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Preface

In order to make Official Development Assistance (ODA) more efficient and effective, the Japanese government has been introducing a number of reforms. In October 2008, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and the overseas economic cooperation operations of the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) were merged to create the new JICA, under which the activities of loan aid, technical cooperation and grant aid have now been centralized. In addition, in July 2009, in the course of the structural reform of International Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), a system to make strategic ODA policy which is more than ever focused on ODA recipient countries and recipient regions and to provide more effective aid by linking various aid methods organically was established.

The role ODA evaluation plays is important in implementing ODA of an even higher quality, and as such, MOFA is making daily efforts to further improve ODA evaluation. Also, as ODA evaluation serves to fulfill the accountability to the public and to promote greater understanding of ODA, MOFA strongly recognizes its importance. In the structural reform in July 2009, MOFA, recognizing such importance, inaugurated a new regime, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, in place of Evaluation Division, International Cooperation Bureau of MOFA, for promoting coordination between ODA evaluation and ODA public relations.

To ensure the objectivity and fairness of evaluation, MOFA commissions external experts to conduct third-party evaluations. More precisely, MOFA, with the cooperation of “the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation”, consisting of academic experts and representatives from the media, and NGOs, conducts mainly policy-level evaluations every year and creates a report of evaluation results. Bureaus in charge of each project take the recommendations gained from evaluations to utilize them when formulating polices and improving implementation.

At the same time, we must constantly review the way of ODA evaluation, including how to conduct third-party evaluation, how to make use of ODA evaluation for strengthening the PDCA (plan, do, check, action) cycle, and whether a specific aid has really produced the intended effect. MOFA will, under the direction of Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada, further review the way of ODA evaluation while pondering the entire ODA comprehensively. Also, we consider the importance of further integrating ODA evaluation and ODA public relations.

As the 27th report of ODA evaluation, this report outlines ODA evaluations respectively implemented in FY2008 by MOFA, other related government ministries, and JICA. I sincerely hope that this report helps the Japanese people to deepen the understanding on Japanese ODA and its evaluation.

The contents of this report will soon be made available on the MOFA website (http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/index.html). The full texts and the outline of the individual ODA third party evaluation reports carried out during FY2008, which are also included in this report, have been made available on the website, so I urge you to take a look by all means. In addition, if you have any questions or comments concerning ODA evaluation, please feel free to contact: ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. e-mail:hyoka-iken@mofa.go.jp

January 2010

Shiro Sadoshima
Director-General
International Cooperation Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
This photo shows a woman working at a day-care center for kids operated by Grant Assistance for Grassroots Human Security Project named “Keur Abdou Ndoye Village Living Environment Improvement Project for Women” which has been in place since FY2005.

Keur Abdou Ndoye Village is a farming village near Kayar city. Women there are busy struggling to do field work, household affairs, and child rearing, and to collect drinking water. There was no medical facility. For this reason, a Japanese NGO sent Japanese coordinators to help improve the villagers’ living environment: their support to provide water supply facilities (wells and pumping facilities), educational facilities (day-care centers for kids) and health care conditions (health post) has ameliorated the living environment for women. A health care nurse and a midwife assigned to the health post, help women giving birth there.
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1.1 Recent Trends in ODA Evaluation

1.1.1 Trends in ODA Evaluation in Japan

The evaluation of Official Development Assistance (ODA) began when the then Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund (OECF), which later became the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) and then was merged to create the new JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency), began ex-post evaluations on individual projects in 1975. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) also began ex-post evaluations in 1981, and a system for the evaluation of ODA by MOFA and assistance implementing agencies was begun.

In August 2006, MOFA established the ODA Evaluation Division as an independent department in order to undertake ODA evaluation-related operations in a comprehensive manner. Through this, MOFA aimed to further enhance the evaluation system in order to utilize ODA resources more effectively and efficiently, and achieve "high-quality" international cooperation, in particular, through "policy-level" evaluations of overall ODA policy. In July 2009, the ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division was inaugurated in place of the Evaluation Division, International Cooperation Bureau of MOFA, for promoting coordination between ODA evaluation and ODA public relations so as to deepen public understanding of Japanese ODA.

In addition, with the launch of the new JICA in October 2008 through the integration of JBIC and JICA following the enactment of the 2007 amendment to the law concerning the Independent Administrative Institution Japan International Cooperation Agency, further enhancement of the evaluation system at the project level and the program level in implementing organizations has been carried out.

The ODA Charter and the Enhancement of ODA Evaluation

The former ODA Charter, which was approved by the Cabinet in 1992, stipulated that "future evaluation activities should include third-party evaluations and joint evaluations with other countries for the benefit of future international cooperation." The Charter also stipulates "promotion of comprehensive evaluations of ODA." At that time, ex-post evaluations were conducted by MOFA, Japanese diplomatic missions overseas, implementing agencies and third parties, although the third-party evaluations accounted for only a small part. This was at a time when the importance of more comprehensive evaluations was being pointed out within MOFA.

At the beginning of the 21st century, with the economic rise of emerging countries and escalation of global issues, the international community advocated the concept of "human security," which resulted in the formulation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2001. It then became more necessary than ever to respond to new issues such as poverty, which is increasingly severe following globalization, regional and internal conflicts, and international terrorism. Under such circumstances, the ODA Charter was revised in August 2003.

The new ODA Charter stipulates that the objectives of ODA are not only to contribute to the peace and security of the international community, but also to contribute to Japan's own security and prosperity, and high expectations are placed on the strategic uses of ODA that will serve to promote private-sector economic activities and secure energy and resources.

The ODA Charter specifies "the enhancement of evaluations," as: "consistent evaluations through the ex-ante, interim and ex-post stages, and evaluations of policies, programs and projects shall be implemented. At the same time, while third-party evaluations by those who possess expertise shall be enhanced to measure and analyze the results of ODA, form objective judgments, and policy evaluations by the government itself shall also be implemented."

A prominent feature of the position accorded to evaluation within the ODA Charter is the effort to implement a comprehensive and consistent evaluation from ex-ante to ex-post, covering the entire spectrum with policies at one end and individual projects at the other. Now that evaluations are incorporated into the implementation process of ODA, consistency of evaluations from ex-ante to ex-post is required for the effective implementation of aid policies (refer to the next section, "PDCA cycle"). In an effort to enhance effectiveness, the focus of development assistance has shifted in recent years to a more comprehensive approach, which targets a sector or a country as a whole, in addition to individual projects. In this sense, evaluations with broader scope which target not only individual projects but also all assistance activities at sectors or country level are now required.
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Another feature of the ODA Charter concerning the significance of evaluations is its reference to self-evaluation by governmental administrations, in addition to the third-party evaluations required to improve objectivity. The ODA Charter also stipulates that evaluation results should be reflected in the formulation and implementation of policies.

In addition, as the ODA Charter advocates partnership with recipient countries and international agencies, there is also a need to enhance joint evaluations with recipient countries, international agencies and others. As the ODA Charter and others emphasize the importance of ODA evaluation, evaluation is an important pillar of ODA.

**PDCA Cycle**

As the significance of evaluation began to be widely acknowledged, the “Government Policy Evaluation Act (GPEA)” was put into force in 2002. Under this Act, government agencies are obliged to conduct their own policy evaluations. ODA evaluations are also considered a part of the policy evaluations under the GPEA. In “Basic Policies 2005,” approved by the Cabinet in June 2005, it was announced that “objective third-party evaluations, including cost-effectiveness analysis on the results of ODA projects, should be conducted, with their results disclosed to the public and the PDCA (Plan, do, check and act) cycle established, reflecting such results in the formulation and planning of ODA policy.” Following this, MOFA raised the issue of the “Improvement of Checking Systems” and aimed to enhance the evaluation system and reflect the evaluation in policies by establishing the PDCA cycle. Specifically, by positioning ODA evaluations in the PDCA cycle and strengthening the system of feedback on evaluation results for ODA policy formulation and implementing agencies (in both Japan and recipient countries), MOFA is making efforts to utilize the lessons learned and recommendations derived from evaluations, in the formulation and revision of ODA policies. For instance, since MOFA assumes the role of planning and formulating economic cooperation policies, it focuses on policy-level evaluations, which are primarily conducted in the form of third-party evaluations carried out by the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation, comprised of academic experts and NGO members. MOFA also undertakes follow-ups on a regular basis to ensure that the lessons learned and recommendations derived from the results of evaluations are reflected in ODA policy. Furthermore, the sharing of know-how among government ministries and agencies is encouraged through inter-ministry meetings (Please refer to Chapter 1, 1.2., “ODA Evaluation Implementation System”).

**ODA Implementation Reform and Evaluation**

MOFA undertook the structural reform of the International Cooperation Bureau in July 2009: it abolished the Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation Division and the Loan Aid Division in order to shift the focus from aid modalities to recipient countries. Meanwhile, the responsibility of administering country development cooperation has been assigned to three individual divisions so as to offer more deliberate responses respectively. In terms of ODA evaluation, as previously stated, a new division, the ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division was inaugurated, in place of the Evaluation Division, International Cooperation Bureau of MOFA, to integrate ODA evaluation and ODA public relations.

In 2006, the amended law concerning the Independent Administrative Institution Japan International Cooperation Agency was approved by the Diet, and the new JICA was established in October 2008. The new JICA is responsible for all tasks including continuing technical cooperation traditionally carried out by JICA, as well as most of the yen loans formerly conducted by JBIC, and most of the grant aid formerly conducted by MOFA. Due to the inauguration of the new JICA, the evaluation system at implementing agencies is being restructured. These reforms are expected to enable more proactive partnerships among schemes than has previously been possible, and a more flexible response to the various development needs of developing countries. Likewise for evaluation, the establishment of a consistent monitoring and evaluation system which bears in mind the particular characteristics of individual recipient countries, programs and schemes has become necessary.
1.1.2 Trends in ODA Evaluations in the International Community

Background

From Project Level to Program Level

Prior to the 1980s, the evaluations of ODA were conducted individually within each country’s administrative activities. With increasing international awareness of the importance of ODA evaluation at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and other international meetings since the 1980s, discussions on the evaluation have been earnestly carried out internationally. Subsequently, the evaluations promoted by DAC have been gradually growing in importance as a means to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of ODA and achieve government accountability to the public. In accordance with this, evaluation activities have come to be incorporated as part of the development assistance system.

Following the DAC New Development Strategy in 1996 and the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) announced by the World Bank in 1998, development assistance activities have shifted their focus from individual projects to ones at the program-level (groups comprising a number of projects with a common goal). In accordance with this, evaluation targets have been expanded from individual projects to the development activities of various projects at the sector and the country level. Moreover, with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which were formulated in 2001 based on the Millennium Declaration adopted at the UN Millennium Summit in 2000, setting out macro-level indicators in developing countries, development assistance and evaluation perspectives have accordingly evolved away from individual projects toward being able to respond to the issues and needs particular to the country in question, while remaining conscious of the need for consistency with the procedures of recipient countries and partnerships with other donors.

The OECD-DAC Network on Development Evaluation

The OECD-DAC (Development Assistance Committee) has a number of sub-departmental organizations. The DAC Network on Development Evaluation is one of them and is responsible for evaluations. The DAC Network on Development Evaluation may be described as the best-known and most authoritative international organization in the area of development assistance evaluation.

The DAC Network on Development Evaluation was set up in 1981 as the DAC Group of Evaluation Correspondents. Following this, after going through several name changes (including the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation, the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluations, etc.), the group was renamed the DAC Network on Development Evaluation in 2003 (this name is still used today). The objective of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation is to raise the effectiveness of international development assistance by supporting strong, information-rich and independent evaluation.

Chronological Table of the Network on Development Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>OECD-DAC established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>DAC Group of Evaluation Correspondents established. Three meetings held with the primary objective of reporting on the results of past evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Renamed as the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation. Stronger emphasis was placed on raising assistance results and joint surveys, including information exchange among members and strengthening of evaluation activities and capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Renamed as the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation. Thirty-seven meetings held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Renamed as the DAC Network on Development Evaluation. Eight meetings held so far.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reference: A History of the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation (OECD, 1993), etc.)
In order to carry out this task, the DAC Network on Development Evaluation works toward the strengthening of evaluation structures among approximately 30 donor countries and organizations, improving evaluation quality, promoting joint evaluations and sharing the results of evaluations among its members. The DAC Network on Development Evaluation is a venue for donors, the evaluation offices of international agencies and evaluation experts to share experiences, knowledge and information among themselves. In addition, the DAC Network aims to promote evaluation efforts in each country and improve the effects of development assistance by gathering the evaluations of development assistance carried out by the members and providing advice on better evaluation methods. In the future, the DAC Network will study comprehensive evaluation methods for each recipient country or each sector, as well as joint evaluation methods, and will review the quality of evaluations.

**Five evaluation criteria of OECD-DAC**

The five evaluation criteria proposed by DAC in 1991 have been adopted by most of the world’s development evaluation agencies as basic evaluation standards.

**Relevance**
The extent to which the objectives of development assistance are consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, global priorities, and partner and donor policies.

**Effectiveness**
The extent to which the development assistance objectives are achieved, or are expected to be achieved. Judged by taking into account the relative importance of objectives.

**Efficiency**
A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.

**Impact**
A measure of the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by development assistance, regardless of whether effects are direct or indirect, intended or unintended.

**Sustainability**
The continuation of major benefits from development after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits, and the resilience to the risk that benefits of development will be lost over time.

These five “evaluation criteria” of DAC represent a comprehensive perspective for the evaluation of development assistance projects, and are used for the comprehensive verification of the efficiency, cost-effectiveness of projects, and the sustainability of effects, etc. after projects are concluded.

Based on these five evaluation criteria, the three evaluation standards of (a) relevance of policies, (b) effectiveness of results, and (c) appropriateness of processes are established, for policy-level evaluations (country policy evaluations and priority issue evaluations) and program-level evaluations (sector program evaluations, etc.) implemented in MOFA. JICA, in its ex-post evaluations, employs these five evaluation criteria of DAC in their original form. In this manner, despite slight differences, the five DAC evaluation criteria represent the standards for various organizations in conducting evaluations at a variety of levels.

**Recent Trends**

**The Paris Declaration Concerning Raising the Effectiveness of Assistance**

Today, the international development assistance community is increasingly aware of the importance of improving aid effectiveness. At the “Paris High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness” held in Paris in March 2005, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (Paris Declaration) was adopted, bringing together the measures necessary to raise aid effectiveness. Based on this, reform efforts have been made by both donors and recipient countries.

As part of donor efforts to “improve the effectiveness of assistance”, there is a process for aligning the ODA policy, strategies, and procedures of each donor and organization with those of recipient countries (alignment) and harmonizing assistance procedures among donors, which used to be taken by each donor individually (harmonization). This is expected to help reduce the administrative burdens on recipient countries.

In addition, on the recipient countries’ side, efforts are being made to formulate independent development objectives and strategies with a higher degree of ownership than before, so that the recipient countries become able to promote economic and social development by efficiently utilizing development aid resources. Efforts are also being made to strengthen support among donors and the people of the recipient countries.
Development Evaluation works toward the strengthening of donor countries and organizations, improving evaluation quality, promoting joint evaluations and sharing the knowledge and information among themselves. In addition, each country and improve the effects of development sector, as well as joint evaluation methods, and will provide advice on better evaluation methods. In the future, the DAC Network will study comprehensive assistance by gathering the evaluations of development assistance carried out by the members and organizations with those of recipient countries.

Five evaluation criteria of OECD-DAC evaluation agencies as basic evaluation standards. The five evaluation criteria proposed by DAC in 1991: Sustainability, Effectiveness, Relevance, Efficiency, and Impact.

In order to carry out this task, the DAC Network on the development evaluation methods for each recipient country or each program, regardless of whether effects are direct or indirect, are being made to formulate independent development policies, and partner and donor policies. The probability of continued long-term benefits, and the resilience of major development assistance has been completed. The continuation of major benefits from development after the completion of major development assistance is an ongoing process, and the benefits may continue to be realized over a long period of time. The five evaluation criteria represent a comprehensive perspective for the evaluation of development assistance projects, and are used for the evaluation of implementation state, monitoring and evaluation (results management).

**ODA Evaluation Workshop**

To improve evaluation quality and capacity of recipient countries, as well as a result-based evaluation system, Japan has been inviting Asian countries and international agencies to the ODA Evaluation Workshop every year since 2001. In FY 2008, the eighth ODA Evaluation Workshop was held in Singapore in March 2009, jointly hosted by MOFA, JICA and the Government of Singapore. A total of approximately 60 people from 22 countries in the Asia-Oceania region (including the joint hosts) participated in the workshop.

The workshop in FY 2008 consisted of plenary sessions and two working sessions. At the opening session of the workshop, a comprehensive picture of ODA evaluations, including international trends in policy evaluation and Japan’s approach to ODA evaluations, were presented. One of the working sessions was on “Donor-Partner Joint Evaluation”, and the other was on “Project Evaluation”. At the session of “Donor-Partner Joint Evaluation”, presentations on experiences concerning joint evaluations in Thailand and Vietnam were made, and the participants discussed how governments can ensure high motivation to take part in joint evaluations, and how to improve and develop systems necessary for ODA evaluations. At the working session on “Project Evaluation”, representatives from Japan and Nepal presented the feedback and effective use of project evaluations, and the participants discussed how to confirm that the directions of each project correspond to policy priority concerns of governments and how stakeholders contribute to ODA evaluations.

The Chairperson’s Summary on the final day showed that concerning ODA evaluation methods and issues the workshop significantly contributed to the initial goals to improve understanding and the ability of evaluation in the Asia-Pacific region, through enhanced evaluation capacities, improve donor-side aid effectiveness, increase the recipient country-side ownership as well as development activity efficiency.

In this manner, the Government of Japan contributes to strengthening the evaluation capacity of the Asia-Pacific region as a whole through the Evaluation Workshop.
1.2. ODA Evaluation Implementation

Evaluation Objectives

ODA evaluations carried out by MOFA have the following two objectives.

Improving ODA Management

To work toward raising the quality of ODA by verifying ODA activities, and reflecting the lessons learned and recommendations derived from the results of evaluations into ODA policies and the ODA implementation process (feedback).

Accountability

To promote the public understanding of and participation in ODA by increasing the transparency of ODA; to fulfill the duty of accountability by publicly disclosing evaluation results.

Partnership among the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), implementing organizations and other ministries and agencies

Implementation of ODA Evaluation

The evaluation of Japan’s Official Development Assistance (ODA) is primarily carried out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and the implementing agency, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). In order to carry out efficient evaluations, MOFA and JICA clarify the division of roles and differentiate their evaluation targets. Since MOFA assumes the role of planning and formulating economic cooperation policies, it focuses on evaluations at the policy and program level. JICA, on the other hand, is responsible for implementing and facilitating individual projects, and therefore focuses on evaluations at the project level, and in recent years, conducts evaluations of programs and thematic evaluations from cross-sectional viewpoints.

Forms of ODA Evaluation at MOFA

ODA evaluations at MOFA are grouped into the following categories: (1) policy-level evaluations, (2) program-level evaluations, and (3) project-level evaluations.

(1) Policy-level evaluations

Policy-level evaluations consist of country policy evaluations and priority issue evaluations. They evaluate groups made up of several programs and projects, with the objective of realizing the country’s basic economic cooperation policy.

- Country Policy Evaluation

Country policy evaluations evaluate the overall assistance policy of each country. Specifically, they target the country assistance policies and country assistance plans drawn up by MOFA.

- Priority issue evaluations

Priority issue evaluations evaluate priority issues in the ODA Charter and sectoral initiatives announced by Japan at international conferences such as G8 summits. For example, the targets of the evaluations include “poverty reduction”, and the “Women in Development (WID) initiative”.

(2) Program-level Evaluations

- Sector program evaluations

Sector program evaluations essentially evaluate groups of ODA activities in a single sector in a single country. When a country has sectoral development plans for areas such as medical care, health and infrastructure, the plans form the targets of the evaluation; when a country has no such plans, the ODA activities as a whole in each sector form the target of the evaluation.

- Aid modality Evaluations

Aid modality evaluations essentially evaluate one particular aid modality out of the forms of assistance (aid modalities) that MOFA has, with the primary objective of deriving lessons for their review. Targets of the evaluations include the Grant Assistance for Grassroots Human Security projects, general budget support and development surveys.

(3) Project-level Evaluations

Project-level evaluations evaluate individual projects. In the past, JICA carried out evaluations of technical cooperation projects, while JBIC carried out evaluations of loan cooperation projects. However, from October 2008, JICA has carried out such evaluations, following the merger of JICA and JBIC and the inauguration of the new JICA. With regard to the project-level ex-post evaluations for grant aid introduced in FY 2005, the evaluations will target all general project grant aid and grant aid projects in the fisheries sector that were
completed more than four years ago. From FY 2006, development experts and academic research organizations have participated, enabling more objective evaluations to be carried out. In addition, in line with transfer of some grant aid operations to JICA in October 2008, there are also plans to carry out ex-post evaluations for such projects in JICA.

**Other ODA Evaluations**

Aside from these ODA evaluations centering on third-party evaluations, MOFA also conducts its own evaluations based upon the Government Policy Evaluation Act. The responsible divisions of the International Cooperation Bureau carry out evaluations, in accordance with the Ministry’s policy evaluation plan focusing on policy-level evaluation. The Policy Evaluation and Administrative Review Office of the Minister’s Secretariat compiles these evaluations into the form of the policy evaluation report, which is then submitted to the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC). See the website: [http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/annai/shoucho/hyouka/h21.html](http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofa/annai/shoucho/hyouka/h21.html) for the FY2008 policy evaluation report. MIC compiles evaluation reports submitted by each government agency and presents them to the Diet.

The links between third-party evaluations conducted by MOFA and evaluations conducted pursuant to the Government Policy Evaluation Act are shown in Figure 1.

**Partnership with Other Ministries and Agencies**

MOFA was given the function of central coordination across the government as a whole in terms of overall ODA planning under the Basic Law on the Administrative Reform of the Central Government (1998). Since then, MOFA has been holding the Inter-Ministerial Meeting on ODA consisting of ministries and agencies involved in ODA, and compiling the ODA evaluation results of these ministries and agencies. Along with human resource development projects, such as accepting trainees and hosting seminars, these ministries and agencies also dispatch experts and conduct research studies as part of their ODA operations. For further information on findings of ODA evaluations conducted by ministries and agencies in the last fiscal year, see Chapter 2, Section 2.3. “Results of Evaluations Conducted by Other Ministries and Agencies.”

**Public-Private Partnership**

**Evaluations by Third-party Specialists**

MOFA conducts third-party evaluations of its implementation of ODA evaluations in order to ensure their objectivity. Since October 2003, MOFA has commissioned such evaluations to “The External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation”, which consists primarily of external academics, as an advisory body to the Director-General of the Economic Cooperation Bureau (currently the Director-General of the International Cooperation Bureau. Please refer to Table 1).

In addition, evaluations by recipient country governments or agencies (including think tanks and academic institutions), and joint evaluations with external agencies (such as other donors and NGOs) are conducted.

**Table 1: Members of the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation (Titles as of April 1, 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiromitsu MUTA</td>
<td>Member of the Board (Executive Vice President), Tokyo Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoko IEGAME</td>
<td>Director, UNFP A Tokyo Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshikazu IMAZATO</td>
<td>Former Editorial Writer, the Tokyo Shimbun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isumi OHNO</td>
<td>Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yayoi TANAKA</td>
<td>Associate Professor, National Institute for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masato NODA</td>
<td>Director, Nagoya NGO Center/Associate Professor, Chubu University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinako HASHIMOTO</td>
<td>Professor, Shumin University, the Department of Social and Information Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratsuya MOCHIZUKI</td>
<td>Director, Japan Research Promotion Department, Institute of Developing Economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsumi YAMASITA</td>
<td>Director, Poverty Association and Social Development Studies Group, IDE (Advanced School)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: ODA Evaluation Implementation System**

- **ODA Evaluations**
  - **Policy level evaluations**
    - Country policy evaluations
    - Priority issue evaluations
    - Aid modality evaluations, etc.
  - Evaluations in accordance with Government Policy Evaluation Act
  - Evaluation of the overall policy on economic cooperation (ODA)
  - Evaluation of the overall policy on economic cooperation (ODA) (Ex-ante evaluations)
  - Evaluation of the overall policy on economic cooperation (ODA) (Ex-ante evaluations)
  - Evaluation of the overall policy on economic cooperation (ODA) (Ex-ante evaluations)
  - Evaluation results of the overall policy on economic cooperation (ODA) (Ex-ante evaluations)
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  - Isumi OHNO: Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
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  - Ratsuya MOCHIZUKI: Director, Japan Research Promotion Department, Institute of Developing Economies
  - Tatsumi YAMASITA: Director, Poverty Association and Social Development Studies Group, IDE (Advanced School)
Partnership with NGOs

Following discussions at the NGO-MOFA Regular Meetings (Meetings set up as a venue for provision of information on ODA and regular exchanges of opinions on matters such as improving policies for partnerships with NGOs, with the aim of strengthening the partnership between NGOs and MOFA, and promoting dialogue), “Joint Assessments by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NGOs” have been carried out since 1997, principally in program-level evaluations.

In addition, “the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation”, which MOFA commissions to conduct third-party evaluations, includes representatives from NGOs who carry out policy-level evaluation of one project every year generally, as a chief evaluator. In this way, ODA evaluations reflect the viewpoints of NGOs. (Please refer to Table 2).

In terms of projects, the Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects Effect Measurement Program, in which NGOs verify the effects of projects that were carried out using the Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects Effect Measurement Program, is implemented. In 2008, the effects of projects concerning the removal of unexploded bombs and school construction in Cambodia were verified by the Program.

### Table 2: Recent joint evaluations by MOFA and NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (FY)</th>
<th>Joint evaluations with NGOs (program-level evaluations)</th>
<th>Third-party evaluations (policy-level evaluations)</th>
<th>Country assistance evaluation of...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2004</td>
<td>Evaluation of “the Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects Modality”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country assistance evaluation of Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2005</td>
<td>Evaluation Study on Japan’s ODA to the Education Sector in the Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country assistance evaluation of Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2006</td>
<td>Evaluation Study on Japan’s ODA to the Health Sector in Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s ODA for agriculture and rural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country assistance evaluation of Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s Assistance to the Education Sector in Laos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country assistance evaluation of Pacific island countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note *1: The External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation was established in October 2003.

Efforts toward ODA Evaluation Improvement

#### Feedback of ODA Evaluation

As mentioned above, ODA evaluation is carried out in order to adopt better management on ODA and accomplish government accountability to the public. At the same time, efforts are made to improve ODA evaluation itself.

With the objective of correctly positioning ODA evaluation in the framework of the PDCA cycle, feedback on recommendations presented in yearly ODA evaluations is taken place, in consultation with MOFA, as well as JICA (an implementing organization). The flowchart below shows the steps for feedback about ODA evaluation.

**Flow of feedback on ODA evaluations**

The results of ODA evaluations presented every year are reflected in policy formulation and ODA implementation. (This process corresponds to the stages of “Check (Evaluation) and Act (Reflection) in the framework of the PDCA cycle.

The status of the above follow-up activities has been published partly in the Annual Evaluation Reports. This year, the overall status of the follow-up activities is put on the MOFA’s website (Please refer to Chapter 3).

### Efforts to meet international standards

The evaluation standards of OECD-DAC (Five evaluation criteria of OECD-DAC) have been adopted to evaluate ODA. Meanwhile, the DAC Network on Development Evaluation is now developing the criteria for evaluation. “The DAC Evaluation Quality Standards” which are to be approved in 2009, will serve as a pillar of the process required to ensure the high-quality ODA evaluation and its results. These standards will also be taken into consideration in the future.
Review of Japan’s ODA evaluations

In FY 2009, a review of Japan’s ODA evaluations will be conducted. The objective of the review is to determine whether recommendations presented in ODA evaluations have been reflected appropriately in ODA implementation and its policy formulation, and to determine appropriate recommendations, by confirming the status of follow-up activities of a number of policy-level ODA evaluations conducted in the past. The results of this review will be published, like other ODA evaluations, and will be reflected in “the ODA Evaluation Guideline”, scheduled to be revised in the future, to respond to changing situations that ODA encounters.
In ODA evaluations for FY2008, Ecuador, a South American country, was selected as one of the targets of ODA evaluation. Our team, which consisted of six members, including myself, conducted the field surveys of the Japanese-government financed aid project in Ecuador for the period from September 28 to October 11, 2008, after carrying out preliminary studies in Japan. We visited Quito (the capital of Ecuador), the Galapagos Islands which is a World Natural Heritage site, mountain regions and other areas, during our survey.

**Difficulties in Breathing at High Altitudes**

Quito, the capital of Ecuador, situated near the equator is a city of “everlasting spring”, where one can enjoy cool weather all year long, unlike tropical area. This is because this city is located at the high altitude of 2800 meters.

However, the air is thin there because of its high altitude, so tourists often suffer from high altitude sickness. On the day following the arrival of the on-site survey team at Quito, two team members suffered from severe headaches. One of the two complained of a stomachache and digestive trouble, and had to stay in bed at the hotel. I did not fall ill with altitude sickness, but I was short of breath while climbing stairs or slopes, and could not sleep well due to difficulties in breathing.

As guests there often suffer from high altitude sickness, the hotel always has oxygen bottles and oxygen masks. We hastily borrowed oxygen inhalation equipment at the front desk to allow the two members to rest and recuperate at the hotel. One of them quickly recovered thanks to oxygen inhalation and took part in the site survey immediately, while the other took two days to recover.

As an aside, we met the director of an international organization during our stay while conducting a hearing on international coordination for aid to Ecuador. During the hearing, the director said that he had just arrived at Quito. When I asked whether the thin air at Quito bothered him, the director responded like there was nothing wrong at all, saying “No problem”. Surprised by his response, I asked why.

“I am from Bolivia,” he responded. La Paz, the capital of a neighboring country, is situated at an altitude of around 4,000 meters. It is just like the proverb “superior have others above them”.

However, very few Japanese are accustomed to such high altitudes. In Ecuador, a variety of Japanese people, including an accumulated total of around 400 Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers, as well as the diplomatic staff, have been involved in ODA activities. We might say that overseas representatives of Japanese private businesses involved in ODA-related areas also account for part of this group. One can properly understand the breathlessness that these Japanese people experience there, only after experiencing it by oneself. ODA personnel must adapt to not only natural conditions such as high altitude or desert regions, but also a complex environment of religion, language and culture information. The experiences and countermeasures taken by those in each specific environment must be provided to on-site support personnel. In Quito, I clearly felt the necessity of this.

**Environmental Conservation in the Galapagos Islands**

The Galapagos Islands, well-known as “the showcase of evolution”, are located approximately 1,000 kilometers west of the mainland of Ecuador in the Pacific Ocean near the equator. There, species including giant tortoises, iguanas and finches have been evolving and adapting uniquely to the environment of each island. The islands were designated as one of the first UNESCO’s World Natural Heritage site in 1978.

When flights approached the airport on the Galapagos Islands, flight crews opened overhead storage compartments, splay insecticide-like chemicals inside, then shut the compartments. In this way, the flight crews sterilize passengers’ baggage to reduce the risk that new bacteria could pose to native flora and fauna. Animals brought into the island by humans, such as goats and cats, have already affected the islands’ rare species; with some now in danger of extinction. In 2007, UNESCO put the Galapagos Islands, which were the first World Natural Heritage site, on its “World Heritage in Danger List”.

The islanders were friendly to living things. Specialists dispatched to the islands by JICA said, “There isn’t even a single kid fishing here”, and “when we tried to remove a beehive on the outer wall of our office, local residents watched us sadly”. Meanwhile, however friendly local residents are to living things and even if its natural tourism is a pillar to the islands’ industry, the ocean is where fishermen have to earn their livelihood.

In the past, frequent conflicts used to occur over the
preservation of the marine environment among fishermen, environmental administrations and the tourism industries.

JICA’s technical assistance there started with low-key efforts to encourage parties concerned to discuss the marine environment preservation. This type of assistance is technically known as “the holding of a participatory coordination conference among bodies concerned”, but it may be difficult to fully understand what this term means just by reading documents. Executives of a fishery cooperative that participated in our interview session, expressed a profound sense of gratitude for the effects of Japan’s assistance, saying “Japan’s assistance has led to mutual understanding among the parties concerned about the compatibility between the local fishing industry and environmental preservation”, and “The position of local fishery cooperatives has become better understood when regulations are to be amended”. The effects of Japan’s assistance were also highly appreciated by the Charles Darwin Research Station which contributes to the islands’ environmental preservation. The Research Station commented, “Back in those days, pro-environment and pro-development groups, such as fishermen, had always been against each other, but today, disputes are resolved by discussion”. A donor cannot sometimes accomplish its objectives in its aid just by offering funds and technology to a recipient government. Lessons to be learned from the success story in the Galapagos Islands is that aid projects should be promoted based on the understanding and support from local residents and parties concerned.

● Difficulties in Public-Private Partnership

Ecuador has already reached the level of a “quasi-upper middle income country” with a GDP (gross domestic product) per capita in the range of 3,000 dollars, rich in promising underground resources, including crude oil. For solely development-oriented assistance, poorer countries, such as those in Africa, will rank higher on the list of priorities.

Therefore, before actually starting field studies in Ecuador, the evaluation team initially envisaged that recommendations should be made on the future directions of Japanese aid not only concerning the development of Ecuador, but also focusing on public-private cooperation so that the aid would also help Japanese corporations that send employees to Ecuador for resource exploitation and others. However, after listening to the opinions of the government of Ecuador and Japanese businesspersons assigned to work at offices in Ecuador, during the field survey, the team found that it would be fairly difficult to realize the above-mentioned type of assistance in Ecuador at the present moment.

This is primarily because those in charge of receiving yen loans in the government of Ecuador do not understand the advantage of “financing for development”. They are extremely cautious about any increase in the country’s debt, having almost no knowledge about the low interest rates and long repayment periods of yen loans. After the interviews, a local lawyer, who served as an interpreter between the evaluation team and those of the Ecuadorian government in charge of yen loans, grinding his teeth with vexation at the Ecuadorian government’s failure to appreciate the significance of loan aid, lamented “Ecuadorian people are in an unfortunate situation”.

