saw the need for NR and provided analysis by consultants of what the project could do to support the needs of targeted stakeholders.

Interviews with UNDP noted that the project based its targets on needs identified in the baseline study as well as stakeholders and partners consulted in Phase I and in the baseline study. Consultations and the baseline study identified the need to build capacity of stakeholders and mediators as well as the needs of the national institutions for technical assistance.

Partners interviewed from the NoLM agreed that the project targeted important needs of citizens and of mediators. Donor partners concurred that the project’s design was focused on important needs of Libyan communities, mediators, and the state itself. Partners interviewed however were highly critical of how these identified needs had not been met or only partially supported by the project in implementation. Donor interviewees noted that their role was to track project implementation rather than Libyan needs, which was a function for the political not the project management side of the Department of State.

*Extent that the project contributes to LNOB, gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach*

Interviews with UNDP noted that the TNRL Project had tried to guarantee inclusivity, including all components of Libyan society, in the NoLM. The work of the network was seen by some interviewees as the CO’s main example of integrating all of the social components of Libyan society in one project, in particular towards gender equality. The project was notable as HRBA was included right from the start in design of the initiative. LNOB was not seen as integrated into the project; instead some project interviewees emphasized that another different UNDP Libya project does LNOB. However project managers and consultants interviewed recognized that the project was design to support the rights of marginalized communities and that the project had played important roles in supporting mediation of disputes that marginalized groups had with other tribes/regions/segments of society in Libya.

Other CO interviews felt that the project was a missed opportunity to contribute to LNOB and GEWE as the project had not developed the analysis of the real challenges for women and gaps in NR for women and the disadvantaged in Libyan society, particularly for survivors of violence. The draft NR legislation that the project had supported and draft transitional justice legislation was seen in this perspective as gender blind, which is a problem in a male-dominated society and system of government since a gender blind approach does not address the particular concerns and issues of gender. The project’s work to increase women’s participation as mediators on the local level and to elevate that work through the NoLM was however recognized as valuable. CO interviewees felt that it was a notable achievement that the project had been able to identify women to support as mediators, provide them with a platform and space to share knowledge with male colleagues through the NoLM, and train them along with men to improve mediation skills and networking. Project managers interviewed agreed that these steps were important achievements in gender through a HRBA in Libyan conditions.

*Extent that implementation strategy has been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of other partners and stakeholders and the context of Libya’s emerging political and development scenario*

Project reporting noted specifically how the project had not been active, reportedly at UNSMIL request, for dispute resolution and mediation for long periods of time while UNSMIL and the UN focused on national-level initiatives. Implementation of the project suffered as little was done towards some of the key activities and outputs in the ProDoc’s multi-year work plan and RF as a consequence of project responsiveness to UNSMIL with respect to Libyan political development.

Project managers and reporting noted positive reaction and adaptation of the project in some initiatives. The project was characterized by some interviewees as very reactive and responsive in some ways, particularly with COVID-19. Under Outcome 1, as the project was not moving forward under COVID conditions with planned activities, the project developed through consultants and Libyan partners the Health Diplomacy initiative which had not been envisioned at the start of the project. The initiative made a call for unity through fighting COVID together through physicians and hospitals. Uniting together to fight COVID was seen by project managers and consultants as having made important contributions to brining the country together through medical professionals during the pandemic.

Project managers reported that project support for the training of network of local mediators had been designed based on their needs; these needs were reported to have been brought forward so that the project could later address them in three large regional conferences in 2019. Training of trainers through UNITAR for the NoLM members was only done in March 2020 just as COVID began to affect the globe and at the close of the project in September 2022.

Project managers developed plans and concept notes to address key NoLM and national needs in mediation in 2021. However these plans were not taken to implementation.

*Relevance of project activities for the implementation of strategic and other plans of stakeholders*

Department of State interviewees in grants management noted that their work for Department had not kept track of whether the project was important to the strategic plans and political goals of the Department’s leadership. The relevance of the project to the department however was affirmed by financial support and through support for the NCE.

NoLM leaders noted that the plans of the project were highly relevant to the development of mediators in the network and the NoLM itself. However the actual activities implemented were more modest and were not as relevant as expected to the implementation of their strategic plans and for the development of their organization as well as for capacity building of individual mediators.

***In summary, the findings under relevance suggest most findings were positive and that the project was highly relevant.***

**Coherence**

Coherence assesses how well the intervention fits with its context, defined by the OECD DAC as “the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”

*Extent the TNRL project contributes to CPD outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan, the SDGs, and national development priorities*

In terms of coherence, the TNRL Project was designed by UNDP staff (with UNSMIL leadership) to fit UNDP’s mandates in the SP, which organize UNDP’s contributions to the SDGs. The project’s initiatives were designed to be aligned with the UNDP Libya CPD. The contributions of the project towards outputs and outcomes are assessed below under effectiveness.

As noted in relevance above, while national development priorities in Libya are not drafted or clear from the government, the project and UNDP works with and supports the key national bodies that will prepare national development priorities. This link helps make the TNRL project connected to national development priorities. Project manager interviewees also noted that the project is closely linked to the priorities of the community and local levels in Libya, as identified in the 2017 baseline study done in Phase I. The project thus was built to coherently contribute to meeting these community mediation needs.

Project managers also reported that UNDP Libya, as part of managing EU funds for other projects, had developed within UNDP umbrella projects to increase the coherence of UNDP supported activities across projects. UNDP thus developed the “Stability, unity and social cohesion project” as an integrated approach to boost local stability, national unity, and reconciliation. The TNRL project managers reported feeding their outputs and activities into project reporting for the umbrella project as part of strengthening coherence.

*Fit of interventions*

UNDP interviews noted that the project’s concept was originally designed by UNSMIL and UNDP to fit with UNSMIL priorities and initiatives in Libya and that the project had been designed in conjunction with other UNDP projects to support political development in the country, including national reconciliation. At the start of Phase II, the TNRL project and the UNDP project to support national political development were under the same project manager, which was seen as strengthening the fit between the national and local levels in reconciliation. Having the same project manager manage projects supported complementarities between the projects in implementation and helped maintain coherence in critical areas, such as how NR connected with UNSMIL and UNDP supported activities towards the national political dialogue in Libya.

*Compatibility of the project with other interventions in the country*

The ProDoc developed the project as an integrated approach to strengthen local, regional, and national mediation and reconciliation. Project managers interviewed felt that the design was a good one. As one project manager put it, the “NR project is a perfect combination” because it set out to support multiple dimensions and levels in Libya through one project and manager.

Phase II at the start was managed by the same project manager that managed the support to the political dialogue project, which was seen as ensuring the compatibility of the TNRL project with the national level political dialogue. After the international project manager left, interim project managers managed this way as well, until the TNRL project came to be managed by an acting national project manager with the national dialogue project managed by a different project manager. While the TNRL project still coordinated with other UNDP projects, interviewees noted, this coordination was not as close as before. The project manager role when solely managing this project still reportedly had “multiple hats” to lead the TNRL project as well as work with other UNDP projects supporting municipal level governance, initiatives on national level networks, projects in the RoL and HR, and the national political dialogue project. But this coordination was seen as less strong and less consistent compared to when the TRNL project manager was also directly responsible for managing the national dialogue project.

UNSMIL, as the lead on political and human rights, reportedly took the lead with respect to all of these projects. This UNSMIL leadership was seen as supporting the compatibility of the project and fit with other projects. UNDP and UNSMIL interviews noted that there was not collaboration with other UN agencies in implementation of the TNRL project.

TNRL project managers interviewed reported that the project worked closely with but did not provide funding to other initiatives on reconciliation in Libya from Interpeace, USIP, and PCi. This cooperation did however extend to sharing information of trainings and bringing people that are trained by other projects into TNRL-funded trainings to build their capacity further. An interview with a project manager reported that TNRL had done a training that included 10 of Interpeace’s peace champions. TNRL project managers interviewed reported working with USIP and PCi in assisting with and providing technical cooperation in mediation and for multisectoral conflict analysis. TNRL project managers interviewed reported using this cooperation to help provide a better understanding of the complexity and changing dynamics in Libya. TNRL project managers interviewed also reported coordinating with USIP on providing technical support for municipalities that PCi supported. TNRL support from the project for NoLM was used to support the creation of a USIP supported HR rights violation reporting forum.

*Extent the intervention supported or undermined policies*

UNSMIL and UNDP interviews recognized and affirmed that Libya presents numerous challenges for alignment between development projects, diplomatic and peacebuilding efforts, and evolving realities of Libyan politics, institutions, and policies. The design of the project was to link project initiatives at the local level with developments that the project was to support on the national level to ensure alignment and avoid risks of undermining developments.

Project managers and reporting note that the TNRL project did not engage at the national level in 2019 as UNSMIL sought to avoid perceived risks that having national government counterparts engaging with the project could derail developments encouraged by UNSMIL at the national level. This guidance was seen as limited project local activities as well in 2019. Similarly, UNSMIL and UN efforts to support national level unity processes in 2020 and 2021 encouraged the project to be cautious at the national level to avoid or minimize risks that local efforts and mediation could disrupt UN plans to support national conferences and national elections (which were only cancelled at the end of 2021). Avoiding potentially undermining initiatives was thus an important concern that inhibited the project.

No interviewee identified ways that the project had undermined policies. Instead, the project was seen by UNSMIL, UNDP, and project managers interviewed as supporting key UN and government policies in its support for political dialogue and mediation. Trying to integrate local dialogue initiatives and making sure they link to national level, government institutions was the intended goal of the project; project managers interviewed reported thinking of their initiatives in this way in implementation.

*Synergies or interlinkages between the project for UNDP and other partners, including avoiding duplication*

UNDP sought to link projects and avoid risks of duplication by having the same international project managers lead multiple linked projects at the start of the Phase II project. At the outset of the TNRL project, the same project manager led this project and the political dialogue project, which supported synergies between the two projects. The final acting project manager only managed this single project.

UNDP interviewees also noted UNDP/Libya structures that were developed at the request of the European Union to link projects in reporting that also supported synergies between projects. The TNRL project contributed to these outputs and reporting through this mechanism through the international project manager of this joint political and national dialogue project. This mechanism was reported as having contributed to reporting jointly and sharing information, but was not reported as creating programmatic synergies or changing what the national reconciliation project did.

One UNDP project manager interviewed also noted that as part of their managerial roles, they had done an assessment of potential duplication with other projects to avoid actual duplication. The assessment was not shared with the evaluator. No information was identified on whether and how this assessment was used in TNRL implementation. Project managers also noted that there were mechanisms to develop synergies and avoid duplication; they reported having bilateral meetings with the managers of other UNDP and bilateral donor projects to share information towards benefiting from synergies and avoiding duplication. For example, one project manager interviewed noted that other projects that worked at the municipal level like the Stabilization Facility or “resilience” project seek TNRL intervention and support to use the NoLM as a peace structure.

*In summary, findings of the evaluation under coherence are that most findings are positive. Coherence was strong in the design of the project, but this coherence faded in implementation over time.*

**Effectiveness**

Effectiveness asks whether projects have achieved their objectives. Effectiveness is defined by the OECD DAC as “The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.”

Limited evidence was found in documents for project effectiveness. The Project’s annual reporting for 2019 noted the paucity of results for the year, “as UNSMIL concentrated its efforts on high-level political meetings to set the foundation for the National Conference. Due to sensitivities around the proposed activities to advance and amend the Libyan Political Agreement (LPA), it was seen that many of the proposed inter-community dialogues could distract or inadvertently disrupt the national political process. Therefore, for most of 2019, no dialogue initiatives were undertaken by the National Reconciliation Project (except for the bilateral meetings on Murzuq” (p. 9).

2020 reportedly had some of similar characteristics, as UNSMIL supported the International Conference on Libya in Berlin in January 2020 and further meetings and discussions that led to the initial August 2020 ceasefire between the de-facto Western and Eastern-based governments and the end October signing of the formal ceasefire document. This some project managers interviewed felt encouraged UNSMIL to not push project-supported mediation as still concerned about distractions or disrupting national processes.

UNSMIL had similar incentives in 2021 that were noted in interviews with project managers as not encouraging TNRL project activism and initiatives in 2021 as the UN focused on plans for the 24 December 2021 national elections, which were only cancelled in the last days before the planned elections due to inter-Libyan tensions. UNSMIL interviewees noted that clashes between Libyan factions put reconciliation “on the back burner” when they occur.

*Extent project has contributed to CPD outcomes and outputs, UNDP strategic plan and the SDGs, and national development priorities*

Some past or present project managers interviewed did not have a clear vision of how the project had contributed to CPD outputs and outcomes, the UNDP strategic plan and the SDGs, and national development priorities. Other project managers interviewed when asked did not provide an oral description of results reporting or the main results of the project.

National reconciliation was recognized by other project managers as central to national development priorities. However, project achievements were towards national reconciliation were seen by these project managers as having been modest and local, rather than at the national level; achievements were more noted in objectives 1 and 2, and meagre in objective 3.

*Effectiveness of project initiatives (including institutional strengthening of institutions, gender mainstreaming and engagement with civil society, such as media) to achieve project outcomes*

Some UNDP project managers interviewees suggested that the project had met two out of its three outcomes, which showed that the project was effective. Other UNDP and beneficiary interviewees were highly critical of the project and asserted that there were almost no achievements, which clearly indicated that the project had not been effective. UNSMIL interviews noted that they were not well informed about where the project stood not in terms of its outputs or outcomes.

Project materials did not report on the RF of the project; the lack of monitoring of or reporting on the outcome and output(result) indicators from the ProDoc makes assessing effectiveness inexact. Table 1 summarizes what can be ascertained about the effectiveness (achievement) of project towards its outcomes and outputs. The project often did not have clear targets, including whether presented targets are cumulative over the period of Phase II or also include baseline from Phase I. Table 1 below assesses results as not cumulative and exclusive of (on top of) reported baseline values. Another difficulty is that targets for results with more than one indicator did not break down measurement in the ProDoc between the two or three different indicators with different types of measurement. These problems make it difficult to understand whether specific actual targets set at the outset of the project. These results and targets do not appear to have been systematically used and were not reported on in the 2019 Annual Report or the 2020/2021 Annual Report of the project; the data available to measure and report on in the evaluation are thus from interviews and the text of reports.

