



RÉPUBLIQUE DU BÉNIN  
FRATERNITÉ - JUSTICE - TRAVAIL

# POLITIQUE NATIONALE D'ÉVALUATION *(2012 - 2021)*



DECEMBRE 2012

<b>I - CONTEXT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II – DIAGNOSIS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III - PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION POLICY</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IV - STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION POLICY</b>	<b>8</b>
IV-1 Declaration of the National Evaluation Policy	8
IV-2 Definition and role of evaluation	9
IV-3 Evaluation in the public management cycle	10
IV-4 Distinction of the evaluation function of public action	10
IV-5 Promotion of the participatory approach	11
<b>V - SCOPE, STANDARDS AND PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VI - MEASURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>14</b>
VI-1 Regulatory measures	14
VI-2 Organizational measures	15
VI-3 Financial measures	16
VI-4 Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies	16
VI-5 Legal and Regulatory Framework for Evaluation	18
VI-6 Usefulness of evaluation	18
VI-7 Capacity Building	19
VI-8 Responsible Structures - Office of Evaluation of Public Policies	19
<b>VII - CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VIII - MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b>	<b>22</b>

## I - CONTEXT

Results-based management has been the subject of reform implemented in Benin's public administration since 2000. Since 2006, this reform has been generalized throughout the public administration and has led to a collective awareness of the need to ensure a more efficient and effective public service with a more rational political approach.

In this regard, evaluation has emerged as an important function that needs to be integrated into the public policy management cycle to assist decision-making and guide government action.

In June 2007, the President of the Republic, in an effort to make the Government's interventions effective to the benefit of the population, awarded the public action evaluation mission to the Ministry of Forecasting, Development and Evaluation. of Public Action (MPDEAP)<sup>1</sup>, which became the Ministry of Forecasting, Development, Evaluation of Public Policies and Coordination of Government Action (MPDEPP-CAG)<sup>2</sup> in June 2009. While the MPDEPP- CAG has become the Ministry of Development, Economic Analysis and Prospective (MDAEP)<sup>3</sup>, the evaluation of public policies is now the remit of the Primature (Prime Minister's office)

The work carried out on the evaluation of the State's priority public policies and organization of the function led to the elaboration of the Institutional Framework for Evaluation of Public Policies and the discussion on the development of national capacities in Evaluation.

At the end of these discussions, it proved useful to provide the Government of Benin with a National Evaluation Policy to retain the strategic options for the development of the evaluation and the framework for implementing these options

As the development of evaluative practice in Benin has been recognized as a necessity by all stakeholders in the development process, the Government intends to develop in coherence with the continuation of the reform of results-based management, a genuine national system of development, evaluation that will help improve public action and strengthen the evaluation culture within the Public Administration

The present national evaluation policy constitutes a unifying tool for the realization of this ambition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Decree No. 2007-540 of 02 November 2007 on the composition of the Government of Benin

<sup>2</sup> Decree No. 2009-260 of 12 June 2009, on the composition of the Government

<sup>3</sup> Decree No. 2011-500 of 11 July 2011 on the composition of the Government<sup>4</sup> Decree n ° 2011- 532 of August 08, 2011 on Attributions, Organization and Functioning of the Primature (Prime Minister's office)

## II – DIAGNOSIS

The evaluation in Benin has been conducted historically under the impetus of technical and financial partners (TFP).

Most of these evaluations were conducted by external consultants, with varying participation of national consultants

Since the implementation of the Paris Declaration, there has been a general trend towards greater involvement of national bodies and experts in the management and conduct of evaluation.

Although this trend is positive and promotes greater national ownership of the practice and its benefits, ownership is only realized when a national institution takes the lead and sets the agenda.

Therefore, the evaluation and its institutionalization must serve the general interest and national priorities rather than responding, as a matter of priority, to the needs of donors in terms of accountability and funding allocations

The case of the implementation of monitoring and evaluation units in the five ministries of the PERAC reform in 2002, and the subsequent development of units in the public administration to monitor the poverty reduction strategy, demonstrate it well. The development of an evaluation framework driven more by the needs of TFPs than by national priorities and interests does not constitute a lasting adoption of M&E institutions.

