

英国と日本における都市政策評価手法の比較研究（1）

渋澤 博幸¹⁾, ピーター・ベイティ²⁾

1) 豊橋技術科学大学, 2) リバプール大学

本論では、英国と日本において都市政策のインパクトがどのように評価されてきたのかを検討する。実際に採用されてきた評価システムと手法に焦点を当て国際比較を行う。都市政策の評価を、都市レベルと国家レベルの観点から検討する。英国における都市再生政策の評価手法の事例の特徴を解析し、最近日本において導入されている都市再生政策について若干の提案を行う。英日間の国際比較から、都市政策評価の発展可能性について述べる。

A Comparison of the Urban Policy Evaluation used in Britain and Japan (1)

Hiroyuki Shibusawa¹⁾ and Peter W.J. Batey²⁾

¹⁾ Toyohashi University of Technology ²⁾ University of Liverpool

ABSTRACT

In this study, we examine how the impacts of urban policy are assessed in Britain and Japan. Cross-national comparisons are made by reviewing the evaluation systems and methods that are used in practice. The evaluation of urban policy is examined from two different perspectives: national and local public. Based on the study of urban regeneration evaluation in Britain, we make a number of suggestions for evaluating the recently introduced urban renaissance plan in Japan. We also discuss the potential for the assessment of urban policy evaluation through this cross-national comparison.

1. Introduction

Urban policy plays an important role in improving the quality of life in cities and in supporting the national economy. It must contribute to the sustainability of cities in the future. Various policies had been planned and put into practice in Britain and Japan. Several evaluations had been carried out in the academic and administrative fields. The need for cross-national comparisons in urban policy evaluation has become pressing. Approaches and systems of urban policy and methods of urban planning have been transferred or exchanged among the developed countries. However evaluations of urban policy have not been compared and methods

of evaluation have not been exchanged sufficiently. In this study, we survey the urban policy and the evaluation frameworks used in Britain and Japan. Our focus is on methods and systems to measure the impacts of urban policy. Comparing the experiences in Britain and Japan, we identify the characteristics of the problems associated with urban policy and the methods adopted in Britain and Japan.

In Britain, various urban policies have been adopted since the 1950s under the slogans of reconstruction, revitalization, renewal, redevelopment, regeneration and renaissance (Roberts and Sykes 2000). In the 1950s and 1960s, urban policy focused on the problems of slum clearance and bomb damage dating from the World War II. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, policies were targeted on the social, economic and physical problems of inner cities and city centres. Institutional arrangements evolved from an initial dependence on national and local government to an approach based on collaboration and strategic partnerships (Cullingworth and Nadin 2002, Rydin 2003). Recently, compactness of urban form, the design of the urban environment and integrated public transport systems have been emphasized (DETR 1999).

In Japan, after the World War II, most cities were in a state of ruin and had experienced a rapid decrease in population because of war damage. Japanese government policy was aimed at economic revival and growth. Urbanization had advanced rapidly and the increase in population and the concentration of industry continued until the 1980s. In the 1960s and 1970s, legislation about urban planning and building was enacted in response to the rapid increase in the urban population and the expansion of the urban area in the post war period. The intention was to create a healthier and more culturally rich lifestyle and to revitalize urban activities. The approach was based on zoning and the building of new housing developments in suburban areas. Zoning was aimed at preventing suburban sprawl. However, in the urban areas, the construction of infrastructure such as roads and parks was not able to keep up with rapid increases in population. As a result, the development of urban areas was constrained. In the central areas, office and industrial buildings were supplied, but there was insufficient provision of wooden low-rise housing and the existing old-fashion housing was also not rebuilt. In the 1980s, large development projects were carried out. Some

apartment complexes were development in the suburban areas as part of a new town programme. Population further concentrated into metropolitan areas. The polar concentration of Tokyo and the depopulation of local areas were questioned by central government (Kanekura 1994, Miyamoto 1999).

In the 1990s, Japan experienced the bubble economy, and the collapse of the land market had a negative influence on the urban economy. Land use policy was reviewed giving priority to the public use of land, thus generating public benefits. Currently a number of urban regeneration policies are being put into effect. The aim was to achieve compactness, to revitalize the urban areas, and to achieve international competitiveness of cities (PMJC 2002).

