

# **Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building**

## **Report of the sixth meeting of the TFSCB Advisory Panel (AP)**

(April 27 – May 1, 2009 &  
October 19 – 23, 2009)

**The World Bank  
Washington DC, USA**

**November 19, 2009  
Chandrakant A. PATEL  
Jean-Louis BODIN**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS**

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. To reduce as much as possible the information gap between the AP and CG meetings, the AP report must be based on the most recent facts and findings. For the year 2009, the CG decided to meet only on November 18 (back-to-back with the PARIS21 Consortium meeting in Dakar). The 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting was therefore split into two sessions as it was the case for its 4<sup>th</sup> session before the CG meeting held in April 2007 : the first one took place from April 27 to May 1, 2009 and the second one from October 18 to 24, 2009, i.e. just four weeks before the CG meeting. The present report is a consolidated report of these two sessions.

The mechanism for making decisions within the Internal Management Committee (IMC) is now well established and runs efficiently. It allows NSDS proposals to be immediately reviewed as they are received under the “NSDS Window”. The decisions are well documented; the AP’s opinion is that all decisions made during the real or virtual meetings of the IMC (including the rejections and reductions of amounts) were generally decided according to the guidelines. A clear announcement of TFSCB III on the Web sites of the World Bank and PARIS21 and a better understanding by countries of the goals of the TF has meant that a greater and greater percentage of proposals received each year are in line with the main objective of statistical capacity building.

The AP report first surveys the 48 proposals received for funding by the TFSCB Administration Unit since its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, then makes additional recommendations for looking forward. It draws up a total of 18 recommendations. These recommendations, not necessarily in order of priority, are as follows:

- (1) Efforts should be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the remaining countries to prepare NSDS.
- (2) A study should be conducted to find out 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.
- (3) 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.
- (4) A study should be conducted to better define the framework for priority data needs in countries still in conflict or in a post-conflict situation, the specific ways to collect them, and how the NSDS process can be utilized in post-conflict countries.
- (5) The practical experience gained from implementation of the first round of NSDS should be centrally analyzed and documented and used for developing guidelines for future NSDS.
- (6) 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.
- (7) 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.
- (8) The approval of regional proposals should where possible facilitate preparation of regional strategies for the targeted regions and sub-regions.
  - (9) Regional strategies should be proposed (by PARIS21 ?) in addition to NSDS, in particular in the regions or sub-regions where many countries are small or islands.
  - (10) 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. However, NGOs' proposals conducive to promote national statistical capacity building and generation of demand for statistics should be considered carefully.
  - (11) For efficiency, a single international organization may be assigned the task of financial management and secretarial work relating to the pooled resources on meetings. If the regulatory provisions of these official organizations do not permit management by a single official organization of such a pool, then this task might be assigned with certain guidelines to an independent international organization such as the ISI, involved in similar activities.
  - (12) 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.
  - (13) It would be useful to examine whether the case of meetings organized by official international bodies (where leaders of the NSOs are participating in) has to be dealt with in a different way from the case of meetings organized by scientific NGOs.
  - (14) 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.
  - (15) A calendar of international conferences or meetings should be prepared two years in advance and anticipated funding required be estimated for better budgeting.
  - (16) Three windows should be created: 1. Preparation of NSDS, 2. Bridging gap between NSDS and implementation, and 3. Non-NSDS. Decisions concerning the windows #1 & 2 would be taken immediately through virtual meetings. Decisions concerning the window #3 would continue to be taken during real meetings organized twice a year.
  - (17) In the remaining years of the TFSCB III, the preparatory work for implementation should be given as high priority as the preparation of NSDS and required additional funding should be provided.
  - (18) A maximum of 20 % of TFSCB III resources be allocated in the remaining years for the Window#3 on non-NSDS proposals.

## **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) 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 as much as possible the gap between the AP and CG meetings in order to present a report based on most recent facts and findings. It was the case in 2003, when the 1<sup>st</sup> AP meeting took place on August 25 – 28 and the CG six weeks after. But, in 2004, the dates of the 2<sup>nd</sup> AP meeting were September 13 – 16, when the CG meeting was postponed to the Spring of 2005, more than eight months after the AP meeting. The situation was the same in 2005 with the 3<sup>rd</sup> AP meeting on September 6 – 9 and the CG in the Spring of 2006.

To avoid such gaps in the future, it was decided to split the 4<sup>th</sup> AP meeting into two sessions, one on August 22 – 25, 2006, and the second one on January 16 -17, 2007 with a CG meeting in April 2007. The report presented to the CG was a consolidated report of these two sessions. In 2008, the AP held its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting on March 10 – 14 with a CG meeting in May.

