



**WORLDWIDE REPORT ON THE USE OF STATISTICS FOR DEVELOPMENT:  
SUMMARY OF DECISIONS FOR THE PARIS21 STEERING COMMITTEE**

**The PARIS21 Steering Committee is invited to comment on the production of a worldwide report for the 2005 UN Summit-level event on the Millennium Declaration.**

**Introduction**

In anticipation of the September 2005 UN Summit-level event on the Millennium Declaration, it is important to highlight the use of statistics for development and the capacity of developing country statistical systems. The Worldwide Report, which has already been discussed at the last Steering Committee meeting, could be a good means to promote these issues. Institutional members of the PARIS21 Partnership could carry this work forward. The PARIS21 Secretariat could also lead this work, with the assistance of its partners.

On this basis, the PARIS21 Secretariat commissioned a study (see room document# *P21-SC1-04-WWR*) to explore the feasibility of producing such a report, which proposed the following:

- The report would be entitled for instance “The Worldwide Statistics for Development Report” and be produced every three-to-five years.
- Data informing the report’s content would be collected via two main methods: a review of available documentation and the completion of country questionnaires).
- The questionnaires would be administered in collaboration with regional institutions.
- The report would comprise three sections: (1) an introductory chapter drawing the overall picture of statistics’ progress in contributing to evidence-based policymaking and results-based management; (2) country pages, compiled from questionnaire responses; and (3) statistical annexes.
- The process of reviewing the contents of the report would involve a review board composed of recognised experts and representatives from regional and international institutions.
- Production of the report would take approximately one year and an estimated total of 935 person–days.
- Cost would depend on the implementation of the report and the institution charged with the task.

**Decisions**

1. Does the Committee agree to the production of a worldwide report by July 2005?
2. What are the modalities for the production of such a report?

## **Feasibility Study on the Worldwide “Statistics for Development” Report**

### ***Executive Summary***

To support national statistical development efforts, the PARIS21 Secretariat proposes the production of a worldwide report on the use of statistics for development and on the status and trends of the national statistical systems in developing countries. With the United Nations preparing a major event in 2005 to review progress toward the Millennium Development Goals, a report on statistical capacity is essential. The present document is the result of a study commissioned to explore the feasibility of producing such a report.

It is proposed that the report—to be entitled for instance “The Worldwide Statistics for Development Report”—be produced every three-to-five years. The feasibility study was carried out for the PARIS21 Secretariat and concluded that:

- Data informing the report’s content would be collected via two main methods: a review of available documentation and the completion of country questionnaires).
- The questionnaires would be administered in collaboration with regional institutions.
- The report would comprise three sections: (1) an introductory chapter drawing the overall picture of statistics’ progress in contributing to evidence-based policymaking and results-based management; (2) country pages, compiled from questionnaire responses; and (3) statistical annexes.
- The process of reviewing the contents of the report would involve a review board composed of recognised experts and representatives from regional and international institutions.
- Production of the report would take approximately one year and an estimated total of 1000 person–days.
- Cost would depend on the implementation of the report and the institution charged with the task.



## **I. Background**

Despite many national and international efforts to finance statistics over recent years, a majority of developing countries do not have systems that are capable of providing policymakers, the general public, and economic and social partners with the statistical data they need to take sound policy, business, political, and personal decisions. National statistical systems are not fully demand-driven and are characterised by poor coordination between the different bodies producing statistics, by meagre national financing, and by international support that is too often *ad hoc* or not attuned to the constraints imposed by the country's individual needs.

In light of this situation, PARIS21 is encouraging all developing and transition countries to report regularly on the status of their statistical systems and on the production and use of statistics for development policymaking. As an output of this global reporting process, PARIS21 proposes the production of a worldwide report on the use of statistics for development and on the status and trends of the national statistical systems in developing and transition countries. The objective is to report on the use of statistics in development issues such as reporting on the MDGs, assimilation into PRSPs, governance, and the development of national and international statistical systems. Structured to consider both geographic and thematic issues, the report would also highlight the evolution, constraints, and best practices in statistical systems and would propose recommendations. The audience would be key policymakers in the international community and in developing countries. The report would be an output of a partnership between countries and subregional, regional, and international institutions and would use the Statistical Capacity Building Indicators. Country reports would be produced by the countries themselves and summarised in the publication. A CD-ROM of country documentation would accompany the report.

## **II. Characteristics of the Worldwide Report**

The proposed worldwide report might perhaps best be termed the first "Statistics for Development" report, with a more stimulating subtitle to be chosen at a later date in light of the main emphasis that preparation suggests would be strategic in 2005. The present document refers to it simply as the "Worldwide Report." The main dimensions of the report concept are summarised below.

- The report would address the fundamental objectives of PARIS21 partners of fostering evidence-based policymaking and management for results.
- The report would deal at least as much with the use of statistics, and ways to foster it, as with production.
- The report would emphasise the developing/transition country viewpoint, in line with the PARIS21 partnership's country-leadership philosophy.
- The report would aim mainly at the audience of developing and transition countries' finance/planning ministers and other leaders of national development efforts, national statistical authorities, and key policymakers in the international community.
- The main purpose of the report is to give a systematic comparative picture of the extent to which statistics are adapting to new demands, the contribution they are making to development, and ways to improve their performance.
- The underlying objective of the report is to promote broader understanding of the important role that statistics should play in development and the need for adequate financial support, so that particular interest attaches to success stories, of statistics' positive impact in management of development.



- The report would be produced every three-to-five years. Producing the report annually would be a prohibitively heavy workload; furthermore, the situation would not evolve significantly from year to year to warrant a new report annually.

### **III. Information Collection Methodology**

Data informing the Worldwide Report would be collected mainly from two sources: (1) available documentation and (2) opinion-and-experience surveys of developing/transition countries via a standard questionnaire, slightly adjusted however to individual countries to encourage more elaboration on experience likely to be of broader interest. Regional bodies with a particular interest in statistics would be involved in the tailoring of the questionnaire to each recipient country in their region and in securing thoughtful responses.

#### **A. Available Documentation**

As a result of the regional workshops already held and the work of the their task teams, PARIS21 and its partners already have on their websites a considerable amount of material relating to recent statistical development in many developing and transition countries.

Annexures to this report have been prepared summarising the currently available country coverage of these main sources, for instance:

- PRSPs and Country MDG Reports
- IMF Statistical Standards and Support Initiatives
- Governance-related Statistical Surveys
- Statistical Strategic Plans operating or under preparation
- Application of the PARIS21 Statistical Capacity Building Indicators
- Health Metrics Network (see Annex 1)

In the first two categories listed, reports are added monthly, as work progresses (see websites of WB, UNDG and IMF). In the next three – Governance, Strategic Plans and the Capacity Building Indicators – our lists have been more difficult to prepare and most likely omit important initiatives which will come to light in future work. With respect to the Governance-related activities, it should be noted that few, if any, of the surveys have been carried out directly by government statistical services. Some of the surveys have however been assisted in various ways by NSOs, and a few have been planned specifically as complements to other ongoing official work. Moreover, demand for work in this area is expanding and is likely to be an increasingly important element, if still small in absolute scale, in countries' aggregate statistical effort.

The above-mentioned sources will need complementing most particularly in regard to the legal foundations, and institutional structures for statistics in each country. The UN Statistics Division is almost certainly best informed on these matters for a very large number of countries, and it is hoped that it will be in a position to provide this information.

Searching the websites of regional statistical bodies and aid agencies with important activity in statistics (such as CIDA, DFID, French Cooperation, Sida and USAID), and personal contacts with individuals in those bodies, are likely to draw attention to a number of other publically available reports about individual countries which would be of great help for the work.



To minimise the amount of information, especially factual material, that it will be necessary to solicit from the countries, and to capture any key issues that should be reflected in tailoring the standard questionnaire to a recipient country, the work should start with a short but careful review of the information available from the above-mentioned sources.

## **B. Survey Questionnaire**

Key considerations in designing the questionnaire which would be sent to countries are to make it:

- sufficiently interesting to very busy recipients to generate a thoughtful and informative (more than telegraphic) response, and
- capable of producing answers which will be interesting to the Worldwide Report's intended audience, both in individual country-specific summaries and in the overall, worldwide synthesis.

The draft proposed (Annex 2) minimises factual questions, on the assumption that these generate frustration at having to repeat things that should already be known. It also tries to adopt a very neutral style, minimising implicit advance value judgments – even, for instance, that strategic plans are necessarily the right way to go. It will be noted that the questions deliberately give a large place to demand and use of statistics, accounting for about half the subjects raised.

It is envisaged that the questionnaire would be addressed to the Minister responsible for each country's National Statistical Office. It would be accompanied by a carefully prepared covering letter, describing origin and purpose and explaining the contribution the Worldwide Report is hoped to make to wider understanding of the importance of statistics and to the quantity and quality of national and international support for statistical capacity building. By asking for a response of 5–6 pages or, say, not more than 6 pages, the message would hopefully be conveyed that these purposes were only likely to be fulfilled with substantive and illustrated answers to the questions from a large number of countries.

The intention, which might be gently implied in the covering letter, is that the Minister would call upon both his NSO head and at least one or two senior officials of statistics-using bodies (such as Ministry of Finance or Planning, and maybe a big-spending service-ministry such as Health or Agriculture) to advise him/her on the response.

