

# **Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building**

## **Report of the ninth meeting of the TFSCB Advisory Panel (AP)** (February 13 - 17, 2012)

**The World Bank  
Washington DC, USA**

**March 2, 2012  
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 9<sup>th</sup> AP meeting was held on February 13 - 17, 2012. In its report, the AP reviewed the recent activities of the TFSCB (section II). Then the AP was asked to comment and provide advice on the repositioning of the TFSCB in the context of the implementation and funding of the Busan Action Plan for Statistics (BAPS). The AP reviewed all aspects of the BAPS including the five planned actions proposed in the Action Plan (section III). Some questions regarding TFSCB operations are presented in the section IV of this report. Finally, recommendations are summarized in the section V. The Annex I discusses the funding strategies for revitalizing TFSCB in the context of the BAPS. The Annex II presents and analyzes the projects proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit since the 8<sup>th</sup> AP meeting (March, 2011).

The AP noted a sharp decline in the recent activities of the TFSCB, in particular in the number of projects submitted to the IMC and even more in the percentage of the proposals accepted or conditionally approved and the budget allocated. Only two projects were concerning NSDS. The trend of funding considerably dropped during the last period. Despite some important re-allocation of financial resources arising from the fact that some approved projects were not operationalised, it would be rather difficult to continue to accept new project proposals after the end of the year 2012 without any new funds.

The AP was glad to note that the BAPS has received explicit endorsement from the highest political levels. The AP reviewed all aspects of the BAPS including the five planned actions and came up with views concerning the implementation of NSDSs, the open data policy and effective use of statistics. The Actions 1, 2 and 3 of BAPS pave the way for rewriting and redefining guidelines for NSDSs and for a best and more efficient use of the TFSCB. The AP recommends that a rejuvenated TFSCB should be continued with a revised mandate under the BAPS. It can focus on the actions from the BAPS in addition to its current activities on providing small grants for statistical capacity building projects in various topical areas and for international and regional statistical meetings and seminars. The AP therefore strongly recommends that the financing available to meet the goals of repositioned TFSCB is not only robust but also sufficient..

The AP also encouraged the submission of innovative proposals on new and emerging data needs. It reiterates its former recommendations for case studies of model NSDS countries and post-evaluation.

Finally; the AP agreed with suggestions made by some IMC members in order to make more efficient the preparation of GFRs and the follow-up of the projects by the TTL.

In short, the AP proposes thirteen recommendations, the main ones are as follows:

- An active fund raising campaign should immediately be launched by PARIS21 and the World Bank to provide robust and sufficient financing for repositioned TFSCB. New categories of donors may be approached.
- In line with the recommendation of the BAPS aiming to strengthen and refocus national and regional statistical strategies, country-led strategies reflecting country-level development priorities and delivering end results in terms of new or strengthened indicators and data sets are recommended.
- Implementation plans of NSDSs should be demand-oriented to take into account the specifics on the interest of the users of statistics.
- TFSCB Guidelines should be revised and completed to provide for monitoring and evaluation of supported projects especially in terms of outcomes and results meeting the needs of the users.
- Post-evaluations of countries' NSDS work are necessary. DECDG and PARIS21 should collate and publish case-studies for selected model countries.
- Global monitoring and evaluation to track outcomes of all global summits and high level forums is recommended but there is also a need for building up a framework for monitoring and evaluating ongoing statistical activities in each country to assess whether the outcomes of these activities meet the needs of the users.
- A separate window on "Open Data" should be established under the TFSCB to promote transparency and open accessibility of data.
- As far as possible, the non-NSDS windows of the TFSCB should continue with a focus on financing capacity building in topical statistical areas, international and regional meetings and seminars and regional projects aiming at developing common framework and harmonizing statistics.

## **I. BACKGROUND.**

### **1.1. 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) of the TFSCB during its Annual Meeting. As decided at the Third Meeting of the CG held in Paris on October 6, 2002 the Advisory Panel (AP) consists of two “external advisors”<sup>1</sup> who meet the Administrative Unit in charge of the management of the TFSCB once a year at the Headquarters of the World Bank. These meetings are organized some weeks before the meetings of the Consultative Group that are held in Paris, in parallel with the meetings of the Board of PARIS21, in order to present reports based on the most recent facts and findings.

The 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AP was held from February 13 to 17, 2012.

The reports of the previous meetings are available on the World Bank Website.

### **1.2 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 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AP, in particular:

- the decisions taken by the IMC virtual meetings in 2011 for the proposals made under the NSDS window;
- the minutes of the two Non NSDS windows (Spring 2011 – June 14, 2011 - and Fall 2011 – November 21, 2011);
- the Grant Funding Requests for all proposals (with their Grant Financing Plans and Budget Tables).

It also received the document giving the Key Commitments and Actions Agreed at the 4<sup>th</sup> High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF-4) held in Busan, Korea, from November 29 to December 1, 2011, the Busan Action Plan for Statistics (BAPS) adopted as the action 3-c of these commitments and actions of the HLF-4, and the room document prepared by the World Bank to report to the 43<sup>rd</sup> session of the UN Statistical Commission on the outcome of HLF-4<sup>2</sup>.