The weakness noticed by the evaluation in the public institutions of Benin, eight years after its institutionalization, is a proof.

A diagnostic study of national capacities in evaluation was conducted, by a team of local and international consultants, under the supervision of the Office of Public Policy Evaluation, with the technical and financial support of UNDP, using a methodological approach consisting of: conducting a reinforced survey through interviews and a meta-evaluation (analysis of evaluation reports to determine the quality).

The audit shows that the evaluative function is not yet anchored in the habits of organizations and institutions responsible for conducting projects, programs and public policies in Benin.

The practice of evaluation is known to the main development actors in Benin. However, the use of evaluation is not regular and the lack of budget for conducting evaluations are key reasons behind this underdevelopment.

Development actors are generally hostile to the evaluation they equate with control, ignoring the contribution of evaluation in terms of improved decision-making and capacity building.

The results show that more than 74% of those who answered the questionnaire have knowledge of project, program and public policy evaluation through either university training or continuing education in relation to management-based management results, internal audit and management control

Structures that had never done evaluation activities, or 31.5% of respondents, said that they had never "evaluated" in the last four years, neither project, nor program, nor public policy. These are, among others:

- The Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Benin (CCIB);
- The Economic and Social Council (CES);
- The High Authority for Audiovisual and Communication (HAAC);
- Most sectoral ministries with sectoral strategies; and

- The Audit Chamber of the Supreme Court. The reasons given in priority are, in order of importance, related to the lack of financial resources and the fact that some structures do not have a specific mandate for evaluation.

Although evaluative practice is mainly managed by services and managers with specific focus on monitoring / evaluation, very few structures have a dedicated budget for evaluation.

Depending on the trends, the evaluations are generally carried out, either in response to the requirements of the funders, or by regulatory or legal obligation and, to a lesser extent, on their own initiative. These evaluations:

- relate more to projects (31%) than to programs (26%) and much less to public policies (11%);
- concern both implementation and effects (34%) and, to a lesser extent, each of the two aspects taken separately, namely implementation (24%) and effects (11%);
- were carried out after implementation (ex post, i.e. 34%) but also during project implementation (31%);
- were largely conducted by internal evaluators (26%) and mixed teams (26%);
- were further developed in partnership with the public administration and stakeholders;
- have been carried out in general with methods producing data, both qualitative and quantitative;
- Have their results very often published, but often these represent the view point of the sponsor, not necessary providing learning for the Government of Benin.

However, dissemination of the results of evaluations carried out in Benin is generally limited to stakeholders, because of the confidentiality of certain

information. In terms of utility, most of the evaluations carried out improve the management and effectiveness of public policies.

In terms of evaluation conduct, the use of advanced methodologies is still embryonic, the participatory approach remains weak, concentrated within public structures and the dissemination of evaluation results is also limited.

The usefulness of evaluations carried out in Benin is marginal and several factors hinder the development of the practice. It is

- The absence of evaluative culture;
- Lack of budget;
- The lack of statistical and data information;
- The lack of human resources;
- The weak demand of the managers;
- The lack of valid performance measurement or reporting systems and public policy design and implementation benchmarks;
- The poor definition of the mandates of the structures;
- Lack of knowledge of evaluation methods;
- The quality of governance; and
- The failure of information systems. Thus, the analysis of the major components of a national evaluation practice in Benin provides the results contained in Table I below.

*Table I: Summary of the results of evaluative practice in Benin*

LEVELS	COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT3
<b>Macro (Strategic/ Institutional/ National)</b>	Vision	Policy	Regulatory Framework
	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Meso (Tactical/ Organizational/ Structures)</b>	Evaluation Function	Specific Budget	Specific Skills
	Low	Low	Low
<b>Micro (Operational/ Technical/Tools)</b>	Professional Resources	Specific Training	Quality Assessments
	Low	Low	Low

To improve this situation, many measures are identified as priorities for the development of the evaluation, namely:

- The accountability of a central structure;
- The provision of financial resources;
- The establishment of a legal and regulatory framework;
- Capacity development;
- Sensitization of decision makers;
- The promotion of training;
- The harmonization of development partner approaches in line with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

### III - PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION POLICY

The National Evaluation Policy defines the overall framework (internal and external guiding principles) for planning and carrying out evaluations, as well as the use of information derived from these assessments, as part of the management system results in the Republic of Benin. It is part of the implementation of the Growth Strategy for Poverty Reduction (SCRIP), including the strengthening of monitoring and evaluation and institutional reforms to make public administration more effective in the future achievement of the Government's development objectives.