The impacts of urban policy can be viewed from a variety of perspectives. Who evaluates the impacts? How are the impacts measured? What is the definition of the impacts? What criteria are used to measure the impacts? How do the results of evaluation influence urban policy? Several approaches, including qualitative and quantitative methods, have been developed and the desirability and the limitation of particular methods have been discussed (Batey and Breheny 1978, Shefer and Voogd 1990, Lichfield 1996, 1998). Some of the issues have been identified as data problems, the uncertainty associated with measuring impacts, and the difficulty of consensus building. The difficulties were, in most cases, caused by the complexity and variety of cities, although obviously these are aspects that vary from region-to-region and country-to-country.

In this study, we shall examine how the impacts of urban policy are assessed in Britain and Japan and what the findings of such assessments have been. Our assessment is conducted by considering a number of characteristics which include the social, economic and environmental contexts, the variety of cities, the governmental institutional structure, the planning process, and the choice of evaluation techniques. Comparisons are made by reviewing, over time and cross-section, the evaluation methods and systems used in practice. We will show the potential and limitations of the methods and systems to measure the impacts of urban policy and suggest future directions. We shall also discuss the potentialities of the assessment of urban policy evaluation through this cross-national comparison.

In section 2, we describe general evaluation systems and methods for public policy and the classifications. In section 3, the local administrative

reforms and the local policy evaluation are discussed. In section 4, national urban policy and the evaluation framework are compared. Section 5 shows limitations and potentials of urban policy evaluation, and conclusions are drawn in section 6.

2. General Systems and Methods for Public Policy Evaluation

(1) Historical Background

In public policy, evaluations have been developed in three stages (Derlien, 1990). A guidance manual issued by the OECD (1999) briefly describes these stages. In the first stage in the 1960s and 1970s, evaluation was mainly used to assess social problems. It was largely linked to social-liberal governments launching public programmes and policies. Planning and programming processes were introduced to improve the quality of policy-making. This approach was supported by favourable fiscal conditions. Evaluation studies in social science had developed the capacity to support it. Several methods and techniques, such as regression analysis, the Input-Output model, the planning balance sheet, multi-criteria evaluation and cost-benefit analysis, were developed and tested in academic fields (Batey and Breheny 1978, Shefer and Voogd 1990). The focus was on improving the efficiency of programmes or projects. Evaluation was used as a feedback mechanism by public decision makers and contributed to the refinement of plans and policies.

In the second stage, covering the period since the 1980s, evaluation was stimulated by predominantly conservative governments. Given fiscal constraints, it was necessary to control public policies and programmes. Evaluation was thought to be useful in reviewing the justification for policies and for rationalizing resource allocation within the budget. Evaluation teams and Audit Offices were established and were active in developing evaluation systems. In addition to public financial audits, audit systems were introduced into many areas, such as medicine, technology, environment, and education in what have been referred to as the 'Audit Society' in developed countries (Power 1997). Because civil servants lacked the ability to carry out evaluation themselves, consultants played an important role as external evaluators.

In the third stage in the 1990s, governments have been increasingly concerned with the role of evaluation. They introduced more sophisticated

control mechanisms in evaluations to satisfy the need for legitimacy and for the public sector to strengthen the accountability of government. A approach of New Public Management (NPM), which is characterized by a market-oriented approach, customer-based services, performance control and simplification of the hierarchical system, has been incorporated into evaluations in practice. It has influenced the evaluation framework in the public sector and it has also contributed to improving the flexibility of evaluation systems. Recently, the need for an “evaluation of evaluation” was regarded as important. The meta-analysis of evaluation is relatively advanced in the USA and the Netherlands although it is still fairly rare elsewhere (Stufflebeam 1974; Nijkamp and Pepping 1998; OECD 1999).

