

Administrative Evaluation

Sumida City



Background

- ♦ Implemented through evaluation sheets in the review of administrative services in 1995
- ♦ Administrative evaluation system introduced on a trial basis in 2007 and for full-scale implementation in 2008
- ♦ External evaluation by Administrative Evaluation Committee of Ward Residents implemented in 2010
- ♦ Carried out in the form of an external evaluation committee in 2010
- ♦ All evaluation sheets of administrative services published in 2016 on the official city website

Purpose of project

Measures under the basic plan of the city and administrative services are evaluated objectively to review to what extent goals have been achieved in order to contribute to effective and efficient city administration, by making use of the outcome of the evaluation the following year, such as in reviewing services. In addition, the publication of the evaluation outcomes allows the sharing of information on the goals of each measure and administrative services, as well as the nature and results, and to encourage the residents to participate in city administration.

Outline of project

- a. Table of measures and administrative services
- b. Evaluation of administrative services
 - With an eye toward the introduction of the new public accounting system, administrative services (details) in the annual expenditure budget request of the financial accounting system will be set as a unit of administrative service related to evaluation.
 - Services that have been implemented for three years or more are to be evaluated at an appropriate time during the performance of the services.
 - Evaluators are the managers (primary) and directors (secondary) of divisions in charge
- c. Implementation of subsidised project evaluation
- d. Evaluation of policy measures
 - The benefit to the public (necessity) and priority of administrative services related to policy measures are ranked.
 - Each responsible director conducts the primary evaluation, and final evaluation of all measures is made at the management meetings.
- e. Administrative evaluation by ward residents

Progress and Achievements

(1) Table of measures and administrative services (Form 1: Appendix 1)

The table is designed to rank the outcomes of each administrative service in relation to the achievement of the goals of the measures and to make clear whether each administrative service has contributed to the achievement of the policy goals in an effective and efficient manner.

This table is intended to be used for administrative evaluation, as well as for the review of administrative services and deliberation of studies on policy concerns.

(2) Evaluation sheet for administrative services (Form 2: Appendix 2)

The sheet is designed to clarify the nature, expenses and outcomes of each administrative service, and the responsible manager (primary) and director (secondary) evaluate whether the administrative services are performed in an effective and efficient manner.

Services subject to the evaluation are determined based on the unit of services (details) in the annual expenditure budget request of the financial accounting system and as a general rule include all services performed during fiscal 2016 (including those completed in 2016), excluding the following:

- a. Services that involve revenue of the same amount (including reserved fund or projects wholly funded by national subsidy)
- b. Services to which no discretionary review applies for the purpose of administrative enforcement (including capital system and obligatory expenses such as government bonds)
- c. General administrative expenses

(3) Evaluation sheet for projects subject to subsidies (Form 3: Appendix 3)

Projects subject to subsidies that are included in administrative services, after clarifying the nature, the expenses and outcomes, and their needs and effects, are examined and evaluated based on the standards on granting and reviewing subsidies, with the aim of the effective and efficient use of subsidies.

(4) Evaluation sheet for policy measures (Form 4: Appendix 4)

Based on the evaluation of each administrative service related to policy measures, to what extent the goals of the measures have been achieved is evaluated to inform decisions on which measures should be implemented in the following fiscal year.

In the primary evaluation by the responsible director, the public benefit (necessity) and priority of administrative services related to the measures are graded, and the final evaluation is made at management meetings.

(5) Administrative Evaluation Committee of Ward Residents

Internal evaluation of administrative services and measures are evaluated externally from the perspective of citizens in an objective manner. This enables us to share information with citizens and for them to participate in city administration, while also improving the objectivity of and confidence in the evaluation.

Effects of project

Policy measuring strategies are presented throughout each department as a compass for reform and improvements in each

department, and staff then reform the services, make new proposals, and compile budgets based on the strategies.

After the presentation of these strategies to the Mayor, the strategies are also used as a policy for budget compilation of all staff as a basic policy of ward administration.

Problems and responses

Challenge (1): As we have been addressing the issue over 20 years, there has been complacency with evaluations resembling those of the previous year.

Response (1): The system of administrative evaluation itself is subject to annual evaluation, and the evaluation and the system are to be reintroduced using new perspectives. We have improved the system so far through methods such as the introduction of external evaluation, the responsible director's evaluation of measures and final evaluation in management meetings, the incorporation of the evaluation into the policies of the following year's budget compilation, and the link between the outcome of administrative services and measures through the table of measures and administrative services. We must continually make improvements.

Challenge (2): Office-wide system operation has not been fully implemented. Not all staff are immersed in the mind set of administrative evaluation.

Response (2): An administrative evaluation navigator is assigned to each department as an evaluation leader in order to disseminate and raise awareness of these efforts. Our aim is for each organisation to use the administrative evaluation system under the leadership of managers and directors.

Outlook

The nationwide introduction of the new public accounting system will permit us to compare our financial statements with those of other local governments, as well as clarify service costs covering full expenses such as depreciation and allowance for retirement benefits. It is anticipated that this will bring further accurate standards for evaluation and competition among local governments, as well as improve awareness among staff.

Reference URL

—

Contact

Department in charge:

Policy Planning Department Division,
responsible for the promotion of
administrative reforms

Tel: +81-3-5608-6230 (direct)

Email: GYOUKAKU@city.sumida.lg.jp