

## 論説

# Governance for Independent and Effective Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) a/.

Ryokichi HIRONO  
Professor Emeritus  
Seikei University

## 要約

21世紀の今日では、政策・施策・事業評価活動は、その内容の質的側面、制度面では大きな差異があるが、先進国のみならず、途上国でも国、地方自治体、企業、団体レベルで観察されるようになった。今や、いずれの国でも評価の最大の課題は、各種評価者の専門的能力（対象部門別評価能力と総合的評価能力）・評価実施体制の強化と評価の独立性・信頼度の向上である。本稿では、評価のガバナンスに関わる諸々の法的・人的・制度的課題を整理して、如何にしてあらゆる関係者の信頼に足る独立性と有効性を備えた評価のガバナンス体制を強化するかを議論している。特に、評価が何のために、誰のために導入されているかの視点に立った時、政策・施策・事業の成果を改善・フィードバックし、その数値化・指標化を通じて管理を容易にして従来からの評価目的を達成すると同時に、多様化する政策・施策・事業の形成・実施・監視・評価過程にその費用負担者（納税者）・最終受益者（国民、地域住民、構成員等）が効果的に参加できるという参加型評価体制の整備が急務である。このような体制の樹立こそ、主権在民を範とする社会で現在求められている評価の緊急課題であり、そのためには市民社会組織の強化が大前提となる。

## 1. Introduction

The importance of evaluation for developmental and administrative purposes has been long recognized in developed countries and increasingly so in many, if not, most developing countries today. Most important among the fundamental factors responsible for this enhanced recognition are the increasing fiscal deficits and the rise of civil society organizations and their growing political influences in both developed and developing countries.

While evaluation professionals are occupied with research and development for better evaluation methodologies and outcome indicators, the general public and those specific stakeholders who are supposed to benefit from such improved evaluation are now increasingly questioning if the evaluation system under which evaluation professionals are commissioned to evaluate is in fact appropriately governed to reflect the outcome intended by those policies, programmes and projects (polipros). The Japan Evaluation Society of which the writer is senior adviser has long been concerned with this issue and together with its members have organized a study team under JES board and issued its final proposal for establishing Independent and Effective Evaluation System in Japan (HIRONO, Ryokichi, ed.,

2010; HIRONO, R.,2011).

## 2. **Main Pertinent Questions:**

How to achieve and ensure INDEPENDENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS in all our M&E at local, national and international levels, therefore is one of the major and urgent issues to be dealt with today under the existing polipros evaluation framework around the world. This issue has been one of the major concerns of not only the governments at all levels including international organizations, but also evaluation professionals and NGOs aspiring to make their M&E to be trusted by all relevant stakeholders and the general public per se. (HIRONO, R., 2005; Naidoo, Indran A., 2013).

In addition to the obvious essentiality of professionalism in terms of evaluation capacity/empowerment and ethics of those engaged in M&E and the installation of external evaluation machinery at all levels of M&E activities, (JES, 2013; YAMAYA, K., 2015) major questions to be asked for this purpose are as follows, taking into account **the diversity of prevailing social values of people and communities: and the multi-faceted dimensions of stakeholders as beneficiaries, taxpayers, consumers and producers:**

- 1) To what extent are we satisfied with the current situation of **Transparency** in terms of Disclosure of Government Information at the local, national and International levels ?
- 2) To what extent are we satisfied with the current situation of **Accountability** of Local and National Governments as well as International Organizations including the United Nations and the Bretton Woods Institutions to their respective stakeholders whom these governments and institutions are supposed to serve on the basis of:
  - a) the extent of Participation of various Stakeholders in terms of the frequency and depth of consultative sessions and the access to suggestion boxes in setting the missions, objectives, instrumental policies (regulatory and market-oriented) and implementation mechanisms (internal, commissioning and/or subcontracting) of Local, National and International Action Plans and in the M&E of the Results of Polipros Implemented ?
  - b) the extent of Accommodation of Views and Interests proposed by various Stakeholders in the Plans, Programmes and Projects finally adopted by local and national governments as well as by international organizations ?
  - c) the Results of the Polipros Implemented during the Past Year/Months in terms of achieving the agreed objectives and goals set forth in the respective documents within the financial budgets approved by local councils, national

