ECES, Club of Madrid, Netherlands Multiparty Institute for Democracy, European Partnership for Democracy

Supporting Democracy in Libya (SUDEL) – Evaluation

Final Report

Prepared by

Canadian Leaders in International Consulting (Clic-Consultants)

February 2014

Table of Contents

Clic-Consultants

I.   Executive Summary

The European Centre for Democracy Support (ECES) along with four (3) partners, Club de Madrid (CdM), European Partnership for democracy (EPD) and the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD) implemented a Project entitled "**Supporting Democracy in Libya – SUDEL**" aimed at supporting reconciliation processes and building democracy in the context of the local electoral cycles of 2012 in Libya. To that end, the project aimed at achieving a) the strengthening of Libyan stakeholders' involvement in building democracy in Libya; b) the provision of operational and technical support to electoral cycles and c) the promotion of dialogue among political stakeholders and the engagement of citizens.

KPMG, under the lead of Mrs. Chloe Raman and Mr. Patrick Van Bourgognie proceeded to the expenditure audit for SUDEL and SUDEL II on the first week of February 2014, ECES is currently expecting their final report. The audit firm Price Water House & Coopers under the lead of Mr. Andrea Pluchino, assisted by Mr. Bruno Deraedt and Mrs. Kaouther Amri, contracted by the European Commission, proceeded to the audit of the project from 10 to 14 February 2014. PWC submitted its draft report to the European Commission for comments and revisions. Overall the audits went quite well, SUDEL II project report will thus be labelled unqualified, while SUDEL will be qualified because of an incorrect handling of invoices by one of SUDEL Libyan provider, the Radisson Blu Hotel in Tripoli that sent multiple invoices in different currency.

ECES contracted Canadian Leaders in International Consulting Inc. (Clic-Consultants) to conduct a final evaluation of the project implemented between May 15, 2012 and June 30, 2013 in Libya. The main scope of the evaluation: a) make an overall independent assessment about the past performance of the project with a particular focus on the results and the impact of the project action against its objective, b) identify key lessons and propose practical recommendations for the implementation and follow-up of the project if additional funds become available and c) determine whether the project was implemented in an efficient and effective way.

Summary of key findings:

The overall findings of the evaluation indicate that the project was effective in achieving its intended objective of supporting reconciliation and democracy building in the context of local electoral cycles of 2012 in Libya. This was achieved through a mixed approach comprised of technical assistance and capacity-building activities. Technical assistance was provided to cities in Libya, which had requested assistance from the EU to help organise their local elections, electoral materials were provided, trainings and mentorship were delivered to the beneficiaries to ensure that the elections were successful, fair and conflict-free. The project provided capacity-building activities to a wide variety of key stakeholders to increase their knowledge and concepts of democratic principles, election observation and management as well as created a platform for dialogue and lessons learned.

The implemented activities responded to the Libyan needs, were implemented at a critical time for Libya and assisted in the organisation of successful elections for the first time in 42 years in the country. However, the short period of time in which the project was implemented in the country (18 months) prevented the project to have a long lasting impact, the stakeholders interviewed felt that a longer term

project would have had more impact on the democratisation and reconciliation process in the country. Despite the challenging environment of Libya, all activities were implemented except the National Conclusions and final ceremony. Clearly, the activities achieved their intended objectives. This is the assessment of the writer of the report and based on interviews of project stakeholders. Unfortunately, we were unable to receive the feedback from the project beneficiaries, a reason that we explain below as part of the challenges faced during the evaluation.

The project also had positive unplanned results such as the implementation of the SUDEL II project and the creation of NDEO by local activists, which became an implementing partner organisation in the SUDEL project and an important local actor in knowledge dissemination and capacity development on electoral matters in Libya. Thus increasing the sustainability of the project outcome.

The project encountered management challenges due to the extremely limited time that could be devoted to identification, formulation and budgeting of the activities where SUDEL should have been the continuation of a previous EU funded project implemented by International IDEA.. There were serious complaints from some of the partners and implementing team members who expressed serious frustration with the structure of the project and its management. The complaints are reasonable in some cases, and in others are related to personality difference in a complex project with several partners implementing different components, a conflict and fluid environment and ultimately a very short period for the implementation where the main difficulties is that what should have been a continuation of a previous project implemented by IDEA sharing same staff, offices and local transport, became a project in its own with the withdrawal of International IDEA from the consortium and project given they had been receiving further funds from CIDA and Arab League and could not deal any more with the SUDEL project. These issues are explored further in the body of the evaluation, and recommendations presented for consideration.

One of the problems was that the project documents, budget and contract with the EU signed by ECES as consortium leader for the role ECES had in purchasing and delivering the material, were done taking into consideration IDEA-EU funded facilitations (staff, offices and local transport) already existing in Libya.

The most challenging issue resulted from the need to purchase electoral material to support local elections in Benghazi and other regions, they were purchased and delivered by ECES on May 12th in order to comply with the request of the EU and the Benghazi local elections commission. In June 2012 it was clear that the management and budget assumptions on which the SUDEL consortium and contract were signed changed due to the withdrawal of International IDEA from the project and consortium.

Following this event, ECES had to find its own project staff, find new offices and local transport by making synergies with another project they have funded by the EU in Libya in support of the Libyan Forum for Civil Society, creating important management challenges. We have identified recommendations for consideration in future projects if this model continues. There were implementation delays due to the unstable political and security concerns. As well, there were serious and legitimate complaints from members of the project members who served in Libya about the weak management support, weakness of resources on the ground and the short timelines that impacted negatively the project and that are linked to the above mentioned issues of lack of time for proper identification, formulation of activities and management arrangements and especially withdrawal of

Clic-Consultants

International IDEA from the consortium where the SUDEL project should have been a continuation of the previous EU funded project implemented by International IDEA.

The difficult security and institutional context in Libya had a significant impact on SUDEL's ability to implement activities as scheduled. However, results were achieved:

A summary of the intended results and outcomes are highlighted below:

- **Advanced domestic observation techniques are appreciated and conflict management skills of stakeholders are enhanced**. The project successfully implemented trainings and training of trainers sessions to enhance the capacity of participants in conflict management and observation techniques. The activities were relevant to the needs of Libyans to successfully conduct fair elections according to international standards.
- **To provide operational and technical support to the organisation of elections cycles in Libya**. Electoral material and technical support was provided to 8 cities in Libya. Agreements were made between the different cities to reuse the provided electoral materials. Elections were held successfully. As a result of the success of this component, more cities in Libya requested technical assistance and electoral support leading to the design and implementation of SUDEL II.
- **Facilities for dialogue and reconciliation established and operational. Citizen debates fed into the Constitutional reform and preparation for national elections.** Cascade trainings were organised, local dialogue programmes were implemented, national dialogue meeting took place and a study tour to Spain was organised. This component of the project allowed the participants to exchange ideas and discuss lessons learned from the elections. Codes of conduct were developed as the result of this component. The final activity of this component was canceled due to security concerns and as a result, final feedback from the participants was not collected.

Conclusion of project relevance and contribution towards final goal:

The findings of the evaluation indicate that the project was relevant to Libya and met the needs of Libyans. The timing of the project that was implemented at the time cities were organising their local elections increased its relevance as local elections were conducted successfully and without serious conflict as well capacity of beneficiaries in relevant areas was increased. The project opened up a platform for dialogue for a multitude of key stakeholders, building trust between the different key actors in Libya giving momentum to the democratisation process. Also, within this context, attention was paid to ensuring that the activities were relevant to the changing needs of the beneficiaries and the changing environment in Libya which gave flexibility to the project and addressed the different local priorities needs of the target groups.

The project activities were strategic to achieving the project objectives, however not all activities were implemented but it did not hinder the overall effectiveness of the project. The activities achieved their results and achieved the desired outcomes. The project also saw a series of positive unintended results and impacts such as the creation of NDEO and SUDEL II.

However, the impact of the project was limited due to its short timelines. In order to achieve greater impact and benefit the target beneficiaries, a series of long-term interrelated capacity-development and

technical support interventions are needed in order to achieve a more comprehensive approach and greater results and impact in the country.

II.   Introduction:

The EU-funded project "**Supporting Democracy in Libya**" (SUDEL) was implemented from May 15, 2012 to June 30, 2013 and it aimed at supporting reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of the Libyan local electoral cycles of 2012. It was agreed to with the EU under a direct and accelerated process/negotiations to avoid the complete breakdown of the EU's commitment to the Libyan people to support the election in Libya. The SUDEL project funding and objectives were transferred to the ECES Consortium as a result of the inability of International IDEA to purchase material and conduct specific tasks that outside of its mandate. Therefore, SUDEL was the continuation of the "**Supporting Democratic Transition in Libya**". It started one year following the Libyan revolution and following the first elections in the country since its liberation.

SUDEL came at a time of extreme difficulty in Libya, the institutional structures in the country were non-existent, instability increased and there were many parts of the country where outsiders were not welcome and at risk. The political situation in Libya was also fluid, Libya was considered at the time as a true post conflict environment.

The SUDEL project came as a direct result of the commitment of the EU to support the Libyan people to conduct elections. The EU committed to support the purchasing and delivery of electoral materials prior to the 19th of May 2012 elections in Benghazi. It was a task that could not be undertaken by International IDEA as it was not part of their mandate. The purchase and delivery of materials prior to the 19th of May election was a condition sine qua non for the project and its other activities to be implemented. ECES undertook the project under extremely short timelines and budget constraints as well as the difficult and challenging environment of Libya. Despite the challenges and time constraints, elections in Benghazi were organised successfully and were then followed by other cities in the country. Thus the SUDEL project was the result of direct and accelerated negotiations procedures with the EU to deal with the impossibility of International IDEA to purchase the electoral material the EU committed to fund in favour of the electoral commission Benghazi.

ECES took important financial risks because they signed the contract for the purchase and delivery of the electoral material before signing the contract with the European Union and only on the basis of clear communications of the EU and agreement with all partners. Therefore ECES was in the position to implement an action that was foreseen in the IDEA EU funded project in less than 10 days something that IDEA could not do in the previous 8 months.

ECES implemented the project under the impression that International IDEA would sign the partnership agreement and join the consortium after insuring to sign the Partnership Agreement for the first half of the implementation period, and were going to provide them logistical and administrative support by sharing its staff and office in Tripoli in order to implement the project. This agreement, which was forecasted before signing the contract with the EU, would have brought more financial efficiency to the project as on top of sharing the office, it aimed to promote synergies, sustainability and cost effectiveness. SUDEL would have also shared transportation and staff as 4 local staff were already

present, especially when taking into account that ECES hired as Project Director a former IDEA staff who could only be contracted 70 days considering his very high fees due to his seniority. However, following the beginning of the SUDEL project, International IDEA indicated that ECES and its partners could no longer benefit from their support creating management and coordination issues and challenges for the SUDEL project as the management structure had to be reorganised as well ECES had to look for a new office and staff and attempt to register in Libya.

