Chinese Provincial “Government Performance Evaluation” Model Comparison
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Abstract  Provincial government holds a special place in the level structure of Chinese government. As an evaluation within the governmental system, provincial government performance evaluation model reflects the macro-intentions of the central-government, which dominates the governments of cities, counties and towns. This paper classifies the present provincial government performance evaluation or the assessment of political achievement in China as “efficiency assessment”, “scientific development level assessment” and “government performance evaluation”. Taking Fujian, Guangdong, and Shenzhen (Hunan) for example, this paper compares the three models from the backgrounds, motivations and internal relations, and analyzes the similarities and the differences of the goal settings, evaluation subjects, evaluation objects, technology systems, and organization systems . Because the situations across China are quite different from each other, different evaluation model shows its own local characteristics and personal styles of leaders. However, all the three models can be regarded as a top-down benchmarking and even a “rational tool” to strengthen superior government governance in general speaking.
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1. Provincial government performance evaluation and model devision

Generally speaking, the pattern is to solve the problem of a certain type of methodology , taking solve the class problem up to the height of the theory, that constitute a pattern. Government performance evaluation model is to solve the problem of government performance evaluation methodology. If taking Fujian province-wide implementation of the provincial government office efficiency in 2000 as a "performance evaluation” starting point, then, in 2011, the Central Commission for Discipline Inspection Supervision will choose Beijing, Shenzhen and other eight local governments and departments to carry out Performance Management pilot, marks the Chinese government performance evaluation and management have been imported nationwide, the system-level exploration. Ten years, throughout the local government activities , from "the methodology” perspective, China's provincial government performance evaluation "mode" can be divided into three kinds of circumstances: "efficiency assessment", "scientific development level evaluation" and "government performance evaluation”.

This classification has the dynamic, and with the current domestic academic discussion in different ways. In fact, the government performance evaluation model is a concept with Chinese characteristics. Domestic scholars relevant research literature is not much . Zang Naikang points out, the customer is supreme, the public responsibility and optimized matching is the government performance evaluation system of the three principles of the model. Further, Zhou Zhiren proposed by
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“pioneering, peculiarity, practicality and durability, and dynamic development, social influence, effect and development prospect” such elements make up “unique mode of practice” criteria to judge. Think of Fujian province “institution efficiency” and the construction of Qingdao city as a representative of the “target management and performance evaluation”, represent the performance management the two unique mode of practice in our country. Bao Guoxian based on local government performance evaluation practice characteristics, making China government performance evaluation model summed up in four categories: "Gansu mode" and "Qingdao model", "Siming mode" and "Zhuhai model" Zheng Fanghui, "2010 China local government performance evaluation red data book" of whole, will be in the national takes the lead in pushing" the government and department performance management Shenzhen as a "comprehensive performance management "mode; Chinese administration management group the joint institute in its report, the government performance evaluation mode will be divided into "universality government performance evaluation", "industry organization performance evaluation" and "special organization performance evaluation".

Such scholar to China local government performance evaluation model of the classification has the specific background and pointing. As the methodology, model presents diversity divided. From the logic method, the government performance evaluation to see is a complex system. According to the government of the evaluation of the organization by five dimensions, which, in their mutual combination form matrix structure, as shown in figure 1. Different dimensions of elements consist of specific “model” form. But widely accepted division: one is based on evaluation organization and the main body, will the government performance appraisal is divided into system evaluation and system in the evaluation of two kinds of model, the former refers to the internal government a functional departments or special evaluation organization of the implementation of the performance evaluation, and the latter is also known as the third party evaluation, it is to point to by no subordinate relations with the government and the interests of the relationship between the third sector and folk organizations implement evaluation. Two is based on evaluation objects and attributes, government performance evaluation of government agencies can be divided into universality performance evaluation, specific industry organization's performance evaluation and special performance evaluation three mode; Three is based on the characteristics of evaluation to the words "so-and-so and model".
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But, from the reality of the situation, our country government performance evaluation and the practice of management has just started, top-down system internal various evaluation as the important means of government regulation is universal, there are many place case dubbed the "government
performance evaluation”. But, as the provincial government in China of the performance evaluation of "mode", no matter from the practical characteristics, methods, or meaning and effect logic to see, three models have more specific and representative: one is to strengthen the construction of the target of the institution efficiency for "the government performance evaluation”, or "efficiency assessment”, Fujian province is typical; two is for leadership and management team to carry out the "scientific development level evaluation”, involving provinces, Jiangsu province, and Guangdong province for representative; Three is to introduce a result oriented and public satisfaction oriented process control, or government performance oriented goal (benchmarking) management, for example, Guangxi, Hunan, Shenzhen. Special point out is: in a strict sense, "efficiency assessment", "scientific development level evaluation "with"government performance evaluation” are not the same concept categories,Guangxi, Hunan, shenzhen these cities" the government performance evaluation” also have typical Chinese characteristics, it is different with "the government performance evaluation”. But they are the same function is based on the specific objectives of the evaluation system of top-down, on the background of the reality of our country, looking from broad sense, this paper see it as "government performance evaluation”