assemblies and international governing boards ? and

- d) the Feedback of the Evaluation in terms of frequency and substance under rapidly changing socio-economic domestic and international political environments in setting the missions, objectives, goals, instrumental policies and implementation mechanisms for the current Polipros as proposed by local and national governments and international organizations ?
- 3) In the final analysis, Independent and Effective M&E should result in the enhancement of our satisfaction with the Current State and a degree of progress toward the Improved State of Economic (growth and resources efficiency), Social (racial, gender, educational, health and income/wealth equity and anti-corruption and-irregularities), Environmental (ecological and community livelihood), Cultural (local traditions, beliefs and identity) and Political (policy stability and consistency, freedom, openness, representation and rule of law) Governance so far achieved in respective local, national and international communities as well as in individual organizations with which we all are affiliated.(HIRONO. R., 2008)
- 4) To make inter-city/community, inter-provincial and international comparisons in terms of all these economic, social, environmental and cultural governances feasible and meaningful, it is essential that the criteria used in measuring the input, output and outcome of the municipal, provincial and national policies must be identical among these different entities, while allowing some differences among them in accordance with the special features of respective entities. This requires solutions to the most difficult tasks of preparing and making available all those data essential to such comparisons based on the same criteria. Here it becomes essential that the international community assist developing countries in preparing, collecting and collating such data and that national governments assist smaller communities such as villages, cities and counties even in developed countries to do the same, as shown in Japan.(HIRONO, R., 2012; SASAKI, R., 2015)
- 5) In this connection, TAPES in Musashino City presents some evidences and one of such on-site examples of M&E activities.(Hofmeister, Wilhelm et al, eds. 2014) This, however, does not mean that all stakeholders in Musashino Municipality are completely satisfied with the current state of M&E observed in the city. Citizens and NGOs in the city are constantly seeking in collaboration of the Municipal Administration and evaluation professionals to improve the quality of their M&E without end.

3. Conclusions and Policy and Institutional Recommendations for Independent and Effective M&E:

- 1) While many municipal, provincial and national governments have made official statements that all their policies are for the wellbeing of their citizens, there is a large room in the real world for doubts, as shown by many examples of such policies in pursuit of their own political and bureaucratic self-interests even to the extent of their own narrower departmental or sectional self-interests, compromising their officially stated mission and objectives of serving their citizens and communities for enhancing the people's wellbeing.
- 2) More often than not, examples abound in many countries around the world that local and national governments tend to formulate their development policies, programmes and even projects in favour of their political allies and the latter's policy priorities which are often not consistent with that of the general public and let alone the bottom half of the population. This entails those engaged in independent M&E activities not to be satisfied only with the assessment of the productivity and outcomes of given polipros under examination, but with that of their benefits accruing to the general public and especially to the bottom half which should be the ultimate objective of all polipros.
- 3) In order to ensure the fairness, independence and effectiveness of M&E of all polipros, the installation of independent external evaluation machinery is needed outside the concerned departments/ministries. Under the current practices observed especially in developed countries this is being done either by the office of evaluation of the executive branch of the local and national governments and international organizations, or alternatively the accountability office set up by the legislative branch as seen in the U.S. and others. While the evaluation reports, internal and external, in all departments and ministries of the executive branch are open and published and sent to the legislative branch for the latter's closest possible examination, there may be some risk of compromise by the office as being part of the executive branch and overseen by the Cabinet and the Office of the Prime Minister who are concerned with the public opinion on such reports. For this reason and others, the external evaluation of all polipros could be better performed by the legislative branch, rather than the executive branch, let alone by the office of auditor general. b/ (HIRONO, Ryokichi, 2012; UENO, Makiko, 2015,.c/)
- 4) The selection of external evaluators is another sensitive issue to ensure fair, independent and effective M&E. The current practice of external evaluator

selection process must be reviewed and, if necessary, overhauled. Under the current practice as seen in many countries where such external evaluation system operates, the concerned departments/ministries of the government and international organizations nominate and appoint all those external evaluators. A new and alternative practice could be installed whereby the local, national and international associations of professional evaluators are authorized to recommend, if not appoint, such external evaluators to the boards. This way, the criticism often hauled at the external evaluation committee at the local, national and international levels could be partially dealt with. (TANAKA, H., 2015)

- 5) The newly proposed practice of external evaluator selection has not been installed in any country, although adopted by some international organizations. It entails local, national and international associations of professional evaluators to install both comprehensive data on all their members in terms of the record of their professional evaluation career and experiences and all the evaluation done on them by those who engaged them in the past and the selection procedure transparent to all their respective members and others concerned with fair, independent and effective evaluation so that they can ensure the fairness and credibility of their selection process within such organizations.
- 6) The ultimate shape of Fair, Independent and Effective M&E will be the installation of the Evaluation (Accountability) Organization installed by the legislative branch of the governments at all levels and the policy boards of the international organization. Since the members of the legislative bodies and policy boards are elected respectively by the people and member governments, they would be more serious to ensure that any policy, programme and project evaluation carried out by external evaluation professionals be independent, effective and accountable to those who elected them, while of course needing to have maximum cooperation from the executive branch of governments and international organizations who have access to all those data and information essential to such evaluation. (UENO, H., 2015; HIRONO, R., 2015)
- 7) It is essential, however, to minimizing, if not avoiding, any degree of party politicization of the evaluation exercises by the Evaluation/Accountability Organization, ranging from the selection of the policies, programmes and projects to be evaluated to that of evaluation professionals as well as its timing. Also, it is a must that such evaluation reports by the Evaluation (Accountability) Organization be put under scrutiny by the members of the Parliament and made public for everyone to see. These requirements entail the necessity for parliamentarians and the public to be better educated in policy, programme and

