

FY 2013 Japan Fair Trade Commission Performance Evaluation Report (Standard Format)

(The Japan Fair Trade Commission 25-(6))

Name of the Activity	Public relations and public hearings on competition policy, etc. Public relations and public hearings on competition policy						
Outline of Activity	Seeking to promote public understanding of competition policy by engaging in activities to distribute information about the Antimonopoly Act, etc. and the JFTC's activities using press releases, the JFTC website, and other means, and by engaging in information gathering activities to understand the opinions and requests of a broad cross-section of the public through communication with diverse groups of people.						
Goal	Seeking to enhance public understanding of competition policy and seeking to promote competition policy effectively and appropriately in the future by providing the public with a broad range of information on the details of the Antimonopoly Act, etc. and the JFTC's activities, and gathering opinions and requests from the general public through close communication (holding more than 83 meetings with local experts, holding the JFTC for One Day more than 8 times, and holding more than 41 consumer seminars, and more than 76 Antimonopoly Act workshops). (FY 2012)						
Budget-Related Activity	Breakdown of Budget		FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Amount requested for FY2014
	Amount Allocated (thousand yen)	Budget Supplemented (a)	24,752	29,931	29,320	25,930	25,521
		Budget Carried (b)	0	0	0	0	0
		Total (a + b)	24,752	29,931	29,320	25,930	25,521
	Executed amount (thousand yen) (c)		19,997	25,041	22,130		
Important Cabinet Policy Related to the Activity (Main Administrative Policy Speeches, etc.)	Name of the administrative policy speech, etc.			Date		Relevant part (excerpt)	

Evaluation Index	Meeting with local experts (No. of times) [See Note 1]	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		Commissioners, etc.	8	9	9	10
		Directors of local offices, etc.	74	79	75	73
		Total	82	88	84	82
	Target Figures for Each Fiscal Year		97	91	91	85
	Advisory panel meetings on antimonopoly policy (No. of times)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		2	4	2	4	2
	The JFTC for One Day (No. of times)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		1	1	4	8	8
	Target Figures for Each Fiscal Year		—	—	3	8
	Average rating of JFTC for One Day events by attendees [See Note 2]	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	—	—	86	79
	Consumer seminars(No. of times)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	—	38	39	50
	Target Figures for Each Fiscal Year		—	—	25	41
	Participant degree of understanding of consumer seminars as a percentage [See Note 3]	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	—	85	88	83
	Participant degree of satisfaction with consumer seminars as a percentage [See Note 3]	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	—	71	73	74
	Antimonopoly Act workshop(No. of times)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		39	47	82	96	112
	Target Figures for Each Fiscal Year		31	32	44	75
	Participant degree of understanding of Antimonopoly Act workshops as a percentage [See Note 3]	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	—	87	89	88

Note 1: "Commissioners, etc." denotes meetings between the JFTC commissioners and local experts. "Directors of local offices, etc." denotes meetings between General Secretariat officials such as directors of local offices or branches of the JFTC and local experts.

Note 2: The average rating of JFTC for One Day events by attendees is the percentage of attendees who answered either "very good activity" or "good activity" when asked on a post-event questionnaire about the JFTC for One Day activity.

Note 3: Degree of understanding is percentage of participants who replied "Completely comprehensible" or "Mostly comprehensible" in the questionnaire survey.

Degree of satisfaction is the percentage of participants who replied "Satisfied" or "Mostly satisfied" in the questionnaire survey.

Evaluation Index	Participant degree of satisfaction with AMA workshops as a percentage [See Note 3]	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	—	87	89	87
	Press releases(No. of times)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		359	278	267	253	258
	Amount of advertising expenditures equivalent to the volume of articles reported the JFTC's PR activities in newspaper (ten thousand yen)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		—	92,231	45,657	83,677	52,245
	No.of subscribers to e-mail newsletters (No.of persons)	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		3,153	4,088	4,508	4,797	5,070
	No.of accesses to brochures and videos on the Antimonopoly Act on the JFTC website	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		253,547	193,986	286,420	317,197	515,846
	No.of accesses to the front page of the JFTC website	Actual Results				
		FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
		3,351,082	2,700,101	2,453,330	2,489,509	1,938,070

