



Organizational unit: **Algeria** Year of report: **2022**

Title of evaluation report: **Évaluation finale du 6ème Programme UNFPA- ALGÉRIE 2017-2021**

Overall quality of report: **Good** Date of assessment: **21 02/2022**

Overall comments: This evaluation provides a solid overview of the 6th Program UNFPA-ALGERIA 2017-2021. Evaluators adopted a mixed-methods approach to collect qualitative as well as quantitative data; it was carefully structured and appropriate to cover cross-cutting issues (vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality, and human rights). A stakeholder mapping exercise was conducted and provided the basis for the selection of interviews and site visits. Evaluators developed a comprehensive evaluation matrix and, as per good practice, used it to record key findings and preliminary recommendations. The finding section is organized by evaluation question and focuses primarily on output level results. Recommendations appear to provide useful directions for subsequent work but could include further information on their human, financial and technical implications. People with disabilities (PVD) are covered in the evaluation scope and in two of the evaluation questions (under relevance) as part of marginalized and vulnerable groups. As such, Findings reflect a disability analysis, and one of the recommendations focuses on improving the sensitivity of monitoring indicators for gender and vulnerable populations including adolescents/young people, and people with disabilities. The main shortcomings of the report are that it does not include a clear description of ethical considerations, the names and contact information of evaluation participants are shown, and data sources are not consistently presented in the findings section.

Assessment Levels: **Very Good** (strong, above average, best practice) **Good** (satisfactory, respectable) **Fair** (with some weaknesses, still acceptable) **Unsatisfactory** (weak, does not meet minimal quality standards)

Quality Assessment Criteria Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)

I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
--	----------------------	-------------------	------------------

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Partial	The report is clearly structured and easy to follow. The language is appropriate although there is no use of rights-based terminology.
2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	Yes	At 63 pages, the report is reasonable in length for a country programme evaluation.
3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?	Yes	Annexes are complete and include all required elements as well as additional information about the programme, and a checklist of the monitoring system

Executive summary

4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; Vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	Yes	The Executive Summary includes all required elements.
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	At 5 pages, the executive summary is reasonable in length.

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	A clear explanation of Algeria's country context is provided, including a sociodemographic, economic, and health profile; country challenges; reproductive health issues and needs; persistent gender situation and inequalities; and the role of foreign assistance.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Yes	The evaluators used a theory-based approach and created a ToC to identify the factors that aided in the attainment of the outputs and their contribution to the results, as well as those that impeded or obstructed their success.	
<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	Yes	A consolidated evaluation matrix is provided in Annex 4.2. It includes criteria, evaluation questions, assumptions to check, indicators, sources of information, and data collection methods and tools. Additionally, it has key findings and proposed recommendations. A results framework is also provided in the annexes.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The four main methods of data collection used by the evaluators are clearly described including desk review, semi-structured interviews using videoconference (ZOOM) , individual and group interviews using videoconference (ZOOM), and direct observations. The purpose and rationale of their selection is also clear.	
5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	Yes	It is noted that the evaluation team conducted a stakeholder mapping exercise. Annex 6 presents the distribution of selected and visited entities by component and by region. Figure 1.3 (Main steps in the evaluation process) shows review of the draft report was done by the ERG and ASRO regional office.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	Evaluators briefly note that content analysis was used for data collected from the various interviews (individual and group) to identify the main trends and strong ideas. It would have been useful for this to have been expanded upon and the processes for analyzing documents and site observation data also discussed.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	Limitations and their mitigation strategies are clearly described on page 14. Limitations are mostly related to the COVID-19 pandemic.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy, including the criteria used to select regions and participants, is described on page 11.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The data collection tools and evaluation matrix are designed to capture data that is disaggregated by gender, disability and age. Gender-disaggregated data is evident in the evaluation findings.	
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Evaluators employed an appropriate methodology to cover cross-cutting issues (vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality, and human rights). This is primarily done by incorporating cross-cutting issues into the data collection tools.	
3. Reliability of Data			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	The evaluators ensured triangulation through cross-comparison of the four data collection methods used (documentary review, interviews, focus groups, and direct observations) and by cross-checking with various sources.	