The AP had comprehensive discussions with some members of the IMC in the World Bank: Grant Cameron (Manager, Development Data Group and Head of the TFSCB IMC), Gregory Kisunko (Europe and Central Asia Region), Carolina Diaz-Bonilla (Latin America and Caribbean Region), Manohar Sharma (East Asia and Pacific Region), Antoine Simonpietri (Africa Region), Barbro Hexeberg, Olivier Dupriez, and

---

<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.

<sup>2</sup> Item 3(m) of the provisional agenda of the 43<sup>rd</sup> session of the UN Statistical Commission, from February 28 to March 2, 2012.

Neil Fantom (DDG, DECDG). 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 11 years of operational knowhow and expertise supported by the decision-making process which is now well established and allows for rapid and efficient clearance of project proposals.

### **1.3 Content of the AP Report**

During its 9th meeting, the AP concentrated its work on the Busan Action Plan for Statistics (BAPS) endorsed by the 4<sup>th</sup> High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in December, 2011, since it is largely recognized that this Action Plan provides an exceptional opportunity to rejuvenate the activities funded by the TFSCB.

This report is therefore mainly devoted to the repositioning the TFSCB in the context of the objectives and goals of the BAPS (section III). The section II deals with the recent TFSCB activities. Some other questions, including questions regarding the management of the TFSCB are presented in the section IV of this report. Finally, the AP recommendations are summarized in section V.

The Annex I discusses the funding strategy for strengthening and enhancing the resources available for TFSCB projects in the context of the BAPS. As in the reports of the previous meetings, the Annex II presents and analyzes the project proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit since the 8<sup>th</sup> AP meeting (March 2011).

## **II. RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE TFSCB**

Since its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting held in March, 2011, the AP was provided with twenty documents on proposals received for funding request by the TFSCB Administration Unit. Only two proposals were submitted through the NSDS Window. Nine proposals were submitted through the Non NSDS Spring 2011 Window, and nine through the Non NSDS Fall 2011 Window. During the previous comparable period, twenty-nine project proposals were received: total number of projects submitted to the Internal Management Committee (IMC) declined by 21 %.

Ten proposals (50 %) were approved or conditionally approved, which represents a marked decrease (58 %) from the previous comparable period (82.8 % of the proposals were approved or conditionally approved in the comparable period in 2011). The two proposals submitted through the NSDS Windows were approved. The trend of funding has considerably dropped during the last period: the budget allocated for the ten approved or conditionally approved proposals was \$ 2.24 million (compared to \$ 11.78 million between April 2008 and April 2010, and \$ 5.52 million between April 2010 and March 2011). A detailed update of the survey of the recent proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit is presented in the Annex to this report.

In spite of some important re-allocation of financial resources due to the fact that some approved projects were not operationalised, it seems difficult – rather impossible -

to continue to accept new project proposals after the end of the year 2012 without any new funds. In the report of its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP noted that “it was somewhat disappointed to note that no serious efforts have been made since then either by the World Bank or PARIS21, with a concerted campaign for a revised mandate, to seek financing from donors for the TFSCB”<sup>3</sup>. Even if the implementation of the BAPS (see section III and Annex I) may open the way to an allocation of new and greater funds to the TFSCB, the AP recommends an immediate launching of an active fund raising campaign. New categories of donors may be approached in this context, for instance private funds may be interested in some statistical domains, and emerging countries may support statistical capacity building in some regions or sub-regions<sup>4</sup>.

### **III. REPOSITIONING THE TFSCB IN THE CONTEXT OF THE BUSAN ACTION PLAN FOR STATISTICS (BAPS)**

The 4<sup>th</sup> High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness met in Busan, Korea, from November 29 to December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011. Among the key commitments and actions agreed during this Forum was a document on *Statistics for Transparency, Accountability, and Results*, better known as the Busan Action Plan for Statistics (BAPS).

The AP was glad to note that the BAPS which was built on the success and implementation experience of MAPS and in significant consultations with both the international community and other development partners has received explicit endorsement from the highest political levels.<sup>5</sup> After it receives endorsement at the UN Statistical Commission in February 2012, its implementation arrangements will be presented to the meeting of the Board of PARIS21 at the end of March 2012 for agreement. The AP was asked to comment and provide advice on the repositioning of the TFSCB in the context of the implementation and funding of the BAPS. The AP reviewed all aspects of the BAPS including the five planned actions and came up with the following views:

#### **3.1. Implementation of NSDS**

In the last several years with support of many donors, including the TFSCB, 71 out of 79 low-income IDA-eligible countries have prepared NSDS<sup>6</sup>. However,

---

<sup>3</sup> Only one new pledge (from DFID) has been announced.

<sup>4</sup> The Russia Development Aid Coordination Group created a fund ECASTAT to support statistical capacity building in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. This Fund is managed by the World Bank in the same conditions as the TFSCB.

