

Session B: Thursday 21st April, Poverty Analysis and Data Analysis

Summary of Key Points Raised

Capacity-building:

- We need to clarify the role of CSOs, donors, IFIs to increase capacity of CS to gather data and carry out analysis. We should be clear about what types of capacity is needed at a country level
- There is also a need to recognize and utilize the existing capacity of CS. CS can bring different types of analysis to the debate
- Similarly, IFIs should recognize and use the analysis that is being done. CSOs are already contributing to various types of poverty and impact analyses, and CS can increase capacity just by being consulted and giving their views on these issues, and donors and IFIs must ensure that their consultation is wider.
- We would like concrete recommendations from the WB on how they can work more with CS to facilitate capacity-building and partnerships with CSOs in this type of work. However, we also need an understanding as to why much existing NGO analysis is not used
- Another issue raised on capacity-building was that of increasing the capacity of government for carrying out poverty and impact analysis which is equally a priority for improving the ownership and quality of such work and we would be interested to learn more about the Bank's training programs for government staff that they are starting this year.

Definition of the poor:

- There was an agreement that we need to consider a multi-dimensional definition of poverty, including social and environmental factors. There should be an agreement in each country on what the definition is of poverty should be so that impact analysis is accurate, and WB should work with countries to achieve this

Participation and engagement:

- There seemed to be a feeling that 'PSIA' is Bank driven. There is a need to increase engagement and consultation of CSOs in impact analyses and poverty analyses of IFIs.
- We should view CS participation as a range of opportunities, from consultation in a workshop to economic or social data analysis to their role as interlocutors and we and IFIs should exploit those roles as much as possible.
- Need to open up the debate to other types of analysis (not just focus on PSIA), discuss the choice of reform for analysis,
- Partnership: aim to examine how local NGOs with I-NGOs can work with each other, and with research institutes, unions, grassroots organizations etc

Macroeconomic analysis:

- Also need to improve engagement of CS in macro policies which should be debated more widely. CSOs are interested to debate on specific macro policies, there has been NGO work on fiscal deficits and exp targets

- The IMF should attempt to communicate the outline of the macro framework and its assumptions behind the choices they are making. There needs to be an explanation and an understanding of the scenarios available, and make clear the trade-offs. An attempt should also be made to make macro policies better understood by the CS, illicit feedback from them, and at very least improve the debate between government and IMF to reach a consensus on a macro framework which is often not achieved (as heard this morning).

Alternative scenarios:

- A further recommendation is that there should be more analysis and consideration of alternative scenarios in the analysis of reforms. Impact analyses should present a full range of reform options and their impacts, and currently these are not being sufficiently examined. CS is playing a role in providing alternative views. This is a best practice as recommended by the WB, and the WB should ensure that these best practices are effectively mainstreamed throughout the Bank