

***PARIS21 LIGHT EVALUATION***  
***Final Draft Report***

June 2006  
***PIERRE SPITZ, Facilitator/Evaluator***

## Table of Contents

PART I: Background, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Questions.....	3
Background .....	3
Evaluation process .....	3
Selection of the evaluation questions.....	5
Questions/Answers to/from African countries partipating in the FASDEV meeting.....	7
PART II: PARIS21 Outputs and Inputs 2004-2006.....	9
Outputs .....	9
Inputs.....	10
Summary of Inputs/Outputs .....	12
PART III: The Review Group Answers to Key Evaluation Questions.....	13
PART IV: Remarks by the Facilitator/Evaluator .....	34
Standard evaluation criteria .....	34
A personal view .....	36
ANNEX 1: Notes of a Telephone Conference to Discuss PARIS21 Review Group Activities .....	38
ANNEX 2: PARIS21 Light Evaluation Review Group Meeting, 9th February 2006 – Minutes ...	41
ANNEX 3: Note on a review of PARIS21 by participants at the Second Forum on African Statistical Development, Addis Ababa, February 10, 2006.....	43
ANNEX 4: Minutes from 10 February 2006 Meeting with Francophone Country Representatives Present at FASDEV II.....	46
ANNEX 5: FASDEV II 9/02/06 -- “Light” evaluation of PARIS21 .....	50
ANNEX 6: Terms of Reference for review of PARIS21.....	59
ANNEX 7: Topics for consideration by review.....	70

## **PART I: Background, Evaluation Process, Evaluation Questions**

### **BACKGROUND**

---

During the PARIS21 Steering Committee Meeting of 9-10 June 2005, a “light” evaluation of PARIS21 was proposed to reflect progress in 2004 and 2005, that is for the period following the 2003 Evaluation whose findings came too late to develop the Work Programme and secure funding for 2004-2006, thus slowing down PARIS21 activities in the first half of 2004. This suggested that reporting results of the second evaluation at the June 2006 Steering Committee would be too late to inform development of the next phase of PARIS21’s Work Programme and funding. On the other hand, given the slow start due to delays in funding, it was considered too early to evaluate the 2004-2006 programme.

It was, therefore, decided that a sub-group of Steering Committee members would carry out a review of PARIS21 for the years 2004-2005 and provide recommendations on the possible future of PARIS21, including its orientation, objectives, and priority activities.

### **EVALUATION PROCESS**

---

The composition of the Review Group (thereafter denominated as RG or the Group) was decided in January 2006, after consultations with members of the Steering Committee. Pieter Everaers, of the European Commission, accepted to chair the Group. Other members are : Shaida Badiee (World Bank), Grace Bediako (Ghana), Siobhan Carey (United Kingdom), Paul Cheung (UNSD), Jean François Divay (France), André Portella (AfDB), Romulo Virola (Philippines). Mrs Maria-Magdalena Garcia (Honduras) not being any more a member of the Steering Committee and not being replaced, Latin America is unfortunately not represented.

The Terms of Reference (see Annex 6) proposed by the Secretariat state that the “light” evaluation will be based on a review by the Group, assisted by an external evaluator who will facilitate the process, with logistical support (and funding) from the PARIS21 Secretariat. The evaluator/facilitator (Pierre Spitz) was appointed mid-January. As reported in the document “Framework for the ‘light’ evaluation of PARIS21” (see Annex 6), he pointed out that “a ‘light’ review process cannot realistically evaluate the impact of the PARIS21 work programme or attribute achievements meaningfully”. Even consideration of Consortium outcomes, namely:

1. Development and poverty reduction policies include development, financing and monitoring of national statistical systems
2. Countries elaborate and implement national statistical development strategies based on dialogue between data producers and users at national and international level.

3. Partners involved in statistical activities improve their collaboration nationally, regionally, and internationally to increase the volume and efficiency of their support to developing countries.

.....according to the means of verification set out in the Logical Framework agreed for 2004-06 would be too onerous for a 'light' evaluation. This would involve analysing partner country PRSPs, public expenditure statements and reports on statistical development. But the Review Group might consider recommending that such analysis, and analysis of donor strategies, should in the future be given a higher priority and be carried out systematically as part of the PARIS21 Secretariat's work programme in order to provide inputs into any future reviews.

The "framework" document further states:

"Instead the focus of the review should be on the PARIS21 Secretariat's outputs delivered through its work programme during the period from January 2004 to the present, as agreed by the Steering Committee. The implicit assumption is that if the outputs are relevant and they are being delivered efficiently and effectively, then this will facilitate the achievement of consortium outcomes which, provided the assumptions set out in the Logical Framework are being met, will lead to achievement of the consortium's Purpose and Goal."

Terms of Reference and Framework, as well as the Timetable, were reviewed through a telephone conference organised by the Review Group Chair on 3 February 2006 (see Annex 1). All members took part in the discussion, except Mr. Virola for reasons of time difference with the Philippines. He, however, had discussed previously over the telephone with the facilitator and made amendments to the TOR, which were accepted by the Group. As a result, the tasks of the Group were defined as follows:

- Agree the terms of reference and *modus operandi* for the review of PARIS21 and provide guidance where necessary
- Agree upon the evaluation criteria and a more precise timetable and process about which the full Steering Committee will be kept informed
- Agree on a final set of evaluation questions, some of them tentatively proposed by the facilitator, others by sub-group members or other key stakeholders, including other Steering Committee members
- Answer these questions individually, and by writing, each sub-group member, thus providing his/her inputs to the Review
- Approve the evaluator/facilitator's inception and final report before its submission to the Steering Committee
- Make themselves available (either in person or via email/telephone) for interviews conducted by the evaluator
- Report back to the Steering Committee meeting in April 2006 on the evaluation and with recommendations on the future of PARIS21, including its orientation, objectives, and priority activities.

The “framework for the ‘light’ evaluation of PARIS21” was discussed. The Chair concluded that the framework was generally supported. He commented that the discussion provided guidance to all members on the types of evaluation questions to draft and on the direction the evaluation can be expected to take. He asked members to draft evaluation questions that could gauge impact and proposed that the suggestions of best and worst country examples and peer review of PARIS21 outputs be shelved in light of the review’s time constraints. They could instead be brought up in a future, more comprehensive evaluation of PARIS21. A true impact evaluation would be too heavy and require studying the issues very deeply, but this review process cannot afford such a detailed effort. He closed by commenting that the evaluation process could produce a revised mandate focusing on the new goal of NSDS and making PARIS21 a modern, updated initiative.

The proposed work programme was approved, with the following additions:

- “Review Sub-Group to propose evaluation questions to facilitator in writing” during the weeks of 6-10 February.
- “Evaluator/Facilitator to submit inception report” on 17 February.
- “Review Sub-Group to discuss the final report” on 27 or 28 March (Secretariat to coordinate and propose which date fits best).

RG members attending the FASDEV meeting in Addis Ababa met on February 9<sup>th</sup>. Minutes of the meeting are to be found below (see Annex 2). Participants included the Co-chairs of PARIS21 Steering Committee, Richard Manning (DAC Chairman, OECD) and Grace Bediako (Ghana Statistical Services), as well as Shaida Badiie and Misha Belkindas (World Bank), Siobhan Carey (UK), Jean-François Divay (France), Francesca Perucci (UNSD), André Portella (AfDB), James Whitworth (EC), Antoine Simonpietri and Frances Harper (PARIS21), Pierre Spitz, Evaluator/Facilitator.

## **SELECTION OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

---

Evaluation questions were received from all members of the Group.

Questions by F. Perucci (UNSD) give the most realistic and convenient framework. Many of the questions of others are in one form or another captured by this framework. The most relevant questions in the context of this light evaluation are incorporated in the proposed questionnaire. Some extremely relevant questions cannot be considered at this stage as they require time and resources which are not available. They should be kept for a full-fledged evaluation. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that RG members will give their answers (key inputs in this review process) out of their own knowledge and experience and will have little time to conduct interviews so as to cross-check or enrich their perception. Questions addressed at country level, such as the ones proposed by R. Virola, were asked and/or discussed, at least for African countries, during the FASDEV meeting in Addis (see following section).

As the result of this clearing/pruning the following key questions are proposed. There are, on one hand, certainly still too many. But, on the other hand, it is in no way a restrictive framework

as an RG member may give inputs on other questions proposed by colleagues (contributions were copied to all) or by herself/himself. However, given the fact that more than one hundred questions were received from RG members, the initial intention to request the other members of the Steering Committee to propose questions was abandoned for lack of time to enter these questions, which could have easily been themselves more than one hundred, into the validation process by the Review Group. Given the severe time constraints imposed to the exercise, it was similarly decided not to overload the full Steering Committee with the details of the process, but to concentrate on the timely delivery by the Review Group of its report for discussions at the April Steering Committee meeting.

Proposed key evaluation questions for the Review Sub-group:

1. Since the last review of PARIS21 mandate in the Fall of 2003, do you think the goal has become broader?
  - a) If so, in what way?
  - b) And if so, do you feel PARIS21, in its current structure and organisation, is equipped to carry out the expanded mandate?
  - c) Could you give a ranking of success (from the greater to the lesser) in the attainment of the core objectives and deliverables of P21 (advocacy, NSDS work, coordination and raising financial support) during the review period?
  - d) Overall, how successful has P21 been in creating a “brand identity” for partnership in statistics?
  - e) How successful has it been in creating networks of users and producers of statistics?
  - f) How successful has it been in raising the awareness of the private sector and civil society at large on the value of “good” statistics?
2. Do you think national governments in developing countries have been giving more attention to statistical systems?
  - a) If so, do you think this has translated into stronger government will to support the production of statistics, especially in relation to MDG and PRS monitoring requirements?
  - b) Can you provide evidence that links such an increased support to the advocacy role played by PARIS21?
3. What do you see as the main trigger for PARIS21 to select countries/regions?
4. Do you think users in countries have increased their demand for statistics and improved their dialogue with national data producers?
  - a) If so, can you provide evidence of the role PARIS21 has played to promote that and the impact of their work?
5. Do you think the launch of NSDS has helped:

- a) Develop plans that are based on country's needs rather than driven by international agencies' priorities;
  - b) Bring together all the stakeholders in the country;
  - c) Ensure political and financial support from the government;
  - d) Ensure that international support be consistent with national plans;
  - e) Has the NSDS approach to statistical development shown negative impact?
  - f) How does the NSDS approach compare with previous approach to statistical building?
  - g) In what ways has P21 added value at the country, regional and international levels?
  - h) How do you assess the degree of technicality vs. advocacy in PARIS21 involvement in the NSDS process? Does it require a quality control? By whom and at which stage(s)?
6. Do you think P21 has contributed to a better coordination between funding agencies?
- a) Through reducing duplication of efforts by various funding agencies?
  - b) Through mobilising agencies around NSDS
    - at the country level
    - at the regional/sub-regional level
    - at the international level
7. Do you see, on the contrary, any duplication between P21 work programme deliverables and other agencies? If you view this as a problem, please elaborate.
8. Keeping in mind that P21 Regional Workshops are de facto meetings grouping countries conveniently (by language, geographical proximity, or other criteria) and offering them a common framework for statistical development at the country level, has P21 stuck within their remit of working on advocacy, facilitating international and/or regional events, or have they moved more towards working at the country level?
9. What are the strengths and weaknesses in PARIS21 relations with international statistical organisations?
10. What do you feel should be the most important role of PARIS21 in the near future? Is this role matching their current capacity and experience?

## **QUESTIONS/ANSWERS TO/FROM AFRICAN COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE FASDEV MEETING**

---

Two meetings organised by the Facilitator of one and half hour duration each should have taken place on 08/02 afternoon, as the programme had reserved this slot for parallel meetings. These meetings were expected to group together representatives of Anglophone countries on one hand and of Francophone and Lusophone countries on the other hand so as to hear their views on PARIS21. Unfortunately, due to some ECA reorganisation, a Plenary was suddenly announced for the afternoon. As a result, the two P21 evaluation meetings had to be cancelled. The group meetings, however, could finally be reinserted on the last day but for one hour only and at the same time. Grace Bediako teamed up with Shaida Badiée to lead discussions of the Anglophone group. The Facilitator led the Francophone/Lusophone group.

As reported in the comprehensive note summarising the discussions of the Anglophone group (see Annex 3), the level of interaction with and knowledge of PARIS21 as well as their understanding of the PARIS21 mission and objectives varied considerably between the 12 country representatives.

The 25 country representatives of the Francophone and Lusophone Group had a much better knowledge of PARIS21 (see Annex 4). They were, without exception, praising the past and present role of PARIS21 and making a strong play to receive more support in the future at the country level for facilitating the NSDS process, in particular through advocacy directed at the donors. It was observed, in this respect, that agreements reached for a better coordination at Headquarters level (e.g., between the World Bank, AfDB, PARIS21) do not necessarily trickle down to country level. It was also suggested to give priority to the least developed NSS, for instance through multi-country workshops grouping them together.

In order to get a more systematic understanding of the perceptions of PARIS21 by the country representatives attending the FASDEV meeting a questionnaire was distributed in English and French. Out of the 39 questionnaires distributed, 28 were filled. This response rate of 71% is high given the short time available for filling the questionnaire. Three participants felt they should consult their colleagues in the country and requested to have it sent electronically, which was done. No questionnaire filled was sent back to the Facilitator, thus confirming the difficulty to get answers by e-mail, a difficulty already encountered in the 2003 Evaluation.

As many of the questions correspond to the key evaluation questions proposed above, please find in Annex 5 the results obtained.

## **PART II: PARIS21 Outputs and Inputs 2004-2006**

### **OUTPUTS**

---

As agreed (see above) the “light” evaluation focuses on the Secretariat Outputs, although some of the issues related to the Consortium Goal, Purpose and Outcomes are discussed at times by Review Group members. The CD-ROM provided with this report gives the full details of the Outputs, according to the Logical Framework 2004-2006 agreed upon by the Steering Committee, as well as the full texts of the reports as appropriate.

However for the sake of convenience, and to relate in the same document Outputs to Inputs, a summary of the Outputs is provided below.

From 1 January 2004 to 28 February 2006, PARIS21 has produced, *inter alia*, the following outputs:

- Organisation of 14 regional workshops in Africa, Arab States, Asia, and Latin America, gathering together 77 countries (50 IDA countries).
- Preparations for 5 more regional workshops in Asia and Latin America before the end of 2006, covering 34 countries (15 IDA countries).
- Organisation of 3 consultants briefing sessions (Addis-Ababa, Dakar, Paris), training a total of 62 Africa-based and Europe-based consultants on assisting countries in the design of their NSDS.
- Co-organisation of two Forum on African Statistical Development (FASDEV) meetings, gathering together all African countries and all technical and financial partners in Africa.
- Conduct of 26 country missions to assist NSDS teams in the design of their strategy.
- Participation in and presentation of the PARIS21 agenda at 32 partner meetings.
- Production of the following papers to guide countries in their statistical development processes:
  - *NSDS Essentials* (Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Russian)
  - *Making the Case for an NSDS* (Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Russian)
  - *Guide to Designing an NSDS* (Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, Russian)
  - *Guide to Designing an NSDS Roadmap* (Arabic, English, French, Spanish)

- *NSDS Implementation Issues* (English) - draft
- *Models of Statistical Systems* (English)
- *Measuring Up to the Measurement Problem: The Role of Statistics in Evidence-Based Policy-making* (with a set of pamphlets and leaflets in English, French, and Spanish)
- *Developing a Policy-Based NSDS* (English)
- Baseline assessments on strategic statistical planning in the national statistical systems of Central, Eastern, and Western African Francophone countries.
- Compilation of draft NSDS design roadmaps for Francophone African countries, as of June 2005.
- Compilation of Francophone African countries' statistical legislation.
- Development of an online Knowledge Base of 630 documents on statistical development.
- In collaboration with task teams, production of a report of six case studies on improved statistical support for monitoring development goals, an inventory of agencies involved in statistical training, TORs for a guide on developing a human resources strategy, draft TORs for a guide on integrating agricultural statistical development into the NSDS, and an inception report for the task team on costing and funding of NSDS.
- Production of two advocacy videos on statistical development and agricultural statistics.
- Production of the report *Review of Support to Statistical Capacity Building in Sub-Saharan Africa: From Reporting To Collaboration*, outlining the statistical support programmes of 54 technical and financial partners in sub-Saharan Africa.
- Production of the report *Statistical Development in Africa: Progress Report on National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDS) in Sub-Saharan Africa Countries*.
- Establishment of two satellite programmes — the International Household Survey Network and the Accelerated Data Programme in Pilot Countries — in the Secretariat, as requested by the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics Advisory Board

## **INPUTS**

---

### **A. Financial inputs**

For the period 1 January 2004 to 28 February 2006, the PARIS21 Secretariat (excluding Metagora) received €4.9 million in voluntary contributions from 12 donors. This figure does not include the UNDP-managed Japanese trust fund's contribution of €304k to finance PARIS21's four regional workshops in Asia, as these funds were transferred directly from UNDP to UNESCAP, nor does it include in-kind contributions such as secondees.

