

Summary of the Evaluation Survey
Evaluation on JICA-USAID Collaboration

Table of Contents

1. Outline of Evaluation Study.....	3
1-1 Background and Objectives of Evaluation Study.....	3
1-2 Evaluation Team.....	3
1-3 Period of Study.....	3
2. Evaluation Methods.....	5
2-1 Evaluated Projects.....	5
(1) Evaluated Projects.....	5
(2) Background of Selecting Evaluated Projects.....	5
2-2 Evaluation Methods.....	5
(1) Framework of Evaluation.....	5
(2) Evaluation Methods.....	6
(3) Measures for Data Collection.....	7
3. Evaluation Results.....	8
3-1 Analysis of the Process.....	8
(1) The Collaboration System between Implementing Organizations at Selecting Target Countries.....	8
(2) The System at the U.S. -Japan Policy Level.....	8
(3) The Collaboration System among Implementing Organizations at the Planning Stage.....	9
(4) The System to Sustain Collaboration among Implementing Organizations.....	9
(5) USAID's View.....	10
(6) Overall Evaluation.....	10
3-2 Analysis of the Outcome.....	10
(1) Expected Positive Effects.....	11
(2) Unexpected Positive Effects.....	12
(3) Unexpected Negative Effects.....	12
3-3 Promoting and Impeding Factors.....	13
(1) Promoting Factors.....	13
(2) Impeding Factors.....	13
4. Conclusion.....	15
5. Lessons Learned.....	16
5-1 Lessons Learned which can be implemented in a Short Period of Time.....	16
5-2 Lessons Learned which require Discussions and a Political Decision before Implementation.....	16

1. Outline of Evaluation Study

1-1 Background and Objectives of Evaluation Study

In July 1993, Japanese Prime Minister Miyazawa and President Clinton of the United States launched "the Common Agenda for Cooperation in Global Perspective (the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda)" as a framework for bilateral cooperation. Since then, to cope with international cooperation challenges and global issues such as population and environmental problems, consultations were carried out between Japan and the U.S at the senior official level, and the efforts started under a new partnership.

Accordingly, JICA, as an implementing organization of Japan's ODA, has collaborated with the United States Agency for International Development (hereinafter referred to as "USAID"), the U.S. equivalent for JICA, in some fields including "Population/Health", "Women in Development (WID)", "Global Environment Protection" and "Civil Society and Democratization". Especially, JICA actively promoted collaboration with USAID in the population/health field under the "Global Issues Initiative on Population and AIDS" (hereinafter referred to as "GII") that the Japanese government started in 1994. The framework of the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda was completed in 2001 with the change of the U.S. Administration, and the term of GII also ended at the end of fiscal year 2000. In other words, U.S.-Japan collaboration in the international cooperation field has reached a turning point.

Against this background, this evaluation survey was conducted in order to organize the measures and progress of JICA-USAID collaboration projects carried out based on the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda and to recommend how JICA should collaborate with USAID in the future.

1-2 Evaluation Team

Team Leader	Manabu Watanabe	Deputy Director, Donor Coordination Division, Planning and Evaluation Department, JICA Head Office(for field study in Kenya • Zambia)
Evaluation Planning	Ayumi Suzuki	Donor Coordination Division, Planning and Evaluation Department, JICA Head Office(for field study in Bangladesh • Zambia)

1-3 Period of Study

the middle of November 2001- the middle of March 2002

Field Study (Bangladesh) the end of October 2001

Preparation for questionnaires based on documents review and interviews the middle of November - the middle of December 2001

Field Study (Zambia) the middle of January 2002

Supplemental interviews and collection and analysis of the questionnaires the middle of January - the middle of February 2002

Field Study (Kenya) the beginning of February 2002

Analysis of the survey results and summary the middle of February - the middle of March 2002

2. Evaluation Methods

2-1 Evaluated Projects

(1) Evaluated Projects

1) U.S.-Japan collaboration project group carried out before mid-term evaluation of the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda/the GII

- Biodiversity Conservation project group (Indonesia : Environment)
- Population and Health project group (Kenya: Health/Medical Care)
- Girl's Education project group Program (Guatemala : Education)

2) U.S.-Japan collaboration programs carried out after the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda/the GII mid-term evaluation