Despite the efforts made by the SUDEL consortium, IDEA was not able to sign the Partnership Agreement. Due to this, the SUDEL Steering Committee decided, on 25 July 2012, that SUDEL must initiate activities that would normally have fallen under the responsibility of IDEA. Most importantly, this included the contracting of the Electoral and Conflict Management Advisor. This procedure was implemented with the agreement of the Steering Committee to ensure adequate support for the project activities building upon the existing momentum. As the grant beneficiary, ECES also was responsible vis-à-vis the EU in terms of final implementation and delivery of the SUDEL project. In order to fulfil this obligation a significant delay in implementation could not be permitted.

The project design of SUDEL, particularly the budget of the action was built upon this agreement. However, when ECES conducted its first mission to Libya (3 June – 17 June), it became clear that International IDEA could no longer share its local assets and had earmarked it for use as part of upcoming Canada-funded and League of Arab States-funded projects. SUDEL was left in a situation whereby the applicability of the project's budget was placed in jeopardy. A major effort was thus placed into finding cost effective solutions to the decision of International IDEA not to fulfil its commitments according to the initial agreement, which had been the foundation upon which SUDEL was conceived. These efforts have had an impact both on financial and on operational issues.

Due to the fact that ECES was not able to register in Libya, it had to rely on the Libyan Forum for Civil Society (LFCS) for legal and financial purposes as they already had a bank account in Libya that ECES had to use to transfer funds to the SUDEL project on the field. ECES thus had to reorganise with the creation of the new office in Tripoli and with the management unit in Brussels in a very short period of time in order to organise the delivery of electoral material and implement activities in the field. The management Unit Brussels had to keep on coordinating activities between the Tripoli office and the consortium partners. In addition to these issues, the planned operational activities to be implemented in the electoral component changed continuously due to the unstable nature of the political context in Libya and the changing political scenarios. These elements created a difficult context in which the SUDEL project had to be implemented leading ECES to take important financial and operational risks to ensure the successful implementation of the SUDEL project.

According to the EU Staff contacted for this evaluation, regardless of the challenges faced in the implementation of the project in Libya, the SUDEL project is the template by which by the European Union provide election support around the world.

On February 20, 2012, the city of Misrata held its first ever elections, which started a wave of local elections in the entire country. Benghazi was the first city following Misrata to organise elections and requested the help and support of the European Union (EU). The SUDEL project was driven by local need for technical assistance and a willingness of the European Union to give legitimacy to the election process at a critical moment for Libya.

Clic-Consultants

The main objective of the SUDEL project is to support reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of the Libyan local electoral cycles of 2012. The project has three specific objectives:
1. The strengthening of Libyan stakeholders' involvement in building democracy in Libya
2. The provision of operational and technical support to local electoral cycles
3. The promotion of dialogue among political stakeholders and the engagement of citizens

In February 2013, the IBM consortium contracted by the European Commission, contacted Mr. Raphaël Pouyé in order to organise a ROM evaluation[1] for the SUDEL project. Following several email exchanges and the beginning of a the preparation for a field mission in late March 2013, the ROM evaluation was eventually cancelled considering that the time period the SUDEL project was implemented was actually too short to benefit from this monitoring mechanism.

The evaluation aimed to examine the SUDEL project between May 15, 2012 and June 30, 2013 implemented in Libya. The scope of the evaluation includes a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the SUDEL activities carried out since the beginning of the project; an identification and description of the problems encountered by the project and a set of key lessons and recommendations for the implementation and follow-up of the project if additional funds become available.

As required in the Terms of Reference (TOR), the evaluation was conducted in accordance with the OECD's Development Assistance Committee criteria and through a desk review and interviews (Skype, telephone and face to face). The evaluation aimed to answer key questions on the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The ECES team provided key documents for the desk review, although they were some delays in gathering all the documents from the ECES team. The delays were due to the fact that the operations and financial level of the project was not ensured entirely from the Brussels office, which ECES only realised in late November 2013. The follow-up was entrusted to, now, ECES former Operations and Finance Manager Mr. Xavier Flament, who was actually hired to work on ECES two Libyan projects and did not ensure an appropriate follow-up with the Libyan and consortium partners. When ECES realised that the work had not been properly done, ECES Executive Director took drastic measures and terminated Mr. Xavier Flament's contract and thus had to delay the evaluation and the audits for several weeks, time for the new team to operate adequately the closure of SUDEL[2].

A list of the documents reviewed is attached as Annex 2.

Skype, telephone and face-to-face interviews were conducted with key informants including SUDEL staff and project partners. A total of 11 people were interviewed including 6 SUDEL staff or former staff and 5 consortium members. It was challenging to contact project beneficiaries in Libya due to the fact that a

---

[1] Results Oriented Monitoring system of the Implementation of Projects and Programmes of external aid financed by the European Union (Lot 1 - European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI).

[2] SUDEL was the third contract ever signed by ECES and the first of such a significant amount, the first two being SWAY4 EDU for 250.000,00 EURO in February 2012 and Won for Libya (LFCS) in February 2012 for 385.000,00 EURO. Following the successful financial audit of SUDEL and other EU funded ECES projects, ECES is nowadays in a complete different situation with 36 contracts signed and 8,5 million EURO funds mobilised between 2012 and 2013.

Clic-Consultants

list of beneficiaries was not provided at the start of the evaluation and the fact that key informants contacted for the interviews either declined or cancelled at the last minute. Therefore this evaluation does not take into account the feedback from the project beneficiaries. The schedule of interviews is attached as Annex 3.

Evaluation challenges and limitations:

- Libyan beneficiaries lack of interest in the evaluation, a number of beneficiaries were contacted but did not respond, some of the phone numbers were closed, and those who responded cancelled their interview at the last minute. From our experience in Libya this is a typical behaviour that cannot be attributed to the perception of the stakeholders, it is a behavioural issue that can explain other challenges faced by SUDEL and other projects.

- Challenges and delays were faced in obtaining certain documents for the desk review such as the Study Tour Report and a list of beneficiaries. Efforts had to be made by the ECES team to gather documents and reports from the project, which were consequently provided at different times rather than as a full package. As the third component of SUDEL project was directly managed from Libya by ECES coordinator and by the Libyan NGO NDEO, they were in possession of local contacts of beneficiaries and ECES could only provide contacts of the persons in charge of implementing the action. A comprehensive list of beneficiaries was not available, the information was provided to the evaluator through the former SUDEL Project Coordinator, Majdi Abuzeid, who provided a short list of participants to contact, which made it a more restricted list than expected.

There was a no evidence of project monitoring of results throughout project implementation. The SUDEL project did not have a plan for M&E, a logical framework with identified indicators as well as a mid-term evaluation. This created a challenge for the final evaluation as there is a lack of baseline data and information to measure indicators and progress towards results. We understand the nature of the Project and the need to speed the process by which SUDEL had to be parachuted in a difficult terrain of Libyan elections, however, the time to review the Framework.

A. **Performance Assessment against Activities**

A set of activities were identified to achieve the project objectives during the course of the project. These activities and results achieved are illustrated in the table below.

Component I – Strengthening of Libyan Stakeholders at local level	
Objective: Enhancing Libyan stakeholders' involvement in the democracy building	
Expected Results: • Advanced domestic observation techniques are appreciated • Conflict management skills of stakeholders are enhanced	
Target Groups: electoral management bodies; political parties, civil society organisations, media organisations, security forces and armed groups.	
Main Activities	**Outputs Achieved**
1.1. Development of Codes of Conducts **Objective:** Codes of Conducts	• 5 Codes of Conduct for free and fair elections **has been**

established and signed by relevant stakeholders	**developed** Zawia (17 participants, 7 women) Zliten (21 participants) Derna (23 participants, 7 women) Benghazi (23 participants, 8 women) Ubari (23 participants, 6 women) • Codes of Conducts were developed for the participants **to use as facilitators** in their cities • Codes of Conducts **are not** the ones mentioned in the contract as deliverables • Codes of Conduct developed during the project included in the final draft report • **Implemented under component III** in collaboration with local political and social stakeholders • Activity **built** on the outcomes of "Healing the Wounds" sessions and citizen dialogues • **Developed** during the workshop on Leadership skills and Local Democracy; ToT LEAD training, 27-29 February 2013; 25 participants
1.2. Training of trainers (TOT) on election observation techniques **Objective:** 10 trainings organised (two per target city); at least 250 (25x10) participants from CSOs, political parties and media organisations	• A **6 hours training workshop for election observers** was implemented in Tripoli on 3 September 2012**;** 25 participants (6 women, 20 supervisors, 5 local electoral committee members). • A **training workshop for NGO observers** was implemented in Sorman on 9 September 2012; BRIDGE facilitators; 35 participants • **Recommendations** (head of committee) to change procedures according to international standards for free and fair elections have been approved • A **4 hours training workshop for election observers** was implemented in Tripoli on 20 September 2012; 2 trainers; 38 participants (7 women) • Training **implemented at the request** of the Libyan Human Rights Observatory
1.3. Training of Trainers (TOT) in Conflict Management skills for electoral stakeholders **Objective:** Five (5) trainings are implemented (one per target city); at least 875 (175x5) stakeholder individuals are trained to provide further trainings for their colleagues,	• A **one week training session** was implemented in Alexandria from 24-29 November 2012; cascade training • 18 participants • Training developed in partnership with ECES and CCL (Center for Creative Leadership) • **LEAD Cascade training cycle, December 2012, 6 cycles total**

partners and associates on key issues related to conflict management.	9-10 December: Tripoli and Mistrata 12-13 December: Benghazi and Tobruk 16-17 December: Tripoli and Sabha 2 lead trainers; 4 master trainers **24 new trainers: divided into 8 groups of 3 in order to deliver leadership content to 25-30 individuals for 2 days** Leadership training was delivered **to 240 individuals** • **Cascade Training, February/March 2013** Took place in 6 cities 3 days training course 1 supervisor for each training **625 individuals trained** in conflict management and leadership • Cascade training completed on 26 April 2013, **delayed** due to security reasons • Participants were **provided** with training material in Arabic • Beneficiaries of WON and SUDEL were **trained together** (EU-funded, ECES administered projects)