The breakdown of contributions is as follows:

1. Austria	€ 200k
2. Belgium	€ 400k
3. EFTA	€ 80k
4. Finland	€ 100k
5. France	€ 924k
6. Germany	€ 100k
7. Ireland	€ 215k
8. Netherlands	€ 600k
9. Norway	€ 386k
10. Sweden	€ 497k
11. Switzerland	€ 193k
12. United Kingdom	€ 1,214k

**Total € 4,908k**

**B. Human resources**

Tables I and II below present the human resources inputs into PARIS21 activities in the form of Secretariat staff and consultants.

**Table I: Number of Person-Months for PARIS21 Secretariat staff and person-days for consultants, per month and per year**

		2004												
	Total	Unit	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
<b>Permanent Staff</b>	<b>111</b>	person-month	7	7	8	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
<b>Consultant</b>	<i>137</i>	person-day			35	7	20	19	6			30		20
		2005												
	Total	Unit	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
<b>Permanent Staff</b>	<b>140</b>	person-month	10	10	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
<b>Consultant</b>	<i>235</i>	man-day		30		5		117	40	15	3	5		20
		2006												
	Total	Unit	J	F										
<b>Permanent Staff</b>	<b>24</b>	person-month	12	12										
<b>Consultant</b>	<i>68</i>	man-day	48	20										

**Table II: Average number of person-years, by staff status and by year**

	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Permanent staff</b>	9.25	11.7
<b>Consultant *</b>	0.54	0.92
<b>Total</b>	9.79	12.6
* computed using 255 days per year		

## **SUMMARY OF INPUTS/OUTPUTS**

---

With an average number of a little more than eleven (11.19) person-years for the period 2004-2005 and a budget of around five million Euros for the biennium, and given the considerable output delivered, it can be safely said that the efficiency of the Secretariat is rather on the high side, particularly as funding came late in 2004 and was available only by mid-year. The success of the NSDS approach and the volume of activities it fostered were not anticipated at the time the 2004-2006 Logical Framework including the NSDS was approved by the Steering Committee in October 2003. Its subsequent support by the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics in February 2004 contributed to make NSDS better known as it was singled out as one of the three actions of the global plan for statistics directly addressing national needs. According to the answers of the Review Group members (see below), the funding priorities appear to be consistent with the Consortium Purpose of greater demand, availability and use of better statistics and statistical analysis in decision-making. PARIS21 has also built on synergies with partner agencies, particularly with the World Bank and its Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building and the Bank's other activities, with DFID and with France. Other evaluation criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability will be dealt with after having taken into account the Review Group answers.

## **PART III: The Review Group Answers to Key Evaluation Questions**

The members of the Review Group were invited to give their inputs (answers to the proposed key evaluation questions) before March 6th so as to give the Facilitator the necessary time to complete the draft report by mid-March. Unfortunately, answers were delayed. The last answers were received on March 14th.

The answers fill out 38 pages. They are summarised by the Facilitator, who, at times, gives his own comments. Full quotes are also given to respect the nuances of the respondent. GB stands for Grace Bediako, JFD for Jean-Francois Divay, RV for Romulo Virola.

### ***1. Since the last review of PARIS21 mandate in the Fall of 2003, do you think the goal has become broader?***

#### **a) If so, in what way?**

DFID, before answering that the role of PARIS21 (thereafter shortened as “P21”) has broadened and deepened and is in line with the mandate of the Steering Committee, makes an interesting preamble detailing the role P21 was set up to do as articulated in their June 2001 Steering Committee paper:

- Acting as central contact and reference point for the Consortium, including organising global Consortium meetings for P21 and supporting the steering body
- Building support for the P21 agenda and seeking to ensure that key partners and stakeholders are engaged fully and effectively in PARIS21 processes
- Organising regional workshops and advising on and facilitating follow-up activities at the regional and country levels
- Supporting countries and regional organisations to develop and bring innovative ideas and proposals for consideration by Trust Funds and other P21 partners
- Engaging with national funders and donors to build support for statistical capacity building (including for P21) and to assist in facilitating donor co-ordination, where appropriate

- Supporting development and dissemination of information and guidance on issues such as advocacy, strategic planning, costing and funding, and access to both technical and financial assistance
- Facilitating information exchange and sharing of experience between partners to contribute to the development of knowledge and good practice within the Consortium
- Preparing annual progress reports for approval by the Consortium prior to submission to the UN Statistical Commission

Five other Group members agree with the broader or deeper (JFD) approach which they link with “the demand for a wider range of services broadening the Secretariat’s day-to-day work” (WB) and the development of NSDS (all six), thus responding to changing needs (GB and WB). “This has worked well in P21 managing to get its work integrated into larger initiatives – such as the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics” (WB). DFID concurs in stating that NSDS is more than advocacy, it is also providing guidance for statistical offices. For AfDB, P21 was also involved in RRSF. For JFD, the goal is “deeper” rather than broader “since NSDSs constitute a framework for the practical implementation of P21 initial mandate. NSDSs have become a brand for P21 that embodies what its objectives are.” All these answers are therefore very positive, culminating with RV statement “For P21 to make a difference in the global statistical landscape, the mandate of P21 has to be expanded.”

UNSD wishes to go beyond the evidence of the link referred to above between “broadening” and “increasing the range of activities” to explore deeper causality factors and the attendant priority ordering: “It is not clear whether the goal has become broader or rather the range of activities covered has expanded”, a statement not contradicting the above observations. Of the two examples of increasing the range of activities, one is clearly shared by all Group members with positive connotations (“national strategy development”) and one is not fully spelled out (“more involvement in technical work”), particularly as this involvement would include “data collection”, of which the Evaluator has not found examples in the literature at his disposal.

For EC, the goal has not become broader but the scope has shifted as the increasing emphasis on NSDS has been at the expense of the coordination work. In addition “the balance between advocacy work and the NSDS is sometimes not that clear to draw”, a statement which does not contradict what is said above about NSDS being more than advocacy.

**b) And if so, do you feel P21, in its current structure and organisation, is equipped to carry out the expanded mandate?**

Group members all agree that P21 new tasks require some adjustments. JFD sees the Secretariat “organized along domains (household surveys, administrative information system on health, education, labour, etc.) providing methodological support, keeping its role in promoting advocacy and the coordination of donors and providers of technical assistance.” Others see adjustments needed not so much in terms of structure and organisation but rather in *modus operandi*. The World Bank and GB underline the usefulness of Task Teams,” with more formal relationship with institutions that have clear mandate in the specific areas of statistics that P21 is

branching into” (GB) and “working together with key agencies” (WB). For AfDB, P21 cannot undertake new tasks for lack of staff as “being only a Secretariat”.

DFID points out that “P21 is not resourced to be a major transferer of resources to developing country governments and can do only limited work at the country level” and expresses concern about the accelerated data programme (ADP), although as a pilot programme it is accepted that P21 is a suitable location. Its scaling up, however, should be considered by the Steering Committee and the remit changed if necessary. DFID notes that if the postponement of workshop in the Kyrgyz Republic was due to resources constraints, P21 should be endowed with resources allowing a quick response to country needs. Among the new tasks ahead, the ADP is also singled out by the World Bank and UNSD. After underlying the usefulness of the Task Teams, the World Bank states that “at the same time, P21 needs to have some flexibility to respond to changing needs and be able to assist with special areas of work.” One example is the two satellite programmes being developed as pilot programmes to be coordinated as part of P21. There will be many occasions that P21 may not have all the skills and competencies needed for an urgent area of work to be addressed. But, its strength is that it is where all key agencies come to work together and coordinate their programmes. We could certainly use the strengths of partner agencies to find the skills and expertise needed and fill the gap.”

UNSD has a more radical view: “The two key new elements are the technical assistance to developing countries in developing NSDS and the implementation of the accelerated data programme. It would be advisable to either: 1) keep PARIS21 main mandate as it is and assign the other responsibilities to institutions that are adequately equipped and have a more appropriate structure to carry out the work; or 2) change PARIS21’s mandate. We are fine with either. But it needs to be clear.”

EC singles out coordination as not having been successful and as an element of an expanded mandate which could “only be carried out in combination with an organizational change” and which will “highly depend on the willingness of international institutions to adopt this position and adapt to it.”

The World Bank is the only Group member who addresses the competencies that P21 should have available: partnership building skills; strong communication and advocacy skills; project management skills to organise events and partnership activities; and recognised and seasoned expertise in development statistics to provide overall advice and guidance.

While other Group members answer in a general way as far as countries are concerned, RV takes an interesting viewpoint in stating that under the current structure and organisation of P21, the expanded mandate cannot be meaningfully and effectively carried out, but should focus on mobilising experts “who can work in/with the poorer regions/countries.”

- c) Could you give a ranking of success (from the greater to the lesser) in the attainment of the core objectives and deliverables of P21 (advocacy, NSDS work, coordination and raising financial support) during the review period?**

NSDS and advocacy have together the highest ranking, coordination and financial support the lowest. Variations, however, seem to depend largely on institutional/regional experience.

In the first group, NSDS is ranked first by four Group members: DFID, GB, JFD and EC, second by AfDB and UNSD, third by the World Bank (after Coordination and advocacy) with the following comment: “The NSDS work has also been successful, both in raising awareness of the concept and process and in persuading countries to follow the guidelines. One danger here though is that all the attention given to the preparation on NSDSs may detract from the much harder process of implementation and true capacity building on the ground.” RV ranks NSDS last but in underlining “from the perspective of my region.”

Advocacy is ranked first by UNSD (“certainly the greatest success of P21”), RV and AfDB, second for EC, DFID (“P21 has produced some high quality outputs such as videos, MUMPs, user-producer workshops etc. which appear to have been well received”) and the World Bank which comments: “advocacy has been quite successful, although the fairly rapid turn over of people in both the policy and statistics communities means that we cannot assume that past messages are still recognized and understood”. GB ranks advocacy third and JFD feels he has not enough information on the real impact of advocacy in the countries.

In the second group, coordination is only ranked first by the World Bank: “coordination among agencies has been a major strength of P21. This has helped to bring together countries, international agencies, bilaterals and from time to time high level decision makers and users”. RV and JFD ranked it second, EC and AfDB third as well as DFID, with this comment: “PARIS21 appear to be mainly concentrated on coordination at the international level which has improved greatly. The WB, UN and EC all talk to each other in PARIS21, which is a huge step forward since 1999. This can’t all be attributed to PARIS21 but it has provided a neutral space for interactions to take place. National level coordination has also improved through work on NSDSs which has provided a focus for enhanced coordination. Coordination has also improved through the use of regional workshops, communication, dissemination and supporting national events. It has been well received in countries that DFID advisers have been working in.” For UNSD, “P21 has not been successful in coordinating the response by donors (especially the bi-lateral donors) to fulfill the needs for expanded financial and technical assistance to increasing monitoring requirements.” GB ranks coordination last.

Financial support has the lowest rank for the Group members, except for GB which puts it in the second place and RV in the third. For the six other members ranking it last, there are two qualifying statements: “the link to the World Bank Trust Fund has been productive and funding for statistical capacity has increased although this cannot necessarily all be attributed to P21” (WB), echoed by DFID: “Raising financial resources has also worked rather well as we have been able to sustain the funding of both P21 and the TFSCB and link the two together, based on the request of donors”.

- d) Overall, how successful has P21 been in creating a “brand identity” for partnership in statistics?**

AfDB and RV answer positively, as well as JFD who is, nevertheless, “not sure that it encompasses the partnership aspects, especially concerning the beneficiaries countries” and adds: “I am afraid it remains a partnership mostly of donors”, while for DFID there is, at international meetings, a brand recognition by country level statisticians and non statisticians. Furthermore, DFID adds: “Although P21 is known by most national statistical offices it is less known amongst other producers and still less known amongst users of information.” The World Bank is very much on the same line: “There is a broad recognition for P21 today so the brand identity is successfully achieved. But, to a large extent the brand identity of P21 is concerned with statistics production and dissemination; it has proved much harder to create a true partnership involving both users and providers as was originally intended. The agencies represented in the Steering Committee are all from the statistical community, although the link with OECD DAC does provide a broader network among the donors. Within developing countries, however, P21 is largely seen as representing and involving statisticians.”

GB has an elaborate answer which deserves to be quoted *in extenso* :

“NSDS is generally associated with PARIS21, though there are several other national statistics strategy documents that were not prepared under the auspices of PARIS21. As other institutions such as the World Bank and the African Development Bank step up efforts to support the development of NSDS, it is highly likely that the key role of PARIS21 in the promotion of NSDS would be lost by many. Another potential problem is that PARIS21 is better known in countries where workshops (national/regional) have been held (compare results of the consultations with francophone countries with that of the Anglophone countries at FASDEV). Also, when there are no continuous follow-ups to advocacy activities, information does not seem to get to newcomers in the statistical offices. This slows down the achievements of PARIS21, particularly in countries where the turnover in national statistical offices is high. So PARIS21 has not really managed to create a brand identity as such. More needs to be done to promote the visibility of PARIS21, especially taking advantage of regional and sub-regional statistical and high level meetings.”

UNSD notes the fact that, given the geographic distribution of P21 activities, “P21 has been more successful in some parts of the world than others” and that there are countries where it is unknown. For EC, P21 might be seen as a brand for an international organisation especially active in Africa on statistical capacity building.

**e) How successful has it been in creating networks of users and producers of statistics?**

For AfDB, there has been no significant impact of P21 in creating networks. UNSD finds difficult to assess the impact of P21 alone, “given that other organizations and projects have promoted the same concept over the years”. GB feels that “successes in this direction are more significant in countries that P21 has supported to prepare NSDS” and for which the NSDS was geared to the statistical system rather than the national statistical office. EC links the success in this area with the stability of staff in partner countries “in those countries where a certain sustainability is in place, the success is clearly visible.”

WB and JFD share the same opinion according to which P21 has created or strengthened networks of producers, donors, providers of technical assistance, but not so much with users,

“unless we consider donors as users, which some of them are” (JFD), while WB notes that it is more difficult to involve them, given the structure of the Secretariat and the links with agencies on the ground. DFID gives the following answer: “workshops and P21 meetings and follow-up have provided a useful space for discussions. They have been positively received at the country level, for example David Nalo (PS Planning) in Kenya has given very positive feedback. The ways of working have built on what is there rather than adding more/new layers as some other initiatives do”. RV states that P21 has definitely contributed to the strengthening of existing networks and the birth of new ones, “but the task is far from finished”.