The National Evaluation Policy also aims to promote institutional responsibility in the search for information and accountability of managers.

The National Evaluation Policy aims to:

- Promote an evaluation culture within the Public Administration;
- Promote the tools necessary for the assessment of public policies;
- Contribute to the optimisation and rational use of public resources;
- Help capitalise on knowledge and disseminate good public management practices;
- Strengthen accountability and good governance in the public administration;
- To systematise accountability to institutions and citizens.

## IV - STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION POLICY

The administration has a requirement of transparency towards the people. It has the duty to report on its action and the use of public resources to the President of the Republic, members of the Government, the Parliament, the Supreme Court and the people of Benin

### IV-1 Declaration of the National Evaluation Policy

The President of the Republic is planning to transform the Public Administration into a modern Development Administration, serving the public interest. To achieve this, it is committed to making the Administration a learning organization that implements effective results-based management with the evaluation of public policies as a tool for improving the quality of public service, performance of its organizations and accountability to the people of Benin. In this respect, it places public policy evaluation as a national priority.<sup>4</sup>

The President of the Republic decides that ministries and public bodies incorporate evaluation into their management practices to help the Authority:

1. Develop policies, programs and initiatives that clearly identify expected results and that include, at the outset, valid performance measurement, reporting and accountability systems;
2. Rigorously and objectively evaluate the results and the direct and indirect impacts of government policies, initiatives, programs and other processes that achieve the expected results

For that purpose, the Public administration owes from now on:

1. To ensure the systematic production, at the appropriate time, on behalf of the Government, reliable and objective information and strategic knowledge on the results and effects of its actions with a view to better meeting the needs and aspirations of the people of Benin;
2. To promote the evaluative culture within it, with deconcentrated and decentralized powers and social partners;
3. To develop mechanisms for evaluating public action that will enable citizens to be more involved in the assessment of public policies and their improvement and redefinition.
4. Strengthen the culture of accountability and accountability to the institutions of the Republic and citizens through the systematic production and dissemination of accurate information on the implementation and effects of all State interventions for the benefit of the people.

The implementation of results-based management is the primary responsibility of public service managers.

---

<sup>4</sup> cf. Article No. 30 of the Council of Ministers of 04/08/2010

In this regard, the Government of the Republic of Benin undertakes that the implementation of any public intervention shall be constrained to:

1. Definition of a problem tree / solution tree matrix;
2. Definition of expected results;
3. Rigorous execution focused on achieving results;
4. Regular and effective monitoring;
5. An assessment to measure performance and improve effectiveness and efficiency during implementation;
6. An impact evaluation to assess the impact on beneficiaries and capitalize on knowledge;
7. Accountability to the people, Parliament and other institutions of the Republic.

#### IV-2 Definition and role of evaluation

Evaluation is a systematic exercise of objective and impartial analysis of laws, policies, strategies, programs, decisions and initiatives (hereinafter collectively referred to as "public action") financed in whole or in part by public resources. It allows:

- To understand public action before its implementation (preliminary evaluation), in the course of execution (continuous evaluation) and at the end of cycle (final evaluation and evaluation of impact)
- To evaluate the public action before its implementation (preliminary evaluation), during implementation (continuous evaluation) and at the end of the cycle (final evaluation and impact evaluation);
- To make a reorientation of the objectives and a better framing of the programmed actions;
- To recommend better ways to achieve the expected results, considering other possible solutions, recommended practices and proven lessons learned. By providing reliable information, evaluation contributes to the acquisition of institutional knowledge and learning. It makes a vital contribution to results-based management.

