

Target Management-based Policy Evaluation Implementation Guidelines

December 20, 2013

Approved at the Interministerial Liaison Meeting on Policy Evaluation

These Guidelines clarify the basic logic behind the implementation of target management-based policy evaluations* as well as the steps to be taken when implementing said evaluations, and provide standard guidance for related initiatives in by Administrative Organs.

On the basis of the progress in efforts made by individual Administrative Organs, these guidelines shall be reviewed as necessary in order to improve and enhance target management-based policy evaluations.

- * The term “target management-based policy evaluation” is applied to so-called “program”-level post-adoption evaluations of evaluations related to “policies to be subjected to Ex-post Evaluation” that are stipulated in Article 6 paragraph 2 item 6 of the Government Policy Evaluations Act (Law No. 86 of 2001) that include policy evaluations that use the performance evaluation method established in the separate Basic Guidelines for Implementing Policy Evaluation (cabinet decision of December 16, 2005, hereinafter referred to as the “Basic Guidelines”) as well as evaluations of the level of achievement of targets that were set in advance.

1. Basic logic behind implementation

In the interest of improving the convenience of policy infrastructure, target management-based policy evaluations shall be carried out utilizing a standard method for indicating level of target achievement that is shared by all Administrative Organs after clarification of the policy structure, which is comprised of the policy’s objective, targets, means of achievement, etc. At the same time, efforts shall be made to promote initiatives for implementing in-depth evaluations from the standpoint of making a greater contribution to policy reviews and to achieve higher efficiency in evaluation work.

2. Preparation of pre-implementation analysis tables

(1) Importance

Setting appropriate targets is an important part of target management-based policy evaluation. On that basis, if pre-existing assumptions regarding how the purpose, targets (indicators), and means for achieving targets will contribute to the realization of targets, etc., are not clearly established beforehand, it becomes difficult to verify those assumptions at a later date and to reflect evaluation results on policy improvements. Conversely, clear establishment of assumptions beforehand makes it possible to simplify and streamline later evaluations to verify

those assumptions.

For program-level policies that are targeted for evaluation, arranging and publicizing necessary costs (budget and settlement information) as well as the aforementioned pre-existing assumptions in a form that is easily comprehensible and focused on important information and then verifying them based on subsequent performance is thought to be effective in further clarifying the policy structure of Administrative Organs, promoting external verification, and reinforcing management by the heads of Administrative Organs.

Regarding the clarification of such pre-existing assumptions, given the importance of making those assumptions easily useable and comprehensible and, in addition, to ensure uniformity and consistency among Administrative Organs so as to fully fulfill the obligation for accountability to the public, Administrative Organs shall prepare a yearly pre-implementation analysis table based on Attached Form 1 for each program that will be evaluated.

In the event that the characteristics of a program to be evaluated, budget composition, or other factors require correction to the aforementioned form, such as in the cases provided below, the corrected form shall be prepared with attention paid to uniformity and consistency by incorporating the elements of the aforementioned form.

- When including an item name that differs from the item names established in the aforementioned form is appropriate in order to maintain consistency with a previous evaluation or utilize a previous evaluation's results.
- When adding an additional space for entry of information that is outside the items noted in the aforementioned form in order to facilitate understanding of noted content (However, when the volume of information requiring entry could significantly upset uniformity and consistency, appropriate efforts shall be made to alleviate this situation by, for example, entering the information on a separate sheet.)
- When employing a structure corresponding to the arrangement of the Administrative Organ's policy structure is appropriate in order to clarify the priority of the program in question, etc.

(2) Programs requiring the preparation of a pre-implementation analysis table

Pre-implementation analysis tables must be prepared for all programs that will be the focus of a target management-based policy evaluation.

(3) Other matters

Prepared pre-implementation analysis tables shall be publicized and sent to the Administrative Evaluation Bureau of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications.