<sup>5</sup> This commitment came from the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, held in Busan, Republic of Korea, November 29 – December 1, 2011

<sup>6</sup> According to the brochure published by the secretariat of PARIS21 in November 2011, only 7.6 % of the IDA and low and middle income countries have no strategy (the figure was 25.6 % in May 2009 and 20.3 % in November 2010). But these percentages are somewhat misleading insofar as they confuse NSDS of the first and second generations and don't take into account the real implementation of NSDS.

implementation of these strategies has not made significant progress in many countries. In a few countries NSDS has been implemented partially with STATCAP loans and in some pilot countries implementation is taking place under Statistics for Results Facility (SFR). Some countries have implemented a few selected NSDS components with the TFSCB grants. These strategies have demonstrated their comprehensiveness in covering the entire national statistical systems of their countries, at least for the NSDS of the second generation. They were also important in raising awareness of financing gaps in statistics at the country level. As such, they were often tools for promotion and advocacy rather than concrete implementation schemes. Thus they provide a sound assessment and framework for future statistical planning. However, based on its familiarity and experience with the projects financed by the TFSCB, the AP has noted the following weaknesses to a varied degree in the national strategies:

- (a) Some of the strategies are not well focused and linked to countries' development objectives.
- (b) In some cases the planned statistical actions and activities in NSDS are inadequately prioritized.
- (c) There is often a lack of political will or firm commitment from the national authorities to implement.
- (d) Some of the strategies do not have funding plans nor allocations in the multi-year development plans or annual budget.
- (e) Leader and/or lead agency to guide, coordinate and oversee implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation mechanism geared to delivery of results have often not been identified or appointed.

To rectify some of these weaknesses, the Action 1 of the BAPS aims to *strengthen and refocus national and regional statistical strategies with particular emphasis on improving statistical systems that address country-level development priorities*. This reiterates the need for “*transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks ...*” established by the Forum in Busan. The AP looked into these requirements and recommends the following to assist in the development of implementation plan and guidelines:

#### Country-led Strategies

The country leadership could be interpreted as a firm commitment by the national authorities on implementation evidenced by some or all of the following:

- (a) including strategies in the Multi-year Development Plan;
- (b) committing annual allocation in the budget with domestic financing possibly as a primary source;
- (c) identify multi-stakeholder groups, representing both the users and producers of statistics, to determine a set of realistic goals in relation to developmental needs and resources, and monitoring implementation progress. For execution, the appointee may identify a lead agency or institution<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> When it exists and is operational, this commission might be the National Statistical Council

If these pre-conditioned commitments are not forthcoming from a country while seeking funding on statistical capacity building from the development partners it can be assumed that there is less likelihood of a revised and refocused country strategy to be implemented.

### Country-level Development Priorities

The country strategies should aim to build capacity to produce and/or improve country-level indicators that are required for decision making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for assessing development results. In a request for external financing, the countries should demonstrate that all planned actions on capacity building in statistical strategies are tied to the country's development objectives. In order to assure success, based on the capabilities and resources of the country, the planned actions may be restricted to address crucial domestic policy priorities and to meet emerging urgent data needs. In fact BAPS acknowledges that “*early small successes achieved through gradual implementations will help build up to larger successes at a later stage*”.

As a suggested best practice, a multi-stakeholder group led by the Ministry in charge of Development Planning or an agency responsible for economic development and the National Statistical System specifying briefly the prioritized key development objectives and related statistical indicators to be targeted, should accompany the request on external financing for strengthening and refocusing national strategy. The requesting country should also give commitment that the revised strategy would reflect these priorities clearly and in costing for implementation.

### End Results

It should be recognized that strengthened and refocused national statistical strategies are just instruments and stepping stones for statistical development. Its creation and availability do not necessarily assure its implementation which in turn would deliver the end results in terms of new or strengthened indicators and data sets. The implementation of BAPS does not guarantee final outcome therefore at the end of BAPS question may arise on its credibility in delivering results.

## **3.2. Open Data**

The Action 2 of the BAPS aims to *implement standards for data preservation, documentation and dissemination that permit full public access to statistics*. The AP is glad to support this open data action through standards and new technologies that corresponds to the views it pitched in the report of its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting (March 14-18, 2011). In order to implement the open data action the statistical community has to develop certain key instruments<sup>8</sup>. The AP thinks that the following instruments which are not readily

---

<sup>8</sup> During its previous meetings, the AP presented its views on an open accessibility to the data made recommendations on data dissemination within this context. The 4<sup>th</sup> recommendation of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting urges *DECDG and PARIS21 to carry out advocacy to promote openness and accessibility of data and encourage the preparation of project proposals for TFSCB funding on “Open Accessibility of Data”*.

available be designed in order to lay down viable guidelines for the “open data” projects. These are:

- (a) model legal frameworks and case studies that have provisions on authorizing open access to data and release of micro-data<sup>9</sup>;
- (b) framework for assessing the openness so that the current status could be determined for bench marking further actions;
- (c) technologies and procedures needed for capacity building on data documentation, and preservation at the country level.

The AP endorses the indicators specified to track progress but cautions that “open data” will not necessarily improve transparency and quality of data unless the authorities make rigorous and concerted efforts in loading quality data on their websites. The AP advises that the guidelines for Trust Fund should be linked with the proposed instruments, frameworks and the indicators to track progress.

### **3.3. Effective Use of Statistics**

The Action 3 of the BAPS aims to *develop programs to increase the knowledge and skills needed to use statistics effectively for planning, analysis, monitoring and evaluation*. It is very difficult to gauge to what extent statistics are effectively used. PARIS21 has been carrying out advocacy and promoting use of statistics. If an assessment of these efforts is available, it could be utilized for developing implementation guidelines. E-learning, use of new technologies, increasing public awareness, strengthening liaison between statistical users and producers and encouraging implementation of data standards are the envisaged measures. All these measures and indicators to track progress on this action are basically from the supply side. They will provide instruments, methods, and procedures and training through e-learning. The action however does not convey the viewpoint of the users whether these initiatives would enhance their effective usage of statistics.

