

FINAL REPORT

An Evaluation of PARIS21

An Initiative to Improve the Contribution of Statistical Services to
Development

By Chris Willoughby
Anne Thomson
Xavier Charoy
and
Juan Munoz



Oxford
Policy
Management

August 2003

Acknowledgements

The Oxford Policy Management evaluation team would like to thank the many individuals who participated in the evaluation and gave both time and thought to the questions we asked. We should also like to acknowledge the help that the PARIS21 Secretariat gave us in terms of providing contact details of PARIS21 members, documents and budgetary and other information. In particular we should like to thank Mary Strode, who was the contact point for the evaluation team, for the effort she put into ensuring the evaluation ran smoothly.

The reference group responded in a timely fashion to our various outputs with thorough comments, particularly on issues of methodology. We have responded to these as best the time and resource constraints we faced allowed. The evaluation was funded by the Development Grant Facility of the World Bank.

An Evaluation of PARIS21

Summary

- i. PARIS21 was conceived in 1999 as an experimental and temporary programme to improve the contribution of statistical work to the management of development. It was to do this by strengthening understanding and coordination between producers and users of statistics in developing countries, between them and aid agencies, and among aid agencies themselves.
- ii. The programme has been run by a Steering Committee co-chaired by the DAC Chairman and a senior member of the UN Statistical Commission, and containing equal numbers of representatives of multilateral agencies, bilateral donors and developing-country statistical offices. Its small Secretariat has been located at OECD headquarters and its operations financed largely by European bilateral donors.
- iii. Early discussions led to a definition of the programme's overall goal as the development of "a culture of transparent, evidence-based policy making and implementation". This was to be pursued by organizing regular workshops, especially for low-income (IDA) countries, Task Teams to achieve greater consensus on particular issues, and improved information flows among all concerned parties.
- iv. The programme has operated mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa, where teams from almost all countries have now attended PARIS21 workshops. Workshop programmes began in Asia and Latin America in 2002. By the end of this year, teams from more than 80 developing and transition economies will, on present plans, have participated in PARIS21 workshops.
- v. The workshops aim essentially at stimulating the dialogue between statisticians, policymakers and other users of statistical material for policy-related purposes, and between them and aid agencies involved in supporting statistical work. They have proved particularly relevant and popular in Africa because they coincided in timing with government efforts to prepare Policy Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and to pursue the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
- vi. Interviews with participants from a sample of one-third of the countries involved in the first two workshops (in 2000-01) indicate that they had lasting effects in strengthening interactions between statisticians and policymakers. Even under difficult circumstance, the countries have seriously pursued the action plans they prepared, and most have embarked on longer-term strategic planning exercises to clarify priorities in the development of statistical services.
- vii. These efforts have helped the countries to respond to the needs for the data that are required for evidence-based policy making and implementation in connection with PRSPs and MDGs. Workshop follow-up has also sometimes called forth specific help from donors, and greater mutual self-help among the countries of the region. Interviews with participants from more recent workshops suggest that similar results can be expected.
- viii. The effects of the advances described on the bottom line, of what statistics are produced, and the use that is made of them, are only gradually showing up. The new approaches have also to spread to fields and agencies much beyond those at the core

of work on PRSPs. But the interviews give grounds for hope that PARIS21 activities are creating understanding and ownership of the idea that good statistics are central to good management – and can be generated.

- ix. PARIS21 sponsorship, and partial financing, is enabling the Task Teams to do important work that would not otherwise have been done. They have also helped to create more consensus, among aid agencies and between them and developing countries, about the right approaches to take to various aspects of statistical development. The results should have increasing impact in coming years.
- x. The evidence available on the overall effectiveness of the PARIS21 programme is promising, even though it cannot be conclusive at such an early date. There is virtually universal agreement that the needs it was designed to meet are more important today than when it was founded, and the overall environment more favourable to progress. All we have come across who have actually participated in its workshops have been keen that its activity continue.
- xi. We recommend that the programme be extended for a further three years, but with somewhat more focused and measurable objectives. The particular strength that PARIS21 has shown in bringing statisticians and policymakers together, and bridging the gaps between them, would be further built on. Particular emphasis would go to the achievement of early improvements in (a) collection of data regarding key Development Indicators and the monitoring of MDG-related expenditure programmes and their effects, and (b) country-level coordination of donor assistance to statistical development.
- xii. The first step in this should be the development of a new Logical Framework, with specified targets, to guide PARIS21's activities over the next three years.
- xiii. To help reach the targets suggested, consideration should be given to various reinforced or modified instruments that the Secretariat might use. The following paragraphs mention the principal ones.
- xiv. Follow-up regional workshops, envisaged in original PARIS21 plans but not so far organized, need now to be activated following the large recent effort on initial workshops. They are strongly demanded by participants, as a means to help maintain momentum. They can focus more specifically than was possible in the original gatherings on the aspects of results-based management most relevant to the particular sub-region addressed, including the issue of priority work on Development Indicators, where needed. Regional agencies should be encouraged to play as large a part as they are able to carry.
- xv. Workshops for individual countries, focused on the specific problems they face in development of statistical and monitoring systems, can have powerful effects. They can reach not only a much wider audience than possible at a regional event, but often one including more high officials. Citing its own experience, PARIS21 should strongly encourage bilateral partners to undertake such workshops in appropriate circumstances. But, for budgetary reasons, it should be very selective in undertaking them itself – perhaps, for instance, only when a regional follow-up workshop in the area was also on its agenda and could be held in the same week.
- xvi. The improved donor coordination achieved at the international level needs to be extended to the country level, where little change has so far occurred. PARIS21 staff,

benefiting from their neutral location and status, should carry out systematic brief visits to country statistical agencies and local donor offices. They would review progress in consistency between external assistance and national action/strategic plans, and draw donor attention to any problems or opportunities that emerged. Such visits would also be a useful occasion to gather material for *ex post* evaluation of workshops held.

- xvii. PARIS21 should seek opportunities to deliver its message, in carefully prepared, brief and practical form, at sessions of an hour or two at occasional international/regional meetings of high-level African civil servants and politicians arranged for other purposes. The video that it has already prepared is considered powerful, and PARIS21 now has the reputation in Africa to play a valuable role in spreading results-based management philosophy at this level.
- xviii. Again particularly with a view to African needs, PARIS should convert its periodic individual meetings with the other agencies organizing training and capacity building on statistics and their use into a joint annual meeting. The aim would be to enhance coordination and complementarity. This would involve, in particular, WBI, UNDP and GDDS.
- xix. PARIS21's plan to assemble an annual report briefly summarizing the status of statistical capacity, and its progress, in each developing/transition economy, is much to be welcomed. It activates an idea already envisaged in 1999 and would help draw broader attention to the matter, and to patterns of needs for assistance.
- xx. We believe that some adjustment of governance arrangements should be considered, to enhance the programme's capacities for reaching high-level policymakers and for making a practical contribution to reducing the country-level coordination problem. The Chairman might be a recently retired very high policymaker from a developing country, backed by the DAC Chairman as Vice-Chairman. The Steering Committee should be somewhat expanded in scale to provide a larger number of seats for the developing/transition countries, with half of those seats going to policymakers interested in use of statistics for evidence-based policy. A small Executive Committee run by the Vice-Chairman could take responsibility for supervising and assisting implementation of the policies decided by the full governing body.
- xxi. The correct size for the Secretariat cannot be determined until the Steering Committee has decided whether to accept some of the suggestions in this report and how to phase them. But there is likely to be some need for an increase from the present scale. A highly desirable move would be to recruit one or two development economists, with appropriate developing-country experience, to complement the statisticians. This would expand the programme's abilities to deal with policymakers generally, and increase the Secretariat's capacities for handling several of the new tasks proposed here.
- xxii. We have learned much from our investigation, both about the needs and the demands of the developing countries, and about the overall effectiveness of PARIS21. We conclude from what we have learned that a well worked out increase in the programme's overall expenditure in coming years would be money well spent. This is based on the assumption that the donors would reach a reasonable degree of consensus on appropriate overall targets for categories such as those suggested in the 'Proposed Logical Framework'. It therefore also assumes that there would be an effective focus on early improvements in priority statistics, and in country-level coordination of aid.

- xxiii. It would be particularly important that all donors significantly involved in statistical work with the developing countries become contributing members and participate fully in guiding the programme, especially on aspects relating to aid coordination. The smaller donors will also remain very important to the success of the programme. They need to be provided with somewhat better information flows than they now receive.
- xxiv. An Annexe contains a proposed process for agreeing on a new logical framework, and, in a draft 'Proposed Logical Framework', suggestions by the evaluation team on possible targets for improvements in statistics production and use, statistical planning, and coordination of aid for statistics, over the next three years. These targets need careful scrutiny, particularly by the donor community, with a view to reaching a consensus in PARIS21's governing body as to what should be feasible. This, in turn, would enable the Secretariat to prepare a detailed proposal for PARIS21's own activity, for consideration by the governing body.

An Evaluation of PARIS21

An Initiative to Improve the Contribution of Statistical Services to Development

A. Introduction

1. Substantial, and almost certainly increasing, amounts of technical and financial assistance have been provided to developing countries over the last twenty years in support of statistical work. Because the assistance has normally come from a wide variety of sources to at least several different recipients in each country, and often in relatively small individual amounts, no valid estimates of overall volumes, or trends, appear possible. But the typical pattern appears to have been, for most of the poorer countries, an increasing dependence on external assistance, with a remarkably large number of aid agencies involved. Figures for the situation in 2001 were recently compiled by the IMF for two countries¹: Mozambique, where nearly two-thirds of direct expenditures (excluding costs of technical assistance) on production of statistics came from abroad, with 11 foreign agencies involved; and Bolivia, where well over two-thirds of expenditures (again exclusive of technical assistance) came from abroad, with 8 agencies involved.
2. At the same time as foreign dependence has been increasing, there have also been rising worries, especially among aid agencies, about the quality, timeliness, coverage and use of statistics being produced. This reflects in part increased concern to found development policies on empirical realities and to assess actions by the results they actually yield, and in part the increasing focus of the international aid community on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), highlighting more emphatically than in the past improvements in living standards of the poor, with international targets formally agreed at the highest possible level. The MDG Country Progress Reports prepared under UNDP auspices² now normally include a systematic assessment of the country's production, analysis, and use for policy purposes, of key statistics for each goal. For the large majority of low-income countries, the ratings assigned are predominantly in the lowest grade, 'Weak', and even for those of middle income few reach the 'Strong' grade.
3. Foreseeing the difficulties of effectively operationalising the MDGs (then in their earlier form of the 'International Development Goals') at the country level, OECD, the UN, the World Bank, the IMF and the European Commission convoked in November 1999 a Senior Expert Meeting on Statistical Capacity Building in Paris. It was attended by representatives of both developing and OECD countries, economic policymakers as well as statisticians, and dealt not only with the implications of the MDGs for reporting at the international level, but also with the more disaggregated data, for different regions and groups within a country, that would be needed to manage serious pursuit of the goals. The meeting generated such lively interest and debate that the sponsors decided, with strong support from the UK Department for International Development (DFID), to forgo bureaucratic niceties and to create, on the spot, an international 'consortium' with a small secretariat, housed in OECD, to continue the dialogue started, encourage better inter-agency cooperation and "promote well co-ordinated, effective statistical initiatives at the national, regional and international levels": It was christened 'Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century,' for short PARIS21, and it was envisaged as a strictly

¹ Lucie Laliberté, 2002. Statistical Capacity Building Indicators, Final Report of the PARIS21 Task Team on Statistical Capacity Building Indicators. Paris: PARIS21.

² The reports are available at www.undg.org. By March 2003 reports had been issued for 23 countries.

temporary initiative, with an initial life of three years, at the end of which it would be carefully assessed.

B. Methodology

4. The current report, commissioned by OECD and supervised by a specially created Evaluation Reference Group, attempts to provide an independent, external evaluation of the work accomplished by PARIS21 to date, and of the programme's possible future.
5. It is based on examination of the documents provided by PARIS21 and its internet web-site, and interviews with stakeholders. A number of different categories of stakeholders were identified: workshop participants, both statisticians and policy-makers, PARIS21 consortium members, Steering Committee members, task team convenors, Secretariat members and consultants, DCD senior management, and current and potential financial supporters. Views have also been sought from interested outside observers and related bodies, such as institutions of regional cooperation, and UN specialized agencies, with an interest in statistics
6. These interviews were conducted on the basis of a series of questionnaires, tailored to the individual stakeholder categories. These questionnaires, as well as more information about the division of work, can be found in the Evaluation Team Inception Report, included as Annex C. Interviews and discussions have been conducted partly face-to-face and partly by e-mail, with some follow-up by telephone where appropriate. Field visits were made to Bolivia, Peru, Cameroon, Senegal, South Africa and Zambia, to interview key stakeholders. These were primarily workshop participants, both statistics producers and users. Regional representatives of international agencies and bilateral donors concerned with statistics were also interviewed where possible. In addition, heads of statistics from Kenya, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Uganda and Burundi were interviewed during their attendance at the CODI III meeting in Addis Ababa, in May 2003. Interviews were also conducted with representatives from El Salvador, over the telephone. Email questionnaires were sent out to Asian workshop participants, but the response was very poor with only Cambodia replying. These countries were chosen on the basis of their attendance at PARIS21 regional meetings, and in the case of South Africa, because there had been a national level workshop as follow-up to the regional meeting. In total, interviews were conducted with representative members of a dozen of the country delegations from Africa, Asia and Latin America that have attended PARIS21 workshops (and some of their colleagues in the respective national capitals), and discussions with most of those, from all parts of the world, who have been involved in guiding and carrying out PARIS21's work
7. With such a wide potential set of interviewees, and constraints of both human and financial resources for the evaluation, decisions had to be made as to how best to use the evaluation team's time. The team tried to ensure that some contact was made with each category of stakeholder, while ensuring that certain key categories were covered in more depth. The PARIS21 Secretariat was consulted about whom they felt were key players who should be contacted, and the team did their best to cover these individuals and organisations. Almost a third of the consultants' time was spent in travel to developing countries for interviews, there was also significant time spent in the USA and Europe, meeting with officers of international agencies and bilateral donor organisations.
8. Response rates naturally varied among different groups, from 5-75% in the case of emails and probably 60-90% for face-to-face interviews. The poorest response, around 5%,

came from the emails sent out to civil society and private sector members of the consortium. However, there were uncertainties about some of the email addresses that limit the extent to which this can be interpreted as an indication of lack of interest. In total 137 individuals were contacted during the course of the evaluation, 106 of whom were interviewed face to face. Annex D lists all those who were kind enough to share their views with us, whether in written or spoken form.

9. The evaluation succeeded in contacting a wide variety of stakeholders, but there are certain areas which were more weakly covered than others. In particular, the team would have liked to have been able to contact more developing country policy makers. This may partly be a reflection of the use of the CODI meeting to contact a number of African government statisticians. It had been hoped that some policy-makers would also attend, but in the event, none did from the countries that were interviewed. However, this may also reflect the challenge that still has to be faced in engaging with policy-makers over these issues. We suspect though that it reflects more the heavy burdens on senior policymakers and their feeling that the task of responding to questions posed could safely be delegated to their statisticians. It is noteworthy that in the cases where we were able to have substantive independent interviews with policymaker participants – mainly Senegal, South Africa and Zambia – they expressed opinions that in no way contradicted but, on the contrary reinforce – sometimes very strongly- those conveyed to us by their statisticians.
10. The other challenge, which was identified from the outset by both the evaluation team and the Secretariat, has been in attributing change to the actions of PARIS21, or even identifying change at all. At country level in particular, the evaluation has been based on what the team have been told in interviews – there has not been the time or resources to validate this information independently.
11. The report contains a brief account of how PARIS21 fits into the existing architecture of organisations and activities existing in the area of statistical development. This is followed by a presentation of the evidence on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and effects of PARIS21's activities. There is a review of the log-frame adopted in 2001 to guide PARIS21's activities and a discussion of governance and membership issues. An overall vision for the next three years is presented, and specific areas needing attention are identified. Finally, specific recommendations for future focus are summarised. The report contains four annexes: a proposal for developing a new log-frame, and a draft version for consideration; the Terms of Reference for the evaluation; the team's inception report, which contains the methodology used, questionnaires and team responsibilities; and a list of people met.

C. PARIS21's Unique Role

12. The demand, at international, national and, in some countries, local level, for improved statistics has increased substantively since the 1990s, as a result of the adoption of international development targets, poverty reduction strategies, an increased emphasis on results-based management and evidence-based policy, and greater demand for government accountability both from donors and from national civil society organisations.
13. Although the statistics demanded have both national and global public goods elements, for the most part they have to be produced at national level. National statistical systems, incorporating not just statistical offices but also the collection of routine data by line

ministries at national and local level, are the foundation of international statistical reporting.

14. The role of international and bilateral agencies falls into two main categories: as organisations which agree on standard definitions and methods of data collection, and exchange best practice – a role which in which the UN Statistical Commission takes the lead; and as investors in the improvement of national data collection systems, through building national capacity and funding key data collection initiatives.
15. The concepts of results-based management, as techniques for improving management of public expenditures, are spreading widely to developing countries, and gradually among sectors within them. The MDGs are successfully mobilizing and channelling efforts by aid agencies, and increasingly by developing/transition country governments. They may yet reach the intended goal of raising the priority given in international debates at the highest level (such as G8 and the UN Security Council) to real progress in improving the situation of the poor.
16. There is a quite new degree of cooperation among major international aid institutions to agree on a set of key indicators for measuring development progress, to overcome the obstacles to securing valid and up-to-date empirical data for these indicators, and to use them for measuring the performance of aid institutions, as spenders of public resources.³
17. Indicators of recipient countries' effectiveness in fulfilling MDG targets, as adapted to their national situations, and in introducing an environment conducive to effective pro-poor development, are also likely in coming years to be increasingly taken into account in deciding on allocations of development aid.⁴ This means that the quality of a country's statistics will play a more important part than in the past in determining the aid it receives.
18. Initial experience with PRSPs suggests that countries' systems for monitoring their implementation will be critical to their needed policy refinement and ultimate success. It also indicates that this monitoring will have to rely mainly on improved management information systems in public agencies and supervising ministries (so-called administrative data), combined with non-traditional forms of household and user survey, to help ensure honesty in such reporting.⁵
19. Pressures from local populations, as well as from the international community, to make statistical data much more readily available outside closed government circles are likely to increase substantially. This is particularly because openness to analysis by service-users and consumers is essential to accountability and to attaining the results and the steady improvements that are sought in public expenditure programmes. Civil society interest applies to traditional economic data and increasingly to data often little gathered in the past: information that can show the distinctions among different geographical areas (down to quite small size, corresponding to the areas and groups among which the lowest

³ World Bank, 2003. "IDA Results Measurement System: Progress and Proposals" (April 3); European Commission – DG Development, 2002. "Guidelines for the use of Indicators in country performance assessment" (December).

⁴ OECD, 2003. Joint OECD DAC/Development Centre Experts' Seminar on Aid Effectiveness and Selectivity: Integrating Multiple Objectives into Aid Allocations, Summary Report, March.

⁵ David Booth and Henry Lucas, 2002. Good Practice in the Development of PRSP Indicators and Monitoring Systems. ODI Working Paper 172. London: Overseas Development Institute.

level of government has to allocate public programmes) and data about the way government and judicial systems actually work⁶.

20. Reflecting all of these factors, aid agencies are likely to be giving increasing attention in the coming years to assessing the improvement of countries' statistical capacity and to the possible desirability of interventions to strengthen them.
21. A recent World Bank survey⁷ of key agencies active in capacity building activities shows both the high level of activity and the large number of agencies and initiatives currently involved in this type of activity. The World Bank itself has nine central or regional initiatives active in statistical development through funding and/or technical assistance and training. The IMF has five such initiatives. There are eight UN specialised agencies and four regional agencies active in developing statistical capacity in one form or another. The Multilateral Development Banks, multilateral agencies and statistical agencies all support and fund statistical activity, and there are eleven bilateral agencies which, to varying degrees support either directly, or through partnership, the improvement of statistical capacity in developing and/or transitional economies.
22. There are a number of global initiatives, such as the International Comparison Program, which provide a coordinated approach in one specific area of statistical development, but there is a vast challenge to developing countries in responding to such an array of potential international partners for improving their own statistical systems.
23. PARIS21 was set up specifically to improve donor coordination in support of evidence-based policy-making and monitoring, through establishing partnerships with developing countries. It is not a new organisation but a partnership of existing organisation, both OECD and developing country, governed by representatives of key partner organisations.
24. Over the three years of its life, PARIS21 has established a reputation for neutrality and accessibility that sets it apart from many other agents in this area. It has very limited grant funding for activities, and, unlike the various development banks, is not in the business of giving loans. In our discussions with many of its developing country partners, the view was repeatedly expressed that PARIS21 provided a space for free discussion, and support to countries, not just in technical matters, but also in helping them establish their own priorities for statistical development, which in turn improved their ability to coordinate country level activities.
25. PARIS21, therefore, has perhaps a unique ability, through its emphasis on partnership, to improve donor coordination both at a central level, but also, at country level, thereby increasing country ownership, and providing tools to assist in the promotion of evidence-based policy.

⁶ It was pointed out to team members by stakeholders in a number of African countries that increased democracy had raised the demand for local level statistics by both civil society and elected representatives.

⁷ World Bank, 2002. "Building Statistical Capacity to Monitor Development Progress", Information paper prepared for the World Bank Board of Executive Directors, October.

D. The Evaluation Findings

1. Relevance of the Activities Undertaken

26. After a relatively slow start, reflecting the way in which it was unexpectedly created, PARIS21 rose to a sizeable level of activity in 2002 when it had, for the first time, a full-time manager, recruited by international competition. The first general meeting of PARIS21 in June 2000 had approved establishment of 8 Task Teams, designed to bring together interested parties to resolve particular issues in statistics development, and agreed to hold 9 regional meetings, intended to enable the developing countries to develop proposals appropriate to their specific needs in statistical development. The first such meeting took place in Lusaka, in cooperation with SADC, in December 2000. By the end of March 2003, four more regional workshops had been held in Africa, and country teams from as many as 40 Sub-Saharan African countries had attended PARIS21 regional workshops (Annex 2 lists all the major events in PARIS21's brief history). In addition, two major national workshops in Africa were strongly supported by PARIS21 in 2002, attracting individual participants from many neighbouring countries. Also a one-day meeting had been attached to the 2001 session of UN ECA's Committee on Development Information(CODI), reaching representatives of most African countries.
27. Outside Africa, PARIS21 organized in 2002 a workshop with the Andean Community for teams from its five member countries, and another with the Asian Development Bank for teams from ten south-east Asian countries. For the CIS countries, PARIS21 joined with Eurostat in organizing a two-day meeting in Moscow in 2001, which stimulated considerable interest and led on to an agreement with the CIS Interstate Statistical Committee earlier this year for further cooperation.
28. PARIS21 has also given great attention to its annual general meetings, normally held in Paris in October, centring around a general membership meeting, in which country representatives and Task Team leaders report on progress and issues, but also including shorter sessions of the 18-person Steering Committee charged with guiding the programme, and of the donors who finance the programme. The Steering Committee also meets on one other occasion each year, normally in June. Five of the originally approved Task Teams finally came into being, of which one suspended its operation in 2002, when two new ones were also approved. The PARIS21 Secretariat has devoted great effort to its information exchange and dissemination role, making all its documentation rapidly available on the easily navigable PARIS21 web-site⁸, which is frequently upgraded and elaborated, and introducing in 2002 a substantial newsletter, published three times a year in several international languages.
29. No one whom we have come across in the course of our investigation has doubted the importance of improving the role that statistics play in the management of development. The vast majority would emphasize, on the contrary, that the need – and the opportunity – is greater today than it was when PARIS21 was invented. The differences within the various stakeholder groups consulted concern rather the relative importance of this particular dimension of development efforts and, more particularly, the way in which PARIS 21 has gone about the job.