**Table 1: Evaluation Assessment of Output/Result Achievement**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OUTCOME & EXPECTED OUTPUT (Result)** | **INDICATOR** | **PLANS FOR COLLECTION AND DATA SOURCES IN PRO DOC/REPORTS** | **BASELINE (from Phase I)** | **TARGET** | **DATA USED IN EVALUATION & DATA CHALLENGES** | **EVALUATION ASSESSMENT** |
| **Outcome 1: Space for local dialogue is created and maintained in key locations with potential to contribute to the national reconciliation process.** | | | | | | |
|  | Indicator 1.1: Number of reconciliation dialogues created at the national level | Not included. Project Reporting covers dialogues, but not as indicator. | 5 | 1 in East  1 in West  1 in South  1 in Central | No data on in 2019 and 2020/2021 annual reports, interviews note three regional consultants | Not met (and not an outcome but a process) |
|  | Indicator 1.2: Percentage of community initiatives based on the dialogue agreements | Not included. No data available on in Project Reporting | Unknown | 50% | Not reported on in 2019 and 2020/2021 annual reports; would need other data on reconciliation to determine % | Unknown |
|  | Indicator 1.3: Percentage of reconciliation dialogues operating after one year of creation | Not included. No data available on in Project Reporting | 0% | 50% | Not reported on in 2019 and 2020/2021 annual reports | Unknown |
| Result 1.1: Identify and capacitate implementation team to prepare for the dialogue processes | # of national staff hired and trained for implementing dialogue processes disaggregated by women and men | Field reports. Field reports not made available for evaluation. | 3 2018 | 3 | Interviews | Met |
| Result 1.2: Key issues and grievances are identified and ownership is built for the dialogue initiatives | % of the total number of identified grievances disaggregated by women and men that were addressed during the dialogues | Reports from dialogues. Project reporting does not cover. Reports from dialogues not made available. | 4 2017 and 2018 | 6 | Not reported on by project | Unknown |
| Result 1.3: Facilitated dialogues in targeted areas are convened | # of reconciliation dialogues created at the national level | UNDP project records, meeting notes. Project records and meeting notes not made available. Project reporting does not cover. | 4 2017 and 2018 | 6 | Same as outcome 1 indicator, but higher target. Reporting in 2019 and 2020/2021 annual reports not clear; | Unknown |
| Result 1.4: Outreach and advocacy are conducted to ensure the implementation of reconciliation agreements | # of advocacy and outreach initiatives facilitated to ensure implementation of dialogue agreements  % of reached agreements that were implemented | Field reports. Field reports not made available for evaluation.  Signed agreements, approved minutes of the meetings or signed MOUs between parties of the dialogue; not made available | Field reports 4 2017 and 2018 | 6 | Not reported on systematically in project reporting.  Project did not report on number of agreements supported or how many were implemented | Unknown |
| **Outcome 2: Mediation tools and conflict resolution mechanisms are strengthened to more effectively mitigate tensions and reach consensus at the community level** | | | | | |  |
|  | Indicator 2.1: Number of participants in the three conferences | Not included. | 0 | 100 | 100? | Likely met (but not an outcome) |
|  | Indicator 2.2: Number of network members trained and mentored | Not included. | 0 | 50 | 60? | Likely met (but not an outcome) |
| Result 2.1: Peer learning in reconciliation and conflict resolution is facilitated | # of women and men members involved in the network of mediators  % of local communities regarding effectiveness of the network of mediators | Reports on the three conferences (in East West and South)  No information | 0 | 5 | No reports known or shared  No data from communities available on perceptions of NoLM effectiveness | Not evaluatable |
| Result 2.2: National network of mediators and women mediators are created | # of members on the national network  # of women mediators in the national network | Field reports of initiatives pioneered by network members | 0 | 2 (Target not make sense for indicators, or cover both) | No reports by members of the network available  Project reporting not clear on number and gender of mediators | Not evaluatable |
| **Outcome 3: Central and local governments are strengthened to support and operationalize reconciliation mechanisms based on a coherent strategy and solid legal framework** | | | | | |  |
|  | Indicator 2.1: Strategic plan describing the process for institutionalizing reconciliation | Not included. | 0 | 1 | 1 - Presidency Council (PC) launched the ‘Strategic Vision of the National Reconciliation Project’ June 2022 | Met (but project contribution not notable and vision a limited start to a plan) |
|  | Indicator 2.2: Number of reconciliations institutions created by the central government | Not included. | 0 | 1 | 1 – PC created the High Commission  for National Reconciliation in April 2021 | Met (but project contribution not clear) |
|  | Indicator 2.3: Number of reconciliations institutions strengthened by the central government based on the strategic plan | Not included. | 0 | 1 | 1 – Workshop to evaluate the legal framework held by project. Extent of strengthening unclear. | Met (but one workshop focused on issues rather than institutional strengthening - a limited contribution) |
|  | Indicator 2.4: Legal framework describing responsibilities of reconciliation mechanisms at the central level | Not included. |  |  | 1 - Draft Law produced in March 2019 with project support | Met (but modest support from project since March 2019) |
| Result 3.1: Comprehensive assessment of government institutions and committees related to reconciliation is conducted | # of government institutions assessed for reconciliation skills  % of government institutions assessed that show an important gap in reconciliation mechanisms | Assessment reports | 0 | 1 | No data available; no evidence for assessment being conducted  Indicator only sensible if more than one institution assessed, | Unknown |
| Result 3.2: Technical support to government institutions is provided | # of technical support activities provided to staff members of relevant institutions to implement a national reconciliation strategy | Field reports by consultants | 0 | 4 | No field Reports made available; no reporting identified for TA to national institutions under Phase II | Unknown |
| Result 3.3: Capacity building of government institutions is conducted at the local and national levels | # of capacity building activities provided to central and local authorities to better engage in reconciliation efforts  # of women within the central and local authorities trained | UNDP advisor monthly report | 0 | 3 | No reports of training events for authorities provided | Unknown |

These challenges with the RF and reporting lead to some surprising analysis in Table 1. While interviews and reports noted that results were scant in Outcome 3, the four outcome indicators could nevertheless be conceptualized and measured as met (while simultaneously noting that the project had modest contributions to these achievements (and that the measures used for the achievements described only modest progress as equivalent to met). This finding further supports claims that the RF was weak and underdeveloped, particularly in outcome measures.

*Clarity, practicality and feasibility of project outputs*

The ProDoc described in significant detail the objectives of each outcome, the results sought and activities towards these results (in text, the RF, and the multi-year work plan) as well as how the three outcomes were related. The ProDoc also discussed how the challenging environment of Libya in crisis made reaching the outputs difficult and uncertain. The RF however did not make clear what measurements of project outcomes should be nor targets.

Interviews with project managers found project leaders and consultants felt that project outputs were clear, noting in particular how the design was influenced by and related to the inception study done in Phase I. Project managers felt that the project was practical on the implementation side, and suggested that the feasibility of the project can be measured through the RF.

Some project managers were uncertain and skeptical about what had been achieved towards the outputs, while other project managers interviewed were more sanguine. One in an interview noted that Outcome 1, creating space for local dialogues, met as the target of 3 dialogues was feasible and clear – as well as done. Towards outcome 2, project support for mediation tools and CR as well as that the NoLM had been created, trained and supported meant that this output had also been met. Even the most optimistic interviewee did not feel that outcome 3, a central and local government trained to operationalize the NR strategy, had been achieved. While the NR strategy had been drafted, the instability of central and local government in Libya had led to not making this outcome feasible, or for the project to integrate achievements in the first two outcomes towards outcome 3.

*Extent stakeholders have remained involved in project implementation*

The challenge noted by all interviews was a lack of high-level ownership and leadership for the project. These challenges were seen at the level of UNSMIL, donors, UNDP, Libyan authorities, and project managers. This left the project in later years without attention, direction, and drive.

UNDP and UNSMIL interviews noted that UNDP CO leadership had not been very engaged in the project as a political project that is not really their area as development professionals. Times noted when the project had higher-level achievements were when UNDP resident representatives were active in coordination with UNSMIL.

Interviews found that donors and UNSMIL were not engaged closely with the project at the time of the evaluation. Donor interviewees noted that their engagement focused on project management rather than the political objectives of the project, and that the main stakeholders in the Office of Libyan Affairs of the State Department had not to their knowledge engaged with or provided direction and support to the project in recent years. UNSMIL’s PAL was asserted to have been the main driver of the initial Phase I project and per the ProDoc was due to provide guidance and leadership under Phase II. Interviews noted that the UNSMIL ROL team was instead the main entity that the project engaged with at the Mission at the end of the project and that UNSMIL was “not” or “little” involved in providing detailed guidance or substantial engagement with the project in its last year or years. UNSMIL interviewees reported that they had little information on where the project was, particularly in its engagement with the Presidential Council. UNSMIL ROL worked on other avenues for transitional justice but noted that they did not include the project leadership in these efforts in 2022.

Project managers interviewed reported that the project had created on-line platform with the three major components towards keeping stakeholders involved through whats app groups, connecting all NoLM members and the health diplomacy initiative Let’s Unite Against Corona. Sharing videos on line was seen by project managers as a way to involve stakeholders and keep them involved through information dissemination.

Project managers interviewed noted that one of main ideas of the project was to keep people engaged and informed on mediation and reconciliation. The design of the project was to take local information and share it to support the spread of reconciliation and its incorporation into national-level processes. The project was thus supposed to share information. Some project managers asserted that the project had played important roles when informed about local peace initiatives by its partners in sharing this information.

The project developed and supported a facebook page as a platform to support knowledge transfer on both sides between UNDP and NoLM. The project supported a separate facebook page to support sharing through the Health Dialogue. With COVID, the project even transformed some of the training to the facebook group for short time.

*Extent project responds appropriately to citizen’s needs*

The ProDoc and interviews with UNDP, UNSMIL, and project beneficiaries noted the extensive needs for Libyan citizens in reconciliation at the national and local levels. The ProDoc was seen in interviews as having been designed to respond to these needs through activities towards reaching the three outcomes, which responded to citizens’ needs.

The project however has not been able to deliver on its outputs or the outcomes, thus not meeting the needs for reconciliation in the Libyan context, which has remained divisive and unsettled over the period of project implementation 2019 to September 2022. This context and COVID-19 pandemic have contributed to not responding enough to meet citizen’s needs for reconciliation, as have limits on the efficiency of project implementation discussed below.

*Project contributions to gender equality and inclusion such as capacity building of gender and other stakeholders for promoting political and electoral participation of women, and persons with disabilities*

Project reporting and interviews suggest modest project contributions to GE and inclusion, including for PLWD. Contributions by the project have been with and through women and disabled mediators and training and engagement with the NoLM. The engagement has focused on building the capacity of mediators, for whom neutrality is important. Thus, some project managers noted, the project’s engagement has not promoted the political and electoral participation of women and PLWD as too political which the project should thus not engage in. Instead project managers noted in interviews that the project has emphasized the importance of the engagement of women and other stakeholders, including PLWD, as neutral, impartial mediators with and through the NoLM.

*Consideration of a gender and human rights perspective and its effectiveness for targeted institutions and communities*

Gender and HR perspectives were built into the ProDoc’s approach. In implementation, interviews with UNDP and NoLM members noted that gender came to be largely considered in incorporating women into training as mediators and in the NoLM. HR considerations were kept in mind through a focus on including all parties in dialogues and mediations, including marginalized groups (when appropriate). Interviewees with UNDP and NoLM asserted that this was an appropriate way to consider HR in Libya in mediation and dialogues.

*Complementarities in project activities and outputs towards outcome achievements*

The ProDoc design built down from the interlinked outcomes sought to the outputs under them through the linkages between them activity by activity. The ProDoc thus envisioned activities that flow towards reaching the outputs and outcomes and clearly explained how the three outcomes were related. In implementation however, limited progress was made towards outcome 3 in particular, including having few links between achievements in specific dialogues and in capacity building for mediators and the NoLM with national level institutions. Interviews noted that the anticipated links were limited and had not been built upon, beyond support for capacity building of NoLM and networking in NoLM.

*Effectiveness of UNDP and project management oversight, monitoring and reporting*

The ProDoc set out management arrangements for the project and staffing. The plan was for a project manager with project officer and project assistant to implement the project, with the support of the UNDP Programme Support Unit. The project was to report to the UNDP Resident Representative. A project board of the RR, Ministry of Planning, and UNSMIL Political Affairs Division was listed, but appears not to have been used as no documents note board meetings and no interviewee noted planning for or participating in board meetings. The ProDoc planned for progress reports annual to the board, and noted that “Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project board and management actions agreed to address the issues identified” (p. 31). Not using this board mechanism may have contributed to limitations and weaknesses in project reporting and limited adjustment of the project to implementation challenges, particularly in Outcome 3 where the most political and high level partners and stakeholders of the project were and where the project has had the fewest activities and achievements.

Project managers and consultants reported doing some field monitoring. International staff were highly constrained with respect to travel within Libya. Libyan staff and consultants of the project were able to travel to the field in cases for monitoring and to support dialogues and as well as support the JMC and LEED, for example with a field visit to Bengazi.

That the project had three different Project Managers in 2020 and 2021, which was seen as limiting the project’s effectiveness by UNDP in annual reporting (2020-2021 report, p. 7) and interviews with UNDP and NoLM. Interviews emphasized that changing project managers challenges program management and administration. One project manager interviewed noted that the project provided monthly reporting to senior UNDP management. Some project managers interviewed reported that they felt a distinct lack of senior management interest and support for the project. These project managers interviewed reported that they sought to have UNDP senior management more active in supporting the project, but had not managed to enlist senior management at the time to work towards gaining more traction on the project’s Outcome 3 with government authorities.

Interviews with project managers noted that project reporting was the “main way to keep UNDP informed” about the project. Project managers reported providing quarterly reports to donors; However, only one quarterly report from 2020 was provided. An annual report was provided outlining the limited achievements of 2019 and another annual report combined reporting on the achievement and plans of 2020 and 2021 together was provided. No reporting was provided on 2022 activities of the project.

The project does not appear to have collected, or at least has not shared with the evaluator, any reports by community leaders that participated in the dialogue processes or details on community views in reports filed by the project’s local consultants. The project also does not appear to have collected, or at least has not shared with the evaluator, any signed agreements, approved minutes of the meetings or signed MOUs between parties of the dialogue that were envisioned in the ProDoc as ways to monitor and report out Output 1 results on dialogs.

***In summary, findings under effectiveness are that some findings are positive. This suggest overall that the project was not effective, in that few planned outcomes or outputs were achieved, in the difficult context of Libya for NR over 2019 to September 2022.***

**Efficiency**

Efficiency examines how well resources have been used in implementation of a project. Efficiency is defined as “the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.”

*Extent project implementation strategy and execution has been efficient and cost-effective towards achieving overall outcomes*

Interviewees varied in their perceptions of the efficiency of project implementation and the extent of project implementation, which shaped views on cost-effectiveness. One project manager interviewed characterized the project as having achieved up to 70-80% of expected outcomes, particularly in the first two outcomes and links between them. Other project managers interviewed were less sure about the extent of project achievement. While the structure of project was to link each activity, output, and outcome together, outcome 3 was recognized to have fewer achievements. Other project managers were not well informed about the extent of project achievements but were sceptical that much had been achieved.

The project was originally designed and driven by UNSMIL, with UNDP tasked with implementing decisions by the Mission. Over time, the Mission was seen as less engaged in mediation and the project lost political direction and had limited engagement. Indeed, UNSMIL engagement was described by some interviewees as having the project not engage, due to UNSMIL prioritising national level engagements and having concerns that local mediation and dialogues had the potential to disrupt these national initiatives of UNSMIL. The DOS funders originally were thought by project managers interviewed to have specific goals and aspirations for the project. Over time, the political side of the DOS came to no longer engage with the project or the DOS project managers. UNDP Project Managers thus noted that the project came to have limited engagement and guidance from UNSMIL or the DOS – and that UNDP CO leaders did not fill this lacuna. Instead, no one provided the higher-level guidance and push for the project’s activities or the linkages to other projects and international initiatives.

Interviews with project managers noted that to support mediation in proper ways in Libya was certain to be financially costly based on the need for supporting best practices in mediation and the reality of high financial costs for operating in Libya as an expensive country where specific costly actions were needed to manage mediations in a society in conflict. Mediation requires neutral ground, physically as well as conceptually. Thus meetings often had to be set for outside Libya. To be sure about meeting expected results, most of the planned activities were thus implemented in Tunis to provide proper safe space for dialogues and in-person training. While no detailed expenditure figures were made available, project managers interviewed noted using “a huge portion of budget for travel and accommodations to be more effective” in national reconciliation - and emphasized that this was the plan all along and not a surprise. The periodic recurrence of conflict in Libya reminded the project team of this periodically, and destruction made it so there were no proper accommodations that could have been used as an alternative outside of Tripoli (which was not a neutral site).