project evaluation. End

---

**Footnotes:**

a/ This is based on my paper presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> JES Annual Convention held on 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2015 at JICA International Center, Okinawa.

b/ It is vital to note that the functions of the Auditor-General of any government are to examine the propriety of expenditures reported in terms of the objectives of the budget approved, whereas those of evaluation are to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the targeted action in terms of the expected output and outcome. Thus, auditing cannot be a substitute of evaluation.

c/ The Institute of Statistical Research, one of the non-profit research organizations in Japan, published a special feature edition as recently as in November 2015, assembling several articles focused on the need, learning from overseas experiences especially in developed countries, for setting up an independent and effective evaluation institution outside the executive branch of national government for budgetary formulation. In my view, this institution could be requested to evaluate the effectiveness and outcome of the polipros and report to the legislative and executive branches as well as to the general public for public review.

**References:**

HIRONO, Ryokichi, ed., 2010, Nihon Hyoka Gakkai Yosan Shingi Kaikaku Kento linkai Hokokusho (JES proposal for the Reform of Budget Formulation), May;

HIRONO, Ryokichi, 2011, Nihon Hyoka Gakkai 2011 Shunki Zenkoku Taikai Yosan to Hyoka ni kansuru Roundtable Togi Hokoku (Report of the Roundtable Discussion on Budgets and Evaluation, at the JES Spring Convention, 11 June;

HIRONO, Ryokichi, 2005, Essentials of Evaluation, paper presented at Joint Thailand-Japan Evaluation Seminar/Workshop, Bangkok, 14 January;

NAIDOO, Indran A., 2013, Address to Japan Evaluation Society, delivered at JICA Headquarters, 10 October;

JES, 2013, Ethical Code for Evaluation Professionals, March;

YAMAYA, Hiroshi, Capacity Building and Empowerment for Evaluation, paper presented at JES 14<sup>th</sup> Spring Convention, Tokyo, 30 May;

HIRONO, Ryokichi, 2008, Governance as the Foundation of Economic Growth, Political Stability, Social Progress and Environmental Security in Developing Countries, paper presented at ASEAN Civil Service Conference, Bukit Tinggi, Indonesia, 27 October;

HIRONO, Ryokichi, “Urban Planning for Sustainable Community Development in Japan: City of Musashino,” in Wilhelm Hofmeister et al, eds., *Eco-Cities: Sharing European and Asian Best Practices and Experiences*, KAS, EPC, and EU Center in Singapore, (ISBN:978-981-09-0136-3), pp.63-90.

HIRONO, Ryokichi, 2012, “Reflections and Moving Forward in Results-Based Policy Review and Budgeting in Japan,” paper presented at MES’ 5<sup>th</sup> International Evaluation Conference, Kuala Lumpur, 12 September;

UENO, Makiko, 2015, “Nihon ni okeru Dokuritsu Zaiseikikan no Hitsuyosei (Need for Installing an Independent Finance Institution in Japan),” *ECO-FORUM*, vol,31, No.1, November 2015, pp.1-6;

TANAKA Hiraki, 2015, *Governance of Local Government’ Implementation of Evaluation Activities*, paper presented at JES 14<sup>th</sup> Spring Convention, Tokyo, 30 May;

UENO, Hiroshi, 2015, *Assessing the Governance of Policy Analysis in Japan and Independent Fiscal Institutions*, paper presented at JES 14<sup>th</sup> Spring Convention, Tokyo, 30 May;

SASAKI, Ryo, *Governance of Evaluation in Nepal: Issues and Prospective*, paper presented at JES 14<sup>th</sup> Spring Convention, Tokyo, 30 May;

HIRONO, Ryokichi, 2015, *Improving Evaluation Schemes for Sustainable Urban Development: From Traditional Input-, Sector- and Economy (ISE)-Oriented to Strategic Outcome-, Process- and Holistic (OPH)-Oriented Approach*, paper presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> Asia Smart City Conference, Yokohama, October;