⁸ www.PARIS21.org

30. Since the start of its operation PARIS21 has tried consistently to follow three cardinal principles. First, following the pattern set by the 1999 meeting in Paris, it has sought to reach policymakers and users of statistics, and to enhance statisticians' dialogue with them. Second, in line with the aid partnership principles developed and promoted by OECD and the DAC⁹, it has aimed at putting the developing countries, and in this case the alliance between their leading policymakers and statisticians, in the driver's seat regarding efforts to apply foreign assistance to statistical development. Third, it has tried to assist consensus building, and greater cooperation at all levels, among the many agencies and programmes involved in provision of financial and technical assistance for statistical work in developing countries.
31. Extensive consultations in the months before PARIS21's first general meeting in June 2000 led to the conclusion that the programme's main contribution to these objectives should be at the country level, not directly but indirectly, by organizing regional and sub-regional workshops and inviting all countries in the area. Subsidiary elements to the programme would be the Task Teams and information exchange, both working mainly electronically, for reasons of efficiency and economy. The World Bank and IMF had just introduced the concept of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) as an improved means to guide development efforts, and foreign support for them, in all the poorer (IDA) countries. Great emphasis had been placed on the need for these papers to be prepared by the countries themselves, drawing on broad participation from throughout society, and specifying targets – and corresponding monitoring systems – for effective reduction of poverty in all dimensions. For PARIS21, this task offered a golden opportunity to pursue the overall goal that it had established for itself, of spreading the use of statistics for results-based management and evidence-based policy-making.
32. While a PRSP focus to the workshop programme would clearly be consistent with the "country-driver" principle – provided that the international aid agencies adhered to their aims – there was more debate about other facets. Some proposals to the Steering Committee urged particular promotion of so-called "Sequenced Information Strategies". They would blend a focused initial effort in a country to generate better information about trends on the MDGs, and to improve relevant administrative management information systems for monitoring their implementation, into a broader, longer-term strategy for development of national statistical capacities. Others on the Committee were much more preoccupied with the need to generate, in the countries, a more self-motivated approach than had characterized many previous aid efforts: they stressed the potential of regional seminars to help countries learn from one another, and develop their own solutions, with the aid of existing regional organizations. They argued that prescription of indicators to be prioritised could run counter to this thrust. While documents dating from the start-up period espousing these different viewpoints have been made available to us, it is unclear how intensively, and in what fora, they were discussed. But the notion of "Sequenced Information Strategies" does not seem to have been reflected in objectives statements for the workshops actually mounted nor to have been much pursued by one of the Task Teams in whose original title the phrase appeared.
33. Sub-regional economic integration agencies are generally significantly involved in statistical work. Hoping that they would also strengthen the country-, as opposed to donor-, driven character of the discussions, PARIS21 has normally made significant efforts to involve them in its workshops – in addition to any regional agencies

⁹ Starting, in particular, with publication of DAC, 1996. *Shaping the 21st Century: The Contribution of Development Cooperation*. Paris: OECD.

concentrating exclusively on statistical work. All workshops have been based on a written statement of objectives, or concept note, discussed intensively with the regional partner (wherever there was one) and with at least a few of the countries to be invited.

34. The core structure of PARIS21 regional workshops has always started with presentations by each country (sometimes dual, with a user of statistics succeeded by a producer), followed by presentations from each aid-supplying agency, and ending with break-out sessions leading to presentations of the actions that needed to be taken, at country and regional levels, for future progress in statistics. Though they had substantial participation from neighbouring countries, the two national workshops that PARIS21 itself helped organize – in Malawi and South Africa – naturally departed from this format. Their structure was custom-designed to deal with the conceptual, organizational and other issues raised by the subject the country wanted to address (essentially, development monitoring indicators and systems), and to ensure participation of all national stakeholders. In light of experience gained over time, improvements have naturally been made in workshop design, on matters such as distribution of papers, arrangements for discussion, provision of participant feedback, and reporting of proceedings.
35. While the Task Teams have been intended to produce results that would strengthen countries' abilities to produce statistics of value to their policymakers, their immediate purpose has often been to serve the third purpose mentioned above, of building greater consensus among aid agencies and between them and potential recipients. They have focused on generic issues of statistical capacity building or specific recognized problems such as the decay of agricultural statistical services in many countries, especially in Africa, and the recent inability of many countries – a fifth of all developing countries according to one recent count¹⁰ - to carry out a decennial population census.
36. As regards PARIS21's diverse array of stakeholders, the evidence we have been able to collect suggests that developing-country statisticians who have participated in its workshops consider them highly relevant to their situation and needs, and that PARIS21 has also succeeded in gathering an increasing following among broader policymakers to its basic themes. Its newsletter and, in countries with reasonable internet access, its website are greatly appreciated by many statisticians in the countries where the programme has been active and by aid staff responsible for statistics, but are looked at by very few others. Aid agencies, and the UN Specialized Agencies, are much more split in their views, with most of those who have been involved remaining enthusiastic in light of their experience. However, a minority are concerned by what they perceive as a lack of concrete near-term objectives and of help to countries to meet urgent data needs, and a few others are still largely ignorant of the initiative.
37. In terms of practical fulfilment of the cardinal principles mentioned above, PARIS21 workshops have been unique, in the regions where they have been held, in bringing statisticians so much into contact, and serious discussion, with broader policymakers. The policymakers attracted have naturally been of varying levels, occasionally including ministers, sometimes limited to policy analysts, most often reaching to the level of vice-ministers, major department heads, and chiefs of central units responsible for poverty reduction strategies. Especially in more recent workshops, the country teams invited have often extended beyond civil servants, to include one or two representatives of other groups, such as parliamentarians, NGOs, research bodies and the media; this has also

¹⁰ World Bank, 2002. "Building Statistical Capacity to Monitor Development Progress," Information paper prepared for the World Bank Board of Executive Directors, Appendix A: Statistical Practices.

often generated valuable interactions. National seminars – and, for the host country, even regional seminars – have of course enabled much wider inclusion of policymakers and user groups as well as of statisticians.

38. Reinforcement of countries' capacity to lead their own statistical capacity development does show signs of taking place in many African countries as a result of PARIS21's incorporation of the linkage with PRSPs into workshop design. Developing the data needed for preparation of PRSPs, and designing appropriate monitoring systems, were high-priority jobs which attracted attention from the highest levels of government and gave greater prominence to statistical services; there was fertile ground to receive PARIS21 messages.
39. The PRSP linkage was not so applicable in the regional workshops held outside Africa, in areas where many of the participants came from non-IDA countries without formal need to prepare a PRSP. Although representatives of the countries participating in the Andean seminar had themselves suggested focusing their presentations on priority aspects of the poverty problem in each country and how statistical services were responding, this seemed to work less well. More common ground, and greater empowerment for subsequent statistical development, might have been found from thorough discussions of statistical services' legal status, organization and management, though these would most likely have been of limited interest to the policymaker participants. Nonetheless the workshop did generate wider appreciation of a common need to secure stronger and broader user guidance on what the statistical offices should do, and the Andean Secretariat is leading an effort to reflect this in the strategic planning that all the countries committed themselves to.
40. At the Asian workshop, which also included both PRSP and non-PRSP countries, PARIS21 left the initial country presentations more open and general, but introduced a useful list of focal issues for the country delegations to address in their final 'response' session. From that session it appeared that, as on occasion in the Africa meetings, at least some participants would have welcomed more thorough discussion of MDG indicators, while other common-ground issues would have included national statistical system management and performance measurement, evaluation of strategic plan implementation (most participating countries already had such plans), and review of alternative mechanisms for securing user feedback and contributions to statistical planning.
41. PARIS21 workshops have normally had participation from representatives of the main aid agencies and UN specialized agencies involved in statistics in the region. The agencies have had a good opportunity to present their work and the facilities they can offer. This has certainly helped to improve knowledge of one another, and of one another's programme, and thus has presumably contributed to reducing needless duplication and encouraging mutually supportive activity. It has been particularly valuable for persons newly arrived in the region.

2. Efficiency of the Programme

42. Table 1 below summarizes PARIS21's actual expenditures (in terms of U.S. dollars) in FY 2002, as provided to us by the Secretariat. Expenditures in that year were considerably greater than the accumulated total spent in previous years, with a particularly large increase for workshops (and for staff costs), reflecting the increased pace of activity, and some reduction for the Task Teams, and for Annual Meeting and Steering Committee. To

these recorded expenditures there needs to be added about \$160,000 for OECD contributions in 2002 in kind – mainly for office occupancy (which will only begin to be charged directly to the programme with the move, just now completed, from the Chateau de la Muette to La Défense) and for management, financial, legal and communications services. It should be noted that all staff and general costs are included in the bottom lines of the table; any allocations of staff costs among the different elements of the programme have to be based on estimates.

Table 1. PARIS21's Expenditures FY 2002 (1 Oct. '01 – 30 Sept. '02)
(in U.S. dollars)

Annual Meeting and Steering Committee	179,898
Workshops (incl. preparation & follow-up)	469,406
Task Teams	168,039
Advocacy	<u>243,650</u>
Travel and other meetings	65,457
Newsletter	56,187
Website	67,993
Advocacy Video	52,220
Publications	1,793
Staff Costs	395,336
Office operation	8,330
TOTAL	1,464,659

43. Still in FY 2002 the Annual Meetings and Steering Committee sessions accounted for a relatively significant share of total expenditures: about 16 weeks of staff time (at a cost of around \$20,000) plus some 16% of the total non-salary costs of the programme. The high non-salary costs are mainly due to the fact that the programme covers travel and living costs (using standard OECD rates) for participants from the developing countries – i.e. members of the Steering Committee, and key organizers/participants of recent-past, and near-future, workshop and Task Team activities. These privileges are occasionally extended to persons from other than developing countries, but on a very limited and tightly controlled basis.
44. The Secretariat has made estimates of the staff time that was involved in organizing each of the main workshops held in 2002. Addition of the corresponding salary costs to the other expenditures for the workshop, and division of the total by the number of participants (excluding PARIS21 and other organizing staff and external presenters) indicates a cost per participant day on the order of \$900 for regional seminars and \$350-400 for national seminars.
45. These figures can be very roughly compared with a recent cost of \$950 per participant day for Harvard University's executive programmes and an average cost to the World Bank Institute of its short courses (4-6 days), given around the world and normally for participants from several countries, of some \$300-400 per participant day¹¹. The fairly

¹¹ Nidhi Khattri, Jaime Quizon, et al., 2002. Impact Evaluation of WBI Client Programs, FY 00-01. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Institute. The WBI figures cited include significant expenditures on the

high costs of the PARIS21 workshops appear to be due to the facts that each is essentially a one-off activity, requiring considerable preparation effort with the countries to be invited, duration is short (recently 2.5 days on average) and, at least for the workshops covered, there was less sharing of costs with others than the World Bank Institute now often has. Overall costs to PARIS21 (including staff time) for recent regional workshops have been about \$130-150,000. National seminars have been more in the range of \$100-130,000, so that the lower average costs per participant day are mainly due to larger numbers attending.

46. Costs of the type included in the table (i.e., excluding those paid directly by OECD) have been covered out of financial contributions and payments in kind from a wide range of aid agencies and some statistical organizations. Cumulative contributions (including commitments for the future) stood at \$4.84 million as of 30 September 2002 (i.e., at the end of FY 2002). Table 2 shows the approximate breakdown by source. Since expenditures in the current fiscal year were expected to exceed \$2 million, relatively little of these funds would now be left.

Table 2. Contributions to the Direct Costs of the PARIS21 Programme (as at 30/9/02)
(in U.S. dollar thousands)

UK	2,064	Eurostat	145
World Bank	977	Ireland	100
France	469	EU Commission	98
Netherlands	443	Norway	97
Switzerland	200	Japan	95
Sweden	154	TOTAL	4,841

Source: calculated from PARIS21 Secretariat, Report to the Steering Committee: June - October 2002.

47. Convincing countries and agencies to contribute to the programme, and arranging the actual transfer of funds, have been important tasks for the Secretariat. But flow of funds has not so far been a significant constraint to activities undertaken. Much more important have been a very cautious attitude on the part of the Steering Committee to expansion of staff numbers. The staff employed seem to have been very devoted, and we have heard many plaudits from outsiders who had solicited their help and from those, for instance, who had been responsible in recent times for running Task Teams. But the feeling of the existing staff, and of at least a few members of the Steering Committee, is that the staff have been overloaded – certainly in the start-up years, and possibly even more so now when staff has expanded but the programme has too.
48. The newsletter that PARIS21 introduced in April 2002 has been warmly appreciated by the large majority of the contacts we have had in the course of our enquiries. The costs shown in Table 1 no doubt reflect important start-up expenses and the costs of translation and publication in the four, and more recently five, languages used. PARIS21’s web-site, though also generally appreciated by statisticians, has drawn a greater variety of comment, including from members of the Steering Committee. There is some feeling that

writing of papers for use in the courses as well as for provision of instructors (See op. cit., pp 44-45 and 49-50).

users may get lost in the wealth of detail provided about PARIS21's activities and workshops, and that there is too little synthesis and evaluation of PARIS21 experience. Another suggestion is to include more articles about successes in the improvement of statistics for development, even where they have not been directly related to PARIS21 activity. Readers from other parts of the developing world naturally find excessive emphasis on Africa, but this would no doubt right itself over time with the deepening of PARIS21 contacts in Asia, CIS and Latin America (UN ECE, amongst others, has volunteered to help such broadening of coverage). Academic and research users would like to see PARIS21 developing more links with, and giving greater attention to, statisticians and analysts working outside government.

49. It seems to us that the most important issues to consider for future development of the web-site would be whether it would be possible, at reasonable cost
 - a. to give more content directly related to Results-Based Management and Evidence-Based Policy Making, the issues most relevant to the policymakers and analysts whom PARIS21 wants to attract but who are not now making use of the web-site
 - b. to provide a Search facility for accessing materials and experiences on these subjects and, of course, on others of particular interest to statisticians, such as relevant legislative reforms, dimensions of statistical capacity and alternative mechanisms for securing feedback from users.
 - c. to offer, as suggested to us by Eurostat and others, a country page to all interested developing/transition countries in which they could summarize the various on-going aids they are receiving from abroad for their statistical development, and the needs for which they are seeking additional help.
50. While it is fully consistent with PARIS21's objectives to build up a committed and interested direct membership, expanding as much as possible beyond professional statisticians, there seems no point in trying to maintain membership records of people who, for one reason or another, have lost interest. There is some evidence¹² that it would be desirable now to reconfirm with all the (some 1,700) PARIS21 members currently listed whether they wish really to remain active members.
51. PARIS21 has tried to secure participant evaluations at the end of its workshops but has found the results often disappointing in terms of the numbers responding and the vagueness of comments made. Workshops of the type run by PARIS21 may not be very suitable for use of this technique; judicious verbal enquiry by a senior participant (whether from PARIS21 Secretariat, co-organizers, aid agencies or even a country delegation) with one or two members of each country delegation might produce more useful suggestions. But we believe that the more important type of evaluation for PARIS21's workshops may be a thorough effort between, say, 3 and 9 months after the workshop, to assess, with the various countries, regional organizations and donor agencies which participated, the extent to which the objectives of the seminar, as described in the original concept note, have been, or show signs of being, fulfilled. This is a task that could only be adequately fulfilled by PARIS21's own staff or consultants.

¹² In the course of the evaluation, in order to reach one set of stakeholders beyond government statisticians, we asked the Secretariat to provide, from their membership list, 100 e-mail addresses of persons from developing or transition countries who appeared to be working in non-government organizations or the private business sector (including media). Although a reminder was sent, and the time allowed fairly ample, only six of these persons responded to the quite brief questionnaire we had sent.

3. Effectiveness and Effects of the Programme

52. PARIS21 documents characterize the overall goal of the programme as development of “a culture of transparent, evidence-based policy making and implementation”. It is a question of fundamental philosophical change which, at the level of a whole society, can only take place gradually. Some workshop participants have spoken to us in terms of having their eyes opened to concepts and ideas that were entirely new to them at the time; others, in terms of the crystallization of latent ideas that was induced by the context of a gathering with professionals from other countries; and yet others, in terms of the stimulus that came from exchanging experience with people facing similar problems. These are all important, but there are obviously many other factors which will affect the pace of change, many more important than the attendance of a small team at a regional seminar.
53. Attribution of effects to PARIS21 is therefore inevitably somewhat speculative and contestable. Nonetheless it is worthwhile to try to identify the contribution that may have been made, especially in cases where a year or more has elapsed since the workshop. Hence, in this section, we report primarily on the findings from our interviews with representative members of 7 out of the 19 delegations from different African countries that attended PARIS21’s first two regional workshops, in 2000-01. And while the selection is hardly random, having been constrained by logistic factors, it includes three countries where PARIS21 has had very little further involvement and three where it has had substantial subsequent contact.
54. Our overall impression is that, while there remains a long way to go in spreading philosophy and techniques, there has been an increase in the political and financial support for evidence-based policy making – mainly due to leadership at high political levels, in the Presidency and Ministry of Finance, assisted by broader changes in African political thinking and by donor agency requests and proposals, most outstandingly the PRSP. PARIS21 may have contributed a small amount to this, by helping to make some senior civil servants more comfortable with the new emphases and more responsive to them. Where it has had more significant effect is in helping the statistical services to respond to the new situation, develop alliances, and examine their own work more from the point of view of its policy utility. These changes, and the contributions the statisticians have been able to make to poverty reduction strategies, have in most cases brought budget increases (by contrast with the situation, for example, in the Andean countries, where budgets have mostly continued so far to deteriorate).
55. In all seven countries, all those interviewed, whether policymakers or statisticians, emphasized that the relations they had developed with one another at the regional seminar had blossomed, and often expanded to others. Consequently statistical work was able to respond more effectively than would otherwise have been the case to policy requirements, notably for PRSP preparation and monitoring. Even in Uganda, which is generally considered a pre-PARIS21 forerunner of Africa’s current management improvement efforts, PARIS21 activities are said to have helped open up decisionmakers more to statisticians.
56. In all seven countries, too, serious effort has been underway to implement the action plans prepared at or after the regional workshops. In two cases this trend appeared to have resulted in part from a decision at the level of the Presidency to replace a poorly performing Director of the National Statistical Office (NSO) with a much stronger successor. Even in Burundi, despite great shortage of resources, the country’s chief statistician has been making valiant efforts to implement the action plan he had written,

and has completed the draft of a new statistics law, undertaken advocacy and prioritising initiatives, and is developing a new social and economic data base.

57. Five of the seven countries have recently completed strategic plans, to provide a better framework for the medium-term development of statistical services, and some are already under Cabinet consideration. Three of them started such planning exercises as a direct result of workshop discussions, whereas the others considered that the workshops had helped them strengthen particular aspects of their plans. Assessment of the extent to which these strategic plans conform to recommendations likely to come from the Task Team on the subject would require further investigation. But, at all events, the work undertaken is an important step in a useful direction. It is noteworthy too that there are indications of broadly similar results, in terms of efforts to prepare strategic plans, resulting from the recent Central and West African workshops, although in several cases progress of the work is held up by the need for final government decision on new statistics laws, involving reorganization of the sector.
58. In several cases, donors have been notably responsive to the new, more assertive positions on the part of the NSO Directors. For instance, UNICEF enabled the Burundians to visit Dar es Salaam to follow up on a Tanzanian model they had heard about at the PARIS21 workshop, and then to purchase the software and equipment needed to apply it for their new database. DFID has made important contributions in several cases and, along with the World Bank, financed overdue work in Kenya to process and analyze data collected in past surveys that had been left unused. The World Bank-led Trust Fund has provided rapid and valuable support for several specific jobs in Uganda, but has been found slow and bureaucratic by some other applicants. Concern with the reluctance of some donors to make small modifications to standard surveys to meet specific local needs – notably US AID in the case of Demographic and Health Surveys, and World Bank in the case of Living Standards Measurement Surveys – was mentioned in West Africa, but not by the contacts in Eastern and Southern Africa.
59. A particular contribution of PARIS21 itself has been to stimulate and facilitate technical assistance from one African country to another, beyond the exchanges that take place in the confines of a regional seminar. Several instances have been reported of a country releasing one of its statisticians to help a neighbour on an issue that came up at a workshop. On a larger scale, Uganda developed a very constructive interaction with South Africa on poverty mapping, and South Africa then also sought Ugandan assistance on its strategic planning. The assessment which led to PARIS21 support for the Malawi national seminar on poverty monitoring was done in part by a Zambian consultant, now the Director of Zambia's Central Statistical Office. And PARIS 21 was able to use both the South Africa and Malawi national seminars to invite carefully selected people from neighbouring countries who could provide and receive ideas that would sometimes lead on to further mutual assistance. Regional self-help and networking have clearly been stimulated by PARIS21 activities.
60. Real assessment of what all these efforts may have led to at the bottom line, i.e., in terms of higher-quality data more rapidly available, would require substantially deeper investigation than was possible in the current rapid overview. We believe that it has begun to improve poverty-related economic data and in some cases to strengthen the sectoral MIS data that is needed to monitor outputs critical to achievement of the MDGs¹³.

¹³ This impression appears consistent with the findings (without attribution among the possible sources of change) in reviews by the International Financial Agencies. See, for example, IDA/IMF, 2002. Poverty

But none of the international data compilers we talked to in the World Bank or at the United Nations were able yet to identify any very noticeable improvement in the data flowing to them. Some at the European Commission complained specifically about continuing inconsistencies in the MDG-related data coming from some of the East African countries most advanced in statistical improvement. Both types of data – the detailed, regional economic and social data for use at the national level, and the broader aggregates most relevant internationally – would need to be taken into account in a deeper assessment of whether the PRSP-linked workshop is indeed a successful formula. For the hope was that, having demonstrated the utility of evidence-based policy and results-based management on PRSPs and MDGs, the task of spreading these improvements to other sectors and aspects of development would be greatly facilitated.

61. The newsletter may sometimes play a useful role in stimulating further reform and innovation, particularly in the African countries because they are naturally covered at present more fully as a result of their wider and longer involvement with PARIS21. News of changes achieved in neighbouring countries, facing similar circumstances, can provoke thinking and action. One African NSO Director suggested that a useful, inexpensive way of stimulating more country follow-up action would be to crystallize the main conclusions of each regional workshop into a few specific points, to prepare a small questionnaire based on them, and to encourage participating countries to send a response for publication in the newsletter. The advocacy video which PARIS21 produced, drawing much on the South African national seminar, is considered by most Africans who have seen it, a very useful tool in the campaign to interest African policymakers more in statistical evidence.
62. While PARIS21's effects have not normally extended to the rationalization of data requested by aid donors and multilateral institutions, there have been exceptions. This is mainly a headquarters job among the various institutions. But the European Commission has specifically acknowledged the valuable contribution of the PARIS21 Manager to its efforts to identify a select subset of MDG indicators for which up-to-date information could reasonably be solicited, to help in assessing country performance.
63. Though a relatively minor and little known part of PARIS21 activity, the Task Teams have been quite effective, in their different ways, in bringing together the statistical and aid agencies interested in particular aspects of statistical development in developing countries, and in achieving more consensus. More importantly, these impacts, though at an early stage of realization, have the potential of being significant, and would probably not have been realized without the umbrella of the PARIS21 organization. The table on the following pages summarizes the main facts about the Task Teams (listed in approximate chronological order of the start of their work) and our assessment of their potential impact, based principally on communications with the Convenors and review of the main documents supplied to us and the web-site pages..
64. The IMF, which has run what is generally considered the most efficient Task Team and produced, on schedule, a seminal system for assessing countries' capacities in production of statistics, points out that it would not have done this work had it not been for the demand for it from PARIS21. Moreover, the PARIS21 sponsorship was found to be a helpful factor in securing good cooperation from countries chosen for pilot work, on a subject that could have been considered politically sensitive. The UN agencies which ran

Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) – Progress in Implementation. Report to the Development Committee, September.

the Census and Agriculture Task Teams also assert that it was the neutral PARIS21 umbrella which enabled them to secure the active cooperation of other aid agencies, and high-level representation from many developing countries at the major seminars each ran; and both seminars yielded a clearer and more genuine consensus on the future path for international action in their respective fields than had previously existed. In all three fields, work is underway to bring practical results at country and regional levels from the ideas and papers generated.

