

# *Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building*

---

*Report of the Seventh Meeting  
of the TFSCB Advisory Panel (AP)  
(May 3 - 7, 2010)*

*The World Bank  
May 16, 2010*

*Chandrakant A. Patel  
Jean-Louis Bodin*

## Executive Summary

---

The Advisory Panel (AP) was created to conduct a yearly technical review of Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB) activities and report its findings and recommendations to the Consultative Group (CG) during its Annual Meeting. As decided at the Third Meeting of the Consultative Group (CG) of the TFSCB held in Paris on October 6, 2002 the AP consists of two “external advisors”.

The 7<sup>th</sup> AP meeting was held on May 3 – 7, 2010. Its report may be considered as a complement to the report of the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting (19 November 2009) as it was not available during the last CG meeting held in Dakar, Senegal, on 18 November 2009. In this report, the AP discusses the issues concerning the future of the TFSCB (section II), then some important questions regarding TFSCB operation (section III) and suggests recommendations (section IV). The Annex presents and analyzes the project proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit since October 2009.

With the TFSCB III expected to end in 2012, the AP has looked into various scenarios to broach the issue and has presented four options and outlined their advantages and disadvantages before prioritizing them for consideration:

- Winding up TFSCB in 2012;
- Streamlining a TFSCB IV focusing on financing NSDS and its process;
- Continuing TFSCB in the current mode with marginal changes as TFSCB IV until 2017;
- Preparing a revamped TFSCB IV with a revised mandate that is consistent with current needs and priorities on statistics.

The AP believes that the most reasonable option within the actual context of statistical capacity building is to continue to finance the NSDS process, focusing on the core NSDS activities. However, it may not be desirable to restrict the future activities only to these core activities since TFSCB is now the sole source for grant-financing small-scale topical or sectoral statistical activities in the least bureaucratic manner. The AP also recommends, as suggested in Option 4, that between 2012 and 2017, data dissemination issues be highlighted with a firm emphasis on data integrity, transparency and credibility and be tried initially as a special window under the TFSCB.

To meet this goal, the AP proposes to adopt a number of recommendations and the main ones consist of the following:

- ✓ Continue to enhance the TFSCB and launch a campaign for raising funds for a TFSCB IV to begin in 2012;
- ✓ The TFSCB grants should focus on the NSDS and its implementation by allocating a minimum of 60 % of its resources, but should also continue to finance small sectoral or topical statistical activities meeting operational needs or supporting statistical capacity

building;

- ✓ The Development Data Group of the World Bank (DECDG) and Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (PARIS21) are invited to explore new activities enhancing data use, integrity, transparency and credibility. These activities should become a new special window under the TFSCB IV. As a result, four windows would come into existence: (1) NSDS; (2) bridging gaps between NSDS and implementation; (3) non NSDS projects; and (4) data dissemination and integrity. Decisions concerning the window #3 would continue to be made during face-to-face meetings organized twice a year;
- ✓ In the TFSCB IV, it is recommended to allocate a maximum of 20 % of its resources for projects under the non NSDS Window;
- ✓ The ceiling of 400,000 US dollars for the TFSCB grants should be increased to 500,000 US dollars to adjust for inflation during the last decade;
- ✓ Concerted efforts should be made by the DECDG and PARIS21, internally within the World Bank and externally with the national authorities, to encourage the remaining countries to prepare NSDS and to promote implementation of the available NSDS;
- ✓ A more permanent source for financing the developing countries participation in international conferences, congresses, seminars and workshops should be sought. In the meantime, establishing a ceiling for such funding would be useful. A calendar of international conferences or meetings should be prepared two years in advance and anticipated funding required be estimated;
- ✓ Proposals aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from less developed countries in international meetings should be made through the “Non NSDS windows”, except in explicit cases of urgency.

## I – Background

---

### Organization of the Work of the AP

---

The AP was created to conduct a yearly technical review of TFSCB activities and report its findings and recommendations to the Consultative Group (CG) during its Annual Meeting. As decided at the Third Meeting of the Consultative Group (CG) of the TFSCB held in Paris on October 6, 2002 the Advisory Panel (AP) consists of two “external advisors”<sup>1</sup>.

