

## AFRICAN EVALUATION ASSOCIATION

2006/07 Version



# African Evaluation Guidelines - Standards and Norms

## Preamble.

---

The *African Evaluation Association* (AfrEA) was founded in 1999 to respond to the growing demand in Africa for information sharing, advocacy and advanced capacity building in evaluation. In conjunction with the national associations and committed donors, AfrEA thrive to develop the concept of an African evaluation community. The African Evaluation Guidelines developed and endorsed by African Associations, networks and evaluators present a framework for conducting evaluations that are sensitive to the African context and are in line with international practice, standards and norms for evaluations.

The guidelines for evaluation are ethical principles and quality criteria. They are a set of rules and requirements that are necessary to all stakeholders and applicable throughout the evaluation process. These principles show a shared system of values among all evaluation stakeholders in Africa.

The evaluation standards help enhance independence and impartiality in the conduct of evaluation. They ensure transparency and a participative methodology and create conditions of ownership of evaluation and its results. Also, they aim to standardize methods and upgrade the trustworthiness and usefulness of evaluation.

This edition of the evaluation guidelines, aggregate the various works of stakeholders in the field of evaluation in Africa. It is also in line with the major trends and good practices in evaluation worldwide.

This version takes into account universal standards and promotes requirements justified by the state of evaluation in Africa. It guides the process and products and embraces all sectors and timeframes of the evaluation project. They are maximal and incorporate a pluralist dimension. They help give credit to evaluation stakeholders, make reliable the evaluation processes and better professionalize evaluation in Africa.

---

## Introduction

This document presents the guidelines for evaluators on how evaluations should be framed when conducted in Africa. The purpose of the guidelines is to establish a common understanding of principles to be adhered to by evaluators and those being evaluated. The guidelines seek to increase transparency, coherence and efficiency in generating and using evaluative knowledge for institutional and organizational learning and effective management for results, and to support accountability. The guidelines apply to all evaluators conducting evaluation in Africa and institutions being evaluated in Africa.

The African Evaluation Association subscribes to the international development goals, especially the African Union (AU) and New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) strategic

framework<sup>1</sup> adopted by African Heads of State in July 2001. AfrEA is a continental evaluators network that advocate for change and connect African countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build better lives and achieving sustainable livelihood for all through its efforts of building a platform for standardizing, harmonising and capacity building for African evaluators. AfrEA is committed to building national ownership and capacity development and sharing solutions to challenges in key strategic development areas that requires robust evaluation approaches. It supports the efforts of African governments and institutions in applying known and efficient systems in monitoring and evaluating their developmental efforts.

AfrEA support evaluations that are based on objective assessment of programmes and operations, including advocacy, advisory services, knowledge networks, technical assistance, coordination and partnerships. The association is also committed to ensure that evaluations conducted in Africa improve learning and knowledge for development among stakeholders, especially the users of the evaluation. Engagement of all key stakeholders will enhance capacity for evaluation as well as its utility. The development of knowledge-management systems, learning groups and communities of practice will increase access to knowledge and enhance knowledge-sharing, collaboration and innovation.

## **Background**

During the 1998 UNICEF Regional Evaluation Workshop in Nairobi, a training session was held on the 'Program Evaluation Standards', and a focus group discussion led by African evaluators was conducted on the theme *"Are the US 'Program Evaluation Standards' appropriate for use in African cultures?"* This discussion was followed by a visualized evaluation session on the same topic. A paper describing the proposed modifications to the US PES was produced (Patel & Russon, 1998). Later that year, the Nairobi Monitoring and Evaluation Network discussed this initial draft of modifications to the PES and suggested further changes. The revised draft was presented to and discussed by a group of young researchers in the Kenya Graduate Employment Programme and further amended.

The results of these discussions were presented to a plenary session of the Inaugural Conference of the African Evaluation Association (September 1999), with participation of over 300 African evaluators, as a draft document. Further modifications were suggested. Follow-up discussions were undertaken at the joint World Bank, African Development Bank and South African Development Bank "Regional Workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa" (September, 2000) and at a UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa training workshop on "Monitoring and Evaluation in Emergency Situations" (February 2002).