Mediators interviewed felt that it was not efficient to have such a long time period between UNITAR-implemented training of training sessions for NoLM mediators. The project’s first training in March 2020, just prior to the main COVID shutdowns and disruptions, was not followed up on by the second training until September 2022, the last month of project implementation under the no cost extension.

UNITAR as an implementer for training was seen by project managers as a choice made to support efficiency. With the challenges project managers faced working to procure providers and vendors in Libya with UNDP rules and regulations, an agency to agency agreement between UNDP and UNITAR for training was seen as an attractive modality by project managers interviewed. While UNITAR was seen as expensive, the trainers and team that work on North Africa were viewed by project managers and mediators interviewed as high-quality providers. Their flexibility and ability to work on demand was seen as vital in the uncertainty of Libya. Thus even at a high financial cost, UNITAR provision was seen as efficient.

*Economical use of financial and human resources and strategic allocation to achieve outcomes*

Project plans to carry out some activities were not taken forward into implementation. Interviews did not report efforts to reallocate project funds or change activities towards making more headway on the outcomes where the TNRL project has had fewer achievements that would demonstrate strategic allocation of resources to achieve outcomes. The alignment of actual expenditures does not align closely with the plans and expenditure planned in the ProDoc. Table 2 below aggregates actual expenditures by the project and compares these actual expenditures to what expenditures would be for outcomes and outputs if the project had been implemented as planned in the ProDoc (using adjusted funding levels to account for the fact that the project received half of the resources sought in the ProDoc). This table, which uses expenditures by category as provided by the project, notes that spending was less than planned for outcomes 1 and 2 (with some outputs having no detailed spending broken out). Outcome 1 expenditures were 39% of the level planned for, and Outcome 2 expenditures were 31% of the level planned for (when adjusted for the fact that the project had half the resources envisioned in the ProDoc). And the project categorized some spending as under the outcome, not under any particular output, which impedes financial analysis. Outcome 3, by contrast, had spending at 204% of planned. And as noted in the effectiveness section above, output targets under the Outcome 3 were not measured or apparently achieved. The project also had higher project management expenditures than planned, with management costs (excluding consultants which were costed in the outcomes) of 164% of planned. These substantial budget and expenditure differences were not addressed or resolved in a revision of the ProDoc.

**Table 2: Project Expenditures, ProDoc Levels, and Assessment vis-à-vis Actual Level of Funding**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Expenditure** | | | | |  |  |  |
| **Outcome/Output** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **Grand Total** | **ProDoc Work Plan** | **Half Pro Doc Work Plan** | **Actual Expenditure as % of Half ProDoc planning level** |
| **OUTCOME 1 TOTAL** | | | | | **445,651** | **2,276,536** | **1,138,268** | **39%** |
| Outcome 1: Space for local dialogue is created and maintained in key locations with potential to contribute to the national reconciliation process. | 29,351 | 68,250 | 289,923 | 24,216 | 411,740 |  |  |  |
| OUTPUT 1.1: Identify and capacitate implementation team to prepare for the dialogue processes |  |  | 3,712 |  | 3,712 | 533,536 | 266,768 |  |
| OUTPUT 1.2: Key issues and grievances are identified and ownership is built for the dialogue initiatives |  |  |  |  |  | 125,000 | 62,500 |  |
| OUTPUT 1.3: Facilitated dialogues in targeted areas are convened |  | 25,069 |  | 5,127 | 30,197 | 1,100,000 | 550,000 |  |
| OUTPUT 1.4: Outreach and advocacy are conducted to ensure the implementation of reconciliation agreements |  |  |  |  |  | 518,000 | 259,000 |  |
| **OUTCOME 2 TOTAL** | | | | | 64,860 | **413,600** | **206,800** | **31%** |
| **OUTCOME 2: Mediation tools and conflict resolution mechanisms are strengthened to more effectively mitigate tensions and reach consensus at the community level** | 540 | 6,061 | 17,518 | 6,189 | 30,309 |  |  |  |
| OUTPUT 2.1: Peer learning in reconciliation and conflict resolution is facilitated |  |  | 394 | 794 | 1,188 | 143,600 | 71,800 |  |
| OUTPUT 2.2: National network of mediators and women mediators are created | 15,852 | 5,009 | 10,602 |  | 31,464 | 270,000 | 135,000 |  |
| OUTCOME 2.3: Central and local governments are strengthened to support and operationalize reconciliation mechanisms based on a coherent strategy and solid legal framework | 1,897 |  |  |  | 1,897 | 430,000 | 215,000 |  |
| **OUTCOME 3 TOTAL** | | | | | 904883 | **900,000** | **450,000** | **201%** |
| OUTCOME 3: Central and local governments are strengthened to support and operationalize reconciliation mechanisms based on a coherent strategy and solid legal framework | 86,430 | 18,458 | 294,528 | 152,675 | 552,093 |  |  |  |
| OUTPUT 3.1: Comprehensive assessment of government institutions and committees related to reconciliation is conducted |  |  | 1,873 | 525 | 2,398 | 180,000 | 90,000 |  |
| OUTPUT 3.2: Technical support to government institutions is provided | 145,925 | 138,792 |  | 9,716 | 294,434 | 290,000 | 145,000 |  |
| OUTPUT 3.3: Capacity building of government institutions is conducted at the local and national levels |  |  | 49,239 | 6,717 | 55,957 | 430,000 | 215,000 |  |
| PROJECT MANAGEMENT | 407,955 | 128,671 | 214,822 | 70,557 | 822,007 | 1,005,481 | 502,740 | **164%** |
| **Grand Total** | **687,987** | **393,414** | **882,614** | **276,519** | **2,240,535** | **4,963,266** |  |  |

*Extent project funds and activities delivered in a timely way*

Interviews with the DOS and UNDP as well as UNDP reporting note that funds were provided by the DOS and Italian donors at the start of implementation. The TNRL project thus reported no issues with the timely delivery of donor funds.

Interviews with project managers noted their appreciation with the flexibility of donors, which was more than some had expected. One characterized donors as having had “perfect timing of funds delivery.”

Delivery by the project of activities was seen as challenging or problematic. Some UNDP managers and staff found it challenging to work with UNDP rules and procedures in Libyan conditions to make payments to partners, vendors, and beneficiaries. They noted that the project faced “a huge obstacle with procurement procedures of UN” and that “We have to follow very restrictive procedures, even for short term, low value payments.”

Project staff noted that they had ideas and measures to expediate payments, and had structured payments to consultants, vendors, and participants to do early measurements on milestones and pay them upon completion. This was seen by project staff as important “to avoid inconveniences with beneficiaries.” Other interviews emphasized the importance of solid, assured support the mediators and conflict parties in a dialogue as critical to the successes of dialogues. While project staff recognized that it was important to “not have them upset” and that the project needed to minimize troubles and risks for participants and stakeholders, there were nevertheless issues in delivering activities. For example, the project faced an incident with delayed travel for mediators from the East with Bengazi flights cancelled. This was said to be one of the major challenges for one of the main meetings, that led to complaints from the Eastern mediators who were only able to arrive on the second day for a three day conference. Project staff reported learning from this experience, where since they arrived on second day, it was a huge issue for the project team in trying to change the agenda and support having the mediators come up with conclusions in one less day.

Since then, TNRL staff interviewed reported bringing participants in to meeting sites a day or two before the event to avoid potential issues with travel, and helping make sure there is sufficient, concentrated time for meetings to make sure participants come up with concrete recommendations.

Some mediators interviewed found project efficiency to be problematic as they described project plans as unreliable, which they asserted were especially problematic in building capacity and credibility in mediation as mediation needs capable, credible actors to be able to function with conflicting parties.

Mediators interviewed asserted that activities had often been promised but not delivered, and when delivered, were not done in a timely manner. Both practices were seen as inefficient. While mediators recognized that they did not have a full understanding of UNDP and UNSMIL’s operations and processes that may have contributed to non-delivery or delivery delays, mediators interviewed were highly critical of project managers and consultants for not only not delivering but for promising to delivery and not meeting these commitments. Mediators interviewed asserted that promising and not delivering was a pattern that inhibited the development of mediator capacity, the NoLM, and of potential mediation. Some mediators found this to be even more detrimental as other potential funders and support steered away from the NoLM knowing that it was supposed to be supported by UNDP through the project – and even asserted that TNRL project managers actively discouraged other funders for capacity building and NoLM mediation through claims that the UNDP project would be supporting the NoLM and its activities so that other funders did not need to.

Project managers and consultants interviewed noted that implementing activities in a country that continued to face violent conflicts on a yearly basis was challenging, and that the COVID pandemic and responses to manage the pandemic added to difficulties and led to delays. The transformation of some activities to remote from face to face modalities due to COVID restrictions and travel restrictions contributed to delays in implementation.

Remote methods were noted as having limitations in Libyan conditions and for mediators. The poor IT infrastructure in the country was recognized in interviews with project staff and with mediators as having hindered learning and participation. In particular, most mediators in the NoLM are elders, without experience and skills with modern IT. Thus reaching them through remote methods was more difficult. This was also particularly the case with tribal and religious leaders who tended to have a harder time dealing with IT and remote methods.

*Extent UNDP M&E systems supported effective and efficient project management*

Project managers interviewed reported that the project planned for an M&E plan, with support of M&E colleagues from CO, and that the project provided reporting for quality assurance on a monthly and quarterly basis to the CO. The M&E plan was not provided to the evaluation consultant. No concrete evidence for reporting on project indicators was in the 2019 annual report, the 2020/2021 annual report, or the two quarterly reports provided for the evaluation.

One project manager interviewed asserted that another of the project managers had been directed by UNDP CO management to revise the project, but had not done so. Project managers noted that they had had to do annual work plans, including with budget revisions, and a redesign with changes to activities for the project, due to the evolving and challenging Libyan environment and COVID-19.

***In summary, findings under efficiency are that some findings are positive. Accumulated findings suggest that project implementation was not efficient; project implementation faced many challenges that UNDP CO, project, UNSMIL, and donor managers did not manage to address in implementing the project efficiently.***

**Sustainability and Risk**

Sustainability is defined by the OECD DAC as “the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue” (p. 11). UNDP defines “Risk is the effect of uncertainty on organizational and programming objectives, which could be either positive and/or negative. A risk, if realized, may enhance, prevent, degrade, accelerate or delay the achievement of objectives.”[[2]](#footnote-3)

*Sustainability of project initiatives in institutional strengthening of stakeholders*

UNDP and UNSMIL interviewees noted that the tremendous instability of the Libyan political scene has negative effects on the sustainability of project achievements, including in institutional strengthening of stakeholders.

One Project manager interviewed suggested that the project’s success in mediating in one of major conflicts in the West between Musrata and Tawurgha in 2019 was sustainable – as it had been sustained. The staying power of this agreement was seen as fostered by the support of by donors for sustainability and UNSMIL on this agreement. However this example is not in the institutional strengthening of stakeholders but rather demonstrates that support can ben provided to sustain agreements – and can be an effective way to sustain reconciliation.

Sustainability in institutional strengthening of the NoLM was seen as negatively influenced by COVID. Pandemic restrictions were seem by project managers as having hurt sustainability, as moving to remote methods under pandemic conditions made it difficult for the project to deliver trainings to mediators and build connections across regional networks. Under these conditions, the two major components for NoLM, wound up using very different methods. The first UNITAR training was done in March 2020 in person but then COVID forced a switch to on-line, facebook group and recordings for follow up which was recognized by project staff and mediators interviewed as not working as well as face to face modalities. The lengthy gap between trainings was also seen as problematic, with the final second training for mediators done on-line and then in person only in September 2022 at the very end of the project.

The final second training and a concluding ceremony for the project in September 2022 was designed, project managers noted, to focus on sustainability. The project team reported agreeing with UNITAR to focus on having a multiplication strategy consistent with ToT methods for the final training for 30 mediators on line and in Tunis on conflict analysis, conflict resolution, drafting agreements, and gender sensitivity. Mediators are then supposed to go back to their communities and train 5 mediators in their cities or villages, join an on line assessment taking stock on where things are after 3 months, and then they receive ToT certificates. Mediators interviewed noted that it would have been preferrable to hav this training earlier and to be supported by the project in concrete ways to help them deliver training to others, as could have been done when the project was in implementation.

UNITAR’s training in September 2022 at the close of the project, managers reported, was to support sustainability through the ToT goals and methods used by UNITAR with NoLM mediators, remotely and in person. Mediators interviewed noted that sustainability required a longer time period and more support and mentoring for individual mediators, and structural, concrete support to help with dialogue organization and stakeholder engagement. Finally, even more significant needs were noted by mediators interviewed for support for the implementation of agreements made in dialogues for these agreements to be implemented and sustainable. The TNRL project had not been able to deliver to support agreement implementation in the views of these mediators interviewed.

*Extent financial and economic resources will be available to sustain project benefits*

UNDP and beneficiary interviews noted the difficult challenges of assessing finance in Libya and channelling funding towards national reconciliation in a country in turmoil with many pressing needs and few sources of finance. The project planned to support the incorporation of the NoLM and regional branches as CSOs to support their ability to compete for funding to sustain their activities. UNDP reported that plans to do so through a low value grant through the project were not successful as the fall of the Dinar exchange rate with the USD led UNDP to reallocate these funds within the project.

Mediators interviewed noted that they had received little support from the project to support or sustain dialogue processes to date, which correspondingly were weak in terms of sustainability. Without support for dialogue meetings themselves (in logistics as well as in engagement with stakeholders) with the close of the project, mediators interviewed anticipated doing less mediation going forward and that without support for implementation of agreements, any agreements reached would also be less sustainable (and sustainability was already weak over the period when the TNRL project was in implementation).

*Extent mechanisms exist to allow stakeholders to carry forward results attained in GEWE, HR, and inclusion*

The TNRL Project has modest results in GEWE, HR, and inclusion beyond the successful mediations. UNDP interviews did not identify existing mechanisms to sustain or extend GEWE, HR, and inclusion results. Some beneficiaries interviewed noted that their personal efforts were carrying GEWE, HR, and inclusion results forward as they conducted ToT sessions with youth and women on mediation on their own initiative. This however is not a mechanism.

*Extent project team has documented and shared lessons learned on a continual basis*

UNDP project management interviewed reported producing monthly reports for 2019-2021 and quarterly reports at least for the last year. Reports were characterized as including sections on obstacles and issues. The 2019 and 2020/2021 annual reports noted broad political risks and how these led to scrapping events. These two reports noted some project practices as lessons learned to manage the political risks through “constant attention to East/West/South balance of all our activities” and outreach/protection engagement by the project.

Consultants interviewed lamented that project materials were not shared or used more. Consultants that had provided reports to the project did not know how these materials were used or shared by the project.

NoLM interviewees felt that the project could have and should have done more document, share, and use lessons learned from its activities and those of the mediators in the NoLM.

*Extent sustainability measures have been incorporated into UNDP interventions*

Limited evidence was presented in documents from the project and interviews for the evaluation for project focus on sustainability. One project manager interviewed did not recall the incorporation of sustainability measures. The final training at the very end of the project for NoLM focused on ToT to spread project training and planned to encourage participants to use the training to train others over the next three months.