Component II – Support to the organisation of local electoral cycles	
Objective: To provide operational and technical support to the organisation of electoral cycles in Libya	
Expected Results: • Operational support to the local electoral commissions is provided • Electoral materials are procured	
Target group: local election commissions in Tripoli, Benghazi, Zliten, Nalut, Zawia, Derna, Ubari, Sorman and Sabrata	
Main Activities	**Outputs achieved**
2.1. Development of capacities among members of electoral commissions **Objective**: Mentoring is provided and/or training sessions are organised on specific issues	• **Peer to peer coaching** was implemented from June 2012 for Zliten and Nalut • **Small group training techniques** for polling day were implemented • Procedures based on international standards for all local elections **emerged** • **Exchange of experiences:** Nalut commission visited Zawia commission • Elections of July 1, 2012 **successful** • **Challenges:** Dealing with different electoral systems Issues of whether voters could choose one or more candidate on the ballot paper Voter registration Voter education and public outreach • A **4 hour workshop on local governance** was held in Sabrata on 12 September 2012; 3 trainers, members of

	elections committee, local civil society activists • A **7 day BRIDGE training on voter registration** was held on 5-9 August and 11-12 August 2012 in Tripoli; 37 participants (7 women) – SUDEL II • **A training for members of sub-committees in the 13** districts on 5 September 2012 was implemented; 25 participants (5 women) • **A two-days training workshop on polling procedures** was implemented in Sorman on 8 September 2012; 4 trainers, 100 participants (35 women) • **A TOT in voter registration processes** was implemented in Tripoli on 12 September 2012; 19 trainers participated (7 women) • **A PPT presentation** was distributed to the participants to use in their training • **A two-days BRIDGE training with TLEC personnel on voter registration and voting procedures** was implemented on 9-10 October 2012 in Tripoli; 37 (22 women) local electoral commission staff
Activity 2.2. Electoral planning and budgeting **Objective:** Planning/budgeting/logistics documents are prepared and updated	• Focus on **Tripoli and 3 main areas** (electoral/legal advisory support; operational planning support; media outreach and material design support) • Operational planning support **provided** to TLEC • A **Meeting have been organised on August 6, 2012 with TLEC** to determine the adequate number of Voter Registration Centres in consultation with experts from the Ministry of Local Government • Voter eligibility is conditional to the address of residence recorded in the "Family Booklet" • SUDEL **provided support in** the design of Voter Cards • **Electoral materials purchased and delivered** in Tripoli on December 9, 2012
Activity 2.3. Electoral Procurement **Objective:** Required election material is procured	• Activity implemented by **ECES** supported by **International IDEA** • **Electoral material were delivered** (ballot boxes, plastic security seals, voting booths, corrugated cardboard, indelible ink) in Benghazi on May 12, 2012 • **Procurement** for Nalut, Zawia, Derna, Ubari and Zliten was provided for July – August 2012 in coordination with Benghazi Electoral Commission and the EU • **Electoral material** from Benghazi was **reused** • **500 bottles of ink and 5,000 seals** were procured to Zawia on July 12, 2012 • **Provision of advisory support** to Tripoli – SUDEL II • **SUDEL provided electoral materials** (ballot boxes,

	plastic security seals, voting booth, indelible ink) **to Tripoli** delivered on September 1, 2012 – SUDEL II
Activity 2.4. Election day operations **Objective:** Election day runs smoothly and is perceived as transparent by key stakeholders	• **Technical support was provided** in Benghazi on 19 May 2012; training of staff, elections procedures, plans and assistance for security plan, training of security forces • **Election material was provided** to Benghazi • Elections in Benghazi were perceived to be in accordance with best practices • Facilitation by SUDEL of an arrangement between Benghazi and Nalut for the sharing of election material • SUDEL **provided election materials** in Nalut on July 1st, 2012; **agreement** (decision 3/2012) **was reached** for the regulation of elections between civil society and local election commission • SUDEL **provided technical support and election materials** in Zawia on 17 July 2012; training, election procedures, planning procedures • Elections in Zawia were held successfully and in acceptance of the local community; **160** local observers and **4** international observers • SUDEL **provided technical support and election materials** in Derna on 17 July 2012; training, election procedures, planning procedures • Election in Derna **were held successfully** and in accordance with local community • SUDEL staff attended a local radio show in Ubari due to low voter registration • SUDEL provided **technical support** in Ubari on 18 July 2012; training programme with police officers and officers from the high security committee • **Unused electoral material** from Benghazi were **shared** • Head of local council **did not agree** with the elections results in Ubari and contested their legitimacy (issue is ongoing) • SUDEL provided **technical support** and **electoral materials** to Zliten on July 22, 2012 • Elections in Zliten were held successfully and in acceptance of the local community • SUDEL **provided training to the polling team in Sorman and training to NGOs on domestic observation** • Election materials were transferred from Zawia and **provided** to Sorman • SUDEL **observed** polling process (4 centres were visited) in Sorman on 15 September 2012

	- Elections in Sorman were viewed as legitimate despite questions raised about their legitimacy due to low voter turnout **Training for Sabrata electoral commission** on management of elections, operational plans, logistical plans, how to train polling staff , manage election day and design of ballot paper; 160 polling staff trained **SUDEL provided electoral material** (seals and ink) for elections on October 6, 2012 - The organisation Shahid **observed** the elections and brought legitimacy to them
Activity 2.5. Post-election evaluation and audit **Objective:** Post-election evaluation and audit completed	**A 2-days lessons learned workshop** was implemented on 7-8 June 2012 in Benghazi Participants: local council election commissions in Tripoli, Zawia, Derna and Ubari in partnership with the Higher Commission for Benghazi Local Council Elections, International IDEA and ECES (supported and funded by the EU) **Outcomes of workshop:** increased knowledge of role of electoral management bodies in the democratisation process; better understanding of the existing options for legal frameworks regulating local elections in Libya and articulation between present and future strategic role of local election committees in Libya **Recommendations were developed** **NDEO was created in Benghazi as result of lessons learned of this seminar** - NDEO was created as an offshoot of the Lessons Learned seminar of June 2012

Component III: Promotion of Dialogue among political stakeholders and the engagement of citizens during post-election phase	
Objective: Facilities for dialogue and reconciliation established and operational. Citizen debates fed into the Constitutional reform and preparation for national elections.	
Expected results: - Facilities for dialogue and reconciliation are established and operational - Citizens' debates feed into the constitutional reform debate and preparation for national elections	
Target group: political stakeholders in the project's target cities including political parties, CSOs, media organisations and the citizens at large that will be exposed to opportunities to deliberate on the ongoing political transformation process.	
Activities	**Outputs achieved**
Phase 1: Training and brainstorming seminar on Local Elections and Local democracy	**ToT workshop on Leadership skills and local democracy** was **implemented** in Benghazi on January 26-30, 2013; 25 participants from Zawia, Zliten,

Clic-Consultants

• 25 participants in the activities representative of 5 different cities are connected and share experiences about recent local elections • A list of topics to structure the activities at the local level is identified and validated with the stakeholders • Methodological approach of SUDEL for the 5 cities is discussed and validated by the beneficiaries • The activity gives visibility to the Work of the EU, through SUDEL, in the consolidation of local democracy and practice dialogue at the local level	Benghazi, Derna, Ubari • 5 participants from each of the target cities • Participants shared experiences and observations about elections in their cities • Joint **Healing the Wounds and Code of Conduct sessions** have been **organised**
Phase 2: Local Dialogue and Civil Engagement Cascade and brainstorming workshop • 1 healing the wounds session permits local political leaders to address pending issues from the experience of electoral competition at the local level, developed towards codes of conducts • 1 citizen dialogue strengthens the connections between local elected authorities and citizens, while allowing citizens to address collectively issues of the practice of local governance • 1 citizen manifesto is produced in Arabic	• A **pilot local dialogue programme** was implemented • Was implemented from February 18, 2013 to March 7, 2013 (was extended due to security concerns) in Zawia, Derna, Zliten, Benghazi and Ubari Ubari: 23 participants (6 women) Benghazi: 23 participants (8 women) Derna: 23 participants (7 women) Zliten: 21 participants Zawia: 17 participants (7 women) • Healing the Wounds sessions were **implemented** • Citizens debates were **implemented** • Codes of conducts **were developed** as the result of this activity
Phase 3: SUDEL National Dialogue Meeting • Healing the wounds session permits local political leaders to address pending issues from the experience of electoral competition at the local level • Citizen dialogue strengthens the connections between local elected authorities and citizens, while allowing citizens to address	• A **National Dialogue meeting** in Tripoli was organised on 23 February 2013; 85 participants • Because of changes in activities (activities had to be postponed due to political and security situation), only participants from Zliten and Zawia were able to share their lessons learned at the event • **1 citizen engagement debate** took place during the meeting • Participants were able to share their experience from their Healing the Wounds sessions • Representants from Zawia and Zliten provided civic

collectively issues of the practice of local governance • 4 citizen manifesto are produced in Arabic • Assessment sessions permit adjusting the methodology in order to improve the toolbox of SUDEL for the implementation of the activities in the remaining 4 cities • Local stakeholders are identified to support the implementation of SUDEL in other cities • Local stakeholders are identified for the preparation in the study tour	engagement statements; Ubari, Benghazi and Derna presented challenged they faced and how they overcame them • The meeting was filmed • Process of selection of study tour candidates was explained to participants • Citizen manifesto were **not produced**
Phase 4: Study Tour to Spain • 10 representatives brought to Madrid to learn from transitional experiences in other countries and to discuss key challenges for Libya in the light of that experience	• A **5-days Study Tour to Spain was organised by CdM in partnership with NDEO from 1-5 April 2013**; 12 participants (final report mentions 13 participants) • Outcomes of the SUDEL project to be shared with the participants • Study Tour is detailed in the Final Draft report • Participants received a certificate at the end of the Study Tour • The Study Tour received media coverage: articles in El Pais, El Mundo, International Herald Tribune and The NYT
Phase 5: Second LEAD Training cascades and Final Workshop on Civic engagement • 375 electoral representatives trained in Leadership and conflict management skills for electoral stakeholders in 5 cities (3 sessions with 25 participants per city) • 1 local citizen debate held in each city with all participants (75 per city) of the LEAD training sessions	• A 7-days LEAD cascade training was organised from 25 March to April 30, 2013 in Benghazi, Zliten, Zawia, Derna and Ubari; 3 days of training in each city; 3 groups of 25 participants per city • Ubari: training was compressed in 2 days due to flight cancellations and delays, participants were divided in 2 groups instead of 3; 52 participants, 33 participants; total of **85 participants** • Civil Society Engagement workshops were **implemented**; 1 day per workshop Benghazi: 122 participants Zliten : 104 participants Zawia : 138 participants Derna : 177 participants Ubari : 168 participants • Total of **587 people trained** • Statements (described challenges faced by CSOs and how they intend to face them) from CSOs were developed in Zliten, Benghazi, Zawia, Derna, Ubari;

	statements included in Final Draft report
Phase 6: National Conclusions and final ceremony • Attended by 125 participants in the activities of SUDEL • A network of citizens (125 local leaders) is created, including al the beneficiaries of SUDEL activities • A final manifesto of the participants in the SUDEL activities is produced (in Arabic) • Visibility of EU support for democratisation in Libya is enhanced	• Activity **was cancelled** due to security concerns • Final manifesto was **not produced** • Outcomes of the project **shared** with all participants (questionnaire send to receive feedback)

B. Key findings and analysis

1. Relevance

The evaluation aimed to answer the following questions in terms of relevance:
- To what extent did the project respond to priority issues?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
- Did the project team plan the most appropriate strategies?
- Complementarity and coherence with related activities undertaken elsewhere by Government or other donors, at the same level or higher level.
- Whether stakeholders care about the project and believe it makes sense?

