

## Annual Review - Summary Sheet

This Summary Sheet captures the headlines on programme performance, agreed actions and learning over the course of the review period. It should be attached to all subsequent reviews to build a complete picture of actions and learning throughout the life of the programme.

<b>PROGRAMME TITLE: Algeria North Africa Good Governance Fund (NAGGF)</b>	
<b>Country/Region:</b>	Algeria, North Africa
<b>HMG Partners (LEAD in bold)</b>	<b>Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)</b> , Department for International Development (DFID), Ministry of Defence (MOD), Home Office, National Crime Agency (NCA)
<b>Total Budget:</b>	ODA: £2.08m      Non-ODA: £0
<b>Start Date: 01 April 2016</b>	<b>End Date: 31 March 2017</b>
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Score</b>
Political 1: Work towards an improved understanding of elected assemblies' systems, practices, capabilities, and entry points for engagement.	A
Political 2: Work contributing towards institutional and human rights reform in the penitentiary system according to latest international standards; and improved social reintegration and reduced likelihood of reoffending.	B
Economic 1: Tools and structures are introduced to support teachers with their skills, understanding and confidence.	A
Economic 2: Universities develop graduate employability strategies, university students and unemployed graduates have enhanced job search, core employability and entrepreneurial skills, and the capacity of key governmental labour market actors and universities to link graduates to the job market is strengthened.	A
Economic 3: Students leaving the main Management and Engineering schools have improved creativity and entrepreneurial skills, and are "job creators" instead of "job seekers". Also, the support services provided by "innovation incubator" organisations are enhanced and the entrepreneurial ecosystem is stimulated.	A
<b>Outcome:</b>	
Political: Accelerated political reforms; promoting a more inclusive political system; increasing engagement with formal politics and more responsive state/citizen interaction, especially better human rights protection in detention facilities.	
Economic: Accelerated economic reforms; promoting a more diversified economy with more jobs and young people better equipped to get jobs.	
<b>Outcome Score: N/A</b>	<b>Risk: Medium</b>

### Summary of Programme Performance

Year	<b>2016/17</b>							
Programme Score	<b>B</b>							
Risk Rating	<b>Medium</b>							

### What support is the UK providing?

In 2016/17 the UK supported a number of projects in Algeria through the North Africa Good Governance Fund (NAGGF), with total spend of £2.08m in support of the North Africa National Security Council Strategy.

The Algeria programme team, in consultation with cross-Whitehall colleagues, decided early on that they would focus on two strands: economic and political support. This is a decision that they have decided to take forward into this financial year (2017/18).

### Summary of progress and lessons learnt/actions taken since last review

This is the first year for NAGGF/CSSF in Algeria. We note that the programme team needed additional training and resources to manage the new programme efficiently and effectively. The team is now fully staffed, though some areas of knowledge need to be reinforced.

Despite the challenges, Post and the programme team have worked hard to embed the Country Board into Embassy activities. This has been very successful and the Embassy as a whole are active participants at the regular Country Boards. This has been a success and should be continued.

### **Summary of recommendations for the next year**

All team members should use their results framework as a tool to measure project progress, track results and to hold implementing partners to account. The results framework is a key tool to help the programme team monitor project performance. Implementers should disaggregate data by age and gender and be encouraged to further work on gender sensitivity.

The programme team must ensure they keep in close contact with implementers to ensure the team are kept up to date of any issues and check activities thoroughly on respective projects. This should allow the programme team to make effective decisions about funding and activities in a timely manner, reducing the likelihood of underspend or ineffective spend on projects.

The Embassy/programme team should regularly hold meetings with other donors to ensure donor funds are complementary and don't duplicate activities. This should ensure funding is used more efficiently, resulting in better impact and value for money. As well as this, the programme team should consider using the NAGGF Technical Assistance Facility to map all the donor funding in sectors they are interested in, assess where the UK comparative advantage lies and understand how female participation can be increased.

The programme team should look to replicate its good relationship with the political team to other teams in the Embassy, e.g. the commercial team.

The Algeria Programme Board should be widened to cover other funding streams, including the Global Britain Fund, to ensure suitable expertise is utilised to support the development of new projects and coordination between them.

In 2017/18, the team should consider context sensitivity more deeply across the portfolio so as not to exacerbate any existing tensions.

Conversations by the review team with one particular implementer raised a number of quality concerns which need further investigation by the new Deputy Head of Programmes or Head of Programmes. Further discussions with the implementer have allowed the reviewers and programme team to reassure themselves that the concerns were unfounded and the project is delivering effectively.

The evidence underpinning some projects in the education sector seemed weak and the programme team should consider what evidence needs to be gathered to ensure that programme design is sound for the Algerian context and fit for purpose to meet the NSC strategy for North Africa. The programme team should remain alert to the risk of some projects taking up a disproportionate amount of management time and escalate if required.

The programme team need to build on their work this year to achieve value for money in the portfolio in 2017/18, going beyond driving down costs of proposals. The team should also adopt a consistent approach to risk at project level, in addition to their commendable work at portfolio level. Key risks and corresponding mitigations should be discussed regularly with implementing partners. This will ensure the necessary experience and knowledge to ensure resilience in the team's financial management.