The agency responsible for producing the report and/or the regional statistics body which was helping to secure good answers from the given country would no doubt take the opportunity, at the time of sending the questionnaire, to brief the head of the NSO and other relevant contacts about the letter and the kind of treatment that it was hoped it would receive.

An illustration of the kind of answer that it is hoped the questionnaire would generate is given for the concrete case of Cambodia, in Annex 3. While this illustration has benefited from the brief answers that the NSO head gave to a small questionnaire used in the PARIS21 evaluation in 2003, it is mainly based on a number of other reports about Cambodia's development experience and its statistics. It should be stressed that the illustration is entirely the concoction of the consultant undertaking the present feasibility study and should in no sense be taken to reflect the views of the Cambodian government. While it illustrates the sort of substance required, it obviously cannot provide the authoritative judgments which it is the main purpose of the questionnaire to solicit.



#### **IV. The Main Sources and Issues**

The World Bank (WB) produced a useful table two years ago (see Annex Table 6) rating 125 developing/transition countries on 10 objective criteria of the quality of their macroeconomic statistical production. Nearly half of the countries fulfilled less than half of the criteria. For the Worldwide Report it would no doubt be useful to update, and expand the coverage of, this table.

Annex Table 7 assembles the results to date of UNDP's efforts, through its MDG Country Reports, to assess the availability and quality of data generated by countries on the main MDGs against certain standard, but inevitably more judgmental, criteria.

Annex Table 8 gets closer to the fundamental objectives of PARIS21. It summarises the results of the MDG Country Reports' assessments of the countries' capacities to analyse the data generated, to apply the results, and to do this on a regular basis in the management of relevant government programmes.

The MDG Country Reports do not generally go much beyond the quoted assessments of data production and use, to give specific suggestions as to how they might be strengthened. It is in this respect that the PRSP documents, and IMF/WB Joint Staff Assessments (JSAs) of the programmes, will be of particular value to planning for the Worldwide Report and design of the overall, introductory chapters. These documents naturally have somewhat broader coverage than the MDGs themselves but, more importantly, they are directly concerned with country design of policies and programmes and experience in their implementation. The key issues relating to statistical data that emerge from reviewing a sample of these documents are highlighted below.

1. Better data are urgently needed.
2. Delays on important surveys have been important factors in delay of some PRSPs.
3. Problem of low quality of administrative data, sometimes distorting policies.
4. Clear examples of important programme shortfalls revealed by good monitoring/surveys, with responsive government follow-up action.
5. Much more frequent complaint of lack of real analysis of reasons for shortfalls.
6. The complex and massive nature of the management revolution to which statistics are supposed to be a major contribution, and the sheer ambition of the monitoring and evaluation plans proposed, raising question whether enough support was given.
7. Difficulties in achieving the right balance in monitoring between indicators of Inputs, Outputs, Outcomes and final Impacts, with the most critical issue, according to IMF/WB perceptions, being that of securing effective linkage between budgetary Input and Outputs.
8. The effectiveness of institutional structure for generation and use of statistical data needs greater attention, relative to that given to technical preparation and execution of surveys.
9. Getting representative data (including breakdowns by gender, social group, etc.) generated, available and used at the local government level.
10. Continuing concern about release of data and making it more transparent.
11. Better coordination and structuring of surveys, and other potential economies in data generation, surprisingly not discussed in JSAs encountered.



Another potentially useful source of information for the Worldwide Report would be the examination of the Bolivia, Cambodia, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Tanzania, and Uganda experiences with PRSPs/poverty monitoring, conducted by the UK Overseas Development Institute's Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure.

## ***V. Composition of the Worldwide Report***

It is envisaged that the report would be produced in business-letter size like the World Bank's annual World Development Report (but hopefully less glossy format) or the IMF's World Economic Outlook, probably with two columns of type per page.

**Section I (15–25 pages):** 3 or 4 Introductory Chapters drawing the overall picture of statistics' progress in contributing to evidence-based policymaking and results-based management, on the basis of the questionnaire answers and relevant Annex material, and drawing conclusions.

**Section II (hopefully 100–150 pages):** the Country Pages, perhaps grouped regionally. Annex 4 illustrates the type of text that would be prepared on the basis of the five-or-six-page reply to the questionnaire. While it illustrates fairly well the concept of the country page and how it would be derived from the questionnaire answer, the modest content of the text that it has been possible to prepare underlines the necessity to carry out the proposed survey of authoritative country opinion/experience. It should also be noted that publication in the format mentioned above should permit 800-1000 words (based on examination of a WDR) compared with the less than 700 words used in the presentation on the preceding page.

It is believed that the only exception to the general rule of one page per country should be to allow two pages for the exceptionally large countries, China and India. To avoid wasting space, it should be made clear that countries providing insufficient material to permit preparation of a substantive page would be omitted from inclusion in this section of the first Worldwide Report. The impact/incentives that either inclusion or exclusion might generate need to be considered.

**Section III (10–15 pages):** Annexes, largely statistical, presenting comparative data on many countries, such as Annex Tables 6, 7 and 8 in this report, perhaps the list of GDDS/SDDS participants, and, if enough countries are able to provide substantive answers to question 10 in the questionnaire, a comparative table on budgetary and/or foreign aid expenditures on their NSO or, preferably, NSS. It might also be useful to include a listing of all participating countries' NSO websites.

## ***VI. Organisation of the Work***

Work per country (assuming a response is obtained to the questionnaire) is likely to be at least one person–week, but hopefully not more than one-and-a-half person–weeks. This is likely to be divided between three days in the early period and two days much later in the process, preparing the country page on the basis of the questionnaire response received. The earlier three days would be devoted to reviewing information about the country from the sources mentioned in Section III above, identifying and interacting with the regional-institution staff-member who would be



contacting the country, and preparing any adjustments needed to the standard questionnaire or its covering letter.

The purpose of involving staff from the regional institutions (such as AFRISTAT or the Andean Community Secretariat) in the questionnaire process is both to secure the benefit of their often considerable local knowledge—fulfilling the intention to make the report a joint product of regional and international institutions—and to offer a low-cost way of encouraging countries actually to take the time and trouble to reply substantively to the questionnaire. If arrangements could be made sufficiently far ahead of time, it would be hoped that the subject could be handled in the course of visits that regional-institution staff were making to countries for other purposes, so that additional travel expenses could normally be avoided. On the other hand, it might be appropriate in some regions of the world for agreement to be reached with the regional institution on a small administrative cost per questionnaire-response sought and perhaps a small honorarium (say \$50–100) to the individual staff-member for securing a full, substantive answer to the questionnaire from the right quarters.

As regards tailoring of the questionnaire to individual countries, country experiences of particular relevance to the main themes of the Worldwide Report would be identified and the countries especially encouraged to explain more fully than they might otherwise have done. Such encouragement might be by modification of the questionnaire itself or by specific reference in the covering letter. For instance, unusual experiences, whether positive or negative, might be highlighted in strategic planning, statistics coordination mechanisms, government policy changes resulting from statistical evidence, integration of programme performance data into determination of budgetary allocations, evidences of significant improvement in programme efficiency/effectiveness as a result of increased attention to information about results.

A more precise format and coverage of the Country Pages should probably be determined after as many as possible of the expected country responses have been received. The sub-titles and space allocation used in the illustrative Cambodia page (Annex 4) should certainly not be taken as necessarily the right format. These should be determined rather in light of the main messages that the countries seem, from their responses, to want to convey about development of statistics for better management of socio-economic progress.

Beyond the editing work to boil the country responses down to the, say 900, word limit for the printed country page, the main task will be to prepare the overall introductory chapters synthesising results, drawing conclusions and developing any recommendations that the evidence collected seems to demand. This work should be based on examination of the full country responses, not only the boiled-down country pages, as well as the broader statistical material compiled for the Annexes to the Report. Such integration work would presumably be handled most efficiently by a single individual, working for a month or two, and able to draw on advice from PARIS21 partners.

## **Review Process**

A review board would be established to examine the Worldwide Report's content. Board members would include recognised experts from the international community as well as representatives from regional and international institutions.





## VII. Production Schedule

Assumption: Aim at covering all developing/transition countries, excluding recent entrants to EU, but including OECD members such as Korea and Mexico, say a total of 150 countries, all responding.

### Timetable

<p><i>July 1 – Sept 30: Preparation Phase</i>  Review country data  Arrange regional support  Interact w/ regional inst.  Finalise questionnaire &amp; letter for each country  Annex Tables (UNSD, etc.)</p>
<p><i>Oct 1: Questionnaire to countries, &amp; inform relevant country contacts</i></p>
<p><i>Dec 30: First deadline for quest. responses  (but expect some at earlier PARIS21 mtgs.)</i></p>
<p><i>Feb 15: Final deadline for quest. responses</i></p>
<p><i>Feb 15 – Mar 15: Review responses and consider best presentation</i></p>
<p><i>Mar 15: Decide final norms for country pages and subjects of intro. chapters &amp; annexes</i></p>
<p><i>Mar 20 – June 20: Prepare country pages, annexes &amp; chapters</i></p>
<p><i>June 20 – 30: Review, Revision, Finalisation</i></p>
<p><i>July 15, 2005: Issuance of first Worldwide Report</i></p>

## **Annex Table 1. Countries for which Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Country MDG Reports are Available**

Interim PRSPs (I-PRSPs), PRSPs and Progress Reports (PRs) are prepared by governments but presented to the World Bank/IMF Boards accompanied by a Joint Staff Assessment (JSA) prepared by the staff of World Bank/IMF.

