

POLICY EVALUATION IN EUROPE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT TRENDS OF INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND METHODOLOGICAL CONVERGENCE

Ioana Roxana MELENCIUC-IOAN

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration (SNSPA)
Bucharest/Romania

Abstract

Policy evaluation systems in the EU and EU Member States have evolved differently over time, due to different adoption patterns, institutional frameworks, and the integration of the EU acquis. This comparative analysis focuses on the evolution of these systems, especially covering the dynamics over the last decade (2015-2025). While the subject of an emerging evaluation culture at European level is set aside, the evolving influence of supranational frameworks through the transposition of regulations and practices from the European to the national level is considered the key element for a systemic understanding. The analysis reflects a comparative approach, conducted considering variables such as the level of centralization of processes, the legal framework, the development of evaluation capacity, the sophistication of methodological approaches, and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation processes.

Even though the endeavour cannot be exhaustive, having evident limitations in mapping variables at the level of all Member States, it reflects relevant examples in a comparative manner, serving as a good tool for an overall understanding of public policy evaluation practices in the EU.

Keywords

Evaluation culture; Evaluation systems; Evidence-based policy-making; Policy evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

Public policy evaluation systems in EU and throughout the EU Member States show a lot of differences that were shaped over time by different adoption patterns, institutional frameworks and the integration of the EU acquis. This comparative analysis shows how the policy evaluation systems of EU Member States have changed overtime, with a focus on the evolutions that took place over the last decade (2015-2025). The article is built around the relationship between the institutional practices in the field of policy evaluation that emerged at EU level and their transposition at national level, whether talking about mimetic processes or rather ones more adjusted on the context.

The analysis starts from a concise historical overview of the emergence of national-level public policy evaluation systems. The classification of states into “waves”, considering the patterns of adoption or transposition of evaluation practices is relevant not only for reasons related to the rigor of the scientific approach but also because the timing of their introduction embodies factors that continue to shape the evolution of an evaluation culture at both national and European levels.

Taking into account the historical background, as defined in the first section, I then proceed with a comparative analysis considering the level of centralization of processes, the definition of the legal framework, the development of evaluation capacity at the institutional level, the sophistication of methodological approaches, and last but not least, the way evaluation systems relate to the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation processes.

Setting aside the discussion over the mere existence of a homogeneous evaluation culture at the EU level, which is the subject of a previous article (Melenciuc 2015, 139-160), I address the operational aspects that stem from the existence of regulations and practices that define how evaluations are conducted at the EU level and for all mechanisms funded through European funds. Differences in the way regulations and practices established at European level are transposed at national level are reflected, depending on the historical wave of evaluation system development to which the states belong, as well as on the

level of centralization or decentralization of the evaluation systems developed at the national level.

The section dedicated to conclusions and current challenges reflects a European perspective on issues that are of concern at the level of other international evaluation communities as well. Elements such as the use of artificial intelligence in conducting evaluations and the ethical aspects that arise from this are topics that transcend the boundaries of national practitioner communities and will most likely lead to the emergence of a new generation of evaluations and evaluators.

1.1. Institutionalization of evaluation vs evaluation culture: a false dichotomy?

While for many the differences between institutionalization of evaluation and developing an evaluation culture may seem a false dichotomy (or at least utterly unimportant one), I stand for quite the opposite, even though I admit that the border is rather thin. One can understand institutionalization of evaluation as the first layer out of others that contribute to the development of an evaluation culture. In a previous paper I referred to this interdependence relationship using the visual metaphor of a mandala. The existence of a certain degree of evaluation culture is not necessarily conditioned by having a high level of evaluation institutionalization, but it would be impossible to reach a mature level of evaluation culture without having a well-developed institutional framework for undertaking evaluations (Melenciuc 2015).

According to De Peuter, Bart and V. Pattyn (2009) evaluation culture is *“a pattern of shared beliefs and values of policy makers and evaluators which provide them with rules for behaviour that lead towards a practice of evaluation”*. The existence and the maturity level of an evaluation culture is influenced by the availability of qualified and experienced evaluators, the presence of relevant knowledge and skills among decision-makers and evaluators, and the institutional frameworks for managing the evaluation and dissemination of results (Bachtler & Wren 2006 apud Dotti et al 2024).