2. Chinese provincial "governments performance evaluation" and the typical model

2.1 The basic situation of Chinese provincial "governments performance evaluation"

In China's administrative system, the provincial government which is the highest level of local government among of the central government and grass-roots government, responsible for implementing central policies, local economic development and other major responsibilities. In 2010, the first province-wide implementation of office efficiency in Fujian, can be regarded as th beginning of the Chinese characteristics "Government Performance Evaluation". As the special relationship between our party and government as well as government leaders with the government. In a sense, office efficiency, the scientific concept of development assessment and evaluation of government performance are intrinsically linked, which common than personality, can be expressed as "government performance evaluation ".

In 2009, the CPC Central Committee issued "views on establish appraisal mechanism which to promote the scientific development on the establishment of the party and government leading bodies and leading cadres". At the same time, in this orientation, the provincial party committee and government have been carried out the corresponding practices. However, the literature point of view, there are many differs among the provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities in the name of the managing institutions, offices of the lead unit, the relevant supporting documents, etc. As shown in Table 1.

From the table, it can be found that, the Chinese provincial "government performance” evaluation of the practice have the following characteristics: First, the difference in time to carry out the practice, more than half the provinces set up corresponding organizations in 2008 and later. Second, the evaluation of leading institutions have a strong authority. Most provinces have set up specialized agencies, and provincial party secretary or governor appointed by the head. Third, the department which set up by the office show the diversity, including the party organization department, discipline, the Office of the Government, Civil Service Bureau, Supervision Room and so on. Fourth, only the individual provinces carried out the evaluations under the name of "government performance", the majority of provinces in the name of evaluation team, cadre evaluation and appraisal the scientific
development concept evaluation. Five, from the open literature point of view, to 2010, the annual evaluation of the results of all provinces were not announced. Sixth, the index system is basically designed around the self and self-contained state. Such as it's lack of uniform consensus on the the index terms used, to build ideas, data sources, etc.

Table 1 The government performance evaluation or assessment of the organization of cadres of some provinces (autonomous regions and municipalities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>provinces</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Offices of the lead unit</th>
<th>Establishedtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jilin</td>
<td>Provincial People's Government Performance Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>Provincial Civil Service Bureau</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sichuan</td>
<td>Provincial People's Government Target Performance Management Committee</td>
<td>Provincial Office</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujian</td>
<td>Provincial leading group office of Performance Construction</td>
<td>Provincial Office, the provincial government office</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td>Provincial leading group for appraisal</td>
<td>Provincial Organization Department</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangxi</td>
<td>Regional leadership team performance evaluation</td>
<td>Autonomous discipline, Party Organization Department</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a historical sequence and internal logic point of view, in the course of the Chinese provincial "government performance" evaluation have some typical representative models: "performance assessment" began in Fujian in 2000, "Government Performance Evaluation and Management" in Shenzhen City in 2007 and "the level of appraisal of scientific development" in Guangdong Province in 2008, which can be called three models.