Country MDG Reports<sup>1</sup>, which are organised by UNDP on behalf of the UN Development Group (UNDG), are prepared by varying combinations of Government, UNDP and UN Agency Country Teams, depending on the country.

	Country	Region	Dates of Presentation at IDA Board					Publication Date
			I-PRSP	PRSP	PR 1	PR 2	PR 3	MDG Report
1	Benin	AFR	13-Jul-00	20-Mar-03				2003
2	Burkina Faso	AFR		30-Jun-00	6-Dec-01	5-Nov-02	25-Mar-04	
3	Burundi	AFR	22-Jan-04					
4	Cameroon	AFR	10-Oct-00	31-Jul-03				2002
5	Cape Verde	AFR	8-Apr-02					
6	CAR	AFR	18-Jan-01					
7	Chad	AFR	25-Jul-00	13-Nov-03				2002
8	Congo, DR	AFR	11-Jun-02					
9	Cote D'Ivoire	AFR	28-Mar-02					
10	Ethiopia	AFR	20-Mar-01	17-Sep-02	17-Feb-04			
11	Gambia	AFR	14-Dec-00	16-Jul-02				2003
12	Ghana	AFR	24-Aug-00	8-May-03				
13	Guinea	AFR	22-Dec-00	25-Jul-02				2003
14	Guinea Bissau	AFR	14-Dec-00					
15	Kenya	AFR	1-Aug-00					2003
16	Madagascar	AFR	19-Dec-00	18-Nov-03				
17	Malawi	AFR	21-Dec-00	29-Aug-02	23-Oct-03			
18	Mali	AFR	7-Sep-00	6-Mar-03				
19	Mauritania	AFR		6-Feb-01	18-Jun-02	18-Jul-03		2003
20	Mozambique	AFR	6-Apr-00	25-Sep-01	25-Jul-03			2002
21	Niger	AFR	20-Dec-00	7-Feb-02	19-Nov-03			
22	Rwanda	AFR	21-Dec-00	6-Aug-02				2003
23	S. Tome & Principe	AFR	27-Apr-00					
24	Senegal	AFR	20-Jun-00	23-Dec-02				2001
25	Sierra Leone	AFR	25-Sep-01					
26	Tanzania	AFR	4-Apr-00	30-Nov-00	27-Nov-01	27-May-03		2001
27	Uganda	AFR		2-May-00	31-May-01	23-Jul-02	9-Sep-03	
28	Zambia	AFR	4-Aug-00	22-May-02				
29	Cambodia	EAP	18-Jan-01	20-Feb-03				2001, 2003
30	Lao	EAP	24-Apr-01					
31	Mongolia	EAP	27-Sep-01	9-Sep-03				
32	Vietnam	EAP	12-Apr-01	2-Jul-02	19-Feb-04			2002, 2003
33	Albania	ECA	8-Jun-00	20-Jun-02	10-Jul-03			2002
34	Armenia	ECA	22-May-01	20-Nov-03				
35	Azerbaijan	ECA	5-Jul-01	27-May-03				
36	Bosnia-Herzegovina	ECA	00-Oct-02					
37	Georgia	ECA	11-Jan-01	6-Nov-03				

<sup>1</sup> The table includes only those Country MDG Reports which include an assessment of the MDG-related statistics. UNDP has also published reports on the following 17 countries, but without such assessments: in 2001: Armenia and Madagascar; in 2002: Lithuania and Poland; in 2003: Ukraine, Philippines, Bulgaria, Panama, Ghana, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Argentina and Bahrain; and in 2004: Slovenia, Slovak Republic, Hungary, Czech Republic and Romania.

			Dates of Presentation at IDA Board					Publication Date
	Country	Region	I-PRSP	PRSP	PR 1	PR 2	PR 3	MDG Report
38	Kyrgyz Rep.	ECA	4-Dec-01	27-Feb-03				2003
39	Macedonia, FYR	ECA	14-Dec-00					
40	Moldova	ECA	19-Dec-00					
41	Serbia & Montenegro	ECA	8-Aug-02	16-Mar-04				
42	Tajikistan	ECA	31-Oct-00	5-Dec-02				2003
43	Bolivia	LAC	27-Jan-00	5-Jun-01				2002
44	Dominica	LAC	19-Dec-03					
45	Guyana	LAC	14-Nov-00	17-Sep-02				
46	Honduras	LAC	6-Jul-00	11-Oct-01	26-Feb-04			2003
47	Nicaragua	LAC	21-Dec-00	25-Sep-01	11-Dec-02	22-Jan-04		2003
48	Djibouti	MENA	27-Nov-01					
49	Yemen	MENA	27-Feb-00	1-Aug-02				2003
50	Bangladesh	SAR	17-Jun-03					
51	Nepal	SAR		18-Nov-03				2002
52	Pakistan	SAR	4-Dec-01	11-Mar-04				
53	Sri Lanka	SAR		1-Apr-03				
54	Mauritius	AFR						2001
55	Egypt	MENA						2002
56	Bhutan	SAR						2002
57	Saudi Arabia	MENA						2002
58	Guatemala	LAC						2002
59	Kazakhstan	ECA						2002
60	China, PR	EAP						2003
61	Syria	MENA						2003
62	Uruguay	LAC						2003
63	Paraguay	LAC						2003
64	Palestine	MENA						2003
65	Lebanon	MENA						2003
66	Morocco	MENA						2003
67	Gabon	AFR						2003
68	Algeria	MENA						2004
69	Afghanistan	SAR						2004
70	Tunisia	MENA						2004

## **Annex Table 2. Growth of Developing Country Participation in IMF's Statistical Standards and Support Initiatives**

### **I. Countries subscribing to SDDS (Special Data Dissemination Standard), by date when SDDS specifications were met**

<b>Serial No. (Dev/Trans. Country)</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Date of SDDS subscription</b>	<b>Date of meeting SDDS specs.</b>	<b>Date when data module ROSC, if any, published on web</b>
	United States	6-May-1996	19-Feb-1999	
	Canada	20-Apr-1996	19-Feb-1999	
	Czech Republic	21-Apr-1998	4-Jun-1999	30-Jun-2000, 25-Jul-2001.
	United Kingdom	16-Apr-1996	6-Jul-1999	15-Mar-1999
	Lithuania	30-May-1996	12-Jul-1999	4-Dec-2002 (incl. DQAF)
1.	Peru	7-Aug-1996	15-Jul-1999	24-Oct-2003 (incl. DQAF)
	Latvia	1-Nov-1996	28-Sep-1999	
	Slovak Republic	10-Sep-1996	7-Oct-1999	
2.	El Salvador	5-Jun-1998	12-Oct-1999	
3.	Korea	20-Sep-1996	1-Nov-1999	15-May-2003 (incl. DQAF)
4.	Argentina	16-Aug-1996	1-Nov-1999	15-Apr-1999
	Hungary	24-May-1996	24-Jan-2000	2-May-2001, 5-June-2002, 9-May-2003 (incl. DQAF)
	Poland	17-Apr-1996	2-Mar-2000	3-Oct-2003 (incl. DQAF)
	Germany	2-Dec-1996	23-Mar-2000	
5.	Chile	17-May-1996	30-Mar-2000	30-Jul-2001 (incl. DQAF)
	Estonia	30-Sep-1998	30-Mar-2000	6-Nov-2001, 3-Jul-2002 (incl. DQAF)
	Italy	13-Aug-1996	14-Apr-2000	31-Oct-2002 (incl. DQAF)
	Netherlands	11-Jun-1996	26-Apr-2000	
	Norway	18-Jun-1996	28-Apr-2000	
6.	Colombia	31-May-1996	9-May-2000	
7.	Thailand	9-Aug-1996	16-May-2000	
	Finland	3-Jun-1996	2-Jun-2000	
8.	Indonesia	24-Sep-1996	2-Jun-2000	
	Israel	23-Apr-1996	5-Jun-2000	
	Japan	3-Jul-1996	9-Jun-2000	
9.	Mexico	13-Aug-1996	29-Jun-2000	3-Jun-2003 (incl. DQAF)
	Sweden	31-May-1996	29-Jun-2000	20-Sep-2001 (incl. DQAF)
	Slovenia	2-Aug-1996	7-Jul-2000	
	Hong Kong, SAR, PRC	28-Oct-1996	12-Jul-2000	30-Aug-1999
10.	Ecuador	27-Mar-1998	14-Jul-2000	14-Mar-2003 (incl. DQAF)
	Denmark	7-Jun-1996	1-Sep-2000	
11.	Malaysia	21-Aug-1996	1-Sep-2000	
12.	South Africa	2-Aug-1996	18-Sep-2000	16-Oct-2001 (incl. DQAF)
	Portugal	11-Sep-1997	1-Dec-2000	
	Spain	27-Sep-1996	21-Dec-2000	
13.	Philippines	5-Aug-1996	17-Jan-2001	
	Belgium	6-Jun-1996	26-Jan-2001	
	Singapore	1-Aug-1996	30-Jan-2001	
14.	Brazil	14-Mar-2001	14-Mar-2001	
15.	Croatia	20-May-1996	30-Mar-2001	
	France	8-Aug-1996	27-Apr-2001	
	Switzerland	11-Jun-1996	18-May-2001	