On the other hand, interest in Ecuador among Japanese corporations expanding their business overseas was quite limited. This is because the return for overseas operations and investment depend largely on market size, of which neighboring countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Colombia and Peru, are greater than that of Ecuador. In addition, frequent regime changes in Ecuador and rising resource nationalism, as well as murky factors in judicial soundness, pose relatively high risks to the investment of Japanese private businesses.

During our survey, neither the Ecuadorian government nor Japanese corporations expressed a strong desire to increase public-private cooperation. A policy merely shaped at a desk could be way off target. I believe that ODA field studies, incorporating of past ODA activities, are essential to the formulation of realistic policies for future ODA projects.
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2.1 Results of Evaluation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Chapter 2 introduces concrete cases of ODA evaluation conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, other ministries/agencies, and the implementing agencies, JICA (including the former JBIC).

2.1.1 An Overview of FY2008 Evaluations

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs implemented a total of 107 evaluations in FY2008, including 8 policy-level evaluations, 1 program-level evaluation, and 98 project-level evaluations.

In terms of policy-level evaluations, the Ministry carried out five country assistance evaluations on Mozambique, Ecuador, Pacific island countries, Romania/Bulgaria, and Turkey. The Ministry also conducted three priority issue evaluations which examined Japan's assistance policies toward its priority areas. The issues examined were "Japan's Assistance in Response to Tsunami Disaster", "Japan's ODA in the Health Sector", and "Initiative for Japan's ODA on Water (2003) and Water and Sanitation Broad Partnership Initiative (2006)".

Sector evaluations, included in program-level evaluations, examine Japan’s ODA activities as a whole within one sector of one country. There was one such evaluation in FY2008: "Evaluation of Japan's Assistance to the Education Sector in Laos".

Project-level evaluations in FY2008 consist of a total of 66 cases of grant aid. Projects are subject to an evaluation if a certain period of time has passed since their completion. (Eight of these cases were evaluated by third-party organizations.)

In addition, evaluations were conducted by recipient governments/agencies: Evaluations on "Japan's ODA for Improvement of Management Capacity of Operation and Maintenance Regarding Water Supply in Egypt", "Japan's ODA for Water Supply Department in Egypt", and "Japan's ODA on Consolidation of Peace in Timor-Leste".

All eight policy-level evaluations were executed by external advisors as third-party evaluations. "Evaluation of Japan's Assistance to the Education Sector in Laos", a sector evaluation, was the first time a joint evaluation with NGO representatives, which was conducted within the framework of the third-party evaluation. For project-level evaluations, both an internal evaluation (the primary evaluation) and a third-party evaluation (the secondary evaluation) were conducted for each project.

The summaries of these evaluations are introduced in the following sections. For the full text of each evaluation result, please see the Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/index.html
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Country Assistance Evaluation of Mozambique

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief Evaluator: Izumi Ohno, Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
Advisor: Tatsuhiro Yazawa, Assistant Professor, Keiai University
Consultant: Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd.

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
- To comprehensively evaluate Japanese ODA policy to Mozambique, to provide lessons learned and recommendations as references for formulating assistance policies, including Country Assistance Programs, and for realizing more effective and efficient implementation of aid activities in the future.
- To fulfill its accountability to the public by publishing the evaluation results, and to provide the evaluation results to those concerned with Japan’s ODA in the government of Mozambique and other donors, for the purpose of contributing to the country’s future development and the publicity of Japanese aid activities.

Scope and Period
As the Country Assistance Program for Mozambique has not been formulated to date, the results of the past two policy dialogues between Japan and Mozambique, held in 1994 and 2007, were considered to be the basic aid policy toward Mozambique for further analysis and evaluation.

As for the evaluation of “relevance of policies”, in regard to Japanese aid toward Mozambique, a review is made on major trends in the Japanese aid policy to Mozambique on the period from 1994, when the first policy dialogue between the two countries took place. As for the “effectiveness of results” and “appropriateness of process”, this evaluation focuses on the projects with Exchange of Notes (E/N) signed by the governments of Japan and Mozambique after 2000.

Methodology
This evaluation represents a comprehensive assessment on Japanese assistance toward Mozambique from the perspectives of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results”, “appropriateness of process”, and is based on the 4th Edition of the ODA Evaluation Guidelines published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) in May 2008. It also provides recommendations for the future formulation of the Country Assistance Program for Mozambique.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
The Country Assistance Program for Mozambique has not been formulated to date. However, taking into account the priority areas for assistance agreed upon at two rounds of bilateral policy dialogues, held in 1994 and 2007, and the projects which have been implemented in Mozambique, Japan’s ODA to Mozambique is generally consistent with Japan’s higher-level aid policies and the development needs of Mozambique. Also, it corresponds to the development challenges and priority areas suggested at the last four Tokyo International Conferences on African Development (TICAD), which represents Japan’s foreign policy toward Africa. Japan’s aid policy toward Africa, unveiled at TICAD IV in May 2008, corresponds to the current state of development and the future development challenges in Mozambique. Also, Japan’s aid is appropriate and complementary to the assistance provided by other donors.

Effectiveness of Results
Although achievement level and progress toward the respective development goals of the priority sectors (agriculture and rural development, education, health and medical service, water and sanitation, as well as roads and bridges) slightly varies from sector to sector, there is a tendency of improvement reflected in the social indicators, which suggests Japan’s aid has produced effective results. Japan’s assistance to Mozambique has basic characteristics: technical expertise in providing grant assistance for infrastructure development, human-mediated assistance through the provision of experts in the field of technical cooperation, and grassroots support provided by Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV). The Government of Mozambique considers these characteristics to be the strength of Japanese ODA. At the same time, the Mozambique Government
highly commended Japan’s assistance in infrastructure development, economic sector and human resource development, expressing its gratitude for the on-the-ground and fine-tuned assistance, as well as the quality and reliability of assistance provided by Japan.

Appropriateness of Process
The bilateral policy dialogue in 2007 led to the dramatic strengthening of cooperative relationship between Japan and Mozambique, which contributed to the effective preparation and selection of projects aligned to the developmental needs of Mozambique and the priority areas of Japan’s aid. The two countries also agreed to hold annual policy dialogues from 2008 onwards in line with the request survey cycle. For 2008, bilateral consultations were held in May. A project development plan, or so-called “Rolling Plan”, which covers all three aid schemes, has been formulated on an experimental basis to serve as reference materials for project officials. Such a system should contribute to facilitation of assistance provisions in alignment with the country’s development needs from a comprehensive perspective. The Government of Mozambique has recognized several projects as good examples of a program-based approach whose project formulation was undertaken with attention to the functional coordination among different aid schemes. There have, however, been requests from the Government of Mozambique to Japan to be more prompt and flexible in coordinating and making decisions during the project selection process. The local Task Force of Japan has taken part in a number of donor meetings concerning aid coordination. Yet, reflecting staffing constraints and the workload involved in aid coordination, Japan has not chaired any of the donor meetings. However, there have been expectations for Japan’s more active involvement in the aid coordination from both the Government of Mozambique and the local donor community.

Recommendations

Aid with Strategic Focus
Clarify the position of Mozambique in Japan’s ODA policy in regard to Africa
Mozambique has now reached the stage to promote autonomous development through economic growth and promotion, as well as social development. Based on Japan’s foreign policy in regard with Africa, announced at TICAD IV in May 2008, Japan’s ODA for the region should also focus on the relationship by “accelerating economic growth” and “private-public partnerships”. The Country Assistance Program for Mozambique, planned to be newly formulated, should take into account of those points and clarify the position of Mozambique.

Outcomes of TICAD IV should be implemented as a model for the TICAD process, from Japan’s diplomatic perspective
Mozambique faces a number of challenges, but is making efforts toward “consolidating peace”, “establishing human security”, “achieving the MDGs”, and “accelerating economic growth”, which correspond to the priority areas adopted at TICAD, on which Japan has placed importance. In this sense, Mozambique can be positioned as a model for the TICAD process, and Japan should work to ensure the outcomes of TICAD IV. It is also necessary to disseminate the assistance results to the international community.

Utilize Japan’s ODA budget to strengthen dissemination of clearer messages from Japan, and to establish a mechanism for its active participation in aid coordination
In order to strengthen its policy messages and find ways of getting more actively involved in aid coordination, within the existing staffing and organizational constraints, Japan should make effective use of its ODA budget for Africa, which will be increased by 2012, as one of the major commitments made at TICAD. This should be achieved by
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expanding “software” assistance such as research/studies, dispatching experts capable of participating in policy discussions, and producing publicity materials about Japan’s ODA activities in Mozambique.

Reconsideration of Priority Sectors, Geographical Targets, and Reclassification of Resource Allocations

Give greater consideration to the potentially negative aspects of development such as regional disparities and the environmental degradation, while supporting economic growth.

During the bilateral policy dialogues of 2007, three priority areas were agreed upon by the Governments of Japan and Mozambique; (1) rural development/economic promotion; (2) human resource development; and (3) governance. It is appropriate that the main focus was given to “rural development/economic promotion”. At the same time, due consideration will need to be given to the negative aspects of development in the growth process, such as regional disparities, as well as environmental and pollution issues. Japan also needs to send messages to Mozambique concerning the importance of governance, since this area forms the basis of the other two priority areas. To this end, Japan should continue providing assistance to strengthen the government’s administrative capacity, based on the past achievements of Japan’s ODA toward Mozambique. In addition, as cooperation through providing yen loans to Mozambique is promoted, it is necessary to pay careful attention to debt sustainability and assure sound public debt management.

Provide development assistance to deliver messages making use of the characteristics and strengths of Japanese aid.

Efforts should be made to increase the policy impact and visibility of Japan’s ODA, following the establishment of local aid systems and the inauguration of the “new JICA” (2008) as a comprehensive aid agency. The future challenges include strengthening messages from Japan, making use of the characteristics and strengths of its ODA, and clarifying Japan’s approach to partnerships with the Government of Mozambique and other donors.

Take into account the program-based aid approach and regional development perspectives in considering the geographical target areas for assistance.

In the process of formation and selection of new ODA projects, it is necessary to enhance strategic cooperation to ensure linkages among projects and a program-based aid approach. Under the current staffing constraints, consideration should be given to narrow down the projects and regions to be targeted for Japanese assistance, to provide assistance that delivers messages, making use of the characteristics and strengths of Japanese aid. As has been already discussed, Japan should consider taking the program-based aid approach in the northern area of the country where Japan has started assistance through yen loans. As for cross-regional or cross-ministerial development projects, it is important that Japan closely share the developmental vision with the high-ranking officials of the Government of Mozambique through policy dialogues.

Strengthen Japan’s involvement at a policy level, based on its aid experience and field experience in Asia.

The Government of Mozambique has appreciated the following characteristics of Japanese ODA as strengths: high technical level of providing infrastructure and facility by grant assistance, human-mediated assistance in technical cooperation, and the grassroots support delivered by JOCV. Such approaches stem from Japan’s long-term experience of providing assistance in Asia. Providing proactive support for autonomous development, which Japan has been implementing in Asian countries, is also important and applicable to achieving mid- to long-term development in Mozambique.
Strengthen aid implementation process and field functions

From the viewpoint of delivering clearer messages, Japan should assist in prioritizing and selecting projects, participate in policy dialogues with the Government of Mozambique and other donors, and effectively allocate human resources.

Adopt a more focused approach to aid coordination

Japan needs to explore ways of achieving strategic participation in aid coordination. Participation in General Budget Support (GBS) programs can be one of the options for Japan to get involved in aid coordination. However, Japan should aim to participate at a more practical level. To be more precise, Japan should become more vocal in the sectors and working groups related to its priority areas so as to accumulate experience in leading discussions.

Japan should strengthen policy dialogue with the various agencies of the Government of Mozambique.

Ongoing annual policy discussions are important at the local level. In addition, Japan needs to strengthen the mechanisms for holding regular operational discussions and delivering assistance that is aligned to the developmental needs from a comprehensive perspective, in the priority areas and sectors. It is also necessary to prepare the systems in order to respond more quickly and flexibly to urgent requests from the Government of Mozambique.
Country Assistance Evaluation of Ecuador

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief Evaluator: Yoshikazu Imazato, Former Editorial Writer, Tokyo Shimbun
Advisor: Tatsuya Shimizu, Research Fellow, Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization
Consultant: Mitsubishi Research Institute, Inc.

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
In light of the importance of Japan’s assistance to Ecuador, this study was conducted to analyze the political, economic, and social situations as well as development policies of Ecuador, and to comprehensively evaluate Japan’s assistance policy toward Ecuador, thereby obtaining lessons learned and making recommendations for more efficient and effective formulation and the implementation of Japan’s future assistance policies for Ecuador. In addition, the study aimed to fulfill accountability to the public by publishing the results of the evaluation, and to promote the publicity of Japan’s ODA by giving feedback to Ecuador’s government agencies, concerned organizations and other donors.

Scope and Period
This study assesses Japan’s assistance policy toward Ecuador as stipulated in July 2005. On the other hand, in regard to a series of assistance activities being evaluated, this study evaluates the process and results of assistance efforts conducted from FY 2003 through 2007. It is because the evaluation period from July 2005 would be short, against the general practice of country level evaluations, which in principle are evaluated dating back five years from the previous year of the time of evaluations.

Methodology
To begin with, the evaluation team formulated an evaluation framework which shows perspective, evaluation items and evaluation indicators. In accordance with this framework, the evaluation was conducted mainly from the three perspectives of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results”, and “appropriateness of process”. The team conducted a field survey in Ecuador for the period from September to October 2008, after the preliminary studies which included literature research and interview surveys in Japan.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
The three priority areas of Japan’s assistance (poverty reduction, environmental conservation and disaster prevention) were decided through policy consultations with the Government of Ecuador. They are based on the development plans of the Government of Ecuador and the development issues of the country at those times. However, before the inauguration of the incumbent president Correa in January 2007, there were frequent changes of presidential administrations in Ecuador. Thus, strictly speaking, it is not necessarily clear whether Japan’s policies have been consistent with the development plans of each presidential administration. Japan’s higher policies were consistent with the priority areas in the ODA Charter and with those in the mid-term policies. Meanwhile, Japan’s foreign policy toward Ecuador is not expressed explicitly. Therefore, at the time of the evaluation study, it was difficult to closely examine the relevance between Japan’s foreign policy toward Ecuador and Japan’s assistance policy in Ecuador. As for the relevance to assistance policies of other donors, two of the Japan’s priority areas, poverty reduction and environmental conservation, are also regarded as major development issues in Ecuador by a number of other donors. While Japan is the sole donor that considers “disaster prevention” as one of the main assistance concerns, France, Germany and some other countries have also conducted aid activities in this area. One of the clear differences between Japan and other donors is its emphasis on governance. European donors and international organizations identify good governance as a priority issue while Japan does not.

Effectiveness of Results
The evaluation team evaluated the effectiveness of assistance results mainly in the three priority areas; namely, poverty reduction, environmental conservation and disaster prevention.
For poverty reduction, Japan has conducted a
wide range of activities such as vocational training, agricultural area support, and education/health sector support, and has made steady achievements. Although Ecuador requires economic infrastructure development for its mid- to long-term sustainable poverty reduction, Japan has provided little assistance in this area.

Japan’s primary assistance in the environmental conservation sector was the “Project on Conservation of the Galapagos Marine Reserve”, which has produced steady results, in terms of encouraging self-reliant efforts among local parties concerned. However, there is a room to consider and discuss whether assistance is necessary for environmental conservation of Ecuador’s mainland as well, since there is a need for environmental preservation at areas other than the Galapagos Islands, such as preservation of the Amazonian ecosystem and improvement of the sewage system.

For disaster prevention, Japan’s “Project for Enhancing of the Volcano Monitoring Capacity” has contributed to the functional enhancement of IG (Instituto Geofísico), or the Geophysical Institute, which is an Ecuadorian national research center for volcanic eruption prediction, and to the timely issuance of early warnings for the latest volcano eruption. However, there remain some issues concerning Ecuadorian active volcanoes which Japan’s assistance has not covered, including the education of the public about volcanoes and the inclusion of volcanic information on urban planning.

**Appropriateness of Process**

The priority areas of Japan’s assistance to Ecuador were decided through policy consultations with the Ecuadorian government. However, due to the recent administrative changes, there has been insufficient consultation between the Governments of Japan and Ecuador lately. As the Correa administration, inaugurated in 2007 could create a stable government, it is expected that conditions will be met to make it possible for the two governments to have policy consultations. Japan’s ODA Task Force in Ecuador meets once a month. Although donor meetings have seemingly ceased to be held since the inauguration of the Correa administration, the newly-established the Agencia de Cooperacion Internacional (AGECI) is actively making efforts for donor coordination.
Recommendations

Articulate more clearly Japan’s foreign policy toward Ecuador and align the foreign policy with its assistance to Ecuador

Although Ecuador is currently a lower middle-income country, its GNI per capita is already 2,840 dollars and it is close to becoming an upper middle-income country (Hereinafter, referred to as “quasi-advanced developing country”). In addition, Ecuador is geologically far from Japan, and the bilateral political and economic ties between the two countries can not be said to be very strong. Therefore, to widely gain understanding from the people of Japan about the significance of assisting the country, it is vital to make clear to the Japanese public the significance of Ecuador in Japan’s foreign policy and the meaning of Japan’s assistance to Ecuador.

Strengthen policy dialogues between Japan and Ecuador

In recent years, policy dialogues between the Japanese and Ecuadorian governments have been insufficient, mainly due to the frequent changes of presidents and high-ranking officials in the central administrations of Ecuador. Though further monitoring is still needed, the Correa administration, which took power in 2007, shows signs of becoming a stable government. It seems possible to strengthen policy dialogues between Japan and Ecuador while monitoring the Ecuadorian government and its development of its institutions.

Implement assistance for strengthening industrial infrastructure to reduce poverty

Ecuador appears to be a quasi-upper middle income country. However, in reality, the Ecuadorian economy relies heavily on oil profits, and its industrial base is weak, making the country far from self-sustainable. Until now, as measures to fight poverty, Japan has implemented assistance which brings about direct benefits to the poor, such as vocational training and rural development. These approaches are still relevant, but on the other hand, in the future it will be necessary to reduce poverty and enhance the economic independence of the country as a whole, by implementing assistance to strengthen the industrial base.

Implement cost-effective assistance by taking into account spillover effects to surrounding and outside regions

Considering Ecuador’s GNI per capita, and the economic and political ties between Ecuador and Japan, it is difficult to gain understanding from the Japanese people for the need to provide large amount of financial assistance, which only benefits Ecuador. Therefore, it is necessary to implement cost effective assistance, which not only benefits Ecuador, but also reaches out to the surrounding Andes area, the whole of Latin America, and the Pacific Rim.

Strengthen ODA public relations activities in Ecuador through cooperation with MOFA and the Japanese diplomatic missions overseas in the neighboring countries

When the evaluation team surveyed the ODA publicity and its results in Ecuador, it is found out that in spite of the ODA public relations effort by the Japanese embassy, the Japanese ODA activities and its achievements were not fully recognized or understood among the local media and citizens. However, looking at the present state of the Embassy of Japan in Ecuador, it is difficult to provide enough amount of information on its own. With this situation, to strengthen the provision of information from the local embassy, it is important to lessen the current load of the Embassy of Ecuador by cooperating with MOFA and nearby embassies.
Chapter 2 Outline of Evaluation Results

2.1 Results of Evaluation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- Project for Enhancing of Volcano Monitoring Capacity
- Environmental education community center in Galapagos
**Country Assistance Evaluation of Pacific Island Countries**

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009  
Chief Evaluator: Masato Noda, Executive Director, Nagoya NGO Center/Associate Professor, Chubu University  
Advisor: Hisao Sekine, Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Tsukuba University  
Consultant: International Development Center of Japan (IDCJ)

---

**Evaluation Policy**

**Objectives**

The objective of this study is to conduct a comprehensive evaluation and analysis of Japan’s assistance policies to Pacific island countries, in order to verify the effects of assistance in the past, and to obtain lessons and recommendations for more efficient and effective implementation of the future assistance. In particular, it is intended to make a significant input to the Fifth Pacific Islands Leaders Meeting (PALM 5) in May 2009. This evaluation study consists of two parts, the evaluation of the region as a whole and case studies on specific countries. In selecting case study countries, the evaluation team has classified the Pacific island countries into three groups according to each country’s development potential: Group 1 (Countries which have relatively rich resources, large economic size, and political influence in the region), Group 2 (Countries which need assistance for the time being, however have the potentials to become self-reliant in the future under certain conditions in which resource and social systems are ready, and thus human resource development is promoted), and Group 3 (Countries which need continual assistance due to their high level of vulnerability). Fiji and the Solomon Islands are selected from Group 1 and Group 2, respectively, as case study countries for country assistance evaluation. From Group 3, three atoll countries, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands and Tuvalu, are selected for the subject of literature analysis. This evaluation also aims to ensure the accountability of the government to the public by publishing the evaluation results and to promote public understanding of Japan’s ODA by giving feedback of the evaluation results to the recipient countries, and concerned institutions and other donors.

**Scope and Period**

The scope of the evaluation covers Japanese aid policies toward Pacific island countries from FY2003 onwards.

---

**Methodology**

First, the evaluation team identified policy objectives and the assistance results.

Then the evaluation was conducted based on three evaluation criteria of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results” and “appropriateness of process”, to obtain lessons and recommendations. After formulating the evaluation implementation plan, gathering the related information in Japan and conducting the field survey, the evaluation team analyzed the information gathered to prepare its report.

---

**Evaluation Results**

**Relevance of Policies**

The compatibility between Japan’s ODA policies toward Pacific island countries (the Okinawa Initiative and the Okinawa Partnership) and Japan’s higher ODA policies (the ODA Charter and Medium-Term Policy on ODA), regional development policies (the Pacific Plan) and international priorities (MDGs and the Mauritius Strategy documents) is fairly high. Meanwhile, such development challenges as food security, environmental issues and climate change are emerging in the region. The direction of Japan’s ODA policies should be reviewed to respond to such threats. The priority sectors of Japan’s assistance to Fiji and the Solomon Islands are developed based on Japan’s assistance policy to the region and are compatible with the development needs of the two countries. In particular, it can be highly appreciated that Japan’s assistance for rural development was additionally carried out in response to the local needs of the Solomon Islands.

At the same time, the above mentioned assistance policies for regional development tended to be “comprehensive”; whereas, in order to carry out more effective assistance, it was realized that enhancement through identification of the priority issues of the Pacific Island countries and clarifying focal issues is necessary. Also, because of the diversity of the Pacific islands, each country has specific problems in addition to the region-specific issues. Accordingly, it has been
also recognized that an assistance strategy for each country, which is visible to both the recipient country and other donors, should be formulated.

Effectiveness of Results

Fiji

The region-wide assistance to the Pacific island countries is based in Fiji, and has an effective impact on peripheral small island states. Such effective assistance includes the enhancement of immunization programs in the health sector and the support for the establishment of distance educational networks at the University of the South Pacific in education sectors. In the future, it is hoped that such efforts will be extended to the capacity development of Fiji as a center of region-wide cooperation, its follow-up capacity, and support activities for the neighboring countries. In addition, the dispatching of Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV)/Senior Volunteers (SV), and Grant Assistance for Grassroots Human Security Projects (GGP) are highly appreciated in Fiji as community-based “visible” assistance schemes “with an approach from the people’s perspective”. In the future, efforts should be made to implement assistance in rural areas with high development needs, and to enhance effective, efficient aid activities through collaboration with NGOs and civil societies.

Solomon Islands

Japan’s support for the development of the basic infrastructure, during the reconstruction phase after the series of ethnic tensions, was delivered timely and effective, meeting the local needs. As for rural development, Japan’s efforts for securing “Food and Employment” have been effectively conducted. More precisely, as shown by the good practice of a local NGO, APSD-Solomon, which aims to introduce the concept of permaculture (an approach to utilize natural circumstances for the livelihood), the assistance has been effective through a “dual track” support in both traditional and modern sectors. Food security was ensured by strengthening self-sustenance economy in the rural communities, while seeking the means of cash income were sought through improving access to the market. JOCV’s activities have been highly appreciated in the country, as an important scheme of technology transfer, and have contributed to deepening a friendly relationship between Japan and the Solomon Islands.

Appropriateness of Process

Fiji

The assistance policies to Fiji have been formulated primarily through efficient communication with parties concerned, in spite of some political impediments. However, a “country assistance strategy for Fiji”, visible to the recipient country and other donors, is yet to be developed. Accordingly, there remain some challenges in terms of disseminating Japan’s ODA policies to the recipient country and other donors, as well as the enhancement of a program-based approach. The implementation system can be highly appreciated because of the effort made to utilize the limited aid resources, such as the program formulation of region-wide projects. Meanwhile, there is a need to improve the follow-up system in order to enhance the effect of region-wide projects. In addition, there is also a need to develop an implementation system to enable the strategic input of JOCV/SV and the efficient use of GGP in rural areas.

Solomon Islands

The evaluation team concludes that the assistance policies for the Solomon Islands have been formulated basically through effective communication with the parties concerned. However, a “country assistance strategy for the Solomon Islands”, visible to the recipient country and other donors, is yet to be developed, and accordingly, there remain some challenges in explaining Japan’s assistance policies to the recipient country and other donors, as well as the enhancement of a program-based approach. It is noteworthy that the idea of adding “rural development” to priority sectors was suggested by the local ODA Task Force. This is a good example that the development needs unique to the country are reflected
in the ODA policy. In addition, the assignment of specialists to the organization, in charge of assistance at the recipient country government, has encouraged the publicity of Japan’s aid implementation process and collaboration with other donors. At the same time, as with the case of Fiji, there is a need to develop an implementation system to enable the strategic input of JOCV/SV and the efficient use of GGP in rural areas.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made based on the survey results and lessons learned through the evaluation, in order to address common assistance toward the Pacific island region, as well as the directions of Japan’s assistance policies to Fiji (Group 1), Solomon Islands (Group 2) and the atoll countries, Tuvalu, the Marshall Islands and the Republic of Kiribati (Group 3).

**Recommendations on Japan’s ODA policies to address common challenges faced by the Pacific island region**

- **Basic recognition**: Japan and the Pacific island countries are “island country partners”, sharing beautiful nature and prosperous resources of the Pacific
- **Basic principle**: Assistance for achieving “human security”, with a focus on the economic and environmental vulnerabilities of the region

- **Program-based approach focusing on assistance in the following areas**
  - “Food and employment”: support for economic vulnerability
    - Food security (self-sustained agriculture promotion, and fishery development)
    - Community development (stabilization of self-sustaining economies and securing of cash income in rural areas)
    - Basic education and skill education (enhancement of opportunities for cash income through human capital development)
  - Health (extension of the support for MDGs, based on past assistance experiences, the continuation of such project as the Japanese Support to the Pacific Immunization Program Strengthening (J-PIPS)
  - Infrastructure development, focused on improving the access from local networks to market, in order to ensure “food and employment”
  - “Environment and disaster prevention”: support for environmental vulnerability – the effort to establish “Pacific Environment Community (provisional name)”
    - Alleviation of environmental vulnerability through waste management, etc. (especially in atoll countries)
    - Securing of water resources (common challenge for the Pacific island region)
    - Response to the natural disasters associated with climate change
    - Strengthening of the community and human capital for disaster prevention
    - Infrastructure development for environmental conservation and disaster prevention
    - Establishment of “Japan Pacific Environment Fund (provisional name)” for region-wide support in the environment sector

- **The scale of Japan’s ODA to the Pacific island region should be comparable to the significance of the region addressed in Japan’s policies with regard to the hosting the Pacific Island Leaders Meetings (PALM).**
- **Formulation of “country assistance strategies”:** a comprehensive and visible assistance strategy, also considering private sector cooperation, should be formulated for presentation to the recipient countries and other donors, in order to enhance the efficiency of assistance.
- **Promotion of a program-based approach, with a specific focus on the above two priority areas (“Food and employment” and “environment and disaster prevention”):** the program-based approach should
be promoted through the coordination of different schemes and projects, in the two priority areas, to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of Japan’s ODA.

- Establishment of “Volunteer Experts (provisional title)” and the strategic input of JOCV: centering on volunteers with specific expertise, delivered to the selected priority sectors and geographical areas, while promoting region-wide cooperation of the volunteers.
- Strengthening coordination with NGOs/civil society, prompt, functional utilization of Grant Assistance for Grassroots Human Security Projects (GGP) and Technical Cooperation for Grassroots Projects (TCGP) with the initiative of the local ODA Task Force.
- The support for capacity development on data gathering and analysis, which is vital for formulating development policies, should be increased.
- Promotion of program-based assistance and scaling up of visible, sector-wide regional assistance: promotion of multi-bilateral cooperation, the extension of good practices at a regional level and establishment of a region-wide fund for the environment sector.
- Japan’s Assistance Policy: the publicity of Japan’s aid policies and projects should be further promoted to increase public recognition.

The Republic of the Fiji Islands (Group 1)

- Building the future capacity of Fiji as a center of region-wide cooperation (Development of human resources: education, health and disaster prevention) and responding to the highly required development issues such as “Food and Employment” and tourism.
- Presentation of the ‘visible’ country assistance strategy of Japan’s ODA: promotion of a program-based approach, efficiency and aid coordination with a clear focus on specific areas.
- Clarification of the role of JOCV/SV in the programs: strengthening coordination among volunteers with “Volunteer Experts (provisional title)”, and selection and concentration of JOCV/SV input.
- Strengthening the implementation system of GGP: efficient implementation of initiative in the field, in rural areas and remote islands where the development needs are high.

Solomon Islands (Group 2)

- Assistance for “Food and Employment”: ‘dual track’ support for the effort to ensure access to modern economy through gaining cash income, with the basis of traditional, self-sustained economy.
- Eliminating the causes of ethnic tension through community development: support for filling the gap between urban and rural areas.
- Assistance for “community development” and “food security” in coordination with NGOs/civil society: support for the establishment and scaling up of good practice.
- Achievement of ‘visible’ outcomes through focused input of JOCV and “Volunteer Experts (provisional title)”.
- Shifting the focus of assistance from reconstruction and emergency aid, to infrastructure development, aiming for sustainable development.

Atoll Countries, Tuvalu, the Marshall Islands and Kiribati (Group 3)

- The characteristics of atoll countries and the direction of assistance: Protection and empowerment against the various threats posed by globalization.
- Protection and empowerment in terms of “Food and Employment”.
- Protection and empowerment in terms of “Environment and Disaster Prevention”.
- Support and consideration for the areas other than ODA, such as rent revenues, remittances from overseas, and tourism.
Country Assistance Evaluation of Romania and Bulgaria

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief Evaluator: Yayoi Tanaka, Associate Professor, National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation
Adviser: Takafumi Nakajima, Associate Professor, Department of Intercultural Studies, Gakushuin Women’s College
Consultant: International Development Center of Japan (IDCJ)

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
- To verify the outcomes of Japan’s assistance to Romania and Bulgaria by examining its assistance policies in a comprehensive manner.
- To prepare useful recommendations for the future course of Japanese assistance to Romania and Bulgaria with regard to the fact that both countries have successfully joined the European Union (EU). In addition, to gain lessons to assist other countries which have common features to Romania or Bulgaria, which are now approaching the stage of graduation from ODA.
- To meet accountability requirements to the Japanese people by disclosing the evaluation findings, and provide feedback on the evaluation results to the officials of the Romanian and Bulgarian governments and other donors, for the future development of these two countries, and to contribute to the publicity of Japan’s ODA.

Scope and Period
The assistance period of this evaluation was set as a timeframe from when these countries became subject countries for G24 assistance (1991 for Romania and 1990 for Bulgaria) to the years of their accession to the EU (2007).

Methodology
This evaluation represents a comprehensive assessment of Japanese assistance to the two countries from the three perspectives of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results”, and “appropriateness of process”, based on the 4th Edition of the ODA Evaluation Guidelines published by MOFA in May 2008 and subsequent discussions in the “External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation”.

Constraints in the Evaluation
Because Country Assistance Programs are formulated for selecting countries by considering aid volume and strategic importance, neither Country Assistance Program nor document clearly stating Japan’s ODA policies or strategies has been formulated for Romania or Bulgaria. Moreover, available information and data were quite limited because the subject period for this evaluation was too long to cover, and also because neither Romania nor Bulgaria was on the DAC List of ODA recipients. With these limitations, this evaluation was conducted based on the available information/data and interviews with various organizations concerned.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
Japan’s ODA to Romania and Bulgaria has consistently assisted democratization, a shift to market economies, and accession to the EU, all of which have been national goals of these countries. Such assistance is highly compatible with the higher policies of Japan (both previous and revised versions of the ODA Charter and the Medium-term Policy on ODA), the aid policies of major donors and the international trends in ODA.

Donor meetings did not play a major role in the assistance to Romania or Bulgaria. As the EU was the largest and most important donor, there was little need for aid coordination if the formulation of aid projects was based on the accurate understanding of the aid trends of other donors, and adequate policy discussions to prevent the overlapping of aid. In the formulation of an aid project, Japan ensured sufficient gathering of the necessary information with the Japan Embassy and JICA Office in each country, by maintaining close communication with the Romanian or Bulgarian government. Accordingly, inactive aid coordination has not been seen as a problem with regard to Japan’s ODA in these countries.

Compared to other donors, the priority areas selected by Japan appear to be rather dispersed. They should
have been narrowed down further, from the viewpoint of “selection and concentration”. One reason for the dispersion of priority areas was probably that Japan had to attempt concrete assistance through trial and error, while each recipient country continually lacked a regular development plan for a certain period. Under these circumstances, it is commendable that Japan provided the assistance in areas of comparative advantage, such as earthquake disaster prevention, energy conservation, improvement of port facilities and subway lines.

In the field survey, it was found that Japan's Cultural Grant Assistance, including equipment provision and facility construction, was highly evaluated as a unique assistance, not provided by other donors.

**Effectiveness of Results**

Japan’s aid policies and aid activities for Romania and Bulgaria have played positive roles in the “shift to a market economy” and the “expansion of the bilateral relationship”, both of which are objectives of Japan’s aid policies for these two countries.

The fact that both Romania and Bulgaria acceded to the EU in 2007 met Japan's objective of the aid policy for assisting their “shift to a market economy” through assistance for their accession to the EU. However, Japan’s contribution, in terms of the funding size, was about one-tenth of that of the EU in total, which indicates the limited nature of Japan’s contribution. In regard to the achievement level of the goals in priority areas, some notable progress has been made in such areas as infrastructure development, environmental conservation, and energy conservation.

