

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Algeria WFP Interim Country Strategic Plan 2019-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized - CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly satisfactory: 93%	
The Evaluation of Algeria WFP Interim Country Strategic Plan (ICSP) 2019-2022 presents credible and useful findings that evaluation users can rely on with a high degree of confidence. It is professionally written, well organized and accessible, discussing aspects of the national context in a way that is relevant to understanding the situation of the Sahrawi refugees in Algeria, although a description of the main stakeholders of the evaluation could have been added. A description of the methodological design and appropriate data collection methods is included, with methodological limitations along with mitigation strategies for each. Findings provide answers to all evaluation questions and are presented in an impartial fashion, with a good balance between the strengths and weaknesses of the ICSP performance, supported by substantial evidence. The conclusions and recommendations are logically derived from the findings and reflect gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE)-related and wider equity and inclusion aspects. Recommendations are practical, feasible and prioritized, with a timeline for action. However, implications of findings for the future of the ICSP could have been systematically identified in the conclusions. Moreover, beyond protection and gender, the recommendations could have reflected broader equity and inclusion dimensions.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly satisfactory
The report summary includes a brief introduction to the subject of the evaluation and highlights the key evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations. It succinctly and clearly summarizes the evaluation main findings under the main evaluation questions, including findings on the cross-cutting issues of protection, gender, and inclusion. Conclusions are well summarized, while recommendations are reproduced from the main report. However, the key stakeholders of the evaluation could have been included in the introduction to the summary.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly satisfactory
The report discusses relevant aspects of the national context and includes a description of Algeria 's demographic situation, the livelihood and food security issues in the country, and the international assistance to Algeria. Reference is made to past evaluations which informed the design of the ICSP. The report discusses the ICSP theory of change, the general evolution of the ICSP over time, and indicates how the gender dimension was integrated in the ICSP. However, the overview could have referred to the specific ways in which the ICSP interventions responded to the needs of other vulnerable groups, such as disabled persons and single parent-led households.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
The purpose and objectives of the evaluation (accountability and learning), the scope, as well as the main users of the evaluation are clearly outlined. Protection, accountability to affected populations, gender, and other equity considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation. However, the report should have included a description of the main stakeholders of the evaluation.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly satisfactory
The OECD-DAC criteria, which guided the evaluation (i.e., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coverage, coherence, and connectedness), are presented, with associated evaluation questions. The evaluation matrix is structured around the evaluation questions and sub-questions. For each question, indicators, data sources, and data analysis methods are well defined. The report effectively discusses the methodological design, as well as the appropriateness of data collection methods, and methodological limitations are included along with mitigation strategies for each. A discussion on the ethical standards that were followed by the evaluation team is included in the report. However, the report would have benefited from an analysis of whether sufficient data was collected on specific		

results indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results, as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS**Rating****Satisfactory**

Findings provide answers to all evaluation questions, in line with the evaluation criteria, and this is done in an impartial fashion, with a good deal of evidence from different sources, balancing the strengths and weaknesses of the ICSP performance. The report systematically compares the planned versus achieved results. While the findings are generally supported by the sources corresponding to the stakeholder groups that were consulted, they do not consistently refer to specific groups, such as women, when describing perceptions or experience vis-à-vis WFP interventions. Finally, while unanticipated positive effects of the WFP support are described, the report could have been strengthened with an analysis of positive or negative unanticipated effects on human rights and gender equality, as well as WFP performance against the humanitarian principles of humanity and independence.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS**Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The report presents conclusions that provide a high-level analysis of the evaluation findings. Conclusions are introduced by an overall assessment and organized under a number of themes, demonstrating a balance between the evaluation subject's strengths and challenges. Conclusions are logically linked to, and clearly derived from, the findings, while not introducing any information that was not already presented and discussed in the findings section, reflecting GEWE-related and wider equity and inclusion aspects, and provide a reflection on the ICSP's underlying assumptions. However, the future implications of findings could have been consistently addressed in the conclusions.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS**Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The evaluation presents recommendations that are logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. Recommendations are practical and feasible as they consider the implementation context and potential WFP limitations. Furthermore, recommendations reflect protection and gender issues although they could have reflected broader equity and inclusion dimensions. Finally, recommendations identify responsible/lead actors and supporting entities, are consistently classified as strategic and operational, with their level of prioritization (medium or high) and timeline for action identified.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY**Rating****Highly Satisfactory**

The report meets WFP length requirements for CSP evaluations and uses professional language, ensuring the clarity of the information presented. Data sources are consistently provided and cross-references within the report are accurate and clearly signposted. The report effectively highlights key messages in bold throughout. All requested annexes are included in the report and clearly indicated in the table of contents, as well as all lists required for this type of report. However, the report would have benefited from a final copy edit to correct some minor typos.

Integration of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score**Meets requirements: 7 points**

GEWE aspects and other equity considerations were mainstreamed in the evaluation through specific questions and relevant strategies were used to ensure that data was collected and analysed on these aspects. The evaluation methods included data sources and processes that allowed for the engagement of a variety of the ICSP's stakeholders with ethical standards followed throughout to ensure the dignity and confidentiality of the people involved in the evaluation. Systematic triangulation of data from these sources validated findings and avoided bias in the evaluative judgment. The report includes a good discussion of the gender situation with regard to the Sahrawi refugees in Algeria. While the findings present evidence from the different stakeholder groups that were consulted, the report could have consistently referred to specific groups such as women when describing their perceptions or experience vis-à-vis WFP interventions. Moreover, while unanticipated positive effects of the WFP support are described in the report, no unanticipated effects (positive or negative) on human rights and gender equality are assessed. One recommendation specifically reflects GEWE issues, notably protection and gender.

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.