Results of Evaluations of Activity	Status of Achievements	<p>The target for meetings with local experts was 83 but only 82 were held.</p> <p>The JFTC held eight JFTC for One Day events, meeting the target of eight.</p> <p>The JFTC held 50 consumer seminars, exceeding the target of 41.</p> <p>The JFTC held 112 Antimonopoly Act workshops, exceeding the target of 76.</p>
	Directions for Future Activity	<p>Looking at all evaluation indicators as a whole, the activity can be deemed as being necessary and effective in promoting public understanding of competition policy. The activity does this by providing the public with a broad range of information on the details of the Antimonopoly Act and associated policies and on the JFTC's activities and by gathering public opinions and requests through communications with a broad cross-section of citizens.</p> <p>Despite this, local experts and others have sought further expansion of the number and range of JFTC PR activities. Requests included: "I believe it is quite well understood, due to the JFTC's PR activities, that cartels, bid-rigging, and other similar acts violate the Antimonopoly Act. However, I frequently feel that this awareness is not sufficiently developed in local regions, where even lawyers and attorneys lack understanding of the Antimonopoly Act. Therefore, the JFTC must actively conduct PR activities directed at regional businesses, lawyers, and others." "Consumers have few opportunities to understand JFTC's efforts and the importance of competition. Because elevating 'consumer power' is extremely important, I would like the JFTC to proactively create opportunities to explain its activities to ordinary consumers as well." "I would like to see more Antimonopoly Act workshops held, because I think they are</p> <p>Other comments included requests for improvements to the content of PR activities: "It is necessary to disseminate the importance of competition to ordinary consumers in order to create incentives for businesses to comply with the Antimonopoly Act; however, I question whether the benefits of fair competition for ordinary consumers are being sufficiently conveyed. In your PR activities, I'd like to see more done to drive this point home to ordinary consumers."</p> <p>Therefore, the issue raised is further disseminating information and developing understanding about the Antimonopoly Act, the Subcontract Act, and other issues. To this end, the JFTC will continue to examine holding more sessions of each activity and how to improve the content of each activity.</p>

Use of Expert Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It seems that more attendees of the JFTC for One Day events answered that it is "not very necessary" than attendees of the consumer seminars and the Antimonopoly Act workshops. So, while the scope of the consumer seminars and the Antimonopoly Act workshops is well defined, it may be that the scope and concept of the JFTC for One Day events have become confused because the events deal with too much material. (Mr. Kakizaki) (We made revisions based on this comment.) • Why do university students have lower levels of understanding about the Antimonopoly Act workshops than middle-school and high-school students? (Mr. Wakabayashi) (Summary of reply: The main thrust of the workshops for middle-school and high-school students, who know absolutely nothing about the Antimonopoly Act, is to familiarize them with the Act and develop their interest through activities such as simulation games. Therefore, they likely have higher understanding levels because the content is relatively easy. The workshops for university students, on the other hand, are more classroom focused because they are a part of university lectures on the Antimonopoly Act and the content is fairly advanced, which likely contributes to their lower understanding levels.)
-------------------------	--

Materials and Other Information Used During Policy Evaluation	(1) Questionnaire on understanding, satisfaction, etc., conducted after consumer seminars, JFTC, April 13, 2012 – March 29, 2013 Surveyed consumer seminar participants — 901 valid responses to the question on understanding and 708 to the question on satisfaction Methodology: Multiple choice and spaces for write-in comments
	(2) Questionnaire on understanding, satisfaction, etc., conducted after Antimonopoly Act workshops, JFTC, April 10, 2012 – March 21, 2013 Surveyed Antimonopoly Act workshop participants (middle-school, high-school, and university students) — 6,658 valid responses to the question on understanding and 6,630 to the question on satisfaction Methodology: Multiple choice and spaces for write-in comments
	(3) Awareness questionnaire conducted after JFTC for One Day events, JFTC, June 19, 2012 – March 6, 2013 Surveyed 974 JFTC for One Day event attendees (number of valid responses) Methodology: Multiple choice
	(4) Study of the equivalent advertising value of newspaper articles that reported on JFTC's PR activities, Japan Information Service Inc. Examined 381 newspaper articles about JFTC press releases and other PR activities Methodology: estimated the equivalent advertising value of the articles by multiplying the articles' sizes by a unit price calculated based on the lowest "in-article" advertising fee from the media advertising rates listed in Media Data 2012 (a Media Research Center Inc. publication)
	(5) Summary of proceedings from the 192nd Antimonopoly Meeting (June 27, 2012 press release)
	(6) Summary of proceedings from the 193rd Antimonopoly Meeting (December 12, 2012 press release)
	(7) Main opinions of Antimonopoly Policy Cooperation Committee members (first half of FY 2012) (October 17, 2012 press release)
	(8) Main opinions of Antimonopoly Policy Cooperation Committee members (second half of FY 2012) (April 10, 2013 press release)
	(9) Main opinions expressed at meetings between local experts and the JFTC (January 16, 2013 press release)
These documents are held by the General Affairs Division, Secretariat, JFTC.	

Responsible Department	General Affairs Division, Secretariat	Responsible Person	Kouichi Higashide, Director of General Affairs Division, Secretariat	Year/Month for Policy Evaluation	April – July, 2013
------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------	--	----------------------------------	--------------------