For the year 2009, the CG decided to meet only in mid-November (back-to-back with the Consortium meeting in Dakar). The 6<sup>th</sup> AP meeting was therefore split again into two sessions: the first one took place from April 27 to May 1 and the second one from October 18 to 24, just four weeks before the CG meeting. The present report is a consolidated report of these two sessions<sup>2</sup>. In 2010, there will be only one session with a 7<sup>th</sup> AP meeting organized by the end of September<sup>3</sup>.

### **1.2 General comments and acknowledgments**

The mechanism for making decisions within the Internal Management Committee (IMC) 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’s opinion is that all decisions made during the real or virtual meetings of the IMC (including the rejections and reductions of amounts) were generally decided according to the guidelines. A clear announcement of TFSCB III on the Web

---

<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> An interim report of the first session was produced on May 30, 2009, for internal purposes. It was not distributed outside the TFSCB Administration Unit.

<sup>3</sup> As concerns the expenses, it is worth to note that this decision means only one AP meeting for each of the FY 2008/2009, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011.

sites of the World Bank and PARIS21 and a better understanding by countries of the goals of the TF has contributed to a greater and greater percentage of proposals received each year are in line with the main objective of statistical capacity building.

One observation of the AP in respect of NSDS projects is worth making here. Out of the 9 projects presented under the NSDS Window, only one is a NSDS, 5 are concerning requests of funds aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from developing countries in international meetings, congresses and seminars. The AP is concerned by this rapidly growing and significant practice that is reviewed closely in the sections 2.4 and 2.6 hereafter.

To assist with its deliberations, the AP was provided with the Annual Progress Report covering the period under scrutiny, documents for evaluating the projects submitted to the IMC since the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AP, and minutes of the IMC meetings and other project approval decisions. It received also the new Guidelines and Procedures for the TFSCB produced by the TFSCB Administration Unit in September, 2009, and the Charter for the new Catalytic Fund of the Statistics for Results Facility produced by the SRF-CF Administration Unit.

The AP had comprehensive discussions with:

- 1<sup>st</sup> session: Misha Belkindas, Manager, Development Data Group and Head of the TFSCB IMC, members of the IMC (Antoine Simonpietri, Ms Ghislaine Delaine, Graham Eele, Neil Fantom, Haeduck Lee, Jose Molinas Vega, and Salman Zaidi) and Ms Barbro Hexeberg of the TFSCB Administration Unit
- 2<sup>nd</sup> session: Misha Belkindas, , members of the IMC (Antoine Simonpietri, Ms Ghislaine Delaine, Neil Fantom, Haeduck Lee and Mustafa Dinc) and Ms Naoko Watanabe.

These discussions were fruitful and served to clarify the decision-making process which is now well established and allows for rapid and efficient decisions.

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

In this report, the AP first surveys briefly the 48 proposals received for funding by the TFSCB Administration Unit since its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting , then reviews the main categories of proposals and the issues concened in Sections 2.1 through 2.6 and makes recommendations for looking forward. in Section III.

## II. SURVEY OF THE RECENT PROJECT PROPOSALS RECEIVED BY THE IMC

Since its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, the AP was provided with 48 documents on proposals received for funding by the TFSCB Administration Unit. Eight proposals were submitted through the NSDS Window, eleven through the Non NSDS Spring 2008 Window, eighteen through the Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window, and eleven through the Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window. 70.8 percent of the proposals were approved or conditionally approved.

Windows	Approved or conditionally approved	Rejected. Revision required	Reject <sup>d</sup>	TOTAL	Percent. approved
NSDS Window	8	-	-	8	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

The budget allocated for the 34 approved or conditionally approved proposals is \$ 9.25 millions.

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	12	8
LAC	14	8
MENA	5	3
East Asia & Pacific	5	3
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	3	3
Global <sup>4</sup>	9	9

The percentage of new NSDS proposals has dramatically decreased, which doesn't mean that all the countries are covered (this point will be discussed in the section 2.1 and in the chapter III here below).

---

<sup>4</sup> including the proposals aiming at facilitating the participation in international conferences.

The AP classified the proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit into six non-homogeneous<sup>5</sup> categories<sup>6</sup>:

1. New NSDS proposals (5 proposals identified in this category)
2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS (12 proposals identified in this category)
3. Country proposals concerning topical activities (8 proposals identified in this category)
4. Regional proposals made by multilateral institutions (14 proposals identified in this category)
5. Proposals made by NGOs (4 proposals identified in this category)
6. Proposals aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from developing countries in international conferences, seminars or workshops (6 proposals identified in this category).

The AP report discusses separately the proposals for each of these categories,

The proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS and the regional proposals made by multilateral institutions represent 54.2 % of the proposals received by the IMC, 61.8 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved, and 66.3 % of the budget allocated.