2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected from sources including through semi-structured individual interviews with 21 heads of entities, and 3 individual and 4 group interviews with rightsholders. Data reliability is referred to in the discussion on Evaluability, Constraints and Difficulties (section 1.3.5)
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	No	There is one sentence on page 13 that briefly discusses confidentiality of the information collected and informed consent. However, it would have been useful to more fully explain ethical considerations including their application. More problematic is that the annexed list of evaluation participants includes names and contact information, including of youth beneficiaries, and that one of the quotes in the report identifies the youth respondent by name.
4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Fair
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Partial	There is unevenness in the extent to which Findings are substantiated by qualitative and quantitative evidence. Participant quotes identify the stakeholder group and there is some citing of document sources but this could be more specific (i.e., on page 40 it is noted that "a qualitative survey was carried out in 2019" - data from that was cited, however the name of the survey/report is not provided).
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for the interpretation is shown where possible. For example, under Added Value, it is noted that "support for the audit of maternal deaths has led to the development of guidelines for conduct that will contribute to improving the quality of obstetric care and continuing the downward trend in maternal mortality. Furthermore, the technical and financial support for the realization of the MICS6 has made a significant contribution to providing the Government with reliable data, including on vulnerable groups, for decision-making on public policies".
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The findings are organized by evaluation questions. Under each question there is a brief summary provided of the findings, adding further clarity.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	Causal linkages between outputs and results are reported where feasible - one example being that midwives and service users feel that the provision of ultrasound scanners has improved health services (p. 38) - although a main finding under Effectiveness suggests that under achievement of outputs limited the extent to which higher level results could be observed. Unintended results are not addressed, even though that aspect is mentioned in the ToR.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	This is done. For example, evaluators identify that the monitoring & evaluation system does not have tools adapted to the specificities of the interventions implemented and sensitive to gender and vulnerable groups (Adolescents/Young People, People with Disabilities, Elderly People).
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Contextual factors are identified where appropriate. For example, it is noted that "The overall strategy of specific external communication adapted to the context of Algeria aims to transmit messages of awareness and advocacy on the issues of SR / FP, gender and the fight against GBV, demographic dividend which have a positive impact without hitting taboos and the traditional barriers which are legion".
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues such as gender, vulnerability, and disability are adequately covered in the findings. This is the focus of questions on Relevance and Effectiveness - where, for example, the analysis suggest that rights holders could be more involved in needs assessment processes, and points to accomplishments such as the support for raising awareness of women with disabilities.

5. Conclusions	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The conclusions are based on findings and organized by strategic and programmatic conclusions.	
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	Conclusions are adequately forward looking and cover both strengths and weaknesses of the intervention. Cross-cutting issues such as gender, equity, and human rights are addressed in this section. However, the Conclusions extend over 4 pages and mostly replicate the questions and summary statements found in the findings. As such, they do not add significant insight. This section could be improved if it did not include the evaluation questions, and offered a more succinct and higher level overview of the evaluation results for each criterium.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no indication of bias.	
6. Recommendations			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	Recommendations are briefly presented and state the conclusions on which they are based.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The 10 recommendations are directed towards UNFPA Country Office. They are very briefly presented and most would be more action-oriented if there was further information on their human, financial and technical implications. An example of where more explanation could have been provided is R 7, "Put in place a mechanism for continuous capacity building of staff to mitigate the negative impact of multiple functions on efficiency."	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Recommendations appear to be balanced. One of the recommendations focuses on improving the sensitivity of monitoring indicators to gender and vulnerable populations (adolescents/young people, people with disabilities, the elderly, etc.).	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	Recommendations are ranked in three levels of priority, from 1 (high) to 3 (low).	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>			
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?		<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) The assessment of GEEW is included in the scope of the evaluation= 3</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3) Gender is mainstreamed into the evaluation criteria and questions as a cross-cutting issue = 3</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) Yes, there is a specific question = 3</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?(Score: 0-3) The background and findings section presents gender and age-disaggregated data. = 3</p>	
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?		<p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) It appears that an appropriate approach was used; for example, the data collection tools for KIs and FGDs collect data to assess HRGE. However, it would have been beneficial if the evaluators had an explicit description of how the methodology was gender-responsive. = 2</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3) An appropriate mixed-methods approach was used = 3</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) In order to achieve triangulation, a diverse range of data sources and stakeholders were consulted. = 3</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3) The stakeholders consulted by the evaluators included representative entities for women's rights and people with disabilities. = 3</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) There is a brief statement describing confidentiality of the information collected and informed consent. However, confidentiality was not maintained as evaluation participants, including youth beneficiaries, and their contact information is provided. = 0</p>	

<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3) Gender issues, such as gender inequality and gender-based violence, are adequately covered in the context section. = 3</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3) The findings section contains an extensive discussion on issues related to gender. = 3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) Unintended outcomes of the intervention on human rights and gender equality are not noted. = 0</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3) One of the recommendations focuses on gender and vulnerable populations including adolescents/young people, people with disabilities, and the elderly. = 3</p>
--	---

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.

(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	Assessment Levels (**)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)	7			
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			
3. Reliability of data (11)		11		
4. Analysis and findings (40)			40	
5. Conclusions (11)		11		
6. Recommendations (11)		11		
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	27	33	40	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Good			