**f) How successful has it been in raising the awareness of the private sector and civil society at large on the value of “good” statistics?**

The most positive answer is by RV: “P21 has contributed meaningfully to raising awareness on the value of ‘good’ statistics. It has also helped International Agencies realize/recognize/accept the fact that statistical development cannot take place if the statistical activities funded/supported are inherently donor-driven initiatives”. GB sees the degree of success varying from country to country and depending on how the national statistical office uses the advocacy materials produced by P21 and those from other agencies made accessible by P21. She is not sure that there is any special attention being given to these groups, although overall there are discussions on the radio about the lack of statistics and the implications for planning in the country. This answer exposes the unfortunate ambiguity of the question which could address the indirect impact of P21 activities, or refers to a specific activity involving the private sector and civil society. The latter is what is meant by UNSD stating of not being aware of specific work in the area, by AfDB not seeing P21 playing a role in this area and by WB referring to a “fairly minimal” involvement of the private sector, with the participation of civil society organisations in some activities “but not in a sustained way”. The former is implied in the answers of DFID, mentioning “very limited” impact and EC a “limited” impact. JFD feels not in a position to answer.

**2. Do you think national governments in developing countries have been giving more attention to statistical systems?**

The general answer is positive, ranging from “yes, to a considerable extent” (WB) to “yes, to some extent”. WB adds “we see this increased attention coming through the WB’s country teams placing more emphasis (gradually) on statistical capacity issues in countries through the Country Assistance Strategy papers.” DFID mentions the positive role played in that respect by the second generation of PRSPs monitoring and gives as an example a quote from a speech of the Minister for Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda in January 2005: “It is essential we build a growing coalition by reinforcing ‘evidence based policy making’. It is vital therefore that we can reasonably accurately measure which policies are delivering. I am of the view that we are not investing enough in building statistical capability.” UNSD confirms that attention to statistics has increased and awareness of evidence-based policy making and monitoring has improved. EC gives also a positive reply, as well as RV and JFD who observes that the effect can be seen among statisticians who feel more confident that their role is important and might be more valued by their authorities. GB answers “yes, to some extent” and adds: “however, there seems not to be

sufficient appreciation of what it would take on the part of Government to ensure that the statistical system meets the increasing demand". AfDB instead of answering the question jumps to the role of P21 which is not found significant.

- a) If so, do you think this has translated into stronger government will to support the production of statistics, especially in relation to MDG and PRS monitoring requirements?**

The increased attention given to statistics by governments has, in many cases, according to the WB, "resulted in increased resources and improved conditions of service for staff: the NSDS process has been an important part of this as has the increased demand for indicators to monitor the progress of poverty reduction strategies and MDGs." DFID conducted a joint review with WB on institutional arrangements for PRS monitoring, which showed that there has been limited positive action. While there are a few examples of positive change, "it takes an insightful politician to realize the value of investing in statistics when there are health, education, election and military requirements – so as for funding we may be a bit of a way off yet." For GB, there is more emphasis on the production than on institutional building and sustaining of the statistical system. She adds: "such an orientation would require that poor conditions of service of the statistical system be addressed to help build institutions with qualified and experienced staff", an issue which was also underlined during the February 2006 FASDEV meeting. For UNSD, there have been positive examples, "but it appears that, in general, statistical systems are still lacking the strong support of government, especially in terms of providing adequate financial support and recognizing the important role of the statistical system and its output in fostering development". EC feels that "a big part of the beneficiary countries/regions" have benefited from a stronger government will to support the production of statistics, while for RV it has been done in varying degrees and for JFD the increased attention of government has not led to significant increases in funding statistics. AfDB has not answered the question.

- b) Can you provide evidence that links such an increased support to the advocacy role played by P21?**

According to RV, the advocacy of P21 has strengthened the will of official statisticians to push for increased support for statistical activities: "statisticians now take the opportunity offered by various statistical fora to dramatize the need for greater investment in statistics not only by government but also by the private sector." AfDB took the opposite view and did not see any significant role played in this respect by P21. Other Group members underlined the difficulty of attribution, in particular of P21 vs. PRS and MDG requirements. GB states that the latter preceded the workshops of P21 in many countries, especially Anglophone West Africa. For UNSD and EC the overall attention to PRS and MDGs was the main factor of increased attention while for the WB "P21 has certainly contributed to raising the level of awareness of statistics by government generally". DFID has a very open and realistic attitude in stating that "the more routes to get people thinking in terms of monitoring and statistics the better. They eventually converge in a wider dialogue such as current interest in results".

### **3. What do you see as the main trigger for P21 to select countries/regions?**

The question should have been divided in two parts: what it has been until now and what it should be. WB addresses the first part: "so far the trigger has been largely based on demand from donors, countries, and partner agencies at international and regional levels" as well as DFID in stating that they are not close enough to decisions made: "it would seem that they react to requests but whether request come from their deciding to focus on a particular region we don't know". Similarly UNSD answers that they don't know how countries/regions are selected. But all respondents give their recommendations on what the selection criteria should be:

- Least developed countries and regions, especially those who are classified as low income by the World Bank. In many cases it will be more effective to work with and through sub-regional agencies. Here the choice should be pragmatic, based on assessment of the interest of the agency in statistics and their capacity. (WB)
- Focus primarily on low income countries with the most need for improved statistics. But it is also useful if they develop links with good middle income countries who can help with consultancy and other support to less developed statistical offices. (DFID)
- Being involved in regions/sub-regional groupings with planned or ongoing statistical programmes. These programmes provide an entry for P21 and would also ensure that at regional and country levels it can provide incremental support and value added. Designing programmes that can be incorporated into statistical meetings as well as policy level meetings would be useful and enable P21 to better play the catalytic role that it was set up to play. (GB)
- We now invite P21 to our regional workshops to expand their range of action and increase the number of countries reached. Getting P21 more involved in all ongoing regional/sub-regional activities would be a good way to increase their coverage. (UNSD)
- The level of statistical development but also the will and willingness of the national authorities to participate in the elaboration of the NSDS, the expression of national priorities, the setting-up of coordination mechanisms for the national statistical systems, the negotiation with donors, etc. (JFD)
- The readiness of a country/government to start improving the societal environment and the preparations of international institutions to invest in statistical capacity building in that country. (EC)
- In addition to existing level of statistical capacity, Government/Statistical Office commitment to institutionalize the initiatives pursued should definitely be factored in so that resources and investments do not go to waste. (RV)

In summary, according to these seven answers (AfDB did not answer), preference should be given to low income countries with low level of statistical development (with eventual partnership with middle income countries having more developed statistical system), demonstrating a real commitment to improve their statistical systems. The approach recommended by some Group members to work more through regional and sub-regional

instruments does not refer to the above-mentioned criteria but does not exclude them either. The two can very well work together, but not necessarily to increase the number of countries, as improvement requires a sustained effort which might run against resources availability.

**4. Do you think users in countries have increased their demand for statistics and improved their dialogue with national data producers?**

Only AfDB answered no. JFD gave a somewhat restrictive reading of the question: "I don't have any indication that national councils of statistics, where they already exist, have been convened and begun working". Therefore only six Group members were supposed to answer the following question:

**a) If so, can you provide evidence of the role P21 has played to promote that and the impact of their work?**

EC and UNSD answered no. DFID and WB gave general answers, respectively: "They have supported statistical offices/systems and PRS units in advocating for some of this, which has probably had some impact" and while it is impossible to disentangle the role that P21 has played from other processes, "the importance of advocacy and awareness raising of P21, particularly with PRSP units should not be overlooked".

Not surprisingly, the two Group Members closest to the field did give elaborate answers, which deserve to be quoted *in extenso*. The first answer is GB's, the second RV's.

- "In Ghana, every statistical meeting is used as an opportunity to get discussions on statistics in the public media. So, the hosting of a PARIS21 sub-regional meeting provided a similar opportunity for discussion on the radio. There was a lot of interest from the public media from the fact that the workshop was attended by countries from other parts of Africa. PARIS21 therefore builds on and reinforces the messages that are already out in the media, and thereby enhances the appreciation of the general public for statistics. It may be difficult to say exactly how much PARIS21 has contributed to this trend. However, it is not just important that awareness is created (that is the initial work done by PARIS21), but also that crucial messages are reinforced (that is PARIS21 continues to build on and strengthen any existing foundations). In the case of the latter, it will usually be difficult to say exactly what impact PARIS21 has had."
- "Definitely, even in developing countries, users have learned to appreciate statistics better and have realized the importance of continuing dialogue between users and producers of statistics. The Metagora project implemented under the aegis of P21 in the Philippines has greatly facilitated and resulted in the beginning of a partnership between the users of statistics on indigenous peoples' rights and on human rights in general, on the one hand, and the statistical community on the other hand. We are building on this as the Philippine NSDS (we call it Philippine statistical development

program or PSDP) being finalized now provides greater focus to statistics on human rights and governance.”

## **5. Do you think the launch of NSDS has helped:**

### **a) develop plans that are based on country's needs rather than driven by international agencies' priorities;**

While for WB the answer is a definite yes (although “not all NSDS are of good quality and international consultants who help to draft the NSDS still have a lot of influence”), DFID stated that NSDS is the right approach to address this issue and insisted on the necessity of seeing the process as a long term and iterative approach: “the process of preparing an NSDS being as important as the document itself”. JFD echoed this view in replying: “yes, so far mostly for the ‘road maps’, not yet in NSDS. For all other respondents, the answer is yes, with the following comments by GB, UNSD and RV:

- “The testimony of some countries that have managed this process well is that the NSDS helps the Office to keep focused and redirect support for statistical activities in the respective countries”. (GB)
- “NSDS are key to develop a framework for action that clearly reflect countries’ needs and so allow countries to drive the request for additional support rather than be driven by international agencies’ agendas and priorities. However, the extent to which NSDS really help focus on countries’ needs depends on the way NSDS are developed”. (UNSD)
- “Even before P21, my country has been formulating an NSDS that is primarily based on country needs but also takes into consideration country commitments towards monitoring international conventions. Countries have also realized that their statistical initiatives should not be driven by international agencies’ priorities. This realization of course did not come just with the P21 NSDS, but is the result of various statistical development programs and facilities, including workshops and conferences. Unfortunately, there remain statistical initiatives conducted by national statistical agencies that are basically donor-driven, such as the ICP.” (RV)

### **b) bring together all the stakeholders in the country;**

All Group members answered yes. WB feels that more needs to be done to bring data providers and users from outside the central statistical agency. GB makes the same point in stating that the new orientation to have a system approach – rather than an NSO focus – ensures that some key stakeholders (particularly the producers of statistics and development partners) are involved and cooperate in the production of statistics. For DFID, the process of writing an NSDS can be helpful in bringing together stakeholders although this doesn’t always happen. “P21 advocate this approach and provide support for it but sometimes this is too ambitious for statistical offices, they would rather develop a strategy for themselves before consulting too widely”. For UNSD,

the process of developing NSDS can represent a good vehicle to bring together the main stakeholders: “at our MDG meeting in Rome 2005 we heard some successful stories, where stakeholders actually have come together”, but “it is difficult to assess this on a systematic manner”. JFD replies to the question as follows: “yes, but it depends on donors representatives and policies, and we are not yet at the stage of coordinating projects and financing for NSDS implementation”. RV states that exposure to the objectives of P21 has certainly increased appreciation by statistical agencies for the importance of reaching out to all stakeholders, “but it cannot yet be said that we have reached out to all stakeholders”, a statement with which EC agrees.

**c) ensure political and financial support from the government;**

For RV, “P21 has called the attention of governments to provide political and financial support”, but “the real test will be during the implementation and we do not have enough evidence yet” (WB). While “the existence of a NSDS is not a guarantee of government support” (UNSD), “most countries have taken the opportunity of developing an NSDS to also reform the whole statistical system (e.g. Uganda, Kenya, Pakistan, Rwanda) and they needed to have political support in order to do this. We haven’t seen any evidence of financial support from governments” (DFID), an observation shared by JFD: “in the best cases political support but significant support remains to be seen”. AfDB replies yes, without comment, EC yes “to the extent the government can” and GB has the most elaborate answer: “Yes, to some extent. The national funding processes do not necessarily change as a result of the adoption of the NSDS. The government therefore largely still looks to the NSO or statistical system to raise funds additional for the NSDS implementation. However, to when partners are brought on board and counterpart funding is required, some additional financial support could be generated from the government.”

**d) ensure that international support be consistent with national plans;**

UNSD replies: “This is one of the most important effects of having NSDS in the country – donors initiatives have to be integrated into the overall national plan”, but JFD finds that it is too soon to be seen as does WB: “in principle, yes, but the real test will be during the implementation and we do not have enough evidence yet”. However, DFID gives an example: “in Kenya the NSDS process supported by P21, was very helpful in bringing donors together and ensuring their support was consistent with national plans. There is probably limited scope here at country level as P21 don’t have in-country presence; however, where and how they can I think they push this in the international arena”. AfDB and GB answer “Yes” to the question asked. GB adds: “but this largely depends on the level of discipline Heads of NSOs exert, as funds would need to be turned down if the associated activities are not in the NSDS. EC is the only Group member replying “No”, with the following comment: “this is the element of coordination where to my impression the mandate and the work are lacking”.

**e) Has the NSDS approach to statistical development shown negative impact?**

Five Group members replied “No”. The comments of the three others are as follows: “there is no evidence of negative impact although the NSDS process can be very slow due to the factors out of P21 control” (DFID); “to some extent the emphasis of the NSDS has been on institutional reform and increasing resources for statisticians. In some cases this has led to less attention being given to improving data quality and coverage in the short-term” (WB). “It has raised expectations. The lack of a direct follow-up could result in a rather negative impression, or a misuse of existing low quality statistics” (EC).

**f) How does the NSDS compare with previous approach to statistical building?**

UNSD summarised well the general agreement between all respondents: “NSDS have been instrumental in shifting the focus from internationally driven activities to countries’ owned plans. It is also more widely recognized by donors that all capacity building activities should be decided by countries on the basis of the priorities they identify, and organized within the framework of their national strategy”. AfDB adds the usefulness of a common framework for all countries involved and the ensuing comparability. GB takes a “within the country” approach: “Previously, not many countries had a strategic plan, and they generally focused on the national statistical office and not the system as a whole. The plan gives a coherent framework for sustained development of statistics rather than the haphazard and ad hoc approach to dealing with statistical capacity development. This document also allows NSOs and statistical systems to conduct an objective assessment of their achievements; enhances the visibility of the NSO, its centrality to the national statistical system, and its critical role in the coordination of the national statistical system.”

**g) In what ways has P21 added value at the country, regional and international levels?**

The six respondents to this question agree that P21 has added value at these three levels:

- “The need for NSDS is a strong message that P21 has managed to convey at all levels, as a tool for statistical development. At all these levels it is accepted that NSDS is the way to go with statistical development, as well as donor coordination and capacity building support.” (GB)
- “Some international agencies now seem better coordinated, although this cannot be the result of P21 alone. At the country level, exposure by official statisticians and data users to P21 has contributed to a better management of expectations; indirectly, this has contributed in providing better direction to national statistical development.” (RV)
- “The added value was at the country level through NSDS, at the regional level through RRSF.” (AfDB)
- “The initiative in itself has improved the awareness of the value of good statistics, worldwide and for sure in several regions. The fact that P21 has worked with a country/region in general gives a push to other developments...However, only when taken up within a short delay, the sustainability of results of P21 is very vulnerable and depending on follow-up actions.” (EC)

- “It has been useful in providing guidance on setting up an NSDS and in bringing together statistics office staff and policy makers from different countries so they can learn from each other. It has a very valuable resource base, and has been good at sharing experiences and NSDSs. It has been good to have an almost impartial organization (made up of others) to support this process. They have been quite effective at advocacy around this at the regional and international levels.” (DFID)
- “At all levels P21 has helped to raise awareness of the importance of statistics and the need for effective capacity building. Its work has been very useful at the international level to bring together key agencies in a neutral way to coordinate and discuss common areas of work such as NSDSs. At the regional and international levels it is seen, to some extent as a neutral coordinating agency too with no specific implementation role. At the country level, there is some evidence that it is seen as being much like another international agency, providing finance, TA, etc.” (WB)

**h) How do you assess the degree of technicality vs. advocacy in PARIS21 involvement in the NSDS process? Does it require quality control? By whom and at which stage(s)?**

This question deals with two aspects: technicality vs. advocacy and quality control. Technicality vs. advocacy answers are very varied, maybe for differing definitions of these notions.