2.2 "Efficiency assessment"-- Fujian mode

In 1994, in accordance with the deployment of the Central Commission for Discipline Inspection Commission, Fuan City, in Fujian Province, carried out administrative efficiency in monitoring the pilot in 1995, then extended to the province. In 1999, drawing on the successful experience of Hong Kong Office of the Ombudsman, the first in Fujian Province will expand the effectiveness of performance monitoring construction. Through a comprehensive evaluation of the government and its departments to perform their duties and management activities, efficiency, effectiveness and effects, in order to improve administrative efficiency, improve the work-style, building a transparent, clean, efficient modern government. In the course of building the efficiency of full attention public participation, up and down, and application of the linkage of substantive problems. Fujian performance (evaluation) the practice of building the following features:

First, the establishment of institutions, systems of innovation. In coordination, and the standard is differ, realistic problems, Fujian Province set up a leading group office efficiency, and leading group office (permanent establishment), in charge of office efficiency assessment work. This institutional arrangement that is the work of the security conditions, but also work to achieve a professional assessment and standardized basis.

Second, the main diversity, a comprehensive evaluation. That is internal evaluation, there are public comment, will be responsible for the charge and the next combination, effective to enhance the evaluation of the credibility and accuracy; the same time, indicators covering economic, social, environmental, cultural, and other aspects of the government itself, in particular, highlight the long-term development strategy and building a harmonious society, sustainable development and other
major practical problems, fully reflects the "people-oriented, comprehensive, coordinated and sustainable" scientific development concept.

Third, the first pilot to be gradual. The first pilot in a few government departments (1999, Zhangzhou City; 2002, Siming District, Xiamen), and accumulated experience. In 2005, the provincial government to fully draw on practical experience, Siming District, Xiamen City, in the province and city and provincial government department in full swing.

2.3 "Scientific progress level inspection appraisal" - Guangdong mode

In 2008, to implement the central organization department of the spirit of the documents as an opportunity, the guangdong province launched "guangdong saves ShiTingJi party leader team and leading cadres to implement the scientific development view evaluation index system and evaluation", try to in the whole country formed the scientific development of the evaluation system and the evaluation method. The object of the evaluation for ground level to be listed the party leader team and leading cadres, the evaluation scope covers the government departments and the party and government departments, and the "satisfaction" as the inspection party and government organs leadership and leading cadres effectiveness is an important standard, driving the leading cadres "the eye is down", pay attention to the people's livelihood. At the same time, the evaluation results as leadership adjustment and cadres, rewards and punishment, and the employment of the important basis for training. Guangdong science development of evaluation features:

One is through scientific idea of development, give full play to the evaluation of the baton "role". More prominent overall coordination, overall development, change the past simple to pursue the traditional way of evaluation GDP. The evaluation index system of economic indicators in the proportion of the up and down only 30%, set up the "people's life" index, fully embodies the human-oriented management thinking of the modern.

Two is the introduction of external evaluation as the main body, the weight of the outstanding public opinion. Through the democratic assessment and evaluation of the satisfaction links such as party and government organs cadres and society will be the public into the examinational process, pay attention to collect public opinion, and expand public participation, pay attention to the people's livelihood, satisfy the crowd as the important content of cadre, let people become the leading cadres with inspection work result the important standard.

Three is functional partition, classified assessment. According to the main body function region in guangdong province and planning of the actual situation, creative will be the province regional 21 to be listed into urban development zones, optimization development zones, key development zones, ecological development zones, four regions, to set up different types of the index system and the index weight, in unified economic development, social development and people's life and ecological environment, and other four field layer, setting 24 common index and 20 categories, reflect different regional development index of the characteristics and different function development requirements, effectively guide to realize scientific development in different areas, science to reflect the differences between the different areas of the evaluation results, avoid biased.

Four is sound institutions, and the public. In the provincial party committee was established under the unified leadership of provincial examination evaluation work leading group, and in provincial party committee established organization department province evaluation work leading group office, concrete bear of evaluation organization, coordination and management guidance, etc. At the same time, according to the relevant provisions of the open government to the public examination results. Will the results as leadership and adjustment and cadres, rewards and punishment, and the employment of the
important basis for training.