Evaluation is intended to assess:

1. [relevance]: questioning the rationale and the merits of public action and to ensure that appropriate measures have been taken and that they are properly applied;
2. [coherence]: study the internal dynamics of the intervention (between the various actions planned themselves and those existing) as well as external dynamics (with other public actions to identify conflicts and points of complementarity) so that it contributes to a global convergence of public action;

3. [effectiveness]: analyze processes and contextual factors to understand why, and to what extent, the expected results are achieved. Also focus on unintended outcomes and study direct and indirect effects;
4. [efficiency]: measuring the rationality of the achievement of the expected results and the efficiency in the use of the means implemented;
5. [impact]: to determine the consequences and long-term effects expected or not expected from the implementation of public action;
6. [sustainability]: measuring the impact of public action and identifying good practices and replicable experiences that should be promoted to maximize positive effects over time;
7. [ownership]: ensuring the level of ownership of public action by stakeholders;
8. [governance]: to appreciate the dynamics of management and relations between actors which make it possible to carry out the implementation under the best conditions in accordance with accepted standards in the field;
9. [information system]: determining the quality and performance of the information system and its effects on the performance of public action.

#### IV-3 Evaluation in the public management cycle

Evaluation is a tool that can help streamline public spending, improve central and decentralized governance, and provide new solutions to development challenges.

The prospective dimension must remain present in the evaluation, insofar as it is part of the perspective of future decisions. Any evaluation that concludes the need for reform actions should make it possible to question the likely changes in the context of public action. Prospective reflection, as well as quantitative forecasting, is also necessary before the evaluation, to identify important issues in the medium term, beyond the short-term concerns of the service or the Government. The evaluation must therefore also pay attention, downstream or upstream, to strategic issues by allowing an organized discussion on the objectives and constraints of public action.

#### IV-4 Distinction of the evaluation function of public action

The evaluation focuses on state intervention policies and how they work. It provides information on the cycle of planning, programming, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation. It helps to strengthen results-based management and improve the implementation of public action by periodically and thoroughly analysing the performance of a public action. To do this, it relies on data resulting from monitoring activities as well as information obtained from other sources.

As such, the evaluation is complementary to the monitoring function and is specifically distinguished from the control functions assigned to other structures

and institutions of the State. It is not intended to analyse individual performance and cannot be related to audit and control.

The function of the monitoring is ensured in the Ministries by the structures of execution under the coordination of the Directorates of the Programming and the Prospective and the cells of Monitoring-Evaluation. These structures are responsible for collaborating with the Public Policy Evaluation Office and other evaluation structures in order to provide all the statistical data as well as the information and insights needed for the evaluations.

Auditing and control are handled by the state inspection and control services. These services maintain an exchange of information with the evaluation structures.

When an evaluation mission deems it necessary, in the event of findings of non-compliance in the execution of the programs or of non-compliance with the procedures, the inspection services may be seized by the Authority for audit purposes. and specific controls. Evaluation cannot be dissociated from a global effort for more effective management of public services. It should help to improve public action at the design and implementation stages.

#### IV-5 Promotion of the participatory approach

The evaluation must be conducted in a broadly participatory approach that considers the actors and organizations of the public environment, local authorities, technical and financial partners, the private sphere, the civil society representing the beneficiaries and the public opinion.

As such, it must imperatively be defined before the start of an evaluation:

- the relevant stakeholders;
- the degree of stakeholder participation;
- the composition of the Evaluation Steering Committee;
- ways of communication and the supports.

These indications must be considered and respected during the assessment work and stakeholders should be interested from the outset in the evaluative process and participate in the drafting of the project assessment and terms of reference as well as the assessment of the reports produced.

## V - SCOPE, STANDARDS AND PRINCIPLES

The National Evaluation Policy applies to the Government, Central Public Administration and its decentralized structures, as well as to the devolved administrations.

The National Evaluation Policy is integrated with any other public action carried out by the public authorities. This includes political and legal decisions and is no exception to matters of state security. However, the results of an evaluation on subjects of this nature remain confidential and their dissemination remains limited to the authorities concerned.

