

Advisory Committee on Evaluation

JICA established the Advisory Committee on Evaluation in July 2010 in order to enhance the quality of evaluations, strengthen feedback of the evaluation results, and better ensure evaluation accountability on the basis of advice regarding operations evaluations.

The Committee, chaired by Shinji Asanuma, Visiting Professor at the School of International and Public Policy, Hitotsubashi University, includes experts in international aid and evaluation from international organizations, academia, NGOs, media, and private sector groups.

Below is an outline of the expert advice provided from the Committee members during the 3rd and 4th meetings convened in FY2011 for the second year running. The wide range of advice will help JICA further improve its operations evaluations.

List of Committee Members (as of January 2012)

● Chairperson	
Shinji Asanuma	Visiting Professor, School of International and Public Policy, Hitotsubashi University
● Acting Chairperson	
Akifumi Kuchiki	Professor, College of Bioresource Sciences, Nihon University
● Members (in alphabetical order)	
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
Toyokazu Nakata	Chairperson, ShaplaNeer=Citizens' Committee in Japan for Overseas Support / Director, Institute of Participatory Development
Masaichi Nosaka	Vice Chairman of Editorial Board, The Yomiuri Shimbun
Yasuyuki Sawada	Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics, Graduate School of Economics, The University of Tokyo
Hisashi Takanashi	Managing Director, Engineering and Consulting Firms Association, Japan (ECFA)
Kiyoshi Yamaya	Professor, Doshisha University Graduate School of Policy and Management
Kenichiro Yokoo	Director, International Cooperation Bureau, Keidanren (Japan Business Federation)

From the 3rd Meeting

(1) Realigning ex-post evaluations (internal evaluations) and the ex-post monitoring system

- If ex-post evaluations are conducted partially under the lead of JICA's overseas offices, the system design should take into account the burden borne by the offices.
- Budgetary measures that allow for local consultants to be hired should be taken in order to fully utilize expert opinion.
- In light of issues of cost, targets for ex-post evaluations should not be all projects over 200 million yen, but be chosen with greater selectivity.
- The Project Evaluation Search Database on JICA's website should be made more user-friendly.

- If the projects subject to evaluation are to be categorized based on their expenditure, it is necessary to examine whether projects, such as small but long-term Technical Cooperation projects, would be appropriately covered.

(2) Presentation of evaluation results, etc.

- As there are trends in lessons learned for each country or sector, their use for projects will be significantly facilitated if the database allows for easier access to the lessons learned.
- As the evaluation criteria themselves are subject to change over time, evaluations of past projects should take into account the situation and circumstances at the time of the project's implementation when drawing out lessons.

From the 4th Meeting

(1) Overview of FY2010 ex-post evaluation

- Detailed ex-post evaluations are required to further improve their quality. Evaluations on relevance and efficiency, in particular, tend not to go beyond formal confirmations and superficial analysis.
- Evaluation on efficiency should include a comparative analysis, including of outcomes. Evaluation on efficiency of Technical Cooperation projects has room for improvement, such as evaluation of the spillover effects of technical transfers.
- Going forward, the system of internal evaluations is expected to become more definite, internal evaluations to be conducted for more projects, and their quality to be further improved.
- Internal workshops can be considered to draw on the lessons learned and good practices offered by ex-post evaluations for the design of projects.
- More specific analyses should be conducted to utilize the lessons learned.

(2) Overview of thematic evaluation

- The thematic evaluation, "Articulation of Evaluation Perspectives and Evaluation Judgments Based on the Five DAC Criteria," is of interest as the theme directly concerns the discussions of the Committee. It may serve as a guideline on the interpretation of the five criteria.
- The task moving ahead is to clarify the differences between "output," "outcome," and "impact" by presenting specific examples of each in all evaluations and making them easier to understand.
- The thematic evaluation, "Economic Impact Assessment of ODA Loans and Grant Aid," is commended for attempting to demonstrate macroeconomic impacts on a pilot basis. The data prepared for the application of the GTAP model is valuable (The GTAP model is introduced on p.43–45).
- Further analysis of the two impact evaluations are required to understand how the results should be interpreted and linked to the designing of future projects.