2.4 "Government performance evaluation"-Shenzhen mode

In the words "government performance evaluation" of Chinese local government, generally in several ways: one is combined with target responsibility system, in order to Qingdao etc for typical in the process of performance evaluation, join the target management the way and the method; The second is the supervision and inspection the key work as a starting point, and the Hunan as representative, main show is in protecting and annual inspection at ordinary times as the main way, the governments at lower levels and departments to implement provincial committee and government, the key work (engineering) and the functions of the government performance evaluation; Three is to introduce a public satisfaction to Hangzhou for typical, pay great attention to the public and management service object into the performance evaluation content, as an important part of the assessment. But relative to character, the practice of Shenzhen more representative.

Shenzhen is China's reform and opening the window, and the Guangdong provincial deputy provincial city. In 2007, Shenzhen launched the performance evaluation of government and management work, and in March of that year in government performance price pilot, for the first time to's 16 government functional departments and six on the district government performance evaluation. In 2009, Shenzhen began to implement the responsibility of system, target and published Shenzhen government performance evaluation and management "1 + 3" series documents, which constitute the Shenzhen government performance evaluation of the basic framework In 2010, Shenzhen government performance evaluation from the original local pilot units extend to the work of the city government departments and the district government and the new administrative committee, will all the work of the government departments and the government at a lower level into the performance evaluation. Shenzhen government performance evaluation features:

One is the concept ahead, positioning is clear. In the national government to "take the lead in performance management" concept development "the performance evaluation of government", the work location for the government performance oriented goal (benchmarking) management. Shenzhen government performance management is the basic idea of "benchmarking, process monitoring, results oriented, continuous improvement, public satisfaction", basic demand is "scientific and reasonable, fairness and transparency, dynamic development, simple and easy".

Two is public evaluation, and construct multi-evaluation evaluation body. Reflect "people oriented" government performance evaluation value orientation and evaluation focuses on the "citizens the desired results", and to be important in the building of the modern government mechanism. Through the external evaluation, especially entrust a third party agencies to collect the views of the public and the service object, constantly increasing involvement in all circles of the society.

Three is the process control and result oriented combination. The index system construction and optimization, adhere to the common index, personality index and special target, and the combination of common index evaluation objects used in horizontal comparison between; Individual character of evaluation index to the history of the object itself on longitudinal comparison; Special target used to assess specific work, and in the process control in the error correction.

Four is the development of "electronic evaluation system" and "electronic polls system". Pay attention to the electronic government affairs, to evaluate the development provided a comparatively full of information and data. Through the electronic evaluation system, realize the real-time evaluation data and breath collection, the evaluation process real-time surveillance, the result of evaluation real-time feedback, effective and timely urges governments to improve work.
Five is results using insist on incentive and accountability combined. Will the evaluation results and evaluation assessment, civil service for selection and appointment, administrative award, the administration accountability combined. The annual appraisal of civil servants and unit to the evaluation results hook, evaluation for "good" or "good" the order, and improve the civil servants the year inspection "outstanding" number order, and vice, reduce the proportion of civil servants the year inspection "outstanding" number order proportion.

3. A comparative analysis of three models

Based on China's special conditions, it's very difficult to measure the content of Chinese provincial government performance evaluation or appraisal practice with the performance from Western governments. Fujian Province's "performance assessment", Guangdong Province, the "appraisal of scientific development" and Shenzhen "government performance evaluation and management" that is connotation progression, also has the connotation of a consistent relationship. As a problem-solving methodology, cf typical representative of the three models has a great value for assessing the performance evaluation of the Chinese provincial government status and analyzing the trends.

3.1 Analysis of three models of common

First, within the system of top-down evaluation, set up a special organization. It shows that the system of internal self-evaluation by higher levels of government (party) led top-down authority and the formation of pressure within the system, characterized by significant one-way and assessment. Three have set up a special organization, including leading institutions and offices. Evaluation objects related to subordinate the government (party) and government (party) sector.