It is important to reduce the gap between the AP and CG meetings as much as possible in order to present a report based on the most recent facts and findings. It is the reason why it was decided to organize the 7<sup>th</sup> AP meeting in May 2010, only 7 months after the previous one, to produce an updated report to be presented to the meeting of the CG to be held in Paris, France, on June 3, 2010. From many aspects, this report may be considered as a complement of the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (19 November 2009), in as much as it was not available during the last CG meeting held in Dakar, Senegal, on 18 November 2009. This report is available on the World Bank Website at: <http://www.worldbank.org/tfscb>.

### Acknowledgments

---

The AP was provided with documents for review and discussions from project proposals submitted to the Internal Management Committee (IMC) of the TFSCB since the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AP, in particular the minutes of the IMC meetings and other project approval decisions. It also received the Evaluation Report delivered in January 2010.

The AP had comprehensive discussions with some members of the IMC: Misha Belkindas (Manager, Development Data Group and Head of the TFSCB IMC), Ghislaine Delaine, Olivier Dupriez, Neil Fantom, Haeduck Lee, and Antoine Simonpietri. The AP also met with Mustafa Dinc and Naoko Watanabe of the TFSCB Administration Unit. These discussions were fruitful and served to look forward to the future of TFSCB after more than 10 years of operations supported by the decision-making process which is now well established and allows for rapid and efficient clearance of project proposals.

### Content of the AP Report

---

In this report, the AP discusses the issues concerning the future of the TFSCB (section II), followed by important questions regarding TFSCB operation (section III) and provides recommendations (section IV). The Annex presents and analyzes the project proposals received

---

<sup>1</sup> See the rationale behind this decision and the terms of the reference of the AP in the reports of the previous AP meetings.

by the TFSCB Administration Unit since October 2009, to update the report of the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting.

## II - Future of the TFSCB

---

The TFSCB has successfully operated, since its inception in 1999, in promoting medium- to long-term system-wide vision on statistical development in developing countries. Its financing has contributed to the design and creation of National Statistical Development Strategies (NSDS<sup>2</sup>) in about 60 countries<sup>3</sup>. These NSDS have provided the basis for 5 (out of six) STATCAP projects of the World Bank and 3 (out of 5) country projects that are being implemented with financing from the Statistics for Results Facility (SRF) Catalytic Fund. In addition, TFSCB financing has contributed to the implementation of a large number of smaller country or regional sectoral and training projects.

Improved communication created on World Bank and PARIS 21 websites led to a better understanding of TF goals and resulted in a greater percentage of proposals in line with the main objective of statistical capacity building. The mechanism for making decisions within the Internal Management Committee (IMC) of the TFSCB is now well established and runs efficiently and allows NSDS proposals to be immediately reviewed as they are received under the “NSDS Window”. The decisions are well documented. The AP has found that all decisions made during the face-to-face or virtual meetings of the IMC (including the rejections and reductions of amounts) were generally decided according to the guidelines.

As the TFSCB III is expected to end in 2012, it is worthwhile to ask, after 10 years of its operations, what its future should be. The AP looked into various scenarios to broach the issue and has presented four options and outlined their advantages and disadvantages before prioritizing them for consideration:

- Winding up TFSCB in 2012;
- Streamlining TFSCB IV focusing on financing NSDS and its process;
- Continuing TFSCB in the current mode with marginal changes as TFSCB IV until 2017;
- Preparing revamped TFSCB IV with a revised mandate that is consistent with current needs and priorities for statistics.

### Option 1

---

The *winding up of the TFSCB* would relieve the donors from its financing and the World Bank from its related management, administrative, and supervisory tasks. However, the decision

---

<sup>2</sup> It is also called Statistical Master Plans (SMP).

<sup>3</sup> There were in total 69 projects supporting preparation of NSDS of which 3 were « regional »; 6 countries had two projects. In addition, around 25 other countries prepared a strategy for the development of their statistical system with financing from other sources than the TFSCB (see the NSDS summary table prepared by the Secretariate of PARIS21 in May 2009 and updated in February 2010).