65. The other two long-standing Task Teams, those on Advocacy Products and on Strategic Plans for Statistics, have had more of a research task and have not organized large, high-profile meetings. They have assembled materials and produced some draft products which have been useful for PARIS21 workshops, because the broad subjects each is dealing with are central to PARIS21's work and of rapidly growing interest among developing-country statisticians. But they have not yet brought any major products to final form, due to discontinuities in their operation and overload on the part of the individuals chairing the Teams. Experience has shown those individuals, with whatever backing they can get from staff in the organizations where they are employed, have usually to do the main work. Members of the Teams who come from other organizations normally limiting their role to discussion and commentary. When they are completed, such products should be in high demand throughout the statistical community, it is hoped to make important progress before the end of this year.
66. The Task Team whose work has only just started – confronting the practical problems of measuring countries' progress on main development goals – strongly maintains the tradition of bringing agencies together to find shared solutions. It has also started with larger and more assured financial and management backing than most of the predecessors. It may also have greater impact than any previous Task Team on PARIS21's workshops insofar as the subject matter is so topical and of such widespread interest.
67. Beyond the six teams listed in the table, a seventh is just now coming into being. Entitled "Tools and Methods", its main initial work is to guide and supervise a major research project (called METAGORA), jointly financed by the EU and a number of European aid agencies, on meaningful ways of measuring participatory democracy, quality of governance and respect for human rights, issues now given far greater importance than in the past in efforts to assist the development of both developing and transition economies. The proposal to extend PARIS21's work into this important but obviously difficult area received strong support from Steering Committee members from both developing and transition economies. Studies would be carried out, with local partners, in several countries, including Mexico, South Africa, Sri Lanka, and Philippines as well as selected cities of the Andean region and West Africa. The hope is to synthesize the results, within two years, in an "Outline Manual of Applied Measurement for Monitoring Democracy, Human Rights and Good Governance".

PARIS 21 TASK TEAMS

Purpose	Led by	Paris21 Expenditure	Output to Date	Our Impressions of Potential Impact
<p>Advocacy Products: Develop materials demonstrating utility and value of Statistics</p>	World Bank (G. Eele), main work 2000-01	\$127,000 (mainly contract with specialized Italian company)	<p>Draft text of a possible web-site "Why Statistics ?", which has been accessible on PARIS 21 web-site, with links to reference material.</p> <p>- Drafts of a pamphlet "Why governments need good statistics" and a corresponding poster.</p>	Materials have been used a little in workshops and have helped stimulate statisticians' interest in the need for advocacy activities. Secretariat, with help of former Convenor of Task Team, hopes this year to develop, from what has been assembled, materials more specifically focused to advocacy and to put them into more finished form, from which countries could develop materials to meet their specific needs.
<p>Census: To promote improved funding and management of Population Censuses</p>	UNFPA, main work in 2001	\$52,000 (mainly part financing of international expert group meeting in Pretoria Nov. 2001, attended by census statisticians from 27 developing countries and representatives of most agencies concerned with support for censuses)	<p>Meeting report placed on PARIS 21 web-site, including consensus emphasizing importance of census, user participation in questionnaire design and analysis of results, and economies possible in training and data processing, which could often be facilitated by better cooperation among neighbouring countries</p> <p>- Book now being issued by UNFPA, containing revised versions of most of the major papers presented at Pretoria</p>	Should contribute to wider understanding of the importance of regular population censuses and of the search for ways to enable them to continue. UNFPA is following up the Pretoria recommendations with a draft proposal, for which it would seek outside financing, to support census-related advocacy work, regional and national workshops, applied research, staff training, and a web-site providing continuously updated information through a 'good practices' data-base, a roster of people with recent experience in census management in developing countries, and a bulletin board.
<p>Strategic Statistical Development Plan: Review and diffuse experience in developing countries and promote best practices</p>	Gérard Chenais (adviser to Mauritania and subsequently leading PARIS21 staff member), main work started 2001	\$27,000 (mainly support for meeting in Seoul Aug. 2001, and translations)	<p>Useful exchanges in Task Team, Extensive documentation on web-site,</p> <p>- Presentations in regional workshops</p>	Hope this year to synthesize results, on the basis of documents now collected, and to produce 'best practices' document which could be very useful given greatly increased recognition of need for strategic planning – although a serious constraint on progress is believed to be the general scarcity of people with relevant experience in developing countries

An Evaluation of PARIS21

<p>Statistical Capacity Building Indicators: Develop indicators measuring progress in statistical capacity</p>	<p>IMF, main work from May 2001 to Oct. 2002</p>	<p>\$106,000 (mainly for some of the consultants mobilized for specific tasks and contributions to April 2002 seminar that IMF organized to consult statisticians from 20 developing countries on draft prepared)</p>	<p>Final Report issued Oct. 2002, presenting the selected indicators (18 qualitative, to be rated on a 1-4 scale, and 16 quantitative, e.g., numbers of staff and volume of output), questionnaire formats for their application (completed for two countries that had tried them out), and detailed notes identifying, for each of the qualitative indicators, the characteristics that would prompt attribution of the different rating scales</p>	<p>A major new tool, equally applicable for self-evaluation by a statistical organization as for use by external assessors, that should contribute fundamentally to improvement of efforts to build capacities for producing useful statistics. The work has regularly been presented in PARIS21 workshops, and a larger round of pilot testing is presently underway in 10 African countries under the ICP-Africa project</p>
<p>Food, Agriculture and Rural Statistics (FARS): Promote improvement of FARS in support of poverty reduction strategies</p>	<p>FAO Statistics Division, work really began following reapproval Oct. 2001</p>	<p>\$40,000 (part of costs of Sept. 2002 seminar in Paris, attended by 13 developing country delegations and representatives of 11 aid agencies)</p>	<p>The seminar: agreed an important set of guiding principles for a new partnership to strengthen FARS in Africa, - endorsed broad outline of a 5-year programme of external assistance for African countries' FARS capacities</p>	<p>Has contributed to increased recognition in Africa of the need to strengthen FARS, and begun to have some effects in Asia. It should gradually lead to increased donor support. Interim projects to respond to urgent needs in connection with PRSPs, and to initiate pilot activities in some countries, are expected to be financed in near future by TFSCB and France, as forerunners to the full programme</p>
<p>Statistical Support for Monitoring Development Goals: Identify causes and possible solutions to inconsistencies and other weaknesses in measurement of MDGs and related indicators</p>	<p>Eurostat and World Bank, work started Oct. 2002</p>	<p>\$3,000</p>	<p>ToRs for studies identifying differences among the sources used at international level, and, on basis of two pilot country case studies, difficulties arising at country level</p>	<p>Reduce inconsistencies and overlaps among multilateral organizations, and help strengthen national systems, for monitoring MDGs and other development goals. Task Team leaders hope the work will lead on to improved assistance to countries (in the framework of NSS strategic plans) on the immediate issue of high-quality reporting on the (approx 15) key Development Indicators</p>

4. Sustainability of Partnerships and of Programme Results

68. If the bottom-line effects of PARIS21 on the production and use of statistics are so far spotty, there are nonetheless significant positive signs that the base is being built for more progress in the future. PARIS21's theme of better partnerships – between users and producers, among aid agencies, and between recipient countries and donor agencies – has contributed, notably by bolstering the status and visibility of statistical agencies, and increasing their interaction with others.
69. PARIS21's efforts have also clearly benefited from being consistent with the general flow of the tide. Countries, and the international community, have been increasingly concerned about improving the management of public resources and getting more measurable results from international aid flows and multilateral organizations. The spread of democratic philosophies and demands for wider participation in government increase pressures on public bodies to demonstrate transparency and accountability. It is abundantly clear that the key distinguishing features of countries that have made significant progress in statistics are modern, future-oriented managers in the country's political leadership and appointment (normally thanks to them) of a dynamic leader to the country's statistical organization. These are factors on which a body like PARIS 21 can have very little influence.
70. But we believe it would be wrong to infer from this that the flow of the general tide would be sufficient on its own to carry forward the positive trends that have resulted from PARIS21 initiatives. And it would be equally wrong to infer that these broader, little-influenceable changes in political leadership are so critical as to render the type of initiatives undertaken by PARIS21 superfluous. We have shown evidence that, even in its very brief existence, PARIS21 has genuinely changed some hearts and minds, especially in Africa¹⁴. All the Africans whom we have interviewed, however, consider that the task remains huge: the gap between statistics-illiterate policymakers and policy-unskilled statisticians has to be closed much more broadly within countries and in countries so far little touched. The understanding of even many of the more technically inclined policymakers, who already see the utility of statistics, has to be deepened with regard to the work involved in maintaining the records and systems needed to generate reliable numbers. If the senior officials in the Ministries of Finance and Central Banks are already increasingly convinced, much work remains to be done in many of the sectoral ministries and agencies. The efforts many countries are making to decentralize authority, and bring decision-making closer to the people, mean that local leaders and civil servants have also to be brought on board.
71. The more thoughtful heads of national statistical agencies in Africa are increasingly aware of what modernizing political leaderships of their countries will demand of them, in terms of spreading nationally what PARIS21 has spread regionally. Workshop participants whom we have been able to interview, not only in Africa, are unanimous in urging that PARIS21 be continued. Many of those in Africa have stressed the value of follow-up regional seminars (a year after the original workshop), which were originally foreseen in PARIS21 planning but were not carried out for lack of resources. They are seen as an opportunity to compare notes on implementation of country action plans and to discuss new challenges arising – and hence a significant help to maintaining momentum.

¹⁴ See paras 50-53.

72. An important issue is the right blend between efforts to spread the message among senior policymakers (often called 'Advocacy' in PARIS21 language) and provision of training, to (typically younger and more highly educated) people who work in their offices or in other organizations, in analysis of statistical data for purposes of public policy formulation and monitoring. Efforts in both directions should be mutually reinforcing, so that the analysts would, for instance, explain to their superiors what data they require for key current purposes and the work that would be involved in its production.
73. PARIS21 is now well placed to supplement individual efforts that national statistics heads can make with their national leaders, by seeking opportunities to discuss experience of results-based management of public expenditure in a session or two at gatherings of Ministers or Directors-General from many countries on broader subjects. Over the last three years the World Bank Institute (WBI) has developed an extensive training programme in analysis of poverty data and monitoring of poverty reduction strategies. Drawing on earlier Asian experience, it is now developing, with six East African countries, a Poverty Analysis and Data Initiative (PADI) to create a network among the countries' statisticians, government officials and researchers that would increase the productivity of their combined work. UNDP has started a programme, which it intends to expand, to strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and local governments to analyse and use development data.
74. The seeds that PARIS 21 has sown with regard to strategic planning – and, where relevant, reform of the legal status of the national statistical organization – have begun to take root. They will be further encouraged by efforts to apply, in self-evaluation and peer reviews, the Statistical Capacity Building Indicators. The legal changes have to be finalized, approved and implemented. The strategic planning efforts have to be institutionalised into a permanent process that brings users frequently into consultation and adopts revisions in response to changing needs. The strategy has to be extended from the central statistical office to embrace the national statistical system (including the parts located in sector ministries and agencies).
75. Many Steering Committee discussions, and the Log-frame approved for the programme in 2001, put considerable stress on increased national-government financial support for statistics, as one important step towards sustainability. This is certainly desirable, to increase the freedom of action of statistical offices, to enable them to offer working conditions that will retain and motivate their employees, and to reduce the excessive diversity of equipment and software that they sometimes accumulate from different donor-funded projects. While there is evidence, as mentioned, of significant budgetary increases granted to the statistical offices in most of the Eastern and Southern African countries whose representatives we interviewed, assessing what this has really amounted to would require deeper study. Because it normally goes to a number of different bodies, many of them only partly doing statistical work, total government spending on statistics is not an easy figure to come by. We have uncovered no well-founded trend figures for any developing country.
76. It is fairly clear, however, that national budgetary appropriations have not increased, and in some cases have even fallen, for some of the African and Latin American countries that participated in the workshops. But this reflects essentially nationwide budget crises. Some of the statistics offices involved are consequently suffering extreme constraints. Budgetary support for statistics thus remains an important issue, but we do not think it should be taken as the overriding criterion of countries' seriousness about improving statistical services. A more pragmatic approach is appropriate, recognizing countries' differing and varying budgetary circumstances – and the fluctuating pressures from the

aid community to safeguard or increase budgetary provisions in particular areas, such as education and social safety nets, even in times of stringency. Foreign assistance should be able to be sufficiently flexible that different sources can combine efficiently to support achievement of important improvements of statistical capacity, which should remain PARIS21's main objective.

77. Some donors have shown desirable degrees of flexibility in responding to well-founded priorities newly identified by national statistical offices. But we are still left with the impression that there is room in most countries for increasing the output from the combined amounts of national resources and foreign assistance available. Donors are often reluctant to adjust projects previously agreed, despite changing local priorities. Partially duplicatory review missions and household surveys are still occurring.¹⁵ Uganda appears to have been exceptionally proactive in using combined local and foreign resources more effectively and to have achieved a unique degree of donor harmonization. One notable result is that they have been able to cut the cost of the annual household budget survey from some \$2 million to less than \$500,000, so that this particular work no longer needs to be donor-funded.
78. A problem that arises in many aid agencies is some discrepancy in approach and emphasis between the headquarters statistics leaders and those at country offices and country desks, or in technical departments not primarily concerned with statistics, who actually develop and fund the projects assisted in the countries. To some extent the problem may have increased in recent years with the implementation of general management reforms emphasizing decentralization and increased authority in the country office. While such moves should stimulate more imagination and flexibility in responding to specific local circumstances, they can also result in initiatives that give short shrift to the partnership and donor-collaboration principles promoted by PARIS21. Hence one thing gets said by the donors' statistical leaders at Steering Committee meetings and in regional workshops in which they participate, while quite another thing sometimes gets said and, more importantly, done at the individual country and project level.¹⁶
79. One further important dimension of sustainability of PARIS21's effects relates to the regional and sub-regional bodies responsible for promoting economic cooperation and gradual integration. As mentioned, early PARIS21 planning stressed the potential role of

¹⁵ AFRISTAT, a joint venture between France and 17 Francophone African governments to strengthen national statistical capacities, is among the organizations best placed to see trends in this regard. It perceives a serious continuing problem of lack of donor coordination on country-level interventions, with missions frequently sent without sufficient prior consultation with others as to the work they may have already done. It offers its own services to advise agencies prior to their launching of new initiatives in its member countries.

¹⁶ The World Bank staff openly identify these problems in their recent report on statistical capacity building to the Bank's Executive Directors: "... changes are needed in operations and, to some extent in the culture of country programs. The challenge for the Bank and other international agencies is to work in the spirit of the PRSP, applying national priorities to guide the development of national statistical programs. The approach needs to shift from being extractive to being supportive, with Bank requirements for data seen as part of the overall program, not as ad hoc needs to be met.... The Bank and other donors must also resist the temptation to create parallel systems that bypass weak national systems and establish separate data collection units, often drawing off the limited local expertise..... Because international organizations have a growing need for data – to monitor their own programs and to assist clients in monitoring theirs – there is a strong temptation for agencies to undertake new data gathering activities, sometimes duplicating the work of others...." World Bank, 2002. Building Statistical Capacity to Monitor Development Progress, Information paper prepared for the World Bank Board of Executive Directors, October 23.

these particular partners, and the Secretariat has usually tried to mount its workshops as much as possible in collaboration with them. Even though these regional partners are not normally very well funded, they should be able to play a particularly vital role in follow-up on the initial regional workshop, whether by fostering collaboration among their members on major statistical tasks (e.g., harmonization of classifications, sharing of questionnaire designs and processing software) or, more generally, by reviewing with countries the progress in implementing their action plans and helping them to organize national workshops.

80. Some of the regional economic agencies with which PARIS21 has collaborated, notably the Andean Community, ASEAN and, at a much broader regional level, the Asian Development Bank, have considerable experience, sometimes much preceding PARIS21, in working with their member countries on statistics. They show signs of making excellent progress on the lines suggested. Unfortunately, in Africa, where the regional follow-up role is most crucial to support the small national statistical offices, the regional organizations have been weak in statistics and have made only limited progress. They are, to varying extents, improving their capacities to assemble consistent economic data for their member countries, but most of them simply do not have the leadership or organization which would enable them yet to play a significant role in the policymaker-statistician dialogue. It is unclear whether or not the priorities facing these bodies are such that a combined effort between governments and donors to raise their capacities in these areas would be feasible and worthwhile.

5. The 2001 Log-Frame Reviewed

81. Following extensive consultations in the preceding months on how to clarify goals and priorities, the Steering Committee approved in June 2001 an overall Logical Framework statement for the programme. The following table reproduces the statements of 'Output' that were aimed at in the log-frame statement and attempts to capture, on the one hand, what has occurred so far and, on the other, what contribution PARIS21 may have made. It should be noted that the 'Outputs' identified were characterised in a manner that was obviously far beyond the capacities of PARIS21 to bring about on its own. Our assessments therefore try first to depict the amount of progress that the world has made in the area- and, where possible, the key causative factors. They then go on to give our impression of what difference the existence of PARIS21 may have made (including the extent to which it has completed what may have been one or two more specific deliverables implied in the log-frame) and the difference that it might be considered to be on the way to making, recognizing the extremely short time that has elapsed since the workshops took place.
82. In summary, the seven outputs could be categorised as:
- Promising: this would include output (1) increased political commitment to statistics, output (4) user-producer dialogue and output (5) comprehensive statistical strategic planning.
 - Moving: in other words some progress detected. This would include (2) capacity to produce/use statistics and (6) improved collaboration amongst partners
 - Potential: where there is still quite a lot of work to be done. This would include (3) partnership principles applied and (7) effective donor collaboration.

June 2001 Log Frame

<p>1. Increased political support, funding and demand for information systems to underpin poverty reduction strategies both nationally and amongst donors and multilateral institutions</p>	<p>Demand for improved information systems, and readiness to support them, has increased significantly in multilateral institutions and in many governments, stimulated particularly by the MDGs and other efforts to reduce poverty, notably preparation of PRSPs. PARIS21 workshops have helped to raise the profile of statistics services, and bring the problems of their development to the attention of broader policymakers. Among the 50 countries who have participated, there is already evidence from a few, and hopes in others, that the workshops may have helped generate a more serious and genuine commitment than in the past to improvements in production and use.</p>
<p>2. Strengthened capacity to produce, analyse and use statistical and other information amongst public sector, academic and civil society organisations</p>	<p>Significant improvements appear to be taking place in some countries and some fields as a result of heightened public and government interest and major donor-supported projects, supplemented by regional training programmes such as those of GDDS (on standards for economic and socio-demographic statistics) and WBI (on poverty analysis). But a rising wave of change is not yet assured: for instance, still only 36 (out of a total of about 80) IDA countries have subscribed to GDDS, although the number is still expanding, and a further 26 countries are actively working towards participation. Political and physical restrictions on access to data remain important. PARIS21 has helped spread awareness of the issues among low-income countries' governments and may turn out to have had significant and lasting practical effect in some countries, especially, but not only, those where national workshops have been organized by it or by others.</p>
<p>3. PARIS21 partnership principles and UN guidelines for technical cooperation for statistics applied at global, regional and country level</p>	<p>Coordinated outside support for accomplishment of nationally established priorities has improved in some countries, such as Tanzania and Cameroon, coordination of data demands among international agencies has strengthened, and exchange of information among concerned aid agencies has increased. PARIS21 meetings and publications have contributed to the last mentioned, and the emphasis it has given to NSS strategic planning should gradually result in more countries having a clearer picture of their own priorities and guiding donors effectively. Joint donor support for national plans, as envisaged in the 1999 conference, has however yet to emerge, and cases still occur of duplicatory missions and projects that contradict the partnership principles expounded by the donor agencies in regional workshops.</p>
<p>4. Effective user-producer dialogue processes established</p>	<p>Creating and sustaining effective two-way dialogue, especially from users to producers, remains a major challenge, even in many of the countries with the institutional arrangements, such as National Statistical Councils, sectoral committees and user satisfaction surveys, that are supposed to ensure this feed-back. PARIS21 has not produced any written document on practical measures to foster this kind of dialogue in developing-country circumstances, but its workshops, systematically including data-users and policymakers as well as statisticians in country delegations, and the presentations made, have strongly promoted user-producer dialogue. There are good chances that, with the broader environment also favouring moves in this direction, PARIS21 emphasis on this area will be increasingly reflected in many countries' practice.</p>
<p>5. Comprehensive strategy covering the information needed nationally (and internationally) to inform, implement and monitor</p>	<p>Given the great stress placed on NSS strategic planning, and aid agency support for the process, in the conclusions of the 1999 conference, development in this area to date appears somewhat disappointing, for a variety of reasons, including the pressure of urgent demands for new data and the need for institutional reform preparatory to introducing</p>

policies	planning processes. PARIS21 Task Team on the subject has assembled much useful documentation but not so far produced a major guidance document. All PARIS21 workshops have however persistently stressed strategic planning, and many countries have followed up the idea., Other bodies such as the World Bank – especially its Africa Region – and the Andean Secretariat are doing the same. The Task Team hopes to summarize conclusions from its work this year. More fruits in terms of sound national processes for strategic planning of statistics can therefore be expected in coming years.
6. Improved collaboration between partners undertaking statistical activities and interventions nationally, regionally and internationally	Not much progress so far in most countries, due to lack of sound strategic planning process and preoccupation of aid agency country offices/desks with urgent data requirements connected with their own operations. Some countries (most notably Uganda) have however set examples that show signs of having gradual regional impact. Some aid agencies have made important efforts to increase the contribution of their statistical work with developing countries to the build-up of sustainable local capacity. PARIS21 regional workshops, which have generally had strong participation from donor agencies, have highlighted and promoted action in this direction and have contributed notably to lesson-learning between neighbouring countries and provision of technical assistance from one to another, which many consider to be among the most effective techniques of aiding development
7. More effective donor collaboration, leading to more efficient use of official development assistance	While improved information exchange has reduced duplications, inconsistencies, and diversion of resources from core statistical tasks, there is generally considered to be further scope in most countries for achieving greater overall output from the financial and human resources provided in support of statistical work by means of improved collaboration and coordination. Coordination among UN agencies has improved in some countries as a result of application of the ‘Common Country Assessment’ (CCA) approach, but no models (with the partial exception of Uganda) have emerged for wider coordination in the statistics field at the country level nor has any generally applicable mechanism been agreed. Effects of workshop discussions have depended on local situations and extent of follow-up activity by PARIS21 or others.