Second, the combination of the quantitative evaluation and the qualitative evaluation. Indicator system covers most of the economic development, social development, ecological protection, people's lives, the administrative process, satisfaction, etc. Including objective indicators and subjective indicators, using the way that quantitative evaluation and qualitative evaluation of a combination. Such as the economic development indicators, standardization calculations, the performance data, and evaluation of satisfaction with reasoning and subjective attributes, to be able to relatively vague definition of reasonable things.

Again, as the promoter of the party and the government priorities, it emphasize on process control. The process of determining the outcome, and strengthen the process control is an important guarantee to achieve the desired results. Such as strengthening the inspection verified that the administrative process issues to identify and solve a timely manner, reduce errors, which improve the effects of management and service.

Finally, circulating evaluation results to internal. Provincial government performance evaluation at the pilot stage of exploration, both in theory and in practice there are still many problems, and thus directly affect the evaluation results of scientific and credibility. Plus the supporting environment is not yet mature in the current conditions, the evaluation results public in a certain range.

3.2 Compared three models of personality

First, the evaluation of the ideas and goals are different, the lead unit of the different offices. The "Performance assessment" focus on the effectiveness to the party and government organs of the construction. the "scientific development level of assessment" for the party and government leading bodies and leading cadres of comprehensive performance and the "Government Performance Evaluation and Management" for the government under the performance-oriented goals (benchmark) management. Meanwhile, the offices of the lead units are not the same, such as the lead unit in
Guangdong Province at the Provincial Organization Department, located in Fujian Province at the Provincial Office and the provincial government office, located in Hunan Provincial Personnel Department, located in Shenzhen City Discipline Inspection Commission and Municipal Supervision Bureau. As the Party and government departments within the system functions, resources and authority of the different offices of the lead unit to some extent, influence and even decided to evaluate the function and direction.

Second, the index structure and system are different, a different focus. The Chinese government performance evaluation is still in its infancy, has not yet formed a nationwide general model and indicators, together with local conditions, and leading the evaluation of different departments, each of the evaluation system are quite different. Such as Fujian's "performance assessment" to strengthen the authority of the performance indicators, Guangdong "assessments of the level of scientific development" highlighting functional area index, Shenzhen’s' government performance assessment "into the government White Paper targets.

Third, the introduction of public satisfaction rating, extent, methods are different. In contrast, Shenzhen's "Government Performance Evaluation" the introduction of the degree of public satisfaction rating is strong, through the network with real-time communication and public communication, and by adjusting the work to improve public service delivery quality and efficiency to respond to needs of the public, strengthen the government's credibility.

Fourth, with varying degrees of intelligence. Basic to manual for the current Chinese practice of local government performance evaluation. However, Shenzhen's "Government Performance Assessment" established "e-assessment system." “E-assessment and the Shenzhen Municipal Government Performance Management System” based on submitted data, the object being evaluated indicators derived real-time, dynamic system evaluation, real-time feedback to the unit being evaluated results of the assessment, and urge them to improve their work at any time. The other two models are also explored intelligently. Related to the characteristics of three models such as Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Evaluation Object</th>
<th>Evaluation Methods</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Results of the Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>performance assessment</td>
<td>Provincial Office, the provincial government office (Fujian Province)</td>
<td>he province to municipalities, provincial government departments and other agencies</td>
<td>Comprehensive use of various evaluation methods</td>
<td>Covering economic, social, environmental, cultural, the government itself and some other aspects.</td>
<td>As a government leading bodies and leading cadres of work performance, the main basis of excellent assessment of advanced evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific development level assessment</td>
<td>Provincial Organization Department (Guangdong Province)</td>
<td>Provinces prefecture level party and government leading bodies and leading cadres</td>
<td>the combination of Quantitative evaluation and qualitative evaluation</td>
<td>Economic development, social development, people's lives, the environment, to set common indicators and categories of indicators</td>
<td>As a leadership restructuring and appointment of cadres, rewards and punishments, the main basis for training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government performance evaluation</td>
<td>Municipal Commission for Discipline Inspection and Supervision Bureau (the city of Shenzhen)</td>
<td>The 32 government departments of the city and eight district government (Ribbon)</td>
<td>Real-time evaluation, semi-annual and annual evaluation of the combination</td>
<td>Combination of incentives and accountability, results and assessment appraised, selection and appointment, the executive with incentives and accountability</td>
<td>Combination of incentives and accountability, results and assessment appraised, selection and appointment, the executive with incentives and accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Problems faced by three models

