
Overall Assessment: The present document does not qualify as a CP evaluation report. Instead of structuring the report along a set of evaluation questions and/or DAC criteria (as suggested in ToR), the scope of the assessment consists of a broad screening of activities under the 3 mandate areas. As such, this report amounts to a type of “implementation monitoring” exercise which does not result in any added value. The report does not provide any indication that a methodological design was developed and it seems that only a documentary review and a few interviews (the annex lists only 12 interviewees) were implemented. As a result, data is scarce and the report’s findings and analysis are entirely confined to a rapid assessment of activities without any discussion of progress towards results. Conclusions and recommendations are respectively largely limited to a few human resources and management concerns or long developments on a couple of possible priority areas for the next CP. The very unsatisfactory quality of the report (both form – e.g.; it does not contain an Executive Summary, and substance) is particularly striking in view of the ToR whose demands in terms of questions (and related DAC criteria), focus (on results) and methodology, although not very detailed, were sufficiently clear.

Quality Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acronyms; i) Exec Summary; ii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned (where applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory: The document does not qualify as a CP “evaluation report” (see below criteria 2 to 8 and in particular the absence of reference to the DAC evaluation criteria), even in terms of structure (e.g.; the report opens with a very long (about 50% of the report) description of demographic trends in Algeria which does not specifically relate to the CP evaluation). Furthermore there is neither an executive summary nor methodology section; the introduction (1 page and half) amounts to a very broad presentation of the CP’s 3 components. In the Indicators Table, it is of concern that the evaluators forgot to provide the Maternal Mortality ratio (while, on the other hand, choosing to indicate Algeria’s inflation rate!)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Executive Summary
To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.

Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):
- i) Purpose, including intended audience(s);
- ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para);
- iii) Methodology (1 para);
- iv) Main Conclusions (1 para);
- v) Recommendations (1 para).

**Unsatisfactory:** The report does not include an executive summary.

## 3. Design and Methodology
To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools

Minimum content and sequence:
- Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;
- Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;
- Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;
- Details of participatory stakeholders’ consultation process are provided.
- Whenever relevant, specific attention to cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender equality) in the design of the evaluation

**Unsatisfactory:** The report does not present any information whatsoever on the methodology, nor do the annexes provide any methodology-related instruments. When evaluators make a vague reference to interviews (“entretiens”, p.40) they do not mention with whom. The annex lists 12 interviewees only. Overall it is not quite clear how the little information presented in the report was gathered beyond a rather superficial documentary review.

## 4. Reliability of Data
To clarify data collection processes and data quality

- Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;
- Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit;

**Unsatisfactory:** Data is very scarce and is mainly concerned with the achievement status of activities. The reliability of data cannot easily be established since sources are, by large, not mentioned (e.g it is not clear if data are based upon field visits? Where? Are they based on interviews? With whom?) There is no indication that any triangulation was performed. The very brief list of documents listed in annex (1 page and a half) provides a number of very general documents often not directly related to UNFPA’s programme, at times very old (going back to 1992) and mostly concerned with statistical data.

## 5. Findings and Analysis
To ensure sound analysis and credible findings

**Findings**
- Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;
- Findings are substantiated by evidence;

**Unsatisfactory:** The report (sections V to VIII) consists of a very broad review of activities planned/implemented within the 3 mandate areas. The evaluators make no attempt to analyze UNFPA’s contribution and the extent to which CO’s activities
Findings are presented in a clear manner. Analyses: Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; contextual factors are identified. Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained. It may have led to the achievement of CPAP outcomes. In the RH and P&D mandate area sections, the tables “État d’exécution du projet” (listing: activities, corresponding IPs and implementation status) pertain to some kind of “rapid implementation monitoring” which is of little use for this evaluation. The P&D section is almost entirely confined to such a table (see pp.41-45) while the very superficial narrative (in sections V through VIII) is not structured around the DAC criteria (which are never mentioned within the report) — nor a set of evaluation questions (see below criteria 8).

6. Conclusions
To assess the validity of conclusions
- Conclusions are based on credible findings;
- Conclusions are organized in priority order;
- Conclusions must convey evaluators’ unbiased judgment of the intervention.

Unsatisfactory: Conclusions and recommendations are grouped under a single section (p.54). In line with the “implementation monitoring” approach by the evaluators which characterizes the report, the one-page concluding part of the section does not amount to proper conclusions but, rather, largely consists of a brief discussion on one single issue: human resources/staff concerns (and particularly those related to DNP – “directeurs nationaux de Projets”).

7. Recommendations
To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations
- Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;
- Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible;
- Recommendations must take into account stakeholders’ consultations whilst remaining impartial;
- Recommendations should be presented in priority order

Unsatisfactory: Recommendations do not refer to the conclusions (which, as mentioned above are no conclusions as such) and are clustered in 3 categories:
(i) beneficiaries’ recommendations on projects’ execution: 3 very brief points, rather vague as no guidance is provided regarding their implementation;
(ii) a very long development (rather than precise and actionable recommendations) on (youth and the elderly) presented as “two possible priority themes” for the next country programme;
(iii) 12 bullet points which are not proper recommendations on South/South cooperation (an issue that was briefly discussed in 4 lines in conclusions section).
8. Meeting Needs
To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the report).

**Unsatisfactory:** The gap between the evaluation report and the ToR (annexed to the Report) is very striking. ToR made a very specific reference to the DAC criteria (sections 2 and 3) and also provided a list of 8 specific questions. ToR also explicitly requested the evaluators to assess the results (“appréciation fiables sur les résultats atteints” – p.76) and, to this end, specifically requested the evaluators to: (i) develop a methodology (including documentary review, focus-groups, interviews, field visits and other methods as necessary) and (ii) use a diversity of data the validation of which must be explained (p.68). It is unclear why, in spite of such a discrepancy between the deliverable and ToR, the final report was cleared by CO’s evaluation manager.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)</th>
<th>Assessment Levels (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Findings and analysis (50)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclusions (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recommendations (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting needs (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column – see: EQA Explanatory Notes at: http://web2.unfpa.org/public/about/oversight/evaluations/templates.unfpa

OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Unsatisfactory