The 1999 African Evaluation Association Conference recommended that the African Evaluation Guidelines should be reviewed by national networks and associations and field tested in Africa. The same year, field-testing was initially undertaken in two country evaluations (Zambia and Kenya) and in a multi-country evaluation. These results were favourable and further tests were undertaken in 2000 and 2001. By 2002, it became a practice for UNICEF funded evaluations in Eastern and Southern Africa to include the AEG as part of the protocol of 'Terms of Reference' of an evaluation. To date, the Guidelines have been used in many countries in Africa. (Oumoul – can you incorporate the short description of the ongoing pilot exercise)

Over the period 1999-2002, eleven networks and associations of evaluators in Africa<sup>2</sup> reviewed the AEG. All these groups suggested modifications. These eleven groups will present this

---

<sup>1</sup> The NEPAD Framework Document, Abuja, October 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Nairobi M&E Network, African Evaluation Association Secretariat, Réseau Nigérian de Suivi et Evaluation, Cape Verde Evaluation Network, Réseau Malagache de Suivi et Evaluation, Comoros Evaluation Network, Eritrean Evaluation Network, Malawi M&E Network, Réseau National de

consolidated fourth version of the text to the Second African Evaluation Association Conference, in Nairobi in June 2002, for review and formal approval.

In the 2004 AfrEA conference held in Cape Town, South Africa, Dr Mahesh Patel presented the revised version of the 2002 AEG and indicated that these guidelines are still under going a “ongoing process of review by African evaluators and that the guidelines will continue to evolve over time”. One of the key points raised about the AEG in the presentation was that using the guidelines assist evaluators and those being evaluated a clear initial agreement on the task, assessment of the completion of the task, assessment of quality of the evaluation and justification for using results of the evaluation for decision making.

As part of the continuous process of improving the AEG, AfrEA convene a group of 30 African evaluation experts, associations and network members to review and revise the African Evaluation Guidelines in September 2006.(see Annex 4, for the list of participants). This meeting was held in Niamey, Niger and provided a forum to review the previous version of the AEG. AfrEA realised that during implementation of the guidelines, there were number of aspects that need review in the current guidelines, strategies were also required to promote the use of the guidelines by evaluators and adopted by stakeholders as a framework to guide evaluations in Africa. There were gaps that the guidelines needed to address these included the quality of evaluation practice which include technical and scientific quality; ethical and professional control. The Niamey expert group was mandated to meet the following objectives.

- to work out a version improved of the AEG which takes account of the current context, and in particular of the concerns of kind;
- to take note of the state of the debate on the standards and standards of the evaluation in Africa and in the world;
- to look further into the debate on this question with the representatives of national associations and regional networks of African evaluation;
- to examine the level of integration (use) of the guidelines and standards in conducting evaluations in Africa as well as the outcomes for using the guidelines;
- to work out strategies aiming at the promotion and the institutionalisation of the guidelines and standards of evaluation in Africa.

The expert group concluded that the AEG will be guided by four principles with a number of standards for each principle. These standards were defined from the African context and perspective for needs and usefulness of evaluation outcomes. The importance of standardisation and harmonisation of guidelines across African contexts was raised an important issue in ensuring that the meaning of guidelines across languages, especially the translation of guidelines from one language to another, for example French to English or the other way round. There was also an agreement that the AEG must be made to be user friendly for evaluators so as to facilitate operationalisation of the guidelines.

Indeed, the principles and standards contribute, initially, with the framing and the raising of the quality of the evaluation practice (technical and scientific quality, ethical and professional control). Then, they are used to support the formulation of evaluation and professional development. Lastly, they will used in guiding how evaluation methodologies are applied and carried out and they contribute to the credibility and the professionalisation of the field of the evaluation.