### **2. 1. New NSDS proposals** (5 proposals)

<b>Window</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget Allocated in US dollars</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2008 Window	UNDP Somalia – NSDS	Africa	Rejected Revision requested	
Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window	INS Congo (Democratic Rep.) – NSDS	Africa	Approved	205,340
Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	Jamaica - Strategic Statistical Development Project	Latin America and Caribbean	Approved	346,500
	Vietnam - Statistical Strategy Development	East Asia & Pacific	Approved	311,300
NSDS Window.	CBS Swaziland – NSDS	Africa	Approved	127,450
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>990,590</b>
<i>10.4 % of the presented proposals</i>				
<i>11.8 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i>				
<i>10.7 % of the budget allocated</i>				

<sup>5</sup> The three first categories are depending on the content of the proposal, the three last ones are depending on the different institutions (other than bilateral) having made the proposal.

<sup>6</sup> The total number of documents appearing in this classification is 49 and not 48, because it was not possible to put one project (Global Measuring Progress) in only one category; this project was put into two categories, 4 and 6.

Very few new NSDS proposals have been received by the TFSCB Administration Unit during the period under scrutiny. The main reason for tapering seems that a large number of countries have now drafted and often validated their NSDS. The most important issue under concern is rather now the implementation of the adopted and validated NSDS.

During its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting in 2008, the AP recommended that “*eight years after the creation of TFSCB, the extent to which countries have produced an NSDS and have implemented and updated it should be assessed*”. The AP was pleased to note that efforts have been made in that direction, either by the TFSCB Administration Unit in presenting its recent Progress Reports or by the management of PARIS21 that distributed in May 2009 a brochure on “NSDS Status in IDA and Lower and Middle Income Countries”<sup>7</sup>.

It is nevertheless noticeable that several countries have still failed to prepare NSDS. These countries are generally 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
- Middle East and Northern Africa: Gulf countries.

For some of these sub-regions where the countries have a very small size or are islands, the solution may come through the framework of a “sub-regional strategy” (see hereafter). A pro-active policy should be adopted to improve the coverage of countries having prepared or updated a NSDS. The TFSCB Administration Unit is not necessarily the best place to lead such a pro-active campaign; such a policy should be conducted by PARIS21 (through regional or sub-regional seminars) and by the regional Vice-Presidencies of the WB (that are most familiar with the needs and priorities of the countries).

#### **Recommendation**

1. Efforts should be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the remaining countries to prepare NSDS.

Some members of the IMC have also drawn the attention of the AP to the fact that a significant number of NSDS proposed have never been finalized or, when finalized, never been adopted or validated by the national authorities. It could be interesting to know the reasons why some countries have encountered a deadlock in finalizing their

---

<sup>7</sup> According to this brochure, only 25.6 % of the IDA and low and middle income countries have no strategy. This figure is questionable. The information is drawn through three sources: the Websites of key development partners (in particular the WB), draft information provided by countries to the secretariat of PARIS21 and the Websites of countries’ national statistical office. The brochure indicates that, *while existing strategies may not necessarily follow the NSDS guidelines, most strategies currently being designed do follow them*. The AP is a little bit skeptical towards this declaration and there are in the brochure several contradictory examples.

NSDS. Some other NSDS are obviously outdated because the existing NSDS have been adopted several years ago.

**Recommendations**

2. A study should be conducted to find out 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.
3. 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.

Three additional remarks on these “new” NSDS proposals:

- the proposal for Somalia was presented for the third time without any of the improvement recommended by the IMC during its previous meetings
- the proposal presented for the NSI of Democratic Republic of Congo was not presented under the NSDS window for unclear reasons (political situation in the country ?)
- even if the proposals made by Jamaica and Vietnam were not presented under the flag of NSDS, they have nevertheless all the characteristics of NSDS and correspond to the revised guidelines produced by the TFSCB Administration Unit in September, 2009. There was no reason for not using the NSDS Window to take a decision.

The first remark above persuades the AP to reiterate one of the recommendations it made during its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting:

**Recommendation**

4. A study should be conducted to better define the framework for priority data needs in countries still in conflict or in a post-conflict situation, the specific ways to collect them, and how the NSDS process can be utilized in post-conflict countries<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> NSDS are certainly useful for countries in a post-conflict situation. Their usefulness are questionable in countries still in conflict.