Evaluation standards are required for any evaluation action involving the Government of Benin and / or internal and external resources used in this context. They take into account evaluation activities:

- Public policies of a national character;
- Public policies of a local or regional nature;
- Programs and major projects of the State;
- Private Public Partnerships;
- Skills and services delegated to local authorities;
- Activities of public services, development agencies and other organizations financed by the Beninese State.

Evaluation standards, through the establishment of common criteria, provide a basis for ministries to improve their evaluation practices and enable the Public Policy Evaluation Office (PPPO) to follow implementation of the national evaluation policy

The evaluation standards concern:

- i. evaluation;
- ii. competence;
- iii. objectivity and integrity;
- iv. consultations and advice;
- v. measurements and analyses;
- vi. reports.

These standards are supported by the following guiding principles:

- A mandate is established for each evaluation, which clearly indicates and details the type of evaluation, the way it is conducted and the stakeholders involved in this undertaking. Evaluations are designed to produce current, good quality and reliable information.
- The persons conducting the evaluations must individually or collectively have the knowledge and skills (and experience) required to meet the requirements of the work related to the evaluation concerned.

- Evaluators must demonstrate integrity in their dealings with all stakeholders. Evaluations are conducted in an impartial, transparent and open manner, involving as many stakeholders as possible in the whole process. Stakeholders' differences of opinion will be mentioned in the evaluation report.
- All the works of evaluation have to contain consultations of appropriate nature and in compliance with the requirements, and where necessary, apply the advice (councils) and the orientation supplied by specialists or other competent people.
- Evaluation work must produce, through practical, cost-effective and objective methods of data collection and analysis, timely, relevant and credible findings and results that managers and other stakeholders can use with confidence.
- Evaluations are carried out in accordance with the convictions, the operating modes and the habits of the stakeholders. Anonymity and confidentiality of stakeholders are guaranteed by appropriate measures.
- Evaluation reports must present the findings (results), conclusions and recommendations in a clear, accessible and objective manner.

## Vi - MEASURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

### VI-1 Regulatory measures

#### VI-1-1 professionalization of evaluation

The effective implementation of the evaluation is based on the importance attached to the evaluation function in the Government, the respect of the standards adopted and the creation of the conditions for the development of a strong evaluative culture.

To do this, the evaluation will be used with other management tools to improve decision-making. In this respect, all evaluations should be done by a qualified evaluation team. Use of external expertise is desirable as the main approach. The Government intends to promote the approach and to support the development of national expertise in evaluation.

The administration must also develop qualified human resources to conduct evaluations. The Office of Assessment of Public Policies and the National Council of the Evaluation are responsible, according to their respective attributions, for the development of capacities in internal assessors of the Public administration.

#### VI-1-2 Organization of the evaluation

Evaluation work must be conducted in a coherent, rational and economical manner. Each institution has the responsibility to provide the means necessary for the evaluation to achieve its objectives within the organization.

In this regard, the following provisions must be made: Each ministry has the following obligations:

- to introduce the evaluation function into its management framework;
- to ensure its functionality and make available the necessary means for its effective exercise;
- Periodically evaluate and report on issues affecting the implementation and management of the Department's policies, programs and initiatives, inclusive of policies funded entirely or in part by the Technical and Financial Partners.

**Each ministry must have a five-year Operational Evaluation Program** consistent with Benin's long-term vision, the Strategic Development Guidelines, the Growth Strategy for Poverty Reduction and the priorities of the Government and the Ministry. The Operational Evaluation Program must also be based on a global assessment of the sector taking into account sectoral risks, the risks of interventions at the sector level as well as transversal and exogenous risks.

## VI-2 Organizational measures

The Government resolves that the implementation of the evaluation by the ministries will be done by the Monitoring and Evaluation Units (MSCs). In this respect, specific capacities in the evaluation of ESC will be strengthened. CSEs are responsible for:

1. Empowering specific human resources within the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit to take charge of evaluation issues within the Ministry;
2. Ensuring that the Ministry has an Operational Evaluation Program incorporating a coherent and operational evaluation system that takes into account all the public action implemented and coordinated by the Ministry's services;
3. Ensuring that the Office of Public Policy Evaluation validate the terms of reference and tools, and be involved in the assessment process;
4. Conducting strategic evaluations and assisting managers to incorporate evaluation into the department's management practices;
5. Supervising and organizing the evaluation of interventions falling within the remit of the Ministry, including those of an inter-organizational nature.