In regard to the “development of the bilateral relationship”, it is difficult to explain the causal relationship between Japan’s ODA and the development of the bilateral relationship in a quantitative manner. However, this evaluation survey confirmed certain positive outcomes of Japan’s ODA in the diplomatic, economic and cultural relationship. Such development of the bilateral relationship between Japan and Romania/Bulgaria owes much to the facilitation of Japan’s unique ODA, including the programs aimed at increasing mutual understanding by emphasizing human exchanges, human resource development and cultural cooperation.

One factor, which has boosted the effectiveness of Japan’s ODA, is that both Romania and Bulgaria are regarded as “Japanophiles”, compared to other Eastern European countries. Their sense of affinity with Japan may be attributed to Japan’s timely aid at the height of their hardship, the high level of awareness of Japan's ODA due to frequent publicity and the good historical relationship from the time of the Communist Party rule. In addition, Japan’s accurate understanding of situations and changing needs in the recipient countries and its flexible use of different schemes, can also be appreciated as factors which contributed to the effectiveness of its ODA. To be more precise, Japan’s aid to these countries began by accepting trainees and dispatching specialists, and technical cooperation projects were carried out after the recipient countries got ready to accept them. After that, once the macro economy was well stabilized, Japan provided assistance through yen loans. In addition, Japan’s aid efforts have focused on the priority areas of its comparative advantage with high technology. The fact that Romania and Bulgaria are newly industrializing economies, ready to accept Japanese advanced technologies, in terms of both systems and capacity, also yielded substantial outcomes.

From the viewpoint of the sustainability of the aid effects, the efforts made by these countries have been assessed in relation to the maintenance and utilization of the human assets developed by Japan’s ODA and the ODA graduation strategy, as both countries are at the stage of graduating from ODA. In both countries, JICA Alumni Associations have been established. The continuity of development activities after the closure of the JICA Office is expected with the involvement of the Associations. In Bulgaria, one spillover effect of a
technical cooperation project is the establishment of an award system for quality improvement in industries. Having such a specific task is expected to enhance the organizations’ sustainability. In addition, as per the ODA graduation strategy, capacity development (CD) for assisting these two countries to become donors following their accession to the EU, and joint the development and implementation of ODA projects with Japan are being discussed. For this purpose, the active use of the manpower resources of the JICA Alumni Associations is now being examined as part of the ODA graduation strategy.

Appropriateness of Processes
At the beginning of Japan’s ODA, there was no JICA office in either Romania or Bulgaria. JBIC office has not opened throughout the period of Japan’s ODA in these countries until now. However, close collaboration has been maintained with the leadership of the Embassy of Japan and the JICA Office in each country, ensuring the appropriate process implementation of Japan’s ODA. Even though the number of official policy consultations is not large, efforts have been made to share information among the organizations of Japan and Romania/Bulgaria, including the project selection surveys.

In the beginning, both countries had little experience of receiving aid from the West and it was necessary to explain the various aid schemes of Japan, along with efforts to build a relationship of trust. The Embassy of Japan and JICA Office in each country have worked hard for many years to establish and continue good relationships with these two countries. Aid coordination for Romania and Bulgaria was not a critical element. This is because the high level of ownership and receiving capacity of these countries as newly industrializing countries compensated for the absence of aid coordination.

Particularly in Bulgaria, the Embassy of Japan has made efforts to create a relationship of trust with the local media since the time of political instability following the end of the socialist regime. As a result, Japan’s assistance has been frequently broadcasted on the state television channel. This has been a virtuous cycle of publicity enhancing the recognition of Japan’s ODA, promoting the feeling of affinity with Japan among the public, in turn helping succeeding Japanese aid projects to gain public approval for their smooth implementation and resulting in highly positive outcomes.

Recommendations

Romania and Bulgaria, the target countries of this evaluation survey, are approaching the stage of graduation from Japan’s ODA. In view of the status of these two countries, the following recommendations are generalized so that they can be applied to the assistance to other countries which have common features to Romania or Bulgaria.

Formulation of Country Assistance Programs or quasi assistance programs
There is a consensus among the ministries in Japan to establish and maintain the PDCA cycle, as the importance of this cycle is emphasized by a succession of so-called Basic Policies. ODA policies are no exception and conscious efforts have been made to reflect the lessons and recommendations resulting from evaluations, in the succeeding action plan. An assistance program corresponds to Stage P (plan) of the PDCA cycle. The absence of such an assistance program means the absence of Stage P, which makes the establishment and maintenance of the PDCA cycle difficult.

As of 2008, Country Assistance Programs have not been formulated for 123 countries, including Romania and Bulgaria, which account for more than 80% of the subject countries of Japan’s bilateral ODA. A Country Assistance Program is not only a project management tool for policy makers and implementing organizations, but also a message indicating the purposes and
direction of Japan’s ODA in the country concerned. It is also a means of communication with the government and people of the recipient country, as well as the Japanese people. In addition, the formulation and disclosure of Country Assistance Program is vital to fulfilling the government’s accountability to Japanese taxpayers. However, it is unrealistic to demand the formulation of assistance programs for all countries as detailed as that of priority countries, considering the time and cost required. For this reason, the formulation of a simplified version of the Country Assistance Program, or a strategy paper which clarifies the purposes, policies and priority areas of ODA, as in the case of current Country Assistance Program, is recommended for each country for which a full version of a Country Assistance Program has not yet been formulated.

Ingenious assistance efforts in countries where Japan is not the top donor

The conscious introduction of ingenious assistance efforts, to achieve large effects with small funding, is recommended in the countries where Japan is not the top donor. Such efforts include human exchanges, human resource development, and assistance emphasizing Japan’s comparative advantage or uniqueness.

Implementation of strategic assistance for ODA graduate countries

The preparation of a strategic assistance framework is recommended for ODA graduate countries. For example, the human assets built with Japanese assistance in the past should be maintained and utilized. Also, capacity development (CD) should be provided to help Romania and Bulgaria to become donor countries.

When offering the CD assistance, it is necessary to encourage the independence of Romania and Bulgaria as ODA graduate countries, for example, by requiring them to allocate a certain budget for the CD project. Along with the CD training, a scenario of “triangular cooperation” should be prepared, whereby Japan provides cooperation for third countries jointly with Romania/Bulgaria, particularly in areas where Japan has comparative advantage. What is critical in the implementation of “triangular cooperation” is the careful selection of the third country, the ultimate recipient. The selection of the third country should be made, considering the country’s political situation with the partner country, Romania or Bulgaria, its relationship with other neighboring countries and other aspects of Japanese diplomacy.

The implementation of “triangular cooperation”, utilizing the human assets built in Romania and Bulgaria by past Japanese ODA, including human resource in the JICA Alumni Associations, can be a model for Japan’s assistance for countries to become donors and will be appealing to Japan as well as other countries.

Video equipment offered to the National Museum of Art of Romania
Country Assistance Evaluation of Turkey

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief Evaluator: Katsuya Mochizuki, Director in charge, Inter-disciplinary Studies Center, Institute of Developing Economies
Advisor: Masanori Naito, Professor, Institute for the Study of Global Issues, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Hitotsubashi University
Consultant: Global Link Management Inc.

Evaluation Implementation Policy

Objectives
- To comprehensively evaluate Japan’s assistance policies toward Turkey, so as to provide lessons learned and recommendations for the formulation of its future assistance policies in regard with Turkey and for more efficient and effective implementation of assistance.
- To fulfill the government’s accountability to the public by publishing the evaluation results
- To provide useful information for the future development of Turkey, through feedback of the evaluation results to the government of Turkey and other donor organizations
- To contribute to the publicity of Japanese assistance to Turkey

Scope and Period
In the absence of the “Country Assistance Program” for Turkey, the government of Japan has implemented ODA mainly along the four priority areas upon which the government of Japan and the government of Turkey agreed at the Economic Assistance Policy Dialogue in 1998. Accordingly, this evaluation survey covers all the ODA projects including loan aid, grant aid and technical cooperation, which were commenced, continued, or completed from 1998 (when the Economic Assistance Policy Dialogue was held) to 2007. Additionally, as an Economic Assistance Policy Dialogue was held in July 2008, after an interval of ten years, the dialogue was also reviewed in this evaluation.

Methodology
Japan’s assistance to Turkey has been comprehensively reviewed from the three criteria of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results”, and “appropriateness of process”, based on the “4th Edition of the ODA Evaluation Guidelines” published by MOFA in May 2008, and subsequent discussions at the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation. In particular, while holding several review meetings, the evaluation team formulated the evaluation design, conducted literature reviews and interviews in Japan, and carried out a field survey in Turkey to prepare the final report.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
The relevance of Japan’s ODA policy toward Turkey was reviewed from the following five aspects: ODA policies of Japan, national development plans of Turkey, current needs of Turkey, international priority issues, and development assistance policies of other donors. In general, the review indicated that Japan’s ODA policy toward Turkey maintains a high level of compatibility with the five aspects. As for “South-South Cooperation” and “disparity reduction” which the government of Japan has positioned as its main priorities, the government of Japan needs to seek new ways of cooperation, given the fact that the government of Turkey has been increasingly providing other neighboring countries with assistance and implementing large-scale original projects targeting disparity reduction. Additionally, it is necessary to
consider the possibility of cooperation in science and technology areas, where there is a high demand from the various concerned agencies of Turkey.

**Effectiveness of Results**

As for the “effectiveness of results” of Japan’s ODA activities, this evaluation survey mainly reviewed the five priority areas, and high effectiveness of results is observed from the achievements in each priority area. The major factors contributing to the success of each project include the following: high level of relevance with Turkey’s policies and needs of industries, utilization of the past results and experience of technical cooperation in the long-term continuous assistance, high degree of ownership of the government of Turkey, assistance in the areas where Japan has comparative advantages such as earthquake/disaster prevention and transfer of advanced technology and synergistic effects through the coordination among various aid schemes of Japan. Moreover, this survey tried to verify Japan’s contribution to the rapid socio-economic development of Turkey over the past ten years, by examining its assistance to Turkey from a cross-sectoral viewpoint, and found results and expected impacts on the improvement of the metropolitan transportation environment of Istanbul and socio-economic development, as well as Japan’s contribution to human resource development through the provision of training.

**Appropriateness of Processes**

As for the “appropriateness of process”, the process of formulation and implementation of Japan’s ODA policy toward Turkey was generally appropriate. In particular, in the implementation process, it is worth mentioning the synergistic effects from the coordination among different aid schemes of Japan, as well as good communication maintained between Turkey and Japan. Yet, Japan’s ODA still faces a number of challenges. For example, Turkish government agencies and other donor agencies concerned have not well recognized Japan’s ODA for Turkey. Also, aid implementation processes should be further improved and facilitated. It is also necessary to develop the monitoring and evaluation system of Japan’s Grassroots and Human Security Grant Aid, as well as the Cultural Grant Assistance in order to effectively measure their outcomes. In addition, it is essential to promote further proactive support on the basis of gender mainstreaming.
Recommendations

“Selection and Concentration” within the priority areas
While providing continuous assistance to the priority areas in Turkey, it is important to further strengthen “selection and concentration” of various aid schemes, geographical regions and priority areas to achieve the expected outcomes more efficiently and effectively. More precisely, it would be beneficial to provide assistance in the areas where Japan has comparative advantages (such as environment and energy, human resource development in industrial and sophisticated technological areas, and anti-quake measures), as well as to conduct Grassroots and Human Security Grant Aid projects in the eastern and southeastern Turkey.

Promoting South-South Cooperation contributing to stability and development of the Middle East region
The South-South Cooperation, which is one of the priority areas in Japan’s aid to Turkey, has been highly appreciated. In the future, Japan and Turkey need to build a cooperative relationship focusing on joint assistance to third countries to promote the stability and development of the Middle East region, not only from the perspective of development cooperation, but also from the perspectives of diplomatic policies and regional cooperation.

Effective utilization and maintenance of the results of cooperation
As it is highly possible for Turkey to “graduate” from ODA in the near future, it is necessary for Japan to provide Turkey with assistance in ways to effectively utilize the past cooperation results until the “graduation.” In particular, such assistance as the full use of ex-trainees who returned to the country, and in order to make the best use and maintenance of cooperation results achieved by loan aid, the improvement of the operation of facilities through technical cooperation, as well as follow-up activities would be effective.

Cooperation making the best use of limited aid schemes
Due to the rapid economic growth in Turkey in recent years, aid schemes which can be applied to Turkey are now limited. Therefore, aid effectiveness needs to be improved by making the best use of features of the respective schemes and enhancing coordination among schemes.

Utilizing new aid schemes
Regarding advanced and science technology, it would be beneficial to utilize the new aid schemes, “Science and Technology Research Partnership for Sustainable Development,” for promoting academic exchanges among universities in the field of advanced science and technology, an area of high demand in Turkey. This scheme should be applied to the research related to environment and disaster prevention, which are the priority areas of Japan’s ODA for Turkey.

Promoting exchange programs and strengthening public relations by taking opportunity of “Japan Year 2010 in Turkey”
Making the best use of the “Japan Year 2010 in Turkey”, for further strengthening the bilateral relationship between the two countries, it would be effective to hold ODA seminars targeting high-level officials, to promote public relations for Japan, targeting at the youth of Turkey through the media, and to conduct academic exchanges between the younger generations of the two countries.
Improving the formulation and implementation process of the ODA policy

As for the formulation and implementation process of Japan’s ODA policy, it is necessary to realize the implementation of policy dialogues led by the ODA Task Force, appropriate staffing in the new JICA Office in Turkey, the improvement and facilitation of formulation, approval and implementation procedures of assistance, the construction of monitoring and evaluation system capable of measuring outcomes, and the promotion of assistance from the perspective of gender mainstreaming.
2.1 Results of Evaluation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Evaluation of Japan's Assistance in Response to Tsunami Disaster

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief evaluator: Hiromitsu Muta, Executive Vice President for Finance, Tokyo Institute of Technology
Adviser: Yuriko Minamoto, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Governance Studies, Meiji University
Consultant: International Development Center of Japan

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
Japan actively provides international cooperation, while strongly recognizing the importance of disaster prevention and recovery, as well as emergency support, based on its significant knowledge and technology forged from its experience with past disasters it suffered.

Countries along the coast of the Indian Ocean suffered unprecedented damages from the massive earthquake off the coast of Sumatra, Indonesia in December 2004 and the giant tsunami that resulted. Japan, in response, pledged an immediate grant aid of 500 million US dollars. Accounting for 250 million dollars of that amount, 14.6 billion yen was extended to Indonesia, 8 billion yen to Sri Lanka and 2 billion yen to the Maldives, as bilateral (non-project) grants. The full amount of the bilateral grant aid was disbursed in January 2005. In addition, Japan offered a range of support with the provision of emergency assistance supplies for a series of disasters in Indonesia, including the July 2006 earthquake off the southwest coast of Java and its ensuing tsunami.

The evaluation study was for the purpose of comprehensively verifying the policy relevance concerning Japan's support to countries affected by tsunami disasters, the effectiveness of results and the appropriateness of processes to confirm the outcomes of Japan's support activities so far, and obtain lessons and recommendations which will contribute to more efficient and effective disaster assistance by Japan in the future. Through the disclosure of evaluation results, the study is also aiming to achieve accountability to citizens and helping Japan's public relations activities regarding ODA by providing feedback to the concerned countries and other donors.

Scope and Period
The evaluation covers Japan’s assistance to countries along the Indian Ocean that suffered acutely from the December 2004 tsunami that followed the major earthquake off the Sumatra coast. Analysis of the evaluation study covers bilateral grant loan aid and technical cooperation, including emergency assistance, along with simultaneous support through international organizations during the disaster.

Methodology
For analysis, policy objectives, including actual support, were first systematically clarified. The objectives were then verified from the viewpoints of "relevance of policy", "effectiveness of results", and "appropriateness of processes". Lessons were then extracted and recommendations were given. The procedure began with the preparation of the evaluation plan, followed by the collection of information and data within Japan, a field survey, an analysis of collected information and data, and preparation of a report.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
When the post-tsunami assistance began, there was no governmental document regarded as a prevailing policy on emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance. Accordingly, the evaluation team evaluated whether Japan's assistance to tsunami victim countries was consistent with Japan’s ODA Charter, and found that the assistance was sufficiently consistent with the purposes, basic policies, priority issues and priority regions of the ODA Charter, as well as with the principles of assistance implementation and the formulation and implementation of aid policies stipulated in the Charter.

In terms of consistency with affected countries’ assistance needs, Japan’s assistance generally appeared to be highly consistent based on the high level of evaluation given by recipient countries. This is greatly attributable to the formation of projects at the local level, after grant provision, according to
recipients’ assistance needs, because non-project grants were used as the central assistance scheme of Japan’s bilateral aid in response to tsunami disasters. However, some projects appeared to be excessive in terms of their consistency with disaster support in Japan.

Effectiveness of Results

The evaluation team examined the effectiveness of Japan’s aid results at Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Maldives respectively, which were major recipient countries of the tsunami assistance.

Japan’s assistance to Indonesia was generally effective during the emergency rescue period, with a prompt and highly valued presence. Japan’s assistance activities during the rehabilitation and reconstruction period, fulfilled the objectives of rehabilitation and reconstruction support, which were effective and used the non-project grant aid to maximum advantage. However, Japan’s contribution was not large, in a quantitative sense, in comparison to the scale of the total support by other donors. While most of Japan’s support activities demonstrated necessity and usefulness, some projects appeared to be not sufficiently effective at this point, due to the challenging issues in collaboration with other assistance projects, or the low frequency of the use of provided facilities. Also, recognition of the visible assistance provided by Japan appeared to be insufficient.

Japan’s assistance to Sri Lanka displayed a strong presence, with a high level of promptness, during the emergency rescue period. Japan played an important part in the rehabilitation and reconstruction period, while including support aimed at development beyond the scope of mere rehabilitation. The assistance was effective, taking maximum advantage of non-project grant aid. Japan’s assistance to Sri Lanka ensured a relatively high quantitative contribution, with high effectiveness, along with a good degree of necessity and usefulness. The support was generally appropriate in terms of aid recognized as being provided by Japan, although activity was more restrained than other donors. There was room for improvement in the formation of symbolic projects and public relations (PR) activities.

Japan’s assistance in the Maldives showed high promptness and presence during the emergency rescue period, and was effective in meeting the objectives of rehabilitation and reconstruction during that successive period. Residents in the affected areas appear to have been highly aware of Japan’s assistance.

As for the assistance through trust funds in international financial institutions, the effectiveness of Japan’s aid results somewhat varied with institutions and countries. The Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) projects in Indonesia, through a trust fund set up in the Asian Development Bank, do not always perform favorably, as some of them were cancelled or delayed in their implementation. On the other hand, the other JFPR projects and the projects implemented through the Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF) of the World Bank appeared to be generally effective.

 Appropriateness of Processes

Japan’s tsunami assistance in Indonesia was generally prompt and well managed and implemented. Following the unprecedented disaster, the process of Japan’s assistance was prompt and appropriate during the emergency rescue period, in the face of difficulties, including the reduced governance and coordination capacity of the Indonesian administration and provincial governments. Japan, without delay, pledged an immediate grant aid of 14.6 billion yen to Indonesia as non-project grants, prior to the rehabilitation and reconstruction period, and started talks concerning details of the assistance based on a clear budget for the assistance. The adoption of non-project grants dramatically reduced the period of preparation for projects. On the other hand, when a large-scale non-project-type grant is to be
implemented, including the implementation of project-type assistance such as the construction of facilities, the function to formulate a project is essential. However, originally, Japanese procurement agencies somehow lack the function to examine and formulate project-type assistance. It is necessary to enhance the function of project formulation, including the strategic use of JICA’s emergency development studies.

Japan’s tsunami assistance to Sri Lanka was, in general, promptly and appropriately managed and implemented. Japan began its assistance in the early stages, while viewing the entire process from the emergency period to long-term reconstruction and development, under the leadership of a local ODA task force, respecting the ownership of the government of Sri Lanka. Japan was quick to clearly express an amount of support, 8 billion yen, adopted a non-project grant scheme and strategically made use of JICA’s emergency development studies. As a result, the preparation period for the project was drastically reduced.

For facility construction projects, the challenge in future will be that Japan has to clarify the objectives of its assistance, and set some clear standards in advance; for example, how far Japan should assist the upgrading of facilities, compared to their pre-disaster conditions, and must share the standards with the recipient country to include them in the planning and implementation processes.

As for the process of Japan’s assistance to the Maldives, the prompt implementation of assistance by the “Non-project Grant Aid Operation and Management Committee” is commendable, although the initial response to rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance appeared to be rather late. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that, in some projects, the local-led process of deciding assistance by the Committee resulted in supports beyond the scope of rehabilitation and reconstruction from tsunami damage. The challenge in future will be that Japan has to examine the process of implementing an aid project in the case of a similar disaster.

As for Japan’s assistance efforts through trust funds in international financial institutions, there was room for improvement in the formulation of the JFPR projects. It is important that local parties concerned play more of a leading role in the formulation process. It is also important to formulate a project which is easier to implement and rather simpler in substance.

### Recommendations

#### Clarify and share purposes of the emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance

It is necessary for the parties involved to have substantial discussions on the purpose of emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance, and to obtain some degree of clarification on the topic. In particular, when Japan discusses its future support in response to wide-ranging, large-scale disasters involving numerous stricken countries, such as in the case of tsunami disasters, it would be ideal for the concerned parties to share a general, common recognition of the goal of the assistance.

#### Set a standard for the scale of support according to the relations between Japan and a disaster-stricken country, and a recipient country’s ability to absorb assistance

It is necessary to set a standard for the scale of emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance in consideration of the relation between Japan and a disaster-stricken country, and a recipient’s ability to absorb assistance, as well as the scale of the disaster. In this regard, it is important to permit flexible operations in individual cases, considering the impracticality of using a standard as an absolute restriction.

#### Review the possibility of assistance to personal assets, including housing support

Japan should review the possibility of providing
assistance to personal assets, including housing support. In view of damage assessment results and trends in other donor assistance, it is important to review the possibility of Japan’s providing assistance to personal assets, including housing support, which is really the primary need in an extraordinary situation such as a disaster. Japan should, however, recognize the risks of providing aid supplies and other assistance to private individuals.

Set up a task team specializing in emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance primarily based around the Embassy of Japan

In disaster assistance, a task team should be temporarily set up with a view toward supporting stricken countries, and this should be primarily based around the Japanese embassy within a recipient country. A personnel dispatched by Japan International Cooperation System (JICS) and other related organizations should also be stationed as full-time members for a fixed time period. The purpose of this is to ensure more prompt and effective assistance by simplifying coordination and the line of command on the Japanese side.

Discuss the ideal use of non-project grants and yen loans in emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance

The ideal use of non-project grants and yen loans in emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance should be discussed in advance. Specifically, for the use of non-project grants for long-term support due to a large-scale disaster, the possibility of the split provision of grants in installments, and other issues, should be discussed from the viewpoint of securing useful, effective and efficient support which can respond to changes in needs within the affected area.

Improve PR in emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance

Japan should improve PR during emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance, from the perspective of securing accountability and the promotion of mutual understanding by: disclosing the details of assistance and the results of activities, involving professional PR personnel and journalists, and utilizing media, providing easily comprehensible explanations, and taking efforts to formulate projects with simple and clear objectives and details.

Improve assistance through Japan Trust Fund

In providing assistance through the Japan Trust Fund, Japan should ensure the prompt and secure implementation of assistance which meets real local needs and the effective use of support results by promoting the formulation of projects under the leadership of the local mission, simplifying/accelerating the approval of projects, disclosing proceeding rules, improving the on-site supervision of implementation, and constructing a mechanism for giving feedback on and sharing of monitoring results.

Set emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance guidelines

Japan should discuss the ideal form of emergency disaster rehabilitation assistance in consideration of the aforementioned recommendations in order to set guidelines.
Evaluation of Japan’s ODA in the Health Sector

Chief Evaluator: Hiroko Hashimoto, Professor, Jumonji University
Advisor: Etsuko Kita, MD, Ph.D., President, Japanese Red Cross Kyushu International College of Nursing
Consultants: Mizuho Information & Research Institute, Inc.

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
Following the announcement of the United Nations Millennium Declaration in 2000 and the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) the following year, 2008 marks the midway point until the deadline for the achievement of these goals in 2015. Furthermore, 2008 saw a number of significant movements relating to development assistance in the international community, including the health sector. In May, the Fourth Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD IV), and then in June, the G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit, were convened. One of the goals of these events was to once again cultivate a shared awareness and sense of issues among development partners and aid recipient countries, for the measures intended to achieve the MDGs, relating to assistance in the health sector. With these efforts, this evaluation was conducted to determine the future direction of Japanese ODA policy of the health sector, in consideration of international situations, through an overall evaluation of the relevance, effectiveness, and appropriateness of Japan’s ODA in the health sector. This evaluation also aims to obtain lessons and recommendations to continue to implement efficient and effective assistance, which maximizes the strengths and the advantages it possesses.

Scope and period
To evaluate the aid policy, the Health and Development Initiative (HDI), announced in 2005, was examined. The evaluation on the result of ODA input was conducted in terms of: ODA financial input in the health sector between 2000 and 2007 (including designated contributions, to international organizations and grant aid via international institutions), and contributions to various types of Japanese Funds aiming to reduce poverty as cross-sectoral, supplement assistance for the health sector. ODA projects implemented for the health sector (technical cooperation, grant aid, and loan aid), which were launched after 2000, were also evaluated.

Methodology
The framework for this evaluation was based on the three perspectives of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results” and “appropriateness of processes”. For this evaluation, information was collected through literature review and interviews in both Japan and Senegal. Furthermore, the evaluation team conducted questionnaire surveys with Japanese diplomatic missions overseas and JICA offices in approximately 79 countries, where Japan’s ODA contributions to the health sector have been made since 2000. Questionnaire surveys were also conducted in the Ministry of Health of 41 countries, out of the above-mentioned countries, where two or more Japan’s ODA activities have been contributing to the health sector and JICA offices have been established, regardless of type of scheme.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
The HDI is consistent with the MDGs, the high-level international policies that should be the base of the HDI formulation, subsequently upon which Japan has shown leadership in building higher level international policies, such as the “Yokohama Action Plan”, and the “Toyako Framework for Action on Global Health”. Accordingly, the HDI is appropriate as policy.

With regard to the fields of “maternal/reproductive health”, “human resources development”, and “overall healthcare system”, which are also stipulated in the HDI, there is a high degree of consent with the development plans of the recipient side. For this reason, it can be concluded that the HDI and Japan’s ODA policies to the health sector in each recipient country possess high levels of relevance.
Chapter 2 Outline of Evaluation Results

2.1 Results of Evaluation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Effectiveness of Results
As of 2007, due to the decrease in Japan’s overall ODA budget, when compared with financial input of other donors, the ranking of Japan’s bilateral ODA programs in the health sector has been falling steadily throughout 2005 and 2006, and Japan has not been able to yet regain the position of 2004 or earlier. Accordingly, it is necessary for Japan to increase its ODA budget, focusing on assistance to the Sub Saharan Africa, which noticeably lags behind in the achievement of the MDGs indices of the health sector.

Moreover, Japan has continually contributed to health-sector-related cross-sectoral assistance through international agencies. Therefore, Japanese assistance is viewed as highly valid: one of the basic initiatives defined by the HDI is “assistance to health-related sectors to supplement health-sector assistance, and cross-sectoral activities”, and collaborations with international organizations. It is considered that Japan is able to carry out appropriate assistance by multilateral assistance (ODA) in regions where it is difficult to respond with timely grants, solely through bilateral development assistance (ODA). The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) has successfully raised a large sum of capital, and Japan’s leadership in establishing the GFATM is greatly significant.

Appropriateness of Processes
In the HDI, there are traces of opinions of aid organizations and NGOs that were taken into consideration. Therefore it can be concluded that the HDI has been formulated through a highly transparent process. However, since the Initiative is a high-level policy, it cannot be said that the level of understanding of the basic principles and agenda of the HDI is high at JICA offices in recipient countries. In the formulation of the Initiative, it is necessary to strengthen public relations and include timely reflections of Country Assistance Programs, as well as further inclusion of basic principles and specific efforts among personnel.

Related to Japan’s ODA
Japan has dispatched specialists, as advisors, to the ministries of health and related bodies, mainly in priority recipient countries, and a high level of satisfaction among recipient countries and others has been confirmed in terms of advisors’ expertise and roles. Japan should continue to dispatch advisors to the Ministries of health, and provide bilateral ODA with advices given by specialists to counterparts in the health sector development, in order to implement bilateral assistance (ODA), which is believed to result in the creation of a system for more effective implementation of ODA.

It has been found that the recipient country governments have considered Japan’s assistance processes to be significant, particularly in terms of careful planning, follow-up activities, and support based on long-term views. This was regarded as a result of the characteristics of Japan’s ODA in the health sector, which makes much of sustainability. Meanwhile, Japan should continuously verify the sustainability of the assistance effects by evaluating its validity, including medical equipment, while encouraging the recipient countries’ own efforts to secure the sustainability of their assistance structure, in order to increase further sustainability of assistance results.

Japan should actively take part in the activities funded by the Global Fund, to which Japan has significantly contributed, and align them effectively with Japan’s bilateral ODA. Both MOFA and JICA should systematically address to the worldwide activities funded of the Global Fund, after promptly establishing policies.
Recommendations

Strengthening approaches which contribute to the achievement of the MDGs

Japan has been taking an international leadership in health-sector assistance. Japan should create successive policy initiatives after the HDI, and further increase to secure the relative amount of Japan’s contributions to bilateral ODA in the international health sector, in order to demonstrate to both domestic and foreign audiences how Japan will contribute to the health sector in the future, along with the achievements at the TICAD IV and the G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit. In conjunction with the formulation of the new policy initiative in 2010, it would be effective for Japan to announce its contribution in the form of a certain level of funds to the health sector for the 5-year period before 2015, the deadline for the achievement of the MDGs. Japan should continue to strengthen its ODA in the health sector, in particular to the African region, which is behind in achievement of the MDGs.

Cooperation and collaboration with the Global Fund

The Global Fund, whose parent said to be Japan, has been successfully receiving large contributions from many donors and steadily achieving its targets. Japan played a leading role in the creation of this fund, serving as one of the presiding countries, and contributing to organizational reforms and evaluations. Japan’s efforts should be evaluated. On the other hand, based on the current trend of the Global Fund, Japan needs to formulate the policy toward recipient countries, with regard to cooperation and collaboration for the activities funded by the Global Fund.

Needs for action plans to ensure the feasibility of ODA policy and financial commitments

Japan’s policies for ODA in the health sector stipulated in HDI were significantly reflected in international policy documents, such as the “Yokohama Action Plan” and the “Toyako Framework for Action on Global Health”. While the Japan’s new ODA initiative in the health sector should be based on the HDI basic principles and agenda, it is important to prioritize and strengthen the specified fields, and enhance specific parts of action plans, in order to design a structure that ensures the feasibility, including a declaration of financial commitments.

Strengthening the formulation processes of ODA policy toward the health sector

There are traces of opinions made by NGOs, JICA and JBIC, in some important points of the HDI, therefore, the process should be evaluated to incorporate a wide variety of opinions. Formulating of a new initiative, it should be considered through highly transparent process involving various actors, such as experts and civil groups in the health sector, from a point earlier than the drafting stage.

Strengthening communication and public relations concerning ODA policies toward the health sector

There is a need to internationally strengthen public relations of Japan’s ODA policies. However, there is also a need to promote greater understanding of the basic principles and agenda of Japan’s ODA, among Japanese parties concerning ODA in the health sector, and further strengthen the image of the policy in the assistance activities actually being carried out. Also, Japan should make further efforts to communicate with the ministries of health at a local level, to deepen their understanding of the results of international conferences, such as TICAD IV and the G8 Summit because international conferences and summits are frequently attended by higher-level members of MOFA and other ministries, who may not be fully aware of actual ODA activities in the health-sector sites.
Strengthening assistance processes to establish the foundations of the health system in aid recipient countries

To maintain the infrastructure of health systems in developing countries, it is essential to enhance the maintenance function of medical facilities by provisions of medical equipment and the repairs of medical facilities. It is also important to encourage the recipient country’s own efforts to secure the sustainability of the assistance structure on their own side, in order to ensure the consistent assistance effect of provision of medical equipment. As was seen in case studies, while providing equipment with grant aid, Japan should repeatedly consult with the recipient country governments to ensure their assistance structure, and further continuity of assistance effects in the future.

Improving the presence of Japan’s ODA through promotion of the aid program

It has been confirmed in the case study that in the wake of the launch of the JICA program, it has dramatically changed the perceptions of the ministries of health, which previously tended to perceive it as: “Japan provides a range of assistance in response to our requests, but ultimately we are not sure of what Japan has contributed”. In the health sector, where a lot of donors are active, Japan should further promote program-based activities under scheme coordination as far as possible, in order to offer strategic assistance to specific regions and issues, and to increase the presence of its ODA in the health sector.

Strengthening Japan’s assistance systems in the health sector

To strengthen the health systems in developing countries, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive assistance for the development policies of central governments in the health sector. Japan should continue to actively dispatch advisors to the minister’s secretariat, and related sections at the ministries of health, in the aid recipient countries, where the health sectors are prioritized in Japan’s ODA policy. Japan should actively participate in health-sector development policies in recipient countries, and promote the creation of system capable of smoothly implementing Japan’s health-sector assistance.
Evaluation of “Initiative for Japan’s ODA on Water” and “Water and Sanitation Broad Partnership Initiative (WASABI)”

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief Evaluator: Tatsufumi Yamagata, Director, Poverty Alleviation and Social Development Studies Group; Inter-Disciplinary Studies Center / Professor, IDE Advanced School (IDEAS), the Institute of Developing Economies (IDE)
Advisor: Yukio Tanaka, (Assistant Professor, “Wisdom of Water” (Suntory) Corporate Sponsored Research Program, Organization for Interdisciplinary Research Projects, the University of Tokyo)
Consultant: Mizuho Information & Research Institute, Inc.

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
This survey was conducted for the purpose of obtaining lessons and recommendations which would contribute to effective and efficient implementation of assistance in the water and sanitation sector in the future, by comprehensively evaluating the relevance, effectiveness and appropriateness of the "Two Initiatives", formulated as the development policies in the water and sanitation sector.

