Introduction

The importance of evaluation emerged in the midst of the search for developing public performance and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public activities and interventions. Its impacts on society on the other hand, allowing for evaluating and directing decision-making and formulating policies, which enhances transparency and accountability.

Public authorities have also come to place great emphasis on the evaluation of public policies so that they can ascertain the reasons why objectives or desired benefits are not achieved and the causes of high costs or those that prevented the response to all the needs they are designed to meet, in addition to measuring their economic effectiveness and the extent of the impacts and changes that occur in society because of them.

Definition of evaluation

Evaluation is defined as making a valuable evaluation of a particular public intervention (policy, program or project) given a set of criteria, notably relevance, effectiveness (efficiency), efficacy and impact, taking into account the views and perspectives of all stakeholders (program designers, managers, implementers, beneficiaries and even non-beneficiaries), it is not just a description of the means used and the results achieved (which is the role of monitoring), but aims to develop a shared vision for a policy or program.

Specific and evaluation of its effectiveness on the basis of appropriate and clear criteria, including its objectives, the logic of its intervention, the resources used, its consequences and the resulting effects, whether intended or not.

The evaluation does not only aim at demonstrating the achievement of objectives, but also seeks to establish the impact of public policy, i.e. the total outcomes and impacts of a policy (on society in the broadest sense) and to distinguish between the impacts of the public activity or intervention that is the subject of the evaluation process and those that can be attributed to or are due to the influence of external factors (other public policies or interventions).

Evaluation objectives

The evaluation has several objectives, the most important of which are:

- **Provide knowledge to understand the process of public intervention:** a clear understanding of achievements, results, impacts and beneficiaries.
- **Assess the value of public intervention:** the data collected is analyzed to assess the implementation and consequences of the public policy in question.
- **Assist in decision-making:** through the conclusions and recommendations made, disparities can be corrected, the causes of policy and program failures avoided or program implementation suspended or corrected.
• **Improving public performance:** in particular through the proper use of resources and instruments and by improving the relevance and effectiveness of public policy design and implementation.

**Evaluation principles**

The evaluation is based on a number of principles to ensure the integrity of the analysis and the credibility of the results, which must be applied independently, impartially and objectively when analyzing, drawing conclusions and making recommendations, and to allow stakeholders to respond and comment on the content of the report. For the evaluation to be objective, it must be based primarily on:

- a clear statement of the criteria used for the evaluation;
- a transparent and independent evaluation methodology that takes into account all the views of stakeholders;
- Collect and analyze data in a fair and thoughtful manner.

The evaluation is subject to a rigorous methodology, whether at the level of planning, data collection and analysis or preparation of the report, and this process begins with the selection of the subject then study the feasibility of the evaluation before proceeding with the evaluation and involve the actors involved in the program or policy in directing the evaluation and when preparing questions and when choosing methods of collecting data and preparing conclusions.
Evaluation Stages

Public policy evaluation cycle in supreme audit institutions

- Choose a topic
  - Feasibility study
    - Validation of the feasibility study
      - Composition of the evaluation team
        - Elaboration of the evaluation plan
          - Creation of the support committee
            - Collect and analyse data
              - Preparing the initial evaluation report
                - Approval of the report and implementation of the right of confrontation and response
                  - Final report (final conclusions and recommendations)

- Detect and analyze the goals
- Build the sociogram
- Elaborate the logical impact diagram
- Determine the key questions for the evaluation
- Define and select measurement indicators

- Constatations and conclusions
- Draft of conclusions
The evaluation consists of three main phases:

**The first stage**: includes planning for the evaluation task and mainly includes the selection of the topic to be evaluated and the preparation of the feasibility study.

The **selection of topics** to be evaluated (policies, programs, etc.) is the first step in planning the evaluation process, followed by a feasibility study that distinguishes the evaluation from other types of control.

The selection of the evaluation object is based on criteria such as:
- The importance of the policy or program, the challenges and the size of the financial envelope allocated;
- The impact on beneficiaries, population and public performance;
- The analysis of temporary risks and opportunities;
- The importance of policy to public opinion;
- Promote transparency and appreciation of the good use of public funds.