Within each ministry, **the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit** becomes the focal point and the sectoral respondent of the evaluation activities. In this capacity, they must exercise leadership and oversee the practice of evaluation at the sectoral level. To do this, the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit must:

- Ensure that the Ministry's Operational Evaluation Program is developed and adequately covers the policies, programs and initiatives implemented by the Ministry;
- Collaborate with managers to improve the conception, delivery and performance measurement of departmental policies, programs and initiatives;
- Carry out the evaluations according to the established Operational Evaluation Program;
- Communicate with the Public Policy Evaluation Office on any major information relating to the management or effectiveness of programs, Projects or initiatives for actions to be undertaken by the Authority;
- Make available to the Public Policy Evaluation Office the evaluation reports;
- To implement the evaluation standards of the Office of Evaluation of Public Policies
- Ensure the involvement of the CPRS sector steering committee in the follow-up of the recommendations.

### VI-3 Financial measures

Evaluation funding is considered essential for sustainably establishing the practice and culture of evaluation. In fact, the development of evaluation cannot be carried out in a stable, effective and sustainable way without the provision of specific resources that guarantee the independent implementation of evaluation activities.

In this regard, appropriate measures must be taken by departments and agencies to provide the resources needed to evaluate their programs.

To this end, the evaluation structures must be endowed with their own resources necessary for their operation and for carrying out their evaluation activities.

Specific budgetary resources will also be made available to the evaluation structures and structures responsible for implementing the National Evaluation Policy in order to support efforts to develop evaluative practice at the national level.

These resources will provide financial support for the conduct of evaluation, training, recruitment of experts and resource persons for the benefit of ministries and local communities. As part of the national capacity building program in evaluation, the capacity building of evaluation structures will also be funded.

To this end, the Government will allocate the necessary resources to finance the evaluation of the National Budget with the assistance of Technical and Financial Partners who will accompany Benin in strengthening national capacities in evaluation.

### VI-4 Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies

The National Evaluation Policy is implemented within the Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies. The Public Policy Evaluation Office bases its relations and collaboration with stakeholders in the development process and evaluative processes on the Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies.

The Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies, which defines the relations and roles between the various stakeholders identified, constitutes the crucible of collaboration between the different structures and the Office of Evaluation of Public Policies in the context of the implementation of the PNE(National Evaluation Policy).

The structures represented at CIEPP (Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies) all participate in strengthening the national evaluation system through the different roles assigned to them in the framework of the evaluation and implementation of the PNE (National Evaluation Policy). Thus, the CIEPP is organized as presented in the following table:

## **1. Coordination structures**

- Office of Evaluation of Public Policies
- National Evaluation Council

## **2. Structures associated with the central level**

- Observatory of Social Change (OCS);
- Directorate General of Development Policies (DGPD)
- General Directorate for Project and Program Monitoring (DGPP)
- National Institute of Statistics and Economic Analysis (INSAE)
- Capacity Building Project for Development Policy Analysis
- Monitoring Unit of Economic and Financial Programs (CSPEF);
- General Directorate of Economic Analysis
- State General Inspectorate

## **3. Implementation structures at sectoral level**

- Directorates of Programming and Foresight (DPP)
- Monitoring and Evaluation Cells

## **4. Associated structures at sectoral level**

- CPRS Sector Steering Committees
- Project and Program Management Units
- Agencies and structures under the supervision of Ministries

## **5. Associated institutions**

- National Assembly
- Audit Chamber of the Supreme Court
- Economic and Social Council

## **6. Structures at the deconcentrated and local level**

- Prefectures
- Departmental Directorates of Foresight and Development
- Sectorial departmental directorates
- Local communities

## **7. Non-state stakeholders**

- Technical and financial partners
- Civil society organizations
- Universities and Training Institutes
- Research centers in economic and social sciences

## **8. Private sector**

The Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies should promote the evaluation of public policies and the learning culture in the central and decentralized public administration as well as in local administrations. The Institutional Framework for the Evaluation of Public Policies is attached as an integral part of the National Evaluation Policy.