**2. 2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS** (12 proposals)

Under this heading the proposals presented are on implementing validated NSDS but also 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 US dollars</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2008 Window	Ethiopian Development Research Institute – Analysis to support Policy Decision Making	Africa	Approved	167,596
	Statistics Sierra Leone – Strengthening Capacities in Priority Sectors	Africa	Approved	123,479
	NBS Nigeria – Building Capacity at State Level	Africa	Approved	325,000
	Cape Verde – Implementation of the NSDS	Africa	Rejected	
Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window	Chilean Ministry of Planning – Statistics and Achievement of MDGs	Latin American and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	150,000
	NBS China – Improvement of Data Dissemination	East Asia and Pacific	Rejected	
	NSC Mongolia – Implementation of the NSDS: Census	Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Conditionally approved	400,000
	Banco Central and DGE Paraguay – Policy Decision Making	Latin American and Caribbean	Approved	398,450
	Palestinian CBS – Implementation activities	Middle East and Northern Africa	Approved	400,000

Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	Russia – Strengthening Sub-national Capacity for Analysis of Living	Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Conditionally approved	259,000
	Seychelles – Strengthening Capacity for Evidence-Based Policies	Africa	Approved	376,200
	Syria – Capacity Building for Business Surveys and Economic Analysis	Middle East and Northern Africa	Conditionally approved	400,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>2,999,725</b>
<i>25.0 % of the presented proposals</i> <i>29.4 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i> <i>32.4 % of the budget allocated</i>				

As noticed in the previous section, the percentage of proposals presented under this heading is highly significant (it represents one third of the proposals approved or conditionally approved during the period under scrutiny and also one third of the budget allocated by the IMC). It is certainly a new and interesting development of the TFSCB.

Implementation is a lengthy time consuming and costly process. It cannot be done only through international consultants. Proposals aiming at implementing NSDS should provide local expenses, training and local consultants, which are too often absent from the terms of reference of the projects. It may require a stronger management and leadership of the NSOs than the ones existing.

The implementation phase may reveal some limitations of the NSDS such as:

- the NSDS was too ambitious or unrealistic; it over-estimated the real capacities of the NSOs;
- the strategy concerned only the central statistical office and not the sectors under the charge of line ministries;
- there were no link or few links between the NSDS and the development strategy of the country (e.g. the PRSP or the MDGs) and the statistics required for decision making.

It would be valuable if the practical experience gained from implementation of the first round of NSDS could be centrally analyzed and documented by the TFSCB Administration Unit and/or PARIS21 and used for producing and applying guidelines for future implementation of the NSDS.

#### **Recommendation**

5. The practical experience gained from implementation of the first round of NSDS should be centrally analyzed and documented and used for developing guidelines for future NSDS.

In the future, the IMC may wish to ensure that the proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS are approved only if the NSDS is officially adopted by the countries making these proposals. It is not the case for instance for the proposal presented by Seychelles where the government is currently in the process of developing the NSDS with the support of the AfDB. It will be important to check that there will be no contradiction between the NSDS and the outputs and outcomes of the project financed by the TFSCB.

### **2.3. Country proposals concerning topical activities** (8 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 US dollars</b>
Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window	Algerian Ministry of Agriculture – Development of Agricultural Statistics	Middle East and Northern Africa	Conditionally approved	396,600
	INDRHI Dominican Republic – Statistics in the Water Resources Sector	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected	
	INS Niger – Informal Sector Analysis	Africa	Conditionally approved	150,000
	NSO Philippine – Improvement of the SNA	East Asia and Pacific	Approved	400,000
Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	Mexico + Brazil & Colombia – Consortium for Innovation in Statistics	Latin American and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	341,500
	Brazil – Award for Innovation in Statistics	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected	
	Colombia – Award for Innovation in Statistics	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected	

	Mexico – Award for Innovation in Statistics	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected	
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,288,100</b>
16.7 % of the presented proposals				
11.8 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved				
13.9 % of the budget allocated				

The proposals presented by Brazil, Colombia and Mexico concerning the creation in each of these three countries of an award “for innovation in statistics” are atypical. The AP understands the rejection of the proposals by the IMC. Eventually, such awards may indeed contribute to strengthening national statistical capacities, but having recourse to the TFSCB for financing their creation and distribution does not constitute a sustainable solution.

If these three proposals are excluded, the other ones are in-line with a tendency noted by the AP during its previous meetings. Financing “topical proposals” may be an interesting and valuable complement to the NSDS; it is assumed of course that such proposals have been made in countries having adopted and validated a NSDS, which was the case for all the five proposals made under this heading.

It should be recognized that the percentage of proposals (covered by this section<sup>9</sup>) approved or conditionally approved is higher (80 %) than the percentage of NSDS proposals approved or conditionally approved and that the percentage of the budget allocated is higher than the one allocated for NSDS proposals.