(2) Evaluations in Public Policy

There is no general agreement on what evaluation is. In general, public policy has a hierarchical structure such as policy, programme, and project¹. OECD (1999) pointed out the common characteristics of programme evaluations. These tend to focus on systematic and analytical assessments, addressing important aspects of a programme and its value, and seek to establish the reliability and usability of findings. The lack of consensus about the concept of evaluation may cause confusion. However, it also provides a fruitful area because in some cases we may need to extend our evaluation framework to reflect the changes in our values and in social systems. OECD (1999) also stated that the principal aims of evaluation may be characterized as improving decision-making, resource allocation and accountability.

In Britain, various guidelines for policy evaluation have been published by central government (HM Treasury 1986, 1988, 1995), and the concepts have been widely used in evaluating public policies. In the European context, the

¹ According to the definitions in the MEANS glossary (1999, 2003), these are defined as: policy is overarching priorities and strategies made up of different elements (interventions, measures, laws, programmes, public statements etc.) and it is not delimited in terms of time schedule or budget; programme is organized set of financial, organizational and human resources mobilized to achieve an objective or set of objectives in a given period and it is delimited in terms of a schedule and a budget; and project is a single, non-divisible operation with a fixed time schedule and a dedicated budget.

European Commission announced guidelines for evaluating the impact of Structural Funds (EC 1995b, 1997, 2001). Basic concepts and an evaluation framework are clearly defined in those guidelines. The MEANS Collection (1995a, 1999a, 2003), a compendium of advice on evaluating Structural Funds, has been developed to make clear various policy priorities and to demonstrate systematic frameworks and methodologies. Many evaluation studies in Britain have been greatly influenced by those frameworks and methodologies, while at the same time, British experience in evaluation has fed through into the guidelines issued by the European Commission.

In Japan, the Government Policy Evaluation Act (GPEA) was approved by the Diet in 2001 and a standard set of guidelines for policy evaluation were announced by the Cabinet Office and the Ministries for Policy Evaluation in 2001 (MPHPT 2001b). The basic framework is composed of three standards of evaluation, i.e. project, performance, and comprehensive evaluations. In Japan, a concerted approach to policy evaluation has only just started.

(3) Evaluation Systems

Evaluation systems can be classified into various types by emphasizing different aspects. In practice, these types of evaluation systems are often combined to accommodate particularly complex situations. In general, the standard types of evaluations, as described in textbooks (Clark 1999, Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey 1999), are based on two concepts, summative and formative evaluation. Summative evaluations are carried out when a programme has been in place for some time in order to study its effectiveness and judge its overall value. These evaluations are typically used to assist in allocating resources or enhancing public accountability. Formative evaluations are usually undertaken during the implementation of the programme to gain further insight and contribute to a learning process. The different emphases or categories are summarized in Table 1. The dimensions reflect the different approaches.

Table 1 Categorization of Evaluation Systems

Category	Explanation
Type	Summative, formative evaluation or a combination of these Thematic, process, impact evaluation or a combination of these
Timing	Ex ante, concurrent/intermediate, monitoring, ex post or a combination of these
Flexibility of framework	Assessment against the objective of the programme or assessment involving also the appropriateness of objectives. Assessment of intended and perhaps of unintended effects.
Judgment or presentation	Judging the success or failure of a programme—even suggesting improvements or alternatives—or presenting the findings and leaving the conclusions to decision-makers.
Evaluator and autonomy	Internal (e.g. self-evaluation) or external assessment or a combination of these (e.g. semi-independent government evaluation units) Self, management consultancies, and academic institutions
Expertise or negotiation	Assessment by evaluation experts applying scientific and technical procedures to secure the objectivity of results, or a partnership where aims and methods are negotiated with stakeholders to maximize the use of findings and secure democratic participation.
Use	Public sector reforms, strategic management, or institutional requirements.
Objective	Improving decision-making, assisting in resource allocation, enhancing accountability, or a combination of these
Analytical issue	Analytical, systematic, reliable, issue-oriented, user-driven
Scope	Project, programme, policy, or a combination of these
Key issue	Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, utility, and sustainability

Sources: Compiled from EC (1997) and OECD (1999)

(4) Evaluation Methods

Here we address major methodological approaches related to evaluation. There are various approaches, tools and techniques that may be used in evaluation and the specific evaluation methodological framework is given by a combination of these categories. Choosing the most appropriate evaluation method is difficult. The evaluation design is an important part of selecting an evaluation strategy. It is worth highlighting the golden rule about evaluation methods, i.e. there are no golden rules (EC 1997). In other words, the choice of methods or techniques should be determined by the needs of the particular problems or situations being evaluated. Table 2 shows the categorization of evaluation methods corresponding different aspects.