### ***The Need for Guidelines***

African evaluators have agreed that it is useful to have a set of quality enhancing guidelines for program evaluation conducted in Africa. This has been informed by the need to improve the quality of evaluative work conducted in Africa and for African needs. Governments, civil society

groupings and donor agencies concerns about program efficacy were often mentioned. African evaluators have also expressed the need and usefulness of having checklists that could be used during the planning, implementation and completing evaluations conducted in Africa in order to ascertain the rigor applied when conducting evaluations and adherence also monitor adherence to the use of the guidelines by evaluators. They wanted to have a good description of what should be covered in the evaluation and what could be omitted. Examples of contracting agencies that added tasks after completion of the report were mentioned.

### ***Rationale for African Evaluation Guidelines***

While there is a strong consensus on the desirability of having guidelines, there has been a lot of discussion over the types of guidelines that should be used for African evaluations. In the early stages of developing the African evaluation guidelines, in 1999, there appeared to be three, somewhat overlapping, perspectives on how the guidelines should be framed.

The first perspective was that it is acceptable to adopt an international model that had sufficient sensitivity to the African context. There were views that the US Program Evaluation Standards (US PES) did not come laden with values that were in conflict with African values. There were also expressions that there were no major cultural barriers to the use of the US Program Evaluation Standards in African countries in its original form.

The second perspective was that it was unacceptable to impose an externally developed set of standards on Africa. Proponents of this view thought that Africa should not 'submit' to a set of standards for which they had not provided any input. They felt that the US PES should either be rewritten with input from African stakeholders, or that African evaluators should develop their own standards. There was a consideration that a set of Africa level guidelines could be developed to allow and create local flexibility in their interpretation, or that each country (and perhaps by implication, institution or agency) should create their own guidelines. (can Moctar revise this paragraph)

The third perspective was that the appropriate procedure would be to test the US PES in field conditions in Africa in order to determine their suitability and to identify any modifications that might be required on a pan-African basis.

From 2000 onwards, a consensus was achieved that a checklist that would be useful for evaluators in Africa could be created through a consultative process and field-testing. This does not exclude further national modifications – indeed even the act of translation into local languages, as has been done in Burundi - is likely to generate local modifications.

### **Guidelines Principles**

The African Evaluation guidelines include 35 standards divided into 4 major principles:

1. Utility principle: for produced information and expected and provided results .
2. Feasibility for realism: cautiousness and efficiency.
3. Respect of ethics: respect of legal and ethical rules.
4. Precision and quality: for a relevant methodology related to the goal and the subject matter of the evaluation

The four principles African Evaluation Guidelines are as follows:

**Utility:** The utility guidelines are intended to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users and be owned by stakeholders.

**Feasibility principle:** The feasibility principle is designed to ensure that evaluation is useful, participative, realistic and efficient.

**Precision and quality:**

**Precision:** this principle aims to ensure that evaluation has resulted in technically relevant data, demonstrating efficiency of project, program and policies to be evaluated.

**Quality:** the principle of quality requires that data collection and analysis methods in evaluation determine relevance, validity and reliability of information resulting from an evaluation.

**Principle of respect and ethics:** These principles safeguard the respect of legal and ethical rules as well as the well being of stakeholders involved in the evaluation or affected by its findings.

**Guidelines standards**

These principles are guided by proposed standards to assist evaluators to incorporate these principles in their evaluation. The proposed standards are not set as a golden standard but an attempt to assist evaluators to have a reference point when designing and conducting their evaluations in Africa.

The following are definitions of these standards for each of the four principles.

**1. Utility**

U1 Evaluation Impact: Evaluations should be planned, conducted, reported and disseminated in a manner and within a timeframe that empowers stakeholders, creates ownership and increases the chances that the findings will be used for effective development.

U2 Stakeholder Identification: Persons and organizations involved in or affected by the evaluation (with special attention to community participants and vulnerable groups) should be identified and included in the evaluation process in a participatory manner, so that their needs can be addressed and so that the evaluation findings are utilizable and owned by stakeholders, to the extent this is useful, feasible and allowed.

U3 Credibility of the Evaluator: The persons conducting the evaluation should be independent and trustworthy. They should have cultural sensitivity, appropriate communication skills and proven competence in evaluation methodology, so that the evaluation process and findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance. When unsure of competencies evaluators should seek to work in teams to ensure complementarities of skills and knowledge for credibility of results.