Serial No. (Dev/Trans. Country)	Country	Date of SDDS subscription	Date of meeting SDDS specs.	Date when data module ROSC, if any, published on web
16.	Tunisia	20-Jun-2001	20-Jun-2001	30-Sep-1999, 29-Jan-2001
	Austria	4-Sep-1996	5-Jul-2001	
	Ireland	26-Jul-1996	17-Jul-2001	
17.	Turkey	8-Aug-1996	20-Jul-2001	14-Mar-2002 (incl. DQAF)
	Australia	19-Apr-1996	23-Jul-2001	15-Apr-1999
18.	Costa Rica	28-Nov-2001	28-Nov-2001	16-Aug-2002 (incl. DQAF)
19.	India	27-Dec-1996	14-Dec-2001	2-Apr-2004 (incl. DQAF)
	Greece	8-Nov-2002	8-Nov-2002	
20.	Ukraine	10-Jan-2003	10-Jan-2003	19-Aug-2003 (incl. DQAF)
21.	Kazakhstan	24-Mar-2003	24-Mar-2003	18-Mar-2003 (incl. DQAF)
22.	Armenia	7-Nov-2003	7-Nov-2003	16-Jan-2002
23.	Bulgaria	1-Dec-2003	1-Dec-2003	17-Mar-2000, 8-Mar-2001, 22-Dec-2003
24.	Uruguay	12-Feb-2004	12-Feb-2004	18-Oct-2001
25.	Kyrgyz Republic	26-Feb-2004	26-Feb-2004	10-Nov-2003 (incl. DQAF)
	Iceland	21-Jun-1996	Not in observance	

**II. Countries Participating in GDDS (General Data Dissemination System), by date of first posting Metadata on IMF's Dissemination Standards Bulletin Board website**

Serial No. (Dev/Trans. Country)	Country	Date Metadata first posted on the DSBB	Date when data module ROSC, if any, was published on web
1.	Albania	22-May-2000	30-May-2000
2.	Barbados	22-May-2000	
3.	Côte d'Ivoire	22-May-2000	
4.	Fiji	22-May-2000	
5.	Gambia	22-May-2000	
	Kuwait	22-May-2000	
6.	Uganda	22-May-2000	
7.	Sri Lanka	14-Jul-2000	22-May-2002 (incl. DQAF)
8.	Mongolia	7-Aug-2000	2-May-2001
	Malta	11-Sep-2000	
9.	Mauritius	21-Sep-2000	24-Apr-2002 (incl. DQAF)
10.	St. Lucia	21-Sep-2000	
11.	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	21-Sep-2000	
12.	Jordan	21-Sep-2000	16-Oct-2002, 10-Feb-2004 (incl. DQAF)
13.	Dominica	25-Sep-2000	
14.	Antigua & Barbuda	31-Oct-2000	
15.	St. Kitts & Nevis	31-Oct-2000	
16.	Bolivia	14-Nov-2000	
17.	Cameroon	28-Dec-2000	24-Aug-2001
18.	Panama	28-Dec-2000	
19.	Romania	14-Feb-2001	16-Nov-2001
20.	Bangladesh	29-Mar-2001	
21.	Grenada	29-Mar-2001	
22.	Venezuela, R.B.	29-Mar-2001	
23.	Yemen	26-Apr-2001	

<b>Serial No. (Dev/Trans. Country)</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Date Metadata first posted on the DSBB</b>	<b>Date when data module ROSC, if any, was published on web</b>
24.	Nepal	10-May-2001	
25.	Azerbaijan	6-Jul-2001	31-Mar-2003 (incl. DQAF)
26.	Tanzania	6-Jul-2001	23-Mar-2004 (incl. DQAF)
27.	Senegal	10-Sep-2001	2-Dec-2002 (incl. DQAF)
28.	Mali	25-Sep-2001	
29.	Paraguay	25-Sep-2001	
30.	Benin	25-Sep-2001	
31.	Guinea-Bissau	5-Nov-2001	
32.	Togo	5-Nov-2001	
33.	Burkina Faso	28-Dec-2001	24-Mar-2004 (incl. DQAF)
34.	Niger	26-Feb-2002	
35.	China, People's Rep.	1-Mar-2002	
36.	Cambodia	8-Mar-2002	
37.	Oman	1-Jun-2002	
38.	Chad	24-Sep-2002	
39.	Gabon	1-Oct-2002	
40.	Botswana	24-Oct-2002	18-Apr-2002, 18-Mar-2004 (with DQAF)
41.	Kenya	29-Oct-2002	
42.	Zambia	1-Nov-2002	
43.	Zimbabwe	1-Nov-2002	
44.	Ethiopia	15-Nov-2002	
45.	Namibia	19-Dec-2002	19-Sep-2002 (incl. DQAF)
46.	Malawi	24-Dec-2002	
47.	Lebanon	16-Jan-2003	
48.	Moldova	11-Feb-2003	
49.	Swaziland	11-Feb-2003	
	Bahamas	14-Feb-2003	
50.	Jamaica	28-Feb-2003	
51.	Nigeria	29-Apr-2003	
52.	Sierra Leone	29-May-2003	
53.	Sudan	19-Aug-2003	
54.	Lesotho	25-Aug-2003	
55.	Vietnam	30-Sep-2003	
56.	Rwanda	31-Oct-2003	
57.	Congo, Rep. of	5-Nov-2003	
58.	Pakistan	17-Nov-2003	
59.	Mozambique	24-Nov-2003	13-Mar-2003 (incl. DQAF)
60.	Guinea	12-Dec-2003	
61.	Angola	29-Jan-2004	
62.	Macedonia, FYR	4-Feb-2004	
63.	Cape Verde	23-Feb-2004	
64.	Kiribati	15-Mar-2004	
65.	Vanuatu	8-Apr-2004	
66.	São Tomé & Príncipe	20-Apr-2004	
67.	Congo, Dem. Rep.	24-Apr-2004	



**III. Countries not so far participating in GDDS or SDDS but for which IMF has carried out a data module ROSC which has now been published on the IMF website.**

<b>Serial No. (Dev/Trans. Country)</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Date when data module ROSC was published On the web</b>
1.	Georgia	27-May-2003 (incl. DQAF)
2.	Morocco	4-Apr-2003 (incl. DQAF)
3.	Russian Federation	14-May-2004 (incl. DQAF)

**Annex Table 3. Governance-related Surveys Completed: An incomplete, first-draft list**

	Country	Region	Corruption Surveys	Transparency Intl. Studies <sup>2</sup>	Investment Climate Assess'ts	Publ. Expend. Tracking Surveys <sup>3</sup>
1	Bénin	AFR	*			
2	Botswana			2001		
3	Chad					*
4	Eritrea				FY02*	
5	Ethiopia				FY03	
6	Ghana		*	2001		2000
7	Guinea		*			
8	Kenya				FY04	
9	Nigeria		*		FY01*	*
10	Madagascar					*
11	Mali					*
12	Mozambique		*		FY03*	*
13	Rwanda					*
14	Sénégal			2001		
15	Sierra Leone		*			
16	Tanzania					1998
17	Uganda		*(nat)		FY03	1996
18	Zambia		*	2003	FY03	*
19	Algeria	MENA			FY03	
20	Jordan			2001		
21	Morocco				FY01*	
22	Albania	ECA	*			*
23	Bulgaria			2001		
24	Georgia		*			
25	Kazakhstan			2001		
26	Kyrgyz Rep.		*		FY03	
27	Latvia		1998			
28	Lithuania			2001		
29	Macedonia					*
30	Moldova				FY03	
31	Poland				FY03	
32	Russia		*			*
33	Serbia & Montenegro				FY04	
34	Slovakia		*			
35	Tajikistan				FY03	
36	Uzbekistan				FY03	
37	Cambodia	EAP	1999		FY03	
38	China, PR				FY03	
39	Fiji			2001		
40	Indonesia		*			
41	Korea			2001		
42	Lao					2003
43	Malaysia				FY03	
44	Mongolia			2001		
45	Papua New Guinea			2003		*
46	Philippines				FY04	

<sup>2</sup> Although the TI Corruption studies do not usually involve surveys they often make use of any undertaken by others  
<sup>3</sup> and Quantitative Service Delivery Surveys (QSDS)



	Country	Region	Corruption Surveys	Transparency Intl. Studies <sup>2</sup>	Investment Climate Assess'ts	Publ. Expend. Tracking Surveys <sup>3</sup>
47	Thailand		*			
48	Argentina	LAC		2001		
49	Bolivia		*		FY01*	
50	Brazil		*	2001	FY04	
51	Colombia	LAC	*	2001		
52	Ecuador		*			
53	Guatemala		*		FY04	
54	Honduras		*		FY04	2000
55	Mexico			2001		
56	Nicaragua				FY04	
57	Paraguay		*			
58	Peru		*			*
59	Trinidad & Tobago			2001		
60	Bangladesh	SAR			FY03*	
61	Bhutan				FY02*	
62	India				FY01*	
63	Nepal			2001	FY01*	
64	Pakistan				FY03	

\* indicates that a survey has been carried out within the last few years, but the date is unknown.