3. Ensuring the uniformity and consistency of evaluation reports and using evaluation reports

(1) Ensuring uniformity and consistency

Likewise, for evaluation reports for target management-based policy evaluation (hereinafter "evaluation reports," given the importance of making those reports easily useable and comprehensible and, in addition, to ensure uniformity and consistency among Administrative Organs so as to fully fulfill the obligation for accountability to the public, Administrative Organs shall prepare an evaluation report based on Attached Form 2 for each program that will

be evaluated. At this time, the level of target achievement of each program shall be indicated by applying a five-step system of shared classifications—specifically, “the targets were exceeded,” “the targets were achieved,” “there was considerable progress toward achievement,” “there was a lack of noteworthy progress toward achievement,” and “no progress was made toward achievement.”

In the event that the characteristics of a program to be evaluated, budget composition, or other factors require correction to the aforementioned form, such as in the cases provided below, the corrected form shall be prepared with attention paid to uniformity and consistency by incorporating the elements of the aforementioned form.

- When including an item name that differs from the item names established in the aforementioned form is appropriate in order to maintain consistency with a previous evaluation or utilize a previous evaluation’s results with reference to classifications that were based on an analysis of measurement results, etc.
- When adding an additional space for entry of information that is outside the items noted in the aforementioned form in order to facilitate understanding of noted content (However, when the volume of information requiring entry could significantly upset uniformity and consistency, appropriate efforts shall be made to alleviate this situation by, for example, entering the information on a separate sheet.)
- When employing a structure corresponding to the arrangement of the Administrative Organ’s policy structure is appropriate in order to clarify the priority of the program in question, etc.

(2) Other matters

As a rule, evaluation reports shall be prepared and publicized and sent to the Administrative Evaluation Bureau of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications at the end of August.

At that time, external opinions and requests concerning the evaluation report in question shall be received at the contact point mentioned in I-9-(2) of the Basic Guidelines, and the opinions and requests thus received shall be appropriately processed or utilized by relevant departments, bureaus, etc.

In addition, evaluation reports shall be actively utilized to aid the improvement and review of the program in question.

4. Promotion of in-depth evaluations that aid policy reviews

From the standpoint of making a greater contribution to policy reviews, Administrative Organs shall implement overall evaluations that take a deeper look at the following points. By using a well-modulated approach whereby evaluations are conducted in a cyclical manner that takes into consideration workload, urgency, etc., in cases where an evaluation is implemented each year (to take place at least once during the basic plan period) and, on the other hand, measurements (monitoring) of actual yearly performance vis-à-vis targets that were set in advance are conducted in cases where an evaluation is not scheduled for that fiscal year, Administrative Organs shall make efforts to improve the efficiency of evaluation work.

- Analysis of unanticipated external factors and elements such as costs that were not mentioned in the target
- Verification of whether or not the means of achievements that were mentioned in the pre-implementation analysis table are contributing effectively and efficiently to the targets in question
- The validity of established targets, implementation of necessary reviews of those targets, and consideration of new targets
- Activities that should be used in subsequent program planning and implementation, such as analysis of causes for not achieving targets and identification of effective initiatives and solutions for achieving targets, etc.

When conducting monitoring for fiscal years in which the aforementioned overall evaluation is not scheduled, Administrative Organs shall in principle enter monitoring information into a pre-implementation analysis table (Attached Form 1).

When the need to conduct an overall evaluation becomes recognized based on the results of monitoring, the Administrative Organ shall implement the overall evaluation in the relevant fiscal year.

5. Maintaining linkage between policy evaluation and the Review of Government Programs

(1) Mutual application of policy evaluation and the Review of Government Programs

Administrative Organs shall ascertain circumstances concerning their programs and the projects that comprise those programs in an integrated manner, and shall engage in mutual application of information with the Review of Government Programs through the actions mentioned in 5 (2) and (3) when implementing target management-based policy evaluations so as to contribute to the review and prioritization of policy and to the reduction and efficient use of budgetary outlays.

(2) Maintenance of correspondence between programs and projects

Administrative Organs shall clarify the corresponding relationship with relevant projects in the Review of Government Programs that pertain to their programs and the projects that comprise their programs in the “Means of achievement” space of the pre-implementation analysis table.

(3) Collaboration among relevant departments and bureaus in the implementation process

When implementing target management-based policy evaluations and the Review of Government Programs, Administrative Organs shall ensure collaboration between the organizational unit in charge of policy evaluation and the department, bureau, etc., that compiled the Review of Government Programs based on the fact that initiatives to ensure linkage with policy evaluation are recommended in the “Instructions for Implementation of Reviews of Government Programs.”

Reference: Instructions for Implementation of Reviews of Government Programs 10 (3):

Linkage with policy evaluation

- ② For this reason, it is recommended that Government Ministries promote the following

initiatives:

- a) Integrated promotion of reviews and policy evaluations by combined teams
- b) Joint organization of meetings of external review experts and similar meetings comprised of external policy evaluation experts

6. Implementation period and transitional measures

These Guidelines shall apply to policy evaluations conducted in and after FY2014.

Regarding pre-implementation tables for programs to be implemented in FY2014, the use of previous formats shall be permitted in cases when special circumstances, such as the existence of a previously prepared table, apply.

Standard form of evaluation for program implemented in FY XXXX

(Ministry of xx - (i))

Program name						
Program outline						
Target to be achieved						
Program budget / execution amount	Category	FY XXXX	FY XXXX	FY XXXX	FY XXXX	
	Budget (million yen)	Initial budget (a)				/
		Supplementary budget (b)				
		Amount carried forward (c)			(*Optional)	
		Total (a+b+c)			(*Optional)	
Execution amount (JPY millions)			(*Optional)			
Priority Cabinet policy related to the program (main item in Prime Minister's speech, etc.)						

Measurement indicator	Indicator A	Base value	Actual value					Target value	Achievement
		FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	
	Target value of each FY								
	Indicator B	Base	Progress of program (actual)					Target	Achievement
		FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	FY xx	
	Target value of each FY								
	Indicator C		Progress of program (actual)					Target	Achievement
								FY xx	

Evaluation result	Measurement of target achievement	(Category of measurement)
		(Reasons for judgment)
	Program analysis	
	Feedback to subsequent target	<p>【Program】</p> <p>【Measurement Indicator】</p>

Use of findings of persons with relevant knowledge and experience	
---	--

Materials and other information utilized in the process of policy evaluation	
---	--

Bureau, department in charge	Responsible person (*optional)	Period for policy evaluation
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

Preliminary analysis report for program implemented in FY XXXX

(Sample)

(Ministry of XXX 14-(i))

Program name											Bureau, department in charge		Responsible person (* optional)		
Program outline											Position in the policy structure				
Target to be achieved											Logic and basis for setting target			Scheduled period for policy evaluation	
Measurement indicator	Base value		Target value		Target value of each FY						Reasons for selecting the measurement indicator and setting of the target value (levels, target FY)				
	Base FY		Target FY		Actual value of each FY										
					FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018				
1															
2															
Measurement Indicator	Base		Target		Progress of program (Target)						Reasons for selecting the measurement indicator and setting of the target (levels, target FY)				
	Base FY		Target FY		Progress of program (Actual)										
					FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018				
3															
Measurement indicator	Target		Target FY		Reasons for Selection of the Monitoring Indicator and Setting of the Target (Level, target FY)										
4															
Means of achievement (Starting FY)	Budget total			Initial budget	Related Indicator	Outline of means of achievement, etc.	Project No. for administrative project review in FY 2013								
	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014											
(1)															
(2)															
(3)															
(4)															
Program budget total					Priority Cabinet policy related to the program (main item in Prime Minister's speech, etc.)										