U4 Credibility of the Evaluation Team: Evaluation teams should be constituted to include proven competence in evaluation methodology and in the specialist area(s) under review, as well as cultural competence.

U5 Information Scope and Selection: Data and information collected should be broadly selected to address pertinent questions and be responsive to the needs and interests of stakeholders, with special attention to vulnerable groups.

U6 Values Identification: The rationale, perspectives and methodology used to interpret the findings should be carefully described so that the bases for value judgments are clear. Multiple interpretations of findings should be transparently reflected, provided that these interpretations respond to stakeholders' concerns and needs for utilization purposes.

U7 Report Clarity: Evaluation reports should clearly and concisely describe what is being evaluated and its context, the purpose, methodology, evidence and findings so that essential information is provided and easily understood.

U8 Reporting Format: The reporting format should be adapted to suit diverse stakeholder needs and increase the chance of use.

U9 Report Dissemination: Significant interim findings and evaluation reports should be disseminated to stakeholders, to the extent that this is useful, feasible and allowed. Comments and feedback of stakeholders on interim findings should be taken into consideration prior to the production of the final report.

U10 Contribution to Knowledge Building: Evaluations should be reported and disseminated to contribute to a body of knowledge that can be accessed and utilized by a wider audience. Evaluators should negotiate issues of authorship, publication and copyrights with commissioners of evaluation so that results /findings will be utilizable to a wider audience to the extent that this is feasible and allowed.

### **Feasibility principle**

F1 Practical procedures: Evaluations methodologies should be practical and appropriate to help data collection if necessary.

F2 Political viability: Evaluation should be planned and conducted in a participative manner in order to achieve total involvement of all stakeholders. It should be prepared and conducted on the basis of scientific principles of neutrality and strictness to avoid disputes conducive to a negative impact on processes and findings as well as on implementation and recommendations.

F3 Cost effectiveness: The efficiency principle should be respected all along the evaluation process so that the resources engaged are justified with regard to the data and findings achieved. Those responsible for evaluation and all the other evaluation stakeholders should always lock up budget, human and organizational resources in an optimal way and according to evaluation targets.

### **Precision and quality**

#### **Precision**

A1 Program documents: Any project, program or policy subject to an evaluation should be sufficiently documented. A communication process should be adopted and will target various stakeholders.

A2 Context analysis: The context in which the PPPS evolves should be examined in details including namely social, political, cultural and environmental aspects. Gender should also be highlighted.

A3 Described Goals and procedures: Evaluation goals and procedures should be clearly followed. They are defined in full details and refer to evaluation criteria that are commonly accepted (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, viability, impact) to evaluate them.

A4 Tracing information sources: The information sources utilized in evaluation should be described in full details to ensure reliability without any breach to anonymity and/or cultural and personal sensitivity of informant.

#### **Quality:**

A5 a Valid information: Data collection procedures and sampling should be selected, developed and implemented to make sure that information produced are valid and adequate.

A5 b Representative information: Data collection procedures should be selected, developed and implemented to ensure that produced information are representative of the diversity.

A6 Reliable information: Data collection procedures should be selected, developed and implemented to ensure that data obtained is reliable enough.

A7 Systematic information: The data collected, processed and reported with regard to an evaluation should be systematically reviewed and any mistake should be reported and corrected to the best possible.

A8 Analysis of quantitative data: In an evaluation the quantitative data should be properly and systematically analyzed so that various questions on evaluation, including expected results actually find an answer.

A9 Analysis of qualitative data: When one is engaged in an evaluation, qualitative data should be properly and systematically analyzed to ensure that various questions on evaluation including expected results, actually find an answer.

A10 a Relevant conclusions: The conclusions of an evaluation should result from methods and analysis so that stakeholders can appreciate them in full objectivity.

A10 b Realistic recommendations reached by consensus. The recommendations of an evaluation should be validated by stakeholders, feasible and linked to expected results.

