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Overview
Historical Background

1954: Japan joined the Colombo Plan
1955: started financial assistance as payment of post-war reparations
1960: joined DAG (Development Assistance Group)
1961: joined OECD-DAC (Development Assistance Committee)
1964: joined OECD
1975: OECF started ex-post project evaluation
1981: MoFA started policy/program evaluation
        JICA started project evaluation
1990: FASID developed PCM planning method, and later monitoring/evaluation method
1991: DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance
1991-: JICA introduced PDM and started mid-term/terminal evaluation
2001: JICA published JICA Evaluation Guides
2001: (Government Policy Evaluation Act (Act No.86 of 2001))
2008: New JICA started ex-post evaluation (including rating) of all projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Done by</th>
<th>Key Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-level</td>
<td>Country assessment evaluation</td>
<td>ODA country policy</td>
<td>MoFA (third party)</td>
<td>- Relevance of policies (applicable to DAC 5 evaluation criteria: relevance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority issue evaluation</td>
<td>ODA policy on priority issues and sectors</td>
<td>MoFA (third party)</td>
<td>- Effectiveness of results (&quot;: effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aid modality evaluation</td>
<td>ODA aid modality</td>
<td>MoFA (third party)</td>
<td>- Appropriateness of processes (&quot;: efficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluation from diplomatic viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level</td>
<td>Sector evaluation</td>
<td>Sector development program</td>
<td>MoFA (third party)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic evaluation</td>
<td>Cooperation program</td>
<td>JICA (trial)</td>
<td>- Positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategic aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-level</td>
<td>Project ex-ante evaluation</td>
<td>Individual projects</td>
<td>JICA (internal)</td>
<td>- Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project ex-post evaluation</td>
<td>Individual projects</td>
<td>JICA (third party)</td>
<td>- Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project mid-term / terminal evaluation</td>
<td>Individual projects</td>
<td>JICA (internal)</td>
<td>- Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact evaluation</td>
<td>Specific projects</td>
<td>JICA / JICA Research Institute</td>
<td>- Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rigorous measurements of project outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What evaluation questions are used for each criteria?

Source: JICA (2012) “Review of evaluation viewpoints and judgement standards under the DAC 5 evaluation criteria”
- Needs and relevance are checked but roughly; “relevant” is the answer in most cases.
- Appropriateness of approaches, target area/groups, ripple effects, counterparts are seldom checked.
Evaluability is not checked.
- Project purpose and/or operation/effect indicators are checked from the donor viewpoints.
- Attribution is not clearly checked.
Evaluation questions: efficiency

- Cost benefit analysis is difficult; it is seldom done.
- Output achievement is checked here.
- Efficiency is checked through comparing the performance of the project period and the budget with the initial plan.
Evaluation questions: impact

- Comprehensive/unified methodology not yet developed.
- Socio-economic influence are mentioned, but attribution is not clearly checked.
- Limited consideration is given to how to achieve overall goal/dissemination, influence over policies/institutions/gender etc.
Evaluation questions: sustainability

- Sustainability are checked based on the current data obtained from interview/observation done by an evaluator hired by JICA.
- Institutional/financial/ownership issues and social/cultural risks, consideration to gender etc. are not assessed.
What are the challenges and concerns?
Role of ODA Evaluation

Feedback to Relevant Agencies
- Within Japan’s ODA cycle, feedback system has been improved.
- But more practical, concrete learning needed.

Accountability → Japanese citizens are not interested in ODA evaluation results.

Mutual Feedback/Learning → One sided and partner countries’ limited involvement.
Challenges and Concerns

- To attain the objectives of the evaluation, learning and accountability, the use of evaluation need be improved.
- MoFA and JICA made efforts in introducing management response system; and lessons and recommendation database, respectively.
- Difficulties in producing timely, useful recommendations:
  - Methods to find promoting/prohibiting factors and to produce useful recommendations are not well developed.
  - Some key questions are not assessed or roughly assessed with limited evidences shown.
  - Third-party evaluators may have limited knowledge.
  - Partner governments are not so much interested in ex-post evaluation, since they are not involved.
- Jargons and very brief reporting keep Japanese citizens’ interest.
### How much you know and use?

####表2 世界銀行の研究に対する価値とスタッフによる精通度に係る調査結果

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>(2)業務に対する世界銀行研究の価値</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>低</td>
<td>低</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigorously informed</td>
<td>Happily uninformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ア)</td>
<td>「知られなくて結構」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人数:117 (22.54%)</td>
<td>人数:123 (23.70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>平均精通度: 3.35</td>
<td>平均精通度: 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>平均価値 : 2.72</td>
<td>平均価値 : 6.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

####表3 PEGNetによる調査結果

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>日常業務に対する研究の価値</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>低</td>
<td>高</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ア)</td>
<td>Happily uninformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>「知られなくて結構」</td>
<td>「知られないと嫌だ」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(出所) Ravallion (2011) より筆者訳

(出所) Kleeman & Bohem (2013) から筆者まとめ。

(回答者数:519)
Policy makers want to use evidences?

- Policy making is not only based on evidences (ideology, customs, intuition etc.)
- For policy makers, necessary evidence is difficult to get
- For policy makers, evidence is difficult to understand/use:
  - Timeliness;
  - Too academic;
  - Quality/reliability is not clear;
  - Evidences under different circumstances/goals; and
  - Continuous follow-up needed.
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