Table 2 Categorization of Evaluation Methods

Category	Explanation
Evaluation design	Experimental, quasi-experimental, implicit, and casual
Approach	Experimental, pragmatic, economic, and naturalistic
	Normative and positive
	Meta-evaluation
Data collection	Subjective and objective Qualitative and quantitative Longitudinal and cross-sectional (including geographical)
	Top down and bottom up
	Questionnaires, interviews (expert), case studies, observation, documentary sources
Data analysis	Statistical analysis (statistical inference) and non-statistical analysis
Model	Input-output, micro-economic, macro-economic, ANOVA, SWOT, etc.
Judgment technique	Cost-benefit, cost-effectiveness, multi-criteria, benchmark, baseline

Sources: Compiled from MEANS(2003, 1999), OECD (1999), and Clarke (1999)

The OECD proposes four main approaches to the design of an evaluation framework (OECD 1999). The first of these, the experimental approach, incorporates the positivistic ideas of applying the methodology of the natural sciences or the engineering approaches to public programmes. Pragmatic evaluation focuses above all on the usefulness of the evaluation findings. Evaluation is to be geared to the objectives and working practices of key decision-makers because timeliness and cost are important factors for political feasibility. In quasi-experimental designs, case studies and various descriptive methods are typically used as evaluation tools. Economic evaluation, the third approach, includes some useful tools such as cost-benefit analysis and cost-effectiveness evaluations. Finally, in naturalistic evaluation, the assumption is made that society is socially-constructed and constantly changed by the interaction of individuals, objective answers can act as a facilitator to produce consensus among stakeholders. Therefore, using methods such as participant observation, case studies are applied.

In Britain, reviews of models and techniques of urban planning evaluation have been undertaken by Batey and Breheny (1978), Sager (1981), and Lichfield (1996, 1998). In urban planning, the Planning Balance Sheet (PBS), the Goals Achievement Matrix (GAM) and the land use model were developed and have been applied in practice. The issues and

methods of regional policy evaluation were discussed by Armstrong and Taylor (1993), Taylor (2002), and Vittie and Swales (2003). The standard methods at a national level have been extended by incorporating several regional problems, such as regional employment, interregional migration, interregional trade and disparities. The evaluation of regional policy has been carried out using the inter-regional Input-Output models and the regional econometric models. In Japan, Kohno and Higano (1981) is a useful survey for evaluation in urban and regional planning. A tractable handbook for urban public sector evaluation is that published by MRI (2001).

3. Local Authorities and Policy Evaluation

(1) Local Administrative Reform, Auditing and Evaluation

Reforms of local government have been carried out in Britain since the 1980s and in Japan since the 1990s. In Britain, such reforms have been supported by policies such as Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) and the Private Financial Initiative (PFI), and the establishment of the Audit Commission (AC) (Wilson and Game 2002). The trend of auditing and 'Value-for-Money (VFM)' has been given a new gloss by the Labour government with the concept of 'Best Value'. VFM is a judgment on whether sufficient impact is being achieved for the money spent. It has been adopted as a useful method with which to assess quality in plans and planning decisions. On the other hand, in Japan, the reform of the public sector started in the 1990s. Since the Government Policy Evaluation Act was put into operation in 2002, the introduction of policy evaluation in local government has been proceeding rapidly.

The terms of audit and evaluation are often closely associated. However, audit is not the same as evaluation. Audit is primarily concerned with verifying the legality and regularity of the implementation of policy. Auditing makes a judgment in terms of conformance to general criteria and standards, known and clarified beforehand, applicable to an entire political or professional field and not specific to a public intervention.