A11 Impartiality of the report: The evaluation report should be written so that it does not show subjectivity of those involved in its design to ensure that it is not biased. It is important that the report actually reflect the findings of the evaluation.

A12 Meta-evaluation: The evaluation itself should be formally and systematically evaluated with respect to guidelines to ensure that it is appropriately carried out ; this will allow stakeholders to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses.

### **Principle of respect and ethics**

P1 Goal and scope of the evaluation: The evaluation should be designed to efficiently meet the needs of all target stakeholders.

P2 Range and quality: The evaluation should be comprehensive and satisfactory. It should identify and analyze strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated project or program or policy. Its objective is to make useful recommendations in order to strengthen the positive components of a program and propose how to tackle occurring difficulties.

P3 Formal agreements: Objectives, methodologies, responsibilities, duration and ownership of the evaluation should be negotiated and formalized within a liability charter that can be revised. A particular attention should be focused on implied and informal aspects of the commitment made by involved parties.

P4 Stakeholders rights: The evaluation should be designed and conducted in compliance with rights and moral and physical integrity of stakeholders and their community. Respect of privacy of personal data collected should be observed.

P5 Human relations: Evaluators should respect the dignity and the human value in their interaction with people involved in the evaluation in such a way these people do not feel threatened or harmed physically or culturally or in their religious beliefs.

P6: Disclosure of conclusions: The findings of the evaluation should be owned by stakeholders and the limits of the methodologies in use should be precise. Recommendations resulting from this ownership will be designed with stakeholders. Privacy should be maintained during the whole process to avoid any attempt to intimidate executing agencies or evaluators.

P7 Disputes over interests: These disputes should be settled in an objective manner so that they do not jeopardize the evaluation process and results.

P8 Transparency: The evaluator should apply the principles of effectiveness and transparency in every management action linked to the project and in the conduct of the evaluation.

## **Bibliography**

Forss K & Carlsson J. The quest for quality – Or can evaluation findings be trusted? *Evaluation* (1997) V.3, N.4, 481-501.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) *Standards for evaluations of educational programmes, projects and materials*. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The Program Evaluation Standards*. Sage: Thousand Oakes, CA

Patel M. & Russon C. Appropriateness of the Program Evaluation Standards for use in Africa. 1998. Presented in modified form to the African Evaluation Association in 1999.

Russon C. & Patem M. The African Evaluation Guidelines: Instrument for improving evaluation quality in Africa? Presentation at the 3<sup>rd</sup> African Evaluation Conference, Cape Town, South Africa. 1<sup>st</sup> – 4<sup>th</sup> December 2004

Smith N., Chircop S., & Mukherjee P., Considerations on the development of culturally relevant evaluation standards. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* (1993) V.19, 3-13.

United Nations Evaluation Group. *Standards for evaluation in the UN system*, 29 April 2005. Geneva.

United Nations Development Programme. *The evaluation policy of UNDP*. Annual Session 206, 12 – 23 June 2006, Geneva.

New Partnership for Africa's Development **Framework Document**. **October 2001, Abuja, Nigeria**. <http://www.nepad.org/2005/files/inbrief.php>.