The SUDEL project was implemented at a turning point for democracy in Libya. Different cities in the country decided to hold local elections for the first time in 42 years out of frustration because the NTC was not carrying out its mandate as expected and postponed the national elections several times. Misrata was the first city to hold elections and was then quickly followed by Benghazi. The timeliness and relevance of the project is evident as it is a project that was created based on local demands and needs of the Libyan cities holding local elections as well as the fact that SUDEL is a continuation of the implemented International IDEA project "**Supporting Democratic Transitions in Libya**".

The support of the EU through this project arrived at a critical moment for Libyans and gave the local electoral cycles of 2012 legitimacy. The project combined technical assistance and capacity-building in a multi-stakeholder setting at the grassroots level creating a momentum for the elections to succeed by responding to the Libyans demands to receive assistance in these areas. "*Libyans lacked the knowledge on how to conduct elections so it was necessary to bring something and build the capacity of people on conflict prevention techniques in order for them to replicate them in the country*" stated one of the project partners.

The SUDEL project provided capacity-building to the Libyans through training sessions in conflict management, leadership and election observation helping the beneficiaries to strengthen their understanding of democratic issues and democratic principles as well as their awareness of the different electoral systems and targeted key actors in their communities. As one of the project partner stated "*the SUDEL project had a crucial role because Libya saw its first elections in 42 years*", the SUDEL project provided the tools and the knowledge for the beneficiaries to conduct successful, conflict-free elections as well as a platform for dialogue and exchange, bringing dynamism and speed to the democratic process. The series of cascade trainings and Training of Trainers activities as well as the Study Tour to Spain were based on Libyan needs. It allowed the participants to gain knowledge, share and discuss ideas as well as gave them the capacity to replicate the trainings through the cascade approach.

Moreover, the project activities of the "Way Ahead" component of the SUDEL project focused on dialogue and reconciliation allowing the participants to share their experiences and lessons learned from the elections. The activities, such as the development of codes of conducts and the National Meeting, brought together key players from different cities and groups that resulted in the creation of principles and recommendations they can adhere to, proving that the participants gained the ability to self-assess the elections and their results. It gave a voice to the winners and losers as well as implemented trust between the different cities and groups and created a culture of trust among different actors.

The SUDEL project was changed from its original plan described in the concept note. Component I and III were merged to form the "Way Ahead", divided in 6 phases. Following discussions and consultations with project partners and participants, the changes were made to adapt to the changing needs of Libyans and the reality on the ground. "*The changes made during the implementation of the project is what made it successful because it adapted to the needs of the Libyans*" stated a project partner.

It created a component that was clearly separated from the technical assistance aspect of the project, and aimed at promoting dialogue among the different political stakeholders and citizens to raise awareness and promote reconciliation. These changes provided the participants with a chance to share experiences and lessons learned from the elections, "*the healing the wounds sessions were very appreciated by the participants, it allowed the candidates who lost the elections to understand their loss and support the winner as well as preparing them in being active in the political life*" stated one the project stakeholder.

However, these changes in the project approach and implementation, in a country such as Libya where the security on the ground can change very easily, impacted the project timelines as it was necessary to wait until all elections in the selected cities were finished to implement the "Way Ahead" phase. These changes created management complications in the field as well as the delay and cancellation of some activities due to the growing insecurities in the country, for example the National Meeting that should have concluded the project was canceled, as well during the National Meeting of February 2013, some participants were not able to attend the event.

The SUDEL project was built as a continuation of the International IDEA project that could not respond to the need for technical assistance due to a restriction in their mandate, thus giving coherence to the project as it was built based on the demands from the Libyan beneficiaries for assistance in the local electoral cycles of 2012. The SUDEL project responded to the needs of the Libyan beneficiaries by

providing them technical assistance, electoral material and capacity-building at a critical point for Libya allowing the different cities to conduct successful and fair elections.

The commitment and enthusiasm of the participants and project stakeholders demonstrates the relevance of the project. Key informant interviewed stated that the project received considerable support from the Libyans. For example, a project partner interviewed stated "*the realities in the different cities* [in Libya] *are quite distinct so this representation of the five cities in the events made sure that it was representative of the different types of stakeholders in Libya. It helped many people to feel represented and part of the process*".

2. Effectiveness

The evaluation aimed to answer the following questions in terms of effectiveness:
*   Whether the planned benefits are delivered and received, as perceived mainly by the key beneficiaries.
*   Whether behavioural patterns have changed in beneficiary organisations at various levels; and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements.
*   How unplanned results may have affected the benefits received.
*   Describe any major failures of the project to date, explaining why they have occurred.
*   Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).
*   Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case studies, stories, best practice.

Due to the challenges met during the data gathering phase of the evaluation, the feedback of the project beneficiaries was not gathered. Therefore it is not possible to draw up conclusions regarding the planned benefits of the project and whether the beneficiaries perceive them as delivered and received. It is challenging to assess whether the project achieved its intended results and whether these results are well received by the project beneficiaries. Unfortunately there was no real feedback in the project activities in the form of evaluations or a mid-term evaluation for the project. The absence of activities evaluation resulted in lack of evidence of the effectiveness of SUDEL activities to the beneficiaries at the time of the activities. The evaluator was informed that there were evaluations collected, none were provided.

Interviewed project partners informed us that due to lack of time in the project timelines, case studies that were supposed to be developed were not produced for the project because of the progress reporting requirements partners had to undergo for the EU. Therefore, no baseline data or perceptions of the participants was provided. However, feedback gathered from the project partners and stakeholders informs us that participants gave them positive feedbacks regarding the training and capacity-building activities they received. One of the project partners stated that "*participants enjoyed the fact that they were able to discuss between the different cities and with different stakeholders groups to share their concerns and exchanges ideas on how to move forward*".

The activities implemented during the SUDEL project allowed cities in Libya to conduct successful, fair elections according to international standards: At the local level, the SUDEL project and its activities improved dialogue and democracy building in the cities where it was implemented. As it is the first time the country holds elections in 42 years, it is safe to make the assumption that the knowledge of Libyans

in conducting elections and managing them is extremely limited. The SUDEL project increased the capacity of beneficiaries in election observation, polling techniques, voter education and public outreach, leadership, conflict management. "*The project contributed to the democratic process, it was able to accompany the people and help them reflect in a full cycle (pre, during and post-elections)*" stated one of the project partners.

Component II of the SUDEL project as well as SUDEL II provided the beneficiaries with the tools and knowledge to lead successful, fair and conflict-free elections at the local level. Following the implementation of the activities - the lessons learned exercises, the national meeting, the Study Tour and the healing the wounds sessions - a change in the participants behaviour was noticed by project partners, these activities brought together a wide variety of key actors in their communities and allowed each participant to define their own role in the election and dialogue process. As well, it introduced a principle of self-awareness, as a result codes of conducts were developed with rules and principles for each key category (media, NGOs, political actors, etc.) to be used for future elections.

The SUDEL project saw, during its implementation, an increased demand in technical assistance for supporting the organisation of local elections in Libya. As a result of this demand, the EU allocated more money to implement SUDEL II to procure and deliver electoral materials and provide advisory support and operational assistance to local elections commissions in order to facilitate the delivery of local elections. SUDEL II was specifically designed and implemented to respond to the needs of Libyan cities in organising fair and successful elections. As a result of a lessons learned exercise organised in Benghazi, the National Democracy and Election Organisation (NDEO) was created as a direct by-product of the SUDEL project. The organisation then partnered up with SUDEL to assist in the implementation of the activities. The creation of NDEO is a clear example of how the project reached its objectives and went beyond its intended results. As one of the project stakeholder stated "*it created an organisation that was willing to take on the project and continue it*".

Another unplanned result of the project was the request from the Ministry of Justice to assist them in the drafting of Municipal law. The draft became law and is now the legal base on which municipal elections are organised. These unplanned results affected the benefits received by the project in a very positive manner. As well, project results allowed for the organisation of fair and successful elections in Libya than the project had planned. The SUDEL project is therefore in line with the needs of Libyans and its results increased democracy building and reconciliation processes at the local level in Libya beyond the target objectives planned.

The project faced many challenges caused by the Libyan context, including the deterioration in the security situation. It required flexibility in the implementation of project activities. Due to the deteriorating security situation in Libya, many activities had to be delayed or their location changed, for example the Training of Trainers in Conflict Management had to be implemented in Egypt due to the trainers from CCL not being able to get security clearance to go to Libya. Due to the delays in implementation, the project had to be extended until June 30, 2013. As well, the National Conclusion and Final Ceremony of the project had to be cancelled due to security concerns.

The security situation impacted most of the project, it was agreed following consultations with the partners, that organising a high profile event in Tripoli was too dangerous. Project staff, EU officials and the partners tried hard to find an alternative, according to their statements but it was impossible. The cancellation of this event prevented the participants to gather formal feedback from the participants as expected. Gender representation was also a challenge identified by the project partners as it was

difficult to ensure participation of women in all activities, some trainings had to be organised without any women attending.

The project had positive unplanned impacts in helping instituting a culture of dialogue, trust among different actors as well as successful local elections such as the creation of NDEO and SUDEL II. These unplanned impacts show that the project is responding to the immediate Libyan needs in technical assistance and capacity building for the organisation of local elections.

The momentum of the project was impacted by the delays to the organisation of local elections in Tripoli and the resulting political instability in Libya. The controversy surrounding the elections in Tripoli put a halt in the reconciliation process due to the suspicion that supporters of Gadhafi would undermine the elections. This created a mandate vacuum for SUDEL because the mandate of the project did not cover the national elections. One of the project stakeholders interviewed stated: "*it does not mean that the project changed the democratic direction of the country. If you are going to fund a one year and a half project, you cannot expect a large impact on increasing the capacities and changes in the country*".

One of the project partners interviewed mentioned that during the National Meeting "Way Ahead" phase, a political representative attended the meeting and was very negative and critical on some issues. Immediately, following his comments, the other participants at the meeting informed him that they were here to discuss issues in a peaceful manner and learn how to deal with their problems. This particular participants was kicked out of the meeting by the others because he was being too negative. This example is relevant because it shows that the people are really in demand for projects like SUDEL as well as shows a willingness from the participants to learn and increase their knowledge to contribute to reconciliation and democracy building in the country. As well, another project partner mentioned that participants that were trained in Benghazi are now lobbying the GNC to convince them to work in collaboration with them on developing the next electoral process, the constitution and have a national dialogue to assist in the draft of the Libyan constitution. The project and the knowledge acquired during the activities by the participants was thus used to further pursue democratic reform issues by the Libyans.