Institutionalization of evaluation involves establishing formal mechanisms for conducting evaluations, using their findings to inform decision-making, and fostering a culture of accountability and learning. The most significant endeavour to measure and compare evaluation systems globally is performed through the Evaluation Globe project, based on the three-pillar model developed by Meyer, Stockmann and Taube 2020. The authors propose an extensive comparison of evaluation systems, addressing the characteristics of the political system, the social system and the system that leads to professionalization of evaluation.

Table no 1. Institutionalization of Evaluation in different Sub-Systems

Political System: Institutional Structures and Processes	Social System: Societal Dissemination and Acceptance of Evaluation in Society	System of Professionalization: Professionalization of Evaluations
National laws, regulations and policies	Use of evaluations by civil society	Academic education and training practices
Parliamentarian and national audit structures	Public discourse	Journals and communication platforms
Organizational structure	Participation of civil society	Professional organizations
Evaluation practice	Demand for evaluations	Existence of and compliance to standards

Source: Stockmann 2016; Meyer, Stockmann and Taube 2020, available on <https://evaluation-globe.com/about-the-evaluation-globe/>, accessed May 2025

The approach is in line with the “new-institutionalism” approach, as introduced by March and Olson (Meyer et al. 2020). Elements such as the existence of professional organizations or the use of evaluations by the civil society are elements that can describe both the institutionalization processes as well as the development of an evaluation culture. However, institutionalization involves a

systemic approach over relations between roles and situations, while the latter doesn't reflect the same systemic trait.

1.2. Methodological approach, data sources and limitations

This comparative study is based on document analysis, gathering data available about institutionalization of evaluation systems and practices at the level of Member States. The analysis draws from multiple academic sources examining policy evaluation institutionalization, the evaluation guidelines set at the level of European Commission and OECD as well as primary data sources. Data collection involved a systemic review of academic literature, institutional reports and policy documents from national and EU-level sources.

The study aims to generate a systemic understanding of policy evaluation framework throughout EU in a chronological perspective. However, the temporal focus covers the decade from 2015-2025, thus allowing a thorough examination of changes following the launch of the EU's Better Regulation strategy and its subsequent updates.

As acknowledged by many scholars in the field of evaluation studies, it is not an easy task to perform a comparative evaluation in this field. On one hand, this is due to the dynamics that leads to the case of having systems already changed by the time an extensive study is performed. Secondly, there is a plethora of approaches in measuring the degree of institutionalization or the maturity level of an evaluation culture so data that are not gathered using the same methodology are rather difficult to be used in a comparative manner. Last but nonetheless not least important, an extensive comparative study at the level of all member states can only be performed with the help of national experts. Thus, different evaluation capabilities in terms of evaluation professionals constitute an important limitation in performing an exhaustive study.

2. HISTORICAL WAVES OF EVALUATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

It would exceed the scope of the article to investigate the historical evolution of implementing evaluation systems at the level of each Member State, treated individually. However, I reflect on the history of evaluation practice in Europe, while trying to distinguish if there are patterns of evaluation capacity-building. Thus, two approaches are distinguished in the specialised literature: one in which we group states based on the moment when the evaluation systems were institutionalised, and the other in which we group states on a regional approach. In the second approach, the explanation lies in the similarities of administrative culture that exist within regional blocs, which lead to similar evolutionary paths, including in terms of the development of evaluation systems.

The approach I find more relevant is aligned with the first category, namely the classification of states based on the moment when evaluation systems were institutionalised, but I often introduce regional aspects as well. While there are scholars that rather distinguish two waves of policy evaluation development throughout Europe (Pattyn et al 2018), in the present analysis, based on a similar rationale, it is made the distinction between three waves.

It is worth mentioning that the categorization of European countries in “waves” based on the chronological pattern of development of evaluation systems is a type of classification linked to that regarding the evolution and diffusion of evaluation use at international level (Vedung 2010).

