# Annual Evaluation Report 2006



Japan International Cooperation Agency

PC

JR

07 - 03

# **Annual Evaluation Report** 2006



Japan International Cooperation Agency

#### **Preface**

Three years have passed since Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) embarked on a new path as an independent administrative institution in October 2003. As the leading implementing organization of Japan's Official Development Assistance (ODA), JICA has been undertaking organizational and operational reforms based on three initiatives: (1) a field based management, (2) human security, and (3) effectiveness, efficiency and speed. JICA is determined to respond to the expectations of the people of Japan and provide cooperation that truly contributes to socioeconomic development and peace-building in the developing world.

Evaluation is an important tool for carrying out more effective and efficient projects with public understanding and support. Under this recognition, JICA, as part of the reforms mentioned above, has been working on expanding and enhancing evaluation, promoting the use of evaluation results (feedback) for project improvement, and improving the disclosure system of its evaluation results.

With the presentation of a whole picture of evaluation activities and an overview of individual evaluation results, the Annual Evaluation Report aims to provide comprehensive information in an understandable manner as to whether JICA projects as a whole are carried out effectively and efficiently. JICA promptly discloses the evaluation results of individual projects through its website.

The report for this fiscal year presents the results of the evaluation on the approach for community-centered development from the perspective of assistance that directly reaches people and the evaluation under the theme of economic partnership in relation to capacity development. It also introduces the results of comprehensive analyses on ex-post evaluations on individual projects and specific cases to show how recommendations and lessons learned are fed back.

This year, as in the previous three years, the Advisory Committee on Evaluation kindly agreed to conduct secondary evaluation on the terminal evaluations implemented by JICA. As a new attempt, field studies were carried out by the members of the committee this time. Many valuable recommendations were put forward as to how projects and evaluations can be improved and JICA takes these recommendations seriously and is determined to make improvements.

I would be very pleased if this report serves to promote deeper understanding of JICA's projects and generate further support from its readers.

Finally, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the many persons and organizations who contributed to this undertaking, including the external advisors who offered their help in compiling this report.

> March 2007 Masafumi Kuroki Vice-President Japan International Cooperation Agency

#### Country Targeted for Evaluation Study Published in Annual Evaluation Report 2006





## Annual Evaluation Report 2006 Contents

Preface			3
Part 1	Evaluation in JICA		
	Chapter 1	JICA's Evaluation Activities and Efforts for Expanding and Enhancing Evaluation	10
	Chapter 2	Improving JICA's Cooperation Using Evaluation Results	
		JICA Program Evaluation	
Part 2	Project-le	evel Evaluation	33
	Chapter 1	Overview of Evaluations of Individual Projects in Fiscal 2005	34
	Chapter 2	Synthesis Study of Evaluations (Project-level Ex-post Evaluations)	······ 47
Part 3	Program	-level Evaluation	······ 65
	Chapter 1	Enhancing the Approach for Community- and People-centered Development	67
	Chapter 2	Contribution to Capacity Development in Developing Countries	
		Enhancement of International/Regional Partnership	
Part 4	Seconda	ry Evaluation by the Advisory Committee on Evaluation	····· 99
	Secondary	Evaluation by the Advisory Committee on Evaluation	100
	Chapter 1	Results of Secondary Evaluation Fiscal 2006	101
	Chapter 2	Results of Field Studies Conducted by the Advisory Committee on Evaluation	···· 135
	Chapter 3	Improving JICA's Evaluations and Projects (Recommendations)	139
Reference			
	List of Eva	luations of Individual Projects in Fiscal 2005	143
	Glossary		147

### Figures, Tables, and Box Articles

	Figure
1-1	ODA System and JICA's Evaluation10
1-2	Position of Evaluation within JICA's Project Cycle11
1-3	•
1-4	
1-6	
2-1	·
2-2	
2-3	Results of Impact Analysis Based on Ex-post Evaluation Reports 50
2-4	
2-5	
2-6	
2-7 2-8	
2-0	Score by Promoting and Impeding Factors at the Planning Stage
2-9	
	Average Score by Promoting and Impeding Factors at the Planning Stage 56
2-10	Promoting Factors at Implementation Stage 58
2-11	
2-12	Difference between the Scores on Impact and the Overall Average
0.10	Score by Promoting and Impeding Factors at the Implementation Stage 59
2-13	Difference between the Scores on Sustainability and the Overall  Average Score by Promoting and Impeding Factors at the Planning Stage 59
3-1	
3-2	
3-3	Contribution of JICA's Assistance to the Capacity Development of
	the Indonesian Government
3-4	
0.5	the Malaysian Government
3-5	Contribution of JICA's Assistance to the Capacity Development of the Philippines Government
3-6	Contribution of JICA's Assistance to the Capacity Development of
	the Thai Government
3-7	Organizations Involved in the SSC Implementation90
3-8	Ratio by Item for Each Type of Studied Bodies 95
3-9	
3-10	
3-11	. , , ,
4-1	
4-2	
4-3	Distribution of Scores by Evaluation Criterion
4-4	Score Results for Viewpoints under Each Evaluation Criterion (Average) $\cdots\cdots 106$
4-5	
4-6	
4-7 4-8	Year-to-year Changes in the Quality of Evaluations (Average Scores)
70	2003- 2005)
4-9	Quality of Evaluations Conducted by the Headquarters and
	Overseas Offices113
4-10	Implementation of Ex-ante Evaluation (Standard Deviation of Scores) 114
4-11	
4-12 4-13	Distribution of Evaluation Scores for Projects by Secondary Evaluators
	Evaluation by Sector (Average)120
	Evaluation by Region (Average) 121
	Year-to-Year Changes of Project Evaluation by Secondary Evaluators
	(Average Score)122
	Distribution of Total Scores (Average Score)
	Top 4 Projects
4-19	Worst 4 Projects
	Table
1-1	Perspectives of Five Evaluation Criteria
1-2	Members of the NGO-JICA Evaluation Subcommittee18
1-3	Members of the Advisory Committee on Evaluation19
1-4	Evaluation Items and Examples of Evaluation Questions28