The AP doesn’t disagree with this tendency. In its 5<sup>th</sup> report, the AP recommended *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*. The proposals made during the period under scrutiny are almost in line with this recommendation, even with a small number of proposals making it a little bit risky to draw general conclusions. The AP is therefore willing to reiterate one of the recommendations it made during its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting:

**Recommendation**

6. 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>9</sup> with the exception of the three proposals for awards.

## **2. 4. Regional proposals made by inter-governmental institutions** (14 proposals)

Proposals presented in this section refer to regional proposals made by inter-governmental institutions<sup>10</sup> (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 2008 Window	Knowledge Transfer Network of the Statistical Conference of the Americas – Regional network for SCB of the NSSs	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected. Revised proposal welcomed	
	WB LAC Region – Harnessing best practices – 1 <sup>st</sup> Regional Award for Innovation	Latin American and Caribbean	Rejected. Revised proposal welcomed	
Non NSDS Fall 2008 Window	WBI PADI	Global	Conditionally approved	250,000
	WB Africa Region – Improving Quality of Statistical Production	Africa	Rejected	
	UNECLAC – Prices and National Accounts	Latin American and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	325,000
	WB LAC Region – Gender Statistics	Latin American and Caribbean	Conditionally approved	148,950

<sup>10</sup> It has to be noted that one of these projects (Global Project on Measuring Progress launched by OECD) global has two different objectives:

- to contribute to and stimulate research into key dimensions activities of progress that are particularly relevant for developing countries
- to facilitate the participation of developing countries to the 3<sup>rd</sup> OECD World Forum co-organized by OECD and the Government of Korea in Busan, Korea on October 27 – 29 on “Charting Progress, Building Visions, Improving Life”.

The second objective has to be put under the heading 2.6.

It is therefore proposed to split this proposal into two parts:

- the contribution to research activities (approved for 200,000 USD) being put under the heading 2.4
- the contribution for facilitating the participation of developing countries in the Busan Forum (also approved for 200,000 USD) being put under the heading 2.6.

	OECS – Statistical Development	Latin American and Caribbean	Approved	345,000
	SPC – Pacific Survey Program	East Asia and Pacific	Approved	400,000
	UNECE – New challenges in Central Asia and Eastern Europe	Eastern Europe and Central Asia	Conditionally approved	350,000
Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	AFRISTAT – Africa Implementation Strategy	Africa	Approved	318,235
	OECD – Global Project for Measuring Progress	Global	Approved	200,000
NSDS Windows	P21 (?) – Scaling up Initiatives for SCB	Global	Approved	330,000
	WB LAC Region – Training Courses on National Accounts	Latin American and Caribbean	Approved	80,587
	TFSCB and PARIS21 Evaluations	Global	Approved	400,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>3,147,772</b>
28.1 % of the presented proposals <sup>11</sup>				
30.9 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved <sup>12</sup>				
34 % of the budget allocated				

Out of these fourteen proposals, seven are presented by the World Bank itself (four by its regional vice-presidencies) or by the secretariat of PARIS21. Having the same mechanism for making decisions for internal and external proposals (i.e. decisions prepared and made by a management committee entirely internal to the Bank) is a little bit questionable. It might be advisable to ask the IMC to seek some external advices (e.g. among representatives of donors) before taking decisions for internal proposals.

#### **Recommendation**

7. 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.

<sup>11</sup> Because of its split into two parts, the Global Project on Measuring Progress has been counted for 0.5 when calculating the percentage of proposals in the heading 2.4

<sup>12</sup> Because of its split into two parts, the Global Project on Measuring Progress has been counted for 0.5 when calculating the percentage of the proposals approved or conditionally approved in the heading 2.4

Five of these proposals were for the Latin American countries. Of course Latin America has regional organizations in statistics that benefit from the commonality of language and statistical development, have initiatives and are effective in design and implementation of the proposals. Therefore, more proposals generated by them is not surprising. On the other hand proposals from regional organizations in the Middle East and North Africa region rarely come. It should be noted that:

- the proposals on Pacific Survey Program and the UNECE (New Challenges in Central Asia and East European countries) were approved with the expectation that they would open the door for building an overall regional strategy for these areas to promote NSDS in member countries;
- developing regional strategies could be particularly useful in the regions or sub-regions where many countries are small or islands (Pacific, Caribbean) and have not enough resources to develop NSDS by themselves
- the approval of the research component of the global project for measuring activities raises two different problems: (a) it's not proved whether these activities contribute to strengthening statistical capacities building in developing countries; (b) for administrative reasons, it was proposed that the project be implemented by the Korean National Statistical Office (co-organizer with OECD of the Busan conference – see footnote 6), which is appropriate for the second component, but certainly not specific for the research activities.