The AP suggests that implementation plan could possibly mandate that countries take into account the specifics on the interest of the users of statistics. Thus the capacity building could be demand oriented.

### **3.4. Rejuvenation of the TFSCB**

The AP recommends that a rejuvenated TFSCB should be continued with a revised mandate under the BAPS. It can focus on the following actions from the BAPS in addition to its current activities on providing small grants for national and regional statistical capacity building in various topical areas and for international and regional statistical meetings and seminars:

---

<sup>9</sup> Of course, the release of micro-data should be organized by following the usual rules for respecting statistical confidentiality and privacy.

- (a) Financing for strengthening and refocusing of NSDS addressing statistics required for the prioritized development needs of the countries be made available.. Leadership, monitoring and evaluation and advance commitment to implement the revised strategy should be forthcoming from a TFSCB grant seeking country.
- (b) The AP fully supports the open data initiative which reflects fully the “*open accessibility of data*” pitched in the report of its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. It suggests that a separate window on “open data” be established under the TFSCB. The DECDG should come up with the instruments to be utilized by the countries. On the basis of these instruments precise guidelines for project proposals on “open data” are to be laid down. The issue is whether micro-data projects financing be handled flexibly as now or be brought under the “open data” window. If it is brought under the TFSCB umbrella, it may lose current flexibility on funding.
- (c) The AP considers that comparable to global monitoring and evaluation, there should be a well-designed and practicable framework available for monitoring statistical activities at the national level. For each TFSCB grant/project separate monitoring and evaluation mechanism may not be cost-effective. However, the AP recommends that in the proposal for each project grant there should be identification of tracking indicators for monitoring and assessment of the project results<sup>10</sup>.
- (d) As far as possible, the general (current non-NSDS) window of the TFSCB should continue with a focus on financing capacity building in topical statistical areas, international and regional meetings and seminars and regional projects aiming at developing common framework and harmonizing statistics.

#### **IV. SOME OTHER QUESTIONS**

##### **4.1. Management of the TFSCB**

As noted in the previous reports of the AP meetings, 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 NSDS in a large number of countries. 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, topical, and training projects on statistical capacity building..

Improved communication media created through 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 IMC is now well established and runs efficiently and

---

<sup>10</sup> See also the section 5.1. of this report.

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 after a well-informed thinking and debate.

A number of comments and suggestions were made by the members of the IMC to the AP. In particular, the AP supports the following two proposals:

4.1.1. Preparing a Grant Funding Request is long and somewhat hard and troublesome work. When the project proposal is rejected, the agency or TTL that has prepared the GFR may have the feeling to have wasted the time of those people that had prepared it. The preparation of a request could possibly be divided in two phases, first a letter of intent or a brief concept note describing the goals and objectives of the request, then the GFR itself. The letter of intent or concept note would serve to check that the project fits with the objectives and priorities of the TFSCB. The IMC response would be conveyed after consideration through virtual meetings where expedited decisions will be taken.

4.1.2. The TTLs have generally very little time to really manage the projects, because of their small size that usually generates a problem for the cost/effectiveness of all the tasks to be done by TTL. It would be advisable to propose in the GFR some “tracking indicators” that could be used by the TTL to follow up easily the progresses of each project<sup>11</sup>.

## **4.2. Case studies of Model NSDS countries and post evaluation**

In its reports of the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> meetings, the AP recommended post-evaluation of projects. In order to provide feedback to countries, post-evaluation of countries’ NSDS work is required. The AP was informed during its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that some regional organizations have carried out or initiated studies on the post-evaluation of NSDS design, action plan and implementation. Moreover, a wealth of documentation on individual countries’ experience on NSDS is now available. The AP recommended that case studies for selected model countries be prepared on the basis of ex-post evaluation. DECDG or PARIS21 can collate and publish such case studies, at least one for each region, on their websites. These case studies would be a valuable feedback for training and future updating of NSDS and their action plans for implementation.

In this context, the AP reiterates its recommendation “*on case studies of model NSDS countries and evaluation*” it made in the report of its 8<sup>th</sup> meetings: 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. IMC secretariat should go further and create model studies on the successful implementation of NSDS.

---

<sup>11</sup> See also the section 4.2 (c) of this report.

### **5.3. Innovative projects**

Some IMC members regret that enough project proposals concerning innovative issues or training activities are not received.. One member insisted on the importance of training for building and strengthening statistical capacities.

### **5.4. Projects for fragile countries**

The Board of PARIS21 recommended preparing projects for fragile countries, in particular countries undergoing a serious crisis or emerging from a crisis..The AP supports this concern expressed by PARIS21.

## **VI. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS<sup>12</sup>**

### **TFSCB**

- 1) An active fund raising campaign should immediately be launched by PARIS21 and the World Bank to provide robust and sufficient financing for the repositioned TFSCB.. New categories of donors may be approached.
- 2) In line with the recommendation of the BAPS aiming to strengthen and refocus national and regional statistical strategies, country-led strategies reflecting country-level development priorities and delivering end results in terms of new or strengthened indicators and data sets are recommended.
- 3) Implementation plans of NSDSs should be demand-oriented to take into account the specifics on the interest of the users of statistics.
- 4) TFSCB Guidelines should be revised and completed to provide for monitoring and evaluation of supported projects especially in terms of outcomes and results meeting the needs of the users<sup>13</sup>.
- 5) Post-evaluations of countries' NSDS work are necessary. DECDG and PARIS21 should collate and publish case-studies for selected model countries (at least one for each region)<sup>14</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> This includes recommendations coming from the annexes to the report, in particular the Annex II that presents the update of the survey of the recent project proposals. It also includes recommendations reiterated from the report of the previous AP meetings.