6. Governance and Membership

- 83. PARIS21 was set up essentially to give more prominence to the role of statistical work in support of development and to promote more effective cooperation among all the bodies and interests involved. It evolved as a rather unusual combination between an association of private individuals and a consortium of public institutions, without much distinction between them. This was perhaps desirable during the initial phase when the entity was trying to define its role, but it has also caused weaknesses and sometimes added unnecessarily to costs. Even as a still temporary body, PARIS21 would, we believe, benefit from some minor modifications and clarifications that would enhance its effectiveness in what it is trying to do.
- 84. In considering these issues, two fundamental points need to be borne in mind. PARIS21 has provided a rather unique meeting ground between statisticians and broader policymakers, which has proved its value and could be even more useful in the coming

years. But this role has been largely confined to the regional and national workshops organized; it has been reflected in the work of the task teams¹⁷ very little, and in the October annual meetings hardly at all. The governance structure has remained that of a pressure group for statisticians, and virtually all members of the Steering Committee recognize the high desirability of having some broader policymakers among their number, especially from the developing countries, to increase the weight given to the interests of statistics users in guiding the programme. There is also strong feeling in many quarters that the relative weight of the developing and transition countries in the programme's governing bodies needs to be increased.

85. The second point is that PARIS21 has a large outstanding agenda to bring the improved donor coordination that is visible at the international and policy levels down to actual practical application at the country level. The DAC has played a major role in promoting improved donor coordination in the management of development aid generally. Not a single member of the Steering Committee has favoured moving PARIS21 from its location under the DAC, alongside the Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD) in OECD. We believe that more advantage could be taken of this location to effectuate better coordination in the rather specialized area of statistics. For this to be achieved will require more effective consensus building at the policy level than has been attained by the Steering Committee, and stronger support and follow-up from this level to the Secretariat for application of the policy. Since a key step towards better donor coordination at the level of recipient countries is stronger leadership by national authorities, real progress in coordination will require contributions from both developing countries and aid agencies.
86. In light of these considerations, we would put forward for consideration the following possible modifications and clarifications to existing structures and procedures:
 - i. Membership in PARIS21 should be divided into two classes: individual (of what is sometimes already called the 'association') and institutional (of what is now often called the 'consortium') with the proviso that developing countries desiring to join should be strongly encouraged to have two institutional memberships, one for the national statistics organization(s) and the other for a leading ministry or agency concerned with use of statistics for results-based management (probably, normally, Ministry of Finance or of Planning, or the entity charged with monitoring implementation of the poverty reduction strategy).
 - ii. The Steering Committee would be slightly expanded into a body that might then be better named a 'Council' which would include representatives of all the OECD countries heavily involved in direct assistance to statistical development in developing and transition countries and yet achieve an approximately 50-50 balance between people from developing countries and those from OECD countries, as follows:

¹⁷ With the notable exception of the September 2002 seminar in Paris, on a new partnership to strengthen agricultural and rural statistics in Africa, that was organized by the FARS Task Team.

Developing/Transition Countries	World Organizations & OECD Countries
Chairman 4 African Countries 1 Asian Country 1 Country from Latin America and Caribbean 1 Arab Country 1 CIS Country African Dev. Bank Asian Dev. Bank Inter-American Dev. Bank	DAC Chairman World Bank IMF UNDP UNSD EU UK DFID US AID France Japan Nordic countries' rep. Other donors' rep.

The seven representatives of developing countries,¹⁸ as well as those of the Nordic countries and other smaller donors supporting the programme, would be elected for three-year terms by the institutional members in their regional constituency, with the proviso that statistician Council members from the developing/transition countries should always be succeeded by policymaker members and vice versa. For the initial elections, the eight seats assigned to the developing/transition countries would be divided equally between statisticians and policymakers.

- iii. Recognizing the need for clearer leadership of PARIS21's main governing body and the fact that aid coordination requires leadership from the developing countries and detailed supportive action from the donor countries and agencies, the Chairman would be a person of great standing, and with strong interest in application of results-based management, from a developing country (perhaps most appropriately a recently retired President or Finance Minister who had taken a leading role in getting results-based management approaches applied in his/her country). The Vice-Chairman of the Council would be *ex officio* the DAC Chairman.
- iv. While the Council would normally meet once a year, and might also be consulted electronically if matters required voting in the interim, its sessions and decisions would be prepared, and their implementation followed up, by a much smaller Executive Committee, which might meet three times per year. It would be led *ex officio* by the Council Vice-Chairman and would also seek to mirror the Council's approximate 50-50 representation of developing/transition and OECD countries. It should probably have, in addition to its Chairman, six members: World Bank, UNDP, one representative of the Bilateral donors, one of the non-African member countries, and two of African countries. The representatives of these groups would be elected from amongst Council Members by the Council Members belonging to each group.
- v. With these changed arrangements and the small expansion and changed composition of the Steering Committee, it may be possible, without much loss of practical results, to

¹⁸ They might be senior government officials from the countries concerned or, in some cases, very senior staff-members of regional organizations, wholly or partly devoted to statistical strengthening in these countries.

make the general membership meetings – relatively expensive in Secretariat preparation effort and direct costs – triennial events instead of annual gatherings as over the last three years.

7. Overall Vision for Next Three Years

87. PARIS21 has achieved an enviable reputation in many quarters, perhaps due mainly to the topical themes it has sought to address – improved statistics at a time when they are so much needed, stronger interactions between users and producers of statistics, and genuine capacity building. It has also benefited from the dedication of its small staff and its affiliation to such a prestigious organization as OECD¹⁹. Yet its vague mandate, the failure of the Steering Committee to provide much clear guidance and the lack of a full-time manager until 2002 all make it very difficult for the programme to demonstrate a wide pattern of concrete improvements attributable to its activities. Sceptics, old and new – and we have come across a few of each – can say “Three Years is Enough” and recommend winding up the experiment this year.
88. Even the sceptics recognize the importance of the problems that the programme is intended to help resolve without, to our knowledge, putting forward more convincing alternative structures to solve them. Nor do they appear to appreciate the significance of the testimonials we have received from individuals in various developing countries that PARIS21 activities have sometimes helped catalyze new attitudes among policymakers towards statistics and statisticians, and vice versa. Such philosophical adjustments are certainly vague, with no guarantee against reversion, and yet they are ones which technical assistance has sought to bring about, with very limited success, over several decades. If there is a chance that a small body, benefiting from the prestige of think-tank OECD and its neutral, observer role, and earnestly pursuing DAC partnership principles, can build a more genuine commitment in developing countries than agencies dispensing financial and technical assistance have been able to do, then it is clearly worth pursuing further.
89. The changes just summarized in the context for statistical work in the developing countries, still underway and forthcoming, raise several fundamental issues that can only be resolved by collaborative effort between statisticians and broader policymakers.
 - Spreading the demand (particularly in sector ministries and agencies) for good empirical information and analysis – to enable better understanding of the patterns and drivers of performance and the reasons for shortfalls – lack of interest in which is still identified, from seven recent case studies of poor countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, as the main obstacle to effective results-oriented public expenditure management²⁰; releasing the analysis, and underlying data sets, for use outside government; and creating a sense of responsibility among statisticians to actively engage with policymakers to propose ways in which they could illuminate current policy issues.
 - Operationalising regular evaluation of statistical services (using the Indicators recently assembled by the PARIS21 Task Team led by the IMF, with some augmentation on the

¹⁹ Although many of the individuals contacted were asked about the possibility of relocating PARIS21, almost all indicated that the best option was for it to stay where it was. No-one favoured a shift to a UN location.

²⁰ ODI, 2003. “Results-Oriented Public Expenditure Management: Will it Reduce Poverty Faster?” ODI Briefing Paper, April. London: Overseas Development Institute.

data analysis end) and strategic planning. Both, but especially the former, could generate key contributions to the annual report on progress in countries' statistical capacities which PARIS21 now plans to assemble from all relevant sources²¹, in line with the proposal made at the founding meeting in 1999. That report, in turn, could provide very valuable guidance to donors and statistical training institutions, for example, as to the weaknesses which are felt most seriously in different parts of the world.

- Correcting the incentives that currently encourage statisticians to accept almost any aided project that can bring supplies and materials, irrespective of the opportunity costs to the agency in terms of staff-time diverted from other jobs. The traditional hope that this problem could be relieved by growth of the statistics allocation in the national budget has often been disappointed. Taking account of budgetary realities and actively helping to mobilize foreign resources to fill the gaps, supervisors of statistics managers need to assess their performance rather in terms of improvement on the capacity building indicators that they bring about and comparison of costs of products with benchmarks from other countries (much as in OECD countries); there is important work to be done to gather sound figures from developing countries for the costs of representative products, as Eurostat has done for some OECD countries.
 - Reaching sound compromises between urgent short-term needs for new and better data generation or analysis, on the one hand, and the statistical programmes that would do most for longer-term capacity development, on the other. This is a problem that most statistics managers are familiar with, but it is particularly acute in the poorer developing countries and is likely to become more so in the coming years. It is sometimes possible to find ways to simplify new data demands – demands which often come from international sources – or the methods by which they should be met, or to identify in some cases second-best ways in which they could be handled initially by exploiting others of the country's data sets or ongoing studies.
90. In light of the tentative promise that it has shown, and the scale of the challenges in view for developing countries' statistical services, we believe that PARIS21 should be given a second wind, for a further three years. It should remain, as the Steering Committee has always been careful to insist, a coordination instrument, improving the link between and among developing and transition countries and the multiple existing sources of technical and financial assistance for statistics and application of results-based management. It should retain the overall goal that it defined for itself in 2001 – developing a culture of evidence-based policy making and implementation – and select and design its activities specifically with a view to maximizing the contributions it would make in this direction. And taking account of the experience discussed in preceding sections of this report, it should build further on its main strength of bridging the gap between policymakers and statisticians, and find effective ways to help overcome the continuing weakness in donor coordination at the country level.
91. In pursuit of these objectives, four interrelated areas seem to need particular attention and we discuss them in the following sections: Reinforcing Follow-up, Enhancing Country-level Coordination, Advancing Bottom-Line Impact and Deepening the Policymaker-Statistician Dialogue. We have discussed above possible changes in PARIS21's Governance and Membership arrangements, and in its Secretariat, that would improve

²¹ UN Economic and Social Council, 2002. Annual Report of the Steering Committee of the Partnership in Statistics for Development in the Twenty-first Century (PARIS21). Document E/CN.3/2003/24 (13 December).

the chances of reaching the targets set and potentially lay the foundation for even greater subsequent progress toward the programme's fundamental goals. Finally, although we do not believe that it is useful to try to estimate resource requirements until PARIS21 has decided whether our various substantive suggestions are appropriate and how action on them might be phased, we make some remarks about the important issue of Raising Resources for the Programme.

92. These issues clearly need to be discussed by a wide representation of PARIS21 stakeholders. We also feel that the log-frame for PARIS21 activities should be revised, so that it can provide much stronger guidance for the appropriateness of the organisation's activities. Annex A contains a suggestion as to how PARIS21 might proceed on this, and a draft log-frame, reflecting the priorities identified by the evaluation team, which could be the basis for discussion. This clearly has to be the subject of discussion within PARIS21, and we emphasise that the log-frame suggested is intended only as the starting point for such a discussion.

Reinforcing Follow-up

93. Experience from the early workshops in Africa indicates that they have had significant consequences in terms of developing mutual self-help networks among many of the countries involved. One of the strongest messages coming from the interviews carried out with their chief statisticians was appreciation for the ad hoc help that PARIS21 had given in enabling some of the follow-up exchanges, combined, however, with disappointment at the lack of the expected follow-up regional workshop to review and accelerate progress. Even the success that the workshops seem to have had in stimulating strategic planning efforts should be treated with caution at present, lest inadequate support for the further development and implementation of the plans leads on to disappointment with the approach recommended.
94. How to ensure adequate follow-up is a rather urgent issue following the very large increase in the number of initial regional workshops over the last twelve months. By the end of 2003 PARIS21 would, on present plans, have had country teams from more than 80 countries participating in its regional workshops. About 50 of these countries (including 25 of those of special interest because they are IDA countries) would, however, have participated only in the last year.
95. Part of the solution is probably, with help from PARIS21's governing body, to reinforce the pragmatic efforts that have been made in the past to share the effort at follow-up support among the donors. Recognizing that its own staff limitations largely limited it to a reactive mode of follow-up – responding to requests that the countries themselves initiated, the Secretariat made informal arrangements with the DFID and IMF (GDDS) regional statistics advisers resident in Eastern and Southern Africa to take special interest in this aspect in some countries; arrangements were also made with the SADC Secretariat, but they worked less well, due to staff shortages and competing priorities. In Asia, the ADB and ASEAN will probably be able to handle most of the work, and for the South American countries which have been involved the Andean Secretariat, perhaps with some help from ECLAC, should be able to manage it provided that the TFSCB is able to come through in timely manner with the expected support for the countries' strategic planning efforts. In Africa, where the regional agencies (with the exception of AFRISTAT for some aspects of the work) are not strong enough to do very much, a somewhat more formal division of labour than in the past needs to be made, probably principally among advisers such as those from DFID, GDDS, the IMF's AFRITAC and Eurostat, combined with TFSCB and

PARIS21; and arrangements would need to be made for periodic exchange of information and review.

96. Most NSOs would like to hold national workshops with the aid of an outside body, which would help to attract participation of senior policymakers and the attention of the aid community to their work and their needs. Equally, on the other hand, the NSO Directors are quite realistic in understanding that PARIS21 cannot undertake them as a standard practice. Strong arguments can be made in favour of national workshops as one of the instruments that PARIS21 should have in its armory of follow-up actions. A country team attending a regional workshop may develop better mutual understanding among its members, pick up some useful ideas and contacts, and prepare proposals for consideration back home. But major change in statistics work or applications of results-based management are likely to require support and understanding from a far wider range of people – other government ministries, parliamentarians, NGOs, research and academic bodies, the private sector and, most likely, many staff working in statistics. The two national workshops which PARIS21 has supported to date (South Africa and Malawi) appear to have assembled a wider and more senior range of people than would have been possible without its patronage, and to have had substantial positive consequences for the management of the countries' development efforts. Other donors have also had positive experiences, for instance Eurostat in Zambia and Niger, and DFID also in Zambia.
97. Basic criteria relevant to deciding whether or not a national workshop merits international support would include:
- Do the issues to be focused require further discussion, how critical are they to further development of results-based management in the country, and what is the likelihood of the country taking effective action to implement the conclusions reached ?
 - Do senior policymakers need to participate in the discussions, and would foreign involvement help to attract their presence ?
 - Is progress being made in implementing the Action Plan prepared at or after the regional workshop in which the country participated ?
 - How would the workshop be expected to contribute to improved donor coordination ?
 - Have alternative sources of finance for the workshop been seriously prospected and found to be unavailable ?
 - Is it a PRSP country ?
- Regional organizations, whether concerned solely with statistics or with broader economic development, should be strongly encouraged to participate and share in the organizing burden.
98. In both the cases where PARIS21 accepted significant involvement, it also gave considerable weight to another group of criteria: the extent to which the issues to be discussed paralleled problems arising in neighbouring countries, the degree to which the host country's actions might be taken as a model for emulation elsewhere, the amount of participation from neighbouring countries that would be acceptable, and the possible contribution that this would make to subsequent exchange and mutual support among the countries, reinforcing the network. In both cases there was, in the event, significant participation from neighbouring countries.

99. Despite the arguments that can be made for national workshops, and PARIS21's own very successful initiatives in this field, it is hard to give preference to them over the follow-up regional seminars so strongly requested by most of the participants PARIS21 has had (not only in Africa). A possible compromise solution might be for PARIS21 to be ready to support national workshops when they not only fulfil the criteria mentioned in the preceding two paragraphs but also can be held in conjunction with a regional follow-up activity that was already on its agenda. Costs would somewhat increase because two days would probably be required for the regional follow-up and two-three days for the national event, but the combined costs should clearly be significantly less than for two separate events. Difficulties of timing might sometimes present themselves since national workshops have often to fit appropriately into a calendar of political processes. But the timing of regional follow-up meetings is normally quite flexible and hence could be adjusted to fit. The possibility of attracting PARIS21 support in this way might be an additional incentive to potential host-countries to progress with their statistical reforms and innovations. But many follow-up regional seminars would probably be organized as separate, self-standing events. And PARIS21 should strongly encourage other donors to take main responsibility for supporting national workshops.
100. We would emphasise the importance of a systematic assessment of the impact of such workshops, along the lines suggested in paragraph 51.

Enhancing Country-Level Coordination

101. As instanced at many places in this report, there is widespread agreement, especially at the senior levels of aid agencies and among regional agencies most knowledgeable about statistical questions, that there is a considerable way yet to go to improve donor coordination at the country level and thereby increase the productivity of aid expenditures for statistical work. PARIS21 has pursued the issue in two main ways: with respect to donors, it has tried to ensure that they participate actively in its regional workshops; with respect to recipient countries, it has strongly promoted preparation of strategic plans which would put them into a better position to guide donors ready to support statistical activities. More needs to be done.
102. PARIS21 has no command powers, nor is it going to be given any. This is perhaps the principal reason why it can play a more effective role than others in this sensitive area, just as it has promoted more genuine commitment in developing countries to improvement of their statistical services. What PARIS21 can do, because of its neutral, observer status, is to maintain awareness of problem areas, ask uncomfortable questions, and identify opportunities for possible improvement.
103. These characteristics mean that, in the course of encouraging workshop follow-up by other agencies' regional advisers, as just described, PARIS21 should nonetheless maintain a direct responsibility for reviewing from time to time the situation in respect of aid coordination at the country level. Thus a PARIS21 staff member would focus attention on reviewing with national agencies and the local offices of the aid donors whether aid activities and plans are moving satisfactorily toward mutually consistent and efficient support of the country's statistical priorities and Action Plan. At the end of a brief follow-up visit to a country, a PARIS21 staff-member should be in a good position to provide useful advice to the local aid agency offices regarding the assessment made and any problems, or opportunities for further constructive action, which seem to have emerged. In the case of the African countries, consideration might also be given to compiling the conclusions of such visits to a range of countries into a brief report to the high-level donor group, the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA), which seeks to improve aid

coordination generally. The information gathered might also be very relevant on occasion to DCD for its peer reviews of the DAC members' aid programmes. Although this type of follow-up activity is completely consistent with the aims of the project, as supported by the aid agencies regularly participating in the Steering Committee, it would be desirable for PARIS21's governing body to reinforce staff confidence that they have the moral authority for such discussions – whether by incorporating explicit reference in the work-programme for the coming year or by passing an appropriate resolution.

104. The brief follow-up visits proposed should also enable the Secretariat to do the much-needed *ex post* review as to the extent to which the objectives of its workshops seem to have been fulfilled, and what lessons might be drawn from the experience for improving design of future workshops. It should now be possible to prepare such assessments, even if on a somewhat delayed schedule, for all workshops that have occurred since October 2002, and provision for this should be incorporated in standard procedures for all future workshops, regional or national.
105. PARIS21 should also take advantage of these visits, as well as of its workshops and other suitable occasions, to promote active consideration of the methods and models that have proved effective for improving donors' country-level coordination in other sectors, such as: agreements on identification of a lead donor for the sector, joint commitment between the country and relevant donors to the fulfilment of a strategic plan, shared appraisal and supervision with unified reporting.
106. Mention has already been made of the annual report that the Secretariat intends to prepare on progress in statistical capacity, country by country. Even though the report should be an assemblage of information provided by the countries themselves and from other sources, rather than an entirely original assessment by PARIS21 staff and consultants, its compilation – likely involving reconciliation of different views contributed – will be a major task. The results should be of great value, which will increase with the passage of time as the system strengthens and further reports in the series are issued. They will draw wider attention to the importance, and the potentials, of building statistical capacities in the developing and transition countries, and they should help to improve the responsiveness of all relevant sources of aid to the problems faced in different regions and with respect to different facets of capacity development.
107. Another, more limited contribution to improvement of the information available to potential aid donors is our proposal to offer a page on the PARIS21 web-site to each interested PRSP country briefly to summarize the purposes and scope of all statistics-related aid projects ongoing in the country, and to identify priorities not yet being met. Attempts that have been made in the past regularly to collect such obviously useful information have fallen down because responsibility for the work was centralized. The idea here is to put the task directly in the hands of the countries, in whose interest it would clearly be to maintain the information reasonably up-to-date.

Advancing Bottom-Line Impact

108. PARIS21 needs to give more explicit emphasis in its work to helping countries achieve early improvements on key data that are required externally and internally, especially regarding the MDGs and related goals. At a number of workshops, country representatives themselves have been asking for more discussion of the subject. If the qualms about emphasizing these subjects were correct in 2000 when PARIS21 needed to make sure there was no mistaking its commitment to country-chosen and country-led development, the situation is now much different. PARIS21 has established its reputation.

Virtually all the governments of the world have committed themselves to the MDGs in principle, and many have already worked out the adjustments required to fit their own realities. And the major aid agencies are coming together for the first time on a small common core set of country performance indicators they want to use. PARIS21 is in danger of losing some of its most influential current financial backers for fear that it is interested only in long-term build-up of statistical capacities without regard to what is needed for better management of development now.

109. As they gradually emerge, the results from two on-going pieces of work should be highlighted in workshops addressed principally to PRSP countries. One is the list of 15 “Proposed Country Outcomes Indicators” (and their definitions) that is being developed in response to the demands of IDA’s financial backers for clearer results orientation²². The approach and the selection of indicators build on work by the EU Commission and have strong affinities with work done in some of the developing countries, such as that for the New Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD). The indicators that have been selected may evolve slightly over the coming years, but they, or a subset of them, are likely to become increasingly important in aid management. They will also no doubt be covered, to the extent that they are not already, in the IMF’s GDDS framework, increased adherence to which should be promoted in PARIS21 workshops.
110. The other particularly relevant work is that started by PARIS21’s own Task Team “Statistical Support for Monitoring Development Goals,” as discussed earlier in this report and dealing with the MDGs more widely. PARIS21 should be emphasizing the indicators and issues raised by these studies as an early priority for treatment within the framework of strategic statistical plans, leading over into work on systems for monitoring the effectiveness of government programmes aimed at bringing about improvements whose results should be reflected in the corresponding indicator. PARIS21 discussions should help countries identify and prioritise the relatively limited and straightforward steps that are normally required to get more reliable readings on the selected indicators.
111. Other useful ways of identifying and promoting priority steps towards improving statistics’ contribution to Results-Based Management in PRSP countries are through analysis and discussion of the assessments made in reports by international institutions: notably, “Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity for Tracking MDGs” in UNDP’s MDG Country Progress Reports, and the comments on monitoring and evaluation in the Joint Staff Assessments, by the World Bank and IMF, of PRSPs. Discussion of the methods used in such studies, comparative results found, and measures required to earn a higher assessment would be a very valuable contribution to a PARIS21 workshop.

Deepening the Policymaker-Statistician Dialogue

112. An important dimension of the development of Results-Based Management is achievement of better understanding between policymakers and statisticians. Policymakers have to recognize the importance and the feasibility of obtaining accurate and timely information about actual results. Statisticians have to appreciate the need for sifting out from large data collection exercises the information which is actually relevant to the decisions that the policymakers could take. PARIS21 workshops in Africa have had considerable success in deepening this mutual understanding, with positive effects on subsequent action by those who participated. There is very strong demand for more, to help penetrate society more widely. Initial PARIS21 efforts in the other regions of the

²² World Bank, 2003. IDA Results Measurement System: Progress and Proposals, April.

developing world have shown similar positive impact, if less dramatic, and desire there too to deepen the dialogue.