<b>Recommendations</b>	
8.	The approval of regional proposals should where possible facilitate preparation of regional strategies for the targeted regions and sub-regions.
9.	Regional strategies should be proposed (by PARIS21 ?) in addition to NSDS, in particular in the regions or sub-regions where many countries are small or islands.

**2. 5. Proposals made by NGOs** (4 proposals)

In this section proposals made by non-governmental organizations (trade organizations, training institutes, research projects,...) are discussed:

<b>Window</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget Allocated in US dollars</b>
Non NSDS Spring Window	Inst. for Health Policy, Sri Lanka – Strengthening NHA Capacities	South Asia / East Asia and Pacific	Rejected. Revised proposal welcomed	
	International Road Federation – Statistics on Road Accidents in Africa	Africa	Rejected.	

	Arab Inst. for Stat. Training and Research, Amman – Development of Statistics in Arab Countries	Middle East and Northern Africa	Rejected	
Non NSDS Fall Window	PAPFAM Arab Countries – Health Information Base	Middle East and Northern Africa	Rejected	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>0</b>
8.3 % of the presented proposals				
0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved				
0 % of the budget allocated				

Four proposals from NGOs (included trade associations) is a note-worthy development. But the IMC should thoroughly scrutinize and weigh these proposals and assess whether such proposals meet TFSCB guidelines and priorities. Moreover, if approved it may prove difficult to enforce financing procedures, accountability, and delivery of results. Some proposals may need to be approved for strategic reasons to promote national statistical capacity building and generate demand for statistics. For instance, as very few NSDS have been so far prepared for the Arab countries, approval and implementation of the proposal submitted by the Arab Institute for Statistical Training and Research would hopefully have paved the way for NSDS work in this region..

<b>Recommendation</b>
10. 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. However, NGOs’ proposals conducive to promote national statistical capacity building and generation of demand for statistics should be considered carefully.

## **2. 6. Facilitating participation to international conferences** (6 proposals)

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

<b>Window</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Budget Allocated in US dollars</b>
Non NSDS Spring 2009 Window	Korea/OECD – Global Measuring Progress	Global	Approved	200,000

NSDS Window	Strategic Plan to Improve Agricultural Statistics	Global	Approved	213,450
	Funding participation in the 18 <sup>th</sup> ICLS	Global	Approved	100,000
	Funding participation in the SDMX Conference	Global	Approved	50,000
	Funding participation in the 40 <sup>th</sup> session of the UN Statistical Commission (Feb. 2009)	Global	Approved	75,000
	ISI – Support for Developing Countries Participation in Conferences <sup>13</sup>	Global	Approved	200,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>838,450</b>
<i>11.5 % of the presented proposals</i> <i>16,2 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</i> <i>9.1 % of the budget allocated</i>				

Funding of participation of statisticians from developing countries to international conferences or seminars through the TFSCB is a recent development that started in 2008 with the objective of contributing 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. The AP observed that the coverage of the organisations and institutions requesting such assistance is expanding and the demand for funding is growing. There is some 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). However, it is not easy to design the strategy to monitor and assess the results expected from such sponsorship.

Moreover, TFSCB's intervention on selection of participants, monitoring their contribution and the benefits derived by the countries could become costly and a very

<sup>13</sup> 57<sup>th</sup> ISI Session in Durban, South Africa, from 16 to 22 August 2009 and its satellite meeting in Maputo, Mozambique, on 13 – 14 August on the global strategy for the improvement of agricultural and rural statistics; 5<sup>th</sup> international conference on agricultural statistics (ICAS 5) to be held in Kampala, Uganda, in October 2010.

time-consuming administrative and professional task. The AP also strongly feels that each international governmental agency having interest at stake should budget and bear its own costs for fair global representation. The TFSCB should rein in further growth on funding international meetings by establishing a ceiling for funding and eventually plan to discontinue after providing advance notice to current fund seeking agencies. In the case of meetings held by scientific/technical statistical NGOs such as the ISI (International Statistical Institute), some annual contribution by the World Bank as an institution (in consultation with the DECDG) rather than direct contribution by the TFSCB could be considered.

Most of these recommendations were already made in 2008 by the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AP and it is worth to repeat them. These recommendations have to be discussed not only within the Data Development Group of the Bank, but also by the PARIS21 Steering Committee.

#### **Recommendations**

11. For efficiency, a single international organization may be assigned the task of financial management and secretarial work relating to the pooled resources on meetings. If the regulatory provisions of these official organizations do not permit management by a single official organization of such a pool, then this task might be assigned with certain guidelines to an independent international organization such as the ISI, involved in similar activities.
12. 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.
13. It would be useful to examine whether the case of meetings organized by official international bodies (where leaders of the NSOs are participating in) has to be dealt with in a different way from the case of meetings organized by scientific NGOs.