- U.S.-Japan Joint Project Formulation Studies(JPFS) (the population and health field) :
 - Zambia (December 1997)
 - Bangladesh (December 1999 , February 2000)
 - Cambodia (June 2000)
 - Tanzania (January - February 2001)
- JPFS (environment field) :
 - Mexico (March- April 2001)

(2) Background of Selecting Evaluated Projects

The study team grouped all the JICA-USAID collaboration projects in the past by country and sector, and selected groups of projects for evaluation in consideration of the balance in measures, target fields and area of collaboration. This study focused not on each project but on project groups, due to its emphasis on reviewing collaboration measures used in the process of planning and implementing projects and its inclusion of ongoing projects.

2-2 Evaluation Methods

(1) Framework of Evaluation

This study was implemented based on the following basic policies.

1) The distinction between donor collaboration at the operational level and that at the U.S.-Japan policy level

U.S.-Japan collaboration under the Common Agenda is classified into policy-level collaboration (such as policies, decided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan, the Department of State in the U.S. and USAID) and operational-level collaboration (collaboration in actual activities, decided by JICA and USAID). In this study, they were distinguished and the emphasis was placed on the latter.

2) The distinction between the process and the outputs

This study classified donor collaboration into (1) the process to realize collaboration and (2) each output obtained from collaboration was evaluated.

3) Evaluation from each side of Japan and the U.S.

In this study, the same questionnaires and interviews were carried out to persons concerned in JICA and USAID, and evaluation on the U.S. side was also incorporated.

(2) Evaluation Methods

In this study, the process and the outcome of JICA-USAID collaboration were analyzed from the following points of view.

1) Analysis of the process

Did the two countries collaborate at the operational level (JICA and USAID) in selecting target countries?

Did the collaboration at the policy level (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Department of State and USAID) effectively derive from collaboration at the operational level?

How was cooperation among organizations concerned including JICA (headquarters and overseas offices), the Japanese Embassy and USAID offices conducted in planning projects?

Has the follow-up system been established in JICA (headquarters and field offices) and organizations concerned?

2) Analysis of the outcomes

Since most of the selected projects were still ongoing at the time of this study, the evaluation was carried out focusing on efficiency, relevance and collaboration effects.

Efficiency : Were the outputs commensurate with inputs of persons concerned in the collaboration and activities? In this case, efficiency was analyzed from the collaboration point of view and was distinguished from the efficiency of projects themselves.

Relevance : Was there consistency with the policies of Japan, of the U.S. and those of recipient countries? Was the recipient countries' ownership secured? Were there any established systems of donor collaboration both in Japan and the U.S.?

The influence of donor collaboration on the planning and implementation of projects was analyzed from the following points of view.

- ✓ Did the collaboration take both countries' comparative advantages to make up for shortages on both sides?
- ✓ Were knowledge and expertise shared? Was the knowledge improved?

- ✓ Did the scale of target groups expand?
- ✓ Was there any time lag in support?

3) Identification of promoting and impeding factors for success of the collaboration

Based on the analysis above, promoting and impeding factors for success of the collaboration, which act on planning and implementation of projects, were extracted.

4) Extraction of lessons learned and recommendations

Lessons were derived from the promoting and impeding factors, and recommendations were presented to promote future JICA-USAID collaboration.

(3) Measures for Data Collection

In this study, data were collected from the following process.

- 1) Understanding of status quo from document review on the JICA-USAID collaboration projects
- 2) Interviews to persons concerned in the projects and analysis of the participants
- 3) Establishment of an evaluation frame based on information obtained from the processes 1) and 2)
- 4) Preparation of questionnaires based on the evaluation frame
- 5) Implementation of the questionnaire survey to persons concerned
- 6) Implementation of an interview survey to complement the questionnaire survey

3. Evaluation Results

3-1 Analysis of the Process

The study team analyzed the process and the outcome of donor collaboration of each project group. The following table shows the summary of the result.