113. High officials' appreciation of the information need, and the reputation of PARIS21 itself, have probably now developed sufficiently far in Africa that PARIS21 should be able, on occasion, to secure some time at international and regional meetings of high-level African policymakers to present its message and encourage stronger national leadership for the cultural change sought. Such presentations would need to emphasize concrete ways in which better information flows and analysis (e.g., in Uganda) have helped increase the impact of public expenditure and improve economic performance. They would talk briefly about what is required to generate such flows and analysis, and discuss in greater depth the ways in which this kind of work can be fostered – with emphasis on the kinds of practical leadership action that seem to have worked well.
114. Such efforts will be backed up by the follow-up workshops already discussed, which should of course include policy people and data users just as the original workshops did, and give increased attention to the urgent MDG-related data needs. Equally important is the backing that can be provided by seminars aimed more explicitly at training – of policy analysts, as under the World Bank Institute's Poverty Analysis programme and UNDP's efforts with civil society organizations, and of statisticians, as under the IMF's GDDS, some of the WBI courses, and some other international projects. The possibility for all of these programmes to complement and reinforce one another is such that PARIS21 should consider extending its present periodic contacts with the various individual organizations into a regular annual meeting bringing all the programme heads together. Such a special coordination initiative in the workshops/seminars field in which PARIS21 directly operates could raise complementarity and increase the combined impact on topics prioritised.
115. Some of the general papers presented at PARIS21 workshops have been valuable training materials themselves for the broad subject of increasing synergy between policymakers and statisticians. The main way that PARIS21 can generate largely new materials is through its Task Teams. More is expected in this direction in the near future from the Strategic Planning and Advocacy Task Teams. Early experience under the programme indicates that PARIS21 should be quite cautious about initiating new Task Teams, insisting on clear up-front agreement on what will be produced, by when, and, in particular, how the costs (including staff time) will be shared between PARIS21 and the institutions actually undertaking the work. Careful selectivity is therefore required, to start work only on subjects whose clarification is central to the promotion of Results-Based Management and could be expected to contribute directly to the programme's medium-term objectives. Three rather diverse subjects have come to our attention, each of which we believe would merit the efforts of a Task Team if an institution can be found that is prepared to release staff time to undertake the work and animate the contributions of other Task Team members:
 - a. analysis of comparable cost data from a variety of developing countries for major statistical products, to identify main factors causing differences in unit costs, and establish benchmarks which would be of value in assessing performance of statistics organizations and their managers.
 - b. experience in the development of local (town and district) capacities for generation and application of statistical material relating to management of socio-economic development, including poverty mapping, in order to assist the many countries that are trying to decentralize authority and strengthen capacities for local self-government.

- c. Collection and review of publications, documents and papers prepared in a variety of developing countries on a few defined topics (e.g., annual accountability reports of selected service ministries and agencies, material relating to trade policy development, poverty reduction strategy progress reports) in order to assess their statistical content and the analysis based on those statistics, with a view to reaching clearer standards for measuring progress in the analysis and use (as opposed to production) of statistics.
116. It is possible that the UN Statistical Commission would be prepared to take on one or more of these subjects, and that should be much welcomed. The annual meetings of the Commission appear to be drawing increasing attendance from developing countries. And, despite its demanding responsibilities in other directions, the Commission seems to be giving increasing attention to the problems of statistical development in the developing countries – as illustrated by the worldwide survey requested from UNSD this year on the application of the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics. The recently appointed Acting Director of the UNSD has had considerable involvement with developing countries and has been an important contributor to several PARIS21 activities.

8. Raising Resources for the Programme

117. It has for some time been envisaged that donor agencies should be solicited jointly for funding of PARIS21 and the World Bank-led Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB). The two bodies have distinct but closely related purposes, and TFSCB has contributed to financing several PARIS21-initiated activities and a number of projects, especially in NSS strategic planning, that were stimulated in part by PARIS21. PARIS21 also has an important role in disseminating to countries information about the availability, and application procedures, of TFSCB as of other potential sources of support, especially for introduction of strategic planning processes.
118. Consideration needs also to be given to the possible desirability of including, in the same request to the donors, provision for the work run by the UNDP Bureau for Development Policy on Country Level Monitoring and Reporting on the MDGs, especially that part which is devoted to capacity building in national statistical organizations and among users of statistics in civil society organizations and local governments. Total annual budgets at the current level would be about \$4 million for TFSCB, \$2 million for PARIS21 and \$1 million for the UNDP capacity-building work. UNDP is however considering a possible substantial expansion of its work in capacity building for users of development data; this would require a significant increase over current budget levels for this activity.
119. High demands from the recipient countries for these programmes, and the growing realization on all sides of the need to strengthen statistical services, mean that it will be difficult to generate the funding to match. Contributions will need to be sought from all sides, particularly from all the donor countries directly involved in statistical work whose substantive contribution to shaping PARIS21 work programmes and targets is so much needed in support of the effort to achieve bigger results by better coordination. PARIS21 also needs to pay particular attention to existing and potential smaller bilateral donors who may be involved directly in statistical work in few countries or even in none. We have encountered some concerns that PARIS21 reporting on its programmes relies too much on its web-site and should make more use of periodic e-mailed statements summarizing plans, progress and finances – perhaps preferably in relation to the governing logical framework. PARIS21's OECD location may also be somewhat of a handicap from the point of view of raising the necessary funds. Country delegations in Paris are very busy with numerous other matters and normally more concerned with research and policy than

with operational decision-making. At the same time, in some of the capitals, there are still misunderstandings as to why this programme, if of priority, is not covered out of the overall OECD budget.

120. In recognition of the forceful statements made at last year's Monterrey conference by the Presidents of all the major development banks about their commitment to helping strengthen statistical and monitoring capacities in the developing countries, we have proposed inclusion of the three major regional banks in the proposed Council. There have also been clear signs, in the intervening period, of various follow-up actions on their part to give more emphasis to these matters in their operations. They may find it more feasible to assist PARIS21 operations mainly by cofinancing particular activities than by providing substantial direct financial contributions. Such cofinancing could of course be a great help, but at least a small contribution to the programme's core budget might also reasonably be solicited.
121. The UN Specialized Agencies are not in a position to contribute directly to PARIS21's costs, but their moral support is important in connection with PARIS21's own fund-raising efforts, and they are sometimes able to co finance activities as FAO and UNFPA have done. Our enquiries with the Specialized Agencies suggest that, other than FAO and UNFPA, they are less well informed than they would like to be about PARIS21's current directions – especially the user orientation and support for MDG work. Those more concerned with the health and education sectors appear fully preoccupied with the systems serving the corresponding ministries in the countries. UN Habitat, on the other hand, understandably emphasized the need for more adequate coverage of slum dwellers in the design of censuses and household budget surveys, work normally handled by NSOs themselves. This agency showed clear interest in cooperation with PARIS21.

9. Secretariat

122. The functioning of the PARIS21 programme has clearly been greatly strengthened by the appointment of a full-time Manager. And all those familiar with it whom we encountered in the course of our enquiries were loud in their praises of what he had been able to accomplish during his first year and a half. Nonetheless we are worried that the small staff is overloaded and that this problem will become worse. We also think that the programme has sufficiently proved its value to warrant a somewhat less restrictive attitude towards the staffing of the Secretariat than was appropriate during the first experimental phase.
123. Following the large efforts of 2002 and 2003 the great majority of PRSP countries, as well as of other countries most in need of the programme's assistance, should have been invited to initial PARIS21 workshops, and most will have participated. If present plans for the coming months can be fulfilled, this would leave principally a number of countries in Asia yet to be invited to their first PARIS21 workshop. It is hoped that ADB would be in a position to play a major role in such workshops, with the support of several of the Asian OECD countries. The number of initial seminars for which PARIS21 would be principally responsible in 2004 should be sharply reduced from current levels.
124. If the programme were to be funded at the same level as this year, substantial resources would therefore be released for selective follow-up country visits, regional follow-up workshops, and the annual report on countries' statistical capacity, which were all foreseen in original PARIS21 plans. We have, however, recommended consideration of a number of other initiatives – notably, country visits focused on aid coordination, seminars

attached to occasional high-level policymakers' meetings in Africa which would be brief but require very careful preparation, support – albeit very selective – for national workshops, greater focus in follow-up workshops on early strengthening of key data production and analysis, and some important elaborations of PARIS21's web-site coverage. Individually these initiatives should not be very costly. Together, however, they would amount to a significant additional workload. The recast governing body, and the proposed coordination meetings among bodies involved in training and capacity building in production and use of statistics, would likely give rise to further ideas. But, on the resources side, we understand the team is about to lose the services of a very experienced seconded staff member.

125. It will be possible to calculate staff numbers actually required only after the Steering Committee, with the aid of the Secretariat, has been able to review the various suggestions in this report and decide whether or not to pursue them, and how broadly. But we do believe that, amongst the new senior staff recruited to the programme, there should be at least one or two development economists, with practical experience on the user side of statistics, in the application of results-based management and evidence-based policy making in developing- country circumstances. This would reflect the proposed strengthening of the programme's overall orientation toward policymakers and several of the specific tasks we have proposed be undertaken. To obtain top-class people to fill such posts and to expand the Secretariat's statistician staffing, it would be desirable to start the search for possible candidates as soon as possible, even before a decision could be made on actual numbers required.
126. PARIS21 has made very good use of part-time consultants, taking advantage of its involvement in statistical work in Africa to identify people with outstanding skills and experience that could be relevant to other countries. Development of such a select, informal roster remains very worthwhile and will probably be of growing importance for staffing PARIS21's own activities as well as for use in responding to country enquiries as to who might best be able to help on a specific topic.

E. Summary of Recommendations

The main text of the evaluation report contains a number of specific recommendations for consideration by the Steering Committee of PARIS21. The case for these is carefully argued in the body of the report, and a summary such as this inevitably cannot present the interdependencies of the recommendations. However, the team recognises that it may be helpful to pull out specific actions which the evaluation team considers should be given careful consideration, and these are presented below.

Overall

- PARIS21 should be continued for a further three years, with a more focussed set of objectives drawn up on the basis of an effort to reach wider consensus, especially among concerned development and aid agencies, regarding the progress in statistical capacity that could be realistically achieved within this period.
- It should remain a coordination instrument with the overall goal of developing a culture of evidence-based policy-making and implementation.
- It should build further on bridging the gap between policymakers and statisticians

- It should also focus on overcoming the continuing weakness in donor coordination at country level
- Given its restricted financial and human resources, PARIS21 should focus much of its activities on poor African PRSP countries, and encourage its regional partners to take the lead as much as possible in activities in other regions.

There are four key areas that have been identified as needing specific attention

Reinforcing Follow-up

- At regional level, consider a series of follow-up workshops, to promote country exchange on progress and exchange of experience
- At country level, encourage greater regional body and donor involvement in follow-up support
- Consider limited PARIS21 support to national workshops, which would be largely funded and facilitated by donor or regional bodies

Enhancing country-level coordination

- As part of follow-up activity, undertake selected small country level reviews of aid coordination in support of countries' statistical plans, with a view to providing local advice and also as input into broader aid coordination initiatives.
- Prepare an annual report on progress in statistical capacity based on information provided by the countries themselves
- Offer a page on the PARIS21 website to each interested PRSP country to provide information about current and proposed statistics-related aid projects

Advancing Bottom-line Impact

- Highlight in PARIS21 workshops the core set of country performance indicators as an early priority for incorporation into strategic statistical plans, to encourage greater focus on early improvements on key data.

Deepening the Policy-Maker-Statistician Dialogue

- Organise presentations at international and regional meetings of high-level policymakers, particularly from Africa, to improve understanding and acceptance of the key role for statistics in evidence-based policymaking, and the capacity building implied
- Establish regular meetings with UN and World Bank programmes involved with training of policy makers and data users, in order to improve coordination and raise complementarity

- Consider setting up Task Teams to address:
 - A. Benchmarks for assessing performance of statistical organisations
 - B. Development of local (municipal and district level) capacity for statistics generation
 - C. Focussed reviews of a small sample of existing official publications with a view to defining clearer standards regarding use of statistics
- PARIS21 should also consider producing a document on best practice, or practical measures to foster effective user-producer dialogue based on their own experience and those of other agencies.

Improving PARIS21 governance to achieve these activities

- Divide membership of PARIS21 into an individual and an institutional category
- Expand the Steering Committee into a Council which has equal developing country and OECD country membership, and has greater representation from policymakers
- Recruit one or two development economists to the Secretariat
- Continue to develop an (informal) consultant roster, particularly of experts from developing countries
- Explore possibilities of direct financing and co-financing with regional banks, UN specialised agencies and donors who may not have a strong track record in statistical work. In support of this, prepare regular reports on PARIS21 activities, and programmes, to build awareness.

Annex A: Preparing a New Log Frame

1. We believe that, taking advantage of the experience gained and the priorities that have emerged more clearly, PARIS21 should now pick objectives for the coming three years that will be somewhat more focused and limited than in the past. However, as a development cooperation institution, and more particularly a coordination instrument, these objectives are necessarily ones whose fulfilment will depend not only on its own performance but also on that of the partners whose coordination it is trying to help improve. We believe the objectives should be defined largely in terms of the number of countries expected to achieve certain key capacity improvements or better mechanisms for aid coordination. A main purpose of setting them out explicitly at this stage would be to start the debate among the main partners (and especially, in this case, among the aid agencies) that should lead to consensus on the feasible pace of progress in the different areas and a consequent broad commitment to support PARIS21 in its efforts.²³
2. The development of a new log-frame has important implications for PARIS21 in terms of it itself practising results-based management. It is closely linked in with decisions on the scale of activity to be undertaken, resource availability, and many of the suggestions put forward in this evaluation report, for example, as to the way in which the organisation works with regional bodies. In short, the log-frame should be an integral part of a revisioning exercise to develop a roadmap for PARIS21 for the next three years. It should therefore be undertaken in a collective fashion, principally with members of the steering committee, but possibly including representation from some of the regional development banks and donors such as Sweden and Australia with experience in supporting statistical development.
3. The issues to be decided are wide-reaching, and should be discussed at a short workshop., after opportunity has been given for the bodies concerned to reflect on what are reasonable to seek for the developing/transitional world to achieve in terms of improvements in statistics over the next three years, and how this could translate into specific objectives and targets. Development of a new log-frame is a very useful way of structuring such an exercise and it could be useful to have a log-frame expert facilitate part of the workshop.
4. As an input into this process, the evaluation team have developed, for consideration, a draft logical framework for the forthcoming period. This reflects the understanding gained during the evaluation, and an assessment of a viable way forward, given the resources likely to be available, both financial and human. However, this should only be for guidance, and the suggestions should be validated or adapted within a workshop, as indicated above. It might be useful to circulate the draft log-frame before the workshop, to give participants time to consider and react to this. In particular they should decide whether the three outcomes selected are the right one of which to focus attention, whether the specific targets suggested are reasonable, and whether it would be possible to make them more concrete and quantified.
5. It retains the Goal and Purpose statements of the Log-Frame that was prepared in 2001 since they continue to define well the programme's overall objectives. It also retains much of the 2001 language in its description of Outcomes sought, but it selects only three out of the seven that were included at that time and complements each with detailed statements of measurable objectives, means of verification and assumptions implicit. These outcomes

²³ Howard White "A Drop in the Ocean ? The International Development Targets as a Basis for Performance Measurement"

are dependent, not only on the activities of PARIS21, but also of its development partners, and are subject to the risks identified within the log-frame.

6. The Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) have been drawn up in such a way as to maintain PARIS21's principal, but not exclusive, focus on the PRSP countries. This recognizes that the needs of these countries are particularly great, and that they have more limited resources to meet them. But there is a considerable number of other countries whose statistical systems are severely lagging. A recent review of 125 low- and middle-income countries with populations of more than one million systematically graded them, on the basis of IMF and World Bank statistical publications, for adherence to key international statistical methods and accepted standards of good practice. Of the 60 countries not reaching the mid-point score, as many as 16 were not PRSP countries, half of them countries in the Middle East.²⁴ This would justify some assistance, as for example the proposed Arab states workshop, but should be seen as very much second priority to the PRSP countries who are both numerous and needy.
7. An implication of setting targets in terms of the number of countries expected to reach some given standard is to encourage a degree of selectivity on the part of the aid community, to concentrate more resources on countries which show, or could be expected to develop, serious commitment to reaching the standards specified. This is entirely intentional. But for a programme such as that of PARIS21, designed mainly to stir up thinking and efforts towards modernization, it needs thoughtful and careful application. On the one hand, the programme should aim at being very inclusive, inviting all countries in a region to participate in initial and follow-up workshops, so that the laggards can benefit from hearing what their neighbours are being able to accomplish. On the other had, when it comes to other follow-up effort and additional invitations to participate in seminars, the effort does need to be concentrated on those showing signs of receptivity.
8. Once PARIS21's governing body has agreed on the targets that it would be reasonable to set for the forthcoming period, and has determined which techniques for pursuing them should be used, it would probably be useful for the Secretariat to prepare a more detailed level of log-frame analysis. It could set measurable objectives for the different activities envisaged, in terms of types of reports to be produced and numbers of participants of different groups. Quantified objectives could also be established in terms of intermediate outputs from the combined efforts of PARIS21 and its workshop participants, such as new indicators regularly reported, user surveys carried out, and Action Plans and Strategic Plans produced and followed. If progress on the OVIs now chosen is sufficiently good that it is determined in 2006 to further extend the programme, it would hopefully then be possible to adopt more substantive OVIs. They should aim at specifying the dimensions of capacity to produce and to use statistics that interim applications of the Statistical Capacity Building Indicators, and assessments of countries' arrangements for monitoring of development, had shown to be most needed for strengthening Results-Based Management.

²⁴ World Bank, 2002. Building Statistical Capacity to Monitor Development Progress, Table 1.

PARIS21 – Proposed Logical Framework 2003-2006

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions/ Risks
<p>Goal: Develop a culture of transparent, evidence-based policy making and implementation which serves to improve Government accountability and effectiveness</p> <p>Purpose: Better statistics and statistical analysis available to and used by national and international decision-makers and civil society</p>	<p>Demonstrable increase in the political and financial support for evidence-based policy making and policy relevant statistics</p> <p>Improvement in the indicators for monitoring progress toward the Millennium Development Goals</p> <p>Evidence-based pro-poor policies implemented with widespread agreement of all stakeholders</p> <p>Better availability of developing and transition country statistics</p>	<p>Government reports and publications</p> <p>Progress reports to UN General Assembly</p> <p>Government reports, Civil society and donor assessments, published national and international statistics, PARIS21 performance review</p>	<p>Political support can be maintained</p> <p>Evidence accepted and acted upon</p> <p>Improved statistics used to formulate better economic and social development policies.</p> <p>More and better-targeted resources provide better statistics</p>
<p>Outcomes:</p> <p>1. Strengthened capacity</p>	<p>Three-year Targets (i.e., by September 30, 2006:)</p> <p>a. Raise to 80% the share of IDA countries regularly collecting, and using in the management of government policies and public expenditures, data on the 7 (out of 15)</p>	<p>Relevant Annual Reports of UNDP, IDA and EU DG</p>	<p>Continued spread of Results-Based Management philosophies in developing countries, and sustained coordination in support of MDGs among development</p>

An Evaluation of PARIS21

		<p>progress in build-up of statistical capacities, country by country</p>	
<p>3. More effective donor collaboration, leading to more efficient use of official development assistance relating to generation and use of statistics</p>	<p>a. In 75% of IDA countries aid agencies operating there have effectively assigned responsibility to one of their number as lead donor for statistics who assists the country's periodic meetings for concerned donors and data-demanders, keeps abreast of the evolving situation and helps secure timely response from donors to national priorities</p> <p>b. In 80% of the countries which have established an effective strategic planning process for statistics, the donors involved in statistical work in the country are designing their activities to support plan implementation</p> <p>c. As a pilot operation for subsequent broader replication, in at least 3 IDA countries donors have begun to implement a collaborative approach to support for implementation of the country's NSS strategic plan, undertaking joint appraisal and follow-up, and accepting a unified progress report that includes the detail needed by each donor for components supported</p> <p>d. 60% of IDA countries are making effective use of the country page assigned to them on the</p>	<p>PARIS21 annual report to ECOSOC on build-up of statistical capacities, country by country</p> <p>PARIS21 reviews of capacity building progress and reports to SPA</p> <p>Resultant multi-donor reports and projects</p>	<p>Increasing clarity and substance of recipient countries' identification of priorities in statistical development, and greater readiness of all foreign donors to give higher preference to those priorities, when soundly worked out, than to their own bureaucratic or special-interest requirements</p>

An Evaluation of PARIS21

	<p>PARIS21 web-site for briefly summarizing (i) all foreign assistance currently being received by the NSS, (ii) additional tasks for which foreign assistance is sought, and (iii) current state of discussions with donors who have shown interest in supporting the country's work in statistics</p>	<p>PARIS21 web-site, staff field visits and donor experience</p>	
--	---	--	--

Annex B: Terms of Reference for Evaluators

1. History & Purpose of PARIS21

The PARIS21 Consortium was established in 1999 as a partnership to develop a culture of transparent, evidence-based policy making and implementation which serves to improve Government accountability and effectiveness. Specifically PARIS21 promotes better statistics and statistical analysis in developing countries for use by national and international decision-makers and civil society, through the promotion and facilitation of a strategically planned approach to developing statistical systems. The role of PARIS21 is primarily that of influencing the partners in national statistical systems to want to make changes in the way they produce and use statistics. The countries themselves, with the support of international partners and donors, are expected to follow through in implementing changes. Advocacy is also required for those promoting results-based management to ensure that additional support is directed to strengthening statistical systems for the production of information required for monitoring purposes.

The partnership of policymakers, statisticians, and users of statistical information has so far promoted advocacy for better statistics and for their more effective use in monitoring and developing policy. The work of the Consortium is carried out by a small Secretariat based in Paris, and by partner agencies. There are three distinct areas of work:

1. Regional workshops and country follow-up action aimed at bringing together those who produce statistics with their intended users, to agree proposals for strengthening results-based management.
2. Task Teams producing tools, methodologies and information for use in PARIS21 work.
3. The development of information, materials and resources for use by Consortium members and others.

So far activities have included the sharing of best practices, production of advocacy materials, assessment of statistical capacity, and the promotion of a strategic approach to statistical management. Action has started in Africa, South America and Asia with further work programmed for those continents, and for the Arab States, the Pacific, Central America and the Caribbean.

2. Governance

The work of the Consortium is guided by a steering committee comprising representatives of developing and transition countries from six regions of the world (6 representatives), bilateral donors (6), and the UN, OECD, World Bank, IMF, and EC. A member of the UN Statistical Commission Bureau chairs the Steering Committee, currently South Africa. The PARIS21 Consortium meets annually in Paris, and members of the Steering Committee are elected electronically by their respective constituencies.

The Steering Committee of June 2002 agreed that PARIS21 should be reviewed and evaluated in full during 2003. The review will be related to the goals of PARIS21, including:

- more effective user–producer dialogue and improved collaboration between all partners,
- development and use of integrated and comprehensive country plans for the production, analysis and use of statistics in national development and poverty reduction strategies,
- increased support and demand for statistics from developing countries and donor agencies.