In addition, the AP thinks it is not a good practice to make decisions for this kind of demands through the NSDS Window. Of course, the alleged reason is the urgency of the decision. But it could be possible to anticipate the demand in almost all cases since the dates of the meetings concerned by these demands are known largely in advance. For instance, the IMC received the request for facilitating the participation of some statisticians from developing countries in the 57<sup>th</sup> ISI session (Durban, South Africa, 16 - 22 August 2009) only at the beginning of August 2009, although the date of the Session has been fixed for years. Another example: it is obviously possible to submit now a proposal for funding some participation in the 2010 session of the UN Statistical Commission.

The situation could be improved and funds could be fairly allocated within the ceiling if an advanced calendar of the concerned events is prepared and budgeted.

### **Recommendations**

14. 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.
15. A calendar of international conferences or meetings should be prepared two years in advance and anticipated funding required be estimated for better budgeting..

### **2.7. One more issue: is it necessary to increase the maximum amount of each grant?**

Some IMC members raised the question of the actual ceiling (400 000 US dollars) fixed for the grants allotted through the TFSCB facilities and proposed to raise it. The AP believes that the actual ceiling is not a real problem for preparing NSDS, but doesn't propose a final solution to that question at the moment.;The AP proposes to discuss the issue during its seventh session in 2010.

### **III. LOOKING FORWARD**

As noted earlier in the section 2.1, the AP found that only four proposals (Democratic Republic of Congo, Jamaica, Swaziland and Vietnam) on new NSDS were approved and the fifth one (Somalia) was rejected by the IMC. Proposals by Mongolia, the Russian Federation and Syria on the implementation of their NSDS were also approved. On the other hand, a review of NSDS status in IDA and Lower Middle Income Countries (Progress Report as of May 2009, produced by Paris21) reveals that several countries located in certain regions/sub-regions have not yet produced NSDS. These are (i) Caribbean countries, (ii) Pacific islands, (iii) Central Asian countries, and (iv) South American countries. In addition there are still some individual countries in Africa and Asia who do not have any strategy.

Country proposals for Cape Verde, Nigeria, Palestine and Sierra Leone which were associated with the tasks related either to converting NSDS into action plan or implementation per se were also approved. Otherwise, most of the other approved proposals were for non-NSDS work mainly regional projects, topical/sector statistics and international meetings.

Based on the meetings with some IMS members and the review of past activities, the AP envisages that in coming years the TFSCB can expect to receive proposals for financing the following main activities:

**(A) NSDS**

- (i) Preparation of initial NSDS (including the preparation of regional strategies for statistical capacity building) by remaining countries,
- (ii) Preparation of initial NSDS by countries having already drafted strategic or planning documents in a different form than the one recommended by PARIS21<sup>14</sup>,
- (iii) Updating or revision of initial NSDS, including the preparation of second NSDS on successful implementation of initial one,

**(B) BRIDGING GAP BETWEEN NSDS AND IMPLEMENTATION**

- (iv) Converting initial NSDS into an action plan for implementation<sup>15</sup>,
- (v) Preparatory work to be performed by prospective recipient countries prior to requesting funding under the Statistics for Results Facility (SRF),
- (vi) 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.

**(C) NON-NSDS PROJECTS**

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

---

<sup>14</sup> According to the brochure on “NSDS Status in IDA and Lower and Middle Income Countries”, a number of countries have adopted such documents under the title of “Master Plan”, “National Programme”, “Multi-year statistical plan”, etc. These documents may be far away the recommendations of PARIS21.

<sup>15</sup> This category concerns countries that adopted NSDS without any action plan for implementation, which is less and less frequent.

Based on the above analysis of future requirements, the AP feels that TFSCB needs to review its strategy and guidelines to remain focused on NSDS work. The AP suggests creation of three windows instead of two for this purpose:

- Window #1. Preparation of NSDS
- Window #2. Bridging Gap between NSDS and Implementation
- Window #3. Non-NSDS Proposals

Decisions concerning the windows #1 & 2 would be taken immediately through virtual meetings as it is actually the case for the “NSDS Window”. Decisions concerning the window #3 would continue to be taken during real meetings organized twice a year.

An alternative option would be to have for all three windows only real meetings organised three times (instead of twice) a year<sup>16</sup>. The AP may discuss the different options during its seventh session in 2010.

### 3.1. Window #1:

Since many countries without strategies are located in certain earlier specified regions and sub-regions with some commonalities on size, language, level of economic and social development or natural resources, it may be advisable to develop a regional approach to promote creation of a strategy for each region. A regional framework for NSDS be designed and agreed in consultation with the NSOs of these areas. For this purpose, PARIS21 can carry out advocacy and educational tasks and TFSCB can provide funding for technical assistance and workshops. Based on new impetus and framework, the countries within each region can prepare their own strategies. Such an approach has been successful in producing national strategies in the SADC region and in Central America.