makers and users will not fully see the ultimate statistical results culminating from the expected implementation of the strategies and statistical development plans, more especially as NSDSs are not projects but processes. Supporting the development of statistical systems is a long and continuous process that doesn't finish with the end of a NSDS project. So far only a few NSDS have been, are being or will be fully implemented under the aegis of STATCAP or SRF. There are very rare cases where the Statistical Development Strategy can be implemented without the donors' assistance. In order to support countries' efforts towards seeking international, regional, or bilateral financing, the available NSDS for several countries needs to be substantiated to develop time-bound action plans that are comprehensive, (system-wide), realistic, prioritized, and costed. It is also crucial that authorities come up with institutional arrangements for their implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Untimely termination of TFSCB would cease completely financing for ongoing supportive process as there is at the moment no other alternative international source for financing of these basic requirements for accessing STATCAP, SRF or any regional financing facilities. Moreover, TFSCB is also the only source available from the World Bank to finance with grants small sectoral or topical statistical projects aimed at meeting operational needs or supporting statistical capacity building. During its previous meetings, the AP noted<sup>4</sup> that financing this kind of projects may be an interesting and valuable complement to the NSDS, provided that such proposals have been made by countries having adopted and validated a NSDS. Thus, with the abolition of TFSCB NSDS as well as non-NSDS project financing will come to an end.

## Option 2

---

*Streamlining of the TFSCB to focus solely on NSDS and its process* would make TFSCB narrowly targeted and would enable TFSCB to channel all its resources to NSDS and its process. Such an initiative would also reduce the management, administrative and supervisory load for the World Bank staff. Concerted efforts should be made by DECDG and PARIS21, internally within the World Bank and externally with the national authorities, to encourage the remaining countries to prepare NSDS and to promote implementation of the available NSDS. However, such an option would dry up, like the previous one, the sole source for grant-financing small-scale topical or sectoral statistical activities in the least bureaucratic manner.

## Option 3

---

*Continuation of the TFSCB in the current mode* could take into account the changes recommended by the TFSCB Evaluation Report (January 2010), such as allocating a minimum (instead of maximum) of 60% of the TFSCB resources<sup>5</sup> for the NSDS process (including implementation, preparation of action plans, etc.) and raising the ceiling for an individual grant to a maximum of 500,000 US dollars (instead of 400,000 US dollars). Thus, the financing of both

---

<sup>4</sup> The TFSCB evaluation report made similar comments.

<sup>5</sup> The actual TFSCB guidelines specify that, given that the preparation of NSDS is a priority for developing countries, TFSCB allocates up to 60 % of its resources for this purpose. The evaluation report proposes that this objective of 60 % be a minimum. The recommendation 18 made in the report of the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting proposed to allocate a maximum of 20 % on non NSDS proposals.

the NSDS and non-NSDS activities will continue with added focus on financing not only NSDS but its whole process and also small-scale topical and sectoral projects.

#### Option 4

---

*Revamping TFSCB with a revised mandate* could be considered since TFSCB was launched 10 years ago when there was an urgent need to develop a medium to long-term vision/strategy for a comprehensive and integrated statistical development for each transition or developing country's statistical system, probably more acutely in countries in transition from a centrally planned economic system to a market economy. These strategies were targeted at the creation of NSDS (often under the name of Statistical Master Plans at the beginning of the years 2000) according to the framework provided by PARIS21. In later years, these strategies were geared towards the delivery of measurable results for decision-making and monitoring in accordance with the Marrakesh Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS). During the last two decades there has been tremendous progress in the development of statistical standards, methodologies, manuals, compilation guides and training at the international and regional levels and the national statistical systems of developing countries have benefitted a great deal from documentation, guidance, technical assistance, and training. Moreover, the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics were adopted by the UN Statistical Commission in April 1994 and the Special Data Dissemination Standard (SDDS) and General Data Dissemination System (GDDS) were promulgated in 1995 by the International Monetary Fund in the wake of international financial crisis which underscored the magnitude of data deficiencies. The IMF also created the Data Quality Assessment Framework (DQAF) and put the assessments of the national statistics system for the participating countries on its website. In addition, there were also other initiatives at regional levels such as the European Code of Practice promulgated by the European Commission as a recommendation on the independence, integrity and accountability of the national and community statistical authorities or the African Charter on Statistics prepared by the African Union Commission (AUC) in 2008<sup>6</sup>.

Despite all these salutary initiatives and developments in the realm of official statistics, the recent global economic and financial crisis and the current problems caused by the important sovereign debts in some countries have drawn more and more attention of policy makers, analysts and general public to the transparency, integrity and credibility of official data. Moreover, the integrity and quality of information provided by the statistical offices and financial institutions to their clientele, general public and the authorities' are sometimes being questioned.