	Zambia	Tanzania	Bangladesh	Mexico	Kenya	Cambodia	Guatemala	Indonesia	
Operational level collaboration in selecting target countries	There was experience in collaboration before the initiative					There was no experience in collaboration			
Policy level collaboration at the implementation stage	Effective				N/A	Effective		Not effective	
Operational level collaboration in planning projects	Studies and information exchange to form projects under donor collaboration were carried out.								
The system at operational level to continue collaboration	The system is established		The system is about to be set				The collaboration is already terminated		

(1) The Collaboration System between Implementing Organizations at Selecting Target Countries

In the countries which were selected as the domain of efforts of U.S.-Japan collaboration, they already had some experience in collaboration among JICA field offices, USAID field offices and the Japanese Embassy. Hence, these organizations were relatively well prepared in terms of implementation system in Zambia, Tanzania, Bangladesh, Mexico and Kenya. On the other hand, in Cambodia, Guatemala and Indonesia, there had been no cooperation at the operation level and the collaboration system had not been established.

(2) The System at the U.S. -Japan Policy Level

In Zambia, Tanzania, Bangladesh and Mexico, formulation and implementation of the donor collaboration projects were effectively carried out, since there was a collaborative relationship at the operation level as well as at the U.S.-Japan policy level through JPFS. In the case of programs in Cambodia and Guatemala, there had been no collaboration at the operation level until donor collaboration was introduced. However, the collaboration turned out effective, because the projects planned by JPFS were concrete enough and JPFS led to an enforcement of the collaboration system at the operation level. In the case of Indonesia, however, the framework for donor collaboration was neither established effectively at the policy

level, nor was there previous experience at the operational level. Hence, the implementing organizations had to form the projects without an overall collaboration framework. In Kenya, the embassies of Japan and the U.S., the local offices of JICA and USAID had to form a collaboration relationship by themselves for individual projects, because policy-level collaboration, such as agreement at the U.S.-Japan policy level and JPFS did not take place. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate the system of implementing donor collaboration at the policy level.

(3) The Collaboration System among Implementing Organizations at the Planning Stage

Regardless of the presence of a pre-established system of collaboration in selecting target countries, the organizations concerned, including JICA offices, USAID offices and the Japanese Embassy, a collaboration system was established to exchange information and to make efforts to form collaboration projects. For example, information provision to each headquarters for the JPFS was actively made in all of the selected countries. In Kenya, though the headquarters dispatched no study mission, the local offices pursued the project formulation study jointly, planned strategy for collaboration projects and strengthened the collaboration system among them.

(4) The System to Sustain Collaboration among Implementing Organizations

In Zambia and Tanzania, experts in charge of the donor collaboration are performing the follow-up activities and information exchange with USAID offices. Therefore, the system to continue collaboration is established. In Kenya, such kinds of experts are not dispatched, but the system to continue collaboration is being established by office members and local staff who have been involved in U.S.-Japan donor collaboration in Kenya for years and fully understand the circumstances. In Cambodia and Mexico, project formulation advisors and office members carried out the follow-up activities and information exchange with USAID offices; therefore, the system to continue collaboration seems to be strengthened. On the other hand, in Bangladesh, information is not shared between JICA and USAID partly due to the change of persons in charge on each side. However, the collaboration relationship is expected to be reestablished, as the JICA office is now considering assigning experts to follow up the donor collaboration, and USAID is to dispatch a new person to succeed in the task. In Guatemala, the collaboration has not continued at the moment and the collaboration relationship has been terminated with the completion of the collaboration projects. In Indonesia, the collaboration project has been completed in a state of no specific contact between Japan and the

U.S.; therefore, the collaboration relationship has ended.¹

(5) USAID's View

The three collaboration projects before the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda and the GII mid-term evaluation were formed by trial and error without any precedent cases. On the other hand, the JPFS projects promoted a good relationship and contributed to produce collaborative results, based on the long history of a good relationship among JICA offices, the Embassy of Japan and USAID offices. For example, with the lessons learned from previous JPFSs in other countries, the Japanese side took less time for decision-making for the JPFS in Tanzania, which promoted on-site formulation and implementation of the projects.

(6) Overall Evaluation

The projects in Zambia and Tanzania are recognized as successful cases by both JICA and USAID. The two organizations, however, regard the Kenya's case differently. JICA judges that the collaboration outcome was obtained because the U.S. side provided technical support to JICA's local staff. On the other hand, USAID believes that each organization conducted its project separately with different support schemes, and thus it is difficult to see them as collaboration outcome. Regarding the Guatemala project, USAID recognizes it as a successful case, while JICA believes that there are few outcomes because the collaboration is not continuing at the moment. Regarding the Indonesia project, JICA and USAID have the same opinion. They recognize that there was no collaboration outcome as the project finished before a collaborative relationship was established.² Regarding the Cambodia project, JICA and USAID generally agree that it is difficult to evaluate a collaborative relationship at this time. However, there is a difference of opinions about the Mexico project.