3. Context for the Evaluation

The initiative started its work following the meeting in October 1999, which established PARIS21, and agreed the long-term objectives of;

- Develop evidence-based culture for setting and monitoring policy.
- Develop well-managed statistical systems, utilising available resources efficiently

Formal proposals on the operation of the partnership, its task teams and governance by Steering Committee were not made until June 2000 at the first Consortium meeting. The Steering Committee agreed the logframe for the initiative and the governance arrangements in June 2001 after extensive consultations. This agreed logframe is attached, the goal is; “*Develop a culture of transparent, evidence-based policy making and implementation which serves to improve Government accountability and effectiveness*”.

The first regional workshop for developing countries took place in December 2000, and follow-up action has been taking place among several countries who attended the first workshops. There are now two full years of work to evaluate. It may be premature to look for impact and outcomes, however the evaluators are asked to consider the activities and outputs undertaken by PARIS21, the links to the operational agencies following the action at country level, and to comment on the likelihood of these achieving the goals of the initiative.

3.1 Direct Measures

The evaluation will consider outcomes directly under the control of the initiative. These include effective funding and implementation of the work plan; follow-up actions implemented by countries, donors or Trust Funds; requests for assistance with follow-up action; strategic planning processes initiated; and outputs from task teams and the secretariat valued and used etc.

3.2 Broader Outcomes

It will be difficult to assess at such an early stage of the initiative. There is also an attribution problem and the evaluators may have difficulty disentangling the effects of PARIS21 from the changing external environment of results focused poverty reduction strategies. The evaluators are asked to consider the likely outcomes of the activities undertaken. The expected outcomes would include the influence exerted on senior decision-makers to give greater priority to statistics and results-based management; greater commitment by developing and transition countries to better statistics; and better co-ordination by donors in their statistical capacity-building efforts around country-owned statistical strategies.

3.3 The Process

As PARIS21 is primarily an influencing and advocacy initiative, the method by which the outputs are delivered is important. For example developing country recipients have already indicated that they value the sharing of examples of good practice across national boundaries, and the participation of nationals in consultant activities. South-south co-operation and peer pressures have been used as methods of delivering PARIS21 outputs and influencing stakeholders.

3.4 Partnership

PARIS21 was among the pioneers of putting partnership principles into action. There are several dimensions to the partnership.

- Statisticians (technical) and Decision Makers
- Developed Countries in the North and Less Developed Countries in the South

An Evaluation of PARIS21

- Donor collaboration and co-ordination,

Each has different objectives and needs from PARIS21, and each of these partnerships has its own tension. One clear feature from informal feedback is that collaboration between partners is becoming increasingly valued, both at the national and the international level. In the Consortium the following have all been mentioned in a positive light: the south having an equal voice with the north; the partnerships that are developing between countries in the south; inter-agency working in task teams.

The drawbacks are also evident. Partners in agencies from the north and the south often prefer to continue with existing programmes and methodologies rather than adapt to joint working arrangements. Arranging follow-up of activities initiated by PARIS21 has been problematic where donor support is required. The timeframes for countries wishing to take action and the mechanisms in place to provide that follow-up are not well synchronised. For the Secretariat, the different 'masters' often send conflicting messages which are hard to resolve.

4. Scope of the Evaluation

4.1 Evaluation of PARIS21

The evaluators will be asked to consider the classic concerns of evaluation, i.e. relevance, governance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact etc. These will be developed in section 5.

4.2 Suggest Future Directions

In addition the evaluators will be asked to make proposals for improving the effectiveness of PARIS21. These will be used to develop plans for how to continue the work of PARIS21 beyond 2003. The evaluators are asked to consider the original vision for PARIS21, and following the evaluation, to reflect on its development and appropriateness for 2003 and beyond. The external environment has moved on from 1999 with many influential international policy-makers now recognising the importance of monitoring and the weakness of the supporting statistical systems. There is now a real opportunity to promote and support national statistical systems. The evaluators will be asked to identify the risks and the opportunities posed by the new environment and to suggest amendments to the vision and strategy of PARIS21. The risks and opportunities identified would be used in the months following to identify a new vision and framework for PARIS21.

4.3 Governance Arrangements

The review should also include a review of the governance arrangements, and consultations with stakeholders on the location of PARIS21, currently housed by the OECD. In the past alternatives have been considered for basing PARIS21 with other agencies. The concerns are to maintain neutrality, maximise links with stakeholders and to avoid agency bias.

4.4 Links to the Evaluation of the Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building

To complement PARIS21's advocacy and facilitation role, the World Bank Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building established a fund whose contributors correspond closely with the funders of PARIS21. This fund was partly intended to follow-up PARIS21 activity with operational support to countries. It has been proposed that the evaluation of the Trust Fund be carried out at the same time as that of PARIS21 and that the respective evaluation teams liaise with one another. The evaluators might include questions relating to the Trust Fund in their interviews with stakeholders, these could be the funders of the Trust Fund or the beneficiaries. Stakeholders in South Africa and the Southern African Development community are examples of where PARIS21 has initiated a Trust Fund programme.

5. Topics for Consideration by Evaluation

The Project Framework for PARIS21, which was agreed by the Steering Committee in June 2001, is attached for reference. The evaluators may wish to consider whether the Outputs to Purpose in the existing framework are being achieved, and if these are still relevant.

The questions below will require full elaboration and justification by the evaluators. The topics in Annex 1 supplement the issues described below and are intended to serve as background and guidance for the evaluators, to enable them to grasp quickly the scope and activities of PARIS21.

5.1 Relevance: The extent to which the programme is consistent with the policies and priorities of each of the major stakeholders.

- 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 major stakeholders' priorities?
- Have the activities adapted to cope with changing priorities?

5.2 Efficiency: The relationship between the outputs achieved and the inputs used.

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

5.3 Effectiveness: The extent to which an intervention achieves its objectives at the Purpose and Goal level. In the case of PARIS21 to evaluators will need to consider whether the activities and the follow-up actions in countries and partner agencies are likely to lead to the goal being met.

- Have countries implemented follow-up actions?
- Have strategic planning processes for 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 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?

5.4 Initial Effects: All changes (positive or negative) triggered by PARIS21 intervention.

- Has communication increased between decision-makers and statistics producers?
- Is the commitment by policy-makers in developing and transition countries to statistics likely to improve?
- Are there indications of better co-ordination by donors in their statistical capacity-building efforts around country-owned statistical strategies?
- Is increased funding available for statistics from donors and country governments?.
- Is there evidence of countries initiating their own statistical plans?

5.5 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.

- Is increased collaboration and partnership between agencies observed?
- Is expertise being shared across national borders in developing & transition countries to accelerate lesson learning?
- Are PARIS21 initiatives being taken-up by other agencies?
- Are Countries making progress independently or with partners on actions facilitated by PARIS21?

5.6 Governance:

F. 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.

- Have policy-makers and statisticians had an appropriate voice and participation in the governance of PARIS21?
- Is the balance of influence between donor agencies and partner countries correct?
- Are the Reporting arrangements to the Consortium sufficient?

Is the membership of the Consortium balanced?

6. *Management of the Evaluation and Responsibilities*

A small reference group will oversee the evaluation and to maintain quality, on behalf of the Steering Committee of PARIS21. This reference group will agree the final terms of reference for the consultants, review the tenders and make recommendations to the OECD on the selection of the successful consultant. They will maintain contact periodically with the evaluators during the exercise, and provide guidance where necessary. The reference group will approve the evaluators' final report before its submission to the Steering Committee.

The two representatives with experience in evaluation will be invited to join the reference group; this will bring knowledge, credibility and impartiality to the exercise. In addition to these two experts, a member of the PARIS21 Secretariat and two representatives (1 northern agency and 1 southern representative) from the PARIS21 Steering Committee, plus an evaluation expert from the World Bank will form the reference group to oversee the PARIS21 evaluation.

Consultant evaluators will take on the work and day-to-day management of the process. They will provide an experienced evaluator and may hire experts in development and statistics to undertake the work.

7. *Methodology*

The consultants are expected to propose the full methodology in their tender, including the timetable and travel plans. The following should be included;

- Interviews with members of the Steering Committee, including the current Chair and the past Chair, and the Chair of the DAC.
- Interviews with members of the Secretariat.
- Interviews with task team convenors.
- Interviews with a number of current and potential funders of PARIS21.

- Interviews with some suppliers of technical co-operation in statistics.
- Interviews with some participants of regional workshops in Africa (anglophone & francophone), Asia and Latin America.
- Interviews with the chief statisticians and key policy makers in countries where PARIS21 has carried out follow-up and others where partners have implemented follow-up.
- Review of PARIS21 information, films, meeting reports, interview a sample of recipients.
- Consortium membership records and meeting participants lists.
- PARIS21 accounts.
- PARIS21 activity reports.
- Completed Indicators of Statistical Capacity questionnaires.
- Numbers of statistical plans embarked on in countries.

8. Timing and Cost of the Evaluation

The results are required by the end of May 2003 in order to provide the Steering Committee, funders and other partners with an assessment of the initiative to date and the direction which any continuation of the programme should take. PARIS21 has a life, which is due to expire at the end of 2003, the evaluation results will be reported to the Steering Committee Meeting in June 2003, and if agreed a new framework will be prepared for future work.

90,000 euros is available for the evaluation, selection of evaluators will be by means of competitive tender according to OECD's financial regulations. The tender documents should include proposals for a methodology that gives voice to the different constituencies of PARIS21 and involves interviews with both the funders and beneficiaries of PARIS21 activities. Preference will be given to tender proposals showing strong competence in the areas of development and evaluation.

Tenders should include the following:

- A detailed work plan outlining timelines, activities and travel plans
- Methodology for the work.
- Budget indicating separately the components for fees and travel.

G. 9. Reporting

The evaluators should prepare a full report in April 2003, for review and approval by the reference group. The evaluators should present their findings by report, and in person to the PARIS21 Steering Committee in June 2003.

Annex 1 – Suggested Issues for Consideration

H. Issues for Consideration:

The activities listed below have been suggested by members of the Secretariat and Steering Committee of PARIS21 and should not exclude the consideration of any other issues, which the evaluators discover to be important as a result of their evaluation processes:

1. INPUTS

1. Review PARIS21 funding and resources, determine if expenditures are appropriate to its work plan and objectives.
2. Comment on the Secretariat's strategy for securing funding that is sufficient for its work plan. This will involve consulting with actual and potential donors and identifying obstacles and opportunities.
3. Review the agreed PARIS21 workplan's relevance to PARIS21's stated objectives.
4. Review the implementation of the PARIS21 work plan and determine if it is being implemented on time, within budget, and according to its mandate.

2. OUTPUTS

5. Review the contents of the regional and national workshops and the process for influencing participants, and the extent to which national and regional workshop recommendations are followed-up by participants and result in changes to the wider national statistical systems.
6. Review the operations and outputs of task teams, and if the products are valued by potential users.
7. Review the advocacy materials, newsletters and information offered by PARIS21 to members, and ascertain whether they meet the requirements of members.

IMPACTS

8. Determine with developing country recipients whether PARIS21 activities and products have contributed to changes in policy for statistical governance, an increased demand for statistics, and better use of existing statistics and information, especially in PRSPs.
9. Ascertain if co-ordination is improving among the stakeholders in the statistical system at the international level and in countries where PARIS21 has been active.
10. Determine if there is increased evidence of countries adopting strategic plans for statistics, to supply the information required by country strategies.

An Evaluation of PARIS21

11. Determine whether processes initiated by PARIS21 have been supported by agencies with an operational mandate.
12. Consider the evidence that additional resources are made available to statistics as a result of PARIS21 action.

3. PROCESS

13. Review the operations of the partnership and recommend improvements in the north-south dialogue, and review the Consortium membership and make recommendations on its development.
14. Review the Steering Committee working process, its composition and the modalities of the election to the Steering Committee.
15. Review Consortium membership participation in PARIS21 activities to determine if demand and membership are increasing.
16. Review task team processes, and report on whether these are effective in building collaboration and co-ordination among the international agencies involved.
17. Review whether PARIS21 activities are developing national processes for statistical planning in a manner which is country led and consensual.

4. FUTURE

18. Provide insight on how PARIS21's activities can better lead to positive outcomes and impacts on the capacity of countries to produce statistics and utilise them to both develop and monitor policy. (E.g. an increased use of statistics in decision making, the creation of nationally owned poverty monitoring or statistical strategies, increased donor co-ordination and funding for statistical capacity building.)
19. Propose detailed recommendations on how PARIS21 might improve its performance in pursuit of its objectives beyond 2003.
20. Identify the risks that PARIS21 will face in implementing its vision.
21. Review the governance structure of PARIS21 and propose improvements to widen the participation of non-statisticians and to increase the participation in and 'ownership' of PARIS21 by its members.

An Evaluation of PARIS21

PARIS21 - Project Framework – (31 May 2001) Amended to add activities.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions/ Risks
<p>Goal: Develop a culture of transparent, evidence-based policy making and implementation which serves to improve Government accountability and effectiveness.</p>	<p>Demonstrable increase in the political and financial support for evidence-based policy making and policy relevant statistics.</p> <p>Improvement in the indicators for monitoring progress towards the Millennium/International Development Goals.</p>	<p>Government reports and publications.</p> <p>Progress reports to (i.a.) UN General Assembly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political support can be maintained. • Evidence accepted and acted upon.
<p>Purpose: Better statistics and statistical analysis available to and used by national and international decision-makers and civil society.</p>	<p>Evidence-based pro-poor policies implemented with widespread agreement of all stakeholders.</p> <p>Better availability of developing and transition country statistics.</p>	<p>Government reports.</p> <p>Civil society and donor assessments.</p> <p>Published national and international statistics.</p> <p>PARIS21 Performance Review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved statistics used to formulate better economic and social development policies. • More and better-targeted resources provide better statistics.
<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased political support, funding and demand for information systems to underpin poverty reduction strategies both nationally and amongst donors and multilateral institutions. 2. Strengthened capacity to produce, analyse and use statistical and other information amongst public sector, academic and civil society organisations. <p>PARIS21 partnership principles and UN guidelines for technical co-operation for statistics applied at global, regional and country level.</p>	<p>Advocacy tools developed and operational. A measurable increase in the level of resources devoted to statistics by both donors and national governments.</p> <p>Measurable improvement in the quality and availability of data for policy-making, using (e.g.) SDDS, GDDS, and DQAF.</p> <p>Informal peer review</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient national and external resources made available for statistics. • Acceptance of transparent poverty information systems. • Agreement reached on indicators of statistical capacity.

An Evaluation of PARIS21

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions/ Risks
3. Effective user-producer dialogue processes established.	Guidance or good practice on the essential features of the institutional arrangements designed to support sustainable dialogue between users and producers.		
4. Comprehensive strategy covering the information needed nationally (and internationally) to inform, implement and monitor policies.	Guidance developed on the format of statistical development plans (including sequenced information strategies) and minimum data requirements.		
5. Improved collaboration between partners undertaking statistical activities and interventions nationally, regionally and internationally.	Agreed country-level mechanism for donor co-ordination for the agreed statistical capacity building strategy in place.		Willingness to co-ordinate.
6. More effective donor collaboration, leading to more efficient use of official development assistance.	Guidance on good practice on in-country donor co-ordination and on open dialogue between donors and national governments with respect to support for statistical systems and future plans.		

An Evaluation of PARIS21

Activities:	Inputs:		
<p>a) Facilitate global knowledge development through the outputs of focused task teams and annual consortium meetings.</p> <p>b) Disseminate relevant task team outputs and other materials: including advocacy materials, indicators of statistical capacity, guidelines on good practice, success stories and lessons learned.</p> <p>c) Increase the effectiveness of information sharing amongst donors and developing countries to assist better co-ordination and guide implementation.</p> <p>d) Accelerate the roll-out of regional and sub-regional workshops and work with countries and regional organisations to identify national data gaps and information priorities. Support development of national and regional programmes in support of statistical capacity building for implementation by national governments and development partners including Trust Funds.</p> <p>e) Support effective, country-owned and coherent regional follow-up activities - including advising on mechanisms for sharing information, improve data dissemination, availability and analysis and promoting the development and</p>	<p>See Work Plan and Financing Plan.</p>	<p>Evaluation Activity Number</p> <p>Inputs # 1, 2, 3, 4</p> <p>Outputs # 5, 6, 7</p>	

An Evaluation of PARIS21

<p>retention of expertise within regional partnerships, and supporting the mobilisation of resources.</p> <p>f) Work to Increase donor and national funding for statistical capacity building interventions, particularly those in support of poverty reduction strategies and assist countries and regional organisations to access Trust Fund and other financing sources for activities supporting PARIS21 objectives.</p>			
---	--	--	--

PARIS 21 EVALUATION

INCEPTION REPORT

April 14th 2003

Oxford Policy Management

PARIS21 Evaluation: Inception Report

1. This inception report is based on a brief review of key documents supplied by the PARIS21 secretariat and its web-site, a visit by a senior member of the evaluation team to the secretariat (March 24-25) and a number of discussions with relevant parts of the World Bank (Development Data Group, WBI and Operations Evaluation Department). It sets out PARIS21's history and the key evaluation questions that arise, the overall approach proposed for the evaluation, the main work components envisaged, a preliminary outline of the final evaluation report, and an assignment of the tasks among members of the evaluation team along with key dates. The report has benefited from comments by the Secretariat and the Evaluation Reference Group on an earlier draft.

PARIS21 History and the Key Evaluation Issues

2. International efforts to improve the pace and pattern of progress in the developing countries, and especially to reduce continuing high levels of poverty, led to the adoption in the 1990s of many specific targets for broad social and economic indicators, including the International Development Targets (later transformed, with elaborations, into the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)). Work to give effective meaning to these targets at the national level brought to the fore, however, the long underappreciated problem of the weakness – and in many of the poorest countries, most in need of development progress, continuing erosion – of statistical services. The international aid community convoked a major conference in November 1999, cochaired by the Chairmen of the OECD Development Assistance Committee and of the UN Statistics Commission and attended by representatives of both developing and OECD countries, to focus on practical response to this problem.
3. The conference discussions emphasized the need for preparation of country-specific long-range Strategic Statistical Master Plans, the implementation of which could attract and steer foreign support for real improvement of countries' own statistical capacities. It was agreed to establish a Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21) as a consortium of interested countries and agencies. The Consortium was to continue the dialogue – and encouragement to better inter-agency cooperation – started by the conference in order “to promote well co-ordinated, effective statistical initiatives at the national, regional and international levels.”
4. The Consortium held its first meeting some six months later, in June 2000, and decided to focus efforts initially on support for countries preparing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), using the techniques of regional Workshops aimed at increasing country policymakers' appreciation of the need for real improvement in statistical services and of Task Teams that would draw representatives from interested statistical organizations to find shared solutions to important problems in statistical capacity building. By the end of 2002, the Consortium had obtained cumulative commitments of support of some \$5 million, approximately 40% from UK, 20% from the World Bank, nearly 10% each from France and Netherlands, and smaller amounts from Switzerland, Sweden, Eurostat, Ireland, the EU, Norway and Japan.

5. Other important initiatives in pursuit of the objectives agreed at the 1999 conference have also been taken. Late in 2000 the World Bank established a Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB). PARIS21 is a member of the consultative group which governs the operations of the Fund and has helped some countries prepare submissions for TFSCB support. Besides some 30 projects in developing countries, this trust fund has also provided support for the start of another World Bank activity closely related to PARIS21 objectives: the Poverty Analysis Initiative in the World Bank Institute (WBI), which is carrying out a programme of some 20 seminars per year aimed at building capacity for analysis of poverty – thereby also building demand for generation of better data. The UN and UNDP are organizing regional forums on promotion and measurement of the MDGs and preparation of country reports on progress. The IMF is creating a network of Regional Technical Assistance Centers in Africa to improve coordination of capacity-building technical assistance for PRSPs, including the statistical underpinning for their preparation and management.
6. PARIS21 activities were strongly reinforced by the June 2001 meeting of its Interim Steering Committee, which approved a Logframe for the programme, required clearer work plans from Task Teams and agreed to a small increase in the secretariat, notably including for the first time appointment of a full-time manager. Of the total accumulated expenditure of \$2.2 million up to 30 September 2002, slightly more than half occurred in the year since 1 October 2001, and expenditure in the year that began 1 October 2002 may double again, to about \$2.2 million. The secretariat has continued to play an important role in information exchange and stimulation of contacts among agencies concerned with statistical capacity building in the developing countries (some \$910,000 of total expenditure up to 30/9/02 was for Information Exchange activities and Consortium and Steering Committee meetings). Other main expenditures have been on workshops in the developing countries (some \$740,000), with support for task teams in second place (some \$365,000).
7. The pace of workshop activity has steadily increased, from one in 2000 to three in 2001 and five in 2002, with a further increase in programme scale envisaged in 2003. Well over half of the workshops completed to date have been for Sub-Saharan Africa, but 2002 also saw the first workshops organized for sub-regions in Asia and Latin America (see Annex 9 for details). In 2002 one of the original task teams (Advocacy) was wound up (since it had generated important products that needed to be followed up in the future by the programme and the secretariat as a whole), another produced a major report (Statistical Capacity Building Indicators), a new Team was created specifically to focus on ways to improve the quality of data relating to the MDGs, and agreement was reached for establishment of another new team, on Tools and Methods, including in particular those for measuring country attainments with respect to governance and human rights.
8. PARIS21 regional workshops have given important emphasis to preparation, by participating country teams, of Action Plans for improvement of statistical services, and better use of the data produced, particularly for preparation and monitoring of PRSPs. But it is also fully recognized that longer-term Strategic Plans, as discussed at the international conference in 1999, are badly needed. Some of the grants already made from the World Bank-run TFSCB have been specifically for the preparation of such plans in some of the poorest countries. A high priority of the World Bank and the Trust Fund is rapidly to increase the number of poor countries with satisfactory strategic plans that can give direction to the best use of countries' own statistical resources and of the help available from outside sources. A very important role is seen for PARIS21 and its workshops in building country recognition of the need for such plans and

knowledge of the availability of TFSCB grants to help prepare them.²⁵ To support the actual implementation of domestic capacity building for generation and application of statistical data, the Bank is now envisaging a dedicated lending facility, tentatively entitled STATCAP, to supplement the resources made available from national budgets and by other aid suppliers.

9. This brief summary history of PARIS21 makes clear that besides the effectiveness of the programme in delivering the services it was asked to provide, the evaluation has also to keep constantly in mind more fundamental questions:
- Does the experience to date vindicate the judgment by the 1999 conference that improvement of cooperation among the aid agencies, international and national statistical organizations, in both OECD and poorer countries, was one of the keys to strengthening statistical capacity in the developing countries?
 - Are workshops that stimulate dialogue between countries' economic policymakers and chief statisticians about results-based management, and its data requirements, empowering the key drivers of change in the area of statistical services, or have others also to be brought in, implying the need for other complementary initiatives, some of which may also be suitable for assignment to PARIS21?

The initiatives that were taken by the 1999 conference and the consortium it created have to be seen as thoughtful responses to questions that have only become more important with the passage of time but remain complex and without unequivocal answer: how to generate demand and commitment, in countries suffering from great shortage of resources, to sustained development of capacities to generate and use the data that is essential for good management of economic and social development. The evaluation will not be able to provide conclusive answers to these fundamental questions, but it should be able to find some preliminary evidence that may help refine objectives and programmes for the future.

10. Since 1999 awareness of the importance of generating better and more timely statistical data in the developing countries has greatly increased – not only for monitoring progress on the MDGs but also for achieving better public-sector accountability and making democracy more real. At the same time, other new international initiatives, such as those mentioned above, have been taken to promote and respond to this demand. The evaluation will seek to identify the lessons from PARIS21's experience to date regarding the role that it might be particularly well placed to play, in the new environment, in helping to improve the international community's response to the needs. It will thus seek to identify the elements that might be included in a Logframe that should be able to be more focused than the one produced in 2001 and might serve as the basis for consideration of possible extension of the programme beyond 2003. In light of those conclusions it will also seek to identify any changes in PARIS21's governance arrangements, and in its institutional affiliation and physical location, which might be worth considering to facilitate implementation of the roles identified for the programme.