When choosing a topic, you should avoid falling into the following:
- Choose a broad-based policy such as education policy, employment policy, energy policy, the broader the policy, the harder it is to analyze it and determine the causal relationship between it and the recorded impacts. Therefore, one or another part of it, such as the school dropout policy from the education policy or alternative energies from the energy policy, should be chosen.
- Choose or focus on a project or limited public action, for example (a facility or tax procedure) because it is desirable that the subject of the evaluation is not too narrow as the impacts may be too small or not measurable:
- It is advisable not to evaluate a very old policy or that its implementation has been completed for a short period of time that does not allow for adequate measurement of its results and impacts.

It is advisable to avoid evaluating a policy with limited economic and social impact on society.

The **feasibility study** note allows the evaluability of the public policy to be assessed. Where appropriate, the note should not hesitate to explain that the policy could not be evaluated for objective reasons.

The evaluation feasibility study note allows:
- Identify the topic of the evaluation;
- Identify the objectives, challenges and scope of the evaluation;
- Determine the set of questions to which the evaluation must answer (based on the logic of public intervention and evaluation criteria);
• Appreciate difficulties and propose solutions in order to overcome them (skills required of rapporteurs, intervention of experts...);
• Identify the sources of available and incomplete documents and data necessary for evaluation and how to access them;
• Track a set of goals (goals tree and logical diagram or logical impact diagram) of the public intervention being evaluated;
• Identify the evaluated policy stakeholders and determine the level of consultation/involvement in the evaluation;
• Planning the evaluation's different stages and the deadlines for submitting the report;
• Estimate the resources needed to implement it successfully (financial, human and material resources, number of working days and timetable...).

The evaluator must do the following when selecting the subject of the evaluation and investigating the feasibility of the evaluation:
• Good understanding of the general intervention logic (context "pre-intervention situation" and definition of objectives, resources, achievements and results) and preparation of the logical impact diagram or logical framework;
• Identify and understand the stakeholders' system and their relationships (social scheme of stakeholders);
• Identify evaluation questions;
• Define evaluation criteria and select measurement indicators;
• Select sources of data collection;
• Organization of evaluation;
• Select methodology and methods of collecting and analyzing data and the possibility of using external experts.

Requirements and preparatory works for the feasibility study
In addition to understanding the logic of the intervention and the context (for which the policy was decided), the preparation of the feasibility note requires doing the following:

a- Detecting, arranging and analyzing the explicit and implicit objectives of the policy: (the goals tree)

The evaluation team should work to detect, identify, and rearrange the total objectives of the policy or program to facilitate the analysis and measurement of the expected results and the causal relationships that link them through the preparation of the goal tree and the logical impact diagram. The goals tree helps to visualize the strategy of public stakeholders and to share the understanding with public policy stakeholders.
b- Preparing the logical impact diagram (logical diagram)

The development of the logical impact diagram (LID) or Logical Framework is intended to assist in understanding the business logic that the relevant parties in public policy implement to respond public to the various objectives identified. This logical diagram is a graphic representation that describes the working theory of a program or policy and reveals the assumptions, often implicit, that funders and managers make in order to plan a public intervention and bring it to bear on the expected impacts, from achievements to overall impacts. The logical diagram enables:

- Understand the chain of causation (the logic of cause and effect) that the policy should follow and which the evaluation should test;
- Judge the internal harmony of the policy by indicating whether all achievements contribute to the final impact or whether there are few objectives addressed in the logical intervention chain;
- Assist in the preparation of evaluation questions.

c- Sociogram structure

In order to meet the principle of inclusiveness in public policy evaluations, it is necessary to identify all the stakeholders of the public policy being evaluated. Moreover, the implementation of a public policy involves many stakeholders, whose function varies and may interfere. The sociogram is a graphic representation of the different parties involved in the public policy, their roles and the degree of participation in the public policy objectives.