#### VI-5 Legal and Regulatory Framework for Evaluation

A regulatory framework that sets the exercise arrangements by the various structures responsible for evaluation will be developed and proposed to the Government for adoption. In this respect, it is agreed that the evaluation should be integrated from the adoption of the National Evaluation Policy into any public action project as far as possible, in accordance with the provisions adopted by the scope of this document policy.

**Evaluation is recognised as a tool for results-based management reform.** The development and operationalization of a coherent monitoring and evaluation mechanism is a requirement for the financing of any project, program and public policy on domestic and external resources granted to the State.

The National Evaluation Policy is part of the improvement of the implementation of the Growth Strategy for Poverty Reduction. Policy measures should contribute to strengthening evaluation arrangements and structures. Evaluation structures are required to carry out systematic and coordinated monitoring and evaluation activities within the framework of the CPRS (Growth Strategy for Poverty Reduction).

In this respect, the structures responsible for the National Evaluation Policy and the development of evaluation in Benin are called upon to **define a coherent and comprehensive action agenda** for the CPRS implementation period.

The structures responsible for evaluation within the Public Administration are responsible, each in its own right, for the implementation of the guidelines adopted within the framework of the National Evaluation Policy.

#### VI-6 Usefulness of evaluation

The results of the evaluations are mainly used by the Government and the managers of the Public Administration. In this respect, the results of the evaluations must be used to inform the decision-making of the Government and the execution of the public action.

Managers must use evaluations to improve their results. In this regard, they need to work with evaluation structures to provide timely evaluation results to support decision making and improved performance.

The managers are responsible, in collaboration with the statistical production and activity monitoring departments, to provide all the information and documentation

necessary for the proper conduct of the evaluations. Managers are also required to collaborate on evaluation processes by participating, as appropriate, in the work of the evaluation steering committees.

Managers should incorporate evaluation recommendations and improvement measures into the priority setting, planning, implementation, and reporting processes. Managers are required to report in their periodic reports on the management of recommendations.

### VI-7 Capacity Building

The Government promotes the practice of evaluation:

- within the public administration at the central and deconcentrated levels;
- within local governments to strengthen local governance;
- within organizations, associations, networks and other groups involved in the development or public control of public action.

To this end, a program to strengthen national capacities in evaluation will be developed and implemented.

Local governments need to develop the evaluation of public action at the local level. They receive assistance from the Government in the form of advice, training and human or financial resources.

In order to make available the specific skills required for evaluation, national training institutes and universities are involved in proposing appropriate professional and continuing training courses.

### VI-8 Responsible Structures - Office of Evaluation of Public Policies

**The Public Policy Evaluation Office is the central coordinating body responsible for implementing the Government's evaluation policy. It supports evaluation in ministries and other institutions by providing advice on good practice and disseminating evaluation standards.** It oversees evaluation work of Monitoring and Evaluation Units and uses all evaluation results to inform decision-makers at the central level.

The Office of Assessment of public policies develops and makes adopt by **the Government a Strategic 5 years plan of Evaluation**

The Office of Evaluation of Public Policies is in charge of the design of the Five-Year Strategic Evaluation Plan and to assist all the governmental organizations in the elaboration of their Operational Evaluation Program, in coherence with the strategic evaluation plan of the Government.

The Office of Evaluation of Public Policies has the following roles:

- to evaluate the priority public, sectoral and national policies of the State;

- to inform the Government of the results of the evaluations of public policies of the State;
- to advise the Government of Benin on the general orientation of evaluation and development of capacities and practices in the Public Administration;
- to ensure the proper implementation of the National Evaluation Policy;
- to collaborate with technical and financial partners in the development of evaluation;
- act as the main and privileged interlocutor with Technical and Financial Partners in terms of appropriation of evaluations in accordance with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action. The Office of Evaluation of Public Policies implements the National Evaluation Policy in collaboration with all the relevant monitoring and evaluation structures within the Public Administration.