2.1. First Wave Countries: Early Adopters

The First Wave of policy evaluation adoption in Europe occurred in North-western European countries during the 1960s and 1970s, primarily influenced by developments in the United States and driven by the post-war government interventions and increasing public expenditure (Pattyn et al 2018). The use of evaluations increased in the United States as a mean of assuring accountability

of policies implemented at federal level (Stame 2008). The public pressure was high, especially with reference to the policies on which most of the budget was spent. Defence, health and education were the fields in which evaluation elevated its role, assuring legitimacy of the decisions and accountability of public expenditure. During the Cold War, the public feared that the educational gap was even bigger than the missile gap (Patton 2023).

The pressure for legitimacy was doubled by the push for accurate data, as the trend at the moment was favourable to the use of experiments and randomized controlled trials as the gold standard of scientific research (Vedung 2010).

European countries that were part of this first wave were located in Northwestern Europe, and included Sweden and the other Scandinavian countries, the UK and Germany (Derlien and Rist 2002, 442). It is noteworthy that not all countries in the region are affected by the trend in the same time, such as the Netherlands and Switzerland, due to, most likely, their cultural and religious diversity. Even though the link between the cultural context and the diffusion of evaluation practices may seem fable, the explanation resides in the mechanisms that were used for setting the public agenda. Thus, in the case of the two countries, the diversity led to the practice of consensus as an instrument for defining the public priorities (Stame in Pattyn et al 2018).

Based on recent available comparative data measuring the institutionalization of evaluation, the early adopters are usually the frontrunners up to present times (Jacob 2023, 193-194). They developed solid institutional foundations characterized by dedicated evaluation units, national professional evaluation communities, and integration of evaluation practices with budget and planning processes. By 2015, all First Wave countries had achieved high levels of institutionalization with central coordination mechanisms and regular evaluation cycles. The Scandinavian countries, in particular, demonstrate sophisticated approaches to participatory evaluation and stakeholder engagement, building on corporatist governance traditions (Nedergaard and Nobel 2022).

2.2. Second Wave Countries: EU Integration and New Public Management

The Second Wave in Europe emerged during the 1980s and 1990s, coinciding with deeper and more extensive European integration, as well as with the increasing influence of New Public Management paradigm. Countries including France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, and Austria developed evaluation systems primarily driven by EU membership requirements and access to structural funds (Stame 2008). Whether they show a centralized evaluation system or rather a more de-centralized one, all countries have shown progress overtime in maturing the evaluation culture and strengthening the evaluation institutional capacity (Jacob et al. 2015).

As Vedung puts it, this wave is the “neo-liberal wave”, as the New Public Management approach in public administration spread at a time when neo-liberal paradigm was the norm in many countries that showed a mature democracy and an emerging economy. Governments were made accountable in front of the citizens through evaluation results, checking on economy, effectiveness and cost efficiency. New Public Management was a way of making governments work more like private companies, applying ideas drawn from administrative practices in the private sector (Vedung 2010, 270-273).

This period marked the beginning of significant EU influence on national evaluation practices through cohesion policy evaluation requirements. EU pressure for demonstrating effective use of European funds created powerful incentives for developing systematic evaluation approaches.

While many scholars only distinguish two waves in the development of evaluation systems throughout Europe (the second covering also present times), I find it relevant to make a difference between the countries that developed evaluation systems as a consequence of becoming members of the European Union and those that developed the systems in order to comply to the criteria set in order to become a member state. This distinction among countries that developed evaluation systems before or EU accession makes the point for a third wave, that of “compliant” countries.

2.3. Third Wave Countries: The Compliant Group

The Third Wave encompasses Central and Eastern European countries that joined the EU during the 2000s and 2010s, experiencing the strongest EU influence on evaluation system development. Countries including Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania developed evaluation practices primarily complying to EU accession requirements and cohesion policy obligations. Furthermore, countries that joined the EU at a later stage also have lower degrees of maturity in their evaluation culture (Fitzpatrick 2012).

These countries faced unique challenges including limited evaluation traditions, weak administrative capacities, and political cultures resistant to systematic policy analysis (Zybała 2018).