The elaboration of a "sociogram" allows:

- Get a general overview of the political stakeholders and their functions;
- Determine how they will be involved in the evaluation process (interviews, focus group, etc.);
- Understand the links between the different parties involved and the integration (or competition) in their work in the delivery of public policy;
- A better understand, on the basis of these elements, the positioning, strategies and objectives sought by the two stakeholders.

d- Determining the evaluation questions

Evaluation questions should be built on from the predefined public policy issues through the analysis of the objectives, the intervention logic and the intentions of public policy stakeholders. It is particularly important to link the evaluation questions to the governance standard and quantitative and/or qualitative indicators that allow an answer to them.
The questions allow the evaluation work to be focused on a set of axes that help to collect data and information in a focused way and a more in-depth analysis. Evaluation questions should be based on a set of criteria that allow for the evaluation of public policies, in particular the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, feasibility, economic and social impact, adopted by the INTOSAI in the GUID 9020.

**Evaluation process**

The evaluation questions and analytical work should cover many of these criteria according to the issues identified during the feasibility study, and relevance, effectiveness and efficiency are key criteria for most evaluation work. However, the evaluation does not necessarily have to deal with all criteria.

**e- Identifying and selecting measurement indicators**

An evaluation is mainly based on benchmarks (indicator matrix) and an indicator is an order of volume that allows measuring a particular goal, a packed resource, or a productive impact. The indicators are divided into context indicators (pre-program status) and indicators that measure resources, achievements, results and impacts. The indicator produces quantitative information that allows for the estimation of various aspects of public policy and the indicator must be characterized by the qualities included in the English abbreviation (SMART) that is, it is specific, measurable, reachable, realistic, and accomplished in time.

Indicators are derived or restructured from the intervention programming documents, the follow-up panel and reports, studies, and implementation
reports, minutes of meetings and correspondence related to the intervention. It constitutes one of the objectives of the feasibility note to conduct the identification and counting of indicators, and to propose the formation of some of them if necessary. It should be noted that relying only on quantitative indicators is not enough to get a good analysis, so qualitative indicators and methods should be added through (Questionnaires, interviews and dialogues, documentary examination and reference comparisons....).

If the body preparing or completing the policy or program does not prepare measurement indicators, it is necessary for the evaluation team to establish them (contrary to performance auditing, which does not require the establishment of indicators).

f- Selection of methods of collecting and analyzing data and identifying their sources

To collect the data necessary to conduct the evaluation work, the evaluators use qualitative and quantitative methods according to the nature of the topic to be evaluated, the objectives of the evaluation and the questions to be answered. This stage is essential in the evaluation process where quantitative and qualitative evaluation indicators are filled in to measure and estimate public intervention.

Second Stage:

Once the feasibility study note is approved by the supervisory body (administrative unit of the supreme audit institution) and the process is registered in the annual audit program of the institution. This stage includes completing the team training in charge of the evaluation, preparing the evaluation plan, establishing an accompanying committee, then communicating the evaluation mission to the bodies concerned with the policy or program and collecting and analyzing data.

The team conducting the evaluation should have knowledge of the subject area to be evaluated and be trained in the specific modalities of the evaluation. If necessary, the team can also be given special training related to the topic and a special guide can be prepared to guide and frame the evaluation works.

The evaluation team may, if necessary, use the assistance of an external expert or experts.

After preparing the evaluation feasibility note, the evaluation team prepares a draft evaluation plan, and the plan is subject to modification and adaptation according to the development and progress of the evaluation process, provided that this modification is justified.
The evaluation plan aims to determine the scope and the estimated extent of the evaluation work, but the evaluation plan must respect some conditions, including highlighting the evaluation methodology, which necessarily leads to answering the evaluation questions that were previously posed at the beginning of the evaluation.

The evaluation plan is approved by the evaluation supervisors, as it also constitutes a means for monitoring the evaluation team, unifying its work, and facilitating and synthesizing the results.

**The evaluation plan includes several elements**, the most important of which are: evaluation objectives, evaluation questions, scope and extension of the evaluation process, identification of stakeholders, methodology for collecting and analyzing data, schedule for implementing the evaluation process and the composition of the evaluation team.