\* indicates that the report to which the survey contributed has been published.

**Annex Table 4. Countries Believed to have Statistical Strategic or Master Plans in operation or under preparation as of May 2004 (some covering only the National Statistical Office)**

1. Angola	AFR	16. Senegal	AFR	31. Moldova	ECA
2. Burkina Faso		17. South Africa		32. Tajikistan	
3. Central African Republic		18. Tanzania		33. Mongolia	EAP
4. Chad		19. Gambia		34. China, PR	
5. Congo, Republic of		20. Uganda		35. Chile	LAC
6. Côte D'Ivoire		21. Zambia		36. Colombia	
7. Equatorial Guinea		22. Zanzibar		37. Costa Rica	
8. Kenya		23. Morocco	MENA	38. El Salvador	
9. Madagascar		24. Palestine		39. Guatemala	
10. Malawi		25. Tunisia		40. Honduras	
11. Mali		26. Yemen		41. Jamaica	
12. Mauritania		27. Bulgaria	ECA	42. Nicaragua	
13. Mozambique		28. Kosovo		43. Panama	
14. Nigeria		29. Kyrgyz Republic		44. Peru	
15. Rwanda		30. Lithuania		45. Nepal	SAR



## ***Annex Table 5. Applications of the Statistical Capacity Building Indicators***

- Available at present for Bolivia and Mozambique (as prepared for PARIS21 issuance of the Indicators in September 2002) and for Cambodia (now updated to 2003).
- Prepared in draft form for certain countries which have received recent assistance from the World Bank for statistical development.
- Expected to become available in coming months for a number of African countries, as a result of the African Development Bank's work with them under the ICP project.

## Annex Table 6: World Bank Assessment of Developing Countries' Current Statistical Practice

Score	Sub-Saharan Africa	East Asia & Pacific	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Latin America & Caribbean	Middle East & North Africa	South Asia
0 (no GNI data)	Central African Republic Liberia Somalia					Afghanistan
1–2 (average GNI for group = \$520)	Burundi Congo, Rep. Eritrea Guinea-Bissau Mali Mauritania Sudan Swaziland			Cuba Haiti	Iraq West Bank & Gaza	
3–4 (average GNI for group = \$910)	Angola Benin Burkina Faso Cameroon Chad Congo, Dem. Rep. Côte d'Ivoire Gambia, The Ghana Guinea Madagascar Mozambique Namibia Niger Nigeria Rwanda Senegal Sierra Leone Togo Zimbabwe	Cambodia Korea, Dem. Rep. Lao, PDR Mongolia Myanmar Papua New Guinea Vietnam	Tajikistan Turkmenistan Uzbekistan Yugoslavia, F.R.	Bolivia Honduras Jamaica Nicaragua Panama Trinidad & Tobago	Algeria Iran, Islamic Rep. Lebanon Libya Oman	Nepal
5–6 (average GNI for group = \$1,390)	Botswana Ethiopia Gabon Kenya Lesotho Malawi South Africa Tanzania Uganda Zambia	China Malaysia	Albania Armenia Azerbaijan Bosnia & Herz. Bulgaria Georgia Kazakhstan Kyrgyz Republic Moldova Romania Russian Federation Ukraine	Costa Rica Dominican Rep. Ecuador El Salvador Guatemala Paraguay Uruguay	Egypt, Arab Rep. Morocco Syrian, Arab Rep. Yemen, Rep.	Bangladesh Pakistan Sri Lanka
7–8 (average GNI for group = \$3,320)	Mauritius	Indonesia Philippines Thailand	Belarus Czech Republic Croatia Estonia Macedonia, FYR Poland Slovak Republic Slovenia Turkey	Chile Colombia Mexico Venezuela, R.B.	Jordan	India
9–10 (average GNI for group = \$4,680)		Korea, Rep.	Hungary Latvia Lithuania	Argentina Brazil Peru		

Source: World Bank. *Building Statistical Capacity to Monitor Development Progress*. September 2002.

## Annex Table 7. UNDP Country MDG Reports: Assessments of Countries' Capacities for Collecting Nationally

Representative Data for Main MDGs, and of the Quality of Recent Survey Information  
(Countries listed in descending order of 2002 PPP per capita income in US dollars)

Country	per capita income	Pov./Hunger		UPE		Gender Equ.		U-5MR		MMR		Diseases		Water	
		Data	Qual	Data	Qual	Data	Qual	Data	Qual	Data	Qual	Data	Qual	Data	Qual
Saudi Arabia	12,660	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
Mauritius	10,820	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3
Uruguay	7,710	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	3	2
Tunisia	6,440	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
Kazakhstan	5,630	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Gabon	5,530	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
Algeria	5,530	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
Albania	4,960	1	1	1	1	2	1+	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lebanon	4,600	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1
Paraguay	4,590	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
China, PR	4,520	3	2	3	2	2	1+	2	1+	3	2	1+	1	3	2
Guatemala	4,030	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
Egypt	3,810	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
Morocco	3,730	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2
Syria	3,470	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Palestine		2	2	3	na	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Honduras	2,540	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	2
Bolivia	2,390	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
Nicaragua	2,350	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
Guinea	2,060	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
Cambodia	1,910	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
Cameroon	1,910	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mauritania	1,790	2	2	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	3	2
Gambia	1,660	3	3	na	na	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	3
Kyrgyz Rep.	1,560	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2
Senegal	1,540	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
Bhutan	1,540	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
Nepal	1,370	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	3
Rwanda	1,260	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1
Benin	1,060	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2
Kenya	1,010	2	na	3	na	2	na	3	na	2	na	2	na	2	na
Mozambique	990	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	1	2
Yemen	800	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tanzania	580	2	1	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	1	1	2	3
Afghanistan		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Number of countries:</i>		<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Qual</i>
- scoring 3		5	7	20	10	9	8	12	11	8	6	5	5	7	5
- scoring 2		22	19	11	19	18	16	14	15	16	18	17	19	16	19
- scoring 1		8	8	3	3	8	10	9	8	11	10	13	10	12	10
n.a.		-	1	1	3	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
Total		35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35

3 = Strong, meaning that capacity exists for regular data collection; and, in the case of quality, the most recent data set is evaluated to be valid, reliable, replicable and in consonance with recent allied data sets.

2 = Fair, meaning that capacity is inadequate; or quality falls short of the standards mentioned.

1 = Weak, meaning that the capacity is lacking; or, in the case of quality, recent data are either lacking or fall far short of the standards mentioned.

UPE = Universal Primary Education; U-5MR = Under-5 Mortality Rate; MMR = Maternal Mortality Rate.

**Annex Table 8. UNDP Country MDG Reports: Assessments of Capacities to Analyse Statistical Data, Reflect the Results in Policy Planning and Resource Allocation, and**

sustain an M&E System applying these techniques

Country	Per capita income		Poverty/Hunger			UPE			Gender Equity			Under-5 MR			MMR			Diseases			Water			
	income		Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	
Sdi. Arabia	12,660		3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2
Mauritius	10,820		1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	3	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	2
Uruguay	7,710		3	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
Tunisia	6,440		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Kazakhstan	5,630		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Gabon	5,530		1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1
Algeria	5,530		2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2
Albania	4,960		2	1+	1+	2	1	1+	1+	2	1	1	2	1	2	1+	2	1	2	1+	2	2	2	1
Lebanon	4,600		2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Paraguay	4,590		2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
China, PR	4,520		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1+	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1+	2
Guatemala	4,030		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
Egypt	3,810		2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Morocco	3,730		3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Syria	3,470		2	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Palestine			2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Honduras	2,540		1	2	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Bolivia	2,390		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1
Nicaragua	2,350		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Guinea	2,060		2	na	1	2	na	2	1	na	1	2	na	1	na	1	1	1	1+	na	1	1	na	1
Cambodia	1,910		2	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1
Cameroon	1,910		2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
Mauritania	1,790		2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
Gambia	1,660		3	2	na	na	na	na	3	2	na	1	2	na	1	2	na	1	2	2	na	3	2	na
Kyrgyz Rep.	1,560		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Sénégal	1,540		2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Bhutan	1,540		1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
Nepal	1,370		2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Rwanda	1,260		2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1+	2	1	1	1

Country	Per capita		Poverty/Hunger			UPE			Gender Equity			Under-5 MR			MMR			Diseases			Water					
	income		Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E	Anal	Pol	M&E			
Bénin	1,060		2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1		
Kenya	1,010		1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2		
Mozambique	990		2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2+	1	2	1	
Yemen	800		2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Tanzania	580		2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	
Afghanistan			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<b>Number of countries:</b>																										
- scoring 3			6	4	4	9	3	5	4	3	4	8	6	7	5	4	5	3	2	2	3	2	3	6	3	1
- scoring 2			21	17	14	17	20	20	19	12	10	16	18	11	16	17	10	20	16	16	17	16	17	17	17	15
- scoring 1			8	13	16	8	10	9	12	19	20	11	10	16	14	13	19	12	16	16	14	16	12	14	18	
n.a.			-	1	1	1	2	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	
Total			35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	

3 = Strong, meaning that:

- in the case of Analysis, there is a fairly long-standing mechanism, that has already operated in at least two episodes, for analysing information and engaging in multivariable analysis.
- in the case of Policy Use, it is regular practice for new information and analysis to be systematically fed into policymaking, planning and resource allocation.
- in the case of Monitoring and Evaluation, systematic information-based review and re-planning is a constituent component of ongoing programmes.