- “We are still at a stage where most countries need assistance to embark all stakeholders in their NSDS process and technical assistance and training to implement their program.” (JFD)
- “The degree of technicality in P21 involvement in the NSDS process would be 70%, of advocacy 30%.” (AfDB)
- “They are equal.” (EC)
- “There seems to be an appropriate balance between technicality and advocacy. However, the technicality aspect must always remember that the NSDS should be nationally-owned and should consider national priorities and resource constraints.” (RV)
- “This is the key issue in understanding whether or not the mandate of PARIS21 needs to be redefined. Until now, P21 has played more an advocacy role in promoting the development of NSDS, rather than providing technical assistance in developing the strategies themselves. However, in some cases, P21 has in fact also provided assistance which raises the question of whether or not there is a need to expand its staff and the level of technical skills. An alternative would be to designate other agencies that possess the expertise, in partnership with PARIS21, to provide the technical assistance required.” (UNSD)
- “PARIS21 has played a strong advocacy role in the NSDS process, with its success in getting NSDS into the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS). PARIS21 involvement is to a higher degree in advocacy than technical, though technical support has been provided through consultancies.” (GB)

- “The advocacy role is important but far harder to do and it probably needs to be done within each country context so it is hard for P21 to influence this although P21 can provide the tools and encouragement (through the ongoing P21 advocacy strategy and messages). It also needs tenacity and local leadership for follow through once initial advocacy has started to get some attention. “ (DFID)
- “The P21 NSDS material is proving useful and technically professional, but there is always a danger of replicating the technical material from the specialized agencies. At present, the balance is probably about right, but there is a need for quality control and peer review of P21 material from time-to-time. On the advocacy, P21 needs to maintain its role but do it in a demand driven and rather technical manner for example highlighting good practices on evidence-based decision making or preparing tools and templates for countries and regions to use to develop their own advocacy material, based on substantive information and documented evidence.” (WB)

Only four Group members addressed the quality control issue:

- “Ideally, NSDS and statistical program quality control should be done at the national level, by the national council or by the PRSP coordinating unit.” (JFD)
- “A quality control could kill the initiatives in an early stage. If a quality control is requested this should be part of a stage after implementation of some real statistical work. Quality control could be done by independent organizations or a combination of partner countries.” (EC)
- “It would be necessary for the outputs of the consultants to be assessed for quality and standards, as well as coverage and content. The management of consultants’ work is highly technical and time intensive. Unless the staffing situation of PARIS21 Secretariat can be enhanced, it might be more effective for an institution/agency with technical expertise (such as UNSD, Eurostat, and other regional and more advanced national statistical offices) to be entrusted with the quality control aspect of the work.” (GB)
- “ The issue of quality control is difficult. NSDSs range in both ambition and quality. What is important is that they are adequate in terms of scope and meet minimally acceptable standards. From those that we have seen there is a question about whether they are really strategic documents for the development of the future statistical system or whether they are workplans. Developing the strategic capacity to improve them and to make sure they are sufficiently ambitious should be given a higher priority. In general we would support the concept of some sort of technical quality assurance perhaps peer review as a means of sharing good practice or of encouraging the plans to be broader and more ambitious. “ (DFID)

**6. Do you think P21 has contributed to a better coordination between funding agencies?**

AfDB answers “No”, UNSD “Not yet”, EC “Only to a very, very limited extent”. JFD sees some progress, “mostly at the international level and with some exceptions (AfDB and the ICP for instance). RV feels the funding agencies actively participating in P21 are now better coordinated; “but not the others, although the lack of coordination may be caused more by inherent organizational weaknesses in these funding agencies.” For GB: “Yes, but much more needs to be done. There is potential for greater success with the newly introduced compilation of sources of funding for statistical activities.” DFID and WB agrees with GB on the usefulness of the light reporting exercise in Africa which requires “more work to ensure that the information is reasonably complete” (WB) while for DFID there has been good information flows in Africa and sharing of matrixes of who’s involved in what have helped. “I think some donors also use P21 as a data base for whether they should get involved, or who else they should talk to in a certain sector or country” (DFID).

### **1) Through reducing duplication of efforts by various funding agencies?**

AfDB answers: “No”, EC: “duplication has hardly decreased, because agencies normally follow their own policy and stakeholders in the partner countries are also sometimes not the same” and GB “to some extent”. WB and DFID are more positive:

- “In theory yes, but we need more evidence that funding agencies have changed their practices to a great extent, at least at the policy level. Within countries, there are examples of where the NSDS process has helped to improve coordination between donors.” (WB)
- “The whole idea behind the NSDS’s supports this, with much information being shared around regional meetings by P21. P21 is also a member of the MDG Inter-Agency Expert Working group and plays an important role in pushing these views at these meetings.” (DFID)

### **2) Through mobilising agencies around NSDS**

- At the country level: No (AfDB); “not in my country” (RV); “for selected countries” (GB). For the WB: “The role of P21, through the promotion of the NSDS approach has been important in a number of countries. P21 has certainly not been the only player, but the role of the NSDS material has been important. More needs to be done, however, to empower managers leading the NSDS process”.
- At the regional/sub-regional level: No (AfDB); “somewhat” (RV); “to some extent” (GB); “yes” (EC) For the WB: “P21 has played an important role in strengthening the role of regional and sub-regional agencies and in advocating for statistics. Coordination between funding agencies is less of a concern at this level”.
- At the international level: “Yes, but improvement is needed” (AfDB); “somewhat” (RV); “for selected organizations” (GB); “yes” (EC). For the WB: “There is a good awareness of the role of P21 at the international level and the brand is well established. Funding agencies are concerned to improve coordination, but until

recently there was little practical being done to promote this. The light reporting exercise in Africa is potentially an important step”.

- DFID gives a global answer: “There has been some good work at regional meetings, and as most donors are part of P21 there appears to be more inclination to get behind a shared agenda now. P21 has helped in inspiring Trust Fund request and indeed setting the objectives of the Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building, which was set up to support P21 activities. It has also helped in inspiring AfDB funding of NSDS design.”

**7. Do you see, on the contrary, any duplication between P21 work programme deliverables and other agencies? If you see this as a problem, please elaborate.**

While question 6 a) was addressing duplication by funding agencies, this question is broader as it addresses all agencies, which are many, as underlined by DFID and WB:

- “There are many donors involved in Statistics, P21 has done quite a good job of trying to get information on who is doing what, and sharing that and encouraging less overlap and more coordinated working. There is still, however, a long way to go before we eliminate duplication between donors. Paris Declaration is a useful aspiration in achieving this but it needs to be translated into action on the ground.” (DFID) “There are many agencies that are involved in variety of work labelled as statistical capacity building. Although P21 has done a great job of letting everyone know what is being done, to some extent, as it has become more involved in implementing activities, then there has been some perception of its work duplicating other agencies. This has also occurred with some of the task teams. Overall, we feel that this has not been a problem so far, although care will need to continue to be taken to ensure it does not become so, for which some special efforts, such as a low cost monitoring system, may be needed.” (WB)
- JFD addresses also the issue of the perception of duplication: “I don’t think there is any duplication between P21 work program and the coordinating committee of international agencies, but some people think so, wrongly...”, a statement confirmed by GB: “The deliverables from PARIS21 program do not duplicate those of other agencies. PARIS21 has so far been careful to stay the course, recognizing institutional expertise and drawing on the contribution of the task forces. Also, quite early in its programming PARIS21 has allowed agencies with well established expertise or mandates in a particular area, to have that responsibility.” RV believes that “some countries are now pursuing NSDS-types of initiatives not necessarily under the P21 umbrella but in collaboration with other agencies”. EC finds the work on NSDS rather unique and in the field of advocacy building the role of P21 is also very clear and unique. “On the other fields, the basic technical/methodological information and coordination, yes, there is duplication with other agencies. However especially on coordination it must be stressed that this is lacking overall.”
- UNSD and AfDB don’t see any duplication.

**8. Keeping in mind that P21 Regional Workshops are de facto meetings grouping countries conveniently (by language, geographical proximity, or other criterion) and offering them a common framework for statistical development at the country level, has P21 stuck within their remit of working on advocacy, facilitating international and/or regional events, or have they moved more towards working at the country level?**

The question is clearly directed to the present and recent past of P21 activities, but some answers are also directed to the future, as shown by those most directly concerned, the country/regional representatives of the Group:

- RV: “In my region, yes but I hope there will be occasions in the future when P21 can descend to the country level for specific interventions just to demonstrate how things can be done”.
- GB: “PARIS21 has kept closely to the requirement to focus on international and regional events. Perhaps, between regional and national, some effort could be made to reach sub regional institutions through participation in meetings organized by within the context of the statistics programme of these institutions (for example, providing materials and presentations through members of the consortium). This will help heighten awareness, and permit PARIS21 to respond to the emerging trends in which statistical development is being coordinated or strengthened through sub regional activities. There are some circumstances in which national focus would be appropriate. When countries host PARIS21 meetings, there should be a deliberate effort to use such opportunities to support advocacy at the national level; and also in connection with the support of NSDS preparations in countries.”
- For EC, P21 has moved to the country level; for AfDB, it has not; UNSD is not sure and adds: “I think there have been cases of direct country assistance”. DFID thinks that “they have offered support at the country level in terms of advocacy should countries request it, but the majority of their work seems to be at regional/international levels” while for WB “there have been some P21 activities at the country level, but this has not been at the level to create problems. It will be important for some continued interaction with countries, both to test new material and to gather evidence about good and bad practice.” JFD is going further: “P21 has begun working at the country level, rightly so since everything must be decided nationally. The regional approach was necessary and proved useful at the beginning, for advocacy but also to disseminate the principles of NSDS, but now we are in the process of elaborating and implementing NSDS, obviously at the national level”.

**9. What are the strengths and weaknesses in P21 relations with international statistical organisations?**

RV addresses this issue in a single sentence which is consonant with some other answers and is a fact of life in general: “It seems to be working relatively well with some but not with others.” In the “weaknesses” part of her answer, GB states:

- “PARIS21 does not seem to have effectively developed sustained relationships with international statistical agencies, in the form of cooperation in programme implementation, joint activities, etc. Dissemination of information and agency materials seem limited to a select group of international institutions. PARIS21 needs to be seen as a strong advocate for statistics by among others supporting activities of these statistical agencies. PARIS21 can benefit greatly from other institutions but may not have effectively linked up with such institutions. This would require PARIS21 being proactive and inviting these institutions rather than following the model of the individuals’ membership to the consortium and waiting for them to join.”
- EC has a single answer for strengths and weaknesses: “The international organizations are also the main funding agencies. They have also their own policy for statistical cooperation and assistance. The mandate of P21 in this field as well as the commitment of the agencies to P21 allows the agencies to do a lot of work outside P21. From the other side the resources of P21 are too limited to play the role of coordinator to a greater extent. The management structure of P21 (Steering group) also does not allow a more effective approach. “ JFD tends to concur while identifying the “weaknesses” as follows: “being subjected to ‘big’ donors, not only through their financing, but also because they have the power to impose their programs, projects...Coordination is limited by the good will of the most powerful donors.” UNSD sees weaknesses as P21 seeming “to be linked to some agencies than others. There could be a more efficient mechanism for coordinating with international agencies on a continuous basis.”
- WB identifies the weakness of P21 in “its tendency of trying to do too much and at all levels, which may be perceived as trying to duplicate other agencies’ work or go beyond its agreed terms of reference. In overcoming this and trying to prioritize and get to a broadly agreed work program, we should also avoid the tendency of becoming too bureaucratic and get bogged down with an extensive and slow set of administrative and governance procedures. The challenge is to keep things active, responsive, and efficient.”
- DFID sees as a weakness as well as a strength the fact that P21 can not operate at country level and has not got the resources or the remit is also a weakness. Post advocacy the issue of implementation needs to be addressed. Ideally countries would have created the political commitment and have the capacity and leadership to go and implement themselves. We need to develop a better link between work at country level and work at regional and international level but question over where this should sit. P21 as a Partnership where many of the international agencies are represented should mean support for greater co-ordination and collaboration. There is more to be done to translate this into reality on the ground. As a partnership P21 occupies a space that should build greater cohesion between the international agencies, but that will only happen if they are willing. P21 might also want to do advocacy at the international level?”

The answers above are either global or addressing weaknesses. AfDB does not address weaknesses but sees the main strength of P21 in the fact that it analyses problems in a concrete manner so as to facilitate dialogue between partners. The other strengths identified are:

- “P21 plays a strong role in (i) establishing linkages between international statistical agencies; (ii) raising support for statistics, (iii) increasing access to materials produced by these agencies, (iv) disseminating information about agency programmes, and identifying gaps, (v) providing assessments to redirect efforts and enhance coordination.” (GB)
- “It’s remit to concentrate on the important issue of better availability and use of information gives it a very clear focus and addresses the issues to create demand rather than getting in and doing. This is a good discipline and the advocacy focus has developed a good enabling brand for P21. Can bring together policy makers and practitioners to have a useful conversation without an agenda which is linked to their own mandate. This separation of advocacy from implementation is useful. Has good access to developed country statistics offices and their staff. Can bring together groups of countries.” (DFID)
- “Grouping bilateral and multilateral donors, NSOs from developed and developing countries, dissolving the influence of the ‘big’ donors.” (JFD) “Provided fora for sharing information and foster dialogue across agencies; very useful review of donors’ activities and financial contribution – it is a useful basis for creating a framework for coordination across donors putting together multi-lateral with bi-lateral agencies.” (UNSD) “P21’s main strength is in its name as being a partnership group on statistics, where different agencies come together to cooperate on common areas of interest and make sure we help developing countries as best as is possible given all constraints so that our collective work adds up to be more than sum of parts.” (WB)

**10. What do you feel should be the most important role of P21 in the near future? Is this role matching their current capacity and experience?**

- GB mentions six points for the future:
  - (1) Play a strong advocacy role with international, regional and sub-regional institutions, by seeking opportunities to incorporate PARIS21-type meeting into regular meeting of these organizations.
  - (2) Expand collection of materials and linkages to websites for other regional, sub regional and international statistical organizations.
  - (3) Support sub regional groupings to have a stronger advocacy component in their statistical programmes.
  - (4) Develop and maintain partner relationships with other institutions and draw on expertise of partners to implement programmes.

(5) PARIS21 should find a way to continue the advocacy that it initiates. Given the limitation of resources and the staffing, greater use should be made of the members of the consortium so that they can effectively represent PARIS21 in their respective regions or countries to promote the goal of PARIS21 in sub-regional and other meetings.

(6) Information on statistical activities and available materials need to cover a wider range of institutions at the various levels (sub-regional, regional and global).