Table 3 Local Administrative Reforms, Auditing and Evaluation

	Britain	Japan
Background of Reform	CCT(1980–1997) FMI (Financial Management Initiative, 1982) NEXT STEP (1988) Citizen's Charter (1991) PFI (1992) Audit Commission (1992) Best Value Pilot Projects (1998) Best Value Performance Plan (2000)	Administrative Reform Report (1997) PFI (1999) Municipal Mergers (1999) Decentralization Law (2000) Government Policy Evaluation Act (2002)
Beginning Year	1998 (Modern Local Government in Touch with the People)	1999–
Scope	County, District, Unitary Authority, Borough, GLA	Prefecture, City, Town
Method	Indicator (Best Value), Cost-Benefit	Indicator, Cost-Benefit
Initiative	Central Government	Central Government
Auditing and Evaluation	Central Government, LGA: Local Government Association, I & DeA: Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government, AC: Audit Commission	Local Government Private Consultant

On the other hand, evaluation is necessarily more analytical and examines the effects of policy from the point of view of society. Evaluation makes a judgment on the social value of a public intervention with reference to criteria and explicit standards (e.g. relevance, efficiency). The judgment primarily concerns the needs and the effects. Despite the obvious differences between traditional audit and evaluation, the boundary has begun to blur. The scope of audit has been extended into the evaluation of performance. In Britain, the performance audit has been carried out, known as a value-for-money audit. In Japan, a combined method of audit and evaluation has been carried out depending on the situations of local authorities.

(2) The Best Value Approach in Britain

In Britain, since the enactment of the 1999 Local Government Act, the auditing system which is called as “Best Value” has been introduced into all local authorities. Best Value can itself be regarded as a form of urban policy. It improves the quality of public services and their efficiency by judging the achievement of authorities. The central government vision for public services is described in the Modernizing Government White Paper (the Prime Minister and the Minister for the Cabinet Office 1999). Of the five main themes of

the White Paper, three are particularly relevant to the Best Value policy, viz. a) ensuring that public services are responsive to the needs of citizens, not just the convenience of service providers, b) ensuring that public services are efficient and of a high quality, and c) ensuring that policy making is more joined-up and strategic, forward looking and not reactive to short-term pressures.

Table 4 The Best Value Performance Management Framework

National Focus	Item	Local Focus
General health PIs (Performance Indicators)	Establish authority-wide objectives and performance measures	Local aspirations
Service or cross-service PIs & same national targets	Agree programme of fundamental performance reviews and set out in local performance plan	Prioritize weakest areas- 4-5 year cycle for all services
Service or cross-service PIs	Undertake fundamental performance reviews of selected areas of expenditure	4C (Challenge purpose, Compare performance, Consult community, Compete with others)
Year-on-year improvement	Set and publish performance and efficiency targets in local performance plan	Follow-up action -Report on achievement of targets in local performance plan -Address shortcomings -Deal with failure
Test of robustness for local people and central government	Independent audit/inspection and certification	
Last resort powers to protect public	Areas requiring intervention on referred to Secretary of State	

Source: DETR (1998)

Table 4 shows the basic framework of the Best Value approach as expressed in the 1998 White Paper. It clearly presents the key elements of the Best Value process. In this approach, the relationship between central government and local government is clearly defined and comparisons between local authorities are facilitated.

The Beacon Council Scheme was also introduced by the 1998 White Paper. The aim of the scheme is to identify centres of excellence in local government from which other councils can learn. Central government selects themes for the beacon scheme. Themes are chosen because of their importance in the day-to-day lives of the public and are keys to improving the quality of life in communities. The I & DeA (Improvement and

Development Agency for Local Government) works with the beacon councils to facilitate the sharing of good practice through learning opportunities.

(3) Assessment of Auditing Systems of Local Authorities in Britain

A particular form of assessment has been carried out by the Audit Commission. It is referred to as Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA), a concept announced in the Government's White Paper—*Strong Local Leadership, Quality Public Services* (DTLR 2001a). It is a key approach of the performance framework of local public services and it is expected to contribute to improve the planning process. It also helps to lead to a coordinated and balanced audit and inspection. It is performed by a scoring system (AC 2002a), known as a “balanced scorecard”. The purpose of CPA is to act as a springboard for improvement in local public services and for an improved quality of life.