3-2 Analysis of the Outcome

This survey revealed that JICA-USAID collaboration enabled complementary support by utilizing the comparative advantages of each party and made it possible to provide the assistance in the field and at a scale which may not be attainable solely by one party.

¹ As the latest information, in Indonesia, collaboration with USAID in a new project is coming under consideration. However, it has not restarted yet.

² As stated above, this review could not recognize outcomes of target programs. However, the JICA-USAID collaboration may start in another project, "Coral Reef Management in Manado". JICA may collaborate with U.S.-funded NGOs for this project. It seems that this is a secondary effect of the target programs.

(1) Expected Positive Effects

1) Joint cooperation by utilizing the comparative advantages

Complements of the constraints of one's scheme by the other : equipment provision (JICA) and utilization of local NGOs' techniques (USAID)

USAID has the constraint that the equipment they provide must be made in the U.S. On the other hand, JICA has the constraint that it can not support operation costs such as supplies expenses and salaries, whereas USAID can, which makes it possible to perform technical support utilizing local NGOs. With combining JICA's equipment provision and USAID's technical support, it becomes possible to utilize the inputs of each side effectively.

JICA has only a short history of development assistance in African countries. In those countries, including Zambia and Tanzania, where development assistance has been conducted led by Europe and the U.S., it is more effective for JICA to utilize USAID-funded NGOs with established systems to provide equipment to rural areas, rather than providing and distributing equipment solely by JICA. Maintenance and management of the equipment can also be entrusted to experts in logistic management of American NGOs or consultants

Complements in terms of the target level : assistance to governments (JICA) and assistance to NGOs (USAID)

USAID has an advantage in the grassroots level activities through NGOs, whereas JICA, which conducts activities mainly to the governments, always holds superiority in building human relationships with the government officials of the recipient countries. This also works advantageously on negotiations with the government. The comparative advantages were combined effectively in Bangladesh, Tanzania, Cambodia and Mexico, in particular.

Complements in terms of technical expertise : TB control (JICA) and HIV/AIDS control (USAID)

The JPFS in Cambodia was able to combine cooperation components in which knowledge and techniques of TB control, Japanese forte, and HIV/AIDS control, USAID forte, were effectively utilized. The comparative advantage of each contributed to advancement in knowledge of each side and enhanced synergy effects of assistance in control of infectious diseases.

2) Sharing/advancement in knowledge

Sharing and advancement in knowledge was also expected initially, as positive outcomes of JICA-USAID collaboration. Over 80 percent of the persons concerned in the target programs admitted that "some kind of knowledge was advanced through donor collaboration." In Kenya, the experts of JICA and the researchers of USAID-funded NGOs introduced their activities to each other and acquired new knowledge at the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda Coordinating Committee. The committee also provided feedback on findings relating to HIV tests.

3) Expansion in the scale of target groups

Expansion in the scale of target groups through JICA-USAID collaboration is closely related to "Joint Cooperation by utilizing comparative advantages" mentioned above. Especially, working with NGOs under USAID enabled JICA to approach the beneficiaries, whom JICA is not able to cover alone. The size of the target groups was successfully expanded in every target program.

(2) Unexpected Positive Effects

In some cases, the following points were identified as unexpected positive outcomes.

- "An advertising billboard" of JICA/USAID collaboration contributed to make information public and promotion of JICA's activities, and its presence and understanding of its cooperation forms is improved among donors.
- JICA/USAID collaboration provided an opportunity for those involved to exchange information and contributed to improve the quality of JICA projects.
- The U.S.-Japan collaboration facilitated commitments of the local government and secured approvals and support from other donor countries. The cooperation also encouraged local governmental officials to conduct such activities as seminars.

(3) Unexpected Negative Effects

USAID pointed out the following as unexpected negative effects in implementing JICA-USAID collaboration. Since there were many differences in the development assistance schemes, budgetary cycles and decision-making processes between JICA and USAID, it took massive efforts and much time to precede the collaboration. The communication between Japan and the U.S. was not performed smoothly in consulting and reviewing projects in the process of JPFS. These made the USAID officials concerned unwilling to take part in a collaborative effort.