- For AfDB, P21 should strengthen its advocacy role at the country level and, in particular, in direction of the public authorities so as to incite them to bring the importance of statistics in the democratic debate. But RV does not think P21 will be effective “if it is to concentrate only on advocacy. It must expand its mandate, but it must also be a beneficiary of capacity building.” EC feels the most important roles should be NSDS and organizing information and communication on the follow-up of possible implementation of operational elements of the NSDS: a form of light coordination”.
- Advocacy and coordination, as well as some activities at the country level, are part of the vision for P21 future by UNSD and WB; advocacy and country level activities, part of JFD answer. “The most important role of P21 should continue to be that of advocacy together with a stronger role in improving coordination among agencies and donors. A good starting point could be the review exercise undertaken recently by P21 that provides a very good basis for streamlining capacity building activities, avoiding duplications and helping shift the focus to nationally owned plans, also channelling resources from agencies and donors to the priority areas as set up in NSDS.” (UNSD)
- “There will be a continuing role for promoting good practice in strategic related work. As countries move, however, from the preparation of a strategic plan to its implementation, P21’s role must also evolve and it could very usefully help with pilot programs to experiment and prove a concept that is then shared broadly to be scaled up to other countries. This is similar to what is currently planned with the satellite programs, namely the household survey network activities and the Accelerated Data Program. P21 should also continue to do advocacy, maintain its role as a coordinating and partnership building unit, and do more to identify gaps and concerns in this field. Overall, it could develop itself further as a clearing house for ideas and good practice material on statistical capacity building related areas, planning and NSDS.” (WB)
- “Advocacy, lesson learning, sharing experiences and producing guidance are all very important roles. If they could do more on how to stimulate demand and use of data this would be highly beneficial. I think they need to have more capacity on marketing to help with stimulating demand for and use of statistics and developing opportunities and skills at country level to take this agenda forward.” (WB)

- “We must now prove, collectively, that the NSDS approach is effective and lead to the implementation of a statistical program in each country, reflecting its priorities, serving as a framework for donors coordination...PARIS21 should be the ‘conductor’ of this process, providing methodological and technical support to the countries and the experts involved in the process. I think it imply that PARIS21 concentrate on selected domains, such as household surveys, administrative information systems, programming and budgeting, managing, training programming, etc.” (JFD)

## **PART IV: Remarks by the Facilitator/Evaluator**

The Terms of Reference initially proposed by the Secretariat on December 7th, 2005 were well fitting a full-fledged evaluation. Subsequent discussions came to the conclusion that, given the “light” nature of the evaluation as well as the time and resources available, the Review Group could not be expected to cover in detail all the topics listed for consideration so as to sufficiently inform rating of the standard evaluation criteria, a classic reference even for a self-evaluation exercise, whose nature is very close to this Review, labelled in a very innovative way as “light evaluation”. The core content of this review is made of the answers of the eight members of an ad-hoc Sub-Group of the Steering Committee, answers to questions they proposed themselves and which were streamlined by the Facilitator/Evaluator (F/E). This streamlining was agreed upon by the Group members and answers presented by the F/E. This light evaluation is, therefore, the product of the work of the Review Group, for which the F/E played simply a facilitating role helped by his evaluation background. At the risk of being seen as intruding, the F/E would, however, like to drop in this Section, his facilitating role to take more of an independent evaluator role so as to make a few remarks, from a distance and with, probably, some degree of subjectivity, as they do not stem from a classic evaluation conducted by himself.

It is in this light that standard evaluation criteria will first be looked at, before taking an even more personal position in giving his general impression and his perceptions on what he considers a few key issues.

### **STANDARD EVALUATION CRITERIA**

---

The Annex “topics for consideration by the Review”(see Annex 7) of the initial TOR asked questions which are still worth looking at as they lead to another way of summarising answers. Such a “triangulation” process is always useful to put things in perspective. The Facilitator/Evaluator (F/E) gives below, in the spirit referred to above, his answers drawn from his overall perception of the Review made by the Sub-Group of the Steering Committee.

The Efficiency of PARIS21 was previously examined in relation to the inputs and outputs and found being rather on the high side. The answers of the Review Group allow stating that P21 Relevance and Effectiveness seem in general satisfactory, with the following nuances:

- “Have the activities and work programme of P21 been appropriate to the purpose?” Undoubtedly, the answer is yes, in a very positive manner.
- “Has the programme met stakeholders’ requests?” Yes, to the extent possible given the number and diversity of the requests, themselves conflicting at times (e.g., activities at international/regional vs. country levels).

- “Were the work plan and activities consistent with the priorities of major stakeholders?” Yes, as the work programme was agreed by the Steering Committee on one hand, and as, on the other hand, the “major stakeholders” (whatever the definition of what “major” means) are in close contact with the Secretariat as well as with each other through mail, meetings and video-conferences.
- “Have the activities adapted to cope with changing situations, including progress, and priorities?” P21 has demonstrated quickly a high adaptability to the new situation created by NSDS development. This alone would put P21 Relevance on the high side.

In relation to Effectiveness, seven questions were asked in the initial TOR Annex, which all deserve a positive answer, with, however, an important caveat. Several Group members, and, more particularly DFID, have mentioned that the overall process of going towards the Consortium Goal is by nature and given the complexities of the task a slow maturing process. If, in addition, it is only a two-year period which is reviewed, Effectiveness has to be put in this time-framework, and this being considered, could also be rated on the high side. The seven questions proposed for consideration are the following:

- “Have countries implemented follow-up actions?” Yes, if this refers to the follow-up of the P21 advocacy on NSDS; no, if this refers to the NSDS implementation, as this takes time (road maps, eventual legislation changes, identification of financial resources, actual disbursements, and above all, often a cultural mind-set change for evidence-based results).
- “Have strategic planning processes for statistics (NSDS) been initiated?” Yes, see output section and details in the CD-Rom.
- “Have countries been assisted to overcome obstacles in developing their action programmes?” Yes, to the extent possible, in particular through visits to countries.
- “Have countries requested assistance for their own programmes?” Yes.
- “Has more expertise been made available to countries to assist implementation of their NSDSs and other priority actions?” Yes to the extent that implementation has started, that is in only very few cases (see bullet one).
- “Have partner agencies and Trust Funds carried forward the work initiated in workshops?” Yes, to a great extent.
- “Are outputs from task teams and the Secretariat valued and used?” Yes. For instance the NSDS is an outcome of the Task Team on Strategic Statistical Development Plans.

The “light” nature of this evaluation and its two-year timeframe do not allow addressing Impact in any serious manner, even if the emerging impact may be seen as globally on the positive side; and it is certainly too early to try assessing Sustainability at the different levels, international, regional, sub-regional and national levels.

## A PERSONAL VIEW

---

Taking an even more personal view, the F/E perceives P21 - through the answers of the Review Group - as having the structure of an atom, with a nucleus and electrons circling this nucleus at different levels of energy. The nucleus would be made of DFID, JFD/France and WB, elements which have largely positive converging views on P21 activities, at least for the period 2004-2005 and the first two months of 2006. The five other Review Group members could, through their answers, be distributed on several orbitals. The orbital closest to the nucleus would include the two country/region representatives (GB and RV). AfDB could be close and, slightly further, would be EC and UNSD.

While the F/E is conscious that this analogy should not be taken too far, he, nevertheless, feels that it makes sense for, as being the main donors, the three elements of the nucleus keep themselves closely informed on the activities carried out. Being the most informed means taking time and energy to read documents and maintain close contacts with the Secretariat. Although not donors, country/region representatives illustrate well the correlation between information and support. They have, indeed, strong motivations stemming out of their concern for the improvement of statistics in their own country/region and, in spite of serious time constraints, keep themselves informed and give precious regional perspectives. AfDB interactions<sup>1</sup> with the Secretariat and other P21 partners as well as recent strong statements of support for NSDS, which AfDB has now fully adopted and mainstreamed in its statistical activities, lead one to think they are on the same orbital as the country/region representatives or even integrated into the nucleus.

The other perception the F/E derived from reading the answers is of a certain fuzziness about what P21 refers to: is the implicit reference the Consortium or the Secretariat? The questions proposed by the Group did not make either this distinction. The nature of the review carried out as a "light" evaluation predominantly output-oriented might have led implicitly to the reference leaning more towards the Secretariat. If it is the case, the next full-fledged evaluation which, necessarily will look at outcomes and impacts, should take care of making a clear distinction between the two.

This "fuzziness" is of particular concern for the F/E in relation to the coordination issue, to which Group members have devoted a great interest in their answers. In a partnership organisation such as P21, coordination is a crucial element. However, when more/better coordination is requested, it is not clear whether this wish is addressed to the Secretariat or to other partners of the Consortium or even to both, as, anyhow, all answers are totally devoid of self-criticism. The limits to co-ordination depend, nevertheless, on the willingness of each one to co-operate and to sacrifice some of the self-interest of the "concerned entity" for the benefit of the "whole". The "whole" is clearly defined by the Goal of the Consortium. "Concerned entity" does not necessarily refer to the organisations identified in this light evaluation, such as the World

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, co-organisation and co-financing of two FASDEV meetings in 2004 and 2006; participation in three videoconferences organised in 2005 and 2006 by P21, with UNECA and WB to discuss joint efforts in supporting NSDS; co-organisation of the Tunis meeting in February 2005 on coordination of statistical capacity building and of the NSDS consultants briefing in Addis Ababa in August 2005; co-organisation of seven regional workshops in Africa since 2004 and participation in five of them.

Bank, DFID, EC, as they are represented by units dealing with statistics. The extent to which users/producers dialogue is practiced within their organisations is not known to the F/E. A full-fledged evaluation should look at this issue of co-ordination between the policy makers /development economists/country specialists of each organisation and its statisticians, to be sure that what is preached to the outside is practiced, or increasingly practiced, inside. This applies also to coordination within the UN system, for instance between UNSD and UNDP, or to a major donor country such as France. It is well understood that each entity/organisation has its own mandate, territory and constituency and is in competition with others, but this applies to all Consortium members and partners and, indeed, to society as a whole. As one of the great strengths of P21 is to closely link statistics and development, this might be better reflected in its governance structure, for instance in the membership of the Steering Committee.

It is anyhow easier to arrive at co-ordination agreements at Headquarters level between the P21 concerned units than to have them implemented at lower levels, and particularly at country level. But if there is no monitoring mechanism in a country to periodically assess how coordination is actually working and no mechanism to draw lessons from this monitoring in order to take, if necessary, remedial action, calls for more coordination become a *mantra* easy to repeat, but not supported by an analysis of the concrete constraints met. The Facilitator/Evaluator was confronted for ten years with this problem when he was Chairman of the Evaluation Panel of the now defunct UN Administrative Coordination Committee. The OECD DAC Expert Group on Evaluation had also the greatest difficulty in arriving at carrying out satisfactory Joint Evaluations. It could also be said that the various views expressed vis-à-vis the role of P21 at the country level do not help, as it is a crucial level of co-ordination. But P21, according to the various Review Group answers, is at times not encouraged or even prevented to work in-country, or only in a few cases and for very specific purposes, not including coordination. One cannot request one thing and its contrary at the same time. The full-fledged evaluation should, therefore, go deeper into the coherence of what is expected from the members of the Consortium and from the Secretariat and make a thorough analysis of the coordination constraints at different levels before issuing realistic recommendations on this issue.

## **ANNEX 1: Notes of a Telephone Conference to Discuss PARIS21 Review Group Activities**

Date: Friday, 3 February 2006

Participants: African Development Bank – Charles Lufumpa  
France – Jean-François Divay  
Ghana – Grace Bediako  
European Commission – Pieter Everaers, James Whitworth  
United Kingdom – Siobhan Carey  
UNSD – Paul Cheung, Francesca Collari  
World Bank – Shaida Badiee, Misha Belkindas  
Facilitator – Pierre Spitz  
PARIS21 Secretariat – Eric Bensel (rapporteur)

### **1. Introduction of Members**

- 1.1. Pieter Everaers thanked the group for their confidence in proposing and accepting him as chair for the PARIS21 review process. He announced that Mr. Romula Virola, who could not participate in this meeting due to the time difference, had communicated his thoughts to the facilitator the previous day and that Mrs. Maria-Magdalena Garcia had resigned from the review process. He then handed the floor to the participants in attendance to introduce themselves and express their expectations for the review process.
- 1.2. All participants expressed their support for the PARIS21 agenda and their hope that the review process will identify in what way PARIS21 could be repositioned or fine-tuned in the future to address the changing and increased needs on the initiative.
- 1.3. Mr. Charles Lufumpa announced that he would henceforth be the AfDB representative on this review group and requested that all future correspondence regarding this activity be sent to him.
- 1.4. Mr. Pierre Spitz introduced himself and explained that he would be at the review group's disposal to facilitate the process and to help define evaluation questions.

### **2. Terms of Reference**

- 2.1. The chair presented Mr. Virola's comments on the proposed terms of reference (TORs) for the review. He proposed that the group actively participate in defining the review questions and in answering them. To address this concern, the facilitator proposed that the following two new bullets be added to the TORs under section 2:

- Agree on a final set of evaluation questions, some of them tentatively proposed by the facilitator, others by sub-group members or other key stakeholders, including other Steering Committee members
  - Answer these questions individually, and by writing, each sub-group member thus providing his/her inputs to the Review.
- 2.2. Review group members supported this proposal and emphasised that the evaluation should focus on key themes in order to remain light and respect the tight timeframe for activities.
- 2.3. Those review group members who will attend the Statcom-Africa and FASDEV II meetings in Addis Ababa the following week agreed to work on the evaluation questions together in the margins on either Wednesday or Thursday. The PARIS21 Secretariat will propose a time suitable to all and organise this meeting.

### **3. Review Framework**

- 3.1. In examining the review framework, two main issues emerged from the discussion: (1) a perceived shift in the PARIS21 mandate and (2) the impact PARIS21 has had on countries.
- 3.2. Some participants felt that the PARIS21 goal had shifted from the advocacy-focused “develop a culture of evidence-based policy making ...” to the more technically inclined support to NSDS processes and that the review should take this shift into account. It was asked how the evaluation could assess the impact of PARIS21 based on its original objectives and its new objectives. Suggestions were put forth to study the impact of Secretariat outputs and how PARIS21 has helped improve the landscape of statistics in beneficiary countries, for example by speaking with Afristat for Francophone Africa countries. Another suggestion proposed that the Secretariat identify two countries to be studied as best case and worst case examples of PARIS21 impact. Others felt that this shift was either not a concern or demonstrated a positive adaptation by the partnership to the evolving situation. Studying the relevancy of PARIS21 outputs could be a way of doing a light impact evaluation, which would be more of a “relevancy evaluation.” Another suggestion was to conduct a peer review of NSDS methodology documents to assess the quality of the advice provided by PARIS21.
- 3.3. In his capacity as a professional evaluator, the facilitator commented that an impact evaluation is a very involved affair, requiring much more resources and time than has been allocated to this PARIS21 review. Furthermore, impact would be very difficult to attribute to any one institution. He commented that the review could nevertheless provide some perspective on outcomes and impact, without probing too deeply. He proposed to re-organise the logical framework (just for the purposes of this evaluation) to place greater emphasis on the NSDS thrust. This reworked framework would appear in his inception report to be submitted on 17 February.
- 3.4. The chair concluded that the framework was generally supported. He commented that the discussion provided guidance to all members on the types of evaluation questions to

draft and on the direction the evaluation can be expected to take. He asked members to draft evaluation questions that could gauge impact and proposed that the suggestions of best and worst country examples and peer review of PARIS21 outputs be shelved in light of the review's time constraints. They could instead be brought up in a future, more comprehensive evaluation of PARIS21. A true impact evaluation would be too heavy and require studying the issues very deeply, but this review process cannot afford such a detailed effort. He closed by commenting that the evaluation process could produce a revised mandate focusing on the new goal of NSDS and making PARIS21 a modern, updated initiative.

#### **4. *Work Programme***

4.1. The proposed work programme was approved, with the following additions:

- “Review Sub-Group to propose evaluation questions to facilitator in writing” during the weeks of 6 and 13 February.
- “Evaluator/Facilitator to submit inception report” on 17 February.
- “Review Sub-Group to discuss the final report” on 27 or 28 March (Secretariat to co-ordinate and propose which date fits best).

4.2. All participants felt that the work programme had a tight timeframe but that it would have the positive effect of keeping the reviewers focused and forcing them to reflect. The chair promised to remind all members of their commitments.

#### **5. *Miscellaneous***

5.1. The chair announced that, following the resignation of Mrs. Garcia from this group, the director of statistics from Guatemala was proposed to replace her. Participants felt that — in light of the fact that (a) the proposed gentleman is not a member of the PARIS21 Steering Committee, (b) he does not have experience working with the wider PARIS21 partnership and its activities, (c) the Review Sub-Group does not have obligatory regional representation, and (d) the Review process is already well-advanced — the Group should decline his offer. The chair concluded that the Group would send its regrets and asked the Secretariat Manager, if he deems it necessary, to propose someone to the group who has greater experience working with PARIS21.