However, EU requirements for evaluation of cohesion policy programs provided both technical assistance and financial incentives for capacity building. The European Commission's support through various advisory programs facilitated knowledge transfer and institutional development.

2. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE PATTERNS

2.1. Evaluation Capacity-Building

The establishment of central evaluation units or coordination bodies represents a key indicator of institutional development across EU Member States. During the decade 2015-2025 First Wave countries maintained their existing strong coordination mechanisms while enhancing technical capabilities and digital integration. Second Wave countries demonstrated progress in establishing central evaluation units, with all major countries developing dedicated coordination mechanisms by 2025. France's reinforcement of evaluation coordination through enhanced inter-ministerial cooperation and Italy's establishment of more systematic evaluation planning exemplifies this development. Third Wave countries showed more modest but significant

progress, with Poland establishing evaluation ministry-specific units and other countries developing partial coordination structures.

The trend toward centralization is most likely linked with the EU Better Regulation guidelines requiring systematic evaluation planning and quality assurance. However, centralization approaches vary significantly, from hierarchical coordination models in some countries to networked governance arrangements in others, reflecting different administrative traditions and political cultures as well.

Table 2. Dominant models of countries by reference to the centralization of the evaluation systems

Model Type	Representative States	Core Characteristics	Coordination Mechanisms
Centralized	Netherlands, Spain	Ministry-led (e.g., SAU in Netherlands) or dedicated agency (Spain's State Agency)	Mandatory evaluation agendas, standardized toolkits
Networked	Portugal, Italy	Inter-ministerial coordination bodies (PlanAPP, RePLAN)	Shared guidelines, capacity-building programs
Decentralized	Poland, Czechia, Hungary	Ministry-specific evaluation units with weak central oversight	Limited coordination, project-based evaluations

In general, evaluation systems in Northwestern Europe are less centralized (Stern 2009). Another result of the EU's push is that the second-wave nations' evaluation activities are generally focused on the policy areas that the EU funds, including regional development. The evaluation systems of the first-wave countries, on the other hand, are more varied (Stern 2009).

Legal framework development shows convergence toward stronger evaluation mandates across EU Member States. Spain's 2022 Law on the Institutionalisation of Evaluation represents a landmark development in this regard, establishing comprehensive evaluation mandates across government levels (OECD 2025). Third Wave countries made moderate progress, developing basic legal frameworks while continuing to rely heavily on EU requirements for evaluation mandates.

Digital transformation represents a significant development in policy evaluation practices across EU Member States. Advanced digital tools adoption characterizes First Wave countries, which have integrated artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and automated monitoring systems into evaluation processes (European Commission 2024). These innovations enable real-time policy monitoring and more sophisticated impact analysis.

Second Wave countries demonstrate intermediate digital adoption, focusing on digital consultation platforms, online stakeholder engagement tools, and digital data collection systems. Third Wave countries show basic digital adoption levels, primarily using digital tools for data collection and basic analysis rather than advanced analytical capabilities. However, EU support programs continue to facilitate technology transfer and capacity building in this area, suggesting potential for accelerated development in upcoming years.

Table 3. Dominant models of countries by reference to the centralization of the evaluation systems

	Legal framework development			Digital transformation in policy evaluation practices		
	Basic coherence or lack of clarity in defining mandate	Clarity in mandates among responsible institutions	Mature legal framework and clear mechanisms of legislative	Basic adoption	Intermediate adoption	Advanced digital tools

	s		review			
First wave countries			✓			✓
Second wave countries		✓			✓	
Third wave countries	✓			✓		

2.2. Methodological Approaches and Technical Sophistication

The methodological landscape of policy evaluation across EU Member States reveals increasing sophistication and diversification over the 2015-2025 period. Nordic countries continue to lead in methodological innovation, particularly in theory-based evaluation approaches and mixed-methods designs (Dunlop and Radaelli 2015). Sweden's advancement of theory-based evaluation frameworks and Denmark's integration of digital tools in evaluation processes exemplify this trend.