Scope and Period
This evaluation attempted to verify the “Initiative for Japan’s ODA on Water”, (2003) and the "Water and Sanitation Broad Partnership Initiative (WASABI)" (2006). The survey also evaluated Japan’s ODA in the water and sanitation sector, which is the subject of the Two Initiatives. Projects were evaluated basically for the period from 2000 to 2007.

Methodology
This evaluation was implemented from the viewpoint of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results”, and “appropriateness of processes”. The evaluation team implemented the evaluation through on-site interviews, data collection in Cambodia and India, in addition to domestic literature reviews and interview surveys.

Evaluation Results

Relevance of Policies
The details of the Two Initiatives such as “comprehensive cross-sectoral approach” and “promotion of coordination among various partners and financial resources including private sectors” were evaluated as consistent with the assistance philosophy and policies which have been posed by the international community, regarding the water-related and health sectors. The evaluation team confirmed that the Two Initiatives were in accordance with Japan’s ODA Charter and Japan’s Medium-Term Policy on ODA that advocate the “human security” perspective as one of Japan’s basic aid policies, and address the “water and sanitation” sector as a critical challenge for achieving poverty reduction.

The Two Initiatives have a strong aspect of being formulated as position papers that clearly express Japan’s ODA menu, comprehensively classifying existing aid policies and the details of major assistance activities. That is, it should be kept in mind that the Two Initiatives lack innovativeness and leadership, which the word of “initiative” literally implies, (though all initiatives do not necessarily appear to be required to give innovation or leadership).

Meanwhile, the water-related ODA activities in both case study countries not only follow the Two Initiatives, but are also consistent with poverty reduction, development programs of the both two countries and the international community, as well as with Japan’s ODA Charter.

Effectiveness of results
The total amount of Japan’s ODA contribution to the water and sanitation sector (worldwide) generally has an upward trend since FY2001, and in FY2006, it reached the 30% mark when the WASABI was announced. However, examining the geographical allocation of the ODA grants in the water and sanitation sector, Japan’s ODA has not always been input sufficiently to the regions which have serious development challenges in this sector. Therefore, increasing relative proportion of support to developing countries in such regions, is a critically important challenge in the future.

The MDG Indicators pertaining to water and sanitation have been improving overall. However, both the depth (proportion of countries showing improvement) and degree (extent of the improvement) of improvement are not necessarily evaluated to be satisfactory. It is difficult to simply specify the degree of Japan’s ODA contribution based on such improvements in the
MDG Indicators. However, in Cambodia and India, the case studies for this evaluation survey, many effective projects utilizing Japan’s ODA have been implemented. Therefore, it is reasonable to give a positive evaluation for effectiveness of Japan’s ODA pertaining to water.

** Appropriateness of processes**

As Japan fully utilized the expertise of related specialists, ministries and governmental agencies during the formulation process of the Two Initiatives, it can be highly evaluated that a procedure was adopted for the experiences and expertise accumulated in the past in the water and sanitation sector, would be broadly reflected in the Two Initiatives. Because the Two Initiatives were formulated by proactive participation of related ministries, it seems that the commitment of the ministries concerning ODA in the water and sanitation sector was strengthened and that a system of coordination has been established. This should be evaluated as an important lesson which can be applied to the implementation of ODA in other sectors. On the other hand, regarding the composition of the Two Initiatives, there are further issues that remain in order to adopt a cross-sectoral strategy. Both of the initiatives strongly reflect a sector-by-sector perspective in which the jurisdictions of ministries concerned can be perceived.

According to the results of interview surveys conducted in both Japan and the case study countries, the awareness of the Two Initiatives is generally low. Further, these initiatives were not cited as guidelines for the series of operational processes of assessment, planning, and implementation of the actual programs. While the assistance provided in the field also does not diverge from the ODA philosophy and policies stated in the Two Initiatives, it is difficult to argue that the integrated water resources management and strengthened partnerships, which are put forth as the cross-sectoral orientation of the Two Initiatives, have been sufficiently achieved.

Furthermore, with regard to aid coordination, which is one of the important perspectives of appropriateness of ODA implementation processes, the Cambodian Government is active, while the Indian Central Government is passive. In response to this difference, Japan’s ODA Task Force is contributing actively to aid coordination with other donors in Cambodia, while establishing close ties with the central government of India. Therefore, with respect to “appropriateness of processes”, the maximum efforts have been made according to the conditions in each country.
Recommendations

Consider the water sector as one of the priority areas for Japan’s ODA

The water sector – the urban water supply and purification area in particular – is not a sector where many donors have made much assistance because the financial amount of assistance required for the sector is enormous. In this situation, Japan already has been showing a major presence among bilateral donors with regard to assistance in the global water sector. So far, Japan has been involved in many projects concerning the development of social infrastructure including urban water, sewage system and flood control assistance. Naturally, Japan is expected to provide follow-up assistance. Because the funding repayment periods are usually long, long-term participation is required. In other words, Japan has already been engaged with a strong commitment in the water sector that became a meaningful “asset” in the water assistance sector. Therefore, Japan’s strength in international cooperation in the water sector comes from two points: (1) its comparative advantage concerning the assistance, which combines the construction of socially-needed infrastructure and financing, and (2) its large, long-term contribution to this sector.

From the views of developing countries, it is clear that there are still enormous needs in areas of water supply, purification, irrigation and flood control before the initiation of this survey. Consequently, Japan’s ODA receives significant requests in these areas and has sufficient preparations and capacity for support. Therefore, it is reasonable to say that Japan should target international cooperation in the water sector as one of the priority areas in the future.

Re-examine assistance in the water sector in the way to collaborate with local Japanese governments

In Japan, local governments undertake the role of managing the urban water supply system and sewage services. To make use of these experience and expertise in international cooperation activities when Japan finances urban water supply and sewerage service projects in developing countries, it has simultaneously dispatched water supply and water purification experts of local governments, provided training to local entities related to the projects and supplied related machine parts, thereby providing support which combines loan aid, technical cooperation and grant aid as a set. Until now this methodology was extremely significant in the sense that Japan was able to make the best use of its own experience by transferring the approach which had been developed within Japan.

However, as obtaining the cooperation of local governments and their specialists has become more challenging because of recent structural reform of local governments in Japan, it has become difficult for Japan to maintain this type of collaboration.

On the other hand, as seen in the case study countries, the private sectors are deeply involved in the urban water and sewerage systems in developing countries. It is an international trend to enhance the partnership with the private sector, especially for urban water supply and sewerage services.

Considering these current conditions, we believe two measures are essential. First, Japan should continue its efforts to expand the number of local governments providing cooperation, and recruit and train specialists in the future, since international cooperation in collaboration with local governments has been a strong feature of Japan’s assistance in the urban service water and sewerage assistance until now.

Second, Japan should investigate and study the possibility of the collaboration with the private sector in addition to cooperation with local governments. Issues
which need to be examined: the types of private organizations and firms which other donors cooperate with, the strengths and weaknesses of other donors’ approaches to collaboration with the private sector compared with Japan’s current system of cooperation centered on local governments, and whether Japan’s private sector organizations and firms possess sufficient expertise, technology and experience in the water sector. This is not to say that “Japan must adopt the same form of cooperation with the private sector that other donors currently are pursuing”, in a single leap. As a result of the examination, it will enable the Government of Japan, cooperation agencies, local governments and private firms to seek an optimal approach for the new cooperation, while exploring various types of cooperation. This may eventually give rise to a new format of the Japanese assistance in the water sector beyond the current cooperation with local governments. With such a medium-term goal in mind, Japan should examine the modes of cooperation with the private sector of other donors at this stage.
Evaluation of Japan’s Assistance to the Education Sector in Laos

(Third Party Evaluation: Joint Evaluation with NGOs)

Period of Evaluation Survey: From June 2008 to March 2009
Chief evaluator: Kiyoko Ikegami, Director, UNFPA Tokyo Office
Adviser: Miki Inui, Assistant Professor, Osaka University Graduate School
NGO Representatives: Kaori Kuroda, Co-Director, CSO Network
Toshihiro Yoneyama, Director, Live with Friends on the Earth (LIFE)
Collaborator: Ryoko Nishida, Director, Research Department, Japanese Organization for International Cooperation in Family Planning (JOICFP)
Consultant: IC Net Limited

Objectives
The evaluation seeks to undertake a comprehensive assessment of Japan’s ODA activities in the basic education sector in Laos as a whole, and make recommendations which can contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the future assistance, while outlining directions for ODA implementation that includes effective cooperation and partnerships with NGOs. At the same time, publicizing the results of this evaluation promotes accountability to the public and understanding of Japan’s ODA.

Scope and Period
The evaluation focuses on a total of 152 aid projects which have been implemented under “improvement of basic education”, one of the priority areas determined by the Country Assistance Program for Laos, as implemented during the eight years between FY2000 and FY2007 (April 1, 2000 - March 31, 2008). For this evaluation, information obtained until October 2008, when the field research was carried out, was considered the latest available.

Methodology
The evaluation study was carried out in four steps: (1) setting the evaluation design, (2) study in Japan, (3) study in Laos, and (4) analysis of collected information and report formulation. The evaluation study was comprehensively carried out from the analytical perspectives of “relevance of policies”, “effectiveness of results”, and “appropriateness of processes”. Evaluation results

Relevance of policies
■ So far, Japan’s assistance to the basic education sector in Laos has been implemented, in a manner consistent with higher-level policies of the Japanese government, such as the ODA Charter, the ODA Mid-Term Policy and the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN), which is the basic policy in the educational sector.
■ Japan’s assistance has been implemented in a manner consistent with the development policies of Laos, since it has been contributing to the attainment of the “equity and access”, “quality and appropriateness” and the “administration and management”, which are the three challenges in the educational sector emphasized by the Government of Laos that has aimed to achieve Education for All (EFA).
■ Japan’s assistance has supported the efforts of the Laotian government targetting the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and has been consistent with international priority issues and trends.
■ The clear framework of the current cooperation program, the Improvement of Basic Education, is still in the process of being defined, through participation in aid coordination with the Government of Laos and other donors, and consultations on Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs).

Effectiveness of results
■ Looking at the input of Japan’s assistance to the basic education sector in Laos, more than 50% was allocated to “the improvement of the educational environment and access”. Although it is difficult to express quantitatively the exact effects of Japan’s assistance on higher goals, such as enrollment rate, through its efforts of the construction of schools and educational facilities, as well as maintenance of educational equipment, a certain positive influence can be identified in target areas.
From the viewpoint of the increase in education quality, positive effects were observed in terms of teaching methodology and the creation of teaching materials, as a result of the training of mathematics and science teachers through the Project for Improving Science and Mathematics Teacher Training (SMATT). These achievements are expected to contribute to the increase in education quality in the long run.

A large number of NGO projects, funded by ODA, are characterized by an emphasis on socially vulnerable groups, including the poor, women and disabled people, in relation to the improvement of the educational environment and access, as well as the mitigation of factors inhibiting school attendance. Furthermore, these projects frequently make use of their own networks, close cooperation with local communities and people, in the implementation process. As a result, utilizing such advantages of the NGO, the assistance to school education, the diffusion of books and reading, promotion of cultural activities, vocational training for women and the disabled are being carried out, in close connection with the local communities, contributing to the improvement of basic education as good practices (successful cases/good cases).

Appropriateness of processes

While increased emphasis is rapidly being placed on aid coordination and SWApPs, Japan has been promoting aid coordination and policy dialogue with the Government of Laos, through the dispatch of policy advisors. Meanwhile, Japan’s experience and strength in assistance to the basic education sector are still not fully understood by other donors. Therefore, in the future, it is necessary to prepare documents to publish and share Japan’s experience, expertise and achievements of the assistance in the sector.

Pilot projects have been started; that is, various schemes of Japan’s ODA were selected and linked effectively to suit local circumstances and needs. For example, with one of the pilot projects, grant aid to “hard” aspects, including school construction and the improvement of the educational environment, is combined with assistance provided through technical cooperation projects and partnerships with NGOs, in “soft” aspects, to enable local communities to manage schools and educational activities. Moreover, in another case, a technical cooperation project, in the three less developed southern provinces, aims to comprehensively improve primary education through the participation of local administrations and people, in collaboration with international NGOs.

The evaluation shows that some NGO projects conducted, in collaboration with ODA and local communities and people, are making a definite contribution to the improvement of educational environment and access, as well as the mitigation of factors inhibiting school enrollment. Therefore, Japan may be able to solve these challenging problems, through sharing and making better use of these experience and expertise of NGOs in the ODA framework.
Recommendations

Strengthen basic education assistance aimed at ensuring continuation and completion of primary education

While recent initiatives have successfully managed to increase enrollment rates in primary education, gaps still persist, and the attainment of EFA and MDGs by 2015 is doubtful. It is necessary to extend coverage to the so-called “last 10% or so” in order to ensure universal access to primary education. Against this background, as of October 2008, the Education Sector Development Framework (ESDF) is being formulated through aid coordination in Laos. Japan should use its accumulated experience, and reinforce its support to the basic education sector, in the direction of a shared concern of the international community.

Promote aid coordination, strategic reinforcement of partnerships with other donors, and proactive participation in SWApS

Japan needs to participate actively in the transition to SWApS, while shaping the strategies of its Program for the Improvement of Basic Education, and specifying its assistance targets, its realms of expertise, and issues in collaboration with other donors. An analysis of Japan’s record of assistance to primary education shows that its areas of expertise included: the improvement of the educational environment and access (primary school construction and renovation), the improvement of education quality (training of science and mathematics teachers), and the mitigation of factors inhibiting school enrollment, by working with communities in cooperation with NGOs (promotion for reading, community enlightenment, etc.).

Support attainment of universal access to primary education and enhance assistance effects through reinforced partnerships

Reinforce partnerships in order to ensure comprehensive approaches

Initiatives for the development of basic education, undertaken as part of a larger effort aiming to reduce poverty, require comprehensive approaches which are not limited to the education sector, but focus on region-wide linkages with other sectors, in order to improve the educational environment as a whole. In the planning stage, it is recommended that processes and tools (check items) be set in place, for identifying possibilities for partnerships with other sectors. Such processes can be used to ensure that synergy effects are generated through assistance.

Promote linkages between Japan’s various assistance schemes according to the local needs

To achieve maximum effect with limited funds toward attainment of EFA, it is essential to select and link schemes correctly, and to coordinate cooperation which includes NGOs and the private sector, according to the particular needs of each local area and beneficiary. This includes creating synergies by addressing the “hard” and “soft” dimensions of the needs simultaneously. For example, while using grant aid of ODA for “hard” infrastructure development, such as school construction and improvement of the educational environment, technical cooperation projects and projects conducted in partnership with NGOs can focus on “soft” aspects such as school management and education project administration by local communities.

Strengthen capacities of local governments

With the advance of decentralization, assistance for strengthening capacities of local governments in education services is a critical issue. In particular, assistance is needed to strengthen the capacity of Provincial Educational Services (PES) and District...
Education Bureaus (DEB), which are in charge of the administration and management of local educational institutions, to promote and maintain basic education projects at the local level, with special attention to local particularities and needs, as well as for mobilizing and empowering of local resources through the participation of communities and their residents.

Collaborate with NGOs and other groups with close connections to local people and communities

Some Japanese NGOs have close connections to local people and communities and have rich experience in activities focusing on regions where access to education is difficult, and on minorities and socially vulnerable groups. Therefore, linkages between ODA and NGOs should be enhanced, ensuring that the NGOs’ experience and networks at the local level are effectively used, in order to effectively reach groups comprising the “last 10% or so”.

The above four recommendations share an emphasis on a comprehensive approach, bringing to the foreground the need to strengthen partnerships not only among various ODA schemes, but also with NGOs, other donors and aid organizations. In advancing collaboration, it is also important not only to promote information exchanges, review and consultation with NGOs and other stakeholders from the planning stage, but also to ensure its smooth implementation, through simple and coordinated means.

Share information, expertise and good practices in Japan and Laos

In the future, in line with the move toward SWAs, Japan will need to get actively involved in the decision-making process in the new framework of the ESDF, increasing its presence and providing assistance in an efficient and effective manner. For that purpose, further steps remain to be taken to prepare text materials, which present Japan’s experience, expertise, and good practices of the aids to Laos, under the leadership and enhanced coordination function of the local ODA Task Force to ensure the sharing of the information, ideas and knowledge with NGOs, the private sector and other local stakeholders. Those activities can be effective in: (1) the consideration of concrete cooperation projects, (2) the selection of and concentration on the sub-sectors and issues where Japan’s strengths can be of value and (3) the identification of good practices applicable from the planning stage.

Furthermore, also in Japan, it is necessary to make better use of existing networks to put together the evidence-based results and data achieved concerning each problem and sector, so as to secure places and opportunities for sharing information, ideas, knowledge and good practices with NGOs, the private sector and other assistance stakeholders in Japan involved in the international cooperation regarding Laos.
2.1.4. Project-level Ex-post Evaluation (Grant Aid)

Primary Evaluation by MOFA and Secondary Evaluation by Third Parties

Target Projects of the Project-level Ex-post Evaluation
Totally, 66 projects (47 countries) were the subjects of the project-level ex-post evaluation conducted in FY2008 which include the following projects: all of the general and fisheries grant aid projects completed in FY2004, the general and fisheries grant aid projects with a maximum aid amount of 1 billion yen or more completed between FY1999 and FY2002 which were not evaluated in FY2005 nor FY2006, and the general and fisheries grant aid projects completed in FY2003 which were not evaluated in FY2007.

The project-level ex-post evaluation was introduced in FY2005, and this is the fourth project-level ex-post evaluation. In FY2005 and FY2006, the project-level ex-post evaluation examined only projects with a maximum aid amount of 1 billion yen or more. Since FY2007, the project-level ex-post evaluation has examined all projects including those with a maximum aid amount of 1 billion yen or less.

Primary Evaluation by MOFA
The primary evaluation to be conducted by MOFA was carried out by the Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation Division of MOFA, as well as diplomatic missions abroad. Each diplomatic mission evaluated individual projects by examining documents and survey reports concerning the projects to be evaluated, directly inspecting the projects and interviewing the recipient country’s implementing agencies and beneficiaries.

In doing so, each project was graded on a scale of 1 to 12 based on the pre-established standards of six evaluation criteria, including the five evaluation criteria of OECD-DAC (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability) and the effect of public relations.

Secondary Evaluation by Third Parties
The secondary evaluation was to evaluate the MOFA’s primary evaluation results by external experts.

In the secondary evaluation, evaluators re-evaluated the projects using the same criteria as those used in the primary evaluation, and assessed the primary evaluation results. More precisely, the secondary evaluators independently conducted ratings of the projects by examining the facts described in the primary evaluation sheets on the projects. In addition, they rated the quality of the primary evaluation results, by every evaluation item on the following five rates: (a) Sufficient/High, (b) Generally sufficient/Generally high, (c) Average, (d) Somehow insufficient/Low, and (e) Insufficient/Low.

Project-level Ex-post Evaluation by Third Parties
The project-level ex-post evaluation of grant aid in FY 2005 consisted of solely internal evaluation by the Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation Division and diplomatic missions abroad. Since FY2006, in order to carry out more objective evaluation, MOFA has commissioned a portion of sector-based and country-based evaluation to external experts.

In FY2008, totally eight evaluations were conducted: two sector-based evaluations on the agriculture and forestry sectors, and six country-based evaluations consisting of four projects in the Middle East and two projects in the Southwest Asia.

Evaluation to be Conducted after FY2009
Following the inauguration of the new JICA in October 2008 which implements grant aid, loan aid and technical cooperation in an integrated manner, since FY2009 JICA has been in charge of project-level ex-post evaluation for grant aid projects as well as ex-post evaluation for loan aid and technical cooperation projects. MOFA has transferred the expertise and lessons learned through the past ex-post evaluations to JICA. Meanwhile, MOFA will further push forward efficient and effective implementation of grant aid by continuously following up the development of diplomatic effects, while receiving ex-post evaluation results from JICA.
Chapter 2 Outline of Evaluation Results

2.1 Results of Evaluation by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Objectives

The National Hospital of Pediatrics in Hanoi, the capital of Vietnam, has been positioned as a leading institution in the country’s pediatric service, and has gained the trust of the people as a high level medical center for children, accepting critically-ill patients from all over the country. However, the hospital still used much medical equipment over 20 years old that was installed at the time of the inauguration of the hospital, which adversely affected medical services for an increasing number of patients.

For this reason, this project aimed to restore the hospital’s medical services and upgrade its service quality by providing it with equipment to replace the one which needed to be immediately renewed and to fill shortage of certain equipment in the hospital.

Details of the Program (Provision of equipment)

Surgical Department (surgical beds, shadowless lights, anesthetic equipment, electrosurgical knives, endoscopes, etc.)

Radiology Department (X-ray equipment, etc.)

ICU Department (aspiration devices, ultrasonic nebulizers, incubators, etc.)

Premature Baby Care Department (incubators, aspiration devices, ultrasonic diagnostic devices, etc.)

Relevance

Overall Evaluation: A

The National Hospital of Pediatrics is at the top of health and medical system for children. It accepts patients from all over the country and functions as a training center for pediatric doctors and nurses, just before or after finishing college/university. It also plays a leadership role for lower-level hospitals. Accordingly, providing assistance to the hospital is beneficial for a large number of people and highly significant as the subject of Japan’s ODA.

Appropriateness and efficiency of the facilities and equipment

Overall Evaluation: A

The equipment provided in this project has been well maintained and properly used in the National Hospital of Pediatrics. The use of the equipment has been fairly frequent as they have been used to care for an increasing number of patients. (For example, the ultrasonic diagnostic equipment was used for approximately 38,000 cases and the endoscope was for approximately 4,000 cases in 2007.) As some of these devices had been used too often, problems occurred with such medical devices as pulse monitors and blood oxygen level monitoring devices that had been used for many patients almost everyday. Those devices have been, however, replenished at the hospital’s own expenses. This probably indicates that the project has not resulted in excessive procurement of equipment.

This project, in principle, targeted the equipment that needed to be replaced urgently because of aging, or replenished due to shortages either in quantity or type. And, this project basically provided equipment which has specifications comparable with the existing medical devices. For this reason, the medical
equipment provided through the project has been well maintained and within the management capacity of the hospital, as well as, properly selected according to the hospital’s substantial need.

Development of effects (effectiveness)

**Overall Evaluation: A+**

At the planning stage, this project was expected to serve to increase the number of patients and enhance the hospital’s medical testing and treatment functions. The target figures and the actual results are as follows.

1. Increase in then patients
   (a) Number of outpatients
   - Program design 176,474 cases as of 2001, Target for 2005: 203,000 cases
   - Actual result as of 2005: 350,161 cases
   - Actual result as of 2007: 391,078 cases
   (b) Number of inpatients
   - Program design 19,493 cases as of 2001, Target for 2005: 22,800 cases
   - Actual result as of 2005: 45,546 cases
   - Actual result as of 2007: 44,605 cases

2. Enhancement of the Hospital’s medical testing and treatment functions
   (a) Number of operations
   - Program design 4,153 cases as of 2001, Target for 2005: 5,000 cases
   - Actual result as of 2005: 7,897 cases
   - Actual result as of 2007: 9,886 cases
   (b) Number of radiographic tests
   - Program design 28,316 cases as of 2001, Target for 2005: 35,000 cases
   - Actual result as of 2005: 67,791 cases
   - Actual result as of 2007: 82,676 cases

As described above, the targets at the planning stage have been sufficiently achieved. It has been also recognized that this project has been effective, coupled with the hospital's own efforts. For example, the mortality rate of newborn infant brought to the hospital was reduced from approximately 11.3% in 2001 to 4.8% in 2007.

**Impact**

**Overall Evaluation: A+**

According to the health indexes of the pediatric health and medical sector in Vietnam, the infant mortality rate was 30/1000, and the mortality rate of children under the age of five 39/1000 as of 2000. However, those rates were reduced to 16/1000 and 19/1000 in 2005, respectively. Thus, the situation has been gradually improved due to the government’s intensifying efforts.

The National Hospital of Pediatrics, the subject of this project, frequently accepts critically ill patients from all over the country, and it is not too much to say that the hospital functions as the last resort to save the lives of babies and infants (About 70% of patients of the hospital are transported from rural areas). Accordingly, it is considered that the project has enhanced the hospital’s function, which has directly contributed to the improvement of the above indexes.

The hospital also functions as a training center for doctors, nurses and trainees, offers training courses to hospital staff in provincial areas, and is in charge of formulating medical guidelines. Against this background, this project has contributed to human resource development, which is one of the objectives which the Vietnamese government stipulated in the “Ten-Year Strategy for the Health and Medical Sector”, through the capacity building of the hospital staff and accumulation of experiences. (In 2007, the hospital held 19 seminars, in which approximately 2,500 members of provincial agencies participated. The hospital also held 117 in-hospital training courses. In addition, some doctors of the hospital have offered training courses to hospitals in provincial areas in conjunction with technical cooperation provided by JICA [an example of coordination with technical cooperation].)
Sustainability and room for further improvement

**Overall Evaluation: A**

The medical equipment provided through this project are usually used by healthcare workers and maintained and repaired through technical support by the engineers of the medical equipment and technology section. At the planning stage, seven members worked in this section. Now, the number of the staff has been increased to nine. This section is in charge of organizing and keeping the manuals of the equipment.

While the cost of maintaining and repairing the facilities in FY2007 was estimated to be approximately 2 billion dongs at the planning stage, approximately 3.7 billion dongs were actually spent in FY2007. This is an acceptable level.

The hospital is planning to construct new hospital wards mainly with its own budget in order to accept an increasing number of patients. Taking these factors into consideration, the sustainability of the project is high enough.

**Effect of public relations (Visibility)**

**Overall Evaluation: A-**

“ODA Logos” indicating Japan’s ODA are affixed to the equipment provided by this project. The hospital accepts approximately 400,000 outpatients and 40,000 inpatients annually. In addition, these inpatients and outpatients are accompanied by their family members. Every time they visit the hospital, they see Japan’s ODA Logos affixed to the equipment. For this reason, the public relations of this project are effective.

Moreover, it is believed that the media coverage of the conclusion of the Exchange of Notes has facilitated the understanding of Japan’s ODA among Vietnamese people to a certain degree.

**Evaluation by Recipient Country**

The Vietnamese Ministry of Health has highly appreciated the functional enhancement of the National Hospital of Pediatrics by this project and resulting quality improvement of pediatric healthcare. The Ministry has recognized, at several occasions of consultations with local ODA task forces, that Japan’s assistance to leading hospitals like the National Hospital of Pediatrics is the first effective step toward the general improvement of medical care level in Vietnam. The Ministry also has expressed its expectation for similar cooperation from Japan in obstetrics and gynecology, which shows that the Ministry has been highly satisfied with this project.

**Recommendations and Lessons Learned**

As described above, this project has been showing good results. In addition to this project, Japan’s aid for the improvement of facilities to leading hospitals in Vietnam so far and Japan’s technical cooperation conducted to promote technical transfer from leading hospitals to hospitals in provincial areas have holistically contributed to the considerable improvement of the medical service quality in Vietnam.

The medical care standards in Vietnam, however, still remain low, compared to those in developed nations. (For example, Japan’s infant mortality rate was 3/1000, and its mortality rate of children under the age of five was 4/1000 in 2005.) Accordingly, it is reasonable that Japan continuously offers necessary assistance to Vietnam step by step. In doing so, Japan should take account of such aspect as spillover effects on rural areas where the medical standards remain relatively low in order to ensure the effective implementation of aid projects, as is the case with this project and the other projects carried out so far.
2.1.5 Overview of Cultural Grant Aid and Grant Assistance for Japanese NGOs Projects

Follow-up Study on Cultural Grant Assistance
(Confirmation Study on Equipment status)

- Cultural Grant Assistance is a modality of Official Development Assistance (ODA) aimed at promoting culture and higher education in the target country, as well as at contributing to the conservation of cultural heritage.

- In terms of the materials provided by the Cultural Grant Assistance, they are mostly precision instruments such as: language laboratory equipment for studying Japanese language; audio-visual equipment for theatres and museums; and restoration and research machineries used by universities and laboratories dealing with cultural treasures. In spite of the efforts made by the implementing agencies for appropriate maintenance of such equipment, age deterioration or malfunction of the machine’s activity due to climate conditions is inevitable. Also, some projects implemented towards various countries’ sports sectors, through contribution of Judo equipment like uniforms and Tatami mats etc. to Judo and Karate associations, have also been prone to deterioration as a result of continuous use. Under such circumstances, it is necessary for the implementing agencies to take independent efforts to oversee maintenance of the provided equipment. However, the financial conditions of the implementing agencies have not improved since the Assistance was implemented. If comparatively smaller additional assistance would help repair the overall system, such restoration would allow the equipment to effectively work longer and lead to an overall beneficial effect. Therefore, it is in Japan’s interest to take the results obtained by follow-up studies to actively collaborate with follow-up cooperation program to work with the restoration and reparation assistance.

- Regarding the Cultural Grant Assistance, follow-up studies were implemented to confirm current condition of equipment use to the total 74 cases in 45 countries in FY 2008 (37 cases which have been 1 to 2 years after provision of the equipment, and 37 cases which are 3 to 4 years old).

As a result, malfunction was discovered in some cases in which implementation agencies were considering repairing. Here on, Japan carried out reparation assistance through follow-up cooperation program in FY 2008 for complementing to the reparation effort of the implementing agencies.

For other projects, no specific problems have been reported regarding the current equipment status, and several positive feedbacks were reported. For example, in terms of the language laboratory equipment provided for Japanese language studies, the number of the students who majors in Japanese language has doubled since the equipment provision. In other case, thanks to the laboratory equipment provided for the museum, the research activities have been conducted more effectively and their precise results have improved the country’s research level. The provided sports equipment has contributed to more appropriate training environment for athletes and the highest record of its medal count in the past decade at the regional Olympic game. The TV station which broadcasted the supplied programs got a big response from the viewers and received numerous inquiries particularly from educational institutions. Various favorable comments and high appreciations were made from the recipients, including strong requests to continue this unique Cultural Grant Assistance.
Overview of Ex-post Monitoring on Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects

Details and Objectives

In FY2008, the Japanese diplomatic missions abroad conducted Ex-post Monitorings on the “Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects” carried out in FY 2004.

The “Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects” is a grant aid to projects which are implemented by Japanese NGOs directly for the people in developing countries. In FY2008, Japan offered totally 1.835 billion yen of ODA funds for 72 projects of 45 NGOs that covered 29 countries and one region (excluding the government funding through Japan Platform).

In the cause of increasing importance of development assistance by Japanese NGOs, Ex-post Monitorings were implemented for evaluating the status of projects after a certain period passed since their completion. The staff of the diplomatic missions in charge checked the projects with uniform criteria such as relevance of programs, goal achievement, efficiency, impact, sustainability, consideration for the society and environment-friendliness, and reported the evaluation results to MOFA. These reports have been sent to the implementing NGOs, and also shared between the diplomatic missions in the area and MOFA, as useful information in examining similar projects.

Implementation Methods

Projects in which grant contracts were concluded during FY2004 were monitored by the diplomatic missions responsible for the relevant projects mainly led by staff who were assigned to the missions respectively. The evaluation results were recorded on the “Ex-post Monitoring” sheets and reported by the end of June, 2008 (Ex-post Monitorings are to be conducted on projects after three to four years following their completion).

Ex-post Monitoring checks the maintenance and management conditions of buildings and equipment, the usage of educational/training facilities and human resources, the implementation status of public relations to raise recognition of Japan’s ODA, and the maintenance and management systems. As for projects that need more detailed surveys and verification in addition to Ex-post Monitoring, external institutions are asked to carry out specialized surveys.

Results of Monitoring

Out of 72 projects, in total, in which contracts were signed in FY2004, 59 projects (which covered 26 countries) were evaluated, excluding those of which evaluation monitorings were difficult to be implemented due to various reasons such as security deterioration and those which had been already evaluated in a similar manner by external institutions. As a result, 46 projects earned the rating of “excellent”, and 13 earned the rating of “good”.

Lebanon: Cultural film production equipment provided to the Ministry of Culture

Yemen: Materials designed to restore ancient documents provided to the National Historic Records Center
Evaluation of Japan’s ODA for Improvement of Management Capacity of Operation and Maintenance Regarding Water Supply in Egypt

Period of evaluation survey: From September 2008 to February 2009
Evaluators: Center for Project Evaluation & Macroeconomic Analysis (PEMA) Evaluation Team, Ministry of International Co-operation
Team Leader: Laila Shand
Sub-team Leader: Nabil Makhlouf, Assistant Sub-team-Leader: Abdel-Aziz Nassar and 6 other persons.

Evaluation Results

Relevance

SHAPWASCO (Sharqiya Potable Water & Sanitation Company, taking responsibility for the management of all water supply and sewerage services from the local government of Sharqiya prefecture) suffered from low performance due to low salary standard, low water charge structure, low ratio of water charge collection, high cost of labor due to overstaffing, inefficient operation of facilities due to lack of access to information on water production and supply, and a high unaccounted-for-water (UFW) ratio.

Under such circumstances, the Egyptian Government requested the Japanese Government to implement a technical cooperation project to assist SHAPWASCO in improving its operation and maintenance capacity, and accordingly, the project was deemed relevant.

Impact

Although this project is still continuing, it has had measurable impact so far. As a result of capacity building activities carried out by this project, SHAPWASCO became a leading public agency in the area of UFW reduction. The UFW reduction activity reduced UFW ratios significantly (For example, Zagazig Markaz and Zagazig City achieved 24 and 17 reduction points, respectively).