In this critical environment, international agencies, the World Bank in particular, may wish to rethink how the TFSCB or a new and revised Trust Fund could come up with the financing facility to carry out advocacy and promote data transparency, integrity and credibility at the national level. Such an initiative would require considerable thinking and planning on what countries and activities to be covered, how their execution can deliver results and what partnerships and the level of financing will be required. A quick review by the AP and its discussions with the IMC members identified the following activities that the usage of data and thereby its integrity, which could be regarded as good candidates for inclusion:

---

<sup>6</sup> It has not yet been ratified by the AU members.

- Universalizing and establishing open data policy with user-friendly interactive open data websites at the national level through provision of financing, guidelines, frameworks, technical assistance, training and software;
- Reviewing national or regional<sup>7</sup> codes of ethics, guidelines and procedures and their observance, and of professional independence, data integrity and transparency with due regard to confidentiality;
- Promoting the dissemination of disaggregated data e.g. average prices, as public goods on the open websites;
- Encourage dissemination of micro-data e.g. for households without violating the rules protecting the confidentiality of individual data.

## Ideal Option

The AP believes nevertheless that the most reasonable option within the actual context of statistical capacity building is to continue to finance the NSDS process, focusing on the following NSDS activities as suggested above in the option 2:

- Preparation of initial NSDS by the remaining countries;
- Preparation of second NSDS on successful implementation of the initial NSDS;
- Updating or revision of initial NSDS for countries giving firm authoritative commitment on implementation;
- Implementation of selected key components of NSDS such as institutional strengthening, to provide momentum and to build credibility and confidence for full-scale implementation;
- Converting initial NSDS into action plans for countries committing to implement them under STATCAP, SRF or any other arrangements;
- Preparatory work to meet the preconditions of SRF application by the prospective countries.

Financing of the NSDS process as outlined above would pave the path for their implementation.

However, it is not possible to restrict the future activities only to the ones described in the option 2 since TFSCB is now the sole source for grant-financing small-scale topical or sectoral statistical activities in the least bureaucratic manner. In regards to the financing of the non-NSDS activities mentioned in option 3, the AP recommends that an alternative, equally simple and flexible, financing facility be explored and utilized. Until then TFSCB should continue in the current mode (i.e. option 3) supplemented with new activities proposed for the non NSDS

---

<sup>7</sup> The UN Economic Commission for Latin America and Caribbean is preparing a Code of Practices by reference to the European Code of Practice.



window, taking into account the AP recommendation 18 made in the report of its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (allocating a maximum of 20 % for non NSDS proposals).

However, all these approaches would not rejuvenate the TFSCB unless demand-driven new ideas are injected into it. In the framework of NSDS, data dissemination is promoted by the TFSCB. The AP recommends that between 2012 and 2017, data dissemination issues be highlighted with firm emphasis on data integrity, transparency and credibility and be tried initially as a special window under the TFSCB. As the work on NSDS process tapers off, financing for this activity should grow. Therefore, AP suggests that some activities outlined under option 4 be carefully studied and evaluated for TFSCB IV financing.

### III - SOME OTHER QUESTIONS

---

#### Number of Windows

---

In the report of its 6th meeting, the AP recommended to hold three windows so as to focus on NSDS work (including their implementation):

##### Window #1: NSDS

- Preparation of initial NSDS (including the preparation of regional strategies for statistical capacity building) by remaining countries;
- Preparation of initial NSDS by countries having already drafted strategic or planning documents in a different form than the one recommended by PARIS21;
- Updating or revision of initial NSDS, including the preparation of second NSDS on successful implementation of initial one;

##### Window #2: Bridging Gaps between NSDS and Implementation<sup>8</sup>

- Converting initial NSDS into an action plan for implementation;
- Preparatory work to be performed by prospective recipient countries prior to requesting funding under the Statistics for Results Facility (SRF), or STATCAP;
- Implementation of selected key components and prerequisites of NSDS in order to provide momentum and build confidence among stake holders prior to launching full-scale implementation;

##### Window #3 : Non NSDS projects

- Capacity building or improvement of sector-specific or specific topical areas of statistics emanating from GDDS recommendations, operational needs or otherwise;
- Regional sector specific statistical capacity building projects;
- Regional and international meetings promoting participation by developing countries.

---

<sup>8</sup> See evaluation report's 2<sup>nd</sup> recommendation: opening a special window for implementation grants.