As for the accompanying committee which is established by the supreme audit institution, it is an advisory body that acts as a framework for providing advice in the field of evaluation and exchanging views on the follow-up of implementation and evaluation results to ensure its proper implementation.

The main role of the accompanying committee is to facilitate the evaluation process, in particular by allowing good information to the various stakeholders and its work includes all stages of the evaluation.

It provides its opinion on the feasibility note, the evaluation plan and the evaluation guide in relation to the chosen topic; it also participates in the formulation of the evaluation questions and gives an advisory opinion on the proposed method of data collection.

During the implementation of the evaluation, the parties concerned are informed and interviewed to explain the objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation methodology for this interview plays a communication role to make the evaluation bodies aware of the importance of the process and to involve them in order to facilitate and succeed in the evaluation. During this interview, the evaluation issue, its methodology and the deadlines for the submission of the evaluation report are explained, with the required commitment of all stakeholders.

Then the evaluation team proceeds to carry out the evaluation task by **collecting and analyzing data and data**.

The collection and analysis of data is the key to answering the evaluation questions, which are usually of a different source and nature that require the use of different technologies and mix several qualitative tools and/or quantities as the use of one technology is usually not sufficient to answer a specific evaluation question, rather it is necessary to use several techniques.
Third stage:

The formulation of conclusions and recommendations (report preparation) includes the evaluation team preparing the initial report of the evaluation process in which the conclusions (findings) are derived from the inspections, which in turn leads to the formulation of recommendations. The evaluation report, in addition to telling the objectives and methodology of the evaluation, contains all the inspections constructed from the analysis of data and information.

The report clearly shows: **observations, conclusions and recommendations.** **The observations** are assertions based on the collected data and a statement that represents the final result of the analysis and interpretation of quantitative and qualitative evidence extracted from the analysis and approach of the collected data.

The observations are presented and prepared to answer the questions using the evaluation criteria chosen during the analysis of the problem so that the reader can understand and link the results and evidence collected with identifying the source of those data. Evidence of quantitative or descriptive analysis should be available, relevant and credible. Out of these observations and the public intervention assessment, the evaluation team draws its conclusions (its extracts), which should be presented in a hierarchical manner supported by the strong inspections and analyses (according to the logic of the observation - the conclusion).

**The conclusions** must provide answers to the evaluation questions that were asked before the start of the evaluation implementation, it should be extracted from the analysis of the data and be linked to the predetermined evaluation criteria. The conclusion explains the problem(s) identified, the differences recorded compared to the desired goals, their causes, weaknesses and/or strengths, risks, benefits, disadvantages and failures revealed by the evaluation, and their impacts for the policy or program.

**The recommendations** are derived from the conclusions reached, taking into account their views and relevance, without which the recommendation would not be relevant. The Accompanying Group shall give its opinion on the recommendations before approving them by the supervisory body when approving the report. Recommendations should be reasonable in number, prioritized, useful, realistic and achievable, preferably independent at the end of the report.
The recommendations aim to improve or reform the public policies being evaluated and to learn lessons so that the same mistakes are not made in the design or implementation of other public policies and in the way they are communicated to citizens. Where strengths and advantages exist, the evaluation should recommend that they be reinforced.

Recommendations should also allow for the improvement of evaluated public interventions, be practical and realistic, take into account the obstacles and difficulties faced by the authority and the people who will implement them, be clear and open about the delivery mechanism and the proposed methodology, and describe the costs and resources required for this purpose.

A structured and timetable framework should also be established to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations.

The accompanying committee expresses its opinion on the conclusions and recommendations before the report is approved by the supervisory body (from the supreme audit institution) and communicated to the concerned parties to express their observations and enable them to have the right to respond.

In light of the answers of the concerned parties, the final report of the evaluation is prepared, which is communicated to the concerned parties for their use. It is also necessary to publish it to inform the citizens in a way that enhances the principle of accountability.