*Likelihood that project interventions are sustainable*

With limited evidence in documents from the project and interviews for the evaluation for project focus on sustainability, there is also limited evidence that suggests project interventions are sustainable. Mediators interviewed noted that they had done mediation prior to the project’s development and engagement, and would continue to strive to mediate disputes after project closure in September 2022. The challenge of sustaining agreements made in dialogues was recognized to remain challenging. Other actors have picked up activities and supported some resolutions, including holding new dialogues with different support to build what may be new agreements when prior ones deteriorate, decay, fail, or prove otherwise insufficient. The U.S. Embassy and USAID took credit for supporting the SRSG’s engagement in March 2020 with the American Bar Association to support the Southern Local Mediators organization and a new agreement in Murzug, the location of the most significant dialogue success reported by the TNRL over 2019-2022.[[3]](#footnote-4) The relationship between this new accord and the 2019 one TNRL supported is not clear.

*Social and political risks that jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and outcomes*

The ProDoc identified and enumerated 10 risks. The limited materials shared with the international consultant did not show UNDP monitoring, use of, or adjusting the risk log from the ProDoc. These ten risks – and more – were seen by UNDP interviewees as certainly affecting the sustainability of the limited outputs of the project and some risks were noted and described in more detail in the narrative sections of the project’s 2019 and 2020/2021 annual reports. These ten risks, and evaluation findings on their continued relevance and mitigation measures taken by the project (when identified) were:

Risk 1. Political uncertainty of the country within the current crisis, the prospect of elections and unstable/divided institutions, which remained relevant throughout the project, and were addressed by the project not engaging/not engaging much with partners (especially at the national level) in 2019 and 2021 as UNSMIL sought to not potentially distract from national stabilization goalsl

Risk 2. Possible mistrust of civil society partners in government institutions and international organizations, including the UN, which interviewees at UNDP and civil society noted remained a problem in general with trust in the UN and with issues for NoLM leaders in their trust in the project (the latter which project managers attempted to mitigate through phone calls and by implementing the trainings for NoLM in the final month of the project).

Risk 3. Counterparts refuse foreign interferences and defiance against foreign concepts or lessons learned from comparative experiences, while not noted in interviews or reports as affecting the project, was noted in reports as an ongoing priority of key Libyan stakeholders (to avoid foreign interference) in NR.

Risk 4. The on-going crisis may impact on the quality of dialogue and prevent broad participation, especially of women, which was found as the return to violent conflict in Libya impeded project activities, including for women, which the project mitigated by holding more activities abroad rather than within the country.

Risk 5. Limited capacity of Libyan counterparts to deliver programmes in a timely manner, and lack of structured and organized actors, which was seen to particularly negatively affect Outcome 3 work with the government that lacked the structure and organization to effectively work on NR with the project. Project efforts to provide support to the to the government to address this NR issue were not successful.

Risk 6. Security situation does not allow the UN to reach out to all parts of the country, which has remained the case for international staff; the project mitigated this through national staff and by bringing Libyan mediators from less safe parts of the country to international sites for activities.

Risk 7. Lack of access to targeted areas and beneficiaries, which remained due to insecurity and the COVID pandemic; project efforts ensure access were through support for Libyans to travel to activities and shifting to remote activities (which was still hampered by electricity and internet limits).

Risk 8. Project outputs are achieved, but the impact is minimal, which appears to be the case for the one output target that seems to have been met (the number of national project staff hired and trained); the project does not seem to have use expected outputs or managed towards them.

Risk 9. Failure to verify progress/results on the ground due to lack of access and security situation; project M&E was limited, including by access and security issues. The project does not seem to have emphasized monitoring.

Risk 10. Weak implementing partners’ capacity to deliver; the NoLM was seen by members interviewed as having limited capacity, which the project tried to strengthen through building the capacity of its leaders and members as mediators.

*Appropriateness, effectiveness and contribution of project’s partnership strategy to sustainable impact*

The TNRL project partnered with the NoLM for Outcomes 1 and 2 and was designed to partner with the Libyan authorities in Outcome 3 towards having sustainable impacts. Interviews with project staff and NoLM members did not note this relationship as a partnership. Instead mediators felt that they were not able to count on project support during the period of implementation, which weakened what they were able to in mediation and in the development of the NoLM as well as inhibited the sustainability of both mediated agreements and the network.

Project reporting and interviews with project managers and consultants noted that the partnership with the Presidential Council had not been strong, and that weaknesses and limitations with how little the project had done towards Outcome 3 inhibited any sustainability in these modest achievements.

*Key lessons learned from the project and that can be used to enhance UNDP, donor, and government decision making and programming going forward*

Interviewees suggested key lessons learned for consideration and the evaluator’s analysis of findings from interviews and document review identified other lessons learned. Lessons are both in project management and delivery and in the project’s engagement and partnership with other organizations.

High-level sustained political engagement is needed to support UNDP projects in sensitive areas like reconciliation.

Proactive project management is needed to adjust and accelerate project implementation and address difficulties in implementation

Projects should have and use project boards to increase stakeholder engagement and support sustainability

Sustainability should be the focus of Phase II projects that engage for prolonged time periods with partners

UNDP’s technical project implementation needs to be closely linked to UNSMIL’s political engagement for political projects like TNRL in sensitive areas like reconciliation

Linking mediation and dialogue agreements with tangible support for implementation and development supports peacebuilding and consolidation

***In summary, findings under sustainability and risk are that no findings are positive (although lessons learned do clearly emerge from the design, implementation, and outcomes/outputs of the project. Note The modest achievements of the project have limited sustainability, and that while the project faced many risks, the monitoring, assessment, and management of these risks was informal and of limited utility in addressing or minimizing risks.***

**Evaluation Cross-Cutting Issues**

**Gender equality and women’s empowerment**

*GEWE in project design, implementation, and monitoring*

The design of the project recognized that women should be included as full participants in mediation and dialogues to increase the effectiveness of NR. The ProDoc also noted that Libya was a challenging environment for the inclusion of women, as women were excluded from traditional mediation initiatives across the country. The tribal and community leaders that traditionally led mediations and dialogues were mainly or overwhelmingly men. Project managers interviewed asserted up to 90% of participants in these traditional mediation processes were men. GEWE was thus noted as an important factor to address in the project’s design.

In implementation, limited evidence for attention to GEWE was found through the evaluation fieldwork. Project managers interviewed asserted that the project had no specific activities for gender. The project’s approach was described as mainstreaming gender, and that the approach did not separate out women.

Project managers interviewed noted that the project team met to make sure each activity considered gender in its development. Some interviewees asserted that consultation sessions among the team were held on monthly basis in 2019-2021. With only one person for project team in 2022, the responsibility for gender sensitivity was internal and limited to that person.

CO office staff, project management, and UNSMIL influenced GEWE in implementation. To implement activities, although UNDP did not take into account in procedures the need for support for family members to accompany women participants in travel, project managers reported making special arrangements to include someone for their families to travel to ensure women’s participation in keeping with prevailing traditional norms. Project managers interviewed noted that the project had empowered women to participate with the UN and UNDP in peace talks, and in particular had success stories from M&T dialogues where women from each side had been incorporated into the discussions and played important positive roles.

When UNDP Libya brought on board a dedicated gender advisor, the gender advisor was tasked with reviewing the project, including developing a gender action plan for TNRL project in 2021. Project managers interviewed reported working in coordination with the UNDP gender focal point and NoLM on the question of having a separate women’s NoLM. Project managers reported that it was then agreed that the project and NoLM would not separate the two networks as this would lead to more divisiveness. Project managers interviewed noted that they had decided not to support a separate women’s NoLM but instead provide support to include women in one NoLM network. Project managers interviewed noted that they wanted to reach more women to encourage their participation in the network. Project managers interviewed asserted that the project had made it to 30% women participation in the NoLM as planned as well as that the women members of NoLM are very active, including in decision making within the network.

One women mediator, although suggested for an interview by project management, asserted that she had been completely sidelined by NoLM leaders and had been left out of the project. She reported in the interview consequently that she no longer knew anything about what the NoLM and TNRL project were engaged in. Project managers interviewed did not seem to know about this interviewee’s dissatisfaction and perceived exclusion. This suggests that project monitoring was not attentive to potential and actual tensions and issues in the NoLM, including how these issues affected particular women mediators.

Gender monitoring was noted by an interviewee as occurring through one activity at the end of the project. The project was reportedly now doing an assessment with another UNDP project to map the role of mediators at the local level through a consultant at UNITAR. No other evidence emerged in the evaluation’s fieldwork from interviews or project documents on any project monitoring to address GEWE.

*Extent of implementation of project’s Gender Action Plan?*

Project managers for the period after the development of the May 2021 gender action plan were interviewed. They did not know of the Gender Action Plan. That suggested that the Gender Action Plan was not implemented.

*Project promotion of positive changes in GEWE and any unintended effects*

Project manager interviews were not sure of any positive changes in GEWE promoted by the TNRL project or unintended effects.

Project managers hoped that conducting the women in mediation assessment, with another UNDP project would identify positive changes in GEWE. This final assessment with the other project was still ongoing during the evaluation. One task of the assessment was to plan for legacy activities to go beyond the close of the project period of implementation, which could support future positive changes.

No unintended effects on GEWE were identified in the analysis of project reporting or interviews.

*Extent resources were used to address inequalities in general and gender issues in particular*

Expenditure data was not shared with the evaluation to provide specific USD information on resource use or the extent resources targeted inequalities or gender. With a mainstreaming approach said to have been taken by the project by project managers, resources may not have been targeted towards gender.

**Conflict Sensitivity**

*Extent of conflict sensitivity approach in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project*

Project managers interviewed noted that each activity was conflict sensitive in preparation. Project managers reported meeting as a project team to discuss conflict risks for the development of each activity when there was a team implementing the project 2019-2021. In 2022, with only one person on the project, there were no processes or procedures to assess conflict sensitivity. However the project manager reported keeping conflict sensitivity in mind.

*Unintended effects on the peace and conflict context in areas of intervention as a result of the project*

Project reports did not note any unintended effects on peace and conflict of the project. Interviewees for the evaluation did not identify any unintended effects.

*Extent that the project is perceived to benefit one group over another (and reinforce lines of divisions)*

Project managers noted in interviews that they had been attentive to the importance of avoiding perceptions that the project was not neutral and favoured one group or another. Attentiveness to neutrality was seen as critical in the contentious context of Libya. One project manager interviewed asserted that it was “close to impossible” to make the error of being perceived as supporting one group over another as the project’s output 1 support for dialogues was based on holding bilateral meetings with each side of a dispute and then bringing the disputants together in a process that the project’s supported mediators guaranteed to share all information from the different bilateral meetings in one place.

The project’s role was designed to be only a facilitator for ongoing dialogues or peace talks; the mediation itself was to come from mediators themselves. The project required guarantees of inclusivity from every mediator and initiative supported, and both principles are included in the project-supported NoLM.

*Perceptions of UNDP hiring, partnership, and procurement practices by different groups in the areas of intervention, and whether there are perceptions that hiring and procurement disproportionately benefit one group over another*

One project manager interviewed noted that to address complaints that the hiring of a project consultant benefitted one side, the project chose to work with two consultants to bring in one from the other side and address this complaint. The project was thus careful to show a balanced point of view, for example in mediating the conflict in Murzug.

**Disability**

*Extent UNDP considered the needs of PLWD in project design and implementation*

The ProDoc does not mention PLWD. The focus on inclusion in design is explicit about the inclusion of women, and often focuses on the inclusion of all tribes/parties in an area of the country. Project managers interviewed noted that the project had tried to be inclusive, especially with the NoLM, which has PLWD as mediators. The fact that many mediators are elders led to some of the members being PLWD.

Project managers interviewed noted that they had made sure disabled members of NoLM were included in project supporting trainings. Interviewees from NoLM and the project noted in particular that for one man and one woman who were disabled, but nevertheless very active in their communities, they had made sure these two PLWD were included for trainings, even if that required additional support for their participation (such as facilitating travel for another person to support a blind mediator).

Project managers also asserted that in supporting specific dialogues, the project had emphasized that all sides needed to consider the participation of all members of society, including PLWD.

*Proportion of beneficiaries that were PLWD*

Project reporting did not report on the number of project beneficiaries overall or the number of beneficiaries that were PLWD. Thus there is no way to precisely account for the proportion of beneficiaries of the project that were PLWD.

Project managers noted that three PLWD in NoLM had been included in trainings, as they met the project’s selection criteria as active in reconciliation or peace talks in their communities.

Another way PLWD benefitted from the project was from dialogues that supported reconciliation in the communities in which they live. These PLWD benefitted from the peace achieved through dialogues. Neither the project nor the NoLM tracked beneficiaries of dialogues this way, nor had information on disability in these communities. There is thus no way to count the number of community beneficiaries overall or PLWD in particular.

*Barriers PLWD face and adoption of a twin-track approach by the project towards mainstreaming disability*

Project reporting was silent on PLWD. Interviewees did not note that the project had tried to mainstream disability as well as target PLWD in a twin-track approach. However project managers interviewed noted PLWD had participated in the NoLM and that for supporting PLWD in the project, movement was always an issue. The TNRL project thus made special arrangements to support the participation of PLWD, who they were sure to include in events. Similar to the way the project supported women’s participation by enabling them to travel with someone from their family to activities, the project enabled PLWD to include someone in their family in travel arrangements. These special arrangements were recotnized as necessary, not as special treatment. For the first project-supported mediator training in Tunis, one disabled beneficiary did not bring someone, which led to the whole group supporting his movement through the airport.

**Human Rights and Leave No One Behind**

*Extent research and monitoring was inclusive in terms of capturing the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized*

Project monitoring appears to have been limited. Project reporting for 2019 noted the support for the project for marginalized communities in dialogues, in particular in Murzug. Project managers noted that they had had the project work on and with vulnerable and marginalized tribes in dialogue outputs in Murzug and Obari, where the indigenous people who project managers noted “are literally marginalized” were included. No research products from Phase II were shared with the evaluator.

*Extent disadvantaged and marginalized groups (indigenous populations, unemployed or underemployed/ poor, Libyans with undetermined legal status, etc.) benefitted from this intervention*

The project design noted that the Phase I project had focused on conflicts that often had disadvantaged, marginalized groups (such as the Tebu or Tuareg) at their centre and the importance of engaging with less prominent tribes (e.g. the Hassaouna, Fezzazna, and Megharha in the South) to have comprehensive participation in mediations and dialogues.

Disadvantaged and marginalized groups, project managers interviewed noted, benefitted from the project as participants in NoLM (and trainings for the network) and through project support for mediation of disputes in communities where they resided (or had been displaced to as IDPs). Project reporting noted the success of the UNSMIL-facilitated dialogue process with project support for an initial de-escalation of fighting between Ahaali and Tebu, a marginalized group, in Murzuq in 2019.

***In summary, findings under cross cutting issues are that some findings are positive. Findings identified attention to GEWE, conflict sensitivity, disability, and human rights, and but not enough attention to these cross cutting issues to have substantial results in implementation.***

# CONCLUSIONS

*Relevance*

Phase II of the Towards National Reconciliation in Libya project inherited the experience and strengths of Phase I of the project implemented 2017-2018 with PBF funds. Implementation of Phase II however was impeded by the resumption of widespread conflict and violence in Libya in 2019 which increased political fissures and impeded reconciliation at local and national levels up to the end of 2022. The spread of the COVID-19 Pandemic from March 2020 also impeded project implementation. In addition to the negative effects of these environmental factors, international and national stakeholders key to the project lost attention and focus on NR and the project, which then suffered with less leadership and push from UNSMIL, the DOS, UNDP, the PC, and project management than necessary over 2019-September 2022.