Sustainability

The objective of the SOP activity is to enhance the operation and management capacity of water supply facilities. Therefore, one of the main challenges is the sustainability of project effects. However, the sustainability of operation and maintenance capacity in water facilities is not ensured due to weak structure and a lack of sufficient systems for monitoring SOP activities. Moreover, the attitude of the workers represents another challenge as some of them are not convinced of the benefits of applying the SOPs.
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2.2. Results of Evaluations Conducted by Recipient Government/Agencies

Recomendations

UFW Activities

- Ensure the implementation of UFW activities in project areas before the end of the project
- Set a long-term pipe replacement plan for facility maintenance
- Supply each UFW team with leakage detection equipments to implement leakage detection surveys in project areas
- Recruit new workers and technicians to conduct repair work in the water supply network
- Examine house meters installed in Al-Sharkia governorate, and replacing obsolete meters with new ones
- Conduct leakage detection surveys in the areas where UFW ratios were reduced, to maintain UFW ratios at acceptable levels
- Increase the number of public awareness campaigns on the importance of moderate water consumption
- Provide technical and financial support required for the newly established UFW training center in Sharkia governorate. It is also recommended to employ the best experts in the field of UFW to supervise the training process

Improvement on the Operation and Management Capacity of Water Facilities

- Revise criteria used for selecting water facilities to ensure successful application of the SOPs
- Establish adequate structures and mechanisms at the level of SHAPWASCO to monitor the activities for improving the operation and maintenance capacity of water facilities
- Upgrade the management and administrative capacities of water facilities
- Rehabilitate long-operating water facilities (including the replacement of outdated equipment)
- Increase the number of operation and maintenance workers, technicians, and supervisors in water facilities
- Set clear targets and plans for the implementation of the water quality control program
- Standardize water analysis techniques and chemicals used by all of water quality analysis laboratories to ensure accurate result and facilitate monitoring of water facilities
- Set plans for the water supply network analysis
Evaluation of Japan’s ODA for the Water Supply Development in Egypt

Period of evaluation survey: From September 2008 to February 2009
Evaluators: Center for Project Evaluation & Macroeconomic Analysis (PEMA) Evaluation team, Ministry of International Co-operation
Team Leader: Laila Shahd
Sub-team leaders: Nabil Makhlouf, Assistant Sub-team-Leader: Abdel-Aziz Nassar and six other persons

Evaluation Policy

Objectives
The purpose of this evaluation is to make recommendations for further improvements of Japanese ODA project formulation and implementation regarding water supply development through assessment of the impact of Hihya water purification plant on the living conditions and hygienic environment of beneficiaries in terms of water supply and water quality improvement.

Scope
This report consists of the evaluation of a project of water purification plant in northwest part of Sharqia governorate, which was selected from the water supply development projects implemented in Egypt under Japanese ODA assistance. The project is divided into two main activities:
(a) Construction of a water purification plant in Hihya Markaz
(b) Maintenance of a water transmission/distribution pipeline for integrating Hihya Markaz into the water supply system

Methodology
The Evaluation methodology consists of five aspects: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The assessments of efficiency, effectiveness and relevance are based on information obtained from in-depth interviews. Impact and sustainability are analyzed by the project team.

Evaluation Results

Relevance
This project was selected by thorough deliberation over absence of other sources of water, location next to the Nile branch, strong need of intervention, availability of land, availability of water supply sources within the region and appropriate environment for establishing the plant. Taking all these factors into consideration, this project was deemed relevant.

Efficiency and Effects
The project has successfully achieved its main target of establishing the water plant as scheduled in the planned project duration. In addition, the quality and supply of water have improved tremendously as a result of the establishment of the water station. Before the implementation of the project, most of the inhabitants in target areas lacked access to tap water.

Impact and Sustainability
The project has a direct impact on water supply. The new water supply system provides better water quality as well as a much higher water supply than the previous one did. In Hihya and the surrounding villages such as Mahdyia and Zaramoun, most beneficiaries were satisfied with the water supply and quality, except during peak hours.

On the other hand, the villages located away from the plant, such as Houd Negieh, Kafr Abou Hattab, and Manshiet Ghali, suffer from low quality of water because the Holding Company for Water and Waste Water did not carry out maintenance of the water pipelines.

In terms of sustainability, the water station is fully automated, well constructed, and carefully organized, and there is a strong feeling of enthusiasm among its staff. However, the number of workers is insufficient for carrying out operational and maintenance tasks there.
**Recommendations**

**Impact on Beneficiaries of Construction of Hihya Water Purification Plant**
- Undertake regular tests in various villages among Hihya Markaz to ensure that the quality of tap water meets required standards
- Speed up the maintenance process of the main water pipelines in remote areas such as Houd Nagieh, Mainsheet Ghaly and Kafr Abou Hatab villages

**Hihya Water Purification Plant Management**
- Hire more workers/technicians as well as acquiring the necessary tools and means of transportation to ensure the sustainability of the service, especially in the water network section
Objectives
The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess to what extent and under what circumstances, Japanese ODA to Timor-Leste has been relevant, efficient and effective in the peacebuilding process of the country. Japan has been engaged in assistance to Timor-Leste for ten years since 1999. By comprehensively reviewing Japan’s approaches and projects/activities, this evaluation study, in particular, intends to assess Japan’s contribution to post-conflict peacebuilding and make recommendations on the future issues.

Scope
The scope of the study is focused mainly on peacebuilding related projects/activities implemented by Japan’s ODA. Other factors such as Japan’s involvements in political process and diplomatic interventions are also taken into consideration as long as necessary.

In this evaluation, the research team exercised bibliographical surveys on post-evaluation reports and other related documents, as well as interviews with the officials of JICA, the Embassy of Japan in Timor-Leste, and the relevant offices/ministries of the Government of Timor-Leste such as the Aid Effectiveness Unit at the Ministry of Finance, and the participants and counterparts in the projects/programs.

Methodology
The evaluation study was conducted in line with the ODA Evaluation Guidelines on policy-level evaluation set by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. The study established the frameworks for the evaluation from the three dimensions, policies, results and processes. More precisely, this study carried out by each priority issue regarding the Japanese assistance to Timor-Leste which had been conducted at the initial post-conflict stage, the peace consolidation stage and the each development phase during the peacebuilding process of the country from 1999 to 2009.

Evaluation Results
Relevance of Policy
In recent years, Japan has been increasingly engaged in distinct peacebuilding processes in its assistance to conflict-affected countries and regions. With such background, Timor-Leste is one of the cases in which Japan attempted full-fledged peacebuilding assistance not only with ODA but also by participating in the UN Peace Keeping Operations. Japan’s peacebuilding assistance in Timor-Leste proved to be fully aligned with its diplomatic policies, which hold up international cooperation and peace cooperation, the ODA Charter and the Medium-Term Policy on ODA, as well as the approach of the international community toward conflict-affected countries and regions.

Effectiveness of Results
As one of the major countries supporting Timor-Leste, Japan significantly contributed to the peace consolidation there when Timor-Leste became independent. Japan’s timely humanitarian and reconstruction assistance as well as its financial and personnel contributions to the PKO activities played important roles for Timor-Leste to become an independent nation after the post-conflict situation. However, the crisis which happened in 2006 highlighted the fact that peacebuilding process would not be an easy task; that is, the international community including Timor-Leste and Japan recognized of emerging issues such as public security sector reform, improvement of governance, and countermeasures against poverty and unemployment to attain the peace consolidation.

Most of Japan’s assistance to Timor-Leste in the priority areas that the Japanese government set (“Human resource development”, “Infrastructure development and maintenance”, “Agriculture” and “Consolidation of peace”) has achieved basically satisfactory outcome in line with expectations at each project and activity level. The study acknowledged that these outcomes contributed to the peacebuilding process of Timor-Leste to a certain degree.
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2.2. Results of Evaluations Conducted by Recipient Government/Agencies

Appropriateness and Efficiency of Processes

Japan’s active engagement in the peacebuilding process of Timor-Leste since 1999 has been conducted in close partnership with the UN and the international community in peacebuilding political process. Based on the needs and circumstances at each occasion, Japan has selected the best suited aid and cooperation modalities. It has been recognized that such approaches of Japan have contributed to the peace consolidation in Timor-Leste and encouraged Timor-Leste’s efforts for independent nation-building.

During the process of transition of a temporary administration by the UN toward the independence of Timor-Leste, Japan had gradually shifted its focus from emergency grant aid through multilateral agencies to grant aid and technical cooperation through a bilateral channel, as well as enhanced the effectiveness of grant aid activities through multilateral-bilateral cooperation at various levels. On the other hand, an issue to note concerning Japan’s ODA system is that Japan’s bilateral ODA assistance often demonstrated slow decision making and service delivery vis-à-vis the assistance through multilateral agencies, resulting in large time-lags in responding to the changes of the situation and needs at recipient sides.

On the side of Timor-Leste, weak capacity of government institutions/offices is still a big challenge. Japan’s further engagement in human resource development needs to be enhanced in close collaboration with other donors. A number of cases showed that follow-ups through technical assistance to the government counterparts who received equipment and facilities through grant aid are critical in order to ensure the optimal utilization of the equipment/facilities as designed.

With regard to the implementation process of Japanese ODA, although the efforts for simplification of procedures, provision of indirect support and so forth have been made on the Japanese side regardless of the capacity constraints on the Timorese side, there are still needs for further alignment and harmonization between Timor-Leste and Japan in the implementation process and procedures.

Recommendations

Owing to the joint efforts of Timor-Leste and the international community, Timor-Leste marked stable progress in peacebuilding during the past decade, and is now reaching its final stage for peace consolidation, in spite of serious setbacks such as the incident in 2006. In fact, the majority of attention of the Timor-Leste government and the international community has been shifting from the post-conflict peace consolidation to full-fledged development of the country.

However, the base for peace and stability in this country is still fragile and, as we can learn from the lessons in the past, it is still too early to judge that the country’s peacebuilding has been completed just based on the fact the conflict was terminated. Japan, as a country which has been actively engaged in peacebuilding in conflict affected countries/areas in recent years, still holds an important role to complete the peacebuilding process in Timor-Leste.

Revision of Priority Areas

The current four areas of priorities still hold a strong rationale from these viewpoints; needs in Timor-Leste, distribution of roles with other donors the use of Japan’s expertise. However, in view of transition of Timor-Leste from the post-conflict to the full-fledged development phase, the “Consolidation of Peace” should be dealt with as an overarching theme, rather than as an independent pillar. Issues like “poverty” or “unemployment of youth”, which are often pointed out as potential threats to the stability, should be taken into consideration in the other areas of priorities, whereas, the viewpoint of peace consolidation will play a key role.

Also, capacity building of the government and society should be viewed as an important area of work for encouraging the sustainable peace building. In this regard, “human resource development” should be promoted, taking into consideration the institutional building of the government and society.
Enhancement of Assistance Process, Selection of the Best Assistance Approaches/Modalities

The aid modality or process should be further improved and upgraded in response to the situation in Timor-Leste. The simplification and harmonization of aid procedures according to the Timor-Leste government’s capacity and the country’s current conditions are required in the implementation of assistance through bilateral channels. Also, the approval and implementation processes of the General Grant Assistance Scheme and technical cooperation projects implemented by bilateral ODA should be further accelerated in order to provide timely peacebuilding assistance.

Though Timor-Leste is one of the least developed countries (LDCs), its government is exercising active efforts to lead the economy out of its dependency on the foreign grant aid, by utilizing the Petroleum Fund which is accumulated from resource revenue. One of the big challenges is to seek sustainable use of the Petroleum Fund for the mid- to long-term for industrial and infrastructure development which should lead to the alleviation of poverty. In connection with this, the Timor-Leste government is considering new ways of financing including loans. Japan’s ODA is limited only to grant aid and technical assistance so far; therefore, the Timor-Leste government should promptly prepare its institutions to accept loans and cultivate relevant human resources so that it can consider the best assistance menu, including loan aid, aiming for its self-reliance in the near future. In addition to the assistance through ODA, measures such as facilitation of private investments to Timor-Leste are beneficial.

Promotion of Grass-roots Level Exchange between Timor-Leste and Japan

The general public in Japan, including researchers, does not have many opportunities to know the current status and results of Japan’s peacebuilding activities. Under such circumstances, it is important to promote further understanding on Japan’s peacebuilding activities among the general public through the experience in Timor-Leste. In implementing bilateral ODA, the measures to proactively facilitate the activities of volunteers such as Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCVs) and Japanese NGOs should be considered.
### Financial Services Agency

**Technical Assistance to Financial Authorities in Emerging Market Economies (Program)**

**Outline and Objectives**
Healthy, stable financial systems as well as smooth financial and capital markets are the essential foundations of sustainable economic development in developing countries. Also, as the financial globalization proceeds, the importance of the Asian region has been growing year by year in the world economy, ensuring stability in the financial systems of emerging market economies in Asia is indispensable to the stabilization of the Japanese and the international financial systems.

In light of such circumstances, the Financial Services Agency has actively offered technical assistance (the implementation of financial administration training courses for regulators in charge of supervising banking, securities and insurance sectors) to financial regulators and supervisory agencies in emerging markets in the Asia-Pacific region. This assistance has contributed to the improvement and development of systems necessary for launching financial markets as well as the quality improvement of financial systems of emerging markets in Asia and the capacity building of the financial authorities. In this way, the assistance has enhanced the partnership among Asian nations and strengthened Japan’s presence.

**Outline of Evaluation**

The training projects implemented in FY2008 were planned and implemented based on the results of various studies conducted in the past (for example, not only delivering lectures on practical businesses and institutions, but also responding to a request for case studies, etc.), and therefore met with the needs of developing countries.

Regarding financial administration training, an ex-post survey showed that more than 70% of respondents replied either that the training “had been helpful” or that they were “moving toward the concrete use of training”.

Given these responses, the training projects have contributed to the increase in the capability of financial authorities in emerging market economies through technical assistance and to the further strengthening of their relationships with Japan.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Financial Services Agency:

---

### Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications

**Contribution to Creating a Global Society Integrated Through Advanced Information and Communication Networks (Program)**

**Outline and Objectives**
This program contributes to the realization of a global network of advanced information and communications, and to strengthening international cooperation with the countries involved by: furthering international understanding of Japan’s information and communication administration, implementing actions to provide solutions for bilateral and multilateral framework issues, overcoming the international digital divide (especially in the Asian region), improving market environments and systems to encourage network development, and promoting international standardization within global networks.
Outline of Evaluation

Through international meetings and other opportunities, efforts such as opinion exchanges regarding information communications policy and future cooperation, dialogues regarding regulatory reforms, opinion exchanges regarding other international issues are actively being made to realize policy coordination with each country as well as international organizations regarding information and communications. These opinion exchanges and dialogues involved both high-level officials from each country and people with full capacity to deal with international issues. Therefore, from the perspective of international understanding and collaboration, these measures are recognized as effective.

As for the issues such as elimination of the international digital divide and the improvement of the market environments and systems so as to encourage network development, active and continuous dialogues, adjustments and supports through bilateral as well as multilateral frameworks are required.

Note:
Although only a portion of this policy includes the ODA budget, it is registered as an ODA policy.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications:

Ministry of Justice

Promotion of International Cooperation in Legal Administration
(Program)

Outline and Objectives

Training, studies and research in collaboration with the United Nations
- The implementation of international training and seminars aimed at improving the criminal justice procedures and promoting international cooperation in these fields: crime prevention and the treatment of offenders as well as, prevention of juvenile delinquency and the treatment of juvenile delinquents.
- Participation in international conferences aimed at cooperating in enhancing the crime prevention measures of the United Nations.

Training, research and study for supporting the maintenance and the improvement of legal structures of recipient countries
- The implementation of international training for those in charge of maintenance and the improvement of legal structures in developing countries, as part of technical assistance activities in the legal field. The implementation of research studies on the legal structures of various countries, for the purpose of technical assistance in the legal field.
- The dispatch of experts aimed at supporting active and effective efforts at recipient countries, as part of technical assistance in the legal field.
- Holding conferences inviting international experts on the current status of, and solutions to problems in technical assistance in the legal field support for the maintenance and improvement of legal structures and countermeasures

Outline of Evaluation

- Participants in international training and seminars showed the high level of satisfaction with the training courses, study and research conducted in collaboration with the United Nations.
- In addition, the Regional Seminar on Good Governance for Southeast Asian countries adopted recommendations on issues to be addressed in the future by each member country in the region. Furthermore, the Ministry of Justice has successfully
developed close partnerships with the co-hosts of the seminar, the Thai Attorney General’s office and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes, the Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific.

In addition, information received and personal networks developed through participation in international conferences are to be utilized for future implementation of international training and international cooperation in the fields of criminal investigation and prosecution in Japan. For this reason, this program is evaluated as an effective program which should be continuously carried out.

- Participants in international training showed the high level of satisfaction with the training courses, study and research aimed at supporting the maintenance and improvement of legal structures of target countries.

In addition, in response to the needs of recipient countries such as Vietnam and Cambodia, international training and international conferences have been held in Japan inviting experts in judicial communities such as those in charge of lawmaking, judges and lawyers, from various countries. The results of such activities have steadily been reflected in the improvement of legal structures and human resource development in the recipient countries.

Furthermore, thanks to the intense activities by experts dispatched to Vietnam, the Civil Judgment Execution Act, which was drafted with the help of Japan, became a law passed by the National Assembly of the country in November 2008. In this way, the dispatch of experts has achieved steady results.

The implementation of these programs which have promoted the development of basic legislation and human resources in the legal community is believed to contribute to the development of market economies among recipient countries. This has also served to build confidence between Japan and target countries and in turn to strengthen the Japanese presence in the international community. For this reason, this program is evaluated as an effective program which should be continuously carried out.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Justice:
http://www.moj.go.jp/KANBOU/HYOUKA/hyouka01-03.html

---

Ministry of Finance

Assistance Extended Through Multilateral Development Banks
(Program)

Outline and Objectives

Multilateral development banks, such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, have advantages such as possessing a wide-range of human resources with a wealth of experiences and the specialized knowledge of development assistance, and being able to carry out effective assistance through the utilization of their wide information networks.

With recognition of these advantages, the Ministry of Finance, as a responsible member of the international community, is active in contributing to the activities of multilateral development banks. Also, as a principal investor in multilateral development banks, Japan proactively involves itself in operational activities, working to ensure that the policies and development ideas of Japan’s ODA are reflected in the policies of the multilateral development banks.

Outline of Evaluation

As a principal shareholder in multilateral development banks, the Ministry of Finance actively contributes opinions on the financial operations and organizational administration of each bank, and is making efforts to ensure that Japanese development ideas and ODA policy are appropriately reflected in their programs. In FY2008, the Ministry of Finance reached an agreement
with major shareholders to further increase funding for the Asian Development Fund, which offers concessionary loans to developing countries with particularly low levels of income in the Asia-Pacific region. This increase in capital will go toward the implementation of projects toward the sustainable economic development and the elimination of poverty in developing countries carried out by the Asian Development Fund, such as infrastructure improvements and the provision of social services.

Along with providing funding to the main office of each multilateral development bank, Japan has established Japanese trust funds within each institution, and provides policy advice to developing countries, fosters human resources and develops government systems within the countries, improves the capabilities of civil organizations and works toward poverty reduction and economic development. In FY2008, for example, Policy and Human Resources Development Fund within the World Bank approved the project to support the reinforcement of water resource management capacity in the Mekong region, and the Japan Special Fund within the Asian Development Bank approved to support the water resource management in Afghanistan. Furthermore, in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of Japan’s bilateral assistance, the Ministry of Finance is extending financial cooperation to developing countries, pursuing collaborations and cooperation with multilateral development banks. In the above ways, the program has responded to the assistance needs of the international community and has been able to proactively contribute to the activities of multilateral development banks as well as implement effective assistance which makes use of the expertise of the banks.

**Assistance for Human Resource Development, Institution, and Policy in the Fields of Finance and Customs (Program)**

**Outline and Objectives**

In promoting sustainable economic development in developing countries, it is important that the design and administration of socioeconomic systems appropriately correspond to the developmental stage and economic structure of each country. The Ministry of Finance actively makes efforts to promote international cooperation through implementing support for human resource development and institutional policies in the fields of fiscal/monetary policy and tariff/customs administration.

**Outline of Evaluation**

The Ministry of Finance aims to foster the human resources that will take over the responsibility of economic and social development by carrying out training and seminars for government officials and administrators in charge of policy in developing countries, participating in policy missions, and dispatching experts as a means of giving specialized advice to developing countries.

In FY2008, the Ministry implemented the following assistance.

- Development policy seminars for the Mekong region countries
- Support of the Ministry of Economy and Finance of Cambodia for taxation system and tax administration
- Workshop on external debt management
- Dispatching of experts through the WCO/Japan Customs Technical Cooperation Program

Regarding the implementation of assistance, the Ministry comprehended the current status and requests of the recipient countries in advance through listening to the opinions of local officials in the recipient countries and staff in charge of finance and economy in the Japanese diplomatic missions. The Ministry also listened to the requests of the future technical assistance through discussions with participants, following the end of assistance programs. Additionally, in order to fully understand the activities of participants following the training and requests of the participants regarding
the future technical assistance, the Ministry had consultations with recipient countries’ administration officials in charge and ex-trainees, taking opportunities to dispatch experts.

In this way, in FY2008, the Ministry proactively promoted international cooperation, and at the same time, strived for making assistance more effective and efficient by summarizing the requests and opinions of technical assistance recipients, and by coordinating parties involved in technical assistance in the fields of finance and economy.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Finance:
http://www.mof.go.jp/jouhou/hyouka/top.htm

Outline and Objectives
In order to promote international cooperation, this policy aims to make intellectual contribution such as offering information concerning international cooperation, by organizing and utilizing intellectual resources that Japanese universities possess. Also the policy contributes to international efforts by commissioning projects to international organizations.

Outline of Evaluation
International cooperation activities in education that utilize the expertise of Japan
As part of further promotion and effective implementation of Japan’s international cooperation activities, in FY2007, the Ministry launched “International Cooperation Initiative”. With the implementation of the initiative, the Ministry gathered, organized and accumulated Japanese knowledge and experiences possessed by universities and utilized them to formulate and propagate an education model. The results of this process have been utilized in a variety of ways in both Japan and overseas, contributing to improvements in the quality of international cooperation in education.

Furthermore, “the Special Participation System for In-Service Teachers” for the Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers Program was established in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), in an effort to strengthen and enhance the system in which more in-service teachers can participate. The system is expected to improve the quantities and abilities of teachers such as their problem solving abilities and instructional abilities by overcoming the numerous barriers associated with implementing international education cooperation in developing countries. Also, the teachers are expected to gain valuable experiences from overseas cooperation which they can then utilize in the classroom upon returning to Japan, helping the system to contribute to improvements in the quality of education in Japan as well. In light of this, the Ministry has actively encouraged in-service teacher participation in the program. Unfortunately, participation in the Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers Program through this system has been on the decline though the system is also applied to the Japan Nikkei Society Overseas Development Youth Volunteers for Overseas Japanese Communities Program from this year. The Ministry is continuously making efforts to combat the downward trend away from the participation by providing support before, during and after the program to participating in-service teachers, and by further propagating the existence and content of the system.

Cooperation with UNESCO
The Ministry makes donations to the Funds-in-Trust which fund projects for literacy in the Asia-Pacific region.
In FY2008, the Ministry contributed to the inauguration of “Japanese Fund-in-Trust for the Promotion of Education in Asia and the Pacific Region”, by reorganizing “The Japanese Trust Fund for Education for All (EFA) Programme” and “The Japanese Trust Fund for Preventive Education against AIDS”. The Ministry, working through the UNESCO Bangkok office, strengthened the Community Learning Centers (CLC), promoted lifelong learning, and developed methodology for research on literacy rate. Furthermore, through these projects, the Ministry continuously contributed to making efforts toward goals set in the Dakar Framework for Action, by working to improve school enrollment and literacy rates in developing countries, and by initiating quality improvement reforms on all aspects of education. In particular, the increase in the number of requests asking for the establishment of CLCs, due to raised awareness of CLC projects in the Asia Pacific region, shows the infiltration of UNESCO's activities in the region.

However, the target of the Dakar Framework for Action adopted at the World Education Forum (2000, Dakar), which calls for the improvement of adult (particularly female) literacy by 2015, has not been achieved yet, and further efforts must be made. Particularly in the South and West Asia, there are a number of countries where the literacy rate among adults continues to be low and the speed of improvement in the literacy rate is not sufficient.

Student Exchange Promotion Program (Policy)

Outline and Objectives
Interaction between international students and Japanese students in both Japan and overseas plays an important role in forming human networks and deepening mutual understanding and friendship between Japan and other countries. Furthermore, such interaction has been working significant to the realization of a globally open community, the strengthening of the global competitiveness and internationalization of Japanese universities, and intellectual international contribution through developing human resources. The Ministry has contributed to the enhancement of such interaction through various policies.

In the future, the Ministry will further enhance the policy to accept excellent foreign students, in line with the “300,000 International Students Plan” formulated by relevant six ministries in 2008, and will enhance support to Japanese students studying abroad so as to promote the realization of a globally open community, strengthening of global competitiveness, international contribution and the internationalization of Japanese universities.

Outline of Evaluation
International student enrollment in the Japanese institutions was 123,829 in FY2008, the highest record of the enrollment number. However, the percentage of international students in Japanese institutions of higher education is only 3.5%, which is not necessarily high compared to other developed countries.

In FY2008, the number of international students receiving Japanese Government Scholarships was 9,923, the second highest number on record. During the year, the Ministry continued “the International Priority Graduate Program”, which prioritizes the allocation of research students with Japanese Government Scholarships to universities providing internationally attractive programs for international students. The Ministry, additionally, linked with the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry to implement the “Career Development Program for Foreign Students in Japan” which supports the job-hunting endeavors of high-achieving international students desiring to find work at Japanese companies, in collaboration with universities and industries. In addition, the Ministry newly established a strategic and flexible framework
in the Japanese Government (International Student) Scholarship Program, in response to diplomatic requests.

There were 12,388 recipients of the Honors Scholarships for privately financed international students in FY2008. Against a background of stringent domestic fiscal conditions in which the government was attempting to suppress general spending and cut the budget for ODA, the Ministry supported high-achieving international students by tightening and raising the standards of its grade evaluation scheme.

Regarding Japanese students abroad, there were 681 students selected for Short-term Student Exchange Support Program in FY2008, and 72 students selected for the Support Program for Long-term Study Abroad. Based on these results, the promotion of further interaction by both accepting and sending students abroad was considered to have made overall progress due to efficient and effective support measures, despite the stringent fiscal condition.

**Note:**
Non-ODA projects are included in this evaluation.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology:
http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/hyouka/index.htm

---

**Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare**

**Promoting Participation in and Cooperation to Activities of International Organizations: Contribution to Technical Cooperation Projects for Realizing toward Realization of Decent Work Conducted by International Labour Organization (Program)**

**Outline and Objectives**

The Ministry implements the following projects through voluntary contribution to International Labour Organization (ILO) by utilizing experts in ILO.

**Project for Promoting Youth Employment in South Asia**

This project promotes technical cooperation concerning unemployment assistance of young people in Sri Lanka, an area of poverty.

**Project for Managing Migrant Workers in ASEAN region**

This project surveys the employment status of cross-border migrant workers in Thailand and its neighboring countries, and carries out technical cooperation concerning measures aimed at the protection of the right of migrant workers, focusing on migrant workers overseas, the host countries and homelands of migrant workers.

**Project aimed to cultivate Japanese technical professionals**

This project fosters Japanese professionals who are familiar with local labour situations and have knowledge and experiences concerning technical cooperation, through on-site training in the Asia Pacific region where ILO carries out technical assistance.

**Health enhancement project in the ASEAN region**

This project promotes technical cooperation, including technical cooperation for ensuring the health of local people and workers in the ASEAN region, through the collaboration of ILO and World Health Organization (WHO).

**Project concerning SKILLS-AP (Skills and Employability Program for Asia and the Pacific)**

The project offers a voluntary contribution (100,000 US dollars in FY2008) to support SKILLS-AP projects while implementing supporting projects including holding seminars in Japan by utilizing Japan’s experiences, expertise and facilities.

SKILLS-AP (the former APSDEP), a local program for which ILO works together, was inaugurated in 1978, for the purpose of promoting technical assistance through the interactive use of knowledge, experiences and
facilities in the field of vocational capacity development in the Asia-Pacific region, improving vocational training and the level of expertise, and encouraging economic and social development in the region.

Japan has contributed funds to SKILLS-AP project activities and implemented supporting projects including holding seminars by making use of Japan's knowledge and experiences in the field of vocational training.

Outline of Evaluation
These projects carried out through ILO have comprehensively and efficiently contributed to the solution of various problems concerning employment and labour situations in the Asia-Pacific region including countries not covered by bilateral cooperation, through exploring systems to mutually collaborate among member states that involve labour and management bodies, while taking advantage of plenty of networks, expert knowledge and know-how that ILO possesses as international organization.

In accordance with the target period, ILO carries out objective project evaluations, including mid-term evaluations conducted by third parties and terminal evaluations, and thus strives for more efficient and effective project operations. The projects have been generally highly appreciated by the governments of various countries, labour and management bodies, etc.

As for the projects concerning SKILLS-AP, in-company training and technical evaluation at workplaces were selected as the theme of its workshop in FY2008. Participants in the workshop, after returning home, have contributed to skill development and employment expansion in member countries. For example, utilizing findings from the workshop, an individual participant incorporated the articles concerning in-company training into the related laws when they were revised, and another participant country held new international seminars by developing the results of the workshop.

As a whole, the Ministry's efforts through ILO have been efficiently and effectively implementing projects toward contributing to the international community, promoting health and labour administration that suits the age of globalization, by making use of both Japan's experiences and the expertise of the international organization.

Note:
Policy evaluations referred in this section are those based on the Government Policy Evaluations Act (Act No.86, 2001).

Promotion of Participation in and Cooperation to Activities of International Organizations: Support for Technical Cooperation Projects conducted by World Health Organization and Other International Organizations (Program)

Outline and Objectives

Technical corporation project through financial contributions

Technical corporations will be actively promoted in developing countries through WHO by utilizing advanced technique accumulated in Japan, aiming at serving to solve health care and public health problems in each country, as well as responding to health menace across the world.

Undertaking measures against AIDS in developing countries

Health system for AIDS treatment and prevention will be supported especially in developing countries, in order to proactively respond to AIDS through corporation with the relevant organizations of the UN utilizing Japan's advanced technology, in order for strengthening AIDS care worldwide.

Outline of Evaluation
Supporting to infectious diseases control in
developing countries through financial contribution projects by WHO and anti-AIDS measures all over the world, including developing countries through UNAIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS), enables appropriate and speedy tackling of infectious diseases. That is essential to effectively implement anti-infectious measures in Japan in a consistent manner with other countries.

In addition, the implementation of projects through WHO and UNAIDS, which possess long-standing expertise in preventive measures of infectious disease and AIDS, is recognized for enabling more efficient implementation of the projects.

Note:
Non-ODA projects are included in this evaluation. Policy evaluations referred in this section are those based on the Government Policy Evaluations Act (Act No.86, 2001).

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Agricultural Sectors (Including Fisheries): Promotion of International Cooperation on Food, Agriculture and Rural Development (Policy projects)

Outline and Objectives
The policy projects aim to contribute to the stability of global food demand-supply balances by promoting international cooperation on food, agriculture and rural development. The projects have been implemented mainly as the needs assessment and technical development in developing countries as well as the establishment of rules among developing countries through international organizations, by utilizing technology and know-how that the Ministry possesses.
Short-term food aid and the mid-to-long-term promotion of agricultural products are recognized to be vital measures to support developing countries affected by rising food price, at the TICAD IV, FAO high-level meeting and the G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit held in 2008.
Also, at the G8 Agriculture Ministers’ Meeting in April 2009 and the L’Aquila Summit in July 2009, the recognition on the importance of the agricultural sector for the global food security, as well as the need of investment for sustainable development of the agricultural sector and rural areas, were agreed.

Accordingly, in order to contribute to the reduction of hunger and poverty, the conservation of global environment, and for the stability of global food demand-supply balances in the future, the Ministry actively promotes international cooperation projects in the sectors of food, agriculture and rural areas, in line with the conditions and needs of developing countries.

Outline of Evaluation
Three items have been set as the objectives of the projects: (1) cooperation contributing to ensuring food security in Japan; (2) cooperation contributing to Japan’s initiative in WTO, EPA and other international negotiations; and (3) countermeasures against global environmental issues and trans-boundary diseases now tangibly affecting Japan. Individual goals were also set for each project, and a questionnaire of achievement level rating on a scale of one to four was conducted for the recipient partners. The questionnaire included viewpoints for measuring relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and the target achievement level of each objective was set at 3.5 on averages.

The results of the survey are as follows:
(1) Cooperation contributing to food security in Japan: 3.4
(2) Cooperation contributing to Japan's initiative in WTO, EPA and other international negotiations: 3.4
(3) Countermeasures against global environmental issues and trans-boundary diseases which are now tangibly affecting Japan: 3.2

Though the results of the evaluation were deemed effective overall, there is still a need to effectively implement the projects in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sector by taking practical approaches to alleviate hunger and poverty in developing countries, especially in Africa, in light of the advance of globalization, the progress of international trade and economic partnership negotiations and the agreements made at various international high-level meetings for food security.

In doing so, it is necessary to continue the efforts in the three priority areas to improve the achievement level of cooperation projects in the future.

Note:
Non-ODA projects are included in this evaluation.

Forestry Sectors: Promotion of Maximizing the Multi-Functionality of Forests with International Collaboration
(Policy projects)

Outline and Objectives
The objective of this policy is to promote actions on various issues such as illegal logging, which hinders sustainable forest management in developing countries, through international technical cooperation and others in the forestry sector.

In recent years, the problems caused by deforestation in developing countries are recognized as an important issue in international dialogues. Considering the direction of international discussions and the needs of partner country counterparts, and in cooperating with other countries, international organizations and NGOs, Japan is implementing projects which promote the development of technology for the afforestation on degraded land, projects for information sharing on the overseas afforestation projects of NGOs and support for human resource development and strengthening of forest resource management systems. Furthermore, Japan has held international meetings in which relevant experts from government agencies and NGOs participate, and has funded projects implemented by international organizations such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO). In this way, Japan is working to promote sustainable forest management in developing countries, which is the objective of this policy.

Outline of Evaluation
The Ministry conducted a survey for project results using a five-tire evaluation questionnaire, targeting the parties concerned including government agencies in the countries where international forestry cooperation projects were implemented. The survey results were quantified and calculated in percentages.

In this survey, questions were set up regarding the “degree of contribution to sustainable forest management” made by the projects. The target figure to be achieved was set to 100% for each project, an instance of all respondents giving the highest evaluation. After all, the achievement level was 82%. This result indicates that partner countries felt the projects were effective to a certain extent. It is still necessary to make a variety of efforts to respond more appropriately to the needs from developing countries.

In addition to the “degree of contribution to sustainable forest management” mentioned above, this questionnaire survey also dealt with effectiveness, efficiency, and so forth with a five-tier evaluation and the results obtained are used for analyzing and reviewing the direction of each project.

Note:
Non-ODA projects are included in this evaluation.