## **ANNEX 2: PARIS21 Light Evaluation Review Group Meeting, 9th February 2006 – Minutes**

Present: Richard Manning, OECD DAC; Shaida Badiee, WB; Misha Belkindas, WB; Grace Bediako, Ghana; Siobhan Carey, UK; Jean-Francois Divay, France; Francesca Perucci, UNSD; Andre Portella, AfDB; James Whitworth, EC; Antoine Simonpietri, PARIS21; Frances Harper, PARIS21(note); Pierre Spitz, Evaluator/Facilitator;

Representatives of institutions on the PARIS21 evaluation Review Group met in the margins of the FASDEV meeting in Addis Ababa.

### ***Key Evaluation questions:***

1. PS recalled the teleconference held in the previous week, where the Review Group had agreed to propose 'key' evaluation questions during the week 6-10 February. Group members were invited to propose 5-6 questions, which PS would then synthesise and include in his inception report by 17th February.
2. Regarding these questions, PS noted one which he felt had been implicit in the teleconference discussions, which was whether or not PARIS21's goal had shifted away from the original one of advocacy to the more technical NSDS process (see note of teleconference, Pg 2, Para 3). Discussion around this question then ensued. Some members of the group saw the shift as a positive one (e.g. SB saw it as a useful and dynamic change). Although others (notably Paul Cheung from UNSD, who had originally raised it in the telephone conference) did not have as positive a view on the shift in focus.
3. Participants questioned whether the key issue was whether or not there had indeed been a shift in focus; or whether this shift was within the remit of PARIS21, and had been agreed by its Steering Committee. What did the shift mean, is it positive and/or appropriate? SC mentioned that discussion on this issue was captured in the 2005 Steering Committee minutes, so need to ensure that the review takes note of whether any change in PARIS21's focus reflects the decisions recorded in the minutes.
4. In terms of the other key evaluation questions, PS reminded the meeting that he had distributed a questionnaire to country participants during the FASDEV meeting. The Groups' 'key questions' were likely to reflect those included in this questionnaire quite closely, but would not cover everything. He emphasised that the questions to be proposed by the Review Group could be inspired by those in the questionnaire, or could be additional.

### ***Evaluation process:***

1. PS clarified that the evaluation covered the period 2004-2005, but could be extended to work undertaken during the beginning of 2006.

2. He also stated that once the questions were agreed upon, it would be up to the Review Group to answer them themselves in the following week. PS will then draft a report based on these in mid March.
3. He confirmed that he would like a single consolidated response to the key questions from each institution represented on the Review Group. This response could of course refer to differing or conflicting opinions.
4. AS informed the meeting that Review Group Members would soon receive a CD Rom of PARIS21 documents (meeting reports etc). He also confirmed that Metagora - who have a separate evaluation process - would not be included within the scope of this review.
5. As the evaluation would be reviewing the outputs set out in the PARIS21 2003 logframe (even if within the broader framework of outcomes), PS also proposed a different way to 'read' this logframe, given the increased focus on NSDSs since 2003. So, although all the outputs of the original logframe will be covered, they will be presented in a slightly different way for the review.

***Next meeting:***

PS would propose the timing, venue and logistics of the next Review Group meeting to discuss his draft paper.

***PARIS21 Secretariat  
February 2006***

**ANNEX 3: Note on a review of PARIS21 by participants at the  
Second Forum on African Statistical Development, Addis  
Ababa, February 10, 2006**

**PARTICIPANTS**

- |                      |                             |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| ▪ Ben Botolo         | Ghana                       |
| ▪ Vincent Akinyosoye | Nigeria                     |
| ▪ Cletus Mkai        | Tanzania                    |
| ▪ David Gama         | Swaziland                   |
| ▪ Awad Haq Ali Ahmed | Sudan                       |
| ▪ Alphonse Mwingira  | Tanzania                    |
| ▪ Anthony Kilele     | Kenya                       |
| ▪ M. Nsoni           | Zimbabwe                    |
| ▪ Pali Lehohla       | South Africa                |
| ▪ O. Ajayi           | Nigeria                     |
| ▪ Tom Nyanzi         | Uganda                      |
| ▪ Grace Bediako      | Ghana (Co-facilitator)      |
| ▪ Shaida Badiie      | World Bank (Co-facilitator) |
| ▪ Graham Eele        | World Bank (Rapporteur)     |

**BACKGROUND**

The discussion took place during the second Forum on African Statistical development (FASDEV II) that took place in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia from February 9 to 10. Participants in the meeting were from statistical agencies, statistical units in line ministries and some data users, especially PRSP units. The discussion was held as part of the light evaluation of PARIS21 and covered the period of activities from January 2004 to the present. It was an informal discussion, where the participants were asked to give their views of what PARIS21 has been doing and raise any specific concerns. The discussion below indicates which comments were made by participants from different countries, although it is suggested that specific quotes should not be attributed to individuals.

**Issues and Comments**

**INTERACTION WITH AND AWARENESS OF PARIS21**

It was clear that the level of interaction with and knowledge of PARIS21 varied considerably between participants. In part this is because much of the early involvement of the Consortium with Anglophone Africa took place in the early years prior to 2004 through regional workshops as well as Consortium meetings in Paris. Within the group there has been some turnover of heads of statistical agencies and those who have been appointed within the last two years appeared to have less knowledge of what the Consortium has been doing and have less interaction with the Secretariat.

Tanzania, for example, has been involved from the beginning and has participated in regional workshops, consortium meetings and the Steering Committee. Other countries, such as Kenya, Nigeria, Sudan and Zimbabwe have had less interaction and consequently a narrower view of what PARIS21 has been doing and what it is trying to achieve. There was also less knowledge among participants who were not from national statistical agencies. Statisticians from line ministries and data users, in general have had less chance to participate in activities and less knowledge and awareness of what has been done. It cannot be assumed that once information and material from PARIS21 has been passed on to an individual, in most cases the director of the national statistical agency, that it will then automatically be transferred to other staff in the same agency, other partners in the national statistical system or successors.

## **UNDERSTANDING OF THE PARIS21 MISSION AND OBJECTIVES**

Given the different level of involvement with the Consortium, it was not surprising that there were different levels of understanding of the mission and objectives of PARIS21. In some cases (e.g., Kenya) there was a feeling that PARIS21 is just another donor and/or international agency that needs to be dealt with. What was offered was generally considered useful, but it was felt that it was not always well coordinated with other donors and other activities. Within the meeting as a whole, there seemed to be limited awareness of PARIS21 as a network belonging to and working for developing countries.

A number of participants saw the Consortium as having three key roles: providing technical support and quality assurance for strategic planning; promotion of more effective donor coordination; and promoting advocacy at the political level, particularly through the African Union (Sudan, Zimbabwe, South Africa). Some concern was raised, however as to whether the Secretariat in particular has the capacity to do all of these things effectively and if not whether there might need to be some prioritisation of tasks (Malawi and Tanzania). There was also discussion of the need for PARIS21 to develop its 'brand identity' and to re-focus, with a specific emphasis on advocacy and coordination (South Africa). The question of how to raise the profile of PARIS21 at the country level was also raised (Tanzania).

## **SUPPORT FOR NSDS**

Almost all participants were aware of the PARIS21 material on NSDS, especially the guidelines. This was particularly true for those countries currently involved in preparing a strategy (Tanzania, Uganda, and Swaziland). The material was valued in part for providing a framework, which could be used to ensure completeness and improve the quality of the product. To some extent the Guidelines are seen as a check-list for national strategies to ensure completeness. In this context, peer review mechanism of PARIS21 was mentioned (Kenya) and noted as valuable but still rather difficult to handle and deploy.

## **COORDINATION**

The importance of coordination was raised by many of the participants (Kenya, Sudan, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe). To some extent there is a contradiction between the role of PARIS21 in providing support to statistical systems and in promoting coordination. The need for

more effective coordination is clear and many heads of statistical agencies find it difficult to deal with assistance being provided from many different sources. There seems to be a need for material guidance and possibly even models of how coordination could work better at country level. If PARIS21 is to support this it may need to act less like a donor itself.

## **ADVOCACY**

The need for effective advocacy is widely acknowledged, but it is not clear whether this requires better material for use at the country level or more effective intervention at high political levels. A number of participants identified the importance of advocacy of statistics, but made only limited reference to the material already made available by PARIS21 (Kenya, Ghana). Some concerns were raised about the accessibility of advocacy material, a number of participants indicated that they did not have the time to seek out material on the PARIS21 web-site (Kenya, Swaziland). It was felt that PARIS21 should have a role in advocating for statistics at forums that were not accessible to statistical managers (Sudan).

## **WORKING WITH SECTORS**

Participants not from national statistical agencies felt that PARIS21 has not, so far interacted much with statisticians working with specific sectors, such as agriculture, health, etc (Tanzania). Another concern was working with local government (Nigeria).

## **ANNEX 4: Minutes from 10 February 2006 Meeting with Francophone Country Representatives Present at FASDEV II**

Chair: Pierre Spitz

### **BENIN**

---

- Participated in regional workshops (Bamako and Ouagadougou)
- The NSDS plays an important role at the member state level for the reorganisation of the statistical system.
- Not all countries are at the same level of statistical development.
- Recommends that groups be formed based on level of statistical development to accelerate the progress of the less advanced countries.
- PARIS21 should adapt the modalities for its interventions to take account of the different levels.

### **CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC**

---

- Has not participated in PARIS21 workshops.
- The PRSP and NSDS will be adopted this year.
- PARIS21 support is essential in drafting the roadmap, the stages and mobilising financial resources (World Bank and ADB).

### **GUINEA BISSAU**

---

- The Lusophone workshop was organised in Bissau.
- Currently finds itself at a different stage: roadmap completed; funding request sent to the ADB has still not been answered.
- The statistical law having been judged old, a draft is being discussed at the Council of Ministers level.

### **MADAGASCAR**

---

- Madagascar participated at Addis and Ouagadougou workshops.
- The draft roadmap has been validated, the assessment phase has begun on their own resources, a UNDP funding is available, a request to the ADB has not been answered.
- Madagascar would like to continue to benefit from PARIS21's programme of accompaniment.

### **GUINEA**

---

- Participated at Bamako and Ouagadougou workshops.
- Roadmap designed, funding secured (World Bank and UNDP), support from partners present in Conakry, timetable ready.

- Guinea would like more information on possible technical support.

## **MAURITANIA**

---

- Participated at Bamako and Ouagadougou workshops.
- Mauritania had already designed a Statistical Development Strategy (« Schéma Directeur de la Statistique ») for 2000-2005.
- The roadmap is ready (July 2005 workshop), the TF grant agreement is signed, disbursement is expected very soon.

## **NIGER**

---

- Participated at Bamako and Ouagadougou workshops.
- Roadmap adopted
- The World Bank TF has been accepted, the national team has been put in place, the response and disbursements of the World Bank are expected.
- The UNDP is willing to support, the ACBF could fill in the gaps if needed.
- Advocacy has worked well, an EU project (2005-2007) foresees support to the NSDS.
- International consultation was asked of the ADB but has gone without response.
- Uncertainties on design follow-up required some activism.

## **COMOROS**

---

- Participated at Bamako and Ouagadougou workshops.
- A first assessment was launched with national funding. Authorities and the IMF agree on the need to design an NSDS.
- PARIS21 should continue its support to all countries while taking account of specific situations.
- The ADB proposes its support but Comoros would also like the involvement of other partners.

## **CHAD**

---

- Participated at Bamako and Ouagadougou workshops.
- Seminars are useful, especially the one at Ouagadougou which presented the Burkina Faso experience.
- Seminars should be continued to share experiences.
- The NSDS and the PRSP have improved the visibility of statistics and understanding data needs.
- The light reporting exercise should go further and propose evaluations.
- Decrease in funding contradicts need to develop human capital.
- Regarding funding for the General Census on Population and Housing (RGPH), donor policies are mostly unknown and misunderstood.

## **DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO (DRC)**

---

- Participated in Addis and Ougadougou workshops (Rapporteur Note: the Director of the INS has since been replaced.)
- The DRC is well supported by PARIS21.
- The main difficulty: advocacy to donors and government.

## **BURUNDI**

---

- Participated in Addis and Ougadougou workshops.
- PARIS21 is appreciated for its advocacy to partners.
- The seminars were catalysts to sharing experiences and helped launch the work as well as questioning.
- The roadmap is in preparation for action plans covering 2008 - 2012.
- Consultations with donors is organised by the Minister through a statistical support unit (an empty table was proposed to donors for them to report on their contributions).
- A human resources deficit exists; a statistical department was opened in the university.
- Donors are coming in numbers.

## **TOGO**

---

- Participated in Bamako and Ougadougou workshops.
- The roadmap has been finalised with PARIS21.
- Funding is to be secured, a request was sent to the ADB, a response is expected.
- Would like support for advocacy.

## **DJIBOUTI**

---

- Participated in Addis and Ougadougou workshops.
- The NSDS was designed with UNDP assistance and methodological and technical support from PARIS21.
- The NSDS was just adopted in December 2005 and transmitted to the Council of Ministers.
- PARIS21 support is requested to mobilise resources for implementation.

## **BURKINA FASO**

---

- Adopted a Statistical Development Strategy in 2003, signed up for a STATCAP loan for its implementation.
- Participated in Bamako and Ougadougou workshops (co-organiser).
- Seeks to secure funding for the RGPH scheduled for 2006; a group of villages is currently being constituted.

## **CAPE VERDE**

---

- Could not participate in the Bissau workshop.
- Statistical planning experience is already quite old (1999-2005).
- A Statistical Master Plan is in preparation and intends to seek a STATCAP loan.

- PARIS21 support is requested to share good practices and mobilise resources.

## **COTE d'IVOIRE**

---

- Participated in Bamako and Ougadougou workshops.
- The 2000-2005 Statistical Development Plan had not been formally adopted by the Council of Ministers; it was extended to 2006 and beyond.
- It is necessary to change texts. Also a request for assistance was sent to ADB.
- The Côte d'Ivoire would like to pursue the issue of quality.
- An intervention before governments and the support of partners are necessary for NSDS implementation.

MOROCCO and TUNISIA are covered in the Arab States regional programme.

## **ANNEX 5: FASDEV II 9/02/06 -- “Light” evaluation of PARIS21**

The facilitator/evaluator felt that the opportunity of FASDEV II could be seized to ask the Heads of the Country Delegations, and/or members designated by them, to answer a few questions going beyond PARIS21 outputs as to situate these outputs in a larger outcome and time framework.

Answers to this questionnaire were dependent on the hierarchical level of the respondents within the country statistical system and their past interaction with P21 in 2004-2005. They were relatively few heads of NSOs and, as observed in Annex 3, a more rapid turn-over in Anglophone countries than in Francophone and Lusophone countries. In spite of this heterogeneity, and the attendant information level of the respondents, the answers generally demonstrate a strong interest in P21 initiatives and hope for the future. The 6-point scale used for certain questions (0-5), gives rather good ratings in comparison with similar enquiries. The highest is 4.3 for question 6.2 (usefulness of the regional workshop to acquire a better knowledge of the NSDS approach), with immediately behind 4.2 for question 6.1 (usefulness of the regional workshops for exchanging experiences with other countries) and question 5.2 (since the launch of the NSDS compact by P21 in 2004, do you feel that an added momentum was given to the process of statistical development in your country through NSDS Guidelines and other P21 documentation?). In the same overall question 5 (since the launch.....in your country), the sub-question 5.3 [“through more/better external support (World Bank, TFSCB, AfDB, ECA etc.)] attracted the lowest score of 2.4, a not so surprising result as NSDS has generally not reached the implementation stage. Even, if given the small number of respondents and their heterogeneity, these results have to be taken with caution, they point out directions. As an example, the low score just above 2.4 is 3.4 for the question 5.4 on increased coordination of donor’s activities, an interesting indication that this coordination seen from the country level is perceived as improving.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

**SINCE 2000 UP TO NOW**

---

**1. Do you feel that your Government has increased its attention/political support to your National Statistical System?**

- YES for 23 respondents out of 28 (82 %)
- NO for 5 respondents;

**2. If no for which reasons?**

- “Weak attention, resources allocated to NSS decrease constantly”
- “Planning Ministry promises its support but it is only a part of the Government. Politicians are not interested in statistics. The country is in a post-conflict situation.”
- “National Development Strategies have not been implemented”
- “Armed conflicts and civil strife are paralyzing the country”
- “ Government from 2000 to 2005 was marred by factional rivalry. No attention was given to statistics.”