Decisions concerning the windows #1 and #2 would be made immediately through virtual meetings as it is currently the case for the “NSDS Window”. Decisions concerning the window #3 would continue to be made during face-to-face meetings organized twice a year. In very exceptional cases, decisions concerning participation in international meetings may be made immediately through virtual meetings<sup>9</sup>.

A new window should be opened to accept new proposals dealing with data integrity, transparency and credibility within the TFSCB IV. This new window would be the Window #4. As stated in the previous section, the AP recommends that a minimum of 60% be allocated to Windows #1 and #2. This minimum could increase over time.

### Ceiling for the Grants

---

Only 4 out of the 69 projects supporting preparation of NSDS required a budget of 400,000 US dollars (actual ceiling for the TFSCB grants). Nevertheless, the AP agrees with the 4<sup>th</sup> recommendation of the evaluation report and proposes to adjust the ceiling to 500,000 US dollars,<sup>10</sup> taking into account the inflation which has reduced the grants’ real value over the last decade.

### Post-evaluation of Projects

---

The AP supports recommendation 8 of the Evaluation Report which states that some form of evaluation could help to highlight lessons learned for the benefit of future projects (expansion of the role of the AP to include ex-post evaluation of sample projects, thematic evaluations, end-of-project evaluations of the largest projects). The AP also reiterates the recommendation 2 of its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting: a study should be conducted to understand why some NSDS have never been finalized or, when finalized, never been adopted or validated by the national authorities and propose measures to avoid such a situation in the future.

---

<sup>9</sup> Only if the applicant proves that it was not possible to present his/her request through the normal non NSDS Window.

<sup>10</sup> Adjusting the ceiling to 500,000 US dollars corresponds to an inflation rate of 2.25 % per year.

#### IV - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS<sup>11</sup>

---

- 1) Continuing to enhance a facility that supports the development of statistical systems through the preparation and implementation of NSDS processes is essential. DECDG and PARIS21 should start a campaign for raising funds for a TFSCB IV to begin in 2012.
- 2) The TFSCB grants should focus on the preparation and implementation of NSDS. Nevertheless, financing with grants small sectoral or topical statistical activities meeting operational needs or supporting statistical capacity building is interesting and valuable. An alternative, equally simple and flexible, financing facility should be explored and utilized. Until then, TFSCB should continue in the current mode, but with allocating a minimum of 60 % of its resources for the NSDS and its process.
- 3) DECDG and PARIS21 are invited to explore new activities enhancing data use, integrity, transparency and credibility. These activities should become a new special window under the TFSCB IV. Four windows would exist: (1) NSDS; (2) bridging gaps between NSDS and implementation; (3) non NSDS projects; and (4) data dissemination and integrity. Decisions concerning the window #3 would continue to be made during face-to-face meetings organized twice a year.
- 4) In the TFSCB IV, it is recommended to allocate a maximum of 20 % of its resources for projects under the non NSDS Window.
- 5) The ceiling of 400,000 US dollars for the TFSCB grants should be increased to 500,000 US dollars<sup>12</sup> to adjust for inflation during the last decade.
- 6) Concerted efforts should be made by DECDG and PARIS21, internally within the World Bank and externally with the national authorities, to encourage the remaining countries to prepare NSDS and to promote implementation of the available NSDS.
- 7) A study should be conducted to understand why some NSDS have never been finalized or, when finalized, never been adopted or validated by the national authorities and propose measures to avoid such a situation in the future. A campaign should be initiated to update the older NSDS; a list of the countries with outdated NSDS should be produced as soon as possible<sup>13</sup>.
- 8) It is important to maintain a good balance between project proposals on social and economic statistics, and increase the number of projects in the domain of environmental statistics<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> This includes recommendations coming from the update of the survey of the recent project proposals presented in the Annex or from the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<sup>12</sup> Adjusting the ceiling to 500,000 US dollars based on an inflation rate of 2.25 % per year.