This project was evaluated as part of the policy “Promotion of Maximizing the Multi-Functionality of Forests through Forest Improvement and Health.
Chapter 2 Outline of Evaluation Results

2.3. Results of Evaluations Conducted by Other Ministries/Agencies

Outline and Objectives
This policy focuses on the management of fishery resources, such as tuna, which highly migrates in the high seas. This will be achieved by cooperating with other countries concerned to actively promote fishery capability management, fishing vessels measures, and IUU (Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported) fishing countermeasures. As the core of the policy revolves around the sustainable use of fishery resources, project action, are aimed at appropriate conservation and management measures as well as securing fishing area of Japan's fishing industry.

Outline of Evaluation
In order to ensure stable supply of marine products, the sustainable use and management of fishery resources in not only domestic water but also outside Japan's exclusive economic zone is essential. In this regard, promoting the international agreements regarding fishing operations, discussions with other countries and cooperation to international frameworks regarding the management of fishery resources are effective.

In consideration of these points, an objective, “maintaining and increasing the fish species managed by international organizations and the number of fisheries agreements”, was set for this program. As a result of actively promoting cooperation in resource management at regional fishery management organizations, four new species of fish were added to the list of species subject to resource management, bringing the total up to 81 species this year.

These four species, big-eye tuna (Thunnus obesus), yellowfin tuna (Thunnus albacares), swordfish (Xiphias gladius) and albacore (Thunnus alalunga), were selected as species eligible for resource management as a result of resource evaluation carried out by the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission.

The number of fisheries agreements was 51, which increased by one from the previous year. This new fishery agreement signed by Japanese private-sector fishermen's associations and the Ministry of Fishery and the Environment of Equatorial Guinea, allows Japanese tuna trawlers to fish within the country's exclusive economic zone.

Note:
- Non-ODA projects are included in this evaluation.
- The projects concerning the international fishery cooperation were evaluated as part of the policy “Ensuring a steady supply of marine products” and “Promotion of international cooperation for food, agriculture and farming areas”.

For more detailed information on the projects, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries:
Outline and Objectives

The objectives of this program are the promotion of development cooperation toward improvements in the trade and investment environments of developing counties, and plans for the deepening of economic relationship through the expansion of trade and investment between Japan and the countries concerned, in order to support economic development in developing countries.

As a developed country, Japan is expected to contribute to progress in developing countries as well as the development and peace in the international community. For this reason, the primary tools of yen loans and technical cooperation for the improvements of the foundations of economic development such as infrastructure improvements and human resource development, are essential to Japan’s international economic cooperation, along with Japan’s unique approach to development initiatives that encourage the active flow of investment from the private sector. This will also lead to deepening Japan’s economic relationship with developing countries and benefits to economy and industry in Japan.

Japanese enterprises have already built a network of international projects throughout the East Asian region and have incorporated dynamism in the economic growth of the region. It is vital that, building on current economic partnership negotiations, Japan continues to expand and deepen its relationships in the East Asian region. Furthermore, it is essential that economic cooperation for the improvement of the trade and investment environment in the region continues to be promoted. In addition, with a growing need for economic cooperation with African countries, Japan is expected to implement economic cooperation in a flexible and steady manner, making use of its experiences in Asia and utilizing every economic cooperation tool.

To this end, Japan intends to carry out actions on the important points listed below, in order to improve the trade and investment environment in developing countries through its economic cooperation.

Promotion of improvements in industrial infrastructure and logistics infrastructure

With regard to the promotion of infrastructure improvements which build on the needs of both developing countries and the Japanese enterprises in those countries, the Ministry investigates projects which efficiently utilize Japanese technologies, in order to improve the investment environments of Japanese enterprises and promote the “standardization” of Japanese technologies and products in Asia.

In addition, the Ministry focuses on projects which contribute to the solution of global environmental issues, securing Japanese resources, and the growth of Africa on the basis of the achievements of TICAD IV.

Support for the construction of system infrastructure: Creation and development of “Asian Standards”

In order to construct economic institutions and systems mutually beneficial for each nation in the reinforcement of economic collaboration among the East Asian countries, the Ministry sets five priority areas of economic industrial and technical cooperation (protection of intellectual property, development and improvement of certification criteria, higher efficiency of physical distribution, environmental issues and energy efficiency, and human resource development for industries (qualification systems)), and provides technical cooperation. In particular, the Ministry selects technological and socioeconomic systems which have served as the foundation of Japan’s own economic development as “Asian Standards” and deploys them with a focus on Asia.
**Strengthening industrial human resource development**

The Ministry provides training and dispatches experts for the purpose of developing industrial human resources who will contribute to economic growth in developing countries, particularly, those in Asia. In addition, in line with the “Industrial Sector Human Resource Development Mid-Term Plan in Asia”, the Ministry provides training for businesspersons and technicians in private sector companies and dispatches experts in a strategic manner, and improves the capacity building of industrial human resource development institutions, including higher education institutions.

**Outline of Evaluation**

Japan holds East Asia to be an important region which it has deep economic ties with, and provides ODA, supports the strengthening of diplomatic relationships with partner countries, and supports improvement in the foundation of economic growth in the region. Thus, Japan has been carrying out measures to improve the trade and investment environment in the region. Within the East Asian region that is characterized by distinctive disparities in terms of development, Japan has carried out economic cooperation in accordance with the respective countries’ needs (human resources, infrastructure, control systems, etc.). This economic cooperation attracts a great amount of domestic and foreign private investment to the region and contributes to economic development in the East Asian countries. Economic cooperation from Japan makes up a major part of economic cooperation to the primary East Asian countries, and it can be predicted that barriers to development in the region would have arisen without such economic cooperation. Continuing “soft” economic cooperation that supports system construction and industrial human resource development in developing countries, along with “hard” infrastructure improvements through yen loans or private investment has a large ripple effect not only leading to further deepening of the close relationships with the East Asian countries, but also benefiting the development of Japan’s economy and industry.

Among a difficult financial situation in Japan in recent years, the ODA budget of the Ministry shrunk to 28.3 billion yen in FY2008, almost a 50% drop from the peak budget of 55.8 billion yen in FY1997. During this same time period, the total budget for ODA across the government fell by approximately 40%. Under such an extremely severe budgetary situation, the Ministry continues to implement measures through efforts to select and concentrate on economic cooperation tools, whose combinations are effective and efficient, keeping in mind differences in the content and priority areas of economic cooperation in each recipient country.

With regard to the promotion of development and improvement of industrial infrastructure and logistics infrastructures, among projects subjected to project formation studies, 50.0% has resulted in actual requests for ODA projects from developing countries in FY2004, 59.1% in FY2005, 27.8% in FY2006, 47.8% in FY2007 and 25.0% in FY2008. In spite of year to year fluctuations, the percentage was quite high, 43.3% on average in the period from FY2004 to FY2008.

With regard to strengthening of industrial human resource development, the “Economic and Industrial Human Resource Support Training Project” was reviewed from two criteria, “trainees’ satisfaction” and “goal attainment in companies which have accepted trainees”. The evaluation results indicate that the attainment level of both criteria were more than 90% in each fiscal year for the period from FY2004 to FY2008.
Survey on the Follow-up and Evaluations of Economic Industrial Technical Cooperation (Project)

Outline and Objectives

This project aims to improve accountability to the public for the results of technical cooperation projects, and also to organize information which will contribute to the promotion of the projects.

To this end, “common success factors” and “the way of management and evaluation for higher sophistication” were discussed based on the analysis of eleven projects of “best practice”, selected from the past “Trade Investment Facilitation Project” which supported building of institutional infrastructure.

Outline of Evaluation

The eleven “best practice” projects carried out in the past as part of the “Trade Investment Facilitation Project” were analyzed in terms of accomplishment, including realization of institutionalization and penetration, and impact on recipient countries’ industries, economies and social environments.

The result of the analysis indicates that common factors to the “best practices” listed below led to success.

Common factors to the “best practices”
- Existing counterpart organizations (institutional infrastructures) that coordinate the industrial communities in recipient countries.
- Realization of mid to long-term commitments including continuous implementation of projects and resultant confidence building among parties concerned
- The creation mechanism which begins with a project implementation in accordance with the recipient country’s unique development
- Close communication and mutual feedback between “on-sight” and “government (policies)”

A conclusion has been also drawn that, in order to further sophisticate projects and appropriate evaluations, what is essential are (1) organization and analysis of logical cause-effect relationships between support measures and their results, (2) forward-looking evaluations from the viewpoints of contribution to recipient countries instead of evaluations which strictly testify the effects of projects, (3) targets established from a mid- to long-term viewpoint, (4) monitoring of progress situations, (5) clarification of role-sharing and the building of coordination system among evaluation implementing agencies in ex-post evaluations, and (6) self-reliant monitoring by project implementing agencies and periodic sharing of evaluation results with governments.

Note:
The evaluation survey of the “Trade Investment Facilitation Project” was outsourced in FY2008.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry:
http://www.meti.go.jp/policy/policy_management/
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Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism

Promotion of International Cooperation (Policy)

Outline and Objectives
International relationships have been built through a long-term accumulation of multi-level interchanges, and many-sided continuous efforts from a long-term viewpoint are challenges in promoting international cooperation. To this end, overseas deployment and international interactions by Japanese businesses should be encouraged, and at the same time, cooperation and support for self-sustaining growth in developing countries should be promoted, through the improvement of social infrastructures and policy enhancement on traffic. Thus, the Ministry needs to promote strategic diplomacy conducive to strengthen Japan’s international competitiveness, in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other relevant bodies.

Based on the above perspective, the Ministry implemented the following: (1) policy dialogues and seminars aimed at the use of Japanese technologies for social capital improvement in developing countries and facilitation of infrastructure improvement in priority areas such as roads and water environments, (2) ministers’ meetings on the global environment and energy related to the traffic field, (3) capacity building support in the field of land, marine and aerial traffic aimed at addressing the aggravation of CO2 emissions and serious air pollution caused by the traffic field in Asian nations, (4) seminars and workshops for those in local physical distribution business and administrators in charge of the field aimed at facilitating smoother commodity distribution in ASEAN.

Outline of Evaluation
The Ministry has steadily carried out the above mentioned efforts in collaboration with relevant ministries and agencies in both Japan and abroad, based on the international situation and the needs of recipient countries. Therefore, the number of projects which contribute to international cooperation and coalition has been on the rise by year. The Ministry, making better use of findings and know-how that have been gained over the years, has carried out its programs focused on important recipient countries and priority areas at lower cost. Accordingly it can be concluded that the Ministry has effectively and efficiently promoted international cooperation and coalition.

In the future, the Ministry will effectively and efficiently carry out international exchanges and surveys that have been already underway. Also, it will enhance Japan’s international competitiveness and encourage strategic international cooperation and coalition, by accurately assessing the needs of recipient countries in cooperation and coordination with relevant bodies, in order to appropriately deal with current major challenges such as global environmental issues and security-related issues.

Cooperation to Improvement of Comprehensive Physical Distribution Systems (Project)

Outline and Objectives
With an eye on the enhancement of ASEAN’s competitiveness and the resultant future benefits to Japanese companies, it is essential to improve physical distribution networks in the ASEAN region.

This project aims to determine the direction of Japan’s...
cooperation and aid activities in the future and formulate the Japan-ASEAN Physical Distribution Improvement Program (tentative), by conducting basic surveys to identify problems concerning physical distributions in ASEAN and points to be improved in both software and hardware for physical distributions.

Outline of Evaluation

In FY2008, the Ministry carried out a trial ODA evaluation on the “Survey Project of Cooperation for Improvement of Comprehensive Physical Distribution Systems from FY2002 to FY2005” as part of an international cooperation evaluation project which departments related to transport in the Ministry worked out. This trial evaluation examined the attainment of goals of the project, factors conducive to success and obstacles, evaluated the project in terms of its relevance, impact, effectiveness, and self-sustainability, and confirmed lessons learned from the evaluation results which would be useful for the implementation of similar projects in the future.

Relevance

This project has been recognized as relevant, since its object which is the formulation of the Japan-ASEAN Physical Distribution Improvement Program (tentative) has been positioned as part of the “Japan-ASEAN Transport Cooperation”.

Impact

- Social development and economic development
  Partly thanks to effects of “Japan-ASEAN Traffic Cooperation Physical Distribution Human Resource Development Project”, which is the successor to this project, ten ASEAN member nations have decided to utilize the human resource development program as of FY2008. In this way, the project contributes to the improvement of physical distribution networks in ASEAN member nations.

- Environmental Protection
  Addressing environmental issues has been set as one of the objectives of the “Japan-ASEAN Physical Distribution Improvement Program (tentative)” formulated by this project. The “Japan-ASEAN Traffic Cooperation Physical Distribution Human Resource Development Project”, which is the successor to this project, is also expected to formulate a logistics policy in respect of environment protection and develop the environmental awareness of physical distribution associations and businesses. Therefore, this project is deemed to contribute to environment preservation in ASEAN member countries, recipient nations of this project in the future.

Effectiveness

The eventual outcome will depend on successor projects to this one, yet as the human resource development program, a secondary outcome, has been adopted in ten ASEAN member nations, the targets are expected to be achieved.

Self-sustainability

Human resource development projects have been already underway partly with support from Japan in line with the “Japan-ASEAN Physical Distribution Improvement Program (tentative)”, which is part of the output of this project. The project is believed to contribute to the improvement of ASEAN’s physical distribution networks and eventually self-sustaining development of ASEAN member nations.

Note:

Evaluation survey of Cooperation to Improvement of Comprehensive Physical Distribution Systems (Project) was outsourced in FY2008.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism: http://www.mlit.go.jp/seisakutokatsu/hyouka/index.html
Promotion of Biodiversity Conservation and Co-existence with the Nature (Program)

Outline and Objectives
This program gathers and organizes information necessary to formulate programs aimed at preserving natural environments based on the Third National Biodiversity Strategy of Japan and contributes to the conservation of global biological diversity through taking part in international frameworks and supporting developing countries.

Outline of Evaluation
In line with the Third National Biodiversity Strategy of Japan, the Ministry has actively promoted international cooperation in the area of natural environmental protection, through gathering, organizing and providing information necessary for the formulation of various concrete measures and policies, faithfully implementing international commitments and international agreements for protecting coral reefs, wetlands and migrating birds, and financially supporting international nongovernmental organizations. The Ministry also has encouraged other nations to support Japan’s hosting of the 10th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. These efforts are highly appreciated in the international society.

Note:
- Although only a portion of this program includes the ODA budget, it is registered as an ODA program.
- Policy evaluation by the Ministry of the Environment is performance evaluation and is to be carried out for each “program”, which is a group of projects with common objectives. The Ministry hereby lists a program that includes ODA projects.

For more detailed information on this evaluation, please refer to the website of the Ministry of the Environment:
http://www.env.go.jp/guide/seisaku/
2.4 Results of Evaluations by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

2.4.1 Overview

JICA conducts project evaluation to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of projects by gaining public support and understanding of its ODA projects. Evaluation results are being used for better planning and implementation of projects, allowing parties involved in assistance to learn valuable lessons and ensuring accountability.

Evaluation consistent throughout a project by reflecting the project’s PDCA cycle

The PDCA cycle is a management cycle that promotes the continuous improvement of project activities. It has four steps; Plan, Do, Check and Action. JICA conducts the evaluation within a consistent framework at each stage of the project (planning, implementation, post-implementation and feedback). By conducting the evaluation at each stage of the PDCA cycle, JICA aims to improve the development impact from the project.

Coherent methodology and viewpoint for evaluation

JICA has developed an evaluation system that provides cross-sectional methodologies and criteria applicable to all schemes of assistance. JICA aims to conduct the evaluation and utilize the results based on a consistent philosophy and a standard evaluation framework, while it takes into consideration the characteristics of each assistance scheme. Specifically, an evaluation framework that reflects: (1) project-level evaluation based on the PDCA cycle, (2) evaluation applying the “DAC five criteria” for evaluating development assistance introduced by OECD-DAC and internationally accepted as ODA evaluation method, and (3) publication of more coherent evaluation results based on a standard rating system.

Cross-sectional and comprehensive evaluation offered at program-level evaluation

A program-level evaluation focuses on a specific theme and development goal cross-sectionally, in order to evaluate and analyze JICA’s cooperation comprehensively. This approach creates common lessons learned and recommendations to be shared across projects. “Thematic evaluation” has been conducted based on development issues, region, country, assistance methodology and evaluation methodology. JICA will also review an evaluation method for “cooperation programs”, which is a strategic framework to support developing countries achieve specific mid to long term development goals.

Ensure objectivity and transparency

JICA aims to ensure objectivity and transparency in its evaluation. External evaluations are already conducted at ex-post evaluation stages where objectivity is required for all schemes of assistance. JICA will further advance efforts toward better objectivity and increased transparency in the process of evaluation. JICA has established an Advisory Committee on Evaluation, consisting of third party experts in order to improve the quality of evaluation and objectivity of evaluation results. The Advisory Committee also provides advice on evaluation policy and implementation, as well as on the evaluation structure and overall system. This ensures that the viewpoints of external experts are reflected in the project evaluation.

Emphasize utilization of evaluation results

JICA’s project evaluation not only offers evaluation results but also strengthens feedback system. The results from each evaluation stage are reflected to the “Action” phase within the PDCA cycle. This feedback is utilized as recommendations for improvement of the present project and/or lessons learned for similar projects that are in operation or in preparation. JICA intends to further reflect feedback to its cooperation program and JICA’s basic structure of cooperation policy such as Country Assistance Program and Thematic Guideline. At the same time, JICA makes efforts to reflect evaluation results to the project, program and high-level policy such as development policy of the recipient government, through offering the feedback of evaluation results to the recipient government or conducting joint evaluation.
2.4.2 Program-Level Evaluation

Program for HIV Prevention (Kenya)

Study period: November 2007 to September 2008

Note

The evaluation studies listed on page 50 to 55 are excerpts from evaluation studies carried out in FY2007 published in “JICA Annual Report 2008.” For the latest information, please refer to JICA’s website: http://www.jica.go.jp/english/operations/evaluation/

Outline

The objectives of this evaluation study were to examine the cooperation program called “Program for HIV prevention” for Kenya, which was established in June 2006, in order to produce recommendations and identify lessons learned concerning the planning and operation of the program. Unlike the past program evaluation, this evaluation served as a mid-term evaluation because the subject cooperation program was already underway. Another characteristic of this evaluation was that it identified many lessons concerning the utilization of a volunteer scheme in programs because the volunteer activities constituted a significant part of the program.

Evaluation Results

Background and Objectives of the Evaluation

In recent years, JICA has been working to create and implement cooperation programs with improved aid effects. A cooperation program is a "strategic framework which aims to assist the achievement of specific medium- to long-term development goals of a developing country.”

JICA has been conducting cooperation projects in the field of HIV/AIDS prevention since FY2003 in Kenya. JICA launched a technical cooperation project called “Project on Strengthening People Empowerment against HIV/AIDS in Kenya (SPEAK)” in July 2006. Before starting this project, JICA created a cooperation program called “Program for HIV Prevention” for Kenya in June 2006, as a framework for cooperation between SPEAK and other related projects.

This evaluation study was conducted with the aim of producing recommendations and identifying lessons to be learned, in order to improve the strategy for the ongoing program for HIV Prevention.

The program is comprised of the following projects, as illustrated in Figure 1.

The Framework and the Policy for Evaluation

Based on the cooperation program evaluation method, the program was evaluation in terms of its “contributions.” More specifically, the evaluation study examined the relationship between the program and related government policies, including Japanese policies such as the Country Assistance Program for Republic of Kenya (produced in August 2000), international initiatives such as MDGs, and Kenya’s development policies such as the Kenya National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan. The study also examined whether the program’s strategy was appropriate in terms of its planning, processes and results. Lastly, the study determined to what extent the program contributed to the resolution of Kenya’s development issues.

Due to the circumstances in which the program was created, the program did not go through a proper program formulation process (analyzing program – analyzing objectives – selecting an effective combination of projects which enables flexible cooperation for problem solving between the projects). Taking this background into account, the evaluation study avoided jumping to the conclusion that “the program design is not strategic enough” even though the program does not have a clear program goal and it has inconsistencies between the constituent projects.

Based on the program documents, the program period (2005-2010) was considered to be subject to this evaluation. Since the grant aid cooperation Project for HIV/AIDS Control is not a JICA project, the project content was not directly subject to the evaluation. Instead, the study evaluated the project’s relevance in terms of the cooperation between the project and other JICA projects in the program, and discussed the project’s potential contribution to the achievement of the
program goal. This study also analyzed the volunteer projects in terms of their deployment strategy rather than analyzing individual activities, because individual volunteers did not set clear outputs or goals.

**Evaluation Results**

As a result of the evaluation, it was confirmed that the program is highly aligned with Japanese and Kenyan policies and strategies, including the Country Assistance Program for Republic of Kenya, the Health and Development Initiative (HDI) and the Kenya National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan (hereafter called the “Strategic Plan”). It was also confirmed that the program is providing assistance to a priority field stipulated in the Strategic Plan.

The program strategy was reviewed in light of the structure of the Strategic Plan, and the reasoning connecting the program outputs and the program goal were partly revised in order to increase the consistency between the program strategy and the Strategic Plan. In this process, it was confirmed that the program should categorize its activities into activities targeting VCT service providers and activities targeting beneficiaries (see the diagrams below).

There were some good practices of cooperation between constituent projects. One example was that volunteers were dispatched to the District Health Management Teams (DHMTs) which were provided with vehicles and audio-visual equipment through the medical equipment provision scheme. They then conducted Mobile VCT using the vehicles and equipment, and contributed to increasing the amount of HIV testing. Another example is that the technical cooperation project SPEAK compiled a manual which was created by a Senior Volunteer when she conducted Mobile VCT in Nakuru District. The contents of the compiled manual were reflected in the national guidelines. However, this type of cooperation has not been reported since 2006. With regard to the provision of HIV testing knits through the grant aid cooperation Project for HIV/AIDS Control, the first delivery had just arrived in Kenya at the time of the evaluation and therefore it was too early to expect cooperation effects. There were not special arrangements observed which attempted cooperation between the projects.

**Lessons Learned and Recommendations from the Evaluation Study**

Based on the evaluation results explained above, the study produced the following recommendations.

Regarding planning, amending the Program Design Matrix was recommended. More specifically, it proposed indicators for outputs, outcomes and the program goal so that JICA can monitor progress, in addition to revising the reasoning behind the program scenario explained above.

Regarding the technical cooperation project, there was no plan for activities directly targeting HCT service providers and activities targeting beneficiaries.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the project (and scheme)</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The Project on Strengthening People Empowerment Against HIV/AIDS in Kenya (SPEAK) (Technical Cooperation Project)</strong></td>
<td>July 2006 – September 2009</td>
<td>Through (1) strengthening the government’s capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation regarding HIV testing and to produce and implement an HIV/AIDS control policy, (2) disseminating information about HIV/AIDS to young people to encourage them to take HIV tests, as well as (3) improving the quality of testing and counseling at testing sites, the project aims to increase the number of people taking HIV tests, particularly targeting young people (15-24 years old). The total cost of the cooperation was 380 million yen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. The Project for HIV/AIDS Control (Grant aid cooperation)</strong></td>
<td>FY2007-FY2010</td>
<td>The project aims to support an expanded capacity to identify HIV carriers and support HIV carriers, by procuring and providing HIV testing kits. The total cost of the cooperation in FY2007 was 330 million yen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. HIV/AIDS Control and others (Volunteers)</strong></td>
<td>FY2006-FY2010</td>
<td>The volunteers are working to increase the number of people (particularly the youth) who takes VCT by: improving the government’s capabilities concerning VCT service provision at the district level and below; expand VCT services, and conducting awareness-raising activities for HIV prevention at the community level. They are also working on community empowerment by providing technical guidance for HIV carriers, in order to increase their income. About 10 volunteers are constantly deployed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Blood Testing for HIV/AIDS Control (Medical equipment provision)</strong></td>
<td>FY2005</td>
<td>Vehicles for Mobile VCT, audio-visual equipment and HIV testing kits were provided to 367 VCT centers through the District Health Management Teams (DHMTs) in six districts located in Nyanza Province and Rift Valley Province. The total cost of the cooperation was approximately 20 million yen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beneficiaries except for the production of radio programs. Therefore, the study recommended that the project strengthens its cooperation with the activities of other schemes and other aid organizations concerning Output 3. With regard to volunteers, the types of volunteers should be categorized into volunteers who directly contribute to the program goal and volunteers who indirectly contribute to the program goal, and they should be deployed in accordance with requests. In this way, volunteer groups can respond to diverse needs and their level of contribution can be improved. In order to deploy the appropriate type of volunteers, JICA should help the potential volunteer hosting organizations to understand the program and identify requests which can contribute to the achievement of the program goal. It is also desirable that volunteers receive more detailed information about the program at the volunteer recruiting stage and during the pre-dispatch orientation.

When implementing the program, it is effective to have meetings for liaison and coordination between the involved parties and for the progress management of individual activities. Therefore, it is important for the program to secure a budget for the cost of holding these meetings.

There are three points which should be clarified when implementing a program. Firstly, it is important to consider the ownership of a program. In the current system, a “cooperation program” is a framework shared only among the Japanese parties and it is not officially recognized by the recipient government officials who work on the individual constituent projects. The projects which constitute a program are conducted through collaboration between Japan and the partner country. Therefore, unless a program is also jointly implemented by Japan and the counterparts who are involved in individual projects in the partner country, it may be difficult to maintain the consistency between the individual project and a program. This inconsistency in the system will need to be corrected. It is also important to share program evaluation results with the partner country’s government, as part of the efforts to share program implementation power with the partner country. Secondly, the operational systems for programs should be strengthened. In the case of the Programme for HIV Prevention, for example, a short-term improvement can be made by utilizing the Program Design Matrix which includes indicators for monitoring (as proposed by the study). This improvement is expected to facilitate the consensus building needed for the operation of the program. With this improvement, it is expected that health staff members at the JICA overseas office can operate the program for the time being. However, in the medium- to long-term, it is desirable to recruit a program manager who has knowledge and skills in this field as well as excellent coordination abilities. Finally, the timing for program evaluations should be reviewed. It will be more realistic to set the schedule for program evaluations while considering the timing for project evaluations, because when program designs are corrected in accordance with the program evaluation results, the implementation plans and designs for the constituent projects will also need to be corrected accordingly. It is also desirable to consider in the future the possibility of conducting the project-level evaluations and the program evaluations simultaneously, in order to increase efficiency.
2.4 Results of Evaluations by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Summary of the Evaluation

This thematic evaluation study proposed a method to quantitatively estimate the environmental load and environmental benefit of an infrastructure development project, based on the idea of life cycle assessment (LCA). The evaluation study then employed this method to evaluate the MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line) which was designed to mitigate environmental problems including air pollution in the area. The study also introduced the idea of environmental accounting which converts the environmental impact into a monetary value in order to assess the environmental impact.

This evaluation study is proposing a new framework for analyzing the relationship between transportation problems in metropolitan areas and their environmental impact, and shows one possible direction for environmental impact assessments (EIAs) on large-scale infrastructure development projects.

Evaluation Results

Background and Objectives of the Evaluation

In developing countries, environmental regulations are not keeping up with rapid economic development and so environmental problems such as air pollution are becoming more severe. The MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line) which is subject to the evaluation is a subway construction project in central Bangkok as part of the development of a mass transit railway network. The project was designed to mitigate environmental problems such as air pollution and to mitigate traffic congestion in Bangkok which is continually worsening, as well as realizing the smooth and efficient movement of people.

The idea of life cycle assessment (LCA) is increasingly utilized in EIAs or air pollutants. However, LCA is originally designed to comprehensively assess the environmental impact of industrial products at all stages of their lifecycle (i.e. the manufacturing, the utilization and the disposal stages). Therefore, in order to conduct an EIA for the development of infrastructure (which has different characteristics from industrial products) based on LCA, a different method needs to be developed.

The evaluation study developed a quantitative method which can comprehensively assess both the environmental impact and the environmental benefits of an infrastructure development project, based on the LCA concept. The study then carried out the EIA for the MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line), using the developed method.

The Framework and the Policy for Evaluation

Figure 1 summarizes the evaluation method for the environmental load and benefit of infrastructure developments, which was used in the evaluation. This evaluation method takes into consideration the life cycle of an infrastructure, and considers the construction stage and the operation stage as the period subject to the EIA. Regarding the environmental impact evaluation, the method is divided into the “local impact assessment method” focusing on the direct environmental impact caused by an infrastructure development project, and the “global impact assessment method” focusing on the environmental impact considering the whole effect caused by all industrial activity that is related to an infrastructure development project. The assessment for the “global impact category” therefore estimates the amount of each substance which has an environmental impact that is emitted by all the project-related elements at their production, distribution and consumption stages. On the other hand, the assessment for the “local impact category” estimates the amount of each substance which has an environmental impact that is emitted by the project-related elements at their consumption stage only (such as CO2 emitted by construction machinery or cars).

In addition to the environmental load, the evaluation method takes into consideration the environmental benefits (positive effects on the environment) of an infrastructure development project. Therefore, the evaluation method examines both the environmental load and the benefits of an infrastructure development project. In this evaluation method, the estimated emission of each substance which has an environmental impact is converted into a monetary value (environmental cost) using the damage cost per unit.

In this thematic evaluation, the study limited its evaluation scope to the following elements. Regarding
the environmental load, the study estimated the emission of each substance that has an environmental impact (CO₂, SO₂ and NO₂) which is derived from the utilization of materials, fuel and electric power in the construction stage and in the operation stage of the MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line). Regarding environmental benefits, the study estimated the reduced emission of each substance which has an environmental impact, which is derived from the reduced vehicle traffic around the relevant area due to the operation of the subways in Bangkok.

**Evaluation Results, Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

Tables 1 and 2 show the CO₂, SO₂ and NO₂ emissions estimated by the global and local impact categories in the construction and the operation stages of the Bangkok subways. In infrastructure development projects such as subway construction, the environmental load at the construction stage is often emphasized, but the environmental load at the operation stage is actually bigger because it has a long-term impact. Therefore, it is important to evaluate the overall impact including the construction and the operation stages.

### Table 1: Estimated Environmental Load at the Construction Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>CO₂ (ton)</th>
<th>SO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>NO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>CO₂ (ton)</th>
<th>SO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>NO₂ (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforc.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>326.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Estimated Environmental Load at the Operation Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Electric power used</th>
<th>CO₂ (ton)</th>
<th>SO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>NO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>CO₂ (ton)</th>
<th>SO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>NO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>CO₂ (ton)</th>
<th>SO₂ (kg)</th>
<th>NO₂ (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>MTR-150</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MTR-120</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MTR-105</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>220.1</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>113.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the reduced CO₂, SO₂ and NO₂ emissions (environmental benefit) derived from less vehicle traffic in the relevant area due to the operation of the Bangkok subways, for the global and local impact categories. There is only a small difference between the environmental benefit and the environmental load (shown in Table 2) for the global impact category. Therefore, the operation of the Bangkok subways does not have a negative impact on the environment at the global level.

Table 3: Estimated Environmental Benefit at the Operation Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Electric power used</th>
<th>Global impact category</th>
<th>Local impact category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO₂ emission (x 10^6 yen)</td>
<td>SO₂ emission</td>
<td>NO₂ emission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limited)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>3.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
<td>(10^6 yen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 shows the estimated reductions and the estimated emission of each substance which has an environmental impact (CO₂, NO₂ and SO₂) derived from the MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line) for the global and local impact categories. The results of the estimation of the environmental benefit / load derived from the MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line) change depending on whether one looks at the global impact category or the local impact category.

* Paying compensation for the emission of substances which have an environmental impact has become more widespread in recent years, as can be seen with CO₂ emission trading. The compensation is called the...
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Outline of the Project

Rating

Objectives

The project was to strengthen the capabilities of the Food Industries Research Institute (FIRI) which provides technical assistance to the food processing industry, which has problems with quality management and preservation technologies. The project thereby aimed to improve the technical capacities of small and medium-sized food processing enterprises in Vietnam.

Cooperation Framework

Overall goal:
Food processing technologies are improved in Vietnamese small and medium-sized food processing enterprises.

Project purpose:
The FIRI’s ability to develop food processing technologies is strengthened. The FIRI’s function to provide the necessary information for certification is strengthened.

Outputs:
- The characteristics of major processed food products distributed in Vietnam are clarified.
- FIRI researchers’ ability to utilize microorganisms and enzymes is improved.
- FIRI researchers’ ability to test and analyze the components and quality of food products needed for domestic certification is improved.
- FIRI researchers’ technical guidance ability is improved regarding guidance on quality management and food processing for small and medium-sized food processing enterprises.

Effects of Project Implementation (Effectiveness, Impact)

Project purpose (effectiveness)
R&D capabilities have been improved as can be seen in the fact that 40 research papers were published in the related subject area and six utility solutions were obtained regarding food processing. 26 technical guidance sessions were conducted for small and medium-sized food processing enterprises. Considering that the project was focusing on technical guidance activities when the evaluation was conducted, it is expected that 35 technical guidance sessions (the set target) will be achieved by the end of the project period. Therefore, the project is expected to achieve its project purpose.

Forecast for the achievement of the overall goal (impact)
Improvements were observed in the processing technologies at three food processing enterprises which had received FIRI’s technical guidance. It is expected that the overall goal will be achieved if technical guidance continues to be provided. FIRI staff are aware of the importance of the activities and they are highly motivated, and therefore it is likely that the technical guidance activities will continue.

Relevance

In Vietnam, one of the priority policy issues is the development of rural areas which are home to 70% of the country’s population. The government is implementing various measures to develop small and medium-sized enterprises including food processing enterprises, in addition to the development of the rural infrastructure and the diversification of agricultural products. In Japan’s Country Assistance Program for Vietnam, agricultural and rural development is one of the assistance priorities. Therefore, the project is consistent with both countries’ policies.
Efficiency
All the inputs provided by Japan and Vietnam have been used effectively and are contributing to the delivery of the project’s effects. In the initial stage of the project, clear indicators and targets were not set in the plan. This delayed the delivery of the project’s effects. However, the mid-term evaluation helped to set detailed indicators and the project activities accelerated from then on, therefore the efficiency of the project has been ensured.

Sustainability
At the time of the evaluation, it was determined that the activities were highly sustainable in terms of political, organizational, financial and technical sustainability. However, considering that the FIRI will become an independent administrative corporation in 2009, it is necessary for the FIRI to increase their independent finance sources.