As part of the implementation of the PRSP, the Public Policy Evaluation Office is the coordinating structure for public policy evaluations. In this regard, the Office ensures that operational evaluation programs incorporate evaluations of sectoral strategies in the process of being operationalized. In the context of sector-level evaluations, the sectoral evaluation bodies consist of the members of the sectoral steering committees of the CPRS. The Office of Public Policy Evaluation is liaising with the CPRS sectoral steering committees on the proper use of the results of the evaluations as well as their effective dissemination to inform all stakeholders to improve implementation of the CPRS.

As part of the capacity-building in evaluation, evaluation of public policy Office ensures, in cooperation with other structures including the SCO and the DGSP assessment, programming and implementing actions to capacity-building to the actors in the field of monitoring and evaluation. It is responsible for the development of training, experimentation, promotion and training on specific methodologies for assessment of sectorial policies.

### Office of Evaluation of Public Policies

**A National Evaluation Council will be created with a mandate to ensure the supervision and development of evaluative practice in Benin. It is responsible for developing and managing resources for knowledge, training, practice, exchange and evaluation information. It establishes and updates standards for evaluation in Benin.** It supervises the evaluation services of the Government. The Executive Secretariat of the National Evaluation Council is provided by the Office of Evaluation of Public Policies.

The specific attributions of the National Evaluation Council will be specified by a decree issued by the Council of Ministers.

## Vii - CONDITIONS OF SUCCESS

The development of evaluation within the Administration is a crucial issue for improving the management of development and the culture of transparency. The environment in which the NCB is implemented is favorable because of the strong political will expressed by the Government to make evaluation one of the national priorities. However, political will alone cannot be the key to successful public policy. Its success still lies in the establishment of appropriate conditions and in the determination of all stakeholders to contribute in a transparent manner and with the necessary efficiency to the implementation of the measures adopted. In this respect, three major conditions have been identified to ensure the success of this policy.

### **Support for the evaluation request**

To be effective and to ensure the sustainability of the practice, the evaluation must be **systematically programmed**. This implies that the demand for evaluation by decision-makers is supported. To this end, the Government and the authorities in charge of implementing policies must program evaluation activities in a cyclical and systematic manner, providing the necessary resources for their implementation. In the long term, it is important that any intervention can benefit from an evaluation at the different stages of implementation. It is also important to protect and ensure the independence of evaluation structures so that they can assess and be transparent in the dissemination of results.

### **The financing of the evaluation**

Whether internal or not, evaluation activities have a cost and their systematic implementation depends on the availability of programmed resources. This supposes that sufficient resources are made available to the evaluation structures to guarantee their autonomy of action and the possibility of implementing their programming. Indeed, it is important that in a context of limited resources, the evaluation structures can benefit from the minimum resources to guarantee the sustainability of the activities. It is therefore essential that arrangements be made to ensure stable and sustainable funding for, on the one hand, the carrying out of evaluations and, on the other hand, capacity building for the proper dissemination of the evaluative culture.

### **The continuation of public management reform**

Improving public management requires a constant effort, particularly in Benin, where the Administration does not implement effective results-based management. To enable the evaluation to play its full role, there is a need to improve the implementation of results-based management that would ensure the optimal use of evaluation results to drive positive change. The public administration needs to strengthen its programming tools.

It must also strive to put in place, in all sectors, effective information systems which remain the best guarantees for a good capitalization of evaluations.

## VIII - MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The Office of Evaluation of Public Policies is responsible for monitoring the application of the National Evaluation Policy to ensure that it meets the objectives set.

To monitor the application of the policy, the Office of Evaluation of Public Policies must develop an intervention strategy whose action plan includes monitoring the implementation of the National Evaluation Policy. Targets and key results to be achieved as well as performance measurement will also need to be defined.

The Public Policy Evaluation Office is also in charge of setting up an evaluation monitoring mechanism with the help of Monitoring and Evaluation Units to ensure the compilation, processing and dissemination of the results of evaluations, capitalization and effective use in improving results-based management.

**The National Evaluation Policy will be evaluated five (5) years after its entry into force.**

The evaluation will be based on the policy requirements and the intervention strategy of the Public Policy Evaluation Office for its implementation.