Annex 1: Matrix of the African Evaluation Guidelines: 2007

<b>NEW FORMULATION</b>	
<b>Utility:</b>	<b>The utility guidelines are intended to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users and be owned by stakeholders</b>
<b>U1. Evaluation impact</b>	Evaluations should be planned, conducted, reported and disseminated in a manner and within a timeframe that empowers stakeholders, creates ownership and increases the chances that the findings will be used for effective development.
<b>U2. Stakeholder identification</b>	Persons and organizations involved in or affected by the evaluation (with special attention to community participants and vulnerable groups) should be identified and included in the evaluation process in a participatory manner, so that their needs can be addressed and so that the evaluation findings are utilizable and owned by stakeholders, to the extent this is useful, feasible and allowed.
<b>U3. Credibility of the evaluator</b>	The persons conducting the evaluation should be independent and trustworthy. They should have cultural sensitivity, appropriate communication skills and proven competence in evaluation methodology, so that the evaluation process and findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance. When unsure of competencies evaluators should seek to work in teams to ensure complementarities of skills and knowledge for credibility of results.
<b>U4. credibility of the evaluation team</b>	Rationality, the prospects and the procedures used to interpret the results must attentively be described so that the base of value judgment is clear. The possibility of granting multiple interpretations to the results must be clearly assured so that these interpretations meet the concern and the needs for the fascinating parts.
<b>U5. Information scope and selection</b>	Data and information collected should be broadly selected to address pertinent questions and be responsive to the needs and interests of stakeholders, with special attention to vulnerable groups.
<b>U6. Values identification</b>	The rationale, perspectives and methodology used to interpret the findings should be carefully described so that the bases for value judgments are clear. Multiple interpretations of findings should be transparently reflected, provided that these interpretations respond to stakeholders' concerns and needs for utilization purposes.
<b>U7. Report clarity</b>	Evaluation reports should clearly and concisely describe what is being evaluated and its context, the purpose, methodology, evidence and findings so that essential information is provided and easily understood.
<b>U8. Report format</b>	The reporting format should be adapted to suit diverse stakeholder needs and increase the chance of use.
<b>U9. Report dissemination</b>	Significant interim findings and evaluation reports should be disseminated to stakeholders, to the extent that this is useful, feasible and allowed. Comments and feedback of stakeholders on interim findings should be

	taken into consideration prior to the production of the final report.
<b>U10. Contribution to knowledge building</b>	Evaluations should be reported and disseminated to contribute to a body of knowledge that can be accessed and utilized by a wider audience. Evaluators should negotiate issues of authorship, publication and copyrights with commissioners of evaluation so that results /findings will be utilizable to a wider audience to the extent that this is feasible and allowed.
<b>Feasibility:</b>	<b>The feasibility principle is designed to ensure that evaluation is useful, participative, realistic and efficient</b>
<b>F1. Practical procedures</b>	Evaluations methodologies should be practical and appropriate to help data collection if necessary.
<b>F2. Political viability</b>	Evaluation should be planned and conducted in a participative manner in order to achieve total involvement of all stakeholders. It should be prepared and conducted on the basis of scientific principles of neutrality and strictness to avoid disputes conducive to a negative impact on processes and findings as well as on implementation and recommendations.
<b>F3. Cost effectiveness</b>	The efficiency principle should be respected all along the evaluation process so that the resources engaged are justified with regard to the data and findings achieved. Those responsible for evaluation and all the other evaluation stakeholders should always lock up budget, human and organizational resources in an optimal way and according to evaluation targets.
<b>Precision and quality</b>	<b>Precision: this principle aims to ensure that evaluation has resulted in technically relevant data, demonstrating efficiency of project, program and policies to be evaluated.</b> <b>Quality: the principle of quality requires that data collection and analysis methods in evaluation determine relevance, validity and reliability of information resulting from an evaluation.</b>
<b>A1. Programme documentation</b>	Any project, program or policy subject to an evaluation should be sufficiently documented. A communication process should be adopted and will target various stakeholders.
<b>A2. Context analysis</b>	The context in which the PPPS evolves should be examined in details including namely social, political, cultural and environmental aspects. Gender should also be highlighted.
<b>A3. Described goals and procedures</b>	Evaluation goals and procedures should be clearly followed. They are defined in full details and refer to evaluation criteria that are commonly accepted (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, viability, impact) to evaluate them.
<b>A4. Tracing information sources</b>	The information sources utilized in evaluation should be described in full details to ensure reliability without any breach to anonymity and/or cultural and personal sensitivity of informant.