Conclusion, Lessons Learned, Recommendations
In general the project is highly appreciated. Through the project, the FIRI became recognized as an organization which played an important role in the improvement of technologies used by Vietnamese small- and medium-sized food processing enterprises. It is expected that the FIRI will continue to improve their capacity to conduct research and to provide technical assistance for enterprises, through their own efforts. Lessons learned through this project regarding the operation of a project are that clear indicators and targets should be set from the initial planning stage, and that the Project Design Matrix should be reviewed and amended where necessary as the project proceeds.
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Outline of the Project

Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness, Impact</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Overall rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Objectives

To relieve water shortages due to the insufficient system capacity and meet the emerging demand for water among consumers and industries by improving and expanding water supply network in and around Nadi-Lautoka, thereby contributing to improved health and welfare among local residents and to the development of the national economy, with a focus on tourism – the largest source of foreign currency for Fiji.

Effects of Project Implementation (Effectiveness, Impact)

As the figure below shows, this project is designed to improve and expand the intermediate stages of the water supply flow (mainly purification plants, distribution reservoirs, and transmission pipes). The daily water supply capacity has increased to 103 million liters, surpassing the target of 93 million liters. The purification plants are operating at almost full capacity.

The project has produced tangible benefits in the target areas, including longer water service hours, the reduced number of water trucks dispatched, and the increasing trend in the number of newly connected households per year. Some problems have remained, for example, water cuts occur as a result of leakage from the network of distribution pipes, and, according to the beneficiary survey, there are some areas where improved health and welfare of the residents were not achieved by this project. Still the project, with its focus on a major tourist spot, partly contributed to the increasing number of tourists.

Therefore, the project has largely achieved its objectives and its effectiveness is high.

Relevance

This project has been highly relevant with Fiji's national policies and development needs at the times of both appraisal and ex-post evaluation. The importance of improving and expanding the water supply network to cope with an increasing population and demand was adequately recognized by the time of the appraisal, as evidenced by the formulation of the Nadi-Lautoka Regional Water Supply Project Master Plan (“Master Plan”) in 1996. Also at the time of the ex-post evaluation, the significance of further water supply measures based on the outcomes of this project was recognized at policy levels.

Efficiency

The project period was longer than planned (127% of the planned period) and the project cost slightly exceeded the plan (121% of the planned cost), therefore the evaluation for efficiency is moderate. As a major factor for the extended duration and extra cost, the Fijian government reported the suspension of this project due to a change in political situation.

Sustainability

Though some problems have been observed in the technical and organizational aspects of the executing agency, notably the structural shortfall in human resources and financial difficulties, sustainability of this project is fair. Regarding human resources, sufficient number of local workers with an inadequate level of skills and insufficient number of those in managerial positions with sufficient skills have been observed. While financial difficulties are due to the water supply services operated on a strict government budget, this will be eased when the Water and Sewerage Department (WSD) becomes a self-financed public corporation.
Conclusion, Lessons Learned, Recommendations

In light of the above, this project is evaluated to be satisfactory. A major lesson learned from the project is the need for project formulation and monitoring that consider the entire flow of water supply. The evaluation proposes two major recommendations: (i) steady steps for WSD toward its transformation into a public corporation so as to address the issues of insufficient human resources and financial difficulties, (ii) immediate start of revising the Master Plan to ensure the effectiveness of water supply services in Fiji as a whole.

Relationship between this project and the entire water service flow
Case Example
The Laoag River Basin Flood Control and Sabo Project (Philippines)

An example of the follow-up activities carried out in line with recommendations derived from the mid-term review, which called for the strengthening of cooperation systems among parties concerned and the promotion of afforestation.

The Laoag River flows through the province of Ilocos Norte in northern Luzon. It is one of the Philippines’ important rivers. In the Laoag River drainage basin, floods and sand deposits caused by typhoons are an annual occurrence and damage is often especially severe. A number of stopgap measures have been implemented to deal with this situation such as the construction and repair of dikes, but the problem remained unsolved and comprehensive efforts including the construction of sabo dams to control sediment from upstream and the repair of rivers flowing into the Laoag River, were urgently needed to control flooding. Against such a background, this Project involves the construction of sabo dams, the construction and repair of dikes, and the construction of spur dikes on the Laoag River and its side streams to mitigate a 25-year return period flood. The new and improved structures will reduce flood damage in the Laoag River drainage basin, thereby improving the region’s living environment and sanitation, and contributing to its socioeconomic development. To this end, the Laoag River Basin Flood Control and Sabo Project has been carried out. (The loan agreement was signed in May 2001.)

The recommendations of the mid-term review conducted in January 2007 shows that the establishment of a cooperative framework between the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) which is an executing agency and the project’s beneficiaries that are local municipalities is essential to the appropriate, sustainable operation and maintenance of flood-control facilities. In line with these recommendations, the DPWH is now preparing for the conclusion of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with concerned local municipalities. The MOA will stipulate the budget and staff assignment for facility maintenance, and the role sharing concerning the implementation of countermeasures against waste materials which will contribute to the maintenance of water flow in drainage canals. For drafting this MOA, persons in charge of this project in the DPWH visited Iloilo city and discussed cooperation methods between the DPWH and municipalities and details of the MOA in order to learn lessons from the “Iloilo Flood Control Project (II)”, which is now underway as a yen loan assistance project following the loan agreement signed in March 2002. They also discussed the MOA draft, which was developed following the visit, with local municipalities concerned, and have already agreed on the content. Now they are verifying the actual situation of completed facilities and have entered the final stage toward the conclusion of the MOA.

The recommendations of mid-term review also called for the facilitation of reforestation in the hinterland for mitigating sediment flow and prolonging the service lives of sabo dams from the viewpoint of comprehensive administration as for flood control. Following these recommendations, the DPWH concluded the MOA with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources - Forest Management Bureau (DENR) which is in charge of afforestation. Reforestation work is to begin in the Laoag River Basin in 2010.

Comprehensive approaches, including the improvement in the operation and maintenance systems of flood control facilities in collaboration with other relevant organizations as well as afforestation in the hinterland as recommended in the mid-term review, are expected to further increase the sustainability of facilities constructed under this project to increase the effects of the project, and to further reduce flood damage in the basin.
Chapter 3
Application of Evaluation Results

3.1 Country Policy Evaluation
Country Assistance Evaluation of Indonesia
Country Assistance Evaluation of Sri Lanka
Country Assistance Evaluation of China
Country Assistance Evaluation of Mongolia
Country Assistance Evaluation of Tunisia
Country Assistance Evaluation of Nicaragua

3.2 Priority Issue Evaluation
Evaluation of "Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN)"
Evaluation of Japanese Assistance to Africa through the TICAD Process
Chapter 3

Application of Evaluation Results

3.1 Country Policy Evaluation

Country Assistance Evaluation of Indonesia ........................................ 99
Country Assistance Evaluation of Sri Lanka ......................................... 101
Country Assistance Evaluation of China ............................................. 103
Country Assistance Evaluation of Mongolia .......................................... 105
Country Assistance Evaluation of Tunisia ........................................... 107
Country Assistance Evaluation of Nicaragua ....................................... 109

3.2 Priority Issue Evaluation

Evaluation of “Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN)” ............ 111
Evaluation of Japanese Assistance to Africa through the TICAD Process ................................................................................. 113
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### Policy Dialogue: Need for comprehensive policy dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan needs to conduct comprehensive policy dialogues with the Indonesian government, reviewing the concept of “selection and concentration” of Japan’s assistance to the country. At present, the only regular policy dialogues between representatives from the two countries are annual consultations in the process of formulating new loan aid projects and meetings on the monitoring of project implementation. The two countries have discussed grant aid and technical cooperation, solely in terms of relevance of individual projects through annual survey of requests. It is important that the two countries comprehensively discuss mid to long-term development visions across aid modalities in their policy dialogues to share these visions.</td>
<td>In March 2008, the Japan-Indonesia Economic Cooperation Policy Conference was held, and officials from the Indonesian National Development Planning Agency, Japan’s MOFA, Japanese Embassy in Indonesia, Japanese Ministry of Finance, JICA and JBIC participated in the Conference to comprehensively discuss Japan’s economic cooperation with Indonesia in addition to individual projects, and the two nations successfully created a shared vision for Indonesian development for the medium to long term. MOFA will continue to implement these types of efforts based on recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengthening of Policy Coordination and the Monitoring System:

#### Need for strengthening policy coordination and monitoring systems for Japan’s grant assistance, such as grant aid and technical cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a mechanism for aid coordination after the dissolution of the Consultative Group on Indonesia (CGI), the Indonesian government intends to exercise ownership in establishing a policy framework for each issue, and mobilize aid efforts in line with such framework. The Indonesian government has already started discussing this issue with donors whose main aids are grants. Though projects will not be eliminated in the future, the policy coordination should be reinforced further in terms of grant aid and technical cooperation. In particular, concerning technical cooperation, if Japan is to be actively engaged in policy-support-type program loans and creating the institutional framework for Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), it will be crucial to further strengthen policy coordination and monitoring systems.</td>
<td>- The amount of grant aid and technical cooperation has been on the decline, partly due to unforeseen causes such as the cancellation of projects during preliminary studies and the delay of the implementation due to significant changes in projects. However, the underlying cause of the decline may be inadequate systems incapable of formulating high-quality projects in the face of competition with other donors, including multi-donor funds. MOFA will continue to strengthen policy coordination and monitoring activities with the Indonesian government and will hold discussions with local task forces. - MOFA has formulated technical cooperation projects, with emphasis on engagement in policy-support-type program loans. In the area of climate change policies, the monitoring system of policy matrix and the enforcement structure has been constructed by the advisory and monitoring team. In addition, technical cooperation associated with the policy matrix is planned to be formulated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public-Private Partnerships: Need for strengthening monitoring systems for policy-support-type program loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program loans are more difficult to monitor than project loans and more likely to lead to high fungibility. MOFA needs to reinforce cooperation activities and monitoring systems for enhancing the effectiveness and transparency of Japan’s program loans, keeping in mind the government’s accountability to the public.</td>
<td>Japan extended Climate Change Countermeasures Program Loans in August 2008. As of July 2009, MOFA held three steering committee meetings to regularly monitor the achievement level of the policy target. In doing so, it held discussions and provided essential policy recommendations to the Indonesian government, keeping in mind the need for further reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to ensure the transparency of the funding, MOFA should continuously verify Indonesian accounting audit reports and support the improvement in public financial management through collaboration with the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (ADB).</td>
<td>- With regard to Development Policy Loans (DPL) which Japan has co-financed with the World Bank and ADB, Japan constantly carries out monitoring and dialogues. - In particular, with regard to yen loan projects, JICA has checked yen loan projects worth more than a certain amount of funding, and small-scale procurements and the expense of special accounts are continuously required to be audited by the Inspection Agency of the Indonesian government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Various Stakeholders: Use of local consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many officials in the Indonesian government have strongly demanded cost reduction in using Japanese consultants and the more active use of local resources. It is desirable to utilize Indonesian experts and consultants for projects that may not require advanced technology.</td>
<td>MOFA has made better use of local consultants in technical cooperation projects when appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Country Assistance Evaluation of Sri Lanka

### Country Assistance Program: “Selection and concentration” centering on “human security”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existing Country Assistance Program is beneficial to all to a certain degree, for it has a wide range of sub-sectors under its priority sectors. It is rather difficult to identify the priority of some sub-sectors under priority sectors. With the budget for ODA being reduced in the future, in revising the Country Assistance Program, it is important to perform “selection and concentration” focusing on “human security”. To be more precise, taking into consideration Japan’s position as the top donor and Japan’s aid experiences and comparative advantages, the sub-sectors that are important and effective in achieving priority sector goals should be selected and prioritized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOFA has strived to adopt projects in line with the priority development areas and needs of the Sri Lankan government, and has also revised cooperation programs if necessary, so as to implement more effective and efficient assistance. In addition, keeping up with current situations in northern and eastern Sri Lanka, it has strived to prioritize the most urgent programs with high social needs such as the elimination of landmines and support to internally displaced persons (IDPs). The 25-year civil conflict has profoundly affected Sri Lanka, and it is true that the needs for development apply to all the sectors and all the sub-sectors. MOFA will continuously strive to select and implement appropriate projects based on the urgency and significance of each project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country Assistance Program: Improvement of more direct and shorter-term assistance to “peace consolidation”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Japan has produced multiple effects in supporting more direct and short-term “peace consolidation,” it should continue to expand this kind of support activities in the future. More precisely, what is important is continuing and expanding: (1) humanitarian support and emergency assistance during armed conflicts and (2) reconstruction support such as the elimination of landmines and support to IDPs after conflicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For supporting peace consolidation, Japan has provided people affected by the conflict including IDPs in northern Sri Lanka with urgent humanitarian support activities such as urgent grant aid through international bodies, relief supplies in line with the International Peace Cooperation Law and support for the elimination of landmines through international NGOs. Japan has also extended reconstruction assistance in eastern Sri Lanka for peace consolidation in addition to humanitarian support. Also, Japan has supported the improvement of the standard of living, social environments and assisted the area of governance through international organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ODA Policy Formulation Process: Helping Sri Lanka to become the center for South-South Cooperation connecting Asia and Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka has attained a high level of social development which serves as one model. (Sri Lankan model.) It is also important to continue to help Sri Lanka to become a center for South-South Cooperation for social development connecting Africa and Asia by making better use of its geographical characteristics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan has already contributed to the South-South Cooperation in the health and medical sector, and has extended assistance to Africa for hospital management in the sector as part of the Asia-Africa Knowledge Co-creation Programme (AAKCP). (The assistance target in the first stage of the Program includes eight African countries, and the target in the second stage is four francophone African countries.) MOFA will consider the support for the South-South Cooperation, as far as reasonably achievable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Japan's ODA has a basic philosophy of “human security”. Japan needs to further strive to let other donors involved in Sri Lankan development and restoration know the assistance policy for promoting Japan's ODA and the directions and ways of thinking in implementing Japan's ODA, so that they gain a correct understanding of Japan's ODA. Japan has to demonstrate its leadership in donor coordination and exert a strong presence in the donor community as the top donor.

Status of follow-up efforts

Japan has enhanced its partnership with other donors through the periodical exchanges of opinions with the World Bank and ADB and through the reinforcement of its partnership with UNHCR for providing assistance to northern Sri Lanka. The donor community as well as the Sri Lankan government has high expectations of Japan which is the top donor, and it has been believed that its presence is considerably strong. MOFA will further strive to construct relationships for more effective and timely cooperation.

Policy Implementation Process: Promotion of collaboration with NGOs

With regard to partnerships with NGOs, it is essential to pay attention to the following: (1) improvement of measures to encourage further cooperation with NGOs, for example, through meetings with local NGOs, (2) revision of Japan’s ODA modalities in order to implement more effective and efficient NGO's assistance, and (3) more strategic cooperation with NGOs. It is also necessary for Japanese organizations concerned to build a system for accumulating information on NGOs and CBOs (Community Based Organizations), and define their roles within Japan's overall ODA policies and to propose collaborations with them according to the ability of each organization.

Status of follow-up efforts

Japan's diplomatic missions abroad hold NGO liaison conferences several times a year to exchange information and opinions. They also hold timely exchanges of opinions when NGOs conduct on-site surveys or implement projects. In addition, MOFA, based on opinions exchanged with NGOs at the liaison promotion conferences, has improved the application procedures for Grant assistance for Japanese NGO projects in FY2009. MOFA has also proactively supported NGOs’ activities which help IDPs and support their resettlement, through Grant assistance for Japanese NGO projects, etc.
## Country Assistance Evaluation of China

### Economic Cooperation for China: Continuation of cooperation focused on priority sectors

At the time of the formulation of the existing Economic Cooperation Program for China, six priority areas were identified. However, in view of the new ODA Charter, the formulation of the Mid-term Policy and the speedy development of China, Japan narrowed down the priority areas for grant aid to: (1) areas that can contribute to the solution of problems common to the two countries such as environmental protection and countermeasures against infectious diseases, and (2) those conducive to mutual understanding and exchange between the two countries. With regard to technical cooperation, projects mainly conducive to market-oriented economy, compliance to international rules, good governance and triumph over poverty have been conducted. Various measures have been tried for enhancing the effectiveness of economic cooperation in the narrowed down priority areas. High synergy effects have been achieved through implementing a number of projects relevant to each priority area. It will be important to select appropriate aid projects through “selection and concentration” in order to enhance the effectiveness of economic cooperation.

### Project Formulation and Implementation System: Flexible project formulation and implementation system that can cope with rapid changes in China

During this evaluation study, it was repeatedly pointed out by the Chinese side as a shortcoming of Japan’s economic cooperation that Japan usually took longer time to formulate projects and lacked flexibility in its implementation systems, compared to other donors. Among the specific points raised, it is necessary to urgently consider: (1) surveys of requests throughout the year, and (2) simplification of procedures for amendments after the inauguration of a project. In addition, it would be reasonable to consider that diplomatic missions overseas could select small-scale projects such as those of grassroots grant aid.

### MOFA reviewed priority areas and cooperation programs and as a result, reduced the number of priority issues and programs, from nine to eight, and thirteen to ten, respectively. In addition, MOFA newly formulated four projects concerning the “infectious disease” program based on findings from preliminary surveys, in order to enhance the central government’s ability to address the issue and the on-site staff’s execution capability.

### Review of New Cooperation System: Collection and provision of information

What must be done first is the collection and provision of information. First, basic information concerning which entity is doing what kind of aid activities at which place, should be collected, organized and provided. This will play a key role in partnerships. Partnerships among cooperating entities will result in more effective aid results. The inauguration of the new JICA following the merger of then JICA and JBIC is a good opportunity to review and organize information on the past economic cooperation with China.

Japan has been involved in the review of new cooperation systems through local ODA task forces, for example, taking part in donors’ meetings concerning the restoration of disaster-stricken areas after the earthquake in Sichuan and the donor tours of on-site inspection organized by the Chinese side, exchanging information with other donors mainly concerning priority areas such as countermeasures against infectious disease and the development of legal systems, and participating in leading donors’ meetings which are not limited to any specific areas. In doing so, Japan has strived to encourage partnerships and prevent duplication of aid activities through sharing information with other donors.
## Public Relations: Enhancement of Public Relations Activities

**Recommendations**

For enhancing public relations concerning Japan’s ODA in China, primarily the Japanese Embassy in China and implementing agencies have made various efforts. By continuing these efforts, such as public relations whose audience are narrowed down, developing documents one can understand at a glance the whole picture of Japan’s ODA to China (across aid modalities), it is expected to develop public relations activities with more clarified targets and objectives. The merger of JICA and JBIC is a good opportunity for enhancing public relations concerning Japan’s economic cooperation to China.

**Status of follow-up efforts**

- MOFA has strived to enhance the conveyance of information by issuing monthly newsletters in Chinese and Japanese, which carry topics concerning the implementation of JICA projects and Chinese officials’ comments and sending them by email to Chinese and Japanese internet media, ex-trainees and foreign students, organizations concerned in the central and local governments, and experts who are interested in Japan’s ODA to China.
- With regard to projects concerning the quake in Sichuan Province and other topics which are targets of media’s attention, officials have facilitated media coverage, by responding to media inquiries and putting out a press release in advance each time an event is held.
- Columns concerning Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers have been posted on People’s Daily Online both in Chinese and Japanese. Columns concerning Japan’s ODA to China, which have been already delivered through Japanese internet media are now being prepared to be translated into Chinese for delivery to their Chinese counterparts.

## Assistance to Third Countries through Collaboration with China: Possibility of Collaborating with China as a Donor Country

**Recommendations**

China has offered support to developing countries, including African nations since the 1960s and has doubled the amount of its assistance since the late 1990s, intensifying its assistance activities. As of March 2008, China is not a member of OECD, yet taking into consideration its rapid economic growth and its technical development, Japan will have to consider the possibility of dialogues and cooperation with China as a donor nation. The Chinese government has also offered training assistance to parties concerned in Asia and Africa, and a part of these trainings actually took place at the facilities which are assets of Japan’s economic cooperation, such as the Sino-Japan Friendship Center for Environmental Protection and the China-Japan Friendship Hospital. Judging from the above, there is room for considering assistance to third countries through collaboration with China, utilizing bases established by Japan’s economic assistance to China.

**Status of follow-up efforts**

Japan has encouraged China’s foreign assistance to respect the international standard of conduct and to ensure transparency. In order to share experiences on foreign assistance with China, Japan conducted Sino-Japan dialogues concerning assistance to third countries and held policy consultations concerning aid to African countries between Japanese, Chinese and South Korean officials. In addition, MOFA has held director-general level talks on assistance to third countries since November 2007, and will continue working-level dialogues on this issue with China.
## Country Assistance Program for Mongolia: Formulation of projects with a priority list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of problems, including urban environment of the capital, are difficult to solve effectively solely from an area-specific or sector-specific viewpoint. For example, in the area of infrastructure development or environmental conservation at Ulaanbaatar, assistance should be designed and implemented systematically in line with the revised “Ulaanbaatar Urban Planning Master Plan.”</td>
<td>The final report on the development study, “Ulaanbaatar Urban Planning Master Plan,” analyzed the current status in the comprehensive sector concerning urban development, including the environmental sector, and identified, in a cross-sectoral manner, issues to be addressed. This development study has also formulated, in a cross-sectoral manner, urban development programs which need to be addressed in a short to long-term and identified priority issues and urgent issues. MOFA will consider the support for priority issues and urgent ones, in line with the needs of the recipient country in the “Urban Planning Master Plan” which will be completed in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Country Assistance Program for Mongolia: Priority areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mongolia has made progress toward market-oriented economy to a certain degree, and laws and institutions to facilitate a market economy have been developed. However, problems exist in the operation of both laws and institutions. What is essential to sound development of the Mongolian society is sufficiently raising awareness in its civil society to check the wrongdoings of the public sector while enhancing the capacity building of the public sector in charge of operating a market economy. It is advisable to continue assistance to the Mongolian public sector, narrowing down our assistance areas to tax practices and the development of laws which have been Japan’s cooperation areas with Mongolia. | - As part of cooperation with the Mongolian public sector, Japan will continuously implement its projects, targeting the Mongolian National Tax Agency with ongoing emphasis on human resource development. Following the results of its 10-year-old cooperation, Japan will provide necessary input, encouraging the country’s self-reliant development. Japan has been offering a country-specific three-year training program called the “Capacity Building of National Tax Agency Inspectors” since 2008.  
- The action plan of the Mongolian government (2008 to 2012) specifies the functional enhancement of law, judicial systems and relevant organizations as one of their priority issues. Japan formulated projects and, since this year, has started technological cooperation projects aimed to diversify conflicts solution measures by the full use of mediation system, following the policy toward Mongolia based on the 13th Overseas Economic Cooperation Council held in January 2008: “Japan will consider continuous support to develop judicial human resources and operate law systems functionally (including the introduction of mediation system, and cooperation for building functions or organizations to check consistency of new legislation in line with existing legislation in a uniform manner). |

3.1 Country Policy Evaluation
### Implementation Process: Checking the Mongolian system of aid absorption for selecting aid projects

**Recommendations**

- During the survey of requests, Japan thoroughly explains its cooperation methods as well as the importance of aid projects to the recipient side before the formulation of a project, taking into consideration the recipient's aid absorption ability. Japan will continuously check the Mongolian side's aid absorption system as far as possible during the survey of needs or the selection of projects.
- Japan always checks the implementation system during the detailed program formulation survey following the adoption of a project, reexamining the project from the viewpoint of sustainability in order to design the project.
- Japan also reviews the implementation of aid projects from the viewpoint of the ability of the Mongolian maintenance and management systems.

**Status of follow-up efforts**

Mineral resources serve as an engine of the Mongolian economy, and appropriate resource development and appropriate use of revenues obtained from natural resources are important issues for the country's economy. Japan established the “Japan-Mongolia Public Private Joint Conference” in 2007 and, since then, has repeatedly discussed the area of mineral resources (and the area of trade investment) with the Mongolian side. Recently, the two countries signed the memorandum of cooperation on the extraction of uranium. The Mongolian side highly expects Japan's assistance in developing mineral resources, and Japan's support in this area is also expected to contribute to Japanese businesses starting operations in Mongolia. For this reason, Japan will consider implementing its effective aid in technical assistance and human resource development in the area of mineral resource development to the extent of the resources of Japan's ODA. Meanwhile, the weakness of the Mongolian economic system dependent on mineral resources has been re-recognized through recent economic crises. Japan will encourage the effective development of the country’s abundant mineral resources and strive for industrial diversification in the country, consolidating laws, institutions and developing human resources there for ensuring more stable private sector development.

### Implementation Process: Dispatch of JICA experts, Senior Volunteers (SVs) and Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCVs) and emphasis on the acceptance of Mongolian trainees

**Recommendations**

With regard to the aid modality and in light of the personnel and other limitations in Mongolian aid absorption, it is advisable to more frequently dispatch JICA experts, SVs and JOCVs and to accept Mongolian trainees so as to integrate them into the aid modality (scheme) in Japan's economic cooperation. In particular, management assistance conducted by SVs which is likely to make use of Japanese technical advantages will be effective in the operation of hardware.

**Status of follow-up efforts**

Japan will continue the effective integration of the dispatch of JICA experts, SVs and JOCVs into the aid cooperation programs as far as possible, and will continuously consider the collaboration with their yen loans, grant aid and technical cooperation. More precisely, with regard to JOCV projects, Japan strives to develop requests for aid based on cooperation programs, and proactively works together with JOCV and SVs in a number of technical cooperation projects (including grassroots technical cooperation projects) and in the activities of ex-trainees. With regard to individual experts, we will consider the dispatch of experts who will contribute to the strengthening of counterpart organizations, in particular, in connection with the loan assistance project, the “New Ulaanbaatar International Airport Construction Project.”
Country Assistance Evaluation of Tunisia

### Country Assistance Program: Need for clarifying and utilizing the significance of ODA

**Tunisia** is a country which has three faces such as an African country, a Middle-Eastern country and a Mediterranean country; therefore, Japan can expect Tunisia to play an important role as a launching point to strengthen Japan’s relationships with its neighboring regions. Accordingly, it is desirable that Japan’s ODA to Tunisia should be carried out so as to contribute to higher-level cooperation between the two countries which will build stronger partnerships with Tunisia’s neighboring regions and to ensure stability in the regions, in addition to closer relationships between the two countries.

**Recommendations**

- Tunisia refers itself as “an emerging economy” and Japan has defined the country not as a mere recipient country, but as a country with which Japan needs to construct a strategic partnership in the mid to long-term. Japan will provide assistance to Tunisia which is acquiring the basic level of technology, with its focus on the transfer and utilization of technology, expertise and know-how in which Japan has comparative advantage. In line with Tunisian “eleventh five-year Development Program” which runs from 2007 to 2011, Japan will implement its ODA, focusing on the following four priority areas: (1) improvement of the level of industry, (2) environmental protection, (3) correction of the gap between the rich and the poor, and (4) the triangular cooperation. In addition to the above four areas, Japan will upgrade its assistance for cross-sectoral issues, such as human resource development and enhancement of governance.

### Triangular Technical Cooperation Program: Strategic use of triangular cooperation

**Triangular cooperation** will be effective if Tunisia is positioned as the foothold for strengthening the relationship between Japan, the Middle East and Africa. Tunisia itself has a strong desire to cooperate with Japan. As Japan has a sufficient number of staff well experienced in development assistance, their experiences should be used to develop the recipient's neighboring regions. Japan is expected to regard Tunisia as an important partner to promote Japan's assistance in the regions and provide its ODA to encourage Tunisia to grow into a donor country itself over next ten years. Tunisia is a francophone and Arabic-speaking country and at the same time advanced in English education. For this reason, Tunisia has a competitive advantage in cooperation in the regions where native speaking populations of these languages live. It is also important to utilize Japan-Tunisia partnership for solving global issues.

**Recommendations**

- Tunisia has accepted more than 500 trainees as part of the South-South Cooperation and has been very proactive in enhancing its partnerships with Japan, since Japan and Tunisia signed the “Japan-Tunisia Triangular Technical Cooperation Programme” in 1999. Based on the performances so far, MOFA will give further consideration to the promotion of the South-South Cooperation in the future in line with the “Japan-Tunisia Triangular Technical Cooperation Programme.” In particular, Japan will strive to balance the need for development assistance in francophone Sub-Saharan African countries with the resources of the Tunisian side, for helping the official assistance to Africa to double, as pledged at TICAD IV.
- Japan's triangular cooperation with Tunisia in the reproductive health sector has produced good results; therefore, Japanese experts in the sector were commended by the Tunisian president.

### Issues Yet to be Solved: Correcting disparities

**Status of follow-up efforts**

Though Tunisian GNI per capita has already reached a level of 2,970 dollars, there still remain significant economic disparities in regions and income brackets when looking at the whole country. These kinds of disparities may destabilize the country if left unattended. For this reason, integrating attention to the poor and socially vulnerable groups into development assistance is essential to steady economic development in Tunisia.

**Recommendations**

Though Tunisia has succeeded in maintaining a high growth rate and raising the level of its economy as a whole, the unemployment rate remains high at 14.2% (in 2008): that is, assistance to the poor and the disabled is important from the viewpoint of correcting disparities or as an anti-terrorism measure to prevent jobless youths from turning into terrorists. To this end, Japan carried out six assistance projects in FY2007 and FY2008, mainly in southern Tunisia, to build facilities, donate equipment, buses for the training facilities of disabled persons as well as community centers, preschools and hospitals.
Issues yet to be Solved: Democratization and human rights

An important philosophy of Japan’s ODA is to support democratization and secure human rights. Japan has to pay sufficient attention to the improvement of human rights and the pursuit of democratization in Tunisia, for implementing ODA in the country. The Japanese government will have to continuously focus on dialogues with the Tunisian government to carry out aid activities in harmony with the recipient’s development policies. At the same time, Japan’s aid activities have to take in devices to encourage the improvement of human rights and the pursuit of democratization in Tunisia in collaboration with other donors.

- In line with the ODA implementation principles stipulated in the ODA Charter, Japan will engage in dialogues with the Tunisian government and other donors, paying sufficient attention to the improvement of human rights and the pursuit of democratization in Tunisia in order to implement appropriate ODA activities.
- Japan will care for the livelihood of the socially vulnerable people in its ODA by continuously extending its assistance to the disabled and the poor. Considering the fact that Japan is the second largest donor country to Tunisia after France, Japan intends to ask Tunisia to support Japan’s standpoint in the international arena.

Strengthening Collaboration between Japan and Tunisia: Promotion of mutual understanding

Japan should bring the Tunisian side to understand that necessary procedures take time to complete in order to ensure a high quality of aid; although, while they have pointed out the “slowness” of the preliminary surveys before Japan’s decision to provide assistance. On the other hand, with regard to problematic issues concerning the processes of bid tendering, the appraisal of projects and the selection of consultants pointed out during the evaluation, issues are not always easy to immediately resolve, and there are also many issues requiring careful discussions on whether any changes are desirable. Regarding such issues, efforts should be made to promote understanding among the Tunisian side, in parallel with the discussion in the Japanese government on whether the process can be modified.

Following the inauguration of the new JICA, the “preparatory survey” has been introduced as a survey process common to three aid methods: technical cooperation, loan assistance and grand aid. Through this consistent survey, efforts are made to formulate projects more efficiently and timely. In addition, Japan has strived to smoothly implement yen loan procedures by proactively conducting surveys related yen loans to make use of loan assistance fund accounts.

With regard to the “time consuming” procedures on the Japanese side, Japan has strived to get the Tunisian side to understand that it is necessary procedures in order to ensure the high quality of aid.
## Country Assistance Evaluation of Nicaragua

### Assistance Program to Nicaragua: Response to new needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the formulation of the Country Assistance Program for Nicaragua in 2002, due to radical changes in the country's socioeconomic structures, Japan is required to respond to new needs in the sectors such as energy, environment and public order which are not listed as priority sectors in the existing Country Assistance Program.</td>
<td>In the revision of the Country Assistance Program, the implementation of assistance to priority areas such as environmental conservation, disaster prevention, democratization and governance has been discussed, in order to respond to the new needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facing severe electricity shortages, the Nicaraguan government has been highly concerned with the electric power sector, and accordingly, the government is likely to intervene in the sector. Careful consideration should be made regarding whether Japan's ODA will be extended to such a sector, yet Japan will have to leave open the possibility of extending future assistance to the sector while formulating a new Country Assistance Program for Nicaragua.</td>
<td>In the revision of the Country Assistance Program, efforts are made to put in place assistance in the area of climate change including the use of clean energy sources with an eye on cooperation in the areas of environmental preservation and disaster prevention as well. In spite of some improvements in the status of power supply, Nicaragua has still suffered from a power shortage. The country almost fully depends on thermal power generation with crude oil almost all of which is imported. In order to improve such situations, Japan will proceed with projects which will facilitate the use of alternative energy sources including photovoltaic equipment programs and community-based small-scale power supply systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation issues such as water pollution and waste treatment have become more and more important. Japan should leave the door open to its assistance for addressing environmental problems including water pollution prevention and waste disposal when Japan readies for these new needs and allocates the job appropriately to other donors.</td>
<td>In the formulation of the Country Assistance Program, assistance for addressing water pollution prevention and proper waste disposal has been also discussed. At present, Japan is engaged in cooperative projects concerning the provision and upgrading of garbage trucks and the improvement of public water supply systems through Grant assistance for grassroots human security projects. In addition, Japan has encouraged the recipient government to give high priority to the implementation of projects which will address water pollution and environmental issues through the use of counterpart funds from Non-Project Grant Aid. At the same time, Japan has also strived to identify promising projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Good Practices: Utilizing the ingenuity of the ODA Task Force:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is really distinctive in Nicaragua is the carefully-crafted method of the implementation and operation of Grant assistance for grassroots human security projects which have various detailed features. In implementing and operating Grant assistance for grassroots human security, Japan frequently holds explanation sessions for proponents of projects, and examines candidate projects based on the list of uniquely developed check points.</td>
<td>Japan has been continuously carrying out the items recommended in the evaluation of its Grant assistance for grassroots human security projects, and rigorously screens projects. Japan has paid close attention to the on-site circumstance by enhancing the monitoring of projects, in order to keep the projects from failing due to the administration change resulting from the nationwide election of mayors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In view of the potential reduction of the Japan’s aid amount for non-African low-income countries in the coming years, it is essential for Japan to actively proceed with the gathering and provision of information from the viewpoint of aid coordination. First of all, the shift of the focus from passive participation in a sector-wide approach to participation aimed at collecting information with an eye on “future proactive aid coordination” is expected to expand the range of operations implemented in coordination with other donors.