3. Efficiency

The evaluation aimed to answer the following questions in terms of efficiency:
- Is the overall project action plan used and up to date?
- What % of activities in the workplan is being delivered?
- Is monitoring data being collected as planned, stored and used to inform future plans?
- Capacity gaps.
- Working relationship with the team.
- Working relationship with partners, stakeholders and donors.
- Learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects.
- Internal coordination and external visibility.

The SUDEL project deviated from its original concept note to adapt to the needs of Libyans and the reality on the ground. The changes were made after a series of consultations and meetings with the project partners. Component I and III of the original concept note were merged and reorganised to allow

the consortium to enhance the learning capacity of the project while ensure its timely implementation in the five targeted cities.

The "Way Ahead" component was divided into six phases. "*All the phases implemented under the Way Ahead component were instrumentals in bringing a wide range of different groups to reflect on the benefits of the local elections and then exchange their observations with the other cities*" stated one of the interviewed project partner. Despite the challenging context of the country in which the project was implemented, only one activity was cancelled (National Conclusions and final ceremony). All planned activities were implemented following the changes made to the original concept note. As a project partner stated: "*the changes made during the implementation of the project is what made it successful because it adapted to the needs of Libyans. Otherwise, the project would have not had such a big impact because it would have not replied to their needs*".

There is a lack of monitoring and evaluation plan for the SUDEL project. Only a final evaluation was conducted. There is no evidence of baseline data or indicators being collected or provided. This creates limitations to the extent to which results could be measured and a lack of information on progress as well as no indication of whether project activities were achieving their intended results. The project encountered management challenges on the ground and between the partners, despite the dedication from all partners to the project. The short timelines of the project, the lack of local knowledge as well as the lack of a management team on the ground (the project is managed from Brussels) created obstacles in the project implementation.

The project modality was also a cause for some confusion and misunderstanding between the staff who were hired in Libya to answer to a number of different managers in different countries. Each partner worked at a different speed, which required a lot of communications, something that may have impacted the relationship between those operating in Brussels and the staff on the ground.

Moreover, ECES was not perceived by the other consortium members as a strong lead because it systems and procedures and the level of institutional structure was fairly new. This is an issue that other partners explained as the reason behind some of the challenges. As well, as stated by one of the stakeholders, "*if you want to do a project of this magnitude, you need a field-based management team because decision making has to be delegated to the field*". For countries with constantly changing and unpredictable context, a management team with power of decision in the field would have been more efficient. Nevertheless despite several budget amendments, there was never the possibility of adding a permanent in-country coordinator, as there would have never been enough days of work in Libya allocated.

There were also issues of registration in Libya encountered by ECES as well as logistics problems, which created a lack of control from ECES that had to be registered under the Libyan Forum for Civil Society (LFCS) as well as share offices and staff. However, the fact that the project used Arab-speaking staff in Libya was highly valuable because it allowed establishing trust between the project stakeholders and beneficiaries as well as ensured that the activities were reflective from the reality in the country. The management issues encountered did not hinder the results of the project and all staff members and consortium members were highly dedicated to the project. However, there were questions on the hiring of some senior experts in the field as managers instead of focusing on their technical capacity they were delegated to manage the country programme which was not the best use of their capacity appear to have caused conflicts between partners and staff.

Clic-Consultants

Despite the challenges in project management, the coordination between the project stakeholders was deemed efficient by all interviewees due to the regular meetings and exchanges the partners had. The project partners also coordinated the different activities with CCL, NDEO, International IDEA and LFCS. The latter two did not have the possibility of implementing activities on the entire period of the SUDEL project as the partnership agreement with International IDEA was never signed and the withdrawal of International IDEA was announced in November 2012 and as LFCS depended on the Won for Libya project that ended in December 2012. The situation on the ground was always assessed carefully and the activities adapted to it as well as to the changing needs of the beneficiaries making the project flexible and keeping it relevant. During the implementation of the project, advice and counsel from the EU was always sought as well as the visibility of the EU as a donor was always ensured through banners, logos, press releases and newspapers articles. Representatives of the EU were also invited to attend some of the activities, for example, the National Meeting. Unfortunately, the EU was not responsive to our requests for an interview for this evaluation, therefore, we are relying on the comments of the partners.

4. Impact

The evaluation aimed to answer the following questions in terms of impact:
- To what extent is the project contributing to a long-term positive effect on democracy and national reconciliation in Libya?
- If there were unplanned impacts, how have they affected the overall impact?

The level of impact of the project on democracy and national reconciliation in Libya can be measured with the fact that the local elections were successful and conflict-free. "*The election results showed that the project reached its objectives because they were uncontested and successful*" stated a project stakeholder. Moreover, the fact that the project targeted diverse actors and stakeholders and was implemented at the local level allowed the activities to be closer to the reality and to the Libyan needs, "*it created a movement of discussion between cities that helped create unity*".

The reconciliation process is harder to measure, however a change in the beneficiaries' behaviour was observed, a willingness to dialogue and to find non-violent solutions to encountered problems shows that the project encouraged a positive change. For example, the city of Sabha encountered problems when the former members of the local council refused to step down to let the new elected council to be in place. The new elected members got the support and advice from three other cities and decided to jointly petition the national government to recognise the new authority in the city. This example show that the participants in the SUDEL project were able to apply right away the knowledge gained during their trainings and learned how to resolve their problems in a non-violent way.

The Study Tour allowed the participants to leave Libya for the first time and meet representatives of the international community; the purpose of the study tour was to share the experiences of Spain, Ireland and Poland in terms of political transition. The discussions that occurred during the Study Tour were relevant to the Libyan context and helped the participants clarify the concept of reconciliation. The Study Tour made "*people see the relevance of their role and gave them an idea of what they can do to push for the change they are hoping for. It gave them a different perspective from different countries that were in conflict like them and hear success stories and different examples of democratisation*

processes in order to see the different elements they were looking for to better govern the country"
stated one of the interviewed project stakeholder.

One of the unplanned impact of the project was the creation of the SUDEL II project, signed on August
16, 2012 and aimed at providing technical assistance to Tripoli and other cities in Libya. This project was
created to answer the demand of providing technical assistance and electoral materials to other cities in
Libya such as Al-Beyda, Bani Walid and Tarhuna. As the visibility of the SUDEL increased, other cities in
Libya requested assistance in organising local elections. The electoral material purchased and used for
the SUDEL project was reused for the SUDEL II. As one of the project partner stated, "*it allowed to
organise elections in a place where elections where a non-word, this is a huge symbol*". The creation of
NDEO following a lessons learned exercise in Benghazi in June 2012 was also an unplanned impact. It
allowed the creation of an organisation that is 100% Libyan owned capable of replicating the SUDEL
project insuring the sustainability of the project.

5. Sustainability

The evaluation aimed to answer the following questions in terms of sustainability:
- Is there evidence of local ownership of objectives and achievements?
- Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/will ensure continuity
  of the project activities in the project area?
- Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, upscaled or
  replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? Is such replication or
  magnification likely?
- How far has the national policy corresponded, have there been sustainable change to
  institutional capacity?
- Wherever relevant, were cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, and tribal relations taken
  into account by the project?

The project was designed according to the local context and the needs of the beneficiaries to ensure
local ownership of the project. The cascade training techniques implemented ensured that the
participants could replicate the trainings ensuring local ownership as well. Local ownership of objectives
and achievements was also ensured during the elections as the cities targeted by the project were able
to conduct the elections successfully and according to international standards following the capacity-
building provided through trainings and mentorship.

The SUDEL project, due to its short timelines, did not contribute to lasting benefits as the momentum
was lost when the Tripoli elections were cancelled, slowing the democratisation and reconciliation
process in Libya. However, the short-term benefits of the project allowed the beneficiaries to increase
their knowledge in elections processes, election observation, leadership, voter education and outreach,
conflict management. The series of cascade trainings allowed the participants to get a practical
experience and to apply and share the knowledge acquired right away. However, due to the lack of
monitoring indicators, baseline data and feedback from the beneficiaries it is not possible to establish
the extent to which the SUDEL project had lasting benefits.

NDEO helped implementing the activities under the Way Ahead component of the project. It is a
growing organisation, it is truly local and benefits from the support of many volunteers. NDEO is capable

Clic-Consultants

of ensuring the continuity of the SUDEL project and has the ability to implement similar projects that incorporate technical assistance and knowledge of the political process. NDEO is currently holding trainings in order to show the importance of local elections and the importance of elected representatives in the municipalities therefore ensuring the project continuity in the area of electoral assistance as well as replicated the project activities.

Club de Madrid is in contact with Libyans who requested their support to implement similar missions as the ones implemented for the SUDEL project so they can share their experiences. They are developing a project in coordination with their contacts on the ground, however, the security situation continues to delaying its implementation.

Libyan cities have for the first time been able to express themselves freely and elect their representatives and they have now a successful example they can draw lessons from. The different trainings and dialogue sessions also provided the different participants from the different cities with the knowledge of election principles and techniques as well as conflict management skills they can apply right away. It also instituted a framework for future elections in the country.

It was continuously ensured during the implementation of the project that gender representation was ensured, despite it being challenging. Some of the activities implemented did not have any women attending. The local and tribal context of Libya was considered, the employment of the local Arab speaking staff established trust in the project.

C. EC value added

The SUDEL project is in line with the EU strategy to strengthen Libya and increase cooperation between the EU and Libyans. The SUDEL project's objectives to support democratisation processes and reconciliation is in line with the EU objective to support stability and the hold of peaceful and legitimate elections of a constitutional council. The project is also in line with the EU strategy and programmes to support reconciliation, elections and human rights. The project assisted the organisation of local electoral cycles in 2012 and supported reconciliation through dialogue and lessons learned exercises helping supporting the transition to democracy in the country and the EU External Action strategy for Libya.

III. Conclusions

The findings of the evaluation indicate that the project was relevant to Libya and met the needs of Libyans. The timing of the project that was implemented at the time cities were organising their local elections increased its relevance as local elections were conducted successfully and without any conflict as well capacity of beneficiaries in relevant areas was increased. The project opened up a platform for dialogue for a multitude of key stakeholders, building trust between the different key actors in Libya giving momentum to the democratisation process. As well, within this context attention was paid to ensuring that the activities were relevant to the changing needs of the beneficiaries and the changing security in Libya which gave flexibility to the project and addressed the different local priorities and needs of the target groups.

Clic-Consultants

The project activities and their results also ensured the effectiveness of the project. The activities ensured successful and conflict free local elections in Libya and build the capacity of the beneficiaries in key thematic areas such as elections observation, elections processes and leadership. However, the extent to which the benefits of the project activities are long lasting and well received by the project beneficiaries cannot be established due lack of feedback from the participants.