<sup>13</sup> Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 of the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<sup>14</sup> Recommendation 6 of the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- 9) Proposals submitted by NGOs should be properly monitored and unless such a proposal contributes to statistical capacity building or to its promotion, it should be rejected. On another hand, NGOs' proposals conducive to promote national statistical capacity building and generate demand for statistics should be considered carefully<sup>15</sup>.
- 10) A more permanent source (other than TFSCB) for financing the developing countries participation in international conferences, congresses, seminars and workshops should be sought. In the meantime, establishing a ceiling for such funding would be useful. A calendar of international conferences or meetings should be prepared two years in advance and anticipated funding required be estimated<sup>16</sup>.
- 11) Proposals aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from less developed countries in international meetings should be made through the "Non NSDS windows", except in explicit cases of urgency<sup>17</sup>.
- 12) Proposals aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from less developed countries in international meetings should be limited to requests coming from the international organizations (governmental or non-governmental) in charge of these meetings and exclude those coming from recipient national agencies.

---

<sup>15</sup> Recommendation 10 of the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<sup>16</sup> Recommendations 12 and 15 of the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting

<sup>17</sup> Recommendation 14 of the report of the AP 6<sup>th</sup> meeting

## ANNEX

### UPDATE OF THE SURVEY OF THE RECENT PROJECT PROPOSALS RECEIVED BY THE TFSCB ADMINISTRATION UNIT

Since its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting held in March, 2008, the AP was provided with 74 documents on proposals received for funding by the TFSCB Administration Unit (48 were received before the meetings held in 2009<sup>18</sup>, 26 after). Twenty proposals were submitted through the NSDS Window, but only eleven were proposals facilitating participation in international conferences and are shown separately in the table below. Eleven proposals were submitted through the Non NSDS Spring 2008 Window, eighteen through the Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window, eleven through the Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window, and fourteen through the Non NSDS Fall 2009 Window. 53 proposals (71.6 %) were approved or conditionally approved. All the proposals submitted through the NSDS Windows were approved. The budget allocated for the 53 approved or conditionally approved proposals was \$ 11.78 millions.

Windows	Approved or conditionally approved	Rejected and Revision required	Rejected	TOTAL	Rate of approval (%)
NSDS Window <i>incl. "Conference Window"</i>	9 11	-	-	9 11	100
Non NSDS Spring 2008 Window	4	4	3	11	36.4
Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window	14	1	3	18	77.8
Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	8	-	3	11	72.7
Non NSDS Fall 2009 Window	7	3	4	14	50.0

As noted in its 6<sup>th</sup> report, the AP observed some recent developments in the geographical and topical distribution of the proposals received by the IMC as well as in the breakdown between NSDS and Non NSDS projects.

Region	Number of proposals	Number of accepted proposals
Africa <sup>19</sup>	18	11
LAC	20	12
MENA	9	6
East Asia & Pacific	6	4
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	8	8
Global <sup>20</sup>	13	12

<sup>18</sup> There were two AP meetings in 2009: April 27 – May 1, and October 19 - 23.

<sup>19</sup> One of these 18 proposals concerns also the region MENA.

The percentage of new NSDS proposals has decreased, but doesn't mean that all the countries are covered (this point was discussed in the report of the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting).

Since the report of its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP classifies the proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit into six non-homogeneous<sup>21</sup> categories:

1. NSDS proposals (5 new proposals - received since the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting – are identified in this category)
2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS (3 new proposals identified in this category)
3. Country proposals concerning topical activities (6 new proposals identified in this category)
4. Regional proposals made by multilateral institutions (5 new proposals identified in this category)
5. Proposals made by NGOs (no new proposal identified in this category)
6. Proposals aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from developing countries in international conferences, seminars or workshops (7 new proposals identified in this category).

Only the 26 new proposals received since the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting are listed and reviewed in the sections A.1 to A.6 below<sup>22</sup>. Nevertheless, it seems better to present the statistics at the end of each section by taking into consideration not only these 26 new proposals, but also consolidating them with the 48 received by the AP during the preparation of its 6<sup>th</sup> session.

#### **NSDS proposals** (5 new proposals)

There was a slight acceleration in the number of NSDS proposals received by the IMC (4 during March 2008 through October 2009, 5 during October 2009 through April 2010). The percentage of the budget allocated for these proposals is 14.6 % for the consolidated period covered by both the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> meetings, against only 10.7 % for the period covered by the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

During its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP welcomed the initiative taken by PARIS21 to distribute a brochure on “NSDS Status in IDA and Lower and Middle Income Countries” in May 2009. This brochure was updated in February 2010. According to this updated brochure, only 21.5 % of the IDA and low and middle income countries have no strategy (the figure was 25.6 % in the May 2009 brochure). Efforts should continue to be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the remaining countries to prepare NSDS<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> This includes some proposals aiming at facilitating the participation in international conferences.