*Coherence*

UNSMIL leads the UN’s engagement in Libya, which provides for overall high-level coherence in linking UN projects, which is important given the limitations of state actors and their divisions with limit the ability of the state to support coherence. UNDP also has and used different mechanisms to support coherence through CO management, through having a single project manager lead complementary projects, and through umbrella projects to links discrete projects like TNRL with others. However this coherence had limitations in practice as attention to the project and the goals of NR from UNSMIL, donors, UNDP, and Libyan authorities was not sufficiently active or consistent to support implementation of the project or create coherence with other linked initiatives in implementation.

*Effectiveness*

The ProDoc left ambiguities and inconsistencies in project management and metrics which were not addressed in implementation. UNDP did not tackle these ambiguities and inconsistencies to realign the project with the actual levels of donor funding and the challenging context of Libya’s return to civil war in 2019 and the COVID pandemic the year after, both of which have persisted through the end of the project.

Thus the project did not manage to reach its objectives as developed in the ProDoc, either as enumerated in the RF or as summarized the text. The situation in the country at the end of the project remains similar to that characterized in the ProDoc at the start the project in 2018: that

local reconciliation initiatives have remained mostly ad hoc and limited to these constituencies. They often consist of a “light” version of reconciliation, i.e. a ceasefire agreement with some minimal confidence-building measures, often involving an exchange of prisoners, the payment of compensations, the reopening of some roads and the establishment of regular channels of communications to avoid isolated incidents escalating into new rounds of violence.

This approach, while contributing to temporarily ceasing hostilities, does not bring sustainable peace and fails to address the structural causes of violence, thereby leaving a return to violence in the near future possible. … the lack of real monitoring mechanisms, in the absence of state support, have rendered these efforts less efficient on the ground. More synergies and linkages between national and local reconciliation initiatives should therefore be developed” (p. 4)

*Efficiency*

The limits to project effectiveness, in that project outputs and outcomes have substantially not been achieved and/or were not delivered in a timely way, suggest limits to the project’s efficiency in implementation as well. Limits to leadership and insufficient focus and drive from UNSMIL leadership, UNDP leaders, donors, national authorities and project managers in the context of Libya with expanding tensions and a return to violent conflict plus the COVID-19 pandemic limited the efficiency of project delivery. The project focused on effectiveness, which was seen as appropriate as the issues and processes of reconciliation and mediation are difficult and costly. Focusing on reducing costs in some areas was recognized to risk effectiveness, and effectiveness was prioritized by the project in implementation. This was seen as a sensible priority and decision that justified for example meeting abroad rather than in Libya and supporting accommodation for mediators and participants before the scheduled start of events to make sure they were able to travel and participate as transportation was not reliable in its timing.

Changing project stakeholders (at UNSMIL, the DOS, UNDP CO, Libyan authorities, and UNDP project managers was seen as impeding efficiency, as management and staff lost focus. Some project behaviors were seen as limiting efficiency, such as the long lag between trainings for mediators. The project not carrying out planned activities was inefficient, as these plans were critical to project outputs and outcomes. Project and CO M&E were not seen as very active or supporting efficiency.

*Sustainability and Risk*

The output achievements and contributions towards outcomes of the project likely have limited sustainability in the challenging context of Libya in conflict and crisis and with COVID-19. The TNRL project had limited effects in strengthening institutions – mostly through support for the NoLM as an organization. Support through the project for government of Libya institutions was modest and did not have the level of activity needed to make much progress towards sustainability. Support for the NoLM was often for individual mediators and had limited effects on the organization as a whole or regional suborganizations. Achievements in GEWE and social inclusion are also of limited sustainability (although some of the agreements supported like between Musrata and Tawurga from 2019 were seen as still being sustained – and this example focused on marginalized communities). Financial and economic resources are not in place to sustain project benefits and there are not mechanisms in place to carry forward GEWE, HR, and inclusion results. Lessons learned have only been documented to a limited degree and not shared widely.

*Cross-cutting issues*

In GEWE, the project recognized the challenges for GEWE in Libya in reconciliation but proposed a mainstreaming approach. Efforts to adjust and have a focus in some areas on GEWE, including through a Gender Action Plan developed through the CO, were not focused on by the project in implementation. Monitoring, with the exception of an activity at the end of the project still in process, did not focus on GEWE. No data on resource use or allocation towards GEWE is known.

For conflict sensitivity, the project was built around the concept and considered conflict in an ad-hoc way as a team in implementation as developing plans to support NR and specific mediation activities. No unintended effects were noted, nor were perceptions that the project was not neutral in benefitting one group over another, in the evaluation fieldwork interviews or project materials. One project manager interviewed noted that to address complaints that the hiring of a project consultant benefitted one side, the project chose to work with two consultants to bring in one from the other side and address this complaint.

Disability was not noted explicitly in the ProDoc, but considered as part of inclusivity. Project activities made sure to enable disabled mediators in NoLM to participate, and accommodated PLWD. The project did not report data on the proportion of beneficiaries that were PLWD; however three NoLM beneficiaries with disabilities were trained. And the project emphasized that dialogues needed to include PLWD, but did not track participants or beneficiaries this way.

For human rights and to leave no one behind, project monitoring sometimes captured the situation and participation of vulnerable, marginalized communities. The project design recognized the importance of including marginalized communities in the resolution of disputes. The 2019 Murzuq dialogue process that is the main dialogue success of the project was between marginalized groups.

# LESSONS LEARNED

The conclusions of the evaluation suggest some lessons learned by UNDP and partners from the experience of the project. Lessons learned suggested by interviewees are also included below when supported by the evaluator’s analysis of findings. Lessons learned are developed further as recommendations below.

High-level sustained political engagement is needed to support UNDP projects in sensitive areas like reconciliation.

Proactive project management is needed to adjust and accelerate project implementation and address difficulties in implementation.

Projects should have and use project boards to increase stakeholder engagement and support sustainability.

Sustainability should be the focus of Phase II projects that engage for prolonged time periods with partners.

UNDP’s technical project implementation needs to be closely linked to UNSMIL’s political engagement for political projects like TNRL in sensitive areas like reconciliation.

Linking mediation and dialogue agreements with tangible support for implementation and development supports peacebuilding and consolidation.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions of the evaluation suggest recommendations based on the experience of the project. Recommendations suggested by interviewees are also included in the recommendations here when supported by the evaluator’s analysis of findings.

Project materials and the analysis of interview findings suggests recommendations based on the experience to further support national reconciliation in Libya.

*UNSMIL leadership needs to consistently focus on and support joint UN work in critical, sensitive political areas of Libya’s development like NR*

Phase I of the project had more results and periods in Phase II had more activities conducted by the project when UNSMIL had more of a focus on NR and the project and UNDP CO management were engaged and actively supported the project’s contributions to NR. UNSMIL leadership is needs to be maintained and kept consistent to support progress for UNDP projects in sensitive political areas like NR. Continued leadership attention may be particularly needed to support resilience in a context like Libya where political tensions and a return to conflict have had such apparent negative effects on NR since late 2019.

*UNDP CO leadership needs to lead and support effective project implementation and coordination with UNSMIL and other UNDP projects*

The project reported more results and effectiveness when UNDP CO senior management was engaged, and fell off when CO leaders were not. Political projects like TNRL need sustained engagement from management to be effective in sensitive, political areas like NR.

*UNDP needs to staff and manage projects towards effective and efficient delivery*

The TNRL project had four different project managers in less than four years with different strengths and limitations in managing the project. The size of the project team also varied substantially with consultants and support staff at times, while near the close the project relied only on one national staff person. UNDP should consider the importance of having an international project manager to support strong teams of national staff for sensitive, political areas where perceptions are that no Libyan can be neutral. Project managers need to have the training on UNDP systems and processes to be effective – or be linked to teams with dedicated staff that have these skills and qualifications. For each project, UNDP should consider forming a cohesive team to link the strengths of an international project manager with the advantages of neutrality and UNDP experience with national staff team members that know Libya and can travel and operate effectively as a model for project design and implementation.

*UNDP and UNSMIL should enlist strong partner government support and participation*

The TNRL project appears to have suffered from the fact that partnerships in the project with government actors were weak. PC engagement was limited with the project and few activities were delivered under outcome 3. This contributed to limited progress at the national level and to not meeting output targets (and having few effects on NR from apparently meeting the letter of Outcome 3 outcome targets, as these did not represent substantial enough achievements). Government partnerships are essential to national level outcomes and to sustainability and need to be pursued throughout projects like NR. Having and using project boards may be able to contribute to partner support and participation – and outcomes.

*Substantial support should be devoted to following up on and supporting the implementation of national and local reconciliation agreements*

The TNRL ProDoc noted the challenge of bringing support through other projects like the Stabilization Fund to provide peace dividends to communities that could support the implementation of agreements reached through mediated dialogues. And evidence was identified that showed NR agreements continue to be challenged in implementation, and need to be redone or reaffirmed (e.g. Murzug 2019 and 2022). NR should be linked closely to other support to overcome differences and support agreements; this other support towards overcoming differences and implementing agreements could come from within NR projects if sufficiently large. Or support to reinforce agreements could come from other development projects that could be linked to them by UNSMIL, the UNDP CO, UNDP project managers that lead more than one project, or donors. UNDP Libya should develop procedures and connections that formalize these links to support implementation and linkages between projects. UNDP Libya should consider alternative methods to link projects and which of the four types of links are most appropriate for different projects (including if donors themselves can adequately support and ensure linkages). UNDP M&E should monitor the connections envisioned between projects and whether these links are working as sought to reinforce project-level achievements towards broader CPD and national/regional outcomes.

*UNDP should strengthen CO and Project monitoring and reporting*

UNDP Libya should consider developing systems and staff to support the development and use of results-based management techniques for projects like TNRL and support project team’s reporting through results frameworks. The TNRL project developed a RF, but did not fully elaborate it in the ProDoc, and there was no reporting using the framework nor evidence that it was used to monitor and adjust project implementation. RBM techniques are best practices in development and can be used to support even sensitive, political projects. CO engagement in monitoring and reporting is also needed to support changes in implementation, such as Gender Action Plans, that did not receive attention once developed.

*UNDP should consider substantial revisions of projects as appropriate in implementation as circumstances change*

UNDP Libya should consider revising projects when circumstances change dramatically (as in Libya with renewed conflict post 2019) and project implementation suggests that project goals and targets may not be met. Using RBM methods supports this rethinking, which can be used to reassess what is feasible under changed conditions and design modified projects and activities appropriate to these conditions. This could support more effectiveness and efficiency in projects like NR.

*UNDP should pursue a focus on GEWE as well as marginalized communities in implementation*

While Libya is a challenging environment for GEWE, projects such as reconciliation should not only develop plans for a dual track approach to GEWE but also focus implementation on these areas. The many issues in NR have particular resonance for women and can be used to support greater women’s participation in NR as well as gender equality. The importance of the issues and women’s empowerment in this context require a focused strategy and its implementation to support GEWE progress as well as NR. The situation is similar for marginalized communities, where conflict and its resolution have particular importance for marginalized communities as well as limitations on the engagement of marginalized populations – unless prioritized by development projects. To determine specific areas of NR that are prioritized by Libyan women and are seen by them as most promising towards supporting GEWE, projects should have staff time dedicated to these questions and start with consultative activities that facilitate discussions among Libyan women on NR priorities and opportunities. Then projects can develop activities to support endorsed priorities to seize opportunities for women, with M&E and support of the CO gender team as well as the project itself. Similar consultative processes and active project support and management to follow up on ideas generated in these fora are recommended for NR and marginalized populations.
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**Terms of Reference**

**Individual Consultant (International)**

**Ref: IC-UNDP-22**

**Office: UNDP Libya**

**Description of the assignment: Final Project Evaluation for Towards National Reconciliation in Libya Project**

**Project name: Towards National Reconciliation in Libya**

**Type of Appointment: Individual Consultant (International)**

**Duty Station: Home-based**

**Period of assignment/services: 45 working days**

**Payment arrangements: Lump Sum (payment linked to deliverables)**

**Expected start date 01 July 2022**

Proposal should be submitted by email to [**tenders.ly@undp.org**](mailto:tenders.ly@undp.org) no later than 1st June , 2022, **at 11:00** **hours Tripoli**, **Libya** time ref. [www.greenwichmeantime.com](http://www.greenwichmeantime.com).

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail address: [procurement.ly@undp.org](mailto:procurement.ly@undp.org). UNDP Libya Procurement Unit will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants who express their interest.

**I. Background and Context**

Libya has an estimated population of 8.24 million[[4]](#footnote-5) including 643,123 returnees, 212,593 Internally Displaced Persons (IDP), 597,611 migrants and 43,000 refugees. The legacy of authoritarian rule and the absence of effective and accountable governance institutions, combined with the tribal aspects of governance in parts of the country, and the discriminatory elements of traditional and gendered norms and values, continued to pose significant structural challenges to state-building and addressing inequalities. Weak and divided state and government institutions have further exacerbated the problems facing the Libyan populace by failing to provide adequate basic services—including education, health, cash liquidity, legal documentation, electricity, water, and security—with competition over limited resources further exacerbating cleavages among communities in turn at the local level (REACH, 2019). The weak ability of the central government institutions to provide key public service have increased the pressure on the municipalities to address basic service delivery.

Moreover, Libya is a wealthy nation by many accounts, given its natural resources, strategic location, ethnic diversity, cultural heritage and strong social fabric, all of which are solid foundations for development. Young people make up two thirds of the population and around 18 per cent of Libyans are aged 15 to 24 with high literacy rates. While a decade of political crisis and recent violent conflict have had a devastating impact on the country’s development trajectory and population, particularly the most vulnerable, many of its current structural development challenges –including limited economic diversification and overreliance on oil revenues, foreign labour and public sector employment – date back to the pre-revolution era

Supported by the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), the Project, “Towards National Reconciliation in Libya (TNRL) has been implemented in partnership between the Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), originally in support of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General’s Action Plan (2017) in furtherance of the Libyan Political Agreement and UNSMIL’s political dialogue strategy, which aims to lay the foundations for national reconciliation.

The project was designed in the context of continuing the United Nations (UN) support to the local efforts in the Libyan society, which were facing significant national and local-level challenges that hindered the national reconciliation process. A perception survey was conducted in December 2017 as part of the project with more than 2,000 respondents and 40 key informants revealed the importance for reconciliation initiatives, strictly to be Libyan led to create a perceived legitimacy with the United Nations as having an exactingly facilitating role. The study also stressed the significance of engaging, not only with the top-level representatives of the disputing parties, but also with the community leaders at grassroot such as tribal elders, and notably, youth, women, and militia leaders. Official state or military legitimation of the agreement was also factored to guarantee the legitimacy and durability of reconciliation processes. The project was conceived in phases and had the following key achievement of results:

Phase One from 2017 to 2018. During this period the project held five local dialogues that created space for political processes and peacebuilding at the national level. The project also held several meetings that focused on the Southern region, a key hotspot resulted in the establishment of the Charter of Fezzan, signed by 120 community leaders from the South. It then issued five micro-capital grants conducted by 20 National Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) that created space for more Libyan-led local dialogue processes. Then the project held a media campaign that was a catalysed, which galvanised public support for national reconciliation across the country.