A change in behavior was observed according to interviewed stakeholders. According to their feedback, following the implementation of the project activities, participants gained knowledge of elections principles and procedures and were able to find non-violent solutions to conflicts. Dialogue was also increased between the different target groups that lead to a series of recommendations (Code of Conducts) that will be used as a framework for future elections. The project also saw a series of positive unintended results and impacts such as the creation of NDEO and SUDEL II that increased its success and furthered its effectiveness and impact.

All the project activities were implemented, except for one that was cancelled due to security concerns. This did not hinder the impact or results of the project. The project was changed from its original concept note to adapt to the changing needs of the project beneficiaries. A lack of monitoring data and indicators creates a gap in assessing the extent to which the project achieved its intended results. Only a final evaluation was conducted at the end of the project, with no baseline data to base itself on. A monitoring and evaluation plan as well as a logical framework needs to be established at the beginning of the project to avoid capacity gaps.

Management issues were raised during key informant interviews, the lack of time and knowledge of the local context in Libya as well as the fact that the project was led by a consortium of 4 different organisations created conflict at the management level and coordination issues. However, this did not have an impact on the project results as the project staff and project partners were dedicated to ensuring the success of the project.

However, In order to achieve greater impact and benefit the target beneficiaries, a series of long-term interrelated capacity-development and technical support interventions are needed in order to achieve a more comprehensive approach and greater results and impact in the country.

The project was based on the needs of the target beneficiaries, it was in line with the local context and activities were changed or modified based on the feedback gathered from the project beneficiaries during its implementation. The creation of NDEO ensures the sustainability of the project as it is a Libyan organisation capable of replicating the activities implemented under the SUDEL project. However, local ownership of the project cannot be successfully assessed due to lack of feedback from the project beneficiaries.

IV.   Visibility

The EU was always represented and visible through the entire project. Project staff and project stakeholders ensured that the logo was present on all communications and events ensuring that participants were aware that the project they were participating in was an EU-funded project. Representatives of the EU were also consulted through the entire duration of the project and invited to

events such as the National Meeting and the Study Tour. The SUDEL project was regularly visible through media campaigns such as press releases, articles in newspapers (New York Times, local Libyan newspapers) and two documentaries were produced as well. The visibility of the SUDEL project was successful because it allowed more cities in Libya to request assistance for the organisation of their local elections and resulted in the design and implementation of SUDEL II, funded by the EU, increasing the impact of the action implemented in Libya.

Activities such as the Study Tour to Spain and the National Meeting received considerable media coverage ensuring the visibility of the SUDEL project and the EU. Facebook pages were created by the participants to discuss the project and its activities. According to one the stakeholder interviewed, the participants are still being active on the Facebook page of the SUDEL project. The visibility of the project is also ensured and increased by a website dedicated to the project and its activities.

V.   **Overall Assessment**

The SUDEL project was implemented at a critical and relevant time for Libya and Libyans. It is the continuation of an International IDEA project aimed at supporting the local electoral cycles of 2012 and support the democratic process in Libya. The project deviated from its original concept note to respond to the changing needs of the beneficiaries on the ground and was divided into three components. All components achieved their intended objectives to provided technical support and assistance to the cities in order for them to organise successful elections based on international standards as well as developing the capacity of beneficiaries and encouraging local dialogue.

Regardless of the security challenges and the unstable environment in Libya, activities were implemented and reached their objectives. Beneficiaries were trained in relevant thematic areas such as election observation and conflict management and provided with the knowledge and tools to organise elections for the first time in 42 years.

The beneficiaries were also provided with a platform for dialogue where they could exchanges ideas and lessons learned. This helped create an environment of trust and dialogue between different cities and target group and created a momentum in the democratisation process in Libya. However, this process was stopped due to the cancellation of elections in Tripoli and the increase of political instability. The activities were strategic and reached their objectives, the use of Arab speaking staff on the ground helped establishing trust between the different beneficiaries and ensured that the local needs on the ground were reflected making the SUDEL project flexible.

NDEO and SUDEL II were unplanned positive results of the SUDEL project. They show that Libyans are in need of interventions combining technical assistance and capacity building. NDEO is seen by the project stakeholders as the continuation of the SUDEL project by an organisation 100% Libyan and thus ensures the sustainability of the project. SUDEL II was designed and implemented based on the request of cities in Libya who heard about the SUDEL project and requested assistance as well. This furthered the impact the project had on the support for democratisation by widening its expected results to more cities in the country.

Clic-Consultants

However, due to its short timelines and the recent events in Libya, it is difficult to assess the long-term impact of the project. Moreover, the lack of baseline data and indicator creates a gap in assessing to what extent the project activities achieved their results. The fact that no feedback from the beneficiaries was gathered also hinders the findings of the evaluation. However, based on the feedback of the project stakeholders, the activities reached their objectives and were strategic. A monitoring and evaluation plan established at the beginning of the project as well as a mid-term evaluation would have allowed to gather data and feedback in order to adjust the different activities based on the results and lead to a better understanding regarding the extent to which the activities reached their intended objectives.

The project encountered management issues and implementation delays due to the security challenges in Libya and to the complexity of the outputs and number of partners. The project duration was extended to allow for all activities to be implemented. Management was seen as an issue by the interviewees due to the fact that the project was led by a consortium of four members with different areas of expertise and working at different speeds. Issues were also encountered with staff on the ground who did not have any managerial powers. For country as unstable as Libya, a management team on the ground would have been more efficient and closer to the realities of the environment.

VI.   Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation, the following recommendations are proposed to improve relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability:

- In order to increase the effectiveness and impact of projects implemented in unstable contexts, interventions need to be designed and implemented in a series of comprehensive activities that are implemented over a longer period of time, with a combination of training, mentoring and practical implementation of initiatives. As evident through the interviews, stakeholders state that more needs to be done in the area of democratisation and reconciliation in Libya.

- Short-term interventions, however successful cannot have long-lasting results in countries like Libya where the political context is constantly changing. Libyans need to receive more assistance in enhancing their capacity and skills to be able to achieve long-lasting results in their country.

- Stronger M&E plans need to be developed and tracking of results and indicators throughout project implementation need to be conducted. No monitoring and evaluations tools and approaches were stated in the project concept note and there was no logical framework which created a lack of information on progress and no indication of whether project activities were achieving their intended results. There was also a lack of baseline data, which limited the extent to which results could be measured. More time for follow up and monitoring of results should be incorporated into the design of the project. A mid-term evaluation should also be conducted to ensure that the project activities are still relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries and in order to adapt the project activities if necessary.

- For projects implemented in countries in constantly changing and unpredictable contexts of post-conflict countries, a strong knowledge of the realities on the ground is necessary.

Clic-Consultants

Partnerships with local organisation or the hiring of local staff early on with a strong knowledge of the local context should be encouraged. It is important to have a complete knowledge of the local context at the project design phase to ensure that the designed activities can be realistically implemented and increase the relevance of the project to the needs of the target beneficiaries. Strong knowledge of the realities on the ground can increase the project flexibility and make it more efficient. It will also avoid logistical issues once the project is implemented.

- The management of projects in post-conflict countries should be done in the field and through local staff with a strong knowledge of the local context. Flexibility in decision making should be allowed, and some should be made from the field which would simplify management and coordination issues. As well, for projects lead by consortiums, one project manager in the field should be able to coordinate these activities and rely on each member of the consortium.

- It is also important to note that in post conflict countries it is important to act quickly and to deploy immediately a complete team to establish the office and the support structure. Having a strong structure in place will allow each member of the consortium to focus on their technical strengths. Hiring of staff should be managed locally, as well as budgets for activities. There are many missed opportunities from small and weak office support structure.

Clic-Consultants

Annexes

Annex 1 – Data collection tools

Annex 1a - Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection and Analysis Techniques	Related Issues and Additional Questions
Relevance			
Did the identified problems and the intervention that followed correspond to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries and stakeholders?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informants Interviews Desk Review	
To what extent did the project respond to priority issues?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informants Interviews Desk Review	
To what extend did the project succeed in supporting reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of the Libyan local electoral cycles of 2012?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informants Interviews Desk Review	
Does the delivery of the project align with the roles and responsibilities of ECES and SUDEL?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informants Interviews Desk Review	
Is the project strategic? Is it coherent with ongoing initiatives? Does it address what the stakeholders require?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Effectiveness			
To what extend were the project objectives achieved?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives, factors both internal and external to SUDEL and ECES?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
What types of challenges did the project encounter and how has it affected the achievement of its objectives?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Efficiency			
Were the activities of the project well managed in terms of operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management, delivery of outputs)?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Was the coordination with local partners, beneficiaries, stakeholders, and other donors well managed?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews	

		Desk Review	
Have key stakeholders and partners been well informed of project activities and progress throughout the project?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Are the costs of the project justified by the results and benefits?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Impact			
What change as a result of the project has been observed in relation to the different beneficiaries groups?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Has the project encountered unplanned impacts? If so, how have they affected the overall impact of the project?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Has the project improved stakeholder capacity and coordination?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
What difference did the project make to the beneficiaries and key stakeholders?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Sustainability			
Is there evidence of local ownership of objectives and achievements?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
How adaptable is the assumed change?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
Have there been sustainable changes to institutional capacity?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	
To what extend is the project financially, technically and managerially sustainable?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	

Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/will ensure continuity of the project activities beyond the immediate project area?	Project Documents Key Informants	Key Informant Interviews Desk Review	

Annex 1b – <u>Interview questions for stakeholders</u>

Context question: Can you explain to me a bit about the reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of local electoral cycles in Libya? (Stage of development, processes, mechanisms, national prioritisation of issues, political will…)

<u>**Relevance**</u>

1. Based on this context, was the project timely and relevant in terms of supporting reconciliation processes and democracy building in Libya?
1.1. Was the project timely and relevant in terms of contributing to the strengthening of Libyan stakeholders' involvement in democracy building?
1.2. Was the project timely and relevant in terms of providing operational and technical support to local electoral cycles?
1.3. Was the project timely and relevant in terms of promoting dialogue among political stakeholders and enhancing citizen engagement during the post-election phase?
2. In your opinion, has the project and its activities met the needs of the Libyan political stakeholders and civil society?

<u>**Effectiveness**</u>

1. Was there any feedback gathered from the implemented activities of the project?
2. According to the results and the feedback of the project beneficiaries, how did the SUDEL project improved democracy building in Libya as well as dialogue between political stakeholders and citizens?
3. Have the different trainings provided by Component I of the SUDEL project improved the knowledge of participants in observation techniques and conflict management? Explain how.
4. Has the project encountered any challenges during its implementation? If so, how were the challenges managed?

<u>**Efficiency**</u>

1. According to you, have the three components of the project implemented reached their expected results? Explain why and provide examples.
2. In your opinion, how effective was coordination with the stakeholders?
3. According to you, were the project activities well managed? If so, explain why?