<b>A5a. Valid information</b>	Data collection procedures and sampling should be selected, developed and implemented to make sure that information produced are valid and adequate
<b>A5b. Representative information</b>	Data collection procedures should be selected, developed and implemented to ensure that produced information are representative of the diversity.
<b>A6. Reliable information</b>	Data collection procedures should be selected, developed and implemented to ensure that data obtained is reliable enough.
<b>A7. Systematic information</b>	The data collected, processed and reported with regard to an evaluation should be systematically reviewed and any mistake should be reported and corrected to the best possible.
<b>A8. Analysis of quantitative data</b>	In an evaluation the quantitative data should be properly and systematically analyzed so that various questions on evaluation, including expected results actually find an answer.
<b>A9. Analysis of qualitative data</b>	When one is engaged in an evaluation, qualitative data should be properly and systematically analyzed to ensure that various questions on evaluation including expected results, actually find an answer.
<b>A10a. Relevant conclusions</b>	The conclusions of an evaluation should result from methods and analysis so that stakeholders can appreciate them in full objectivity.
<b>A10b. Realistic recommendations</b>	The recommendations of an evaluation should be validated by stakeholders, feasible and linked to expected results.
<b>A11. Impartiality of the report</b>	The evaluation report should be written so that it does not show subjectivity of those involved in its design to ensure that it is not biased. It is important that the report actually reflect the findings of the evaluation.
<b>A12. Meta-evaluation</b>	The evaluation itself should be formally and systematically evaluated with respect to guidelines to ensure that it is appropriately carried out ; this will allow stakeholders to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses.
<b>Principle of respect and ethics</b>	<b>These principles safeguard the respect of legal and ethical rules as well as the well being of stakeholders involved in the evaluation or affected by its findings.</b>
<b>P1. Goal and scope of the evaluation</b>	The evaluation should be designed to efficiently meet the needs of all target stakeholders.
<b>P2. Range and quality</b>	The evaluation should be comprehensive and satisfactory. It should identify and analyze strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated project or program or policy. Its objective is to make useful recommendations in order to strengthen the positive components of a program and propose how to tackle occurring difficulties.
<b>P3. Formal agreement</b>	Objectives, methodologies, responsibilities, duration and ownership of the evaluation should be negotiated and formalized within a liability charter that can be revised. A particular attention should be focused on

	implied and informal aspects of the commitment made by involved parties.
<b>P4. Stakeholders rights</b>	The evaluation should be designed and conducted in compliance with rights and moral and physical integrity of stakeholders and their community. Respect of privacy of personal data collected should be observed.
<b>P5. Human relations</b>	Evaluators should respect the dignity and the human value in their interaction with people involved in the evaluation in such a way these people do not feel threatened or harmed physically or culturally or in their religious beliefs.
<b>P6. Disclosure of conclusions</b>	The findings of the evaluation should be owned by stakeholders and the limits of the methodologies in use should be precise. Recommendations resulting from this ownership will be designed with stakeholders. Privacy should be maintained during the whole process to avoid any attempt to intimidate executing agencies or evaluators.
<b>P7. Disputes over interests</b>	These disputes should be settled in an objective manner so that they do not jeopardize the evaluation process and results.
<b>P8. Transparency</b>	The evaluator should apply the principles of effectiveness and transparency in every management action linked to the project and in the conduct of the evaluation.

**Annex 2: African Evaluation Guidelines – Checklist for Discussion between Contractor and Evaluator at Start of Evaluation**

<b>Principles and Standards</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	<b>Not Achieved</b>	<b>Details of type of coverage or consideration of this issue</b>
<b>Utility:</b>			
U1. Evaluation impact			
U2. Stakeholder identification			
U3. Credibility of the evaluator			
U4. credibility of the evaluation team			
U5. Information scope and selection			
U6. Values identification			
U7. Report clarity			
U8. Report format			
U9. Report dissemination			
U10. Contribution to knowledge building			
<b>Feasibility:</b>			
F1. Practical procedures			
F2. Political viability			
F3. Cost effectiveness			
<b>Precision and quality</b>			
A1. Programme documentation			
A2. Context analysis			
A3. Described goals and procedures			
A4. Tracing information sources			
A5a. Valid information			
A5b. Representative information			
A6. Reliable information			
A7. Systematic information			
A8. Analysis of quantitative data			
A9. Analysis of qualitative data			
A10a. Relevant conclusions			
A10b. Realistic recommendations			
A11. Impartiality of the report			
A12. Meta-evaluation			
<b>Principle of respect and ethics</b>			
P1. Goal and scope of the evaluation			

