

Evaluation title	Evaluation of the Nutrition Components of the Algeria PRRO 200301 January 2013 – December 2017	Evaluation report number	DE/DZCO/2017/001
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Algeria	PHQA date	January 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 73%		Meets requirements: 9 points	
<p>The evaluation of the Nutrition Components of the Algeria PRRO from January 2013 to December 2017 meets requirements. The report has a good summary and presents well the context, purpose and scope of the evaluation. The findings and analysis section is comprehensive and is followed by a set of informative and balanced conclusions. Gender and equity dimensions are well addressed throughout the report and the recommendations are of high quality. The report could have benefited from a more comprehensive presentation of the evaluation subject and of the methodology.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The summary is well prepared and presents all requested information, including on evaluation purpose, period, and scope. The evaluation subject, the users and the main features of the methodology (with the exclusion of the evaluation questions which are omitted) are described in detail. Although the key findings are well summarized, they are presented together with conclusions, with implications on the completeness and usefulness of the section.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Approaches
The quality of this section is mixed, with much of the required information being omitted or placed under other sections of the report. Examples include the gender disaggregation of refugee population, the geographic scope, the budget-related information and the main partners, among others. On the positive side elements such as the evaluation duration and delivery modalities are included.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The contextual information provided is comprehensive and relevant, including key data and trends for Sahrawi refugees' camps and a detailed description of support provided by international organisations. Challenges faced by women and children living in the area are also addressed and adequately presented. The purpose, objectives, period of evaluation, and main stakeholders are all explicitly specified. The different sections of the overview, context and purpose would have benefited from a clearer separation to enhance their accessibility.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Approaches
The section lacks specific reference to ethical safeguards and does not provide enough information on mitigation efforts against the identified data gaps. Sampling is only briefly mentioned and findings from previous evaluations or reviews are not applied as sources of data. Finally, some evaluation criteria are missing from the evaluation matrix, which is prominently structured around the main evaluation questions. The matrix is not very clear about what benchmarks have been applied to assess performance. On the other hand, the evaluation criteria are used consistently throughout the narrative of the report and the EQs and sub-questions are well defined and answerable.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
The findings are balanced, with both positive and negative aspects of the nutrition component presented in the report. Data limitations, unintended results and reasons for achievement and underachievement are also discussed in detail. However, while findings are transparently generated and sourced, the results of the interviews could have been further triangulated with quantitative analysis to substantiate the analysis. Furthermore, lack of evidence prevents some evaluation question (e.g. under efficiency and sustainability criteria) from being answered.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
The conclusions section is of high quality and no shortcomings emerge. The logical flow from the key findings to conclusions is given and evidence is well summarised in the section.		

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The gender and equity dimensions are well addressed in the evaluation report. Evaluation questions and interview guides included specific references to the Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions and women were specifically targeted during focus group discussions and interviews to promote their participation in the evaluation process. Both findings and recommendations address gender and equity. However, criteria and indicators could have been designed better to capture gender aspects, especially to measure gender transformation and empowerment of women.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The recommendations are relevant, comprehensive, specific and actionable. They are realistic and consider the capacity limitations of WFP in the Tidouf area. Furthermore, their sequencing and prioritization is clear and the timeframe for their implementation is provided. This section does not contain any major weaknesses.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The report is well presented and shows good accessibility to the intended users. The use of tables and graphics enhance readability and key messages are effectively summarised throughout the document. The language used is clear and the tone is balanced and appropriate.</p>		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	9

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Meets requirements: 60–74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
	0–3 points = Missing requirements