<u>**Impact**</u>

1. In your opinion, did the SUDEL project reach its objectives of supporting reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of local elections? In what manner?
2. Have you been able to observe a change as a result of the project implementation in relation to election transparency, democratic principles and conflict management among the project beneficiaries as a result of the project?
3. In your opinion, were there any major contributions or unintended results that the project had on reconciliation processes and democracy building in Libya?

Clic-Consultants

<u>Sustainability</u>

1. In your opinion, do you think that Libya and Libyans are in need of programmes like SUDEL? Why do you think so/not?
2. In your opinion, did the SUDEL project provide the beneficiaries with sufficient knowledge and resources in order for them to be able to continue/replicate the project activities?
3. To what extend did the project and its results draw upon existing experiences and needs of key stakeholders to ensure local ownership? Please provide examples.

Clic-Consultants

Annex 1c – <u>Interview questions for beneficiaries</u>

Context question: Can you explain to me a bit about the reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of local electoral cycles in Libya? (Stage of development, processes, mechanisms, national prioritisation of issues, political will…)

<u>Relevance</u>

3. Based on that context, was the project timely and relevant in terms of supporting reconciliation processes and democracy building in Libya? If yes or no, why is that? Do you have any examples?
4. In your opinion, has the project and its activities met your needs? How and why? Please provide examples.

<u>Effectiveness</u>

5. Were the resources produced for and during the different activities made available to you? What resources were given to you? How did you benefit from these resources? Why?
6. Please describe how you have been using the knowledge you acquired from your participation in the SUDEL project.
7. What other outcomes were produced as a result of the new knowledge you acquired?

<u>Efficiency</u>

4. Were the trainings and activities you participated in well managed? Explain why and provide examples.
5. What are the strengths and weaknesses in terms of management and content of the activities you participated in?

<u>Impact</u>

4. In your opinion, what major contribution has the SUDEL project made to democracy building and reconciliation processes in Libya?
5. Have you seen any improvements in democracy building or national/local reconciliation since the SUDEL project activities have been implemented? Please provide examples.
6. Did you or your organisation benefit from the activities provided by the SUDEL project? Have you been able to use the knowledge and resources you acquired during the elections of 2012?

<u>Sustainability</u>

4. In your opinion, do you think that Libya and Libyans are in need of programmes like SUDEL? Why do you think so/not?
5. Based on the knowledge you have acquired during your participation in the project activities, will you or your organisation plan to replicate or continue any of the activities of the project?

Clic-Consultants

Annex 2 – <u>List of documents reviewed</u>

1. SUDEL – "Way Ahead" Report
2. SUDEL – Concept note
3. SUDEL – Documentary "Pionnières", 40 min
4. SUDEL – Draft Final Report
5. SUDEL – Final Report
6. SUDEL – Final Report, Annexes
7. SUDEL – Interim Report
8. SUDEL – Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes – 23 January 2013
9. SUDEL – Study Tour to Spain report (1 – 5 April 2013)
10. SUDEL Coordination Meeting – Meeting Minutes – 25 July 2012
11. SUDEL II – Concept note (Increasing assistance to Local Electoral Processes)
12. SUDEL Steering Committee Meeting – Meeting Minutes – 19 June 2013

Annex 3 – <u>List of key informants interviewed</u>

	Name	Position	Organization	Contact Information	Interview Date/Time
				SUDEL Staff	
1	Abdulhakim Elkzuri	Operation and Logistic Officer	SUDEL/LFCS	Tel: +218.91.310.7157 Email: hakim.kzuri@eces.eu	**Contacted – still waiting for reply**
2	Abear Algallal	Media	SUDEL	Tel: +218.91.369.6772 Email: a.algallal@gmail.com	**Contacted – still waiting for reply**
3	Hend Alshawesh	Bridge Trainer	SUDEL	Tel: +218.92.610.8521 Email: hend_shawe@hotmail.com	**Wednesday January 29, 2014** **COMPLETED** (Salah Shibani)
4	Hicham Zougagh	Legal Consultant/Bridge Trainer	SUDEL	Tel: +218.92.536.2742 Email: chamz80@gmail.com	**COMPLETED** (Salah Shibani)
5	Khadija Issa Baba	Trainer	SUDEL	Tel: +218.91.876.3635 Email: targuiya@yahoo.com	**COMPLETED** (Salah Shibani)
6	Majdi Abuzaid	Elections Expert	SUDEL	Tel: +218.91.925.3739 +218.91.619.4239 Skype: abuzaidmajdi Email: abuzaidmajdi@gmail.com	**Tuesday January 28, 2014 @ 19:00 (+6, 1pm Ottawa)** **COMPLETED** (Skype)
7	Mustafa Siala	Finance & Admin Officer	SUDEL	Tel: +218.92.685.4475 Email: mustafa.i.siala@gmail.com	**Thursday January 30, 2014** **COMPLETED** (Salah Shibani)
8	Omar Bakhet	SUDEL Project Director	SUDEL	Tel: +32.495.22.99.33 Skype: omarmbakhet Email: obakhet@gmail.com	**Wednesday February 5, 2014 @ 20:00 (+7, 1pm Ottawa)** **COMPLETED** (Skype)
				Project Partners	
9	Fabio Bargiacchi	ECES Executive Director	ECES	Tel: +32.495.799.704 Skype: bargiakk Email: fabio.bargiacchi@eces.eu	**Thursday January 23, 2014 @ 18:30 (+6, 12.30pm, Ottawa)** **COMPLETED** (Skype)
10	Jerome Scheltens	NIMD Programme Manager	NIDM	Tel: +31.70.311.54.64 Skype: jeromescheltens Email: jeromeScheltens@nimd.org	**Monday January 27, 2014 @ 17:00 CET time (+6, 11am Ottawa)** **COMPLETED** (Skype)

Clic-Consultants

11	Maram Anbar	CdM Program Officer	CdM	Phone: +34 911 548 230 +34 911 548 237 Email: manbar@clubmadrid.org Skype: maram_cdm	**Thursday January 30, 2014 @ 15:00 (+6, 11 am Ottawa)** **COMPLETED** (Skype)
12	Nicolas Rougy	EPD Executive Director	EPD	Tel: +32.2.231.08.45 +32.479.852.736 Skype: nicolasrougy Email: nicolasrougy@epd.eu	**Monday January 27, 2014 @ 15:00 Brussels (9 am Ottawa)** **COMPLETED** (Skype and phone)
13	Raphael Pouyé	Former ECES head of Programmes		Tel: +212.654.66.95.64 Skype: rafubuntu Email: raphaelpouye@yahoo.com	**Friday January 31, 2014 @ 14:00 Morocco (9 am Ottawa)** **PARTIALLY COMPLETED** (Lack of time)
European Commission Brussels					
14	Sophie Kammerer	Programme manager, Droits de l'Homme	DEVCO B.1	Tel : +32.22.98.03.10 Email : sophie.kammerer@ec.europa.eu	**Has not replied**
15	Patrice Lenormand	Deputy Head of Unit, Droits de l'Homme	DEVCO B.1	Tel : +32.22.99.47.09 Email : patrice.lenormand@ec.europa.eu	**Has not replied**
EU Delegation to Libya					
16	Samir Gharbaoui	EU programme manager for civil society and culture	EU Delegation to Libya	Tel : +218.92.287.28.43 Email : samir_eu.tripoli@yahoo.com	**Tried to contact by phone but not able to reach him.**
Project Beneficiaries					
17	Dr. Ali Mehdawi	NDEO Executive Director	NDEO	Tel : +218.923.720.847	**Contacted him – still waiting for reply**
18	Suliman Alzoubi	Member of the Libyan National Congress and head of previous Local Elections Commission in Benghazi	Libyan National Congress	Tel: +218.928.072.538	**Has not replied**

Clic-Consultants

19	Ibrahim Eltaieb			Tel: +218.913.313.877	**Declined the interview**
20	Mohamed Abdel Wahab Nadeef	Journalist		Tel: +218.924.580.509	**Has not replied**
21	Ahmed Frishek			Tel: +218.918.249.474	**Has not replied**

Annex 4 – <u>Terms of Reference</u>

Terms of Reference

Position Information
Job Title: Project Evaluator. **Duty Stations**: Tripoli, Benghazi and other project cities in Libya, pending security review. Brussels, Belgium. **Reports to**: ECES Executive Director and ECES Head of Programmes.
1. Project Background and Context

Donor: European Union - European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). DG for Development and Cooperation D6 EuropeAid

Project duration: 15 May 2012 – 15 May 2013

The Financing Agreement N° EIDHR 2012 293-329 which granted The SUDEL Project 1.097.213,94 EUR forms a second phase in European assistance efforts to Libyan post-revolutionary development in the context of the *Arab Spring*.

The following organisations are part of the consortium:
Consortium Leader: European Centre for Electoral Support – ECES.
Consortium Members: Club de Madrid, European Partnership for Democracy, and the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy.

The Consortium came together based on the way in which they exhibit core and complementary experiences and capacities that are required to implement the SUDEL Project and bring about the expected results. Based on their successful experiences from developing viable political parties and party systems as well as promoting inter-party dialogue, CdM, NIMD and EPD formed the backbone to all activities related to this specific area in the SUDEL Project.

The main objective of the SUDEL Project which has been running since on 15 May 2012 is to support reconciliation processes and democracy building in the context of the local electoral cycles of 2012.

The specific objectives of the project are: (1) the strengthening of Libyan stakeholders' involvement in building democracy in Libya; (2) the provision of operational and technical

Page **1** of **8**

support to local electoral cycles; and (3) the promotion of dialogue among political stakeholders and the engagement of citizens.

The following were identified as the main activities to be undertaken and results to be expected for each of the components of the project:

Component 1: Contribute to strengthening of the capacity of Libyan stakeholders' involvement in democracy building

Expected Result 1: Advanced domestic observation techniques appreciated, and conflict management skills of key stakeholders are enhanced.

- Training of Trainers (ToT) on election observation techniques.
- Training of Trainers (ToT) on conflict management skills for electoral stakeholders.

Component 2: The provision of operational and technical support to 5 local electoral cycles.

Expected Result 2: Operational support provided to the local electoral committees and electoral material is procured.

- Development of capacities among members of the 5 targeted LEC's.
- Electoral planning and budgeting.
- Electoral Procurement.
- Election Day Operations.
- Post-election evaluation and audit.

Component 3: The promotion of dialogue among political stakeholders and the engagement of citizens during the post-election phase. In accordance with the Way Ahead Planning review presented in the interim report of 25 November 2012, Component 3 has been reorganised in order to allow the consortium to enhance the learning capacity of the project while ensuring the timely implementation of the action in the five local cities. Component three was thus divided into 5 phases.

Expected Result 3: Facilities for dialogue and reconciliation established and operational. Citizens debates fed into the Constitutional reform debate and preparation for national elections.