3-3 Promoting and Impeding Factors

The analysis on collaboration process and its outcomes revealed the promoting and impeding factors for the success of the JICA-USAID collaboration.

(1) Promoting Factors

- Japanese experts with sufficient expertise and extensive knowledge of Japanese assistance schemes have helped the counterparts in USAID to understand JICA's development assistance.
- JICA and USAID designed the strategy for collaboration together; e.g., what kind of measures they would use to carry out donor collaboration in the recipient countries. This has promoted the JICA-USAID collaboration.
- Such people as local project formulation advisors and policy advisors promoted the collaboration, which helped it to work effectively.
- Since Kenya, Bangladesh and Tanzania were the GII target countries with high priority, synergy effects of GII and Japan-U.S. collaboration have been produced.

(2) Impeding Factors

- As the officials of the policy level and those of the operational level regarded the donor collaboration differently, an effective framework was not established.
- The significance of donor collaboration and its influence on their operation were not shared with articulation.
- In USAID, overseas offices have a certain authority and can make decision in a short period of time. On the other hand, in JICA, the authority is centralized to the headquarters and it takes a long time to make a decision. This caused a gap in the timing in providing the assistance.
- In the process of following up the collaboration projects, the JICA headquarters has some problems, such as (1) the departments in charge are not clear; (2) it takes a long time to make decisions; and (3) cooperation among departments concerned is not sufficient.
- The regular meeting and information exchange became less regular due to the changes of persons in charge in the Japanese Embassy, JICA offices and USAID offices.
- The responsibilities and the task of JICA offices and the Japanese Embassy were not clear to USAID, which caused confusion in on-site consultation from their point of view.
- According to USAID, the Japanese side does not analyze current situations and the

needs of target countries and sectors, which makes it difficult to plan support schemes using Japanese schemes effectively.

4. Conclusion

The study revealed the following points as effects and merits of JICA-USAID collaboration.

- The collaboration enabled JICA and USAID to complement each other and to expand the scope of beneficiaries and the field. Overall, the collaboration has increased the effectiveness of Official Development Assistance.
- JICA-USAID collaboration provided the opportunities for JICA to learn USAID's development scheme. This made JICA realize the areas of improvement for Japanese ODA and to increase JICA's expertise.
- The overseas offices of JICA and USAID can develop more appropriate strategies for assistance, because they have a thorough understanding of the needs of recipient countries.
- JICA can carry out collaboration with USAID effectively with utilizing NGOs.

On the other hand, the following points were pointed out as problems.

- JICA and USAID have not shared a common understanding on and established an effective collaboration mechanism to pursue collaboration.
- As there is no mechanism to follow JPFS consistently, it is not used as an effective tool to promote JICA-USAID collaboration.
- As no specific system exists to share past experiences, knowledge, and expertise of JICA-USAID collaboration, the lessons learned are not utilized properly.

5. Lessons Learned

The followings are the lessons learned from this survey, which are categorized into (1) those that can be applied and implemented in a short period of time and (2) those that require discussions and apolitical decision before implementation.

5-1 Lessons Learned which can be implemented in a Short Period of Time

- JICA should re-define its own policies about donor collaboration, which should be mutually understood by all concerned persons.
- The execution system of donor collaboration in overseas offices should be enforced.
- JICA should collect and organize measures and successful examples of JICA-USAID collaboration and disseminate them to the persons concerned in JICA.

5-2 Lessons Learned which require Discussions and a Political Decision before Implementation

- JICA should consider the reform of the organizational structure.
 - ✓ Clarification of roles and responsibilities between;
JICA and Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
JICA's headquarter and overseas offices, and
JICA's overseas offices and Japanese Embassies.
 - ✓ Empowerment of the overseas offices in;
transfer of authorities,
increase the budget and t number of staff, and
appropriate assignment of staff with practical capabilities and skills.
 - ✓ Simplify and speed-up the process of implementing projects
- JICA should introduce and explain the Japanese assistance mechanism and information about possible schemes of donor collaboration to other donors.
- JICA's working groups for the sector/country based approach should consider donor collaboration.