Phase Two from 2019 to 2021 (NCE 30 Sept 2022). The dialogue processes in Phase One were monitored and phased two dialogue processes were initiated with the conflicting parties. This project phase help and created a National Network of Local Mediators (NoLM). NoLM comprised approximately 120 to 150 participants from across the country, having interlockers in the South, West and East of the country. Phase 2 initiative sought to partner with community leaders and peace actors that had experiences in reconciliation, mediation, and social cohesion work in support for local peace initiatives and potentially participate in the project’s dialogue processes, under the leadership of UNSMIL The project team mentored the active members of NoLM, which total 65 Participants and in March 2020 invited them for the first TOT training course that was conducted in partnership with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). They were trained on advanced mediation practices and equipped with knowledge transfers skills through a Training of Trainers program. The training dedicated substantial efforts to women participation (21 out of the 65 participants) and the concept of gender mainstream was introduced in the training. This created network and sub-network of Women Mediators.

In January 2020, International Conference on Libya was held in Berlin, it was a culmination of a UN-brokered agreement by the Libyan Political Dialogue Forum. The success of the conference laid the foundation for meaningful reconciliation process in Libya. A process that would enable Libyans to come to terms with its past, uncover the truth, and provide reparation for victims, rehabilitation, and establishment of institutions, in line with the traditions of the Libyan society.

These project phases were intended to achieve stability, security and confidence building to restore the broken social fabric of Libyan society, rebuilding the state, and the attainment of justice, and in so doing achieved the basis for the Strategy of National Reconciliation in Libya designed in 2019 with the support of the UNSMIL-UNDP joint initiative, “Towards National Reconciliation in Libya” through Libyan stakeholders. A roadmap for comprehensive national reconciliation in Libya, which identified necessary support for institutionalization of sustainable reconciliation mechanisms at the central and local governments, including non-state actors in Libya. A safe and dignified return of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and refugees return to their homes requires serious and successful reconciliation in Libya, including end arbitrary and prolonged illegal detention, uncover the fate of those individuals and groups missing or those persons who forcibly disappeared, address issues of land and property rights.

The **Towards National Reconciliation in Libya** project seeks to develop seeking dynamic and strategic partnerships with public and private sectors across the fault lines and adopting **innovative** **solutions** and emerging **technologies** to address the national reconciliation in Libya to scale up and create impacts. Various Libyan interlocutors have requested increased support with convening more community-based dialogues while also institutionalizing these reconciliation efforts at the national level.

However, due to the insufficient funds the project facing currently considerable challenge to implement the demands of the information and messaging on the concept of the national reconciliation and participation in the process by the different levels of the Libyan community. Addressing these demands requires a more joint UNDP-UNSMIL strategic approach to engendering inclusivity, to continue to respond to these Libyan needs for a safe space for more dialogue initiatives that can work in creating unity of the different Libyan social fabric that have been torn apart due to eleven years of conflict and insecurity, hates speech and misinformation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION** | | |
| **Project/outcome title** | **Towards National Reconciliation in Libya** | |
| **Atlas ID** | 00114463 | |
| **Corporate outcome and output** | **UNSF outcome involving UNDP No. 3:** By 2022, relevant Libyan institutions improved their capacity to design, develop and implement social policies that focus on quality social services delivery for all women and girls, men and boys (including vulnerable groups, migrants and refugees) in Libya towards enhancing human security and reducing inequalities. | |
| **Country** | Libya | |
| **SDGs** | SDG 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions. | |
| **Region** | RBAS | |
| **Date project document signed** |  | |
| **Project dates** | **Start** | **Planned end** |
| 1st January 2019 | 30 September 2022 |
| **Project budget** | $4,963,266 | |
| **Project expenditure at the time of evaluation** | 2,059,646 $ | |
| **Funding source** | USDOS | |
| **Implementing party** | UNDP Libya | |

Stakeholders roles in the project:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stakeholder | Role in the project |
| UNSMIL | in support to the political process, under the lead of the Political Division of UNSMIL |
| UNITAR | Providing capacity building assessments/training to the project beneficiaries |
| NETWORK OF LOCAL MEDIATORS | One of the project beneficiaries |
| Interpeace | Partner |
| The Stabilization Facility for Libya project UNDP Libya | build synergies |
| The United States Institute of Peace (USIP) | Partner |
| Immediate Assistance to the Libyan Political Dialogue and Government of National Accord project. UNDP Libya | build synergies |
| Peaceful Change Initiative (PCI) | Partner |
| Presidential Council | Responsible counterpart |

**I. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK**

The project evaluation will include a review of the project design and assumptions made at the beginning of the project and the development process. It will assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, and cross cutting issues such as gender, conflict sensitivity, and human rights have been addressed. It will also assess whether the project implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning. The evaluation’s specific objectives include:

* Examine the project theory of change by testing the relationship between activities, outputs, outcomes, and wider context
* Review the appropriateness of the implementation strategy and the overall performance of the Project in achieving the intended outputs and their contributions to outcome level goals by providing an objective assessment of the intervention achievements, constraints, performance, results, relevance, and sustainability.
* Identify factors which facilitated or hindered the results achievement, both in terms of the external environment and those related to internal factors.
* Identify and assess the project’s response mechanisms and adaptability to unforeseen external and internal factors.
* Determine whether the project’s coordinated and area-based approach functioned as intended (building synergies across interventions and leveraging results for the success of others)
* Define the extent to which the Project addressed cross cutting issues including gender, human rights, disability issues, and conflict sensitivity.
* Establish and document the positive impact and any negative or positive unintended consequences of activities and the relevance to the overall strategy, to validate results in terms of achievements toward the outputs; to examine to what extent interventions supported co-existence efforts, strengthened and empowered and enhanced participation of vulnerable groups particularly in decision making and resources sharing
* Document lessons learned, best practices, success stories and challenges encountered throughout the project design and implementation stages to inform future initiatives. Formulate clear, focused, and forward-looking recommendations to inform future UNDP Libya programming and internal coordination in the context of Covid-19 and continued political instability.

1. **Evaluation Criteria and Key Guiding Questions**

The following key questions are proposed to guide the decentralized final project evaluation, which, when answered, will give intended end users the information they seek in order to make decisions, take actions and increase knowledge. The proposed questions are grouped according to the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, including relevance; coherence; impact; effectiveness; efficiency; and sustainability.

The final key guiding questions to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders and the evaluator.

**Relevance**

a) To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, the country project’s outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?

b) To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country project outcomes?

c) Extent to which project initiatives such as awareness raising campaigns, capacity building initiatives and public information products were relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders?

d) To what extent does the project contribute to Leave No One Behind (LNOB), gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

e) Evaluate the extent to which Towards National Reconciliation in Libya implementation strategy has been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of other partners and stakeholders; and to the context of Libya’s emerging political and development scenario;

f) Evaluate whether project activities were relevant for the implementation of strategic and other plans of stakeholders?

**Coherence**

1. To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
2. How well does the intervention fit?
3. How compatible was the project to other interventions in the country?
4. To what extent did the intervention support or undermine policies?
5. What synergies or interlinkages benefitted from this project within UNDP and externally? This includes complementarity, harmonization and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

**Effectiveness**

a) To what extent did the project contribute to the country project outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?

b) Were the project initiatives including institutional strengthening of institutions, gender mainstreaming and engagement with civil society, such as media, effective to achieve project outcomes?

c) Are the project outputs clear, practical and feasible?

d) To what extent have stakeholders such as Towards National Reconciliation in Libya remained involved in project implementation?

e) To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to citizen’s needs?

f) To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and inclusion such as capacity building of gender and other stakeholders for promoting political and electoral participation of women, and persons with disabilities?

g) Assess whether a gender and human rights perspective has been taken into consideration and has been effective for the targeted institutions and communities;

h) Assess how the programme components complemented each other to contribute to the achievement of programme objectives

i) Assess the level of effectiveness of the UNDP and Towards National Reconciliation in Libya oversight and management structures during the review period, in addition to quality and adequacy of programme monitoring and reporting?

**Efficiency**

1. To what extent have the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective to achieve overall outcomes?
2. To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
3. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
4. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

**Sustainability and Risk**

1. Assess the sustainability of Towards National Reconciliation in Libya initiatives for institutional strengthening of stakeholders such as capacity building initiatives
2. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
3. To what extent do mechanisms exist to allow stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and inclusion?
4. To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
5. To what extent has sustainability measures been incorporated in UNDP interventions?
6. What is the likelihood that project interventions are sustainable?
7. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and outcomes?
8. Has the project’s partnership strategy been appropriate, effective and contributed to sustainable impact?
9. What are the key lessons derived from the rich experience provided by the project and that can be used by the evaluation users (UNDP, donor and gov) to enhance decision making and programming?

Evaluation of Cross-Cutting Issues:

Cross cutting issues, including gender, conflict sensitivity, human rights, disability, and ‘leave no one behind’ will be considered evaluation questions as well the evaluation process. Gender analysis, including gender disaggregated data need to be incorporated in the evaluation.

Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

1. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
2. To what extent did the project implement its Gender Action Plan?
3. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the  
   empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
4. To what extent were the resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in particular?

Conflict Sensitivity

* To what extent did UNDP adopt a conflict-sensitive approach to this intervention?
* Were there any unintended [positive or negative] effects on the peace and conflict context in areas of intervention as a result of this project?
* To what extent is the project perceived to benefit one group over another (and reinforcing lines of division)?
* How are UNDP hiring, partnership, and procurement practices perceived by different groups in the areas of intervention? Are they disproportionately benefitting/ favouring one group over another?

Disability

* To what extent did UNDP consider the needs of people living with disabilities within the project design and implementation?
* What proportion of the beneficiaries of a programme were persons with disabilities?
* What barriers did persons with disabilities face? Was a twin-track approach adopted? [[5]](#footnote-6)

Human Rights and ‘Leave No One Behind’

* To what extent have the research and monitoring been inclusive in terms of capturing the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized part of the Libya population?
* To what extent have disadvantaged and marginalized groups (indigenous populations, unemployed or underemployed/ poor, Libyans with undetermined legal status, etc.) benefitted from this intervention?

1. **Methodology**

Based on UNDP guidelines for evaluations, and in consultation with UNDP Libya CO, the evaluation will be inclusive and participatory, involving all principal stakeholders into the analysis. The evaluator is expected to ensure close engagement with the evaluation manager and project staff throughout the process. The evaluation will consider the social, political, security and economic context which affects the overall performance of the project. All evaluation products are expected to address gender, conflict sensitivity, disability and human right issues.

The project evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where interventions or advisory support were provided.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of the support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, and other means as far as the current situation allows. During this exercise, the evaluator is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis, which include a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods:

* **Desk review of relevant documents** (including project documents, donor reports with project amendments made, project quality assurance reports, annual workplans, financial reports etc.) and including funding data required for the funding analysis as per the evaluation questions.
* **Interviews and meetings** with current and former (men and women) UNDP Libya Country Office (CO) project staff and key stakeholders such as representatives of involved ministries, representatives of key civil society organizations, and partners:
  + **Semi-structured key informant interviews** designed for different categories of stakeholders(UNDP Libya staff, government and civil society partners, beneficiaries) **(men and women)** based on the key guiding evaluation questions around relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.
  + Focus group discussions (if feasible) with male and female beneficiaries and stakeholders.
* **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, partners, and other stakeholders.
* **Data review and analysis** of monitoring, financial data and other data sources and methods. Evidence will be provided for every claim generated by the evaluation and data will be triangulated to ensure validity. An evaluation matrix or other methods need be used to map the data and triangulate the available evidence.

The evaluation methodology needs to employ a gender sensitive approach and inclusion principle and this needs to be elaborated in the evaluation report including how data-collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations, use of disaggregated data and outreach to diverse stakeholders’ groups.

The findings of the evaluation should lead to the elaboration of specific, practical, achievable recommendations that should be directed to the intended users.

The proposed approach and methodology should be considered as flexible guidelines rather than final requirements. The evaluator will have an opportunity to make their inputs and propose changes in the evaluation design—with the final methodological approach to be clearly outlined in the inception report and fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, key stakeholders and the evaluator.

The consultancy is home based using different tools (Zoom, WhatsApp, Microsoft teams, etc.) to conduct the evaluation—as such, the evaluation will be home-based. The Consultant is expected to have experience in conducting remote evaluations.

**7. The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs:**

UNDP Libya expects the following deliverables from the evaluator (with the detailed timeline and schedule for completion of the evaluation products outlined in the section ‘evaluation timeline’ below. These products include:

* **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages).** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluator. The report should include all the requirements in the standard template of the inception reports.
* **Evaluation debriefings.** The evaluator will provide briefing and debriefing session with UNDP, including Senior Management and UNDP CO project staff—including preliminary findings.
* **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length).** A length of 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested.
* **Evaluation report audit trail.** The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the evaluator within an agreed period of time, as outlined in these guidelines. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
* **Final evaluation report addressing the content required (in the standard evaluation report template and as agreed in the inception report) and quality criteria as outlined in the UNDP evaluation guidelines**
* **Presentation to UNDP Libya and other stakeholders**
* **Evaluation brief and other knowledge products** or participation in knowledge-sharing events, if relevant to maximise use.

The detailed evaluation workplan will be agreed upon between the UNDP and the selected International Consultant. The Project evaluation will require forty (45) working days starting 1st July 2022. Due to travel restrictions from the COVID-19 pandemic, the consultancy will be mostly remote (home-based) while on-site data collection is encouraged if logistically feasible depending on local context.

The International Consultant is expected to commence the assignment on 1st July 2022 subject to restrictions and conditions imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. The assignment and final deliverable are expected to be completed, with the detail as described in the below table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Deliverables** | **Time frame** | **Payment** |
| Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed  Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and proposed structure of the report. | Inception Report | 10 days |  |
| Briefing to UNDP on inception report for agreeing methodology | 1 day |
| Desk review of existing documents, interviews, and preparation of guidance for national consultant  Data collection and interviews in the country | Draft Report | 15 days |  |
| Draft evaluation report | 10 days |
| Debriefing with UNDP | 1 day |
| Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report |  | 1 day |
| Finalization of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on the drafts) and the set of recommendations | Final Report | 5 days |  |
| Presentation to Members | 1 day |
| **Total number of working days** |  | **45 days** | **100%** |

Payment is based upon successful delivery and approval of all deliverables as specified in the TOR. In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Country Office and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the evaluation, that deliverable or service will not be paid. Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete due to circumstances.

**8. Implementation Arrangements**

The project Evaluation is commissioned by the UNDP Libya Deputy Resident Representative (Programme). The International Consultant will work with the evaluation manager (UNDP Libya Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist) and the National Reconciliation project team for conducting the evaluation. These CO colleagues will be responsible for the provision of documents and data as requested and support the overall evaluation, including facilitating meeting arrangements.

UNDP National Reconciliation project team will:

* Provide the evaluator with appropriate logistical support to ensure that the objective of the evaluation is achieved with reasonable efficiency and effectiveness;
* Project Team will ensure that relevant documents are available to the consultant upon the commencement of the tasks;
* Project Team will coordinate and inform government counterparts, partners and other related stakeholders as needed;
* Support to identify key stakeholders to be interviewed as part of the assessment;
* Help in liaising with partners; and
* Organize the inception meeting between the selected evaluator, partners and stakeholders prior to the scheduled start of the evaluation assignment.

The Evaluation Manager is the technical person from UNDP responsible for the oversight of the whole evaluation process, and is separated from the project under evaluation. The Evaluation Manager has the following overall responsibilities in this evaluation:

Lead the evaluation process and participate in all of its stages - evaluability assessment, preparation, implementation, management and the use of the evaluation.