Apart from the regional approach, more pro-active approach be adopted immediately by the World Bank (DECDG, Regional offices, and the Country Directorates to better inform and draw in and fund NSDS proposals from remaining individual countries, some of which may be emerging from conflict, economic chaos, or isolation.

Under globalization and linkages, it is important that no countries should remain behind in modernizing and strengthening their statistical systems. Some high income countries, enriched through their natural resources, may need upgrading of their statistical systems. PARIS21 should utilize any available opportunity to carry out advocacy and propagate NSDS among these countries through regional approach. Similarly, TFSCB should seriously look into any avenue for co-financing a proposal on designing and developing NSDS framework for oil-rich countries with a view to promote preparation of country strategies.

---

<sup>16</sup> It is noticeable that, among the five NSDS proposals received since the AP 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, only one was presented during a virtual meeting; the four other ones were presented during the non-NSDS windows.

### 3.2. Window #2.

The progress report on the status of NSDS shows that several countries have prepared and adopted strategies but are awaiting implementation. Some of these countries may not have expertise and resources to convert NSDS into action/implementation plan. Those countries whose authorities decide to have access to STATCAP can have access to resources in advance for the preparation of action plan from the World Bank PPF. Other countries have to look for bilateral or other grants. It is envisaged that under the Statistics for Results Facility (SRF), five pilot countries would have access to the Catalytic Fund pooling multi-donor resources consisting of grants and in some cases supplemented with loans. Among these uncertainties, it is not advisable to have strategies for several countries expire pending the availability of funds for implementation. TFSCB does not have resources to finance entire implementation plans but it could certainly provide funding for preparatory work and lead components such as on fixing priorities, detailing targeted actions in terms of costs, procurement etc., recruitment and training of human resources, strengthening organization and management, and developing annual and multi-year expenditure plan with a prospect of converting into a financing plan<sup>17</sup>. The AP recommends that in the remaining years of the TFSCB III, the preparatory work for implementation and other NSDS related listed activities be given as high priority as the preparation of NSDS . AP was informed that TFSCB III is left with only \$4 million of uncommitted funds. If the TFSCB continues to receive proposals with the same order of magnitude as in recent years the funds would exhaust by the end of 2010 even though the TFSCBIII would continue through end-2012 to allow for the implementation of approved projects. In view of the range of activities to be financed and to derive targeted results from TFSCB funded projects, AP recommends that additional funding be made available to TFSCB III and its duration be extended.

### 3.3. Window #3.

These proposals range from individual country proposals for capacity building in specific topical/sector areas such as statistics on national accounts, prices, health, gender, agriculture, etc. and regional projects on training to funding of international meetings. Some of the proposals are closely related to statistical capacity building and a few of them need stretching guidelines to be justified as statistical capacity building proposals. In relation to the extent of the NSDS and related work still to be financed by the Fund the amount of resources are limited. The AP therefore strongly feels that the IMC should not deviate from the main thrust of TFSCB and exercise caution in approving proposals under Window#3 on non-NSDS projects<sup>18</sup>. In fact the IMC may wish to adopt an

---

<sup>17</sup> The World Bank proposal on scaling up initiatives for SCB on which revision is requested by IMC targeted at some of the elements of Windows #1 & 2. It provided only costs for five international experts and their travel. To convert NSDS into action plan expertise in statistics as well as in institution building, IT, budgeting and costing, procurement etc. are needed. Moreover, workshops need to be conducted to agree on priorities and details. The proposal did not take into account costs for local consultants and other local costs.

<sup>18</sup> For the proposals received by the IMC from March 2008 to March 2009, the percentage of funds allocated to non-NSDS proposals was over 60%.

informal ceiling of 20 percent of total allocations for non-NSDS related activities. Some favourable consideration be given to any non-NSDS proposal that is emanating from GDDS recommendations made in the requesting country or operational needs of the WB..

**Recommendations**

16. Three windows should be created: 1. Preparation of NSDS, 2. Bridging gap between NSDS and implementation, and 3. Non-NSDS. Decisions concerning the windows #1 & 2 would be taken immediately through virtual meetings. Decisions concerning the window #3 would continue to be taken during real meetings organized twice a year.
17. In the remaining years of the TFSCB III, the preparatory work for implementation should be given as high priority as the preparation of NSDS and required additional funding should be provided.
18. A maximum of 20 % of TFSCB III resources be allocated in the remaining years for the Window#3 on non-NSDS proposals.