	Table			
2-1	Target Projects (Ex-post Evaluation)4	18		
2-2	Rating Criteria for Impact			
2-3	Change in Scores of Impact at the Time of Terminal Evaluation and			
	Ex-post Evaluation	50		
2-4	Rating Criteria for Sustainability5	51		
2-5	Change in Scores of Sustainability (Overall) at the Time of Terminal			
	Evaluation and Ex-post Evaluation	54		
2-6	Change in Scores of Sustainability (Technology) at the Time of Terminal			
	Evaluation and Ex-post Evaluation5	54		
2-7	Change in Scores of Sustainability (Organization) at the Time of Terminal			
	Evaluation and Ex-post Evaluation	54		
2-8	Change in Scores of Sustainability (Finance) at the Time of Terminal			
20	Evaluation and Ex-post Evaluation	54		
2-9	Classifications of Promoting and Impeding Factors			
3-1	Program-level Evaluation (Conducted in Fiscal 2005)			
3-2	Projects Subject to the Study			
3-3	Members of the Field Study Teams			
3-4	Points of Evaluation According to the Process of Project Implementation6			
3-5	Importance of Each Aspect in Each Implementation Process			
3-6	Social Capacity Development in Trade in the Four Targeted Countries			
3-7	Social Capacity Development in Trade in the Four Targeted Countries	9		
3-7	(Capacity of the Business Sector)	70		
3-8	JICA's Assistance Inputs in Indonesia by Development Issue			
	JICA's Assistance Injuts in Indonesia by Development Issue			
3-9	JICA's Assistance inputs in Malaysia by Development Issue			
3-10				
3-11	JICA's Assistance Inputs in Thailand by Development Issue	)4		
3-12	Development Assistance Programs that Correspond to Social Capacity  Development Stages			
0.10				
3-13	•			
3-14		,1		
3-15	3 0 (3)			
0.40	Activities, Positioning and Effects)9			
3-16		10		
4-1	Comparison of Evaluation Viewpoints and Rating Scale between Fiscal 2004, 2005, and 200610	20		
4-2	Secondary Evaluation Criteria10			
4-3	Score Results of the Top 4 and Worst 4 Projects (Average)			
4-3	Terminal Evaluations of Good Quality11			
4-4	Terminal Evaluations of Good Quality			
4-6	Year-to-year Changes in the Quality of Evaluations (Average Scores)			
4-7	Correlation between Relevance and Other Four Criteria11			
4-7	Evaluation by Sector (Average)			
4-0	Evaluation by Region (Average) 12			
4-9	Distribution of Target Projects by Region and Sector			
		:1		
4-11	Year-to-Year Changes of Project Evaluation by Secondary Evaluators (2003-2005)12	20		
1 10	Correlation between Project Evaluation with Five Evaluation Criteria and	.2		
4-12	Various Factors12	20		
4.10				
4-13	Differences between Top 4 and Worst 4 (Average Scores)			
4-14	Ranking of Top 4 Projects Rated "Excellent" by Secondary Evaluators12			
4-15	Ranking of the Worst 4 Projects Rated "Poor" by Secondary Evaluators12	:5		
	Box			
BOX 1	Evaluation Chief Training – For Improvement of JICA's Evaluation Capacity 1	15		
BOX 2	Introduction of Evaluation to Various Activities – Volunteer Program1			
BOX 3	-			
	Community-centered Development	17		
BOX 4	Partnership with Other Aid Agencies in Evaluation			
	Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)	8		
BOX 5	Secondary Evaluation by External Experts			
BOX 6				
BOX 7				
BOX 8				
		-		
	Appendix			
Appendix		28		