Table 5 Best Value in Britain and the Evaluation of Local Public Services in Japan

	Britain	Japan
Objective	Establishment of local public services, Improvement of efficiency and quality	Outcome of local services, Improvement of efficiency, Accountability
Criterion	4C's (Challenge, Compare, Consult, Compete)	Depending on local authorities
Initiative	Central government	Local Government
Period	All the plans are reviewed every 4–5 years	Projects and programs are reviewed every 1–2 years
External Evaluation	Citizen, Audit agency	Citizen, External commission
Comparability	BVPI, ACPI, CPA, Beacon Council	None
Intervention	Intervention to failure by central government	None

The score consists of an overall score measuring how well a council is run, and a score is given on a scale from 1 to 4 for each of the core service areas. The core services are education, social services, housing, environment, libraries and leisure, benefits, and use of resources. The score is ranked from 1 (lowest) to 4 (highest). And an overall score based on these scores is expressed on a four point scale: excellent, good, fair, weak and poor. CPA also produces a judgment about a council's ability to improve local services in the future. The score is also expressed from 1 (worst score) to 4 (best score). In 2002 the Single Tier Local Authorities (London Boroughs, Metropolitan Councils and Unitary Authorities)

and County Councils were assessed (see Table 6). The Audit Commission has tried to develop a more strategic approach, which depends on self-assessment by councils and risk assessment by the Audit Commission itself (AC 2002b).

The use of systematic evaluation frameworks such as CPA, BVPI (Best Value Performance Indicator) in comparing the full range of local authorities has advantages and disadvantages. The first merit is the standardization of data collection and indicators. It removes the arbitrary decisions about the choice of indicators. Local authorities could choose and collect intentionally their indicators, if there is no common approach. The second merit is the comparability of local authorities. This makes the difference between local authorities clear. Common indicators would give local authorities an incentive to make an effort to improve their public services. On the other hand, specific indicators reduce the scope of evaluation. Therefore, local authorities pay attention to specific services. The scoring method also results in a middle category of local authorities. They are content with their middle position and are apt to become complacent.

Table 6 Performance of Local Services and Ability to Improve

CPA Category	Number of Councils (%)	Score on Ability to Improve	Number of Councils (%)
Excellent	22 (14.6)	1 (worst score)	13 (8.7)
Good	54 (36.0)	2	48 (32.0)
Fair	39 (26.0)	3	69 (46.0)
Weak	22 (14.6)	4 (best score)	20 (13.3)
Poor	13 (8.6)	Total	150 (100.0)
Total	150 (100.0)		

Source: Audit Commission (2002c)

In a European context, a general audit framework was announced by the EC in 1999 (1999b). The aim is to set out a methodology for the audit of member states management and control of the Structural Funds. To improve comparative information on urban areas, the urban audit framework was also published (European Communities 2000). This provides a self-sustaining and dynamic information tool and the indicators cover five fields: socio-economic aspects, participation in civic life, training and education, environment, and culture and leisure. However there is no direct intervention by the EU even though the indicators provide a feedback function for improvements to be made.

Table 7 Current Status of Evaluation of Local Public Services

	Policy	Program	Project
Prefecture	36.2%	63.8%	95.7%
City	3.8%	13.9%	54.2%
Town	1.2%	2.9%	13.5%
Village	0.0%	1.8%	2.8%

Source: MRI (2002)

(4) Local Public Services and Evaluation in Japan

In the 1960's, concepts for measuring municipal activities were considered by central government in Japan. Some authorities have tried to measure the effects of public policy and but this work never progressed beyond the experimental stage. At the local level, comprehensive indicators were proposed to measure the quality of life. In the 1970s, Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems (PPBS) were introduced by central government, but these were also experimental. Central government also developed social indicators. However these were used merely as statistical data and had no role in policy evaluation. From the 1980s onwards, simple evaluations for local public policy were initiated by pioneers working in local authorities. Those trials focused on the planning process such as Plan-Do-Check-Action (P-D-C-A). Since the 1990s, central government has begun to be more concerned about policy evaluation. In 2001, guidelines for policy evaluation were announced and the Government Policy Evaluation Act (GPEA) was enacted in 2002. Since this act came into force, the evaluation of local public services has been carried out in local authorities.