Phase 1: A Training and Brainstorming Seminar on Local Elections and Local Democracy.
- 25 participants in the activities representative of five different cities are connected and share experiences about recent local elections.
- A list of topics to structure the activities at the local level is identified and validated with the stakeholders
- Methodological approach of SUDEL for the five cities is discussed and validated by the beneficiaries
- The activity gives visibility to the work of the EU, through SUDEL, in the consolidation of local democracy and practice of dialogue at the local level

Phase 2: Local Dialogue & Civil Engagement Cascade & Brainstorming Workshop.
- One healing the wounds session permits local political leaders to address pending issues from the experience of electoral competition at the local level, developed towards codes of conduct;
- One citizen dialogue strengthens the connections between local elected authorities and citizens, while allowing citizens to address collectively issues of the practice of local

Clic-Consultants

governance - one citizens manifesto is produced in Arabic);
- One assessment session permits adjusting the methodology in order to improve the toolbox of SUDEL for the implementation of the activities in the remaining four cities;
- Four Local stakeholders are identified in order to support the implementation of SUDEL in other cities;
- Five Local stakeholders are identified for the participation in the study tour

Phase 3: SUDEL National Dialogue Meeting
- Healing the wounds session permits local political leaders to address pending issues from the experience of electoral competition at the local level;
- Citizen dialogue strengthens the connections between local elected authorities and citizens, while allowing citizens to address collectively issues of the practice of local governance - four citizens manifesto is produced in Arabic;
- Assessment sessions permit adjusting the methodology in order to improve the toolbox of SUDEL for the implementation of the activities in the remaining four cities;
- Local stakeholders are identified to support the implementation of SUDEL in other cities;
- Local stakeholders are identified for the participation in the study tour.

Phase 4 Study Tour to Spain.
- 10 Representatives brought to Madrid, Spain to learn from transitional experiences in other countries and to discuss key challenges for Libya in the light of that experience.

Phase 5: Second LEAD Training Cascades & Final Workshops Civic Engagement
- 375 Electoral representatives trained in Leadership and Conflict Management Skills for Electoral Stakeholders (LEAD) in 5 cities across Libya – Three sessions with 25 participants per city.
- 1 Local Citizen Debate held in each city with all participants (75 per city) of the LEAD training sessions.

Project Management:

The SUDEL Project Board, which consists of consortium member representatives, is in charge of the management and coordination of the SUDEL Project. ECES, as the consortium leader, has convened and chaired coordination meetings. In support of the SUDEL project Board, the Executive Director of ECES will serve as SUDEL Project Coordinator, assuming the overall responsibility for the project implementation. He has been supported by ECES Head of Programmes and an ECES Project Associate in ECES Headquarters in Brussels. Furthermore, a Senior Program Officer worked for Club de Madrid The in-country management/coordination team in Tripoli has been responsible for the implementation of the project in collaboration with the SUDEL Project Coordinator. This included providing support services to the consortium partners in the implementation of project activities, recruitment of project staff and consultants, narrative and financial monitoring and reporting. During the first half of the project, the in country team in-country team was headed by a Project Director who also served as senior advisor specifically for the reconciliation part of the project.

Implementation Method: the Project.

1. The **location** is centred on five cities (Tripoli, Benghazi, Zliten, Zawia and Derna) where local elections were foreseen in the near future at the start of the project. However, civic education, capacity development and reconciliation are to benefit Libya as a whole.

2. In the volatile political setting that is currently defining democracy building in Libya., **Flexibility** is necessary to make it possible to take advantage of specific opportunities when they arise as well as to potentially re-direct existing activities in case circumstances become unfavourable.

3. Close communication with the EU ensured throughout, particularly when specific issues and challenges arise, that would impact on the implementation of Project activities as foreseen.

4. Equal participation and engagement of women and youth mainstreamed throughout

5. Development of **synergies** and complementarities with ongoing initiatives by European Union, including the on-going project implemented by IDEA and ECES, and other actors such as the World Bank, UN, and IFES etc. Close collaboration between the different actors involved is essential to harmonize activities and avoid duplication of efforts.

6. **Local ownership** of the Project process and the results lies at the heart of the project. The SUDEL Project draws upon the existing experiences and needs of key stakeholders.

7. Capacity development efforts will build local and sustainable capacities among political parties, electoral administrations, civil society, security forces etc. All training materials will be made available to local stakeholders that can replicate the trainings for their colleagues and associates. Specific trainings in the field of domestic observation will further promote ownership and transparency in local electoral processes as a whole.

8. **Sustainability** and potential **multiplying effects** will be systematically factored into the project activities.

The project ended its activities on 30 June.

2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is to provide Local Elections Committees, Local Councils, Civil Society Organisations and Local Level Politicians in Libya, the relevant external cooperation services of the European Commission and the wider public with sufficient information to:

- Make an overall independent assessment about the past performance of the project/ programme, paying particularly attention to the results and if possible the impact of the project actions against its objectives;
- Identify key lessons and propose practical recommendations for the implementation and follow-up of the project if additional funds become available.
- Determine whether the project was implemented in an efficient and effective way.

The ex ante evaluation is to ensure that the Programme Components are being executed in accordance with the stipulated conditions and the desired benefits have been achieved.

The beneficiaries of the evaluation are the Local Elections Committees, Local Councils, Civil Society Organisations and Local Level Politicians in Libya and the EC

Specific objective
The specific objective of this assignment is to analyse the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project with regard to its purpose, objectives, expected results and impact (as established in the Development Assistance Committee guidelines).

3. Requested services, including suggested methodology:

The Consultant is required to carry out this assignment in accordance with the Project Cycle Management Guidelines[1] and the Evaluation Methodology of the European Commission[2].

The evaluation will carry out:
- a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the activities carried out since the beginning of the project;
- an identification and description of the problems (technical and /or managerial) encountered by the project, proposing possible measures to overcome them.

The evaluation shall be based on a participatory approach, involving beneficiaries and all stakeholders concerned and can be in accordance with the OECD's Development Assistance Committee's (DAC) agreed set of standard international criteria to guide all evaluations of development assistance. The DAC criteria are as follows:

- Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities, and partners' and donors' policies.
- Effectiveness: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/ inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) are converted to results.
- Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long term benefits.

4. Methodological aspects

Key issues to be addressed in the final evaluation of the project are as follows:

Relevance:

Assess the continuing appropriateness and relevance of the Design. The project context, threats and opportunities may have changed during the course of the project. Assess what adjustments have been made and what others would have been necessary. The evaluation analysis of relevance will therefore focus, without being limited to, on the following:

- To what extent did the project respond to priority issues?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
- Did the project team plan the most appropriate strategies?
- Complementary and coherence with related activities undertaken elsewhere by Government or other donors, at the same level or at a higher level.
- Whether stakeholders care about the project and believe it makes sense?

---

[1]   http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/europeaid/documents/pcm_guidelines_2004_en.pdf

[2] http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm

Effectiveness:

Assess the major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. As far as possible this should be a systematic assessment of progress based on the planned Goal, Objectives and Strategic Activities. The evaluation analysis of effectiveness will therefore focus, without being limited to, on the following:

- Whether the planned benefits are delivered and received, as perceived mainly by the key beneficiaries.
- Whether behavioural patterns have changed in beneficiary organisations at various levels; and how far the changed institutional arrangements and characteristics have produced the planned improvements.
- How unplanned results may have affected the benefits received
- Describe any major failures of the project to date, explaining why they have occurred.
- Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).
- Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice.

Efficiency of planning and implementation

Assess to what extent resources are being used economically to deliver the project.
Are plans being used, implemented and adapted as necessary? For example:
- Is the overall project action plan used and up to date?
- What % of activities in the workplan is being delivered?
- Is monitoring data being collected as planned, stored and used to inform future plans

Assess other programme management factors important for delivery, such as:
- Capacity gaps (these could be in the project team, other internal functions such as HR or Finance, or external organisations as appropriate).
- Working relationships within the team
- Working relationships with partners, stakeholders and donors
- Learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects.
- Internal coordination and external visibility.

Impact:

To what extent is the project contributing to a long-term positive effect on democracy and national reconciliation in Libya.

If there were unplanned impacts, how have they affected the overall impact?

Sustainability:

The sustainability relates to whether the positive outcomes of the project at purpose level are likely to continue after external funding ends, and also whether its longer-term impact on the wider development process can also be sustained at the level of the sector, or country.

The evaluation analysis of sustainability will therefore focus, without being limited to, on the following:

- Is there evidence of local ownership of objectives and achievement
- Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/ will ensure

- continuity of project activities in the project area?
- Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, upscaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? Is such replication or magnification likely?
- How far has national policy corresponded, have there been Sustainable change to institutional capacity
- Wherever relevant, were **crosscutting issues** such as gender equity, and tribal relations taken into account by the project.

5. Expert Profile

Education, experience, references of the expert:

The candidate must possess:
- Master degree in Law, Politics/ Social Science, International Relations or any other discipline relevant to the assignment.
- or equivalent professional experience of at least 5 years.

General Professional Experience

He/She will have at least 5 years of professional experience in the evaluation/implementation/follow up or monitoring of Projects.

Specific Professional Experience

At least 3 years of professional experience in the evaluation/implementation/follow up or monitoring of Projects in the field of electoral assistance and democratic governance.

The expert must be familiar with Project Cycle Management and Logical Framework Approach.

Working experience within Election Technical Assistance projects and/or Election Observation Mission will be an asset.

He/she must be fluent in Arabic and English, and computer literate.

Location and Duration

Starting period:
The start of the Evaluation is planned for 1st December 2013

Foreseen finishing period / duration of the evaluation :

The foreseen duration from the start of the evaluation until the submission of the final report is a maximum of 30 **calendar days**.

Planning including the period for notification for placement of the staff:

A kickoff meeting will be organized with all the relevant stakeholders upon arrival of the

consultant in Libya.

5 days of preparation to be summarised in a Launch note to be sent to the contracting authority.
10 days on activities related to the Final Evaluation exercise in Libya (place of assignment).
5 days for report writing.

Locations of assignment

The location of the assignment will be in Benghazi with travel to other locations in Libya, or home based for the team leader.

REPORTING

The Consultant will submit the following reports:

Launch note

Prior to travelling to Libya, the Consultant will submit a Launch note stating the main issues/ questions to be addressed on the assignment.

Draft Final Report

A Draft Report (of maximum 15 pages using) the structure set out in **Annex 2** shall be submitted to ECES in electronic copy not later than **20 days** following the completion of the work in Libya. Comments on the Draft Report shall be sent to the Consultants within **20 days** from the date of receipt of the Draft Report.

Final Report

The Consultants shall submit their Final Report in electronic copy no later than **20 days** following the receipt of the comments on the report to ECES.

Language

All reports have to be prepared and submitted in English.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

The lump sum will include:
- International travel, included visa.
- Fees