<sup>13</sup> Reiteration of the recommendation nr. 3 of the report of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<sup>14</sup> Reiteration of the recommendation nr. 7 of the report of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- 6) In order to implement an open data policy as recommended by the BAPS, key instruments (legal instruments, frameworks for assessing the openness, technologies and procedures ...) should be designed. DECDG and PARIS21 are urged<sup>15</sup> to carry out advocacy to promote openness and accessibility of data and encourage the preparation of project proposals for TFSCB funding on “Open Accessibility of Data”.
- 7) Global monitoring and evaluation to track outcomes of all global summits and high level forums<sup>16</sup> is recommended but there is also a need for building up a framework for monitoring and evaluating ongoing statistical activities in each country to assess whether the outcomes of these activities meet the needs of the users.
- 8) A separate window on “Open Data” should be established under the TFSCB to promote transparency and open accessibility of data..
- 9) As far as possible, the non-NSDS windows of the TFSCB should continue with a focus on financing capacity building in topical statistical areas, international and regional meetings and seminars and regional projects aiming at developing common framework and harmonizing statistics. Concerning the topical areas, it is important to maintain a good balance between project proposals on social and economic statistics, and encourage the number of small projects in the domain of global initiatives and environmental statistics<sup>17</sup>.
- 10) The AP recommends checking that the help provided by the TFSCB for facilitating participation in international conferences will strictly used for conferences, seminars, and workshops in the scope of capacity building in official statistics.

### **Management of TFSCB**

- 11) The IMC is invited to consider the presentation of project proposals in two phases, the Grant Funding Request (GFR) being drafted after the agreement of the IMC on a letter of intention or a concept note explaining the objectives and expected results of the proposals.
- 12) “Tracking indicators” should be included in each GFR. They could be used by the TTL to follow up easily the progresses of the projects should be included in the Grant Funding Request.

---

<sup>15</sup> The second part of this recommendation reiterates the recommendation nr. 4 of the report of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<sup>16</sup> See Action 4 of the BAPS.

<sup>17</sup> The last part of this recommendation reiterates the recommendations of the report of the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting (nr. 6) and of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting (nr. 2) .

**13)** New projects proposals corresponding to the five priority domains set by the BAPS (agriculture statistics, health statistics, education statistics, gender statistics, vital statistics) requesting small grants should be encouraged with flexibility.. However major projects in these areas are likely to be funded largely by sources other than the current TFSCB. New donors may be identified for this purpose.

## ANNEX I

### FUNDING STRATEGIES FOR REVITALIZING TFSCB IN THE CONTEXT OF THE BAPS

The AP fully agrees with and supports BAPS and the four actions planned under it. Therefore, the AP deliberated on the funding issue and has broached the following issues:

#### **1. Choice of Funding**

The AP considered whether the first four actions and the subcomponents of Action 1 be packaged together for funding or each one should have their own financing and operational arrangements. There is advantage in packaging as each grant could be of a large size enough to have a full set-up for it together with its own monitoring and evaluation. Currently most of the TFSCB grants are smaller than \$500,000 which from the World Bank's point of view are very small grants having no economies of scale. On the other hand if each action and components of Action 1, namely NSDS, Agriculture Statistics, Health Statistics, Education Statistics, Gender Statistics and Vital Statistics are separately financed there could be small grants each not exceeding \$ 500,000. Taking into consideration expertise available at various international organizations and their capabilities and prospective source of funding, the AP recommends packaging of certain activities and treating certain global initiatives and activities on their own merits, i.e. technical and operational requirements and flexibility in financing. In this connection the BAPS notes that *funding instruments and approaches reflect the new modalities and actors in development finance.*

In MAPS in fact funding as well as executive and operational responsibilities were dished out among international and regional organizations. While funding for some actions came from multilateral and bilateral sources for some it was from a single source like the World Bank's Development Grant Facility. Even though BAPS has been well advanced in principle with support from all levels it is not yet a well-costed and time bound plan.

Before rushing into its implementation details relating to institutional responsibilities for each action and its sub-components, time bound costing etc. need to be worked out and advocacy needs to be rigorously carried out among prospective donors and recipient countries. The BAPS notes that *primary funding will be coming from countries own domestic sources.*

#### **2. Funding strategy for implementation of projects suggested by the BAPS**

This section provides a strategy for raising funds required for financing various actions planned under BAPS.

## **2.1 TFSCB**

As suggested in section 3, the scope of the TFSCB could possibly cover the first two actions planned under BAPS and the ongoing non NSDS activities. The BAPS targeted actions on: 1) refocused and strengthened NSDS; and, 2) open data could be the first two windows of TFSCB and non NSDS activities the third window. There is an advantage in packaging these three activities because small grants required by the proposed projects for these areas could be efficiently and flexibly processed and managed by the set up and expertise built over the last 11 years of TFSCB operations. Since the repositioned TFSCB will be targeting provision of small grants for new actions like open data and the new global initiatives, TFSCB resources need to be replenished as well as boosted.