**3. If yes, could you give some evidence of this increased attention, particularly in regard to increasing demand for quality and development oriented statistics, such as required by PRSP and MDG monitoring?**

- “ Strengthening of the NSO human resources (27 staff recruited in 2005; 10 to be recruited in each year 2006, 2007 and 2008) ; increased financial resources”
- “ The elaboration of the first PRSP and of the first report of the country progress towards MDGs have greatly increased demand for development oriented statistics. The sub-sequent development programmes have, in turn, further increased this demand.”
- “ The production of the Poverty Index for the Geo-political level is now used for the distribution of funds for that level and for the secondary school bursary fund.”
- “ Signature of the decree establishing the National Agency for Statistics and development; financing of the Census data processing; increase of statisticians salaries; increase of the annual investment devoted to the national statistics.”

- “ 2003 census; 2004 household survey; 2004 agricultural survey ;data collection and analysis for PRSP update.”
- “ Increase of the national budget devoted to statistical activities; support to the NSDS elaboration.”
- “ Government has provided the necessary budget and demanded accountability from the statistical organization.”
- “Use of statistical indicators in the PRSP and MDG report.”
- “ Demand for quality and development oriented statistics increased for the PRSP.”
- “ The government has contributed financially to the 2002 General Census. The National Institute of Statistics has a major role in the PRSP, and in the NSDS development.”
- “Several surveys and studies aimed at the monitoring/evaluation of PRSP and MDG; progress on the harmonization of statistics.”
- “ Budget increase of the NSO; government joint financing of HH survey with the World Bank and UNDP; government financing of industrial surveys, labour surveys, etc.”
- “Government committed to indicators for MDG monitoring.”
- “ Statistical divisions created in all ministries; NSO given the major role in PRSP monitoring/evaluation; NSO given the task of evaluating annual performance of sectoral statistical programmes.”
- “ Government has financed with its own resources several important surveys for PRSP and MDG monitoring; it has also increased greatly its budgetary contribution to NSO: training, building etc.”
- “ New legal base for the NSS; First National Statistical Programme; strengthening of the NSO Human Resources.”
- “Data required by PRSP and MDGs highly emphasized by the Gvt; demand for data to monitor short-term economic management is increasing; quarterly data on manufacturing industries has started;other new developments: Welfare Monitoring Survey, HICES, ICP etc.
- “Preparation of MICS survey.”
- “The President has on several occasions stated that he thinks that the current GDP estimate is lower than it should be. Under the pressure of the media, the Minister of Finances has requested statistics on job creation on monthly basis as the CPI. There were also arguments about including a statistical component in the main body of the PRSP document which has just been adopted.”
- “In 2003-2004,survey carried out for the evaluation of poverty allowing preparing the PRSP II and giving indicators for MDGs.”
- “Institutional strengthening : in 2002 setting up of a new direction of statistics under the Ministry of Economics, Finance and Planning.”
- “NSO Director General is (i) custodian of PRSP Indicators; (ii)Chair of Technical Working Group overseeing agreed sequence of censuses and surveys as well as routine

data; (iii) increased and ring fenced budget; (iv) participant in authorship of Tanzania Poverty and Human Development Report.”

- “ Focus has been on Labour statistics and GDP. As a consequence the organization has undertaken a review of Labour Force Surveys and an estimation of GDP.”

**4. If more attention is given, do you feel that the advocacy efforts and catalyst function of PARIS21 played a role in this evolution? To which extent? Score from 0 (no role) to 5 (very important role) and feel free to comment.**

A facilitator’s note : The question 4 above was introduced to tentatively capture the eventual role of PARIS21 in a longer time framework (2000 up to now) than the 2004-2005 Light evaluation framework .It was also asked as a cross-checking with the more detailed questions of the section pertaining to 2004-05. Out of the 28 respondents this approach was clearly understood by 20 respondents.

Amongst the remaining 8, 2 did not answer. None of the other 6 gave scorings, but they offered comments most of them unrelated or not directly related to the question:

- P21 did not have a noticeable impact on our division in the Ministry of Planning an answer rather off the mark; the same respondent did not answer many questions and the few he answered are disconnected thus pointing out a general ignorance of the context. He is not a NSO staff; he is referred to below as “respondent Z”.
- My country takes measures in the NSDS framework, measures that the Government will not be able to oppose (a rather obscure statement)
- Government is committed to indicators for MDG monitoring
- P21 has given a significant support
- We think that P21 advocacy on a person-to-person basis could be a catalyst. We are anxiously waiting for its implication in the country so as to make our authorities aware of the support they should provide to statistics.
- No role until 2004 (the respondent, NSO Director General, gives very high scores to P21 in the subsequent questions of section B)

The average score of the group of 20 is 3.6 a rather high score of satisfaction

The group of 20 respondents needs to be divided into two sub-groups, one of 8 respondents with scores but no comments, the other one of 12 with scores and comments. The 12 comments are as follows:

- I do not think that things have improved thanks to P21 but rather to my appointment as Adviser to the Prime Minister (score 2)
- P21 support has been felt as rather weak. We are expecting its support to launch NSDS and identify sources of financing (score2)

- Even if P21 has given us some support I don't think it played a role in the Government's decision to strengthen the institutional set-up of statistics. I, nevertheless, trust its advocacy efforts aimed at the development of statistics (score 3)
- P21 must continue to play in our country its catalytic role and its advocacy efforts. We believe that it will yield good results (score 3)
- A lot of publicity was given to the conference/workshop that was held for Anglophone countries in Ghana. This provided an opportunity for advocacy and to highlight some of the nagging problems. This built on other opportunities for advocacy that had taken place before (score 3)
- P21 advocacy, particularly through workshops in which we participated with representatives of the anti-poverty programmes as well as with the media, has triggered articles in the printed press. (score 3)
- The 2002 meeting co-sponsored by P21 and the advocacy video were central to bring about more attention (score 4)
- The NSDS workshop for lusophone countries has captured the attention of Government and resulted in the elaboration of a road map for designing a strategy (score 4)
- The role played by P21 in the development of statistics in Africa, and especially in Mauritania, does not need any more to be proved .We have been supported all along by P21 in our development process (score 4)
- Very important through the support to the SNDS road map design (score 5)
- Very important role and in the future the advocacy efforts and catalyst function of P21 should draw further the attention of Government to support the NSS through a partnership with P21 so as to empower the NSO to design the NSDS and the PRSP (score 5)
- P21 in both the East Africa and SADC regions sensitized high level central ministries (Finance and Planning) officials to raise to the conviction that NSO has to be better resourced to meet the data demand (score 5)

## **SINCE 2004 UP TO NOW**

---

### **5. Since the launch of the NSDS compact by PARIS21 in 2004, do you feel that an added momentum was given to the process of statistical development in your country through:**

#### **5.1. Regional Workshops : score 0 to 5 if you attended one in 2004/2005; and feel free to comment in all cases**

Six respondents who didn't participate in Regional Workshops (RWs) gave no score and no comments. Two gave comments but no score:

- Allowed the design of a draft road map

- NSDS design in 2005 prompted by the RW and fundamental importance given by political decision makers\_(not very clear statement)

The average score of the other 20 respondents is 3.75.

One group of 8 gave score but no comments. The other 12 gave scores and offered the following comments:

- The contribution of national workshops is modest. The idea is very good but for such an ambitious project with a very short delay, two workshops (Addis and Bamako) are not sufficient (score 2)
- Useful and important workshops which will gain in better focusing the discussions so as to avoid giving non-specialists the impression of having a right to life over NSOs when they don't know anything about statistics (score 3)
- These workshops have allowed to size up the importance of NSDS and, at the methodological level, the different formulation stages (score 3)
- Though in our country we had produced a National Strategy Plan for the development of NSS, my attendance to various workshops has been very enlightening as we gave our experiences in its implementation (score 3)
- I didn't participate but benefited from the documents produced (score 4)
- The 2005 RW held in Accra created the awareness of the NSDS and PRSP (score 4)
- The Bamako RW allowed to mobilize our efforts for the NSDS design and its integration with the PRSP (score 4)
- My participation to several workshops organized by P21 have firmed up my belief that statistics are necessary for the management of development policies and should be an integral part of national development plans (score 4)
- Since establishing partnership with other countries on the continent our strategy document has improved in terms of its quality of measurement and presentation of results and outputs of our organization (score 4)
- RWs have allowed to fruitful experiences exchanges and have enriched all participants with new experiences and good practices (score 5)
- Managers of the Department of statistics and national accounts have participated to all workshops organized by P21 and, as a result, started the NSDS road map with P21 before the involvement of the NSO (score 5)
- RWs enhanced conceptual understanding and the required processes (score 5)

## **5.2. NSDS Guidelines and other PARIS21 documentation? Score 0-5 and feel free to comment**

Two respondents only did not score. One (respondent Z) answered "nil", a confirmation that he does not know the documentation and, more generally, P21. The other wrote that the P21 documentation helped for NSDS design.

One respondent not knowing the use of a scale gave a score of 2.5 and requested more documentation. His other answers show a very limited understanding of the issues at stake. All his half-point ratings were counted as the below round figure.

The average score of the 25 other respondents is 4.2. The inclusion of a score of 2 by the above mentioned respondent would give an average of 4.1.

Nine respondents gave only scores and no comments. The comments of the other 16 are rather repetitive in their praise for P21 documentation, with no restriction, even for the three respondents who scored 3: "importance of the doc."; "a doc. of reference"; "we have it all but have not acted upon yet".

Comments accompanying scores 4 and 5: "very useful"; "important input"; "very good"; "absolutely necessary".

No suggestions made for improvement in content, presentation or distribution.

### **5.3. More/better external support (World Bank TFSCB, AfDB, ECA etc.) Please specify and score on a scale from 0 to 5 for each entity you single out. Feel free to offer comments/evidence**

This question was not answered in 4 questionnaires. General scoring without attribution to any entity was given in 11 questionnaires, with a rather low average score of 2.4.

Amongst the other 13 questionnaires two didn't give scoring but the following comments:

- Support increasingly important, in particular from the BAD with its PCI
- Support of the WB not very significant ;agreement reached with BAD thanks to P21 support; ECA: nothing

In the remaining 11 questionnaires, IMF was quoted once, with a zero score, EU once with a score of 4, UNDP three times with the following scores: 3, 4 and 5. ECA was mentioned 5 times with the following scores: 3,3,1,0,0.

ADB and the World Bank (including TFSCB) received the highest scores as well as number of mentions, 9 for the WB, 8 for ADB.

The average score of the WB is 3.8 for 9 mentions or 3.1 if we consider the 11 questionnaires. The average score of ADB is 3.6 for 8 mentions or 2.6 for the 11 questionnaires.

### **5.4. Increased coordination of donor's activities. Please score 0 to 5 and feel free to offer comments/evidence**

The question was not answered in 6 questionnaires. One answer deals with the coordination of documents (recommended on CD support). Another one states: "There is donor

coordination at the country level for the larger programmes of the Government under a multi-donor programme budget support. It is not clear that the launching of NSDS had any impact on this.”

The average score of the 20 other questionnaires is 3.4. Most significant comments:

- Since 2003 a NSS coordination committee has been put into place. But this has nothing to do with the launching of NSDS. (score 1)
- Donors are still uncoordinated and agencies are usually eager to have their flag displayed as a donor (score 2)
- “Mobilisation” of partners around NSDS greatly contributes to better coordination (score 3)
- Yes, but WB doesn’t finance the priorities decided by the Government but what the WB directors want (score 4)
- The PRSP process has led the PRSP unit to centralize the donor’s funds (score 4)
- The present P21 efforts will certainly lead to a better coordination (score 4)
- The NSDS process increases the visibility of statistics and leads to promote a better coordination (score 5)
- There is in place a dedicated (statistics) donor committee with strong East AFRITAC influence and Government participation (score 5)

**6. If you participated in a PARIS21 Regional Workshop since the launch of NSDS, did you find it useful**

Seven respondents didn’t have the opportunity to attend Regional Workshops. Average scores are given below for the 21 who answered the questions. Comments were repetitive and didn’t bring anything significant.

**6.1. For exchanging experiences with other countries? Score 0-5 and comment**

Average score: 4.2

**6.2. For acquiring a better knowledge of the NSDS approach. Score 0-5 and comment**

Average score: 4.3

**6.3. Bringing pressure in your country for a better recognition of the role of NSS in development policy? Score 0-5 and feel free to comment**

Average score: 3.2

**6.4. Developing a closer dialogue with users, in particular with PRSP units? Score 0-5 and comment**

Average score: 3.3

**7. Any other comments you feel appropriate about PARIS21**

All comments are very positive about past activities of P21 and its role in the development of statistics in Africa. All requests for the future imply an increased P21 advocacy and support at the country level, in particular to continue assisting the NSDS process, identifying sources of funding for its implementation and reinforcing donor coordination in the country itself. Specific recommendations include also continued support beyond the NSDS completion point, tailoring P21 support according to the development level of NSS, as the least developed require more attention, and pursuing the advocacy efforts for statistics as a tool of democracy.

Two NSO Directors wrote only one sentence each under point 7:

- “We pray for no slippage in the momentum”
- “Keep up with the spirit for the development of Statistics in Africa”

## **ANNEX 6: Terms of Reference for review of PARIS21**

### **1. Nature of review**

A 'light' evaluation will be made of PARIS21 early in 2006. This will be based on a review by a Review Group (a sub-group of the Steering Committee) assisted by an external evaluator who will facilitate the process, with logistical support (and funding) from the PARIS21 Secretariat. The principal aim of the review will be to look to the future to, if necessary, re-orientate PARIS21's work to take account of progress towards objectives (with the focus on delivery of outputs) and the continuing relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of delivery (see annex for suggested framework and timetable for review):

The review will refer to PARIS21's Logical Framework (attached), the Joint Funding Proposal (with the World Bank Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building: 2004–2006) and the 2003 evaluation report. The review will consider the original vision for PARIS21, reflect on its development and consider how best to continue the work of PARIS21 beyond 2006.

### **2. PARIS21 Review Group**

This sub-group of the Steering Committee will:

- agree the terms of reference and modus operandi for the review of PARIS21 and provide guidance where necessary
- agree upon the evaluation criteria and a more precise timetable and process, about which the full Steering Committee will be kept informed
- approve the evaluator/ facilitator's inception and final report before its submission to the Steering Committee
- make themselves available (either in person or via email/telephone) for interviews conducted by the evaluator
- report back to the Steering Committee meeting in April 2006 on the evaluation and with recommendations on the future of PARIS21, including its orientation, objectives, and priority activities.

It is envisaged that the review group will mainly work virtually, using telephonic and electronic media, but may decide to meet face-to-face as a group or, individually, to interview a representative selection of stakeholders, including canvassing the views of other Steering Committee members. The Review Group will select a chairperson to act as the main point of contact for the evaluator/ facilitator and the PARIS21 Secretariat.