2 = Fair, meaning that the criteria stated above are partially fulfilled, for example that thorough analysis has been done of at least one data-collection exercise.

1 = Weak, meaning that the above-described practices are largely absent.



## **Annex 1: Health Metrics Network**

Health Metrics Network is a concept, on which a great deal of preparatory work has been done over the last year, that is now expected to be activated in the near future. The Network would be a worldwide partnership of agencies, public and private, and governments interested in improving countries' Health Information Systems.

Following its initiative in 2001 to introduce the annual World Health Survey and conscious of the inadequacies of most developing/transition countries' health information systems, WHO initiated talks in January 2002 with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to identify appropriate action. Further discussions with other potential partners led to the idea of a broad network arrangement. Developing country governments, bilateral donors, global initiatives, and implementing agencies confirmed their general interest. Following a first meeting of potential partners in July 2003, an interim steering committee was formed, co-chaired by the Gates Foundation and WHO, and a preparatory task force, with subsidiary issues groups, appointed.

Consensus was reached by December 2003 on a definition of the basic problems: Supply and demand in the health information field are far from equilibrium – oversupply of data coexisting with large unmet needs for information. National health information systems are weak and fragmented, driven by programme and donor demands rather than country needs and rarely sensitive to country capacities. There is overlap, duplication and wasted resources, and lack of standardisation and coherence in terms of definitions and methods used. Information flows from different parts of the system – statistical departments, public and private health sectors, other sectors – are weak. There is little horizontal information transmission among actors and consumers, for example between communities and facilities. The information flow is generally exclusively upwards, from the periphery to the center, with little feedback. Most significantly, at all levels of the system, data are not analysed and translated into information for decision-making. International disease-specific initiatives tended to have an adverse effect on national information systems, and even to distract attention from the problem of improving service for those most in need as a result of their focus on nation- or region-wide averages.

The preparatory work led to a more precise definition of the proposed network's goal. The overall goal would be "to improve availability and use of sound health information at local, national and global levels." The emphasis would be on strengthening and reforming country health information systems, which also form the basis for global health information and include subnational health information. It was proposed that the network should have three primary functions: (a) strengthening and reforming country health information systems, to which it would devote about 50% of its resources, (b) initiatives to develop and implement priority innovations in health information, using about 30% of resources, and (c) improved coordination, on which 20% of resources would be spent.

The synthesis document prepared last December states that, to help standardise the assessment of the quality of health statistics, WHO has a framework on the basis of five basic principles: proven validity, quantified reliability, comparability, consultation and explicit audit trail. Not all of these principles apply equally in all cases, but it is felt that they could lay the foundation for an improved communication across disciplines, countries and topics on the evidence for public health action.

The preparatory work has also initiated preparation of a template of core standards for health information systems. It is intended that the template would pay attention to the policy and legal



framework for health information systems, to the roles of the different national and international players, to the balance between standardisation and local relevance, to the identification of indicators and components of health information systems, to health equity measurement, to volume and quality of outputs, and to dissemination and use of health information for health decision-making. It would include measurable standards for production of information and for dissemination and use of information (including targeting of information to gatekeepers such as the Minister of Finance), and would examine the different components of a health information system, from both technical and operation (including costs) aspects.

The intention is to start practical work with initially 5-7 countries, and to expand technical assistance activity by subsequently adding some 5-10 countries per year. In the meantime, it should be noted that the report of the issues group which dealt with Country and Subnational Health Information Systems makes frequent references to recent past country studies and assessments of health information systems which would be worth following up. While it is unclear how much these assessments in fact deal with the data-use questions which are of principal interest for purposes of the Worldwide Report, there is room for hope that at least some of them do. Relevant references are as follows:

- (a) The report lists twelve country appendices which may perhaps be available upon further request: for Chile, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Thailand, Uganda and Viet Nam.
- (b) “Reviews of health information systems are being undertaken in a number of middle-income countries, notably in former transition economies, and there are important lessons to be learned from these experiences.....” (page 8).
- (c) “An important finding in most reviews and assessments of national health information systems is that the links between suppliers/producers, consumers and users of different types of health information are weak.” (p. 12).
- (d) “A recent review of evaluations of national health information systems (Kruse, S-E 2003, “National Health Information Systems: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses, A Meta-Evaluation,” unpublished document produced for the Interim Secretariat of the Health Metrics Network, WHO Geneva) and reports of national experiences presented by several countries at a recent meeting in Geneva (meeting of the issues group on national and subnational health information systems, Geneva October 2003) found many organizational patterns of health information systems, reflecting widely different historical experiences and systems of government.” (p. 16)
- (e) “An interesting finding from the many assessments and evaluations of health information systems that have been undertaken over the past few years is that the problems afflicting health information systems are well known, commonly shared across countries and regions, and have not changed significantly. Recommendations of such evaluations have, however, rarely been implemented.” (p. 18).
- (f) “Recent health sector reform has not generally been accompanied by serious efforts to strengthen health information systems. As a result, the health information field finds itself facing new challenges which it is ill-equipped to deal with.. For example, decentralization of decision-making to the district level...” (p. 19).
- (g) “Using simple questions [about who produces data for what purpose, when and how], a number of countries have recently undertaken in-depth assessments of health information systems to clarify the essential steps that need to be taken if reform is to take place effectively....” (p. 22).

## **Annex 2: Questionnaire to Countries**

1. Has demand for statistics been increasing in your country in recent years ? Among the various sources of demand, such as planning agencies, line ministries, parliamentarians, the media and general public, private business (domestic and foreign), research bodies, civil society, regional and international agencies, which are proving most interested in more/better statistical data ?
2. What kind of improvements are the users most concerned about – wider coverage (for instance, of particular regions, sectors or population groups), or improved frequency/timeliness, or greater reliability of figures produced, or increased ease of access ?
3. Do you perceive improvements in government’s ability to make good use of statistical data ? Have your statistical services found effective ways to help further such improvement ? Would you point to any particular cases where new/better statistics or analysis have helped identify the need for policy changes that your government has introduced, or led it to change budget allocations among government programmes ?
4. Which government policy debate/decisions of 2003-04 do you believe suffered most from the inadequacy or uncertainty of relevant statistical data that was available ?
5. In many countries demand has been increasing in particular for statistics relating to (a) Millennium Development Goals and issues prioritised in national Poverty Reduction Strategies, (b) Governance, and Transparency in Public Expenditures, and (c) key aspects of Macroeconomic Management. Have these been important demands in your country ? Are there other areas which generated greater needs for more/better statistics ?
6. How satisfied are you with the response that your statistical services have been able to give to recent trends in demand for statistics ? What do you consider their greatest successes, and do you think that they will be able to sustain the improvements made ? Have statistics deepened knowledge about the lower-income parts of the population and the effectiveness of programmes to help them improve their situation ?
7. What do you consider to be the main constraints to the effectiveness of your country’s statistical services, and how do you see them being overcome ?
8. Many countries have been experimenting in recent years with longer-run strategic planning to establish national priorities in statistics production and systematically develop capacities in all relevant parts of government to meet them, by coordinated build-up of personnel, management, statistical infrastructure and software, equipment and finances. Has your country had a positive experience with such strategic planning, and how do you think it could be made more useful in the future ?
9. Do you consider that the international community, such as UN and regional bodies, foreign aid agencies and international NGOs, have been effective in supporting your country’s efforts to strengthen its own capacities for production and use of statistics in recent years ? What do you see as the most important improvements or shortfalls in this regard in 2003-04 ?
10. If possible, please also give approximate figures on public expenditures on the production of statistics in your country. It would be most helpful to provide, for the latest year for which these numbers are available, the approved budget and actual expenditures (a) for your National Statistical Office (NSO) and (b) for the aggregate of statistical activities of other government bodies, national and regional, in your country. Please also show, for the same year, the aggregate amounts of foreign assistance (in money terms and/or person-weeks) provided (a) to the NSO and (b) for other statistical activities. Have budgetary and foreign-aid support been increasing or decreasing in recent years ?

### **Annex 3: Illustrative Answers to Questionnaire for Cambodia**

**ILLUSTRATIVE DRAFT ONLY**  
(not prepared, or approved, by Government of Cambodia)

- 1. Has demand for statistics been increasing in your country in recent years? Among the various sources of demand, such as planning agencies, line ministries, parliamentarians, the media and general public, private business (domestic and foreign), research bodies, civil society, regional and international agencies, which are proving most interested in more/better statistical data ?**

Demand for statistical information has been growing very strongly in recent years, both from international agencies of many sorts and from an increasing range of our own national government bodies.

Our main traditional clients for statistics have been international and donor agencies, which have been unusually important in the country due to our particular history and the need to reconstruct the government almost from scratch in the first half of the 1990s when peace was only gradually returning to the country. Their demand for statistical information has further increased in recent years as a result of expanding aid flows and the demands of these agencies' funders for better focus, and more convincing demonstration of results, of their efforts. Cambodia has also joined other international bodies with significant requirements for regular supply of data, such as ASEAN and WTO; for instance, we are required to provide data for about 300 indicators which are covered in the ASEAN statistical yearbook for all member countries.