* Safeguard the independence of evaluations.
* Organize the kick-off meeting to introduce the evaluator to the project Team and discuss the evaluation assignment.
* Liaise with the project Manager throughout the evaluation process.
* Circulate, review and obtain approval of the inception report, including the methodologies and evaluation matrix.
* Ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment and other cross-cutting issues are considered in the inception report, including a gender-responsive methodology.
* Circulate, review and comment on the draft evaluation report (according to the TOR and inception report).
* Ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment and other cross-cutting issues are considered in the draft evaluation report and ensure that all and respective evaluation questions are answered, and relevant data, disaggregated by sex, is presented, analyzed and interpreted.
* Collect and consolidate comments on the draft evaluation report in one feedback document (audit trail) and share with the evaluator for finalization of the evaluation report.
* Review the final evaluation report to ensure compliance to the UNDP report template and quality assurance and seek final approval of the commissioner of the evaluation.

The evaluator will submit the evaluation report to the evaluation commissioner. The UNDP Libya evaluation manager will facilitate a feedback mechanism enabling key stakeholders, including the donor and project partners, to provide feedback on the evaluation through the audit trail document. This includes circulating the draft Terms of Reference for this evaluation, as well as the inception report and draft review report to provide detailed comments on the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. Stakeholders will also provide input to the development of management responses and key actions recommended by the evaluation. The feedback provided by UNDP and stakeholders in the audit trail should be addressed by the evaluator and retained to show how they were addressed. Additional review and adjustments might be needed depending on the quality of the submitted evaluation report.

The deliverables will be approved by the evaluation commissioner.

An international consultant will perform the following tasks:

* Lead the entire evaluation process, including communicating all required information
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology (including the methods for data collection and analysis) for the report.
* Finalize the research design and questions based on the feedback and complete inception report
* Develop data collection tools and conduct of data gathering activities: desk review, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions etc.
* Data analysis, draft and final report preparation, consolidation and submission, and presenting the findings
* Provide UNDP with data collection tools in advance for UNDP feedback to ensure realistic application in the field.
* Submit draft evaluation report
* Ensure UNDP feedback on inception and draft evaluation reports is considered in final versions, always under the basis of an independent evaluation.
* Finalize the whole evaluation report and engage in debriefing with UNDP.
* Submit final evaluation report revised
* Conduct a final presentation of evaluation findings to UNDP and other stakeholders, including the donor
* Have/bring their laptops, and other relevant software/equipment

**9. Evaluation Ethics**

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

**III. Duty Station**

Home-based

**IV. Contract Duration**

The duration of the contract will be 45 working days as per the deliverables.

**V. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

**I. Academic Qualifications:**

Master’s degree in Development Studies, International Relations, Governance, Peace and Conflict Studies, Gender, Public Policy and Management/ Administration, or any other relevant social science degree

**II. Years of experience:**

Extensive experience in programme/project monitoring and evaluation, of which at least five years should be in conflict or post-conflict/ fragile or ‘in transition’ state contexts

**Experience:**

* Proven experience in conducting evaluations and in using a mix of evaluations tools and in applying a variety of mixed-methods evaluation approaches (including the Theory of Change-based, Utilization-focused, Participatory, and Gender and Equity-based evaluations)
* Experience using range of quantitative and qualitative data gathering techniques to assess programme/project results at individual, institutional, sector and policy level
* Proven experience in **conducting remote evaluations and using technology** (Zoom, Skype, Kobo, etc) to effectively do so, including within the context of COVID-19
* Demonstrated experience in in designing and leading participatory and gender-sensitive evaluations of relevant development, stabilization, governance, and/ or peacebuilding projects/ programmes, which engage with different stakeholders
* Experience/ knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, UNDP Results-Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, and UNDP DIM/ NIM Guidelines and procedures
* Thorough understanding of key elements of result-based management
* In-depth understanding of development and peacebuilding issues in “in-conflict” and post-conflict context and/or countries in transition
* Technical knowledge and experience in other cross-cutting areas such equality, disability issues, rights-based approach, and capacity development. Knowledge of Libya and its socio-political context is considered an extremely strong asset
* Strong interpersonal and managerial skills, ability to work with people from different backgrounds and evidence of delivering good quality evaluation and research products in a timely manner
* Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and excellent analytical and English language writing skills
* **Fluency** in spoken and written English

**III. Competencies:**

A consultant must be independent to the Programme’s formulation, implementation, or monitoring phases. It is proposed that an evaluation be carried out by an international consultant. He/she/they must have extensive experience in strategic programming of development assistance, preferably in the monitoring and evaluation of UNDP development, governance, resilience and recovery and/or peacebuilding projects in fragile environments. Substantial experience with conducting remote evaluations. Specific knowledge of the Libyan context is considered a strong asset. The required expertise, qualifications and competencies are listed below:

**Core Competencies:**

* Demonstrates integrity and fairness by modelling UN values and ethical standards.
* Demonstrates professional competence and is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines, and achieving results.
* Display cultural, gender, nationality, religion and age sensitivity and adaptability.
* High sense of relational skills, including cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability, with a demonstrated ability to work in a multidisciplinary team.

**Functional Competencies:**

* Ability to deliver timely submission of quality evaluation reports.
* Good knowledge and understanding of the UN system, familiarity with UNDP mandate an asset.
* Knowledge of issues concerning peacebuilding, governance, stabilization.
* Thorough knowledge of results-based management and strategic planning processes.
* Excellent facilitation and communication skills.
* Wide experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and –analysis including surveys, focus group discussions, key informant interviews etc.
* Ability to write focused evaluation reports.

**Annexes**

Annexes will be provided upon request:

**Annex 1: Recommended List of Documents**

* Project Document
  1. Initial project document (donor agreement)
  2. Revised project document (donor agreement) upon no-cost extension
  3. Theory of Change
  4. Revised Logical Framework, indicators and targets
* Project Reports
  1. Project progress reports (annual, quarterly, monthly)
  2. Communication and visibility reports including links of communication materials
  3. Third-party monitoring monthly reports
* Other Project Products
  1. Meeting minutes (project board, steering committee, technical committee)
  2. Presentation slides (project board meetings)
* Country Programme Document
* Annual Work Plans (AWPs)
* Inception Report Template
* Key stakeholders and partners

NB; While the mentioned documents are must to review and consult, it should not limit consultants from reviewing and consulting other documents which will be considered of help to ensure adequate and reliable information for the purpose of this assignment.

**Annex 2: Sample Evaluation Matrix**

Evaluation matrices are useful tools for planning and conducting evaluations, helping to summarize and visually present an evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. In an evaluation matrix, the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods appropriate for each data source are presented, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated is shown.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevant evaluation criteria** | **Key questions** | **Specific sub-questions** | **Data sources** | **Data collection methods/ tools** | **Indicators/ success standards** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* **Schedule of tasks, milestones, and deliverables.** Based on the time frame specified in the TOR, the evaluator present the detailed schedule.
* **Required format for the evaluation report.** The final report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the elements outlined for evaluation reports (see annex 4 below).
* **Dispute and wrongdoing resolution process and contact details**
* **Pledge of ethical conduct in evaluation.** UNDP programme units should request each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation of the United Nations system’.[[6]](#footnote-7)

1. **Evaluation Quality Assessment**

Evaluations commissioned by UNDP country offices are subject to a quality assessment, including this evaluation. Final evaluation reports will be uploaded to the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC site) after the evaluations complete. The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) will later undertake the quality assessment and assign a rating. IEO will notify the assessment results to country offices and makes the results publicized in the ERC site. UNDP Libya aims to ensure evaluation quality. To do so, the consultant should put in place the quality control of deliverables. Also, consultant should familiarize themselves with rating criteria and assessment questions outlined in the Section six of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/>).

1. Code of conduct.

UNDP requests each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluator in the United Nations system’, which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report. Follow this link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

It is also required to sign a pledge of ethical conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. The Pledge can be downloaded from the following [link](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

1. Guidance on Integrating Gender and Human Rights in Evaluation

[Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452) (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1452>)

**Annex 3: Individual Consultant General Terms and Conditions**

**Annex 4: Statement of Health - Individual Contractor**

**Annex 5: Financial Proposal Template**

**Annex 6: Inception Report Template**

**Annex 7: Recommended Structure (Outline) of Evaluation Report**

The length of the Report should not exceed 60 pages in total (not including annexes)

* Title and opening pages
* Table of contents
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the intervention
* Evaluation scope and objectives
  + Evaluation scope
  + Evaluation objectives
  + Evaluation criteria
  + Evaluation questions
* Evaluation approach and methods
  + Data sources
  + Sample and sampling frame (if applicable)
  + Data collection procedures and instruments
  + Performance standards
  + Stakeholder engagement
  + Ethical considerations
  + Background information on evaluator
  + Major limitations of the methodology
* Data analysis
* Findings
* Lessons learned
* Recommendations
* Conclusion
* Report annexes

**Annex 8: Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations**

Evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluator must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluator should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluator must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact during the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluator should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant)**:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at \_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Sub-questions** | **Indicators/Performance Measures** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods/Tools** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
| **Relevance** | | | | | |
| 1. To what extent was the project in line with national development priorities, the country programme document outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?  2. To what extent did the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country project outcomes?  3. To what extent were project initiatives such as awareness raising campaigns, capacity building initiatives and public information products relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders?  4. To what extent did the project contribute to Leave No One Behind (LNOB), gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?  5. To what extent has the project’s implementation strategy been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of other partners and stakeholders; and to the context of Libya’s political and development?  6. Were project activities relevant for the implementation of strategic and other plans of stakeholders? | To what extent was the TNRL project in line with national development priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?  To what extent has the project contributed to CPD outcomes?  To what extent were project initiatives relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders?  How did the project contribute to LNOB, gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?  Has implementation been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of partners and stakeholders; and the of Libyan context?  Were project activities relevant for the implementation of strategic and other plans of stakeholders? Why or why not? | Project, UNDP, donor, partner, beneficiary, and stakeholder statements and perceptions of alignment  Project staff and UNDP statements and perceptions of contributions CPD outcomes  Project, UNDP, donor, partner, and stakeholder statements and perceptions of relevance to needs of partners and stakeholders  Project staff, UNDP, donor, partner, beneficiary, and stakeholder statements and perceptions of contributions  Evidence for responsiveness and change as situation changed  Statements and perceptions of relevance of project in conjunction with plans of others | Project documents (Project planning and implementation materials, project reporting, other project documentation)  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and questions / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison  Trend analysis of change over time |
| **Coherence** | | | | | |
| 1. To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?  2. How well does the intervention fit?  3. How compatible was the project to other interventions in the country?  4. To what extent did the intervention support or undermine policies?  5. What synergies or interlinkages from this project benefitted UNDP and external actors? This includes complementarity, harmonization and co-ordination with others, and the extent to  which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort. | To what extent did the TNRL project contribute to CPD outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?  To what extent did the TNRL project contribute to national development priorities?  How does the TNRL project fit with other interventions in the country?  Did the TNRL project support other policies bringing Libya together? Or instead did the project undermine these other policies?  Are there ways the project benefitted UNDP and other partners? If so, what were the ways the project complemented other efforts? Was, and how was, duplication avoided? | Evidence of contributions to CPD outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs  Evidence of contributions to national development priorities  Evidence of connections between project activities and goals with other initiatives  Perceptions of complementarity or antagonistic relationships between project initiatives with other policies  Evidence for benefits to UNDP and other projects from TNRL activities | Project documents (Project planning and implementation materials, project reporting, other project documentation)  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and questions / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison  Trend analysis of change over time |
| **Effectiveness** | | | | | |
| 1. To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme document outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?  2. Were the project initiatives, including institutional strengthening of institutions, gender mainstreaming and engagement with civil society, such as media, effective to achieve project outcomes?  3. Are the project outputs clear, practical and feasible?  4. To what extent have stakeholders remained involved in project implementation?  5. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to citizen’s needs?  6. To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and inclusion, such as through capacity building promoting political and electoral participation of women, and persons with disabilities?  7. Has a gender and human rights perspective been taken into consideration in development and implementation, and how effective has this perspective been for targeted institutions and communities?  8. How have programme components complemented each other to contribute to the achievement of programme objectives  9. What was the level of effectiveness of UNDP and project oversight and management structures, in addition to quality and adequacy of programme monitoring and reporting? | How has the project contributed to CPD outcomes and outputs?  How has the project contributed to the UNDP strategic plan and the SDGs?  How has the project contributed to national development priorities?  Would you say project initiatives were effective to achieve project outcomes? Why or why not?  In your experience, were project outputs clear, practical, and feasible or not?  Have stakeholders remained involved in project implementation or not?  Does the project respond appropriately to citizen’s needs? Why or why not?  To what extent has the project contributed to GEWE and the inclusion, of persons with disabilities?  Has and how has the project taken gender and human rights into consideration?  What has the project done so that project activities and outputs complement each other towards outcome achievements?  How effective was UNDP and project management oversight over the project?  How effective was UNDP and project management monitoring of the project? | Specific knowledge of alignment and contributions of project to CPD  Specific knowledge of alignment and contributions of project-to UNDP SP and SDGs  Specific knowledge of alignment and contributions of project-to national priorities  Specific knowledge of output goals and activities  Explanation of contributions to outcomes  Perceptions of feasibility of output achievement  Evidence for continued engagement  Evidence for disengagement  Perceptions of appropriateness relative to needs  Statements and perceptions of contributions to GEWE, PLWD inclusion  Statements and perceptions of consideration of gender and HR  Statements and perceptions of project work to connect activities and outputs towards outcomes  Evidence of oversight; perceptions of effectiveness of oversight  Evidence of management and monitoring; perceptions of effectiveness of management and monitoring | Project Documents (Project planning and implementation materials, project reporting, other project documentation)  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and questions / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison  Trend analysis of change over time |
| **Efficiency** | | | | | |
| 1. To what extent has the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective to achieve overall outcomes?  2. To what extent has the use of financial and human resources been economical? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?  3. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?  4. To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management? | Was the project implementation efficient in generating the expected outcomes? Why or why not?  Would you say the project has used financial and human resources economically to achieve outcomes? Why or why not?    Have project funds been delivered in a timely way?  Have activities been delivered in a timely manner? Why or why not?  Have UNDP M&E systems supported effective and efficient project management? Why or why not? | Perceptions of efficiency  Evidence of efficiency  Specific examples of attention to costs, attention to maximizing results  Perceptions of economical use  Evidence for use of M&E data to inform adjustments | Project Documents (Project planning and implementation materials, project reporting, other project documentation)  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and questions / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison  Trend analysis of change over time |
| **Sustainability and Risk** | | | | | |
| 1. How sustainable are the project initiatives in institutional  strengthening of stakeholders?  2. To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?  3. To what extent do mechanisms exist to allow stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on  gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and inclusion?  4. To what extent have lessons learned been documented by the project team on a continual basis and  shared?  5. To what extent have sustainability measures been incorporated into UNDP interventions?  6. How likely do you think it is project interventions are sustainable?  7. Are there social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and outcomes? If so, what are these social and political risks?  8. Has the project’s partnership strategy been appropriate, effective and contributed to sustainable impact?  9. What are the key lessons learned from the project and that can be used to enhance UNDP, donor, and government decision making and programming going forward? | Which project activities and outputs are likely to be sustained?  Why are these activities and outputs sustainable?  Are there financial resources available to sustain project benefits?  Are there mechanisms to support stakeholders to sustain results in GEWE, HR, and inclusion? If so, what are these mechanisms that support sustainability?  What did the project do to document and use lessons learned?  What did the project do to encourage the sustainability of project-supported interventions?  Do you think project supported interventions are sustainable? Why or why not?  Do you think there are social and political risks that hamper sustainability? If so, what are these risks to sustainability?  Has – and how has – the project’s partnerships contributed to implementation and sustainability?  What do you see as lessons learned from the project’s work that can be used to support national reconciliation? | Perceptions of potential sustainability  Explanations for sustainability  Evidence of financial resources going forward  Perceptions of mechanisms  Evidence that mechanisms support sustainability  Evidence of documenting lessons learned  Evidence of attentiveness to sustainability in design and implementation  Perceptions of likelihood of sustainability in future  Evidence of sustainability  Perceptions of social and political risks to sustainability  Perceptions of the partnership strategy’s appropriateness, effectiveness, and contributions to sustainability | Project documents (Project planning and implementation materials, project reporting, other project documentation)  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and questions / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison  Trend analysis of change over time |
| **Evaluation cross-cutting issues** | | | | | |
| *Gender equality and Women’s Empowerment*  1. To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?  2. To what extent did the project implement its Gender Action Plan?  3. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and empowered women? Were there any unintended effects?  4. To what extent were the resources used to address inequalities in general, and gender issues in  particular?  *Conflict sensitivity*  7. To what extent did UNDP adopt a conflict sensitivity approach in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?  8. Were there any unintended [positive or negative] effects on the peace and conflict context in areas of intervention as a result of this project?  9. To what extent is the project perceived to benefit one group over another (and reinforcing lines of division)?  10. How are UNDP hiring, partnership, and procurement practices perceived by different groups in the areas of intervention? Are there perceptions that hiring and procurement disproportionately benefit one group over another?  *Disability*  11. To what extent did UNDP consider the needs of people living with disabilities in project design and implementation?  12.What proportion of the beneficiaries were persons with disabilities?  13. What barriers did persons with disabilities face? Was a twin-track approach adopted by the project towards mainstreaming disability?  *Human Rights and ‘Leave No One Behind’*  14. To what extent has research and monitoring been inclusive in terms of capturing the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized?  15. To what extent have disadvantaged and marginalized groups (indigenous populations, unemployed or underemployed/ poor, Libyans with undetermined legal status, etc.) benefitted from this intervention? | How did project design, implementation, and monitoring address GEWE?  How and to what extent, implement its Gender Action Plan?  How and to what extent did the project promote positive changes in GEWE?  Were there any unintended effects of the project’s work in GEWE?  How much did the project use resources to address inequalities, particularly gender inequalities and issues?  How and to what extent has conflict sensitivity been incorporated into the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?  Were there effects of the project on peace or conflict? If so, what were these unintended effects?  Are there perceptions that you know of that the TNRL project benefits one group over another, or reinforces social divisions? If so, what are these issues?  Are there perceptions that partnership and hiring practices were not equal and benefitted one or more groups over others?  Did the project consider PLWD in design and implementation?  How many PLWD benefitted from the project?  What challenges did PLWD face in engaging with the project?  Did the project try to mainstream disability as well as target PLWD as a twin-track approach?  How has project monitoring captured the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized?  Have, and how have, disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from the project? | Evidence for GEWE in design, implementation and monitoring  Evidence for Gender Action Plan and implementation  Evidence for positive GEWE change  Assessment that any GEWE effects observed were not intended  Evidence for resource use to addressing inequalities, GEWE and in other areas  Perceptions and evidence for conflict mainstreaming in design, implementation, and monitoring  Evidence for effects and that were unintended  Evidence for perceptions of differential effects on groups and/or effects on social divisions  Evidence for perceptions that partnership and hiring practices were not equal  Evidence for consideration of PLWDs in design and implementation  Evidence for PLWD beneficiaries  Perceptions of challenges  Evidence for project approaches to disability  Evidence for monitoring attentiveness to vulnerable, marginalized populations  Evidence for benefits from project for disadvantaged, marginalized groups | Project Documents (Project planning and implementation materials, project reporting, other project documentation)  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and questions / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison  Trend analysis of change over time |
| **Lessons learned** | | | | | |
|  | What do you see as lessons learned from the project’s work that can be used to support national reconciliation? | Perceptions of lessons learned from design and implementation that are useful going forward | Project documents  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and question / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison |
| **Recommendations** | | | | | |
|  | What would you recommend based on your experience with the project to further support national reconciliation in Libya? | Perceptions of what should be done next on national reconciliation | Project documents  Interviews with Project, UNDP, partner, and donor staff  Interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders | Document review/notes  Semi-structured interview guide and question / transcripts and notes | Content and thematic analysis and comparison |

# ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

**United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)** **Documents**

Standards for Evaluation in the UN System: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/22](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/22)

Norms for Evaluation in the UN System: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/21](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21)

Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – towards UNEG Guidance: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/980](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980)

UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender into Evaluation: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616)

UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/1452](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1452)

UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports: [www.uneval.org/document/detail/607](http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607)

UNEG Ethical Guidelines: [www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102)

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN: [www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100)

**UNDP Libya Documents**

Country programme document for Libya (2019-2020). DP/DCP/LBY/3. New York: United Nations, 2018. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1636223/files/DP_DCP_LBY_3-EN.pdf?ln=en>

Gender Action Plan for the National Reconciliation Project

Minutes of the Gender Mainstreaming Meeting with National Reconciliation PM

Recommendations on mainstreaming a gender equality perspective into Towards National Reconciliation in Libya Project (NRP)

**Towards National Reconciliation in Libya Project Documents**

Project Document, Project Title: Towards National Reconciliation in Libya

Amendment No. 1: Project Document, Project Title: Towards National Reconciliation in Libya

Annual Report 2019: UNSMIL/UNDP Towards National Reconciliation

National Reconciliation Technical Committee, List of Members, n.d.

PBF Project: “Towards National Reconciliation in Libya” Phase II Project Number: 00114463 Project Progress Report 1 January 2021 – December 2022, May 2022

Annual Workplan 2022, Towards National Reconciliation in Libya, 13 March 2022

Annual Workplan 2021 Revised - Towards National Reconciliation in Libya, 11 November 2021

Progress Report: April – June 2020 (Q2), UNDP’s Towards a National Reconciliation in Libya Project

GMMR CS1 Project Team, Minutes of the Meeting, 10 November 2020

Concept Note, Workshop, Focus Group Meeting of Libyan Experts on Transitional Justice & National Reconciliation, October 2021

Concept Note, Workshop on Women Participation in National Reconciliation and election in Libya, October 2021

Concept Note, Workshop on Youth and CSO Participation in National Reconciliation in Libya, October 2021

**TNRL Partner Documents**

"Towards National Reconciliation in Libya," Strategy for Libyan Reconciliation, Strategy for National Reconciliation in Libya Draft 7, 10 March 2019.

Network of Local Mediators (NoLM), Quarter 1 2021 Report

NoLM, Quarter 2 2021 Report

Peaceful Change initiative (PCi), Conflict Sensitive Assistance in Libya Forum, CSA 43 Scenarios, 7 October 2021

PCi. Libyan Community Perspectives: Snapshot survey of perspectives on elections in Libya, June 2021

**United Nations Documents**

October 2021. UNSF 2019-2022 –Libya: Evaluation Report. <https://minio.dev.devqube.io/uninfo-production-main/0e0fab08-3573-46d9-a96e-d175d888c1de_UNSF_Final_Evaluation_Report_final.pdf>

n.d. Common Country Analysis: Libya, 2021. <https://minio.dev.devqube.io/uninfo-production-main/0a793d44-0215-48f3-9331-66cdd05cfa6d_United_Nations_Libya_Common_Country_Analysis_2021.pdf>

n.d.. United Nations Strategic Framework for Libya. <https://archive.unescwa.org/sites/www.unescwa.org/files/events/files/session_4_libya_planning_strategic_framework.pdf>

**Other Documents**

Edabbar, Mohamed. and Emam, Khaled. “Agents and Drivers of Peace: Strengthening meaningful engagement of young men and women in building sustainable peace in Libya.” Global Partnership for Prevention of Armed Conflict, December 2020. <https://gppac.net/files/2021-01/YPS_Libya_Policy%20Brief_ENG_05012021.pdf>

# ANNEX 4: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

**UNDP**

Rawhi Afghani, TNRL Project manager 2017-2019 Phase 1

Andrew Chetaham, TNRL Project manager 2019-2020 Phase 2

Emmanuel Maduike, Acting TNRL Project manager 2021 Phase 2

Mohamed Abuznad, Acting TNRL Project manager 2021-2022 Phase 2

Christopher Laker, Deputy Resident Representative-Programme

Hisham El Windi, TNRL Project consultant

**Beneficiaries**

Abdulrahman Al Mansouri, Network of Local Mediators (NoLM)

Ghalia Sasi, NoLM

Khadija Elwerfalli, NoLM

Seraj Al Hudairi, NoLM

**Stakeholders**

Tyler Joyner, Deputy Director, NEA/AC Regional Office Rabat, U.S. Department of State

Suki Nagra, UNSMIL, Human Rights Department

# ANNEX 5: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

INTRODUCTION AND INFORMED CONSENT

The introduction and consent note introduces the evaluator, the evaluation, and methods to participants in the evaluation to gather the explicit consent of people with participating in the evaluation. The evaluator recited the following to all prospective interviewees and obtained their explicit oral consent to participate in the evaluation’s fieldwork*.*

**Introduction and Informed Consent**

Thank you for talking with me today.

My name is Lawrence Robertson. I am working independently for UNDP to conduct an evaluation of the Towards National Reconciliation in Libya project. The goal of the review is to learn about what has been accomplished through the project, what has worked well, and what has not worked as well. Lessons from this review will used to help UNDP and its partners in future work in Libya and around the world.

The information collected today will only be used for the review. I will not use this information in a way that identifies you as an individual in the report.

I would also like to clarify that this interview is entirely voluntary and that you have the right **to withdraw** from interview at any point without consequence.

I hope to learn from you from your knowledge and experience with the project and its activities. Are you willing to participate in this study? [Ensure that participant(s) verbally agree to participate]

Do you have any questions for me before I begin with a short list of questions to learn about the ways that you or your organisation may have worked with the project?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

[NOT ALL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED IN AN INTERVIEWS; INTERVIEWS FOCUSED ON THE AREAS AND QUESTIONS MOST RELEVANT TO INFORMANT’S KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE WITH THE TOWARDS NATIONAL RECONCILIATION IN LIBYA PROJECT]

**Relevance**

To what extent was the TNRL project in line with national development priorities, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?

To what extent has the project contributed to CPD outcomes?

To what extent were project initiatives relevant to the needs of partners and stakeholders?

How did the project contribute to LNOB, gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?

Has implementation been responsive to the emerging needs and priorities of partners and stakeholders; and the of Libyan context?

Were project activities relevant for the implementation of strategic and other plans of stakeholders? Why or why not?

**Coherence**

To what extent did the TNRL project contribute to CPD outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?

To what extent did the TNRL project contribute to national development priorities?

How does the TNRL project fit with other interventions in the country?

Did the TNRL project support other policies bringing Libya together? Or instead did the project undermine these other policies?

Are there ways the project benefitted UNDP and other partners? If so, what were the ways the project complemented other efforts? Was, and how was, duplication avoided?

**Effectiveness**

How has the project contributed to CPD outcomes and outputs?

How has the project contributed to the UNDP strategic plan and the SDGs?

How has the project contributed to national development priorities?

Would you say project initiatives were effective to achieve project outcomes? Why or why not?

In your experience, were project outputs clear, practical, and feasible or not?

Have stakeholders remained involved in project implementation or not?

Does the project respond appropriately to citizen’s needs? Why or why not?

What has the project done so that project activities and outputs complement each other towards outcome achievements?

How effective was UNDP and project management oversight over the project?

How effective was UNDP and project management monitoring of the project?

**Efficiency**

Was the project implementation efficient in generating the expected outcomes? Why or why not?

Would you say the project has used financial and human resources economically to achieve outcomes? Why or why not?

Have project funds been delivered in a timely way?

Have activities been delivered in a timely manner? Why or why not?

Have UNDP M&E systems supported effective and efficient project management? Why or why not?

**Sustainability and Risk**

Which project activities and outputs are likely to be sustained?

Why are these activities and outputs sustainable?

Are there financial resources available to sustain project benefits?

Are there mechanisms to support stakeholders to sustain results in GEWE, HR, and inclusion? If so, what are these mechanisms that support sustainability?

What did the project do to document and use lessons learned?

What did the project do to encourage the sustainability of project-supported interventions?

Do you think project supported interventions are sustainable? Why or why not?

Do you think there are social and political risks that hamper sustainability? If so, what are these risks to sustainability?

Has – and how has – the project’s partnerships contributed to implementation and sustainability?

**Evaluation Cross-Cutting Issues**

**Gender equality and women’s empowerment**

How did project design, implementation, and monitoring address GEWE?

To your knowledge, did the project have and implement a Gender Action Plan?

How and to what extent did the project promote positive changes in GEWE?

Were there any unintended effects of the project’s work in GEWE?

How much did the project use resources to address inequalities, particularly gender inequalities and issues?

**Conflict Sensitivity**

How and to what extent has conflict sensitivity been incorporated into the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?

Were there effects of the project on peace or conflict? If so, what were these unintended effects?

Are there perceptions that you know of that the TNRL project benefits one group over another, or reinforces social divisions? If so, what are these issues?

Are there perceptions that partnership and hiring practices were not equal and benefitted one or more groups over others?

**Disability**

Did the project consider PLWD in design and implementation?

How many PLWD benefitted from the project?

What challenges did PLWD face in engaging with the project?

Did the project try to mainstream disability as well as target PLWD as a twin-track approach?

**Human Rights and Leave No One Behind**

How has project monitoring captured the situation of the most vulnerable and marginalized?

Have, and how have, disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from the project?

**Lessons Learned**

What do you see as lessons learned from the project’s work that can be used to support national reconciliation?

**Recommendations**

What would you recommend based on your experience with the project to further support national reconciliation in Libya?

# ANNEX 6: SIGNED PLEDGE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

Text

Description automatically generated



Lawrence R. Robertson, 8 August 2022

1. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> (accessed 24 August 2022) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Risk Assessment (New York: UNDP, n.d.), available at <https://info.undp.org/sites/ERM/SitePages/Step%202%20-%20Risk%20Assessment.aspx> (accessed 12 August 2022). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. <https://www.facebook.com/USEmbassyLibya/posts/306978428208741> (accessed 15 August 2022). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) by UN OCHA/UNHCR/IOM-DTM as of August 2021 and updated in December 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The twin-track approach combines mainstream programmes and projects that are inclusive of persons with disabilities as well as programmes and projects that are *targeted* towards persons with disabilities. It is an essential element of any strategy that seeks to mainstream disability inclusion successfully. Also, see chapter 9 of the Technical Notes. Entity Accountability Framework. United Nations Disability and Inclusion Strategy: <https://www.un.org/en/disabilitystrategy/resources> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866#:~:text=The%20UNEG%20Ethical%20Guidelines%20for%20Evaluation%20were%20first%20published%20in%202008.&text=This%20document%20aims%20to%20support,day%20to%20day%20evaluation%20practice. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)