²⁵ World Bank (2002) "Building Statistical Capacity to Monitor Development Progress," Information paper prepared for the World Bank Board of Executive Directors.

Approach to Evaluation Proposed

11. The 2001 Logframe provides one important basis for the evaluation, because it portrayed the consensus at the time as to appropriate directions of the programme, and it may prove to provide a structure that is helpful for generating a Logframe for the future. It defined the overall purpose of PARIS21 as “Better statistics and statistical analysis available to, and used by, national and international decision-makers and civil society,” and it identified seven broad outputs to be expected from the programme:
 1. Increased political support, funding and demand for information systems to underpin poverty reduction strategies
 2. Strengthened capacity to produce, analyse and use statistical and other information
 3. Partnership principles applied at global, regional and country levels
 4. Effective user-producer dialogue processes established
 5. Comprehensive strategy covering information needed for policy purposes
 6. Improved collaboration between partners engaging in statistical work
 7. More effective donor collaboration, and more efficient use of aid.

The Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) chosen for assessing the outputs suggest that direct results on the ground (ie., progress in application at the country and regional levels) were expected in the case of the first three outputs, and that the guidance or best practices stressed for the others were also envisaged not merely as advisory guidelines but as actual implementations in country and regional context. All are sufficiently concrete that their application at country and regional level could in principle be checked, though with a simpler factual base in some cases than others. The extent of progress that would actually be achieved on most of these “outputs”, and especially some such as outputs 2 and 5, would, however, obviously depend very much on complementary actions by many other bodies, but no indicators were identified which would capture more precisely the contribution that might be expected from a programme intended only to undertake activities such as information exchange, organization of workshops and assembly of task teams. It is also unclear what time frame and country coverage were in mind for the fruits of the work to become apparent.

12. We believe that, with all but the first workshop having occurred within the last two years, and most over the past year, it is unreasonable to expect to be able to find much evidence of major changes in government policies or budgets already accomplished as a result, in large part, of PARIS21 activities. After all, the object of the programme has been to change minds – towards adoption of results-based economic management, towards increased national budgets for statistical services, towards work in partnership. The Logframe statements of output are more useful as indicators of the direction towards which the programme was intended to help, in situations where movement was difficult, but where there were other influences simultaneously at work in the same direction, and others no doubt in a contrary direction.
13. The evaluation has therefore to proceed mainly on the basis of recall-based interviews, regarding changes in thinking and intentions – perhaps supplemented by incipient

evidence of potential government actions. And great care has to be taken to reach cautious and objective judgments as to the extent of influence that PARIS21 activity may have had on the apparent changes in thinking and intention.

14. Since the changes sought are difficult for most countries to bring about, and workshops and similar promotional activities can hardly be expected to convince all participants, and their governments, to pursue the advice dispensed, we believe it may be most useful to concentrate main attention on countries which do show signs of overcoming inertia and taking follow-up action, in order to learn why and how they did so – without losing from view the larger perspective of all the countries invited, including those which do not currently show signs of being able to overcome the obstacles to action.

Main Work Components Envisaged

15. To verify the cautious expectations just described, and to get a first view of the possible impacts of the work accomplished on the countries that have participated in the workshops organized by PARIS21, we propose to carry out a brief review with the Secretariat, as kindly suggested in its March 27 note 'Consultants Guidelines for the Evaluation,' of its impressions as to countries which have made progress and those which appear not to have done so. In those discussions we will seek indications of believed actual or incipient impacts on aspects such as the following:
 - Increase in government resources devoted to statistics
 - Progress in developing strategic plan for statistics
 - Better dissemination of existing information
 - Stronger producer-use dialogue
 - New statistical initiatives to meet PRSP needs
 - Improved application of external support
 - Trends, if available, in statistical capacity indicators
16. Helped by this initial overview, we will then proceed to the main work of systematically interviewing a broad range of beneficiaries and stakeholders. While interviews are best carried out personally, normally on a one-to-one basis, we believe focus groups may sometimes also be useful, and we propose to cover somewhat larger numbers of stakeholders than we could directly meet by using telephone and e-mail. We have thus prepared sets of questions which may simply be kept in mind in the course of an interview, or may be mailed in advance, or may equally be sent (in some cases with modifications such as inclusion of multiple-choice answers, to simplify responses and analysis thereof) with a request for an e-mailed response.
17. We believe that the main focus of our enquiries should be with a large number of participants in the workshops PARIS21 has organized, since this activity has accounted for a large share of total expenditure and it is the one for which it is hardest for the supporting agencies to form a balanced picture of impact. Moreover, these participants most likely constitute a significant part of the clientele reached by PARIS21 documentation and information exchange services. But we also propose to carry out interviews for a number of other groups and categories of people and agency to get a

more rounded view of what PARIS21 has been able to do and what it may yet be able to do. Our questionnaires seek to elicit understanding not only about the direct effect of activities to date but also more generally about the dynamics of change in statistical services in the developing countries.

18. The following paragraphs enumerate the categories of people and agencies whose views we propose to seek, give a preliminary list of such interlocutors where it would otherwise be unclear, and give a reference to the relevant annex giving the list of questions envisaged. Since there are so many groups of stakeholders important to the programme, and the time available for the evaluation is quite limited, it will be possible in few, if any, cases to interview (even electronically) all members of each group; the hope will be to obtain the views of a reasonably representative sample, but success in this will depend on the responsiveness of the individuals approached.
19. **Workshop Participants:** As mentioned, we believe it is more useful for purposes of this particular evaluation to focus main attention on participants who show signs of having been able to follow up on some of the workshop themes rather than to take the normally appropriate approach of seeking a random sample. In light of this consideration, the secretariat's impressions of follow-up action directly involving PARIS21, and logistical considerations, we presently envisage conducting on-the-ground interviews in the following countries: Bolivia, Peru and possibly El Salvador in Latin America, Senegal, Cameroon and possibly Mauritania in Western/Central Africa, and South Africa, Zambia, Kenya and possibly Malawi in Eastern/Southern Africa²⁶. (Kenya and Malawi would be covered by the attendance of a member of the evaluation team at a forthcoming meeting of UN ECA's Committee on Development Information (CODI) in Addis Ababa where Kenya is expected to be well represented and useful opportunities will also arise for sounding out other African countries' views more briefly). In the case of Asia, we propose to email questions to the country teams from Cambodia, Indonesia and Vietnam. This choice was based on discussions with concerned representatives of the Asian Development Bank, which was the very active partner for PARIS21's South East Asia Workshop. We may also e-mail questionnaires to some additional African countries. E-mails will be followed up in appropriate cases by telephone calls. For all country teams we envisage using separate questionnaires for policymaker participants (Annex 1) and for statistician participants (Annex 2).
20. **PARIS21 Members:** We understand that PARIS21's services, and especially those of its web-site, are used not only by former participants in its workshops but also by others, including some from the private and non-governmental sector whose views we think it also important to canvass. We propose therefore to seek to identify from the Membership Lists academic staffs, researchers, civil society organizations, private businesses and media representatives, from the developing countries, and to email them the appropriate questionnaire (Annex 3).
21. **Regional Bodies with interest in statistics:** Important existing and potential partners for PARIS21, with a good vantage-point for judging, and often assisting, the development of country statistical capacities, are regional bodies either fully dedicated to statistical work or with an important department devoted to this work. Annex 4 gives

²⁶ The opportunity of these country visits would also be taken, to the extent possible, to interview a few appropriate people from others of the groups noted below, including Opinion Leaders (para. 28) and people from private/non-government organizations (whether already Members, as in para. 20, or anyway likely to be interested).

the relevant questionnaire. We presently envisage e-mailing it to each of the UN Regional Economic Commissions, and to AFRISTAT, Andean Group Secretariat, Arab League Statistics Commission, ASEAN, CIS Statistics Committee, ECOWAS, SADC and SIAP.

22. **Principal UN Specialized Agencies** should also be canvassed for their opinions, since they are heavily involved in statistical work at international, and often also national, levels, and are much concerned with the adequacy of data relating to the MDGs which relate to their areas of sectoral responsibility. We intend to request largely e-mail responses to the questions given in Annex 5 from FAO, Habitat, ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF and WHO
23. **Task Team Convenors:** Annex 6 gives the relevant list of questions, which we would expect to handle mainly in face-to-face interview.
24. **Secretariat Staff and Consultants:** Annex 7 gives the relevant list of questions, which we would also expect to handle by direct interview; to the extent that the evaluation should cover financial questions, they would be dealt with mainly here.
25. **DCD Senior Management:** PARIS21 is hosted by the OECD's Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD), which supports the Development Assistance Committee. Since 1999 the programme has grown considerably and takes up time, space, and administrative and other scarce resources from DCD. Some steps have been taken to compensate DCD for this, and there are also certain positive PARIS21 contributions to DCD's profile and other work. Aspects of PARIS21's continued location at OECD will therefore be explored with DCD management and personnel (Annex 8), largely by face-to-face interview.
26. **Members of the Steering Committee (past and present) and Other Main Existing Financial Supporters:** We hope to be able to pose the questions intended for members of this group (Annex 9) mostly by direct interview, the exceptions (who would be contacted by email and telephone) being principally those members located outside Europe, Africa and North America.
27. **Potential Financial Supporters:** We envisage addressing these questions (Annex 10) to the main regional development banks concerned with lower-income developing countries (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, and Inter-American Development Bank), Australia, Canada, Germany, Italy, Japan and USA. These communications would have to be handled mainly by telephone and e-mail.
28. **Opinion Leaders and Major Users of Developing Country Statistics:** Given the ambitious fundamental objectives of the programme, it is important to carry out at least a few interviews with people who have been observers of PARIS21 work, rather than direct contributors, but are heavily involved in promoting or leading improved management and analysis of development. Annex 11 gives the relevant questions, and it is proposed to pose them, mainly in face-to-face interviews, to current and past leaders of major statistical organizations, economists heavily engaged in international comparative work (including assessment of progress on the MDGs), and leading development practitioners.

Tentative Outline of Final Report

29. The results of this wide range of interviews and e-mail exchanges would be combined with the results of our own reviews of the documentation available from the secretariat – and any other relevant sources, such as the World Bank, IMF and UNSD – to adduce all available evidence to permit balanced judgments in each of the report sections outlined below. The report will identify areas of good practice and less successful areas of work, to give guidance for future activities.
1. Relevance: Extent to which programme is consistent with the policies and priorities of each of the major stakeholders and, in particular, the needs of the targeted countries:
 - Have the activities and work programme been appropriate to the purpose?
 - Has the programme met stakeholder requests?
 - Were work plans/activities consistent with major stakeholders' priorities?
 - Have the activities adapted to cope with changing priorities and environment, including the proliferation of initiatives by other international bodies to promote improvement of statistical information?
 2. Efficiency: Relationship between the outputs achieved and the inputs used:
 - Has there been effective funding of work programmes?
 - Have funding priorities been consistent with purpose?
 - Has PARIS21 built on synergies with partner agencies?
 - Has the initiative been adequately funded and staffed?
 - Have individual activities, such as workshops, had clear objectives, and has there been evaluation of whether or not these objectives have been achieved?
 3. Effectiveness: Extent to which the activities and follow-up actions in countries and partner agencies are likely to lead to the goal being met:
 - Have countries implemented follow-up actions?
 - Have strategic planning processes for statistics been initiated?
 - Have countries been helped 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 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?
4. Initial Effects: All changes (positive or negative) triggered by PARIS21 intervention:
- Has communication increased between decision-makers and statistics producers?
 - Is the commitment by policymakers in developing and transition countries to statistics likely to improve?
 - Are there indications of better co-ordination by donors in their statistical capacity building efforts around country-owned statistical strategies?
 - Is increased funding available for statistics from donors and country governments?
 - Is there evidence of countries initiating their own statistical development plans?
 - Are the aid agencies better coordinating their demands upon countries for statistical information?
5. Partnership: How well has the partnership concept operated?
- How have partners seen their roles?
 - Has the voluntary basis of task teams worked?
 - Is there a need for stronger links between partners, such as the MoU signed with CIS?
6. Sustainability: Any indications about extent to which activities, outputs and impacts will continue after external support has ended
- Is increased collaboration /partnership between agencies observed?
 - Is expertise being shared across national borders in developing and transition countries to accelerate lesson learning?
 - Are PARIS21 initiatives being taken up by other agencies?
 - Are countries making progress independently or with partners on actions facilitated by PARIS21?
7. Overall Assessment: What does the initial experience show regarding the effectiveness of the interventions used by PARIS21 in pursuit of the outputs identified in its 2001 Logframe?
- Has PARIS21 truly increased partnership in the international effort to support improvement of statistical services in developing countries, and in what respects has it been more effective, and less?
 - What signs are there of PARIS21 activities increasing political support, funding and demand for information to underpin poverty reduction strategies?

- Is PARIS21 activity beginning to strengthen capacity to produce, analyse or use statistics and other information?
 - Has PARIS21 activity generated effective advocacy tools, and guidance notes on (a) institutional arrangements for user-producer dialogue, (b) format of strategic statistical development plans and (c) good practice in respect of in-country donor coordination? How far have the tools and guidance provided actually been effectively applied at country and regional levels?
 - What is the role of PARIS21 in the international architecture? What are its unique features? Are there areas of overlap with other agencies? Is the relationship with TFSCB, and other sources of capacity-building support, sufficiently close to maximize synergy and enable quick and effective response to opportunities countries find for making progress in build-up of their statistical capacities?
8. Governance: Is PARIS21 effectively accountable to its various constituencies, each of whom may have differing interests, priorities and degrees of influence?
- Have both policymakers and statisticians had an appropriate voice and participation in the governance of PARIS21?
 - Is the balance of influence between donor agencies and partner countries correct?
 - Are the reporting arrangements to the Consortium members and financial supporters sufficient?
 - Should the membership of the Consortium be further expanded and, if so, how?
 - Are the size and composition of the Steering Committee, and the method of election of members, satisfactory?
9. Future Directions: Appropriate refinements or adjustments of goals and emphases in the event of extension of the programme beyond 2003. New perspectives and ideas should emerge from the interview campaign, but some issues can already be foreseen as meriting consideration:
- Balance between short-term, MDG-related improvements and longer-term strategic capacity building.
 - Outreach to other potential drivers of change, such as civil society, parliamentarians, regional and local governments, news media; and measures to broaden access to data collected by statistical organizations.
 - Balance between regional and national activities and follow-up work: how far should PARIS21 go in supporting national activities (of what type?) and what should be the criteria for selection of countries for support at the national level?
 - Feasibility of systematic ratings of adequacy and progress of countries' statistical systems, as stimulus to faster improvement.

- Value of initiatives to increase support, perhaps through UN Statistical Commission, from OECD country statistical organizations for capacity building in the developing/transition countries.
- Pooling information on short- and long-course training offerings, worldwide, for statisticians, and value of a prestigious international scholarship programme.
- Would the chances of success in what seem to be the most promising future lines of work be enhanced by change in physical location from OECD-DAC to World Bank-IMF or UNSC or UNDP, or even by establishment of PARIS21 as an independent organization?

Work Assignments and Schedule

30. The members of the OPM team are Willoughby, Charoy, Thomson, Munoz, Flint and a Researcher, and they will work often in separate places but always in close support of one another, sometimes, in recognition of special skills and logistic realities, undertaking parts of the work for which others have principal responsibility; for instance, Willoughby will certainly solicit the views of other team members on the quality and utility of main materials produced by the Task Teams and the Secretariat. While Oxford Policy Management (OPM) and the team itself must take full responsibility for the design of the work and for the judgments reached, in order to provide the independent, outside evaluation desired, efficient implementation will also depend crucially on maintenance of the fine support that the PARIS21 secretariat has already been providing.
31. One particular area where Secretariat assistance will continue to be important is identification of many of the individuals who need to be contacted in numerous different agencies (and updating of their telephone numbers and e-mail addresses), and of the PARIS21 Members to be invited to respond to the list of questions given in Annex 3; it would be very desirable if the Secretariat could itself e-mail that questionnaire to the selected Members, with request to return either to itself or direct to Researcher at OPM in Oxford.
32. On 14 April Willoughby, Thomson and Charoy will meet with the Secretariat in Paris to finalize plans for the evaluation and the specific schedules for completion of inputs from all parties, and to carry out the initial comprehensive rapid review of believed impacts (emphasizing indicators such as those listed in para. 15) on countries that have participated in PARIS21 workshops. Thereafter, Charoy will have main responsibility for execution of the interviews (direct or e-mail) with PARIS21 staff and consultants (Annex 7) and regional bodies interested in statistics (Annex 4) and for all contacts and participant interviews in Western/Central Africa. Thomson will concentrate her subsequent work heavily on Eastern/Southern Africa participant interviews. Willoughby will take responsibility for the interviews with Task Team Convenors (Annex 6), Members of Steering Committee and Existing Financial Supporters (Annex 9), Potential Financial Supporters (Annex 10), and most of those with Opinion Leaders and Major Users of Developing Country Statistics (Annex 11); he will seek to see those located in Paris and neighbouring capitals in continental Europe on 15-18 April, and those in New York and Washington. D.C. in the week 21-26 April and in London within the first days of May.
33. After the 14 April meeting, the OPM team members besides Charoy will no doubt remain in active contact with the Secretariat on the execution of the evaluation work,

but they hope that major implementation problems will not arise; if they do, they will draw them immediately to the attention of Willoughby, who will in turn solicit the help of the Secretariat and the Reference Group.

34. Charoy, Munoz and Thomson will e-mail the reports on their work – in the form of summary of interview results and an interpretation of the conclusions to be drawn on the issues listed in para. 25 above – to Willoughby by 5 May at latest (with later supplementary reports on particular parts of the work, such as the CODI meeting which is scheduled for May 11-16). Willoughby will aim to complete a first draft of the overall report on the study by 20 May, at which point he would e-mail it back to all members of the OPM team for scrutiny and revision.
35. OPM will deliver its draft of the final report on the study to the PARIS21 Secretariat and Reference Group on Friday, 30 May. Willoughby will also write a letter at this stage to the TFSCB, drawing attention to any issues that have emerged from OPM's work that may be worth particular attention in the ensuing TFSCB evaluation.

Questions for Workshop Participants – Policymakers

1. Did you find the PARIS21 Workshop on (dates) in (city) interesting? Any particular parts or aspects more than others?
2. Thinking back, would you say that there were any particular ideas or bits of information that you picked up at the Workshop that have subsequently proved useful to you? If so, what?
3. Did your country team prepare – whether before, during or after the Workshop – an Action Plan? In what way, if any, did the content of the Action Plan benefit from the discussions, or other experiences presented, at the Workshop?
4. Do you feel that your government, and your ministry, have been making progress since (date of workshop) in applying results-based management and improving the statistics underlying it? What have been the main successes, and what the major obstacles?
5. Do you feel that communication and dialogue with the statistics units in your country has improved since the workshop?
6. Has your government been able to increase budgetary provisions for statistical work?
7. Have you received any outside assistance for strengthening your government's capacities in managing for results and, if so, from which agency and on which aspects? Would you identify any particular aspects on which additional outside assistance could have been useful?
8. Do you have any suggestions as to how the Workshop you attended could have been more useful, or how PARIS21 might have provided more helpful follow-up support?
9. Any other views as to whether PARIS21 should be continued, and how it could be more valuable to developing countries?
10. Do you ever look at the PARIS21 website or read its newsletter?

Questions for Workshop Participants – Statisticians

1. Did you find the PARIS21 Workshop on (dates) in (city) interesting? Any particular parts or aspects more than others?
2. Thinking back, would you say that there were any particular ideas or bits of information that you picked up at the Workshop that have subsequently proved useful to you? If so, what?
3. Did you develop any ideas from the workshop for changing your country's statistical system, and what has been the outcome of these ideas?
4. Did your country team prepare – whether before, during or after the Workshop – an Action Plan? In what way, if any, did the content of the Action Plan benefit from the discussions, or other experiences presented, at the Workshop?
5. Did you consider developing a longer-term strategic plan for development of your country's statistical services? If so, how far have you got? Did you request any PARIS21 support, and was the outcome useful or not useful?
6. Do you feel that your government has been making progress since (date of workshop) in applying results-based management and improving the statistics underlying it? What have been the main successes, and what the major obstacles?
7. Did the workshop help change the way that you interact with your country's policymakers, especially in the area of the statistics required for monitoring the PRSP?
8. Have you introduced new data collection, processing or analysis to assist the preparation or monitoring of your country's PRSP, or to improve measurement of the Millennium Development Goals?
9. Do you perceive increasing interest from policy-making levels of government, politicians, or others in your statistical work, and do you feel able to respond satisfactorily? What channels do you have for regular communications with the users of statistics on their needs? Are existing statistics being better used by government than in the past, for instance in preparation of the PRSP?
10. Has the government been able to increase its budgetary provisions or staff allocations for statistical work, and what do you feel are the further prospects?
11. What support do you get from academic institutions and research or business groups in your country for your work –whether in its actual execution or in developing the demand, and budgetary support, for your services? Can this become a more effective support?
12. Do you find the information (including the newsletter, CDs and videos), task team reports and contacts provided on the PARIS21 web-site useful? Which items have been of greatest value to you?
13. Have you found the PARIS21 Task Team meetings and web-sites and products relevant to your particular situation and understandable?

An Evaluation of PARIS21

14. Have you been receiving outside assistance for strengthening your agency's statistical work and, if so, from which sources and on what aspects? To what extent is the support provided from the different sources consistent with national statistics priorities and strategic plan? Would you identify any particular aspects on which additional outside assistance could have been useful?
15. Are you aware of the existence of the World Bank's grant-making "Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building", have you tried to use it, and have you had any difficulty in accessing its funds?
16. Do you have any suggestions as to how the Workshop you attended could have been more useful, or how PARIS21 might have provided more helpful follow-up support?
17. Any other views as to whether PARIS21 should be continued, and how it could be more valuable to developing countries?

Questions for PARIS21 Consortium Members

1. Do you find your membership of the PARIS21 network useful and, if so, in what way?
2. Approximately how often do you access the PARIS21 web-site? What do you look for on it, and do you normally find the information you are looking for?
3. Do you have occasion sometimes to contact the PARIS21 secretariat directly and, if so, do you find them helpful?
4. What documentation, information or support that you have obtained as a result of your PARIS21 membership has been most valuable for your work?
5. Are there any additional services related to PARIS21 objectives that you would like to see the network providing?
6. Do you have any suggestions as to how PARIS21 could more effectively promote results-based management, and improvement of statistical services, in your country?
7. What is your occupation/business?

Questions for Regional Bodies

1. What involvements have you had to date with PARIS21?
2. Have you been satisfied with the relationship you have had, and the attention given by the PARIS21 secretariat to your views or questions?
3. If you organize a workshop jointly with PARIS21, do you expect to provide follow-up support to your individual member countries after the workshop, and how much of this have you actually been able to do?
4. What do you consider the best examples, in your region, of progress over the last few years in strengthening statistical services and spreading results-based management? What factors, in your opinion, made possible better progress in those cases than elsewhere?
5. Do you see signs of increased interest among government policymakers, in your region, in the quality and quantity of their countries' statistical services?
6. Are there measures that you would like to see the international aid community take to better assist your own organization's work with your member countries' statistical organizations?
7. Do you find the documentation provided by PARIS21, especially through its website, and its information exchange efforts, useful for your work? Could you give examples of what has been most useful to you, and how it has helped your own work?
8. Are you aware of the existence of the World Bank's grant-making "Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building"? In what circumstances would you recommend countries using it? Have you or your member countries had any difficulty in accessing its funds?
9. Do you have any suggestions as to ways in which the PARIS21 network might be able to help accelerate improvement of statistical services and spread of results-based management in those of your member countries where these are most needed?

