

Advisory Committee on Evaluation

JICA established the Advisory Committee on Evaluation to enhance evaluation quality, strengthen feedback of evaluation results and ensure evaluation accountability.

The Committee, chaired by Motoki Takahashi, Professor at the Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University, includes experts in international cooperation and evaluation from international organizations, academia, NGOs, media and private sector groups.

Two meetings were held in FY 2015. The main points discussed in the meetings were outlined as below.

Other discussions in the meetings have also been reflected on various efforts to sophisticate JICA's evaluation.

List of Committee Members

(as of January 2016)

Chairperson	
Motoki Takahashi	Professor, Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University
Acting Chairperson	
Akifumi Kuchiki	Professor, College of Bioresource Sciences, Nihon University
Members	
Yasuyuki Sawada	Professor, Faculty of Economics, Graduate School of Economics, The University of Tokyo
Hisashi Takanashi	Executive Managing Director, Engineering and Consulting Firms Association, Japan (ECFA)
Toyokazu Nakata	Chairperson, Muranomirai (NPO)
Masaichi Nosaka	Senior Deputy Chief Officer, Yomiuri Research Institute, The Yomiuri Shimbun
Kunihiko Hirabayashi	Director, UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund) Tokyo Office
Yoshiko Homma	Lawyer (Yoshiko Homma Law Office) / Professor, The Graduate School of Law, Soka University
Kiyotaka Morita	Senior Manager, International Cooperation Bureau, Keidanren (Japan Business Federation)
Kiyoshi Yamaya	Professor, Doshisha University Graduate School of Policy and Management

Suggestions and Recommendations from the Committee	Direction of Actions to Be Taken by JICA
Improvement of the ex-post evaluation methodology	
<p>A deeper analysis on relevance For the external evaluation, most of the projects were rated as "fully relevant." In order to verify whether the assessment was made properly, the Committee recommended JICA to conduct a deeper analysis, for example, to examine the position of each project against the national and sectoral development plans and strategies.</p>	<p>A profound analysis on relevance was conducted on a trial basis for four external evaluations started in FY2014 (and completed in FY2015) (Refer to p.29 "Key Point of Evaluation" in "India: Rural Electrification Project"). Based on the results of these analyses, the methodology was improved for all external evaluations started in FY2015. For example, while keeping the principle that relevance should be assessed by comparing the results against the original plan, the aimed outcomes and the contribution to the development needs should be assessed after verifying the causal chain of the project in the evaluation framework. Moreover, the assessment for development needs of the borrower was improved to include a comprehensive analysis on the priority of the project as well as the appropriateness of the selection of beneficiaries and target areas.</p>
<p>Improvement of the evaluation methodology for efficiency Efficiency of each project should be assessed not only through a simple comparison of inputs and outputs but also through comparison with the outcomes produced by the project.</p>	<p>A cost-effectiveness analysis was conducted on a trial basis for a Technical Cooperation project in Central America as it had been expected that some data for the analysis would be available. This analysis, however, did not lead to satisfactory results because it was difficult to select comparison groups and to estimate non-project costs after project completion. In conclusion, JICA found it impossible to conduct a cost-effectiveness analysis for each and every Technical Cooperation project. JICA considers that it should select projects for which cost-effectiveness analysis will be carried out and prepare beforehand to ensure their evaluability before the project implementation (refer to p.22).</p>
Strengthening of the strategy of ex-post evaluation	
<p>In response to the suggestions from the review of administrative programs, the Committee reviewed JICA's ex-post evaluation procedure and found that accountability had been ensured with due care (refer to p.8). Therefore, the Committee recommended that going forward, JICA should shift its focus to in-depth and cross-sectoral analyses of specific issues.</p>	<p>JICA will strengthen the learning aspects of evaluation by promoting in-depth and cross-sectoral analyses while ensuring accountability on all evaluations.</p>
<p>Projects to be evaluated should be selected strategically.</p>	<p>JICA is working to develop its evaluation system for two purposes: (i) to make evaluation easier to understand in order to fulfill its accountability to the public; and (ii) to strengthen the learning aspects of evaluation. As for the latter purpose, JICA is cooperating with experts in the specific fields.</p>
<p>The evaluation results should be published strategically. They should be presented to experts at international conferences and other meetings as well as to the public in an easy way for them to understand.</p>	<p>In order to deliver the information in an easy way for anyone to understand, JICA will explore the best means and media for communication. Meanwhile, JICA will continue to share the results of impact evaluations and other academic reports with experts.</p>
<p>It is desirable for Japan to participate in and lead international discussions to enhance the effectiveness of development assistance. To this end, JICA should make better use of evaluation results.</p>	<p>JICA will enhance its efforts to utilize the past evaluation results for projects and institutional improvements.</p>