<sup>21</sup> The three first categories are depending on the content of the proposals; the three last ones are depending on the different institutions (other than bilateral) having made the proposal.

<sup>22</sup> The proposals received by the IMC after its Fall 2009 meeting (15 December 2009) aren't presented in this list. They will be reviewed during the Spring 2010 meeting that was not yet held when the AP met for its 7<sup>th</sup> session.

<sup>23</sup> See the recommendation 1 of the report of the 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting.

Window	Proposal	Region	Decision	Budget Allocated in US dollars
NSDS Window	PDR China – Statistical Master Plan	East Asia & Pacific	Approved	150,000
	El Salvador – Updating the NSDS	Latin America and Caribbean	Approved	75,000
	Zimbabwe - NSDS	Africa	Approved	120,000
	Kazakhstan – Updating the SMP	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Approved	80,000
	Georgia – NSDS	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Approved	280,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>705,000</b>
<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>				
<i>13.5 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>17.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>14.4 % of the budget allocated</i>				

In its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP noted that countries that have still failed to prepare NSDS are concentrated in some sub-regions, namely: Africa: Central Africa; East Asia and Pacific: Pacific islands; Eastern Europe and Central Asia: Balkans, Central Asia; Latin America and Caribbean: Caribbean islands, South Cone and; Middle East and Northern Africa: Gulf countries. It is noticeable that two out of the five proposals listed above concern one of these sub-regions.

**Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS** (3 new proposals)

Proposals suggested here present methods on implementing validated NSDS but also focusing on the enhancement of NSDS through advocacy, evaluation, etc.

Window	Proposal	Region	Decision	Budget Allocated in US dollars
Non NSDS Fall 2009 Window	Mexico – Strengthening Information in the State of Yucatan	Latin American and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	116,900
	Tunisia ONEQ – Strengthening Capacity Building	Middle East and Northern Africa	Rejected	
	Cape Verde – Statistical Capacity Building / Implementation of the NSDS	Africa	Rejected Revision required	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>116,900</b>
<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>				
<i>20.3 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>20.8 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>26.5 % of the budget allocated</i>				

The number of proposals aimed at implementing NSDS has dramatically decreased even though the AP (and also the evaluation report) has been drawing its attention to the importance of such projects.

**Country proposals concerning topical activities** (7 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section relate to specific statistical topics complementing the preparation or the implementation of NSDS:

Window	Proposal	Region	Decision	Budget Allocated in US dollars
Non NSDS Fall 2009 Window	Zambian Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries – Livestock Data collection and analysis	Africa	Conditionally approved	315,000
	Burkina Faso – HLCS	Africa	Rejected Revision required	
	Yemen – Capacity Building for the 2010 HBS and Sector Capacity Building	Middle East and Northern Africa	Conditionally approved	200,000
	Burkina Faso – Enhancing control of the 2006 – 2010 General Census of Agriculture	Africa	Rejected Revision required	
	Vietnam – organization of an international conference on informal sector and informal employment	Global <sup>24</sup>	Approved	43,000
	Mexico – Strengthening the Epidemiological Surveillance system for Influenza	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected	
	Mexico – Risk assessment tool for the Popular Health Insurance Program	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected	

<sup>24</sup> Vietnam requested funds from the TFSCB for helping to the organization of the conference. All developing countries were invited to participate to this conference that may therefore be considered as 'Global'.



<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>515,000</b>
<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>	
20.3 % of the presented proposals	
13.2 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved	
15.7 % of the budget allocated	

During its previous meetings, the AP noted that financing “topical proposals’ may be an interesting and valuable complement to the NSDS, provided that such proposals have been made in countries having adopted and validated a NSDS, which was the case for all the proposals made under this heading.

The AP also recommended *maintaining a good balance between project proposals on social and economic statistics, and increasing the number of projects in the domain of environmental statistics*. This recommendation deserves to be reiterated.