As our own government departments have gradually strengthened, their demand for relevant statistical information has also grown, and this is likely to be the most rapidly expanding source of demand in the coming years. With the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS) and various economic, fiscal and monetary reform initiatives, the demand for official statistics has increased substantially in the ministries most centrally involved, such as Finance, Health and Education. Many other ministries have also begun to show a new interest in statistical information, both for their contributions to these national efforts and for better management of their own specific programmes.

The National Institute of Statistics (NIS) has been proactive in trying to ensure the relevance and practical utility of its statistics, consulting all interested data users in the development of national surveys. The Ministries of Women's Affairs and Social Affairs, for example, both made specific suggestions, for the first time, about items that should be included in the current Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey (CSES).

- 2. What kind of improvements are the users most concerned about – wider coverage (for instance, of particular regions, sectors or population groups), or improved frequency/timeliness, or greater reliability of figures produced, or increased ease of access ?**

All these dimensions are of interest, but probably the greatest concern is to increase reliability, by improving quality and ensuring better comparability over time; another very widespread demand, reflecting the limited familiarity of most government officials with statistical work, is to present the results in more understandable and digestible form.

Macroeconomic and sectoral statistics are almost entirely based on administrative data collections and there are still significant data gaps. Most administrative data collections do not conform to international concepts, definitions and standards. Better data collection, processing and validation are needed. Administrative staff within government institutions and ministries have limited or no statistical skills and do not generally appreciate how the information they collect will be used. Most collections do not meet the needs of data users (e.g., investment approvals versus actual investment). The majority of these collections involve manual tabulation, and significant transcription errors are common. In most instances the administrative and regulatory documents do not include data items needed by intermediate and end users (e.g., customs declaration form). Underreporting is common (e.g., agriculture, fisheries and forestry production and exports). Input editing and validation is not common practice and output editing and validation is limited.

NIS's application of the PARIS21 Statistical Capacity Building Indicators to Cambodia (in 2003) rates statistics on Health, Education and Government Finance as largely falling short on almost all quality criteria and particularly deficient in regard to provision of metadata and clarity in dissemination.

**3. Do you perceive improvements in government's ability to make good use of statistical data ? Have your statistical services found effective ways to help further such improvement ? Would you point to any particular cases where new/better statistics or analysis have helped identify the need for policy changes that your government has introduced, or led it to change budget allocations among government programmes ?**

Improvements in government's ability to use data effectively are definitely visible, but they are largely concentrated to date in core groups of mostly younger, better trained senior staff in a few key agencies, notably the Ministry of Finance, Central Bank, Ministry of Education and, to some extent, Ministries of Commerce, Health and Planning. Changing attitudes are, however, also apparent in a much wider range of ministries, especially at the level of deputy directors, who are increasingly interested in better monitoring of the programmes for which they are responsible and deeper understanding of trends in their sectors. Follow-up to the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS), which was completed in December 2002, can be expected to reinforce and spread this attitudinal change as budgets become more effectively linked with evidence of intermediate outcomes from the programmes financed.

We have tried to give more emphasis to interaction with users, as illustrated by the increased contributions we have obtained from other departments to survey design. We have participated actively in the Poverty Analysis and Data Initiative organised by the Philippine Institute of Development Studies, in collaboration with the World Bank Institute, to create a network of statisticians and users of statistics for improvement of poverty analysis for policy purposes. Senior staff of the NSI and the Ministry of Planning have also lectured in local training courses in Phnom Penh, and have made special effort to draw the attention of policymakers to particularly interesting trends revealed by the statistics we produce.

One practical example of evidence-based policy change comes from the Ministry of Education's annual survey to assess the impact of the abolition of school fees at the primary and secondary levels. Survey results have indicated that the impact has been largest in primary schools in poor areas; it was much lower at the secondary level, because of other costs that students have to pay to attend secondary schools, such as for transport and texts. Based on this analysis, the Ministry decided to implement a special programme to improve attendance at secondary schools.

**4. Which government policy debate/decisions of 2003-04 do you believe suffered most from the inadequacy or uncertainty of relevant statistical data that was available ?**

Management of the country's substantial forestry resources, and receipt of the taxes due to government on logging operations. Despite the importance of this national resource, statistical data remain particularly weak and out-of-date.

**5. In many countries demand has been increasing in particular for statistics relating to (a) Millennium Development Goals and issues prioritised in national Poverty Reduction Strategies, (b) Governance, and Transparency in Public Expenditures, and (c) key aspects of Macroeconomic Management. Have these been important demands in your country ? Are there other areas which generated greater needs for more/better statistics ?**

Demand growth in Cambodia has been principally in the three areas mentioned. As regards Governance, statistical improvement has so far been sought mainly in the form of improved budgetary arrangements and disbursement mechanisms. An 'Attitudes to Corruption' survey was also undertaken in 1999 (not by NIS but by a national NGO) under joint supervision of the Government and the World Bank Institute, and another one is envisaged for the coming years, with assistance from a Danish NGO and Sida.

**6. How satisfied are you with the response that your statistical services have been able to give to recent trends in demand for statistics ? What do you consider their greatest successes, and do you think that they will be able to sustain the improvements made ? Have statistics deepened knowledge about the lower-income parts of the population and the effectiveness of programmes to help them improve their situation ?**

We are quite dissatisfied at the pace of progress we have been able to make. Many good ideas have been generated, but we have not succeeded in getting the government to give the needed priority to the statistics problem, amongst the large array of difficult issues that it confronts. It has not been able to give the necessary leadership itself, nor to assign effective responsibility to one of its agencies to give the leadership required.

Nonetheless, important progress has been made in a number of areas. A census of population was effectively conducted in 1998 (the first since 1962), with UNFPA assistance. National accounts, balance of payments, trade, fiscal, and monetary and financial statistics have been steadily improved, with help mainly from ADB and IMF. Cambodia was accepted for participation in GDDS in January 2002, posted its metadata on the IMF web-site (DSBB) in March 2002, and received positive results from its first annual GDDS review in January 2003. Access to official statistics has been improved with the opening of the NIS Data Users Service Center and launch of the NIS Website in July 2002, as well as steadily expanding coverage of the NIS *Statistics Yearbook* and other publications.

The Education Management Information System (EMIS), developed by the Ministry of Education with help from UNICEF and UNESCO, has been steadily improved, adapting internationally agreed methods and standards to national needs. Foundations have been laid, with help from WHO and DFID, for a corresponding Health Management Information System, and an important element of Cambodia's current Health Sector Strategic Plan is further strengthening of this MIS. Health performance data are to be gathered broken down by sex, socio-economic status and ethnicity, as well as locality. The data are to be developed in such a way as to enable systematic comparisons of the outcomes of ongoing pilots and experiments, such as contracting of health-care provision. Health service delivery outside the public sector is to be covered so as to permit a comprehensive view of sector-wide change. And the information is to be provided to local bodies such as health center management committees, feedback committees and NGOs, to help improve health sector governance.

Critical to the preparation of the NPRS in 2001-02 was the availability of results from the 1998 Census and the 2000 Demographic and Health Survey. The current situation of the country's poorer inhabitants should be substantially clarified by the 2003-04 Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey (CSES), underway with support from UNDP and Sida. Work has also been going on to compile a unified system of some 90 key indicators, with agreed definitions, for monitoring progress on the localised version of the MDGs (called CMDGs) and the Poverty Reduction Strategy; a unified Poverty MIS, assembling data from all relevant agencies, is aimed at; and the data gathered would be made readily accessible (including drill-down possibilities) through Caminfo, based on the ChildInfo/DevInfo software developed by UNICEF and adopted by UNDG. Nonetheless, despite limited-scale surveys by civil society organisations, statistical data about the determinants of rural poverty, and promising ways to increase poor people's productivity in agriculture and fisheries, remains very weak.

**7. What do you consider to be the main constraints to the effectiveness of your country's statistical services, and how do you see them being overcome ?**

There are three constraints of overriding importance. One is the absence of legislation and structure, appropriate to the market economy that Cambodia has been developing, for managing official statistics' production and dissemination. The second is the great shortage of financial resources, with effects exacerbated by the demotivation of civil servants that results from slow progress by government in resolving wage problems. The third is the weak interest of all but a few government officials in high-quality statistical information.

The NIS and the units dealing with statistics in the sector ministries do not have the legal and institutional prerequisites to collect the range of quality statistics needed to monitor and measure development results. There is currently no crosscutting statistics legislation to provide the legal basis for official statistics and there are no statistics regulations to effectively define the roles, rights and obligations of data collectors, providers and users. Moreover, in agencies other than NIS, the statistical function is combined with others such as planning or research, and generally given a low priority.

The basis for overcoming these problems should be laid by the legislature passing the new draft Statistics Law which we prepared in 2001-02. It was approved in 2002 by the Council of Ministers, though with some undesirable amendments (deleting important provisions for the independence and autonomy of NIS) which should be reversed by the legislature. However, the law still awaits consideration since the legislature has not met since the elections of 1993, due to the inability of the political parties to reach a workable agreement for a new government.

Once enacted, the draft Statistics Law will provide the NIS with the authority to establish coordination and cooperation in statistical activities and development, and to define national statistical standards for classifications, concepts, definitions and statistical units. Effective implementation of the provisions of the law should also ensure that only one statistical unit has the mandate to produce a particular official dataset.