Western European countries demonstrate varied methodological preferences reflecting different administrative cultures and policy traditions. Germany's emphasis on theory-based approaches builds on strong social science research traditions, while the Netherlands' mixed-methods orientation reflects pragmatic governance approaches and extensive stakeholder consultation practices. France's focus on impact assessment methodologies aligns with its rationalist administrative culture and emphasis on technical expertise in policy-making.

Central and Eastern European countries show emerging methodological development, though capacity constraints limit sophistication. Poland's adoption of participatory evaluation approaches reflects democratic consolidation efforts and civil society development, while other countries in this group rely primarily on basic evaluation frameworks focused on compliance and output measurement rather than outcome and impact assessment.

Stakeholder engagement levels vary significantly across EU Member States, reflecting different democratic traditions and governance cultures. Nordic countries demonstrate very high engagement levels, building on corporatist traditions and strong civil society organizations. The Netherlands' systematic stakeholder consultation processes and Denmark's citizen engagement initiatives in evaluation represent best practices in this area.

Western and Southern European countries show medium engagement levels, with increasing emphasis on civil society participation and transparency requirements. Central and Eastern European countries generally show lower stakeholder engagement levels, as limited civil society capacity and political cultures emphasizing technocratic decision-making contribute to these patterns.

It is noteworthy The European Economic and Social Committee's enhanced role in policy evaluation and civil dialogue that demonstrates EU-level efforts to strengthen participatory approaches.

2.3. EU Level Influence and Coordination Mechanisms

Policy evaluation has emerged as a cornerstone of modern democratic governance, serving multiple functions including accountability, learning, and legitimacy enhancement (Pattyn et al. 2018). Within the European Union context, evaluation practices have evolved from ad-hoc assessment exercises to systematic, institutionalized frameworks that integrate with broader governance mechanisms (Stephenson and Schoenefeld 2023). The EU's Better Regulation agenda, launched in 2015 and updated in 2021, has positioned evaluation as essential for evidence-based policy-making and regulatory fitness (Listorti et al. 2020).

The European Commission's Better Regulation 2021 initiative, formalized through the Communication "Better regulation: Joining forces to make better laws" of April 29, 2021, represents a significant evolution in EU regulatory governance (Briefing 2021). This comprehensive reform builds upon two decades of regulatory modernization efforts while introducing novel instruments designed to address post-pandemic recovery challenges and support the Union's digital and green transitions (Renda 2022). The initiative's academic significance lies not merely in its policy innovations, but in its attempt to reconcile competing theoretical frameworks of regulatory governance: evidence-based policymaking, burden reduction, stakeholder participation, and future-oriented policy design.

Academic assessment of the Better Regulation 2021 initiative has focused particularly on the initiative's two primary innovations: the introduction of a regulatory offsetting mechanism through the "One In, One Out"(OIOO) principle and the systematic integration of strategic foresight into EU policymaking (Pollex and van Voorst 2024). These innovations represent significant changes from previous regulatory approaches, being the warranty for comprehensive academic evaluation.

The OIOO approach constitutes the most theoretically significant innovation within Better Regulation 2021, representing what academic literature characterizes as a "paradigm shift" in EU regulatory practice (Briefing 2021). From a theoretical perspective, this approach draws upon regulatory budget theory and administrative cost optimization frameworks developed in OECD countries. Academic analysis reveals fundamental tensions within the OIOO framework about regulatory offsetting mechanisms, which academic literature suggests may prioritize quantitative burden reduction over qualitative regulatory effectiveness (James et al. 2024).

The methodological framework underlying OIOO implementation raises significant academic questions regarding cost calculation methodologies and burden measurement techniques. The approach relies on the EU Standard Cost Model (SCM) for quantifying administrative burdens, but academic evaluation suggests this methodology may inadequately capture the full spectrum of regulatory impacts.

The second important innovation refers to the systematic integration of strategic foresight, thus addressing longstanding academic criticisms of reactive policymaking approaches (Briefing 2025). Academic literature defines strategic foresight as "*the discipline of exploring, anticipating and shaping the future,*" emphasizing its role in creating more resilient and adaptable regulatory frameworks. The theoretical foundation draws from complexity theory and adaptive governance literature, suggesting that regulatory systems must incorporate anticipatory mechanisms to address rapidly changing technological and social environments (Briefing 2025).