**Regional proposals made by inter-governmental institutions** (5 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section refer to regional proposals made by inter-governmental institutions (regional or multilateral):

<b>Window</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget Allocated in US dollars</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	WHO – Global Initiative on Burden of Foodborne disease	Global	Rejected.	
	CIS – Training Program	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Approved	375,000
	African Union Commission – Implementation of the African Charter on Statistics	Africa + Middle East and Northern Africa	Conditionally approved	223,260
	WB LAC Region – Socio Economic Database for LAC	Latin American and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	184,000
	European Commission (MEDSTAT project) – Household International Migration Surveys in Mediterranean Countries	Middle East and Northern Africa	Conditionally approved	132,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>914,260</b>
<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>				
25.0 % of the presented proposals				
27.4 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved				
34.5 % of the budget allocated				

Among these proposals, one was presented by the LAC Vice- Presidency of the World Bank. During its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP recommended that specific rules for making decisions on proposals submitted by World Bank units or by the secretariat of PARIS21 have to be prepared and submitted to the Donors' Committee.

We can note that the proposals made by the Statistical Committee of the CIS (training of statisticians) and by the Commission of the African Union (implementation of the African Charter of Statistics) are particularly relevant as tools to permit an efficient implementation of statistical strategies.

The demand presented by the European Commission in the context of the MEDSTAT project that had a huge budget at its disposal (30 000 000 €, i.e. 120 times the budget requested for this TFSCB proposal).

**Proposals made by NGOs** (no new proposal)

Window	Proposal	Region	Decision	Budget Allocated in US dollars
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>0</b>
<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>				
<i>5.4 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>0 % of the budget allocated</i>				

The AP reiterates the recommendation made during its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting: that proposals submitted by NGOs should be properly monitored and unless such a proposal contributes to statistical capacity building or to its promotion, it should be rejected. Proposals from NGOs' aimed at promoting national statistical capacity building and creating the demand for statistics should be considered carefully

**Facilitating participation to international conferences** (6 new proposals)

Requests submitted by organizers of international conferences or seminars to facilitate developing countries' participation in these events are discussed in this section:

Window	Proposal	Region	Decision	Budget Allocated in US dollars
NSDS Window	Strategic Plan to Improve Agricultural Statistics (additional funding)	Global	Approved	91,000
	Funding participation in the 40 <sup>th</sup> session of the UN Statistical Commission (Feb. 2010)	Global	Approved	100,000

	Participation of Moldova in two conferences <sup>25</sup>	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Approved	11,256
	Participation in the FAO Roundtable on the 2010 Censuses of Agriculture (Nov., 2009)	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Approved	11,256
	Participation of Colombia in the OECD Latin American Economic Outlook	Latin America & Caribbean	Approved	3,380
	Participation of Palestine in the Expert Group for Data Harmonization in the Economic Research Forum Region, Cairo, April 2010	Middle East & North Africa	Approved	2,346
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>262,238</b>
<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>				
<i>15.5 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>21.7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>9.0 % of the budget allocated</i>				

During its 6<sup>th</sup> session, the AP recognized that funding participation of statisticians from developing countries to international conferences or seminars through the TFSCB can contribute to international co-operation by encouraging the participation of developing countries in the dialogue on the development of policy, framework, standards and methodologies on statistics. There is merit in funding such participation provided there is an effective contribution by the sponsored participants in the development of standards, methodologies and innovations in statistics and they become vehicles for knowledge transfer to the developing countries (for instance sponsoring only participants who have prepared a paper to be presented during the meetings and committed to send in time back to office report including a statement on how the participant plans to apply his newly acquired knowledge.).

However, it is not easy to design a strategy to monitor and assess the results expected from such sponsorship. The AP observed that coverage of the organizations and institutions requesting such assistance is expanding and the demand for funding is growing.

Recently, several requests were made not only from international organizations (intergovernmental or non-governmental) but also from national offices in order to send staff members to events; at least one of these events was not concerning strengthening statistical capacities (OECD Latin America Outlook). While the budget allocated for these requests was not very high (0.2 % of the total budget allocated), the demand for such participation might expand

<sup>25</sup> Workshop on short-term statistics and seasonal adjustment – UNECE, Geneva – November, 2009  
Roundtable on the 2010 Round of Censuses of Agriculture – FAO, Hungary – November, 2009

quickly. Moreover, TFSCB's interventions on this type of activities may rapidly become a time-consuming administrative task.

Finally, the AP considers that it is not a good practice to make decisions for such requests through the NSDS Window although it understands that it is done due to the urgency of these requests. It should be noted, however, that in almost all cases, dates of the meetings addressed by these requests are known in advance (UN Statistical Commission meetings, for example). The situation could be improved and funds could be fairly allocated within the ceiling if an advance calendar of international events is prepared and budgeted.