## **2.2 Effective Use of Statistics**

The responsibilities for this action be delegated to PARIS21 and they should develop time bound cost and funding plan based on the evaluation and experience of their past activities. It should be noted that their implementation plan should have monitoring and evaluation indicators so that success (results) in promoting effective use of statistics can be assessed. The indicators should preferably be demand-fed rather than supply-oriented and ideally reflect in the implementation plans for TFSCB financed revised NSDS.

## **2.3 Global Recognition of Statistical Capacity Building**

The Action 4 of the BAPS aims to *build and maintain results monitoring instruments to track outcomes of all global summits and high level forums*<sup>18</sup>. The AP is glad with this initiative that has lot of benefits in ascertaining global interest in statistical indicators and their usage, carrying out advocacy and training, and in determining and coordinating actions on statistical capacity building. The AP thinks that global monitoring and evaluation is commendable but there is also a need for building up a framework for monitoring and evaluating ongoing statistical activities in each country to assess whether the outcomes of these activities meet the needs of the users.

## **2.4 Agriculture Statistics:**

The AP noted that the thrust it put on *current and usable indicators on food security* in its eight meeting report is supported in the BAPS by establishing component on agriculture statistics. Agricultural statistics is a large subject and scope for capacity building in this area is vast. Therefore, the implementation plan should be restrictive perhaps covering food production, marketing, and distribution only. The funding overseen by FAO for implementing the Global Strategy to improve agricultural statistics should be recognized as the main instrument for this domain. However, TFSCB could remain flexible to fund specific elements of the strategy that, at present, are unanticipated

---

<sup>18</sup> For instance, statistics produced for measuring PRSP and MDG permits impressive progresses in the statistical production in a number of developing countries.

or complementary to what the FAO is funding. Some other donors who have so far not funded TFSCB may also come forward for this activity because of urgency of food security.

### **2.5 Health and Education Statistics:**

There are several projects in these sectors that are being financed by other trust funds in the World Bank or directly with Development Grant Facility. Expertise relating to these two sectors is also located in the vice-presidencies for these two sectors in the World Bank and also at the WHO and UNESCO respectively. Should interest rise in increasing the quality or accessibility of education and health stats, DECDG should work in concert with the vice-presidencies for these two sectors to draw time-bound costing and implementation plan for them. They should also come up with the plan for financing and fund raising. These two sectors could also attract funding from private and non-profit foundations.

### **2.6 Gender Statistics:**

The action plan envisages UNSD, UN Women, World Bank, OECD to be lead agencies. The AP suggests that these agencies get together and prepare a time-bound and well-costed implementation plan to operationalize this component of BAPS. They should also remain jointly responsible for fund raising. They could also identify bilateral donors among the countries who championed support for gender statistics at the Busan Forum.

### **2.7 Vital Statistics:**

Most of the vital statistics come from administrative data collected in connection with the vital registration. Therefore, in addition to support from external development partners, the initiative and commitment have to come from the countries. In developing implementation plan the cooperation of developing countries is essential to identify their needs and resources. Representatives from these countries be drawn to confirm the ownership and leadership of planned actions. WHO could be interested in this action but technical and image-building support need to come from UN secretariat: UNSD of course as they have been historically involved in demographic statistics and decennial censuses, but also other units interested in developing vital registration as a fundamental tool to increase citizens' participation in the development of their countries and improve the global governance. If requested, the World Bank could be involved in fund raising as it strongly supports this initiative. There were also certain countries who were highly involved in supporting this initiative. They could possibly be asked to provide financial and technical support for it.

## ANNEX II

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

Since its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting held in March, 2011, the AP was provided with 20 documents on proposals received for funding by the TFSCB Administration Unit. Only two proposals were submitted through the NSDS Window. Nine proposals were submitted through the Non NSDS Spring 2011 Window, and nine through the Non NSDS Fall 2011 Window. 10 proposals (50 %) were approved or conditionally approved, which represents a marked decrease compared to the previous periods (82.8 % of the proposals were approved or conditionally approved in the comparable period in 2011). The two proposals submitted through the NSDS Windows were approved. The budget allocated for the 10 approved or conditionally approved proposals was \$ 2.24 million (compared to \$ 11.78 million between April 2008 and April 2010, and \$ 5.52 million between April 2010 and March 2011). The trend of funding has considerably decreased during the last period.

Windows	Approved or conditionally approved	Rejected. Revision required	Reject <sup>d</sup>	TOTAL	Percent. approved
NSDS Window	2	-	-	2	100
Non NSDS Spring 2010 Window	5	1	3	9	55
Non NSDS Fall 2010 Window	3	3	3	9	33
TOTAL	10	4	6	20	50

As noted in the reports of their 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> meetings, the AP observed some 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 <sup>19</sup>	Number of accepted proposals
Africa	5	3
LAC	4	2
MENA	2	1
South Asia	3	1
East Asia & Pacific	1	1
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	5	4
Global	3	0

<sup>19</sup> Three proposals concern more than one region, which explains that 23 proposals appear in this table. See details below.