3. CONCLUSIONS

This comparative study of policy evaluation systems throughout Europe is part of a more in-depth endeavour of defining a common framework for measuring institutionalization of evaluation as well as the development of evaluation cultures throughout Europe. The analysis shows that the landscape is marked by both convergence and enduring diversity. First Wave nations, particularly those in Northern Europe, are still setting the benchmarks for digital integration, methodological sophistication, and institutional resilience. By utilizing cutting-edge digital tools and upholding high levels of stakeholder engagement, these countries have deeply integrated evaluation into their governance structures. Due in part to the Better Regulation agenda and the requirements of the EU cohesion policy, Second Wave countries have made notable progress in centralizing evaluation procedures and implementing digital platforms. Despite beginning from a lower baseline, Third Wave countries have shown consistent progress thanks to EU-supported technology transfer and capacity-building programs.

Notwithstanding these developments, difficulties still exist. New demands are brought about by the quick speed of technological advancement, the complexity of policy concerns, and the expanding use of artificial intelligence in evaluation procedures. Ethics are becoming important issues that need coordinated national and EU responses, especially when it comes to data privacy and the

open application of AI. Evaluation systems do not all mature equally, and variations in administrative culture, legal systems, and stakeholder involvement continue to influence how evaluation practices change amongst Member States. Transposition of supranational laws and practices, particularly under the EU's Better Regulation framework, has fuelled a distinct trend toward convergence in the evolution of policy evaluation systems in the EU. Nonetheless, variations in the degree of centralization, legal requirements, and stakeholder involvement will continue to exist due to the diversity of national contexts. While Second and Third Wave countries have made significant strides, they still face difficulties with capacity, coordination, and incorporating evaluation results into policy-making. First Wave countries are prime examples of developed systems with robust institutionalization and sophisticated methodologies.

It is crucial to keep funding institutional capacity, especially in Third Wave nations, in order to create sustainable evaluation cultures and fortify policy evaluation systems even more in order to meet future challenges. Strong data governance and ethical standards should go hand in hand with accelerating the adoption of digital tools like artificial intelligence (AI) and big data analytics. The legitimacy and efficacy of evaluation procedures will be improved by bolstering stakeholder engagement and incorporating best practices from Nordic and Western European nations. Sustained conformity to EU frameworks, like the Better Regulation guidelines, will facilitate the incorporation of evidence-based policymaking and strategic foresight into evaluation cycles. Guidelines for the responsible use of AI in evaluation must be developed in order to address new ethical issues while maintaining accountability, transparency, and privacy.

Policy evaluation systems have become much more sophisticated and institutionalized during the last decade, but continued adaptation, learning, and cooperation will be necessary to guarantee that evaluation continues to be a vital component of efficient and democratic governance in Europe.

REFERENCES

- Better Regulation Guidelines. 2021. Effective May 2025
https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2021-11/swd2021_305_en.pdf
- Pollex, Jan and Stijn van Voorst. 2024. "Chapter 22: Better Regulation" in *Handbook on European Union Public Administration*, edited by Gijs J. Brandsma. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Briefing on "What is new in the Commission's 2021 Better Regulation Guidelines?". Effective May 2025
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/699463/EPRS_BRI\(2022\)699463_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2022/699463/EPRS_BRI(2022)699463_EN.pdf)
- De Peuter, Bart and Pattyn V. 2009. "Evaluation capacity: enabler or exponent of evaluation culture?" in *L'Evaluation des politiques publiques en Europe: Cultures et Futurs*, coordinated by A. Fouquet and L. Meassonn. l'Harmattan.
- Derlien, H., & Rist, R. C. 2002. "Conclusion: Policy evaluation in international comparison." in *International atlas of evaluation*, edited by J.-E. Furubo, C. Rayand, and R. Sandahl. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Dotti, N. F, Walczyk, J., Pellegrin, J., Colnot, L. and Kupiec, T. 2024. "Triggering policy learning via formal EU evaluation requirements in the case of Cohesion Policy". *European Policy Analysis* 10(4): 515–531
- Dunlop, Claire and C. Radaelli. 2015. "Impact Assessment in the European Union: Lessons from a Research Project". *European Journal of Risk Regulation* 6(1)
- Eager, James, E. Nacer and L. Douville. 2024. "Application of the 'One in, one out' approach – and its impact on businesses". Effective May 2025.
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2024/754202/IPOL_STU\(2024\)754202_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2024/754202/IPOL_STU(2024)754202_EN.pdf)
- Fitzpatrick, Teresa. 2012. "Evaluating legislation: An alternative approach for evaluating EU internal market and services law". *Evaluation* 18(4):477-499
- Jacob, Steven. 2023. "The institutionalization of evaluation around the globe: understanding the main drivers and effects over the past decades" in *Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation* edited by Frédéric Varone, Steve Jacob and Pirmin Bundi. Edward Elgar Publishing
- Jacob, Steven and Speer, S, Furubo, J-E. 2015. "The institutionalization of evaluation matters: Updating the International Atlas of Evaluation 10 years later". *Evaluation* 21(1): 6–31.