Questions for UN Specialized Agencies

1. What involvement have you had to date with PARIS21?
2. Have you been satisfied with the relationship you have had, and the attention given by the PARIS21 secretariat to your views or questions?
3. Do you feel that the mandate of PARIS21 to improve interagency coordination in support to statistical capacity development, especially in lower-income developing countries, has already begun to affect work on statistics critical to your sector?
4. What do you consider the best examples, in your field, of progress over the last few years in strengthening statistical services and spreading results-based management? What factors, in your opinion, made possible better progress in those cases than elsewhere?
5. Do you see signs of increased interest among the government policymakers concerned with your sectors in the quality and quantity of their countries' statistical services?
6. Are there measures that you would like to see the international aid community take to better assist your own organization's work in improving countries' statistical data generation and capacities in your sectors of activity?
7. Do you find the documentation provided by PARIS21, especially through its website, and its information exchange efforts, useful for your work? Could you give examples of what has been most useful to you, and how it has helped your own work?
8. Do you have any suggestions as to ways in which the PARIS21 network might be able to help accelerate improvement of statistical services and spread of results-based management in your sectors?

Questions for Task Team Convenors

1. What was the original objective of your Task Team when it was set up, and what was the background to its selection for support by PARIS21?
2. In what ways did the existence of the PARIS21 network facilitate involvement of people from different agencies in the work of your Team? Were these arrangements, and the small financial support provided, sufficient to meet your objectives, or were there, for example, other relevant agencies whose interest it proved impossible to attract?
3. What benefits are there to having a Task Team operating under the PARIS21 initiative?
4. Would the work of your Task Team have benefited from greater participation of (non-statistical) policymakers or more balanced representation of different parts of the developing world?
5. Are you satisfied with the progress made so far by your Task Team, and what do you consider the relative strengths and weaknesses?
6. Do you believe that the work of your Task Team has helped to reduce earlier inconsistencies and duplications among agencies supporting statistical work in the developing countries?
7. Have you been satisfied with the dissemination of the results of your work by PARIS21, and do you believe the work is having the impact you hoped for?
8. What measures could be taken, by PARIS21 or by others, to further accelerate the impact of the work?
9. Are there other topics, or sequels to your own work to date, which you consider important to the achievement of PARIS21 objectives and suitable for treatment by an inter-agency Task Team, whether under the same arrangements as in the past or with modifications?

Questions for Secretariat Staff and Consultants

(The questions listed will be of varying relevance to different staff-members and consultants, and will therefore be posed selectively.)

1. Thinking back to the time when you first began to work for PARIS21, what are the most important changes that have since been made in its operation, and do you believe that they are having the intended effects on your clientele?
2. Do you get good cooperation from all of the huge range of other bodies and agencies with which you interact, and how might that cooperation be further deepened?
3. What are the main improvements you feel you have made to PARIS21 workshops in light of the early experience?
4. To what extent has it been possible to attract to the Workshops the “right” policymakers, who are able to affect what is actually done in their country about results-based management and statistical capacity development?
5. Do you encounter difficulties in securing from partner agencies the presenters that you really want for different Workshop sessions?
6. Do you consider the reporting on PARIS21 Workshops satisfactory? What, in your opinion, would be the ideal reporting arrangements, and what would need to be done to reach them?
7. Have end-of-workshop participant evaluations been regularly conducted (written questionnaire only, or results reviewed in final session?), and have the results been useful?
8. How do you handle the follow-up with individual countries following their participation in a Workshop? Would a more active follow-up than PARIS21 can currently manage be cost-effective? How could the delays that sometimes arise in securing aid for Action Plan implementation be reduced?
9. Do you establish specific objectives for each workshop and then, a few weeks or a few months later, try to assess the extent to which those objectives have been fulfilled?
10. Do you consider that PARIS21 has now achieved about the right balance in distribution of its expenditures between workshops, task teams and information exchange (including publications and web-site)?
11. Are the Task Teams functioning satisfactorily in your opinion? How much administrative burden do they impose on the Secretariat? Should or could the Secretariat or the Steering Committee play a stronger hand in guiding them, or provide stronger financial support?
12. Could the Advocacy materials, which were always seen as such an important output of PARIS21, be further improved? In what main ways, and with what potential additional impact?

An Evaluation of PARIS21

13. What level of activity, and what types of intervention, do you think that PARIS21 should be aiming at undertaking in the future at the individual country level, and what criteria would you apply in selecting countries for such supports?
14. Are there additional functions that you would like to see PARIS21 staffed to fulfil?
15. Has the level of PARIS21 activity been limited below the desired level by shortage of funds and/or staff, and what are the difficulties in attracting additional resources?
16. Has the auditing of the PARIS21 accounts been thorough, and has it yielded any useful recommendations for improvements?
17. Would you suggest any modifications to the goals and purposes defined for PARIS21 in the 2001 Logframe?
18. What do you consider the pros and cons of the alternative physical locations and institutional attachments that are sometimes mooted for PARIS21: Paris, New York, Washington, D.C. – or any other preferred alternative?

Questions for DCD Management and Senior Staff

1. What were the factors that led to creation of PARIS21 in OECD, and specifically in DCD, in preference to other possible locations? Do you believe those factors still apply with the same force?
2. What do you see as the main benefits that DCD has derived from its incorporation of PARIS21, and that PARIS21 has enjoyed from being part of DCD? Have there also been disadvantages to DCD and/or to PARIS21?
3. What burdens does PARIS21 impose on DCD, and does the programme fully pay its share of the Directorate's costs?
4. Do you foresee increased difficulties for DCD in housing PARIS21 as a result of OECD's forthcoming move to La Défense? If so, how could these difficulties be resolved?
5. Are there measures that could be taken to increase synergies between PARIS21 and other DCD activities?
6. If PARIS21 were to be extended beyond 2003, do you believe that OECD/DCD would remain its best home? If so, what would need to be done to make it possible for this to be accomplished?

Questions for Steering Committee Members (past and present) and Main Existing Financial Supporters

1. Are you generally satisfied with the evolution of PARIS21 and its work since 1999?
2. Do the Steering Committee members and the financial supporters of the programme get adequate reports on PARIS21 activities?
3. Do you perceive that the inconsistencies, or duplications, among agencies seeking to help developing countries with their statistical development, which were emphasized at the meeting that established PARIS21, have diminished? How effective do you think PARIS21's contribution in this direction has been?
4. Is real progress now being made, in your opinion, in building statistical capacity in some of the developing countries? What are the factors present in those cases, but still absent in others, which enable that success?
5. Do you have views on the quality and impact of the work of the PARIS21 Task Teams to date?
6. Has PARIS21 achieved, in your opinion, the right balance in its work, for instance organization of workshops as against task teams and other activities, main focus on very poor countries without exclusion of somewhat better off countries, initial concentration on improvement of statistics critical to poverty reduction strategies as opposed to more general statistical capacities?
7. How do you view the recent experiments (in South Africa and Malawi) that PARIS21 has made in supporting national-level (as opposed to regional) Workshops, and do you think that this approach should be extended in future to cover more countries?
8. How can PARIS21 best contribute to improving coordination among external supporters of statistical work at the country level, which many seem to identify as the main area where inter-agency cooperation now needs to be further strengthened?
9. Is the formula adopted for the membership of the Steering Committee – 6 permanent multilateral agencies, 6 rotating developing/transition country statistical agencies, and 6 rotating bilateral aid agencies – satisfactory? Should any refinements be considered? Are the concerns and interests of developing-country (non-statistical) policymakers sufficiently well represented? Are the processes for electing members of the Steering Committee satisfactory?
10. Should there be clearer rules for who is permitted to become a Steering Committee member and for the election and replacement of members
11. Do you foresee potential for securing private-sector contribution to PARIS21, for instance from major users of statistics such as economic research organizations (e.g. Economist Intelligence Unit), foundations, business news agencies or rating companies?
12. Would you favour the development of an even stronger link than now exists between PARIS21 and the World Bank-led Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB)?

An Evaluation of PARIS21

13. Should PARIS21 be extended beyond 2003?
14. Are there any significant modifications in PARIS21's structure or objectives that you would like to see studied with a view to implementation in the possible extension of the programme's life, beyond 2003?
15. Do you have views regarding the pros and cons of the various host organizations that might be considered for the PARIS21 secretariat: Paris vs. New York vs. Washington, D.C. vs. any other candidate?

Questions for Potential Financial Supporters

1. From what you have seen and heard of the work of PARIS21 to date, do you believe that it is on the right track in promoting results-based management in the poorer countries, strengthening of statistical capacities and better coordination among sources of outside aid for both purposes?
2. What priority does your own agency assign to these objectives, and do you feel that PARIS21 activity has been a help, a hindrance or just neutral in improving the effectiveness of your own activities in assisting statistics development in developing countries? How does your agency currently obtain statistics to monitor development progress and aid effectiveness?
3. Do you have suggestions for modifying or elaborating the work of PARIS21 in the possible extension of its life beyond the end of 2003?
4. Would your agency be prepared in principle to become a contributing member of the PARIS21 Consortium in the event of an extension of its life, and what criteria would it have to fulfil to be eligible for your support?

Questions for Opinion Leaders and Major Users of Developing Country Statistics

1. How long and how much have you been aware of the PARIS21 initiative?
2. From your vantage-point, do you believe that PARIS21 has already made a difference to the trends that would otherwise have prevailed in development of statistical capacities of the developing countries (especially those of lowest incomes) and in the coordination of outside support for such capacity building – or are there perhaps signs of incipient impact? What do you consider the most important impacts – or signs of impact – for the evaluation to try to document?
3. Have you had direct experience of any of the PARIS21 activities – such as particular regional or national workshops, its information services, or its task team efforts and products? If so, which particular ones, and how do you assess their strengths and weaknesses?
4. What, in your experience, are the most important gaps or weaknesses (if any) still outstanding in the aid that is now available from such a wide variety of sources, and in so many different forms, for support of statistical work in low-income developing countries?
5. You will recall that the 1999 conference, which called for the creation of PARIS21, also emphasized greater attention by all aid donors to countries' development of national statistical master plans, or strategic planning. Do you believe that the spread and improvement of such master planning has been as rapid as the underlying factors in the poorer developing countries permitted? How could it have been accelerated – and would that have been desirable?
6. Would you identify any particular ways in which PARIS21 could significantly improve its work?
7. If you believe that PARIS21 should be continued beyond 2003, what would be the main arguments you would give to potential sources of funding?
8. If you do think that PARIS21's life should be extended, do you feel that the functions you foresee for it would best be assisted by retaining the present affiliation with OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), and location in Paris, or that their pursuit would be facilitated by transfer of its affiliation to another major development organization, change of home city, or even separation from any single umbrella organization?

Main Events in History of PARIS21

1999

Nov. 18-19 Joint UN/OECD/WB/IMF Senior Expert Meeting on Statistical Capacity Building, attended by representatives of 12 developing/transition country governments and 17 OECD member governments, proposes creation of PARIS21.

2000

June 21-23 First Donor Meeting and First Consortium Meeting: Interim Steering Committee established.

[Oct. Establishment of WB's Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building]

Nov. Preliminary regional workshop for East Africa and the Horn, and Celebration of Africa Statistics Day, Kampala.

Dec. 5-8 First Regional Workshop, for SADC, Lusaka: Teams from 13 countries.

2001

April 25-27 First country workshop in Zambia funded by EC

June 14 Interim Steering Committee meeting approves Logframe, and expansion of Secretariat staff from 4 to 6, including a full-time manager.

July 23-26 Regional Workshop East Africa and the Horn, Kampala: Country teams from 7 countries.

Sept. 3 Workshop "Strengthening Statistical Capacity for Poverty Monitoring," Addis Ababa, for 40 country delegations assembled for meeting of ECA Committee on Development Information (CODI).

Oct. 3-5 Meetings of Interim Steering Committee and Donors followed by full Consortium meeting.

Oct. 17-19 Russia meeting, Moscow

Nov. Antoine Simonpietri appointed full-time manager, following international competition.

2002

Apr. 3-6 South Africa Workshop on Development Indicators, Capetown – 14 countries participated

May 13-15 Andean Community Workshop, Santa Cruz de la Sierra: country teams from 5 countries.

June 13 Steering Committee meeting

An Evaluation of PARIS21

- July 24-26 Malawi Workshop on Poverty Monitoring System, Blantyre, including representatives of 9 countries.
- Sept. Final Report of Task Team on “Statistical Capacity Building Indicators”
- Oct. 16-18 Meetings of Donors, of full Consortium, and of Steering Committee.
- Nov. 7-9 South East Asian Workshop, Manila: country teams from 10 countries.
- Dec. 9-11 Central Africa Regional Workshop, Yaounde: country teams from 7 countries.

2003

- Jan. 21-23 West Africa Regional Workshop I, Dakar: country teams from 9 countries.
- Mar. 18-20 West Africa Regional Workshop II, Abuja: teams from 7 countries.

List of Persons who Contributed Views (Direct Interview or E-mail)²⁷

1. Recipient Countries

Workshop Participants

Others

Bolivia

Roberto Rivero Ovieda, Economist, UDAPE (F)

Wilson Jiménez Pozo, UDAPE (F)

Burundi

Vedaste Ngendanganya, Director, ISTEERBU (F)

Cambodia

San Sy Than, Director-General, NIS (E)

Cameroon

Joseph Tedou, Director, DSCN (F)
Barnabé Okouda, Dy. Dir., DSCN (F)
Guy She Etoundi, Dy. Dir., DSCN (F)
Thimothée Ayissi, Stat. Unit, Min. Agric. (F)
Apollinaire Tchameni, Dy. Dir., Planning, Min. of Nat. Ed. (F)
Jeannot Nghanza, ISSEA (F)

Paul-Roger Libite, Dy. Dir., DSCN (F)
Apollinaire Kingne, Service Chief, DSCN (F)

Chile

Gunther Hintze Goebel, INE (F)
Ximena Aguilera Sanhueza, Min. Health (F)
Danuta Rajs Grzebien, Min. Health (F)

El Salvador

Miguel Corleto Urey, Director, DIGESTYC (T)

Ethiopia

Samia Zekaria, Dy. Gen. Mgr., ECSA (F)

Kenya

David Nalo, Director, Statistics Office (F)

²⁷ Persons contacted more than once, whether by interview or by e-mail on different dimensions of the evaluation, are listed here only once. The letters in brackets following each name indicates the method(s) of communication used: E for e-mailed response to questions, F for face-to-face interview and T for telephone conversation (usually based on questionnaire(s)).

Peru

Farid Matuk, Jefe INEI (F)
Alberto Padilla Trejo, Stat. Consult. (F)

Rwanda

Philippe Gafishi Ngango, Dir., Statistics Dept. (F)

Senég

Sogué Diarisso, Director, DPS (F)
Mamadou N'Dao, Inspector of Services, DPS (F)
Babacar Fall, Nat. Accts., DPS (F)
Samba Ba, Projections Div., DPS (F)
Ibrahima Sarr, DPS (F)
Hamidou Ba, DPS (F)
Mamadou Wane, Stats., Min. Agric. (F)
Serigne Diasse, Director ENEA-DSD (F)

Aliou Gaye, Chief, Soc. Surveys Div., DPS (F)
Harouna Soumare, Min. Agric. (F)
Mafakha Touré, Stats., Min. Health (F)
El Hadj Malick Diame, Stats., Min Education (F)
Aliou Faye, Min Econs & Finance (F)
Mama Dabo, Chmn, Commission for General Economy, Finance Planning and Econ Coopn, National Assembly (F)
Abdoulaye Diagne, Dir., Research Center, Dakar Univ. (F)
Adramé Gueye, Dy. Mayor, commune Fann-PointE (F)
Taib Diallo, UNDP (F)
John McIntire, Country Dir., W.B. (F)
Amacodou Diouf, CONGAD (F)
Johnson Mbengué, journalist, Walfradji. (F)
Abibou Diallo, Sud Radio. (F)

South Africa

John Kahimbaara, Dir., Nat. Stat. System Div, SSA (F)
Mbuyiseli Deliwe, Dir., Office of Dir. Gen., Justice and Constitutional Development (F)
Anne Letsebe, Dy. Dir.-Gen., Presidency (F)
Julia Bunting, regional stats. adviser, DFID (F)
Barbara Barungi, UNDP (Southern Afr. SURF) (F)

Uganda

Ben Kiregyera, Board Chmn., UBOS (F)

Zambia

Buleti Nsemukila, Dir., Census and Stats, CSO (F)
Oliver Chinganya, former Dy. Dir., CSO (F)
James Mulungushi, Dir. in Min. Fin. & Nat. Planning (F)

An Evaluation of PARIS21

2. PARIS21 Consortium Members

Anwar Khurshid, Stats. Dept, Univ. of Karachi (E)
Jimmy Joseph Namangalbe, Univ. Stats. Lecturer, Malawi (E)
Bakary Sacko, statistician, Agrhymet. (E)
Richard Coe, statistician, ICRAF (CGIAR) (E)
Mudar Kassis, Univ. Lecturer (E)

3. Regional Bodies

Lamine Diop, Dir.-Gen., AFRISTAT (F)
Guillermo Lecaros, Chief of Stats., Secretaria-General, Comunidad Andina. (E,F)
Mikhail Korolev, Chmn., Statcommittee of CIS (E)
Andrew Flatt, UN ESCAP (E)
UEMOA Secretariat (E)
ASEAN Secretariat (E)
SIAP (E)
Jean-Etienne Chapron, UN ECE (E)
Bishnu Pant, Dev. Indicators & Research Div., ADB (F)
Olivier Dupriez, Dev. Indicators & Research Div., ADB (F)
CARICOM Secretariat (E)

4. UN Specialized Agencies

Haluk Kasnakoglu, Director of Stats. Div., FAO (E)
Harvey Herr, Global Urban Observatory, UN-HABITAT (E)
Gareth Jones, Chief Strategic Information, UNICEF (E)
Dr. C. Mathers, Coordinator Epidemiology and Burden of Disease, WHO (E)

5. Task Team Convenors

Graham Eele, (Advocacy Products), World Bank (F)
Richard Leete (Census), Chief Popn. & Dev. Branch, UNFPA (T,E)
G rard Chenais (Strategic Planning), PARIS21 (F,E)
Lucie Lalibert  (Stat. Cap. Building Indicators), IMF (F)
Naman Keita (FARS), FAO (E)
Daniel Byk (Monitoring Dev. Goals), Eurostat (F)

6. Secretariat Staff and Consultants

Antoine Simonpietri, Manager (F,E)
Mary Strode, Senior Advisor (F,E)
Jean-Paul Vasquez, Statistics Advisor (F)
Andr  Bellon, Funding coordinator (F)
Eric Bensel, Newsletter Editor (F)
Jenny Galleli, Knowledge and Communications (F)
Sandra Migdal, Budget and Finance (F)
Emer Heenan, Membership (F)
Dennis Bogusz, Advocacy Products (F)
Bahjat Achikbache (World Bank) (F)
Makiko Harrison, PARIS21/WB Coordinator (F)

7. Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD) Management & Senior Staff

Michael Roeskau, Director DCD (F)
Richard Carey, Dy. Dir., DCD (F)
Hilary Balbuena, Chief of Administration, DCD (F)

An Evaluation of PARIS21

Hunter McGill, Div. Head, Peer Review & Pol. Monitoring, DCD (F)

8. Steering Committee Members (past & present) and Main Financial Supporters

Jean-Claude Faure, Co-Chairman PARIS21 and Chairman DAC (F)
Pali Lehohla, Co-Chairman PARIS21 and Statistician General of South Africa (F)
Guest Charumbira, past Co-Chairman PARIS21 and Chief Statistician, Botswana (E)
Tony Williams, Head UN and Commonwealth Div., UK DFID and former Head Statistics Dept. of DFID (F)
Roger Edmunds, Head Statistics Dept., UK DFID (F)
Shaïda Badiée, Director, Development Data Group, World Bank (F)
Misha Belkindas, Development Data Group, World Bank (F)
Willem F.M. de Vries, Director, UN Statistics Division (F)
Gilles Hervio, Head of Econ. Coopn. PRSP Process Unit, DG Development, Eur. Commission (F)
Jürgen Heimann, Principal Administrator, Eurostat (F)
Pascal Delorme, Project Manager ACP, Eurostat (F)
Steven K. Gale, Senior Analyst, US AID (F)
Fritz Meijndert, Head Information Management Division, Netherlands Foreign Ministry (F)
Raul Suarez de Miguel, Head Dept. of Internl. Affairs, Swiss Federal Statistics Office (F)
Philippe Pommier, Mission appuis financiers et études économiques, Direction du Développement et de la
Coopération technique, French Foreign Ministry (F)
Jean-François Divay, Head of Cooperation Programmes Division, INSEE (F)
Cletus P.B. Mkai, Director, Tanzania National Bureau of Statistics (E)
Maria Eulalia Arteta Manrique, Bogota, Colombia (E)
Paul Cheung, Chief Statistician, Singapore (E)
Zarylbek Kudabaev, Chmn., National Statistical Committee, Kyrgyz Republic (E)
José Luis Carvajal B., Director, Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Bolivia (E,F)
Jan Vandemoortele, Principal Adviser, Socio-economic Development Group, UNDP (F)
Diana Alarcon, Socio-economic Dev. Group, Bureau for Dev. Pol., UNDP (F)
Jürgen T. Reitmaier, Assistant Director, Statistics Dept., IMF (F)
Marit Strand, Macroeconomic Adviser, NORAD, Oslo (E)
Lennart Nordstrom, Head Democ. Governance Div., Dept Democ. & Social Dev., SIDA (E)
Koichi Tagamori, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tokyo (E)
Brian Hammond, Head of Statistical Division, DCD (F)

9. Potential Financial Supporters

Bill Singleton, Director of Economic Policies Division, CIDA (E)
Robert Navin, Policy Planning and Coordination/DP, US AID (F)
José Antonio Mejía Guerra, InterAmerican Development Bank (E)

10. Opinion Leaders and Major Users of Developing Country Statistics

Yves Franchet, Director-General Eurostat (F)
Len Cook, National Statistician U.K. and Head ONS (F)
James W. Adams, Vice President and Head of Operations Policy Network, World Bank (F)
Alan H. Gelb, Chief Economist, Africa Regional Office, World Bank (F)
Timothy Marchant, former head of Statistics Unit, Africa Regional Office, World Bank (F)
Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, Director Human Development Report Office, UNDP (F)
Eric V. Swanson, World Development Indicators, Dev. Data Group, World Bank (F)
Noko Watanabe, Data Base on NSOs in Developing/Transition countries, World Bank (F)
Heidi Swindells, Associate Director UN Development Group Office (F)
Raj Nallari, Team Leader of Program for Attacking Poverty, WBI PREM, World Bank (F)
Shahidur Khandker, Chief of Poverty Analysis program, WBI PREM, World Bank (F)
Enrico Giovannini, Chief Statistician and Director Statistics Division, OECD (F)
Jean-Louis Bodin, Inspecteur-Général de l'INSEE and Adviser to President, ADETEF (F)
Sid David, former Chief Statistician, Asian Development Bank (E)
Haeduck Lee, Senior Economist, Latin America & Carib. Regional