During its 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP supported the 4<sup>th</sup> recommendation of the evaluation report and proposed to adjust the ceiling of the grants from 400,000 to 500,000 US dollars (corresponding to an inflation rate of 2.25 % per year since 2000). Seven proposals (instead of two during the previous period) presented a request above the former ceiling of 400,000 US dollars:

- Senegal: the proposal was approved with a reduced amount of 400,000 dollars instead of 443,547;
- Peru: the proposal was approved with a reduced amount of 240,000 dollars instead of 491,000;
- Seychelles presented a request for 423,500 dollars that was rejected;
- South Sudan: the proposal was approved with a reduced amount of 424,000 dollars instead of 474,000;
- ILO presented a request for 442,478 dollars that was rejected;
- Colombia presented a request for 489,000 dollars that was rejected;
- Tunisia presented a request for 408,000 dollars that was rejected

But finally only three among these seven proposals were accepted and only one was accepted over the former ceiling of 400,000 dollars.

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>20</sup> categories:

1. NSDS proposals (3 new proposals - received since the 8<sup>th</sup> AP meeting – are identified in this category)
2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS (7 new proposals identified in this category)
3. Country proposals concerning topical activities (3 new proposals identified in this category)
4. Regional proposals made by multilateral institutions (7 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 (no new proposal identified in this category).

The statistics at the end of each section are presented with a reminder of the ones presented in the reports of the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> meetings. In the column “Budget allocated”, the figures are presented in US dollars.

---

<sup>20</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.

## **2. 1. NSDS proposals** (3 new proposals)

These proposals might be either new NSDS proposals, or updates of former NSDS (or Statistical Master Plans), or NSDS replacing “first generation” NSDS that did not comply with the guidelines proposed by PARIS21 after some years of experience.

<b>Window</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget allocated in \$</b>
NSDS Window	Tajikistan – Preparation of the Statistical Master Plan 2	Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Approved	80,400
	Kyrgyz Republic – Preparation of a New Statistical Master Plan	Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Approved	74,400
Non NSDS Fall 2011 Window	Niger – Statistical Capacity Building – 2	Africa	Approved (with revision)	300,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>454,800</b>
<p><b><i>15.0 % of the presented proposals</i></b>  <b><i>30.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i></b>  <b><i>18.7 % of the budget allocated</i></b></p>				
<p><b><u>Reminder: Statistics (8<sup>th</sup> AP meeting)</u></b>  <i>17.2 % of the presented proposals</i>  <i>20.8 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>  <i>16.2 % of the budget allocated</i></p>			<p><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></p>	

There seems to be a slight acceleration in the percentage of NSDS proposals compared to other proposals as well as in the part of the budget allocated to NSDS proposals. But this apparent acceleration is due largely to the absence of proposals under categories 5 and 6 and a decrease of the number of accepted projects.

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, November 2010, and November 2011. According to this updated brochure, only 7.6 % of the IDA and low and middle income countries have no strategy (the figure was 25.6 % in May 2009 and 20.3 % in November 2010). But these percentages are somewhat misleading insofar as they confuse NSDS of the first and second generations. Efforts should continue to be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the countries to prepare more comprehensive NSDS really adapted to the situation of the statistical system and to update, or re-draft the NSDSs of the first generation.

It should be noted also that two out of these three proposals concern fragile countries, which meets one of the recommendations of the Board of PARIS21.

**2. 2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS** (7 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section concern methods on implementing validated NSDS but also focusing on the enhancement of NSDS through advocacy, evaluation, etc.

<b>Window</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget allocated in \$</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2011 Window	Lebanon – Capacity Building to Implement Key Steps for the SMP	Middle East and Northern Africa	Conditionally approved	130,000
	Senegal – Support to SCB Implementation and Training	Africa	Conditionally approved	400,000
	Peru – Operationalizing open data access and Improving Quality, Relevance and Accessibility of the NSS	Latin America and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	240,000
	Seychelles – SCB for Evidence Based Policies II	Africa	Rejected	
	South Sudan – Statistical Capacity	Africa	Conditionally approved	424,000
Non NSDS Fall 2011 Window	Tunisia – Capacity Building for Poverty Measurement and Analysis	Middle East and Northern Africa	Rejected. Resubmission invited	
	Botswana – Assistance to Establish Statistics Botswana as an Autonomous Agency	Africa	Rejected Resubmission invited	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>1,194,000</b>
<p><b>35.0 % of the presented proposals</b>  <b>40.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</b>  <b>49.2 % of the budget allocated</b></p>				
<p><u>Reminder: Statistics (8<sup>th</sup> meeting)</u>  13.8 % of the presented proposals  12.5 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved  15.4 % of the budget allocated</p>			<p><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u>  20.3 % of the presented proposals  20.8 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved  26.5 % of the budget allocated</p>	

In its previous meetings, the AP had noted an important decrease of the number of proposals aiming at implementing NSDS even though the AP and the 2009 evaluation report had been drawing their attention to the importance of such projects. During the last period, we can note on the contrary a very important increase of proposals in this category. Some of these projects may become models for further proposals:

- the Peruvian proposal is the first in the history of TFSCB dealing with the domain of open accessibility of data that was one of the main recommendation made by the AP during its 8<sup>th</sup> meeting;
- the Senegalese proposal puts the accent on training activities that are considered as a priority by some members of the IMC;
- the South Sudanese proposal concerns the implementation of an NSDS in a fragile country coming out from a long conflict.

