JICA conducts project-level and program-level evaluations. Project-level evaluation conducted by JICA can be classified into ex-ante, mid-term, and ex-post evaluations. This chapter summarizes major ex-post evaluations conducted by JICA.

Evaluation result can be also found on JICA’s website at http://www.jica.go.jp/evaluation/index.html.

Project-level evaluation carried out by JICA was mainly focused on terminal evaluations. Ex-ante evaluation was first introduced in FY 2001, for establishing a consistent evaluation system from ex-ante to ex-post stage. Furthermore, starting from FY 2002, JICA’s overseas offices conduct some 70 ex-post evaluations on individual projects each year.

The program-level evaluation is carried out as country-program and thematic evaluations. To upgrade the quality and to maintain the neutrality of evaluation, JICA has outsourced these evaluations to third-party research institutes who well versed in development assistance, since such evaluations essentially require specialist knowledge. In addition, starting from FY 2001, JICA holds evaluation seminars around six times a year to disclose the evaluation results to the public.

The following summarizes findings of the evaluations conducted in FY 2001.

(1) Country-program evaluation is intended to obtain lessons and recommendations for the future cooperation toward recipient countries, so as to strengthen the effectiveness of country-specific and region-specific cooperation through program-specific approaches. This assessment clarifies and analyzes the effects and issues to be addressed in JICA’s cooperation as a whole and the implementation of cooperation efforts, by transcending borders between past projects implemented by JICA.

In JICA’s country-program evaluation in FY 2001, the projects in Honduras and Panama were targeted under the comprehensive analysis of the effects of JICA’s aid activities in priority areas in the last decade, and insights for formulating better JICA country-programs have been gained.

(2) Thematic evaluation is intended to obtain lessons and recommendations for future aid related to the said theme, so as to enhance the effectiveness of thematic approaches. This type of evaluation focuses specific themes in specific sectors, issues or project types, and clarifies and analyzes the effects and issues to be addressed in JICA’s cooperation, by transcending the borders between past projects implemented by JICA.

In FY 2001, peace-building in Cambodia was selected as the subject. Peace-building has been currently focused as one of the topics to be addressed. This evaluation assessed JICA’s aid in Cambodia in chronological order from the period where the country requires urgent aid, rehabilitation assistance, and aid for development. In this way, insights for future peace-building aid activities have been obtained.

(3) To enhance the feedback from evaluations and to systematically accumulate useful information from lessons learned from individual evaluations, comprehensive analysis is annually conducted on around 10 cases of evaluations previously conducted in specific sectors or issues.

In FY 2001, the health care sector was selected as a subject for this comprehensive analysis. Useful insights have been gained from the analysis of reports on 55 previous evaluations regarding medical care cooperation.
This evaluation is designed to comprehensively assess the aid projects previously conducted by JICA through various modalities in the following sectors (priority areas for evaluation) in Honduras and Panama. The evaluation is aimed for gaining insights and formulating recommendations so as to improve the future implementation of the JICA’s assistance and strengthen country-specific and issue-specific approaches.

A. Priority sectors for evaluation of JICA’s aid in Honduras
   a. Infrastructure upgrading/development (roads and bridges and disaster prevention measures)
   b. Life infrastructure (Health care) development
   c. Promotion of agriculture, forestry and fisheries
   d. Human resources development (Education and vocational training)
   e. Environmental preservation

B. Priority sectors for evaluation of JICA’s aid in Panama
   a. Poverty reduction and the alleviation of regional disparity
   b. Human resources development for sustainable economic growth
   c. Environmental preservation
   d. Support for the Panama Canal and its peripheral areas

Among the total economic cooperation projects implemented from 1991 to 2000, the above priority areas involve 33 projects in Honduras and 16 in Panama.

The following describes the evaluation framework adopted in this study.

A. The degree of contribution JICA’s projects have made to the recipient countries’ development has been assessed from the following standpoints.
   a. Socio-economical development and the present condition
   b. Evaluation of the projects
   c. Sector-specific evaluation
   d. Cross-sector evaluation
      (i) Evaluation by project type
      (ii) Considerations to poverty reduction and gender issues
      (iii) Region-specific evaluation (Conducted only for Honduras)

B. The above evaluation activities have led to the following insights and recommendations.
   a. Insights and recommendations for upgrading JICA’s country programs.
   b. Insights and recommendations for formulating and implementing economic cooperation programs and projects.

A. Degree of contribution
   The evaluation revealed no problem regarding the directions of JICA’s projects, since such projects have mainly supported the sectors politically prioritized by the Japanese and recipient countries’ governments as well as by other major donor countries.
B. Recommendations and lessons learned

a. Recommendations were made for improving JICA’s country programs based on the country-specific analysis of priority issues that Japan will have to selectively address and support. These recommendations reflected considerations to the basic directions of the development in the recipient countries and to intentions of other donor countries.

b. Recommendations were made to improve the formulation and implementation of each project type as well as to fully introduce program-specific approaches.