The Law and the Sub-decree include provisions to facilitate effective governance of official statistics. A peak advisory body to be known as the **Statistics Advisory Council** will be established, with representatives from the donor community, NGOs, and academia as well as the policy ministries, the Ministry of Planning and NIS. The role of the Council will be to advise the government and NIS on statistical capacity building and statistics priorities, as well as providing a forum to address financial and technical assistance issues.

Effective arrangements and procedures will be introduced clarifying the responsibilities for coordination of statistical work and promotion of statistical standards. These arrangements are to be implemented through:

- Development of a coordinated national programme of statistical activities, to be assisted by the establishment of the **Statistics Coordination Committee**, with representatives from each statistics producing agency and the NIS;
- Establishment of statistics units in ministries that do not currently have statistics capacity;
- Creation of a **Statistics Clearing House** and a Directory of Statistical Sources, to eliminate duplication of statistical effort;
- Promotion of standard frameworks, concepts, classifications and methodologies.

The funding problem can only be resolved by combined efforts of the government and the donors. A very recent assessment, by a PARIS21 study team, of the priorities among different statistical activities suggests that a minimally adequate national programme of statistical work for the immediately coming years would require expenditure nearly twice that made by government and donors combined in 2003. The staff motivation problems, which are shared with the rest of the civil service, have to be resolved by actions on that level – which in turn would make the development of effective staff assessment and development policies a high priority for the managers of the statistical services.

Strengthening the government officials' interest in, and support for, good statistical work is partly a matter of time, as the younger and more highly educated officials move up the ranks. But it can be significantly accelerated by stronger leadership from the key Ministers, by firm government pursuit of the management principles laid out in the NPRS, and by steady resolution of the civil service salary and performance-management problems just mentioned in the narrower context of the statistical staff.

8. **Many countries have been experimenting in recent years with longer-run strategic planning to establish national priorities in statistics production and systematically develop capacities in all relevant parts of government to meet them, by coordinated build-up of personnel, management, statistical infrastructure and software, equipment and finances. Has your country had a positive experience with such strategic planning, and how do you think it could be made more useful in the future ?**

With the aid of our IMF-provided Statistics Adviser, we prepared in early 2002 an NIS Strategic Plan 2002-06 and an NIS Forward Work Program 2003-07, which were issued in July of that year and formed part of the background for a major Statistics Capacity Building Workshop that we organised in October, bringing together all relevant parts of the government and civil society with the interested donors. Lack of a new government since mid-2003 and of any progress on the legislative front has severely affected the benefits that have so far accrued from those initiatives.

When the legislation is eventually passed, an early priority would probably be to seek agreement between government and interested donors on a feasible overall budgetary-plus-aid envelope for the statistical services as a whole for the forthcoming years, and then to undertake a serious strategic planning exercise for the national statistical system as a whole, systematically involving all main users and encompassing the efforts needed to improve their capacities to make best use of statistics for results-based management and evidence-based policymaking.

- 9. Do you consider that the international community, such as UN and regional bodies, foreign aid agencies and international NGOs, have been effective in supporting your country's efforts to strengthen its own capacities for production and use of statistics in recent years? What do you see as the most important improvements or shortfalls in this regard in 2003-04?**

The international and foreign-aid agencies have played a very important part in helping us to make whatever progress we have been able to make. But the way the process has worked has not been very efficient. It has tended to contribute to the non-comparability of data over time, as different agencies, with different priorities, required use of different methodologies and definitions in successive surveys. It has led to partial duplication of work. And it has certainly done less for building up national capacities than should have been possible with the funds provided.

We hope that the rationalised and coordinated structure which would be introduced by the proposed Statistics Law would enable a more coordinated approach on the part of the aid donors. Several donors at the above-mentioned October 2002 workshop made clear their preference to contribute to a multi-donor fund in support of all statistical activities.

An important development in 2003 was the agreement of UNDP to provide \$1.4 million to support initial steps in implementation of the expected new Statistics Law, especially creation of the new bodies mentioned in answer to question 7 above, preparation of needed sub-decrees and related bureaus, and development of a national statistics dissemination strategy and a comprehensive statistics training plan.

- 10. If possible, please also give approximate figures on public expenditures on the production of statistics in your country. It would be most helpful to provide, for the latest year for which these numbers are available, the approved budget and actual expenditures (a) for your National Statistical Office (NSO) and (b) for the aggregate of statistical activities of other government bodies, national and regional, in your country. Please also show, for the same year, the aggregate amounts of foreign assistance (in money terms and/or person-weeks) provided (a) to the NSO and (b) for other statistical activities. Have budgetary and foreign-aid support been increasing or decreasing in recent years?**

The estimates we compiled for 2003 in applying the PARIS21 template regarding Statistical Capacity Building Indicators showed that total government expenditure on production of statistics in that year was about \$1.5 million equivalent, of which \$430,000 was for NIS and the remainder for other government departments, notably the Ministries of Agriculture, Commerce, Environment and Crime and Justice. Foreign assistance provided (including the estimated costs of technical assistance) amounted to some \$1.3 million equivalent, of which about \$480,000 was for NIS and the remainder for other government departments. The domestic budget for statistics has been increasing in recent years, but by very small amounts (e.g., by less than 2% for NIS between 2002 and 2003). Foreign assistance in 2003 appears to have been lower than in previous years.



#### ***Annex 4: Illustrative Country Page for Cambodia***

The following country page is prepared from theoretical responses to the questionnaire, as outlined in Annex 3. It is offered as an illustration of what a country page might look like in the Worldwide Report. The information was neither prepared nor approved by the government of Cambodia.



## CAMBODIA

**Trends in Demand:** Demand for statistics has been rising rapidly. International demand has increased with growing foreign-aid flows and changing aid procedures, and because Cambodia has joined additional regional and international bodies. Domestic demand has grown strongly in the Ministries most concerned with the MDGs and the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS), and is beginning to take off in some other ministries. The widest concern is for greater reliability, quality and comparability of the figures produced. Most of our statistics are based on administrative data collections which do not yet conform to international standards. Comparability of survey results has suffered from different definitions and methodologies, depending on the source of financing.

**User Capacity:** Growth in government's capacity to use data effectively has been heavily concentrated in core groups of mostly younger, better trained senior staff in a few key agencies, notably the Ministry of Finance, Central Bank, Ministry of Education and, to some extent, Ministries of Commerce, Health and Planning. Interest in statistics in other ministries is beginning to show up mainly at the level of deputy directors, for purposes of better monitoring of programmes for which they are responsible and deeper understanding of trends in their sectors. Government ability to develop sound policies and programmes in some areas, such as forestry and smallholder agriculture, has continued to suffer from dearth of good statistical information and capacity to analyse it. But some of the social ministries, notably Education, have begun to use statistics effectively in the management of their programmes and to take policy and programme actions in response to what the statistics show. This practice should spread as ongoing budgetary reforms progress and the NPRS is fully implemented.

**Trends in Supply:** National accounts, balance of payments, trade, fiscal, and monetary and financial statistics have been steadily improved, with help mainly from ADB and IMF. Cambodia posted its metadata, as a GDDS participant, on the IMF website in March 2002, and received positive results from its first annual GDDS review in January 2003. Access to official statistics has been improved with the opening of the National Institute of Statistics (NIS) Data Users Center and launch of the NIS website in July 2002. Critical to the preparation of the NPRS in 2001-02 was the availability of results from the 1998 Census and the 2000 Demographic and Health Survey. The situation of the country's poorer inhabitants should be significantly clarified by the 2003-04 Cambodia Socio-Economic Survey underway with support from UNDP and Sida. Work has also been going on to compile a unified system of some 90 key indicators, with agreed

definitions, for monitoring progress on the NPRS and the localised version of the MDGs.

**Main Constraints:** There are three constraints of overriding importance. One is the absence of legislation and structure, appropriate to the market economy that Cambodia has been developing, for managing official statistics' production and dissemination. The second is the great shortage of financial resources, with effects exacerbated by the demotivation of civil servants that results from slow progress by government in resolving system-wide wage problems. The third is the weak interest of all but a few government officials in high-quality statistical information. The basis for solving the first problem should be laid by passage of the new Statistics Law which was approved by the Council of Ministers soon after we prepared it in 2002 but has not been able to be considered by the legislature since inter-party disputes have prevented it sitting since mid-2003. The funding problem can only be resolved by combined efforts of the government and the donors. A very recent assessment, by a PARIS21 study team, suggests that a minimally adequate national programme of statistical work for the immediately coming years would require expenditure nearly twice that made by government and donors combined in 2003. Strengthening the government officials' interest in, and support for, good statistical work is partly a matter of time, but it can be significantly accelerated by stronger leadership from the key Ministers on the management principles laid out in the NPRS and by gradual resolution of the civil service salary and performance-management problems.

**Strategic Planning:** We prepared in early 2002 an NIS Strategic Plan 2002-06, which was issued in July of that year. It formed part of the background for a major Statistics Capacity Building Workshop among all interested parties, which has unfortunately had limited follow-up due to the continued delay on the legislation. When the Statistics Law is passed, an early priority will be to seek agreement between government and donors on a feasible overall financial envelope and to undertake a serious strategic planning for the NSS as a whole.