Overall, three models are shown from top to bottom evaluation of the "one-way", from the layers of government relations, mainly for the higher levels of government (or on behalf of higher levels of government to do the performance, evaluation, office, etc.) on the lower levels of government and the evaluation of level of government departments. Although the existence of Guangdong’s evaluation of the lower evaluation of superior ingredients, but the weight is very small, in the actual implementation is often a mere formality. Undeniable, top-down evaluation of the role of the Government's objective to achieve significantly higher, but evaluation is still government "is doing", it have a qualitative difference in meaning requirements with the "should do" government performance. The consequences: First, easily contribute the bad atmosphere to the government of "Not only superior to the lower". As the evaluation of the right by the higher levels of government control, the use of evaluation results and also depends largely on the higher levels of government will, in the long run, lower levels of government is not conducive to mobilizing the enthusiasm. The second is not conducive to higher levels of government to improve work performance. Although higher levels of government to strengthen the control of the lower levels of government, but the lack of higher levels of government supervision and their job performance constraints, and promote higher levels of government to improve job performance.

In fact, China's provincial-level "government performance evaluation," in a semi-spontaneous and spontaneous state and national levels of government performance evaluation model has not been established, the provincial "government performance evaluation," both in theory and in practice are not mature. To sum up, the problems mainly as follows: First, the similarity of the large variety of evaluation models, features not clear. Second, the "Government Performance evaluation" of management rights, the right to organize and evaluate the right is not clear. Third, the evaluation process is shorter, the evaluation results to be tested. Index system is lack of scientific and targeted. Fourth, the academic evaluation method and comparative study of model theory lack of practice, and the guidance for practice is limited.

4. Conclusion and outlook

Government Performance evaluation is recognized as an international problem. Strictly speaking, "efficiency assessment", "scientific development level assessment" and "Government Performance Evaluation and Management" is not the same connotation of the concept, they are called the three models are based on top-down evaluation of characteristics within the system. From the development trend of China provincial "government performance evaluation" model of evolution depends on many factors, but several features will become increasingly clear:

First, the Government under the performance-oriented goals (benchmark) management will become a Chinese provincial government performance evaluation of the concept of positioning. This is a Chinese provincial "government performance evaluation" within the system characteristics and the inherent requirements of the Government Performance evaluation of a common decision. Within the system evaluation must be objective (benchmark) assessment, but this evaluation will be more integrated into public satisfaction with the results-oriented guidance, especially to expand citizen participation in the evaluation of the breadth and depth.

Second, the relative standard evaluation system of organization and technology will be gradually unified. June 2011, China's State Council agreed to establish a government led by the Ministry of Supervision, the Inter-Ministerial Joint performance management system, choose Beijing, Shenzhen
and other areas of eight local governments and their departments performance management pilot for the full implementation of Government Performance Management System explore the accumulation of experience. Such institutional arrangements, and specifications for the uniform evaluation of the current fragmented system of organization and technology provided the conditions.

Third, the government performance management and evaluation system construction will be mentioned on the agenda of government innovation. To meet the needs of the new situation will gradually establish the rule of law, institutionalization and scientific government performance management system. Improve government performance management and evaluation of the legal system, unified planning, and strengthen legislation to protect the work, and gradually form a standardized, systematic technical system. A sound performance management system, including the target management system, benchmarking mechanisms, quality management system, customer-oriented mechanism.

Fourth, the provincial government performance evaluation model is evaluation of the main characteristics and results accountability. From a trend point of view, the Chinese provincial "government performance evaluation" in the "performance assessment", "examine and evaluate the level of scientific development" will, "Government Performance Evaluation and Management" change. Performance evaluation model to measure the provincial government is a wide range of evaluation of the main features, a variety of evaluation methods, multiple of the evaluation mechanism, and how science and use of evaluation results, evaluation results as a benchmark to establish a reward system.
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