As a member of bilateral negotiations and of the Quintet, a group made up of leading donor nations, Japan has been repeatedly asking its diplomatic missions abroad to actively facilitate aid coordination. To this end, MOFA has never failed to take part in donor tables and sector tables aimed at implementing aid coordination, making use of these tables to gather information on assistance and convey messages on Japan’s aid policies. MOFA intends to continue these kinds of activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In view of the potential reduction of the Japan’s aid amount for non-African low-income countries in the coming years, it is essential for Japan to actively proceed with the gathering and provision of information from the viewpoint of aid coordination. First of all, the shift of the focus from passive participation in a sector-wide approach to participation aimed at collecting information with an eye on “future proactive aid coordination” is expected to expand the range of operations implemented in coordination with other donors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a member of bilateral negotiations and of the Quintet, a group made up of leading donor nations, Japan has been repeatedly asking its diplomatic missions abroad to actively facilitate aid coordination. To this end, MOFA has never failed to take part in donor tables and sector tables aimed at implementing aid coordination, making use of these tables to gather information on assistance and convey messages on Japan’s aid policies. MOFA intends to continue these kinds of activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Political Positioning and Mainstreaming of BEGIN

#### Recommendations

In order for all parties concerned with Japan’s assistance in basic education to come together and move forward in the same direction, based on the BEGIN initiative, it is necessary to clearly define BEGIN as a policy, make the concept of BEGIN more concrete, and develop and improve the BEGIN implementation structure.

#### Status of follow-up efforts

MOFA is working to reflect efficient initiatives that have been already released in the formulation and revision of country assistance programs, and will consider the setting of numerical targets in them. MOFA intends to have these initiatives reflected in the on-site project formulation by paying special attention to the process of project formulation.

#### Recommendations

In order to position BEGIN as an effective basic education assistance policy, it is essential that higher level policies such as the ODA Charter and the Medium-Term Policy on ODA must explicitly support BEGIN as a sectoral aid policy. Also, Country Assistance Programs must support BEGIN as the higher level of policy in basic education assistance so that strategies and specific approach projects can be formulated in line with BEGIN.

Japan’s ODA Charter (2003) and the Medium-Term Policy on ODA (2005) specify education as one of the areas essential for attaining “human security,” and stipulate that Japan should get involved in education and human resource development as part of its contribution to priority areas: “poverty reduction,” “sustainable development” and “peace building.” Based on the above, MOFA intends to position BEGIN as a relevant policy in formulating and revising Country Assistance Programs.

#### Status of follow-up efforts

Japan has played the role of the co-chair country of the Education for All-Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) since January 2008. By making use of the basic philosophies of BEGIN, Japan has to develop and implement concrete and effective measures for FTI. To this end, Japan should promptly announce at FTI-related meetings its intention to extend basic educational assistance to FTI target countries through bilateral assistance and provide quantitative commitments to FTI’s Catalytic Fund and Education Program Development Fund as part of provisions through international organizations.

Japan, which has played the role of the co-chair country of the EFA-FTI as the chair of the G-8 Countries since January 2008, led the FTI working-level talk in April of the same year, and was deeply involved in discussions on FTI and its reform as a member of the FTI steering committee until June 2009. In addition to bilateral and multilateral assistance to FTI approved countries, Japan offered a total of 3.6 million US dollars to FTI-related funds (2.4 million US dollars to FTI’s Catalyst Fund from MOFA and 1.2 million US dollars to FTI’s Education Program Development Fund from the Ministry of Finance) in FY2007 and FY2008. During the G8 Summit, Japan has also taken part in discussions on the G8’s assistance to FTI and on promoting implementation of external evaluations for improving FTI more effective.

#### Recommendations

While the support for eliminating gender disparities is defined as one of priority areas in BEGIN, efforts to correct gender disparities have not been proactively or effectively made. It is important that the ways to eliminate gender disparity should be explicitly addressed in every basic education assistance project.

Based on Japan’s “Gender and Development (GAD) Initiative”, MOFA has continuously assigned officials in charge of gender equality to Japan’s diplomatic missions abroad in recipient countries in order to promote gender equality in all areas, including education.
Technical cooperation projects are expected to play an important role in ensuring access to education, improving the quality of education, and upgrading the management of education. The implementation structure should aim for more extensive project promotion through coordination with grant aid and ODA loans, instead of depending on hub-based activities through individual projects.

Basically, the Strengthening of Mathematics and Science in Secondary Education (SMASSE)-related projects in Africa have been horizontally expanded through recipient countries’ budgets. Meanwhile, in Uganda, there was a precedent of expanding the target area of training programs which were expanded through the use of counterpart funds. In the future, MOFA will plan to use counterpart funds of Non-Project Grant Aid for expanding project target areas.

In order to build the “all-Japan” ODA implementation structure for realizing BEGIN’s basic philosophies and policy objectives, it is necessary to organize and hold regular meetings with the Ministry of Finance (MOF), MOFA, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), the new JICA, NGOs, consultants and researchers.

MOFA inaugurated the “Liaison Conference of International Education Cooperation” in July 2008, which intends to enhance partnerships by sharing information and exchanging opinions between those involved in supporting education including relevant ministries, JICA, experts, NGOs, international organizations, and private sectors.
## Evaluation of Japan’s Assistance to Africa through the TICAD Process

### Development Challenges To Be Followed Up: Gender equality and environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan should clearly announce its commitment to gender equality and environmental protection issues in the process of its assistance to African nations through the TICAD process. Among a number of environment-related issues, it may be recommended to focus on countermeasures against global warming, which is an international issue in recent years, and technical measures related to global warming, such as CO2 restraint measures, alternative energies, forestry preservation and forestation.</td>
<td>With regard to gender equality, after the Japanese government and UNDP expressed their support for the Women’s Entrepreneurship initiative, Japan provided training to more than 1,000 women living in northern Ghana who were engaged in shea butter production, as part of a pilot initiative support program through the Japan WID Fund. Through environmental program grant aid, Japan has supported the development of flood control facilities, the formation of organizations of local residents and training for local residents at river areas in Kenya frequented by floods. It has also supported the procurement of equipment for providing safe drinking water and for taking appropriate disaster countermeasures in Ethiopia, Senegal, Niger, and Mozambique. Furthermore, Japan is now preparing the provision of adjustment support for 20 countries under the “Japan-UNDP Joint Framework for Building Partnership to Address Climate Change in Africa.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Complete and Holistic Assistance: Complete assistance in infrastructure, software and hardware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order for an aid policy to be relevant, it is important that each policy should be “complete” and “holistic.” In regard to this point, in particular in the health sector, Japan’s aid policies put emphasis on assistance to infrastructure, while Western donors do not emphasize this type of assistance well. Indeed Japan’s assistance has been highly appreciated for its “comprehensiveness” as Japan provides assistance in software such as technology transfer and human resource development together with assistance to infrastructure.</td>
<td>Based on the “specific measures to be implemented through the TICAD process during the next five years” specified in the TICAD IV Yokohama Action Plan, Japan has already decided to implement grant aid and technical cooperation worth at least 36% of the amount of assistance earmarked for the specific measures to be implemented during the five years. Of 14 target posts supported in terms of One Stop Border Post (facilitation of custom procedures), as announced under the Yokohama Action Plan, Japan now implements support for eight posts, either through hardware assistance such as facilities improvement, or software assistance such as human resource development and development of legal systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Need to Place Greater Emphasis on MDGs in the Development of Assistance Policies: MDG indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of follow-up efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It will be an extremely difficult task to make visible improvements on output indicators for basic social needs over the short or medium term, and in principle, it seems almost impossible to ascertain the precise degree of Japanese contribution to such improvements. However, considering the significance of MDGs, assistance should be designed and implemented to realize visible effects by improving MDG indicators.</td>
<td>- Even in the face of the ongoing monetary and financial crisis, a number of assistance measures have been underway in various sectors, including MDGs-related sectors such as community development, education, health, water supply and sanitation. It is important to carry out existing commitments without fail and not to reverse the progress of attaining the MDGs. The progress situation of TICAD IV Yokohama Action Plan was published at TICAD IV Ministerial-level Follow-up Meeting held in March 2009. MOFA will periodically monitor the progress of various measures referred to in the Action Plan. - For example, with regard to community development, UNDP has implemented AMV (African Millennium Village) projects in eight countries (Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania and Uganda) through the “Human Security Fund” which Japan established in the United Nations. Japan has also improved rural environments in Mozambique by developing agricultural facilities, constructing elementary school-related facilities and providing related materials, through bilateral assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appropriateness of Process: Need to further strengthen the South-South Cooperation

**Recommendations**

The South-South Cooperation is an aid modality which the TICAD process has strongly promoted, and it has indeed proved effective in many sectors because development assistance will work better in the context of “assistance from Asia to Africa” or “interregional cooperation in Africa”, than in the context of “Japan and Africa”, between which there is enormous difference in the level of economic development. In light of the appropriateness of the aid process of the South-South Cooperation, Japan should clearly and specifically promote the South-South Cooperation through the TICAD process more than ever, which effectively links assistance that is independent but similar in content to that Japan implements in different countries.

**Status of follow-up efforts**

- With regard to the South-South Cooperation specified in the schedule of the Yokohama Action Plan, Japan has steadily provided assistance in Thailand (in the sectors of agriculture, rural development, community development, post-basic education, higher education, and health) and in Vietnam (in the sectors of post-basic education and higher education/research, health and partnership enhancement).
- Japan intends to further promote cooperation in the sectors such as broadband infrastructures (human resource development in custom services to deploy One Stop Border Posts in a wider area.) and agriculture (mutual learning of rice cropping and agricultural productivity enhancement). In addition, making use of the experiences and expertise learned from technical cooperation projects in mathematics and science education, Japan conducted the Third Country Training Program (Kenya, in 2008) aimed at capacity building of persons in charge of training teachers. Delegates from 20 Sub-Saharan nations took part in this program.

Appropriateness of Process: Need to build stronger partnerships with other donors

**Recommendations**

Clearly defining a framework of Japan's ODA policy toward Africa through the TICAD process has been successful in strengthening the international image of “Japan as a donor” and promoting a closer coordination between Japan and other donors. This event can be found particularly in the agricultural sector through cooperation with the World Food Programme and in the health sector through Japan-US partnerships.

**Status of follow-up efforts**

TICAD IV participants launched the Coalition for African Rice Development (CARD) which is a new consultation group attended by development partners, the African region and international organizations in corporation with African rice producing countries interested in rice production increase in Africa. The CARD has been holding discussion with the aim of doubling the rice production in Sub-Saharan Africa from the present 14 million tons/year to 28 million tons/year by 2018. The second CARD meeting was held at Tokyo in June 2009. The CARD also intends to share experiences and lessons learned from rice production in non-African regions, such as Asian countries and Brazil.
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### Ministry of Foreign Affairs

#### Policy-Level/Program-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Evaluation Study (Country/Sector)</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2002</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy-Level</strong></td>
<td>Country Policy Evaluation Study of Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Policy Evaluation Study of Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Issue Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of WID/Gender-related Policy (Guatemala, Honduras)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Support of South-South Cooperation</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program-Level</strong></td>
<td>Sector Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Transport Sector in Cambodia</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Trade and Investment Sector in Africa</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aid Modality Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Study on Multilateral/Bilateral Technical Cooperation</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation (UNICEF/UNFPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOFA-NGO Joint Evaluation -Subsidy System for NGO Projects</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation (NGOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy-Level</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Medium-Term Policy on ODA</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Indonesia</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of India</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Pakistan</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Jordan</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Issue Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term Evaluation of Okinawa Infectious Diseases Initiative (IDI)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program-Level</strong></td>
<td>Sector Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Infrastructure Development Sector Cooperation in Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Water Resources Development Sector Cooperation in the Kingdom of Morocco</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s ODA to the Education Sector in Ghana</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Environment Sector Cooperation in Senegal</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s Basic Human Needs Sector Cooperation in Bolivia</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aid Modality Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan Disaster Relief (JDR) Teams (Vietnam, Algeria)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s Cultural Grant Aid</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY2004

### Policy-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation of Laos</th>
<th>Third-party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Bangladesh</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Ethiopia</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority Issue Evaluation

| Evaluation of Japan’s Contribution to the Achievement of the MDGs in the Area of Education | Third-party |
| Evaluation of Japan’s Contribution to the Achievement of the MDGs in the Area of Health | Third-party |
| Evaluation of Japan’s Anti-Personnel Mine Action Assistance Policy | Third-party |

### Program-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Program Evaluation</th>
<th>Morocco-UNICEF Country Programme Evaluation</th>
<th>Joint evaluation with other donor (UNICEF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the Bridge Construction Program for Tegucigalpa and on Main Highways in Honduras</td>
<td>Recipient government/agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid Modality Evaluation</th>
<th>Review of Adjustment Lending -Overview of Structural Adjustment Loans and Sector Adjustment Loans</th>
<th>Third-party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Grant Assistance for Japanese NGO Projects Modality</td>
<td>Joint evaluation with NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistance: The Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Joint evaluation with other donor (USAID)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Grassroots Human Security Grant Aid for Bolivia</td>
<td>Recipient government/agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FY2005

### Policy-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation</th>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation of Cambodia</th>
<th>Third-party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Kenya</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Tanzania</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Senegal</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority Issue Evaluation

| Evaluation of Japan’s ODA Contribution to Poverty Reduction | Third-party |
| Evaluation of Japan’s Peacebuilding Assistance Policy | Third-party |

### Program-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam-Japan Joint Evaluation on the Japan’s ODA Program for the Transport Infrastructure Development in the Red River Delta Area of Vietnam</td>
<td>Joint-evaluation with recipient country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Study on Japan’s ODA to the Education Sector in the Philippines</td>
<td>Joint-evaluation with NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program “Grass Roots” in Mongolia Recipient government/agencies</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation with NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aid Modality Evaluation

| Evaluation of Japan’s Grant Assistance for Grassroots Human Security | Third-party |
| Review of General Budget Support (PRBS in Tanzania and PRSC in Vietnam) | Joint-evaluation with other donors |
| Evaluation of the Non-Project Grant Aid Program in Zambia | Recipient government/agencies |
### FY2006

#### Policy-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation</th>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation of Zambia</th>
<th>Third-party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Bhutan</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Vietnam</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Madagascar</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Morocco</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Issue Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s ODA for Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s Assistance for Forest Conservation and its Contribution to Global Issues</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s Support for Regional Cooperation -A Case Study of Central America-</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Program Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Study on Japan’s ODA to the Health Sector in Thailand</th>
<th>Joint Evaluation with NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s ODA to the Education Sector in the Independent State of Samoa</td>
<td>Recipient government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s ODA to the Road and Bridge Sector</td>
<td>Recipient government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Modality Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation on Japan’s Development Studies</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY2007

#### Policy-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation</th>
<th>Country Assistance Evaluation Study of Indonesia</th>
<th>Third-party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation Study of Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation Study of China</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation Study of Tunisia</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation Study of Nicaragua</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Policy Evaluation Study of Mongolia</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japanese Assistance to Africa through the TICAD Process</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Program Evaluation</th>
<th>USAID-Japan Joint Evaluation on “The US-Japan Partnership for Global Health”</th>
<th>Joint evaluation with other donors (United States)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japanese Development Assistance to Malaysia Project</td>
<td>Recipient government/agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s ODA on Consolidation of Peace and Security in Africa in Relation to The Fourth Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD IV)</td>
<td>Recipient government/agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japanese Cooperation in El Salvador’s Eastern Region</td>
<td>Recipient government/agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>Policy-Level Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation</td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Ecuador</td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Pacific Island Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Romania/Bulgaria</td>
<td>Country Assistance Evaluation of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority Issue Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s Assistance in Response to Tsunami Disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s Assistance to the Education Sector in Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on “Japan’s ODA for Improvement of Management Capacity of Operation and Maintenance Regarding Water Supply in Egypt” and “Japan’s ODA for Drinking Water Treatment Plants in Egypt”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Japan’s ODA on Consolidation of Peace in Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Project-Level Evaluation  EX-Post Evaluation of Grant Aid Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Project for Rural Communities Water Supply</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Project for Rural Drinking Water Supply in peri-Urban of Phnom Penh City</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Child Health Care in Rural Area</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability Project</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Expanded Program on Immunization</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Project for Emergency Rehabilitation of Sino-Rail (Section IV)</td>
<td>Transportation and Communications</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Project for Support to Strengthening of Emergency Obstetric Care Service</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Project for Establishment of the Automated Fingerprint Identification System</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Educational Facilities (Phase V)</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Equipment of Water Quality in Local Areas</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of National Hospital of Pediatrics</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Project for Attention on the Coastal Sandy Area in Southern Central Vietnam</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Meteorological Network</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Project for Rehabilitation of Railway Facility (Phase II)</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of International Telephone Switching System</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>People's Republic of China</td>
<td>Project for Attention to Conservation of Middle Stream of Huang He</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>People's Republic of China</td>
<td>Project for Tuberculosis Control in Poor Area (Phase III)</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
<td>Project for Rehabilitation of Power Distribution Network in Dili</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Project for Rehabilitation of Bridges on the Ring Road in the East Island</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of the National Broadcasting Corporation</td>
<td>Transportation and Communications</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Equipment of University of Goroka</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Project for Enhancing Basic Health Services</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Project for Groundwater Development in Ayacu Province</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Project for Reconstruction of the New Amsterdam Hospital</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Basic Medical Equipment for Mother and Child Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Saint Vincent</td>
<td>Project for Re-modeling of New Kingston Fish Market</td>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Dominica</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Margot Fishing Leading Facilities</td>
<td>Fishery</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Project for Groundwater Development in the Former Plantation Areas</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Project for Underground Water Development in the Rural Area (Phase III)</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Project for Groundwater Development in the 7th Health Area</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Evaluation Study</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Equipment of the Kabul International Airport</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Project for Supplying Medical Equipment to Kabul Hospital</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of the Water Supply for Zarqa District</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Project for Rehabilitation of Transit Road (Phase II)</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Project for Consolidation of Educational Television and Radio Recording Studios (Phase II)</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Equipment of the Kabul International Airport</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Project for Primary School Construction</td>
<td>Education and Human Resource Development</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Project for Improvement of Osareka Bridge and Bogolje Bridge</td>
<td>Transport and Communications</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Primary Evaluations rated higher than Secondary Evaluation
*Secondary Evaluations rated higher than Primary Evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry/Agency</th>
<th>For details to</th>
<th>ODA Policy, Program or Project</th>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Timing of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications</td>
<td>p.67</td>
<td>Contribution to Creating a Global Society Integrated through Information and Communication Networks (Program)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>p.68</td>
<td>Promotion of International Cooperation in Legal Administration (Program)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosting of Seminars, etc., on Immigration Controls for Southeast Asian Countries (Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration/Visa Application Procedure Support for Trainees/Technical Interns (Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>p.69</td>
<td>Assistance Extended through Multilateral Development Banks (Programs)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>p.73</td>
<td>Promotion of Participation in and Cooperation to Activities of International Organizations: Support for Technical Cooperation Projects toward Realization of Decent Work Conducted by International Labour Organization (Program)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>p.74</td>
<td>Promotion of Participation in and Cooperation to Activities of International Organizations: Support for Technical Cooperation Projects conducted by World Health Organization and Other International Organizations (Program)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>p.75</td>
<td>Promotion of International Cooperation for Food, Agriculture and Farming Areas (Policy)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>p.76</td>
<td>Promotion of Maximizing the Multi-Functionality of Forests with International Collaboration (Policy)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>p.77</td>
<td>Sustenance and Increase in the Managed Species of Fishes and Fishery Agreement with International Organizations (Policy)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry</td>
<td>p.78</td>
<td>Promotion of Economic Cooperation (Program)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism</td>
<td>p.80</td>
<td>Survey on the Follow-up and Evaluations of Economic Industrial Technical Cooperation (Project)</td>
<td>Non-GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry and Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>p.83</td>
<td>Promotion of Biological Diversity Conservation and Co-existence with the Nature (Program)</td>
<td>GPEA Evaluation</td>
<td>Ex-Post</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program-Level Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Subject Evaluation Study</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yen Loan Thematic Evaluation</td>
<td>Participatory Rural Development (Thai/Pakistan)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment for the MRTA Initial System Project (Blue Line)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Evaluation in Education Sector (Jordan)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact Analysis of Small Scale Irrigation Project (Indonesia)</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Operation and Maintenance Management in Waterworks Sector</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Indonesia/Philippines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Four Donors’ Assistance in the Bangladeshi Transport Sector</td>
<td>Third-party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bangladesh)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Cooperation Thematic Evaluation</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation: Comprehensive Analysis “International Emergency Assistance Project” (Indonesia/Pakistan)(Second Year)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation: Long-term Technical Cooperation - Technology and Educational Sector- (Indonesia/Thai/Kenya/Senegal)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation: Patient Referral System (Vietnam/Bangladesh)(Second Year)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation: Community Participation Approach Phase II (NGO-JICA Evaluation Subcommittee)(Panama/Honduras/Ghana)</td>
<td>NGO-JICA Joint Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation: Distance Technical Cooperation (Philippines/Kenya)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Cooperation Program: Arsenic Mitigation Program (Bangladesh)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Cooperation Program: Capacity Enhancement Program to Reduce Water Contamination (Mexico)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Cooperation Program: Project for HIV/AIDS Control (Kenya)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation on Cooperation Program: Water Resources Development Sector (Morocco)</td>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project-Level Evaluation

Please refer to “Ex-Post Evaluation” on the following website:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MOFA</th>
<th>JICA</th>
<th>JBIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Economic Cooperation Evaluation Committee established in Economic Cooperation Bureau; ex-post evaluation begins</td>
<td>Evaluation Reviewing Committee established</td>
<td>Ex-post evaluation starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Publication of Annual Evaluation Report on Japan’s Economic Cooperation begins</td>
<td>Section specializing in ex-post evaluation established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Research and Planning Division established in Economic Cooperation Bureau</td>
<td>Ex-post evaluation begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>ODA Evaluation Reviewing Panel established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Research and Planning Division reorganized; Evaluation Office established</td>
<td>Section specializing in ex-post evaluation established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>ODA Charter formulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Evaluation Group set up at newly established Development Aid Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Publication of Annual Evaluation Report begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Medium-Term Policy on ODA formulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Internal Feedback Liaison Meeting on ODA Evaluation established</td>
<td>Ex-ante evaluation begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ODA Evaluation Study Group Report” submitted to foreign minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The First ODA Evaluation Workshop (Tokyo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Force for Improvement of the Evaluation System established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifteen Specific Measures for ODA Reform announced</td>
<td>Feedback Committee on Ex-Post Evaluation of ODA Loan Projects established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Action Program” for the Reform of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Second ODA Evaluation Workshop (Tokyo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Ex-ante evaluation started under GPEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation established (renamed from the Wise Men Committee for Evaluation Feedback)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Charter approved by cabinet meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Division reorganized as the “Evaluation Unit, Research and Programming Division” as a result of organizational reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Third ODA Evaluation Workshop (Tokyo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Evaluation Unit, Research and Programming Division reorganized as the “Evaluation Unit, Aid Planning Division” as a result of organizational reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Fourth ODA Evaluation Workshop (Thailand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Medium-Term Policy on ODA formulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Fifth ODA Evaluation Workshop (Tokyo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>“Aid Policy and Management Division, ODA Evaluation Division” established as a result of organizational reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Sixth ODA Evaluation Workshop (Philippines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Seventh ODA Evaluation Workshop (Malaysia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New JICA inaugurated (October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Eighth ODA Evaluation Workshop (Singapore)</td>
<td>As a result of organizational reform, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division inaugurated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms listed here are based on the “Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management” published by the OECD. In 2002, the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (WP-EV) (*1) developed this glossary of key terms in order to promote conversations and understanding among people involved in development and evaluation by sharing these terms. Furthermore, this glossary is meant to fulfill the need to clarify concepts and reduce the terminological confusion frequently encountered in these areas. The original version is in English, French and Spanish. Please refer to http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf for French and Spanish.

The terms are listed in alphabetical order for easy reference to the original version.

Note:
*1 The WP-EV is an organization which operates under the DAC. Bilateral and multilateral development evaluation experts meet periodically in WP-EV meetings to share their experiences and improve evaluation practices, and to strengthen the ability of the organization as an instrument for development cooperation policy. The organization has changed names since 2002 and is now known as the “DAC Network on Development Evaluation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis-à-vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even legally defensible, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms. Note: Accountability in development may refer to the obligations of partners to act according to clearly defined responsibilities, roles and performance expectations, often with respect to the prudent use of resources. For evaluators, it connotes the responsibility to provide accurate, fair and credible monitoring reports and performance assessments. For public sector managers and policy-makers, accountability is to taxpayers/citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilize to produce specific outputs. Related term: development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical tools</td>
<td>Methods used to process and interpret information during an evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>An overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a development intervention prior to a decision of funding. Related term: ex-ante evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>Hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention. Note: Assumptions can also be understood as hypothesized conditions that bear on the validity of the evaluation itself, e.g., about the characteristics of the population when designing a sampling procedure for a survey. Assumptions are made explicit in theory-based evaluations where evaluation tracks systematically the anticipated results chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>The ascription of a casual link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention. Note: Attribution refers to that which is to be credited for the observed changes or results achieved. It represents the extent to which observed development effects can be attributed to a specific intervention or to the performance of one or more partner taking account of other interventions, (anticipated or unanticipated) confounding factors, or external shocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>An independent, objective assurance activity designed to add value and improve an organization’s operations. It helps an organization accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to assess and improve the effectiveness of risk management control and governance processes. Note: a distinction is made between regularity (financial) auditing which focuses on compliance with applicable statutes and regulation and performance auditing, which is concerned with relevance, economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Internal auditing provides an assessment of internal controls undertaken by a unit reporting to management while external auditing is conducted by an independent organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-line study</td>
<td>An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>The individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation of a set of related activities, projects and/or programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Conclusions point out the factors of success and failure of the evaluated intervention, with special attention paid to the intended an unintended results and impacts, and more generally to any other strength or weakness. A conclusion draws on data collection and analyses undertaken, through a transparent chain of arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterfactual</td>
<td>The situation or condition which hypothetically may prevail for individuals, organizations, or groups were there no development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Program Evaluation/Country Assistance Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation of one or more donor’s or agency’s portfolio of development interventions, and the assistance strategy behind them, in a partner country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection tools</td>
<td>Methodologies used to identify information sources and collect information during an evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development intervention</td>
<td>An instrument for partner (donor and non-donor) support aimed to promote development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development objective</td>
<td>Intended impact contributing to physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other benefits to a society, community, or group of people via one or more development interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Absence of waste for a given output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise time, etc.) are converted to results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluability</td>
<td>Extent to which an activity or a program can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned in the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-ante evaluation</td>
<td>An evaluation that is performed before implementation of a development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-post evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation of a development intervention after it has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td>The evaluation of a development intervention conducted by entities and/or individuals outside the donor and implementing organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>The transmission of findings generated through the evaluation process to parties for whom it is relevant and useful so as to facilitate learning. This may involve the collection and dissemination of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons from experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>A finding uses evidence from one or more evaluations to allow for a factual statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation intended to improve performance, most often conducted during the implementation phase of projects or programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>The higher-order objective to which a development intervention is intended to contribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent evaluation</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation carried out by entities and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention. Note: The credibility of an evaluation depends in part on how independently it has been carried out. Independence implies freedom from political influence and organizational pressure. It is characterized by full access to information and by full autonomy in carrying out investigations and reporting findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td>The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional development impact</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which an intervention improves or weakens the ability of a country or region to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial, and natural resources, for example through: (a) better definition, stability, transparency, enforceability and predictability of institutional arrangements and/or (b) better alignment of the mission and capacity of an organization with its mandate, which derives from these institutional arrangements. Such impacts can include intended and unintended effects of an action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of a development intervention conducted by a unit and/or individuals reporting to the management of the donor, partner, or implementing organization. Related term: self-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint evaluation</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation to which different donor agencies and/or partners participate. Note: There are various degrees of “jointness” depending on the extent to which individual partners cooperate in the evaluation process, merge their evaluation resources and combine their evaluation reporting. Joint evaluations can help overcome attribution problems in assessing the effectiveness of programs and strategies, the complementarity of efforts supported by different partners, the quality of aid coordination, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessons learned</strong></td>
<td>Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logical framework (Logframe)</strong></td>
<td>Management tool used to improve the design of interventions, most often at the project level. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution and evaluation of a development intervention. Related term: results based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meta-evaluation</strong></td>
<td>The term is used for evaluations designed to aggregate findings from series of evaluations. It can also be used to denote the evaluation of an evaluation to judge its quality and/or assess the performance of the evaluators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-term evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation performed towards the middle of the period of implementation of the intervention. Related term: formative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation method in which representatives of agencies and stakeholders (including beneficiaries) work together in designing, carrying out and interpreting an evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners</strong></td>
<td>The individuals and/or organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which a development intervention or a development partner operates according to specific criteria/standards/guidelines or achieves result in accordance with stated goals or plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance indicator</strong></td>
<td>A variable that allows the verification of changes in the development intervention or shows results relative to what was planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance measurement</strong></td>
<td>A system for assessing performance of development interventions against stated goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance monitoring</strong></td>
<td>A continuous process of collecting and analyzing data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process evaluation</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation of the internal dynamics of implementing organizations, their policy instruments, their service delivery mechanisms, their management practices, and the linkages among these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of a set of interventions, marshaled to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector development objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of an individual development intervention designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources and implementation schedules, often within the framework of a broader program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project or program objective</td>
<td>The intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development results to which a project or program is expected to contribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>The publicly stated objectives of the development program or project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit or the worth of a development intervention or its compliance with given standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>The beneficiaries and other stakeholders of a development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. Recommendations should be linked to conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner’s and donors’ policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Consistency or dependability of data and evaluation judgments, with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures and analyses used to collect and interpret evaluation data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results chain</td>
<td>The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives, beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts, and feedback. In some agencies, reach is part of the results chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results framework</td>
<td>The program logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including casual relationships and underlying assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results-Based Management (RBM)</td>
<td>A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>An assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk analysis: An analysis or an assessment of factors (called assumptions in the logframe) affect or are likely to affect the successful achievement of an intervention’s objectives. A detailed examination of the potential unwanted and negative consequences to human life, health, property or the environment posed by development interventions; a systematic process to provide information regarding such undesirable consequences; the process of quantification of the probabilities and expected impacts for identified risks.

Sector program evaluation: Evaluation of a cluster of development interventions in a sector within one country or across countries, all of which contribute to the achievement of a specific development goal.

Self-evaluation: An evaluation by those who are entrusted with the design and delivery of a development intervention.

Stakeholders: Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.

Summative evaluation: A study conducted at the end of an intervention (or a phase of that intervention) to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. Summative evaluation is intended to provide information about the worth of the program. Related terms: impact evaluation.

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Target group: The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit the development intervention is undertaken.

Terms of reference: Written document presenting the purposes and scope of the evaluation, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements. Two other expressions sometimes used with the same meaning are “scope of work” and “evaluation mandate.”

Thematic evaluation: Evaluation of a selection of development interventions, all of which address a specific development priority that cuts across countries, regions, and sectors.

Triangulation: The use of three or more theories, sources or types of information or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. Note: by combining multiple data-sources, methods, analyses, or theories, evaluators seek to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single-methods, single observer or single theory studies.

Validity: The extent to which the data collection strategies and instruments measure what they purport to measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAKCP</td>
<td>Asia-Africa Knowledge Co-creation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGECI</td>
<td>Agencia Ecuatoriana de Cooperación Internacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMV</td>
<td>African Millennium Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSD</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSDEP</td>
<td>Asian and Pacific Skill Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGIN</td>
<td>Basic Education for Growth Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>Coalition for African Rice Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Comprehensive Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM/ J I /GIS</td>
<td>Clean Development Mechanism/ Joint Implementation/Green Investment Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGI</td>
<td>Consultative Group on Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Community Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENR</td>
<td>Department of Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPL</td>
<td>Development Policy Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPWH</td>
<td>Department of Public Works and Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/N</td>
<td>Exchange of Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Economic Partnership Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESDF</td>
<td>Education Sector Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRI</td>
<td>Food Industries Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G24</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Group of Twenty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAD</td>
<td>Gender and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBS</td>
<td>General Budget Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNi</td>
<td>Gross National Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>HIV Counseling and Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Health and Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Intensive Care Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITTO</td>
<td>International Tropical Timber Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUU</td>
<td>Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBIC</td>
<td>Japan Bank for International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFPR</td>
<td>Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICS</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOCV</td>
<td>Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-PIPS</td>
<td>Japanese Support to the Pacific Immunization Program Strengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSDF</td>
<td>Japan Social Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>Life Cycle Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>Language Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>Pacific Island Leaders Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS-AP</td>
<td>Skills and Employability Program for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMASSE</td>
<td>Strengthening of Mathematics and Science in Secondary Education Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMATT</td>
<td>Science and Mathematics Teacher Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Senior Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAps</td>
<td>Sector Wide Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICAD</td>
<td>Tokyo International Conference on African Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCT</td>
<td>Voluntary Counselling and Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASABI</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation Broad Partnership Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>World Customs Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WECSA</td>
<td>Western, Eastern, Central and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>Women in Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Website</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA Evaluations</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jica.go.jp/english/operations/evaluation/">http://www.jica.go.jp/english/operations/evaluation/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac">http://www.oecd.org/dac</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/">http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program (UNDP)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.undp.org/">http://www.undp.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unep.org/">http://www.unep.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unhcr.org/">http://www.unhcr.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization (WHO)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.who.int/">http://www.who.int/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.imf.org/">http://www.imf.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank (ADB)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adb.org/">http://www.adb.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank (AfDB)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.afdb.org/">http://www.afdb.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="http://www.usaid.gov/">http://www.usaid.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dfid.gov.uk/">http://www.dfid.gov.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EuropeAid</td>
<td><a href="http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/">http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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