Table 8 Purposes of Evaluation in Local Authorities in Japan

Purposes	Policy	Program	Project
Efficiency	33.3% (5)	40.0% (22)	85.6% (184)
Activities and outcomes	66.7% (10)	85.5% (47)	81.9% (176)
Planning cycle (P-D-C-A)	60.0% (9)	50.9% (28)	48.4% (104)
Allocation of resources	60.0% (9)	54.5% (30)	52.6% (113)
Communications with citizens	86.7% (13)	63.6% (35)	51.6% (111)

Note: Values in brackets represent the number of cities.

Source: MRI (2002)

(5) Current Status of Evaluation of Local Public Services in Japan

Since the GPEA, many local authorities have begun to introduce evaluation for local public services. Table 7 shows the status of evaluation for public services in 2002. At the prefecture level, most authorities have introduced project evaluation. The type of evaluation is generally known as performance achievement. As far as programme evaluation is concerned, some 63.8% of prefectures have committed themselves. Policy evaluation has been introduced by 36.2% of prefectures. At the urban level, the proportion of local authorities that have introduced evaluation is smaller. Policy evaluation is carried out by only 3.8% of cities. According to the MPHPT (2001a) report, 12 prefectures and 15 cities or wards have introduced an evaluation framework into all the three tiers: policy, programme, and project.

Evaluations are performed for particular purposes. According to the survey by MRI (2002), in project and programme evaluations, many authorities are hoping to increase efficiency and to improve the quality of administrative activities and outcomes (see Table 8). At the policy level, the improvement of communications with citizens is the most important purpose.

In Japan, the evaluation of local public services has just started and has therefore only a short history. At this early stage, how do local authority staffs assess the success of their evaluation systems? MRI (2002) investigates the achievement of the introduction of evaluation systems (Table 9). Up till now, the positive effects have yet to be seen. There are a lot of answers of the kind: "the effect has not been understood yet". The effects are particularly insignificant at the policy level. The evaluation can be expected to have a bigger impact in the near future.

Table 9 Effects of the Introduction of Evaluation Systems by Local Authorities

Effects (Improved)	Policy (%)			Programme (%)			Project (%)		
	Enhanced	No effect	No response	Enhanced	No effect	No response	Enhanced	No effect	No response
Efficiency	0.0	80.0	20.0	18.1	77.3	4.6	28.2	71.3	0.5
Activities and outcomes	10.0	80.0	10.0	14.9	78.7	6.4	17.6	81.2	1.2
Planning cycle (P-D-C-A)	11.1	77.8	11.1	25.0	64.3	10.7	18.3	79.8	1.9
Allocation of resources	11.1	77.8	11.1	20.0	73.3	6.7	21.2	77.9	0.9
Communications with citizens	0.0	92.3	7.7	17.1	77.2	5.7	11.7	85.6	2.7

Source: MRI (2002)

(6) The Evaluation of Urban Public Policy in Japan

In Japan, the local comprehensive plan generally consists of three tiers, policy, programme, and project. For each tier, several evaluations are implemented. The process of introduction has two streams, sequential and simultaneous. Many cities adopt the sequential introduction of evaluation, from project to policy. Several cities are trying to introduce an evaluation framework for all three tiers at the same time. In the 1990s, performance achievement was focused solely on administrative activities at the project tier. Recently an evaluation framework linking the local comprehensive plan and the three tier evaluations has been developed (MRI 2001).

In order to examine policy evaluations used in local authorities in Japan, eleven case studies are compared (see Table 10). The data have been obtained from the web site for each city. In general, the objectives of evaluation are classified into three categories: outcomes, efficiency, and accountability. Almost all local authorities emphasize the outcomes of public services rather than the outputs². Both Ichikawa and Soka cities suggest that problem-solving is an important purpose for evaluation.

In local authorities, the ex post evaluation and monitoring at programme and project levels are general ones. If a programme is new or is on a large-scale, then an ex ante evaluation is performed. At the project level, ex ante evaluation is rare (Ichikawa, Zushi). A comprehensive evaluation framework which contains evaluations at three tiers is developed. Setting common criteria among the various tiers, different evaluations at each layer are comprehensively assessed (Kyoto, Matsudo, and Zushi).