- Listorti, G., Basyte-Ferrari, E., Acs, S., & Smits, P. 2020. "Towards an evidence-based and integrated policy cycle in the EU: A review of the debate on the Better Regulation agenda". *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 58(6), 1558–1577.
- Nedergaard, Peter and Trine C. Nobel. 2022. "The Nordic formula: an analysis of policy learning in sectoral networks of the Nordic Council of Ministers." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 45 (4): 529-547
- Melenciuc I. 2015. "The Emergence of an Evaluation Culture in the EU: Between International Practices and Europeanization Pressures." *Europolity. Continuity and change* 9 (1): 137-160
- Melenciuc I. 2015. *The Emergence of a European Evaluation Culture*. Tritonic
- Meyer, Wolfgang, S. Reinhard and L. Taube. 2020. "The Institutionalisation of Evaluation. Theoretical Background, Analytical Concept and Methods" in *The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe*, edited by R. Stockmann, W. Meyer and L. Taube. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. 2023 "Public policy evaluation: origins and evolution" in *Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation* edited by Frédéric Varone, Steve Jacob and Pirmin Bundi. Edward Elgar Publishing
- Pattyn, Valerye. Voorst, S., Mastenbroek, E. and Dunlop, C. 2018, "Policy evaluation in Europe" in *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*, edited by S. Thiel. and E. Ongaro.
- Renda, Andrea. 2022. "Assessment of current initiatives of the European Commission on better regulation". Effective May 2025.
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2022/734766/IPOL_IDA\(2022\)734766_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2022/734766/IPOL_IDA(2022)734766_EN.pdf)
- Stame, Nicoletta. 2008. "The European Project, Federalism and Evaluation." *Evaluation* 14(2):117-140
- Stern, Elliot. 2009. "Evaluation policy in the European Union and its institutions", in *Evaluation policy and evaluation practice: New directions for evaluation*, edited by W.M.K. Trochim, M. M. Mark, & L. J. Cooksy. San Francisco.
- Stephenson, Paul J., and Jonas Schoenefeld. 2023. "The role and functioning of evaluation in the European Union." in *Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation*, edited by F. Varone, S. Jacob, and P. Bundi. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- OECD. 2020. "Improving Governance with Policy Evaluation: Lessons From Country Experiences". OECD Public Governance Reviews. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/89b1577d-en>
- OECD. 2025. "Implementation toolkit for the OECD Recommendation on Public Policy Evaluation" effective May 2025. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2025/02/implementation-toolkit-for-the-oecd-recommendation-on-public-policy-evaluation_f24516be/77faa4fe-en.pdf
- Vedung, Evert. 2010. "Four Waves of Evaluation Diffusion." *Evaluation* 16(3): 263-277.
- Zybała, Andrzej. 2018 "Public Policy in Poland in Context of Tendencies Unfolding in Central Europe. Conclusions from Case Studies." In *Yearbook of the Institute of East-Central Europe* 16(5): 81-103.