P2. Range and quality			
P3. Formal agreement			
P4. Stakeholders rights			
P5. Human relations			
P6. Disclosure of conclusions			
P7. Disputes over interests			
P8. Transparency			

### Annex 3: African Evaluation Guidelines – Matrix to check use of guidelines during an evaluation

Principles and Standards	Met	Partly Met	Not Met	Irrelevant	Suggestions or recommendations for improvement
<b>Utility:</b>					
U1. Evaluation impact					
U2. Stakeholder identification					
U3. Credibility of the evaluator					
U4. credibility of the evaluation team					
U5. Information scope and selection					
U6. Values identification					
U7. Report clarity					
U8. Report format					
U9. Report dissemination					
U10. Contribution to knowledge building					
<b>Feasibility:</b>					
F1. Practical procedures					
F2. Political viability					
F3. Cost effectiveness					
<b>Precision and quality</b>					
A1. Programme documentation					
A2. Context analysis					
A3. Described goals and procedures					
A4. Tracing information sources					
A5a. Valid information					
A5b. Representative information					
A6. Reliable information					
A7. Systematic information					
A8. Analysis of quantitative data					
A9. Analysis of qualitative data					
A10a. Relevant conclusions					
A10b. Realistic recommendations					
A11. Impartiality of the report					
A12. Meta-evaluation					
<b>Principle of respect and ethics</b>					
P1. Goal and scope of the evaluation					

P2. Range and quality					
P3. Formal agreement					
P4. Stakeholders rights					
P5. Human relations					
P6. Disclosure of conclusions					
P7. Disputes over interests					
P8. Transparency					

**Annex 4: Participants of the workshop of revision of the standards and norms of the African evaluation**

*(Niamey Grand Hotel, September 20-22, 2006)*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Name and First name</b>
Benin	Béninois network of Follow-up-Evaluation (ReBSE)	François Kedowide Crow
Cameroon	Cameroon Development Evaluation Association (CaDEA)	Lydie Nguimbous (Mrs)
Côte.d'ivoire	Network Man from the Ivory Coast of Follow-up Evaluation (SMALL CHANNEL)	Kinda Kassoum
France	Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MAE/DGCID)	Michael Ruleta
Guinea	Network in constitution	Mamadou Baldé Alpha
Kenya	Kenya Evaluation Association (KEA)	Obonyo Digolo (Prof)
Madagascar	Malagasy Association for Evaluation (MASS)	Barbara Rakotoniaina
Mali	Association Malian of Follow-up Evaluation	Mamadou Ba
Mauritania	Association Mauritanian of Follow-up Evaluation (AMSE)	Sall Tinder
Mauritania	AfrEA, AMSE, Secretary-general	Oumoul Khayri Ba Tall
Niger	RÉNSE/Care Niger	Mohamed
Niger	RÉNSE	Sayo Tinder, Dr..
Niger	RÉNSE	Ibrahim Ba
Niger	RÉNSE/Nobody Resource	Mamadou Abdou Gaoh Sani
Niger	RÉNSE	Yayé Seydou
Niger	RÉNSE	Robert Ndamobissi
Niger	RÉNSE/UNDP	Daniela Gregr
Niger	UNICEF	Aïssatou Maidagi
Nigeria	Africa Gender and Development Evaluation Network (AGDEN)	Olaronke Ladipo
Senegal	Senegalese network of ME (SenEval)	Abdoulaye Sadio
Senegal	Senegalese network of ME (SenEval)	Malick Sow

<b>Country</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Name and First name</b>
Senegal	Senegalese network of ME (SenEval)/Nobody Resource	Moctar Sow
South Africa	South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA)	Bongani Magongo
South Africa	AfrEA, past president	Zenda Ofir
Tanzania, Zanzibar		Saïd Mr. Khamis
Thailand	UNICEF past AfrEA chairs	Mahesh Patel
The USA	Unicef New York	Ada Ocampo
Zambia	Zambian Evaluation Association (ZEA)	Greenwell Mukwavi (Mr.)
Niger	ISEP	Ibro Abdou