#### ***Role of the Review Group Chairperson***

The Review Group chairperson will preside over the review process. Specifically, he/she will:

- call and chair the meetings of the Review Group

- draw up the agenda of the meetings
- liaise with and provide strategic guidance to the evaluator/ facilitator
- supervise the implementation of the evaluation activities
- as a member, provide inputs to the evaluation
- present the results to the Steering Committee in April, with input if desired from the evaluator/ facilitator

### **3. Terms of reference for the evaluator/ facilitator**

The review group will be assisted by an evaluator/ facilitator, who will be contracted by OECD for a period of up to 30 days (an indicative breakdown is shown below). S/he will consult the Review Group and propose working arrangements, including a detailed timetable, meeting and travel plans, which will be amended following comments from the sub-group. (5 days)

The evaluator/ facilitator will facilitate discussion by the Review Group and wider consultation, including (if deemed appropriate by the Review Group) opening up the consultation to a representative selection of stakeholders and PARIS21 partners, for instance through a notice on the PARIS21 website and by participating at the STATCOM and FASDEV meetings in Addis Ababa in February; and maintain a record of discussions and an audit trail of the evaluation process (up to 20 days):

The evaluator/ facilitator will prepare a draft report, with an executive summary, reflecting views of the Review Group and others consulted, and the final report, taking account of comments received (5 days).

### **4. Role of the PARIS21 Secretariat in the review process**

The evaluator/facilitator and Review Group will be supported by the PARIS21 Secretariat throughout the review process. The Secretariat will:

- Prepare draft terms of reference for the review
- Engage the evaluator/ facilitator according to instructions from the Review Group
- Collate and summarise background papers and other materials relevant to the evaluation
- Make arrangements for meetings of the group and with others they wish to consult
- Take notes of meetings, as required by the evaluator/ facilitator and Review Group
- Prepare an updated report on progress and work plans for 2006
- Prepare a paper setting out the Secretariat's vision for PARIS21 beyond 2006

The Secretariat will nominate a contact person for the review.

### **5. Time frame for the review**

The review will be conducted between mid-January to mid-March 2006, by when the draft report will have been written. This will be finalised by the end of March, in time for a

meeting of PARIS21's "founding fathers" (EC, IMF, OECD, UN, World Bank) at the end of March or early April to discuss the review findings and consider their response.

The Review Group will present its results at the PARIS21 Steering Committee meeting in Paris on 26-27 April. Depending on the outcome, a new framework will then be prepared for PARIS21's future work.

**PARIS21 Secretariat**  
**24 January 2006**

## ***Framework for the 'light' evaluation of PARIS21***

### **Aims and focus of the evaluation**

1. The 'light' evaluation will be based on a review by a sub-group of the PARIS21 Steering Committee assisted by an external evaluator who will facilitate the process, with logistical support (and funding) from the PARIS21 Secretariat. The principal aim of the review will be to consider the PARIS21's original vision, reflect on progress toward achieving that vision, and look to the future and consider how best to continue the work of PARIS21 beyond 2006.

The goal of PARIS21 is to "Develop a culture of evidence-based policy making and implementation which serves to improve governance and government effectiveness in reducing poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)". The partnership can help to achieve this by stimulating "Greater demand, availability and use of better statistics and statistical analysis in national, international, and civil society decision-making", which is the Purpose statement for PARIS21.

2. The advice of the evaluator/facilitator is that a 'light' review process cannot realistically evaluate the impact of the PARIS21 work programme; or attribute achievements meaningfully. Even consideration of consortium outcomes, namely:

1. Development and poverty reduction policies include development, financing and monitoring of national statistical systems
2. Countries elaborate and implement national statistical development strategies based on dialogue between data producers and users at national and international level.
3. Partners involved in statistical activities improve their collaboration nationally, regionally, and internationally to increase the volume and efficiency of their support to developing countries.

.....according to the means of verification set out in the Logical Framework agreed for 2004-06 would be too onerous for a 'light' evaluation. This would involve analysing partner country PRSPs, public expenditure statements and reports on statistical development. But the Review Group might consider recommending that such analysis, and analysis of donor strategies, should in the future be given a higher priority and be carried out systematically as part of the PARIS21 Secretariat's work programme in order to provide inputs into any future reviews.

3. Instead the focus of the review should be on the PARIS21 Secretariat's outputs delivered through its work programme during the period from January 2004 to the present, as agreed by the Steering Committee. The implicit assumption is that if the outputs are relevant and they are being delivered efficiently and effectively, then this will facilitate the achievement of consortium outcomes which, provided the assumptions set out in the Logical Framework are being met, will lead to achievement of the consortium's Purpose and Goal.

4. It is proposed therefore that in reaching conclusions about progress and recommendations for the future orientation of PARIS21, the Review Group considers the PARIS21 Secretariat's outputs against:

- (1) The indicators set out in the Logical Framework
- (2) Their relevance, and efficiency and effectiveness of delivery.

5. The review should take into account that there is still nearly a full year in which to complete the work programme for 2004-06; and that it got off to a slow start in 2004 because of delays in achieving adequate funding. Governance arrangements were reviewed by the Steering Committee in 2004 and are not proposed for further review at this time unless this appears desirable in the light of emerging review findings.

6. The proposed framework for the review follows this approach: firstly reviewing whether the PARIS21 Secretariat is delivering its outputs; and secondly whether the outputs remain relevant and are being delivered efficiency and effectively. The following table lists the outputs according to the Logical Framework, with the addition of a fifth category for work agreed subsequently by the Steering Committee. Most of the background material needed for this review is available from existing documents and reports, such as progress reports to the Steering Committee. The source is indicated in the fourth column. These documents will be provided to the Review Group with, if required, relevant extracts from the documents.

**Review framework: (1) Are PARIS21 Secretariat Outputs being achieved?**  
**Shaded columns have been taken directly from the PARIS21 logical framework.**

Secretariat Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Key source documents	Comments
<b>1 Knowledge Base and Studies</b>			- <u>SC Progress reports</u>	
a. Tools & Methods				
- Advocacy material for supporting population census	- Number of material produced and disseminated, by nature	- TT reports; actual materials and distribution lists.	- Census Advocacy video	- Responsibility passed to UNSD and UNFPA
- Guidelines and training material for developing or improving national statistical development strategies	- Number of Guidelines document disseminated; number of material produced by nature; number of training sessions and number of attendants	- TT reports; actual Guidelines document and distribution list, actual materials and their distribution lists; training sessions reports	- NSDS documentation and dissemination. - Advocacy through regional workshops. - Workshop and BTO reports	- Work mainstreamed in Secretariat's work programme.
- Specific programme for Africa agriculture statistics	- Number of programme documents disseminated	- TT reports; actual document reproduced and distribution list	- Advocacy video - TORs for study of linkages to NSDS	
- Recommendations to improved statistical support for Monitoring Development Goals	- Number of finalised documents disseminated	- TT report; actual document reproduced and distribution list	- <u>TT final report</u>	
b. Studies				
	- Existence of finalised study		- PRSP study (World Bank, DEC-DG)	

Secretariat Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Key source documents	Comments
- Baseline study on the inclusion of statistics in key policy documents (e.g., PRSPs)				
<b>2 Advocacy</b>			- <u>SC Progress reports</u>	
- Advocacy strategy	- Number of finalised Strategy documents disseminated	- Analysis of Strategy document and distribution list	- Initial document produced May 2004, updated in January 2006	
- Advocacy material	- Number of advocacy items produced and translated, by nature	- Analysis of items	- NSDS advocacy documents - <u>Measuring Up to the Measurement Problem and derivatives (E, F)</u> - PowerPoint presentations	
- Delivery of advocacy messages	- Number of presentations made and number of attendants by nature of the message and type of audience;	- Analysis of messages and mission reports	- Workshop reports	
- Delivery of training sessions on advocacy methods to statistical systems managers.	- Number of training sessions, and number of statistical systems managers trained	- Analysis of Training sessions reports	- Workshop reports	
<b>3 Partnership and Information exchange</b>			- <u>SC Progress reports</u>	
- Newsletter production and dissemination in several languages	- Number of Newsletter copies disseminated, by issue and language	- Actual printed issues, distribution list and report on readership	- Replaced by <u>monthly report</u>	

Secretariat Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Key source documents	Comments
- Website	- Website on line and average number of visits	- Site archive and reports of web site visits	- <u>Website</u> revised in 2004. Statistics on access	
- Expert roster	- Number of experts registered and number of inquiries made.	- Periodical list of experts and analysis of requests received	- <u>Consultants' roster</u>	Countries contact consultants directly. 171 consultants have already registered.
- Membership	- Number of members registered	- Periodical lists of members and analysis of membership	- Membership invited to re-register 2004. Current membership	
- Institutional membership	- Number of MOUs adopted	- Actual MOUs documents, reports on joint donors' meetings	- MOUs with partner institutions eg for workshops	- Institutional membership not pursued.
- Documentation gathered by country through PARLISTAT	- Number of countries with PARLISTAT files on the Web	- Actual files and analysis of PARLISTAT files	- NSDS country status reports	
<b>4 International and Regional programmes</b>				
- Delivery of regional and technical meeting to improve user-producer dialogue, and to support the elaboration of national statistical development strategies.	- Number of Meetings, and number of participants by country; number of countries having developed a statistical integrated development plans	- Analysis of meeting reports; Country Reports; Actual Plans documents	- <u>SC Progress reports</u> - Workshop reports - Country NSDS status reports - NSDSs on Knowledge base	
- Advocacy material targeted to regions; Messages delivered to specific audiences	- Number of Advocacy items by nature, by targeted region and audiences;	- Actual material used; Meeting Reports	- Regional workshop reports	

Secretariat Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Key source documents	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of meetings during which a presentation was made ; number of participants</li> <li>- Number of meetings held and number of donors institutions attending, by region</li> <li>- Number of world reports disseminated, by issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings reports</li> <li>- Actual reports and distribution lists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PARIS21 donors' meetings</li> <li>- FASDEV</li> </ul>	
- Donors joint meeting				
- World report on the use of statistics for development and on the status and trends of the national statistical systems in developing and transition countries.				- Exercise not accepted by Steering Committee

Secretariat Outputs	Key source documents	Comments
<b>5 Other work, not included in Logical Framework:</b>		
- Other task teams: costing and funding; training; Intersect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC Progress reports</li> <li>- Task team reports</li> </ul>	
- Other methodological work in response to demand, eg models of statistical systems; lessons learnt from strategic planning; Guide to implementation of NSDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Internal and published reports</li> </ul>	
- Briefing sessions for potential NSDS consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Session reports</li> </ul>	
- Light reporting mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FASDEV report</li> </ul>	

**Review framework: (2) Are outputs still relevant and being delivered efficiency and effectively?**

7. The second stage of the review will consider the continuing relevance of this work programme and whether it is being delivered efficiently and effectively.

Topic/ issues	How assessed
<p><b>Relevance:</b> The extent to which the programme is consistent with the policies and priorities of PARIS21 partners. Some issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the activities and work programme of PARIS21 been appropriate to the purpose?</li> <li>• Has the programme met stakeholders' priorities for PARIS21?</li> <li>• Have the activities adapted to cope with lessons learnt and changing priorities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC progress reports and minutes/ other?</li> <li>- SC progress reports and minutes/ other?</li> <li>- SC progress reports and minutes/ other?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Efficiency:</b> The relationship between inputs (including funding) and the outputs they achieved. Some issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Composition of Secretariat and responsibilities</li> <li>• Has there been effective funding by donors of the PARIS21 work programme?</li> <li>• Have the expenditure priorities been appropriate</li> <li>• Are activities cost effective?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To be provided by Secretariat manager</li> <li>- SC progress reports and minutes</li> <li>- SC progress reports and minutes</li> <li>- workshop and other programme budgets from work programme</li> </ul>
<p><b>Effectiveness:</b> Are PARIS21 Secretariat and consortium activities consistent with achieving the purpose and goal being met. Some issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have National Strategies for the Development of Statistics been initiated?</li> <li>• Have countries requested assistance with their programmes?</li> <li>• Has more expertise been made available to countries to assist the design and implementation of NSDSs?</li> <li>• Have partner agencies and Trust Funds supported countries in carrying forward the work initiated in workshops.</li> <li>• Are Secretariat outputs valued and used?</li> </ul>	<p>Questionnaire to partner countries and donors attending FASDEV meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NSDS country status reports/ workshop reports</li> <li>- NSDS country status reports</li> <li>- Briefing sessions for potential NSDS consultants</li> <li>- NSDS country status reports/ STATCAP, Trust Fund, regional Development Bank applications, UN and bilateral donors</li> <li>- Questionnaire to selection of countries attending FASDEV meeting</li> </ul>

## **Future of PARIS21**

8. The principal aim of the review is to consider the original vision for PARIS21, reflect on its development and consider how best to continue the work of PARIS21 beyond 2006. The issues suggested for review will help to inform recommendations:

- Continuing relevance and progress towards objectives
- PARIS21 performance and comparative advantage
- What has worked and what has not
- Views of stakeholders, including both users and producers of statistics in both the developed and developing world
- Sustainability and governance arrangements.

**PARIS21 Secretariat**  
**24 January 2006**

## **ANNEX 7: Topics for consideration by review**

The review will consider the extent to which the Outputs have been achieved and the extent to which they remain relevant to achieving the Purpose of PARIS21. The following may assist consideration of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and governance of PARIS21:

**Relevance:** The extent to which the programme is consistent with the policies and priorities of the major stakeholders in the partnership. Some issues are:

- Have the activities and work programme of PARIS21 been appropriate to the purpose?
- Has the programme met stakeholders' requests?
- Were the work plan and activities consistent with the priorities of major stakeholders?
- Have the activities adapted to cope with changing situations, including progress, and priorities?

**Efficiency:** The relationship between the outputs achieved and the inputs used. Some issues are:

- Has there been effective funding of the work programme?
- Have funding priorities been consistent with the Purpose?
- Has PARIS21 built on synergies with partner agencies?

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which the Purpose and Goal level objectives have been achieved, or are likely to be achieved, taking account of whether the activities and the follow-up actions in countries and partner agencies are likely to lead to the goal being met. Some issues are:

- Have countries implemented follow-up actions?
- Have strategic planning processes for statistics (National Strategies for the Development of Statistics) been initiated?
- Have countries been assisted to overcome obstacles in developing their action programmes?
- Have countries requested assistance with their own programmes?
- Has more expertise been made available to countries to assist implementation of their NSDSs and other priority actions?
- Have partner agencies and Trust Funds carried forward the work initiated in workshops.
- Are outputs from task teams and the Secretariat valued and used?

**Impact:** All changes (positive or negative) triggered by PARIS21 intervention. Some issues are:

- Is there evidence that communication has increased between decision-makers and statistics producers?
- Is the commitment to statistics by policy-makers in developing countries improving or likely to improve?
- Are there indications of better co-ordination by donors in their statistical capacity-building efforts around country-owned NSDSs?

- Is increased funding available for statistics from donors and country governments?
- Is there evidence of countries initiating their own NSDSs?

**Sustainability:** The extent to which the activities, outputs and impacts will continue after external support has ended will be difficult to assess at this early stage, but:

- Is there evidence of increased collaboration and partnership between agencies?
- Is expertise and lesson learning being shared between developing countries?
- Are PARIS21 initiatives being taken-up by other agencies?
- Are countries making progress independently or with partners on actions facilitated by PARIS21?
- Governance: PARIS21 is a loosely constituted partnership between statisticians and policy-makers and agencies from the north and south. It is funded by a number of donor agencies and it is important that the governance of the initiative is accountable to the various constituencies, each of whom may have differing interests, priorities and degrees of influence. Some issues are:
- Have policy-makers and statisticians each had an appropriate voice and participation in the governance of PARIS21?
- Is the balance of influence between donor agencies and partners countries correct?
- Are the reporting arrangements to the Consortium sufficient?
- Is the membership of the Consortium and Steering Committee balanced?

**Future of PARIS21:** This is the principal aim of the review, which will consider the original vision for PARIS21, reflect on its development and consider how best to continue the work of PARIS21 beyond 2006. Some issues are:

- Continuing relevance and progress towards its objectives
- PARIS21 performance and comparative advantage
- What has worked and what has not
- Impact on stakeholders, including both users and producers of statistics in both the developed and developing world
- Sustainability and governance arrangements.

Paris21 Secretariat,  
December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2005 (Annex to the initial TOR further revised on January 24, 2006)