2. Evaluation Findings by JICA

The Japan-Canada Symposium on Peace-building for Development held in Tokyo in September 1999 brought together Canadian and Japanese NGOs, government representatives and academics to exchange views on, and experiences in, peace-building and development, and to explore the possibilities for cooperation in this area, including the implementation of joint evaluation on peace-building efforts. Following this event, on-site survey teams for the first joint evaluation study were sent to Winnipeg in September 2000, and another team was sent for the second evaluation study to Guatemala in February 2001. For the third Japan-Canada joint evaluation study, on-site survey teams were dispatched to Cambodia in November 2001.

This third joint evaluation study, reflecting the findings from the first and second joint evaluation studies, focused on eight JICA’s projects which support the country’s reconstruction (including the support for returning soldiers and discharged soldiers, the reform of a legal system, public safety measures, landmine removal, power supply, traffic networks, tuberculosis control, and the support for the socially weak) and three projects jointly implemented by Japanese and Canadian NGOs. This study has yielded insights and recommendations for future peace-building assistance based on the followings: (1) What impacts these projects have had on peace-building and (2) How great a contribution the special considerations in planning and implementing these projects have made to peace-building and conflict control. The purposes of this joint evaluation also included exploring the possibility of the on-site application of the Japanese version of the Conflict Analysis Method (i.e. Japanese Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment, or JPCIA), by way of its ex-post implementation. JPCIA is currently being developed by JICA in collaboration with third-party experts including NGOs.

Peace-building is a relatively new concept, and for this reason, none of the 8 JICA’s projects assessed on this occasion states peace-building as its immediate objective. The priority objectives of these projects, however, have almost corresponded to the needs in Cambodia’s reconstruction support defined by JPCIA. Despite this,
the degree of each project’s impacts on peace-building significantly varies with the timing of its implementation and other factors. Further, it is difficult to reach to a clear-cut definition of what specific impacts can be attributed to a specific individual project, since various donors have simultaneously supported a number of relevant sectors.

The findings from this joint evaluation in Cambodia pointed to the following three characteristics of Japanese reconstruction support. First, JICA’s aid started earlier than that of other donor countries, namely immediately after the peace agreement was concluded in Cambodia. The JICA aid activities have played a leading role in supporting tuberculosis control and the construction of a legal system. These activities have maintained a strong presence particularly in infrastructure development. Secondly, JICA’s assistance efforts have been concentrated in and around Phnom Penh due to safety consideration. Thirdly, JICA’s efforts have succeeded in developing human resources and reinforcing organizations, with consideration given to the development of human resources that were once decimated during the brutal reign of the Khmer Rouge.

This study has recognized the significant validity of the use of the JPCAIA methods for the following two reasons. Firstly, unlike other donors’ conflict analysis methods that are focused on conflict prevention, the JICA methods highlight rehabilitation development for extracting the needs for reconstruction support so that any adverse factors that could potentially re-ignite conflicts can be addressed earlier and continuous economic growth can be promoted. Secondly, JICA’s project teams have prepared checklists to identify the necessary considerations for peace-building and for conflict prevention that should be taken into account during the formulation and implementation of projects. In this way, JICA has allowed for assessing indirect impacts of projects related to infrastructure development and epidemic control, which used to be thought of as having nothing to do with peace-building or conflict prevention.

In this evaluation study, “project evaluation tables” have been prepared for summarizing the individual evaluation findings and “project analysis sheets” have been also developed for analyzing various factors that appear to have a bearing on the project effects. These tables and sheets are designed to identify certain patterns and trends in project implementation from qualitative information. Further, a hierarchical analysis was used to examine the correlation among the project inputs, activities and results. For two particular projects, the parties concerned were interviewed and qualitative analysis was carried out. As a result, some general trends in each aid scheme were found: project-type technical cooperation tends to present significant problems in the planning stage and in relation to the counterparts, while the grant aid projects often have problems related to the selection and maintenance of materials and equipment to be provided under the aid scheme. This analysis also revealed the following factors that would significantly influence the effectiveness of a project: (1) “Identification of beneficiaries” and “compatibility with policies” in the planning stage and (2) “What the aid activities actually provide” and “details of the activities” in actual aid activities. This analysis also pointed to the need for upgrading efforts in the planning and monitoring of projects to share and accumulate useful information among the parties concerned. Since this evaluation has been conducted as a trial, the methodology of this type of evaluation should be further examined while conducting meta-evaluation at the same time. Then in turn, the quality of the evaluation should be upgraded and the evaluation findings must be more effectively