The main techniques used by local authorities are indicators, surveys and questionnaires. The indicator approach is used to measure the outcomes of public services. Various indicators are developed in each authority and these are used to check the level of achievement of urban policies and programmes. The definition of indicators is different for each authority. Since each city has a different background, it is helpful to choose different indicators. In Japan, there is no agency to control or inspect various

² Outputs mean that the goods and services directly produced by an intervention of local authorities. Outcomes represent that the long-term impact, expressed in terms of broad socio-economic consequences.

indicators. In administrative activities, the efficiency is measured by an evaluation checklist table. In this table, items such as cost, purpose, and outcome of activity are checked. If the cost is regarded as particularly important, then cost-benefit (effectiveness) analysis is adopted. And if it is a large-scale project, then the social impact is also measured.

Table 10 Evaluations of Urban Public Policy in Japan

City	Kyoto	Kawasaki	Suginami	Matsudo	Ichikawa
Population:1000	1,462	1,284	513	475	461
Beginning Year	2003	1999	1999	1999	1999
Tier	Policy Programme	Programme	Policy Programme Project	Policy Programme Project	Project
Objective	Efficiency Accountability	Outcome Accountability	Outcome Efficiency Accountability	Outcome Accountability	Accountability Outcome Problem-Solving
Technique	Indicator Questionnaire	Indicator, Cost-Benefit	Indicator Questionnaire	Indicator	Project Evaluation Table
Scope of Evaluation	26 Policies, 106 Programmes, 2000 Projects (2003)	3 Programmes (2001)	975 Projects (2002)		30 Projects (2002)
External	Committee		Committee	Committee	
Timing	Ex post, Monitoring	Ex ante, Ex post, Monitoring	Ex post, Monitoring	Ex ante, Ex post, Monitoring	Ex post, Monitoring
Focus	Social, Economic Environmental		Social, Economic, Environmental	Social, Economic, Environmental	
Characteristic	Total Evaluation		Total Evaluation, Check List	Hierarchical system:6 level, Object oriented	3 criteria (Validity, Effectiveness, Efficiency)
Web Site	www.city.kyoto.jp	www.city.kawasaki.jp	www.city.suginami.tokyo.jp	www.intership.ne.jp	www.city.ichikawa.chiba.jp

A Comparison of the Urban Policy Evaluation used in Britain and Japan (1)

Yokosuka	Toyonaka	Fukushima	Soka	Cyofu	Zushi
436	391	291	233	203	58
2001	2000	1999	1999	2000	2002
Policy Programme Project	Programme	Programme	Project	Project	Policy Programme Project
Outcome Efficiency Accountability	Efficiency	Efficiency	Outcome Accountability Problem-Solving	Outcome Efficiency Accountability	Accountability Outcome
Indicator Questionnaire	Cost-Benefit	Cost-Benefit	Project Evaluation Table	Indicator	Indicator, Project Evaluation Table
230 Projects (2001)	1 Programme (2000)	2 Programmes (2003)	456 Projects (2002)	Primary: 258 Second: 9 Projects (2003)	42 Programmes, 350 Projects (2001)
Committee	Committee	Committee			
Ex post, Monitoring	Ex post, Monitoring	Ex post, Monitoring	Ex post, Monitoring	Ex post, Monitoring	Ex ante, Ex post, Monitoring
Social, Economic, Environmental	Economic, Environmental	Economic		Social, Economic	
Total evaluation, Citizen based system, IT			3 criteria (validity, effectiveness, efficiency)	2 stage evaluation, 6 criteria	Ex ante (large-scale, new), Citizen evaluator
www.city.yokosuka.kanagawa.jp	www.city.toyonaka.osaka.jp	www.city.fukushima.fukushima.jp	www.city.soka.saitama.jp	www.city.chofu.tokyo.jp	www.city.zushi.kanagawa.jp

The evaluation work is carried out by local authorities and private consultants. The evaluators are often managers of each section in the local authorities. In many cases at project level, evaluation is carried out by an evaluation team employed by a local authority. The reliability and quality of the internal evaluation is reassessed by external committee which is composed of experts in the field.