### **2.3. Country proposals concerning topical activities** (3 new proposals)

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

<b>Window</b>	<b>proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget allocated in \$</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2011 Window	Russian Federation – The Need to Develop an Integrated System of Household Surveys to Collect Data on International Migration in CIS States	Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Approved	320,000
	India – Consolidation of Administrative Data for National Health Insurance System	South Asia	Rejected. Resubmission invited	
Non NSDS Fall 2011 Window	Colombia – Development of National Disaster Risk Management Reporting System for Damages and Losses	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected. Resubmission invited	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>320,000</b>

<b>15.0 % of the presented proposals</b>	
<b>10.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</b>	
<b>13.2 % of the budget allocated</b>	
<b><u>Reminder: Statistics (8<sup>th</sup> meeting)</u></b>	<b><u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u></b>
37,9 % of the presented proposals	20.3 % of the presented proposals
41,7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved	13.2 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
39,8 % of the budget allocated	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 is the case for the accepted proposal.

But, because of the rarefaction of the available funds, the percentage of the proposals approved and the budget allocated has considerably has significantly decreased. If the TF has to rely in the future on limited resources, it would be advisable to find other funding sources for topical proposals. It would also be advisable to get proposals in the four topical domains considered as important by the BAPS.

#### **2. 4. Regional proposals made by inter-governmental institutions** (7 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 \$</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2011 Window	IBRD – Efficiency Building of the Capacity for Collecting Data for the Rural Access Index (RAI)	World	Rejected	
	ILO – Promoting the Use of Time-Use Statistics to Advance Gender Equality at the Heart of Decent Work	World	Rejected	

Non NSDS Fall 2011 Window	SIAP <sup>21</sup> – Development of a Skill-based Curriculum for Professional Statistician and Advocacy for Microdata Management Standards and Practices	South Asia East Asia and Pacific Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Conditionally approved	257,570
	IBRD – Efficiency Building of the Capacity for Collecting Data and Creating Transport Statistics	World	Rejected	
	UN ECLAC – Harmonization of Price Statistics and National Accounts in Caribbean Countries	Latin America and Caribbean	Approved	200,000
	ECOSTAT <sup>22</sup> – Capacity Building for Regional Poverty Statistics	Eastern Europe and Central Asia South Asia	Rejected	
	OECS <sup>23</sup> – Design and Establishment of OECS Economic Union Monitoring System	Latin America and Caribbean	Rejected	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>457,570</b>
<b><i>35.0 of the presented proposals</i></b>				
<b><i>20.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i></b>				
<b><i>18.9 % of the budget allocated</i></b>				
<b><i>Reminder (8<sup>th</sup> meeting)</i></b>			<b><i>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</i></b>	
<i>20.7 % of the presented proposals</i>			<i>25.0 % of the presented proposals</i>	
<i>16.7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>			<i>27.4 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>	
<i>20.3 % of the budget allocated</i>			<i>34.5 % of the budget allocated</i>	

Only two project proposals were presented in this category during the period. The second one meets partly the recommendation made by the AP during its 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, that regional strategies should be proposed, in particular in the regions or sub-regions where many countries are small or islands. The proposal presented by UNECLAC will contribute to the implementation of a regional strategy in the Caribbean sub-region.

<sup>21</sup> SIAP is the UN Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific

<sup>22</sup> ECOSTAT is a branch of the Economic Cooperation Organization, a regional organization based in Iran, that has 10 partners' countries (Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan).

<sup>23</sup> OECS is the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States

**2. 5. Proposals made by NGOs** (no new proposal)

Window	Proposal	Region	Decision	Budget allocated in \$
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>0</b>
<i>0 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>0 % of the budget allocated</i>				
<u>Reminder (8<sup>th</sup> meeting)</u>			<u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u>	
3.4 % of the presented proposals			5.4 % of the presented proposals	
0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved			0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved	
0 % of the budget allocated			0 % of the budget allocated	

No proposal was made by NGOs during the last period. The proposals made during the two previous comparable periods were not approved and no budget was allocated. However, during its 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP noted that NGOs' proposals conducive to promote national statistical capacity building and generation of demand for statistics should be considered carefully.

**2. 6. Facilitating participation in international conferences** (no new proposal)

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 \$
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>458,000</b>
<i>0 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>0 % of the budget allocated</i>				
<u>Reminder (8<sup>th</sup> meeting)</u>			<u>Consolidated statistics (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> AP meetings)</u>	
6.8 % of the presented proposals			15.5 % of the presented proposals	
8.3 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved			21.7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved	
8.3 % of the budget allocated			9.0 % of the budget allocated	

During its previous sessions, 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.

During its 2010 Fall meeting, the IMC took decisions on the principles, the budget allocation, the event selection process and the administrative process<sup>24</sup>. The TFSCB Guidelines and Procedures will be revised to reflect the changes.

The TFSCB Administrative Unit did not receive any request in 2011. But it should be reminded that the request made by the ISI in 2010 aiming at supporting developing countries participation in conferences was a global plan covering the two calendar years 2011 and 2012. The IMC's opinion was that the ISI's demand was nearly consistent with the decisions taken during its meeting. The AP welcomes these decisions. Consequently, ISI did not present a new request. It was announced by its Permanent Office that a new request will be made in the coming weeks. The AP recommends checking that the help will strictly used for conferences and seminars in the scope of capacity building in official statistics:

---

<sup>24</sup> The details of these decisions could be found in the report of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AP (March 28, 2011 – page 20).