

## Scorecard: Output reporting and accessibility

JICA

**2.14** / 4

### 3.4 / 4 – Output accessibility

- Is project-level data centralized and accessible?

### 0.0 / 4 – Ease of extraction

- Are project-level reports standardized and available in open formats?

### 3.5 / 4 – Output reporting clarity

- How frequently and consistently are outputs reported?

### 1.6 / 4 – Output Dataset Transparency

- Are tabular and/ or spatial datasets gathered and available?

### 2.2 / 4 – Output Reporting System

- Are there project-level reporting policies in place?

\* Scores based on one-country sample (Ghana)

## Comparison with other scored organizations

<i>First round of scores complete</i>	
<i>World Bank</i>	<i>3.36</i>
<i>PEPFAR</i>	<i>3.32</i>
<i>DFID</i>	<i>3.26</i>
<i>MCC</i>	<i>2.62</i>
<i>USAID</i>	<i>2.6</i>
<i>DFATD</i>	<i>2.4</i>
<i>Global Fund</i>	<i>2.3</i>
<i>UNDP</i>	<i>2.28</i>
<i>WFP</i>	<i>2.22</i>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>2.16</i>
<b>JICA</b>	<b>2.14</b>
<i>AfDB</i>	<i>2.04</i>
<i>DANIDA</i>	<i>2.02</i>
<i>UNICEF</i>	<i>1.92</i>
<i>WHO</i>	<i>1.42</i>
<i>FAO</i>	<i>0.94</i>

## Next steps/ suggested improvements:

1. Create standardized monitoring templates and encourage all project teams to use these templates in their project reporting to encourage standardization across the organization. A good start to creating this template would be the

- dataset-style [Project Design Matrix \(PDM\)](#), of which certain project already make use.
2. Create and publish an access to information policy that lays out expectations about which data JICA must release publicly, how they must do so, and by when.
    - a. Such a policy will increase organization-wide accountability and transparency as laid out in the [Evaluation Guide](#)
  3. Continue to include detailed geospatial information in project documentation and consider ways to summarize and visualize the geographic information currently routinely reported by project teams
  4. Upload documentation in open formats (e.g. .txt, .docx, .csv)

#### Subcomponent breakdown and justifications:

Category	Component	Score	Discussion
Monitoring Data Accessibility	Site Stability	4	At no point through multiple visits to the site over the course of 4 months, did the team experience interruptions to use.
	Site Navigability	2	JICA's splitting of information and documentation across its individual country pages ( <a href="http://www.jica.go.jp/ghana/english/activities/ghana.html">http://www.jica.go.jp/ghana/english/activities/ghana.html</a> ), its Evaluations database ( <a href="http://www2.jica.go.jp/en/evaluation/index.php">http://www2.jica.go.jp/en/evaluation/index.php</a> ), and its report portal ( <a href="http://open_jicareport.jica.go.jp/">http://open_jicareport.jica.go.jp/</a> ) makes it difficult for users to find the information they need in an efficient and comprehensive manner. JICA fails to provide a link to this important portal on its main site. Further, this report portal lacks search, sort, or filter functionality, forcing users to manually go through each subpage to find project documentation.
	Central Portal or Site	4	A list of all projects and information about these projects can be found on each individual country page ( <a href="http://www.jica.go.jp/ghana/english/activities/ghana.html">http://www.jica.go.jp/ghana/english/activities/ghana.html</a> ). Further documentation can be found on the JICA report portal ( <a href="http://open_jicareport.jica.go.jp/">http://open_jicareport.jica.go.jp/</a> ), and ex-post evaluations can be searched in the Evaluations database ( <a href="http://www2.jica.go.jp/en/evaluation/index.php">http://www2.jica.go.jp/en/evaluation/index.php</a> )
Ease of Automatic Monitoring Data Extraction	Use of Open Formats	0	All projects in our sample offer documentation exclusively in .pdf format.
	Distribution of Monitoring Template to Project Teams	0	Some JICA projects make use of a standardized Project Design Matrix (PDM), but this document plots out intended goals, outputs, inputs, and activities, rather than serving as a resource for the monitoring and reporting of results data. No monitoring-specific templates were found.
	Use of Standardized Monitoring Template	0	Some JICA projects make use of a standardized Project Design Matrix (PDM), but this document plots out intended goals, outputs, inputs, and activities, rather than serving as a resource for the monitoring and reporting of results data. No monitoring-specific templates were found.
Monitoring and Reporting Clarity	Legibility of Results Documentation	4	All documents are available on websites or in .pdf format; no scanned forms exist
	Completeness of Monitoring Reporting	3	No monitoring data found for 2/13 (15%) of the projects in our sample.

	Internal Consistency with Results Terminology	4	JICA's language throughout project documentation is consistent with the language found in its Evaluation Methods guide ( <a href="http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/pdf/guideline02-01.pdf">http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/pdf/guideline02-01.pdf</a> )
	Precision of Monitoring Reporting	3	Though JICA's monitoring data are often precise, JICA sometimes uses imprecise or unquantified language, such as, "PPAG field officers trained more than 326 in-school peer educators and more than 172 out-of-school peer educators as conveyers of messages for awareness creation."
Monitoring Dataset Transparency	Availability of Monitoring Datasets	0	None of the JICA guidelines or policies lay out specific expectations for the tracking and reporting of monitoring data. Further, we found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Datasets	0	We found no monitoring datasets for any projects in our sample.
	Availability of Monitoring Spatial Data	4	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 11/11 (100%) geographically disaggregate results. This accounts for 11/13 (85%) of total projects in our sample. Of these 11, 6 (55%) disaggregate at the regional level, and 4 (45%) at the city level.
	Accessibility of Monitoring Spatial Data	4	Of the projects in our sample that have monitoring data, 11/11 (100%) geographically disaggregate results. This accounts for 11/13 (85%) of total projects in our sample. Of these 11, 6 (55%) disaggregate at the regional level, and 4 (45%) at the city level.
Monitoring and Reporting System	Standardized Terminology	4	JICA outlines its results terminology in its Evaluation Methods guide ( <a href="http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/pdf/guideline02-01.pdf">http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/pdf/guideline02-01.pdf</a> )
	Monitoring and Reporting Policy or Framework	2	JICA provides project managers with a "Guideline for Project Evaluation" document ( <a href="http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/guideline.html">http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/guides/guideline.html</a> ), which contains a section on monitoring for mid-term evaluations. Unfortunately, this section notes that, "The methods for monitoring and evaluation will be developed by the monitoring and evaluation taskforce due to be established in the project," and therefore answers few questions about the who, how, and when of monitoring and reporting.
	Free Public Access to Monitoring Information Policy	0	We could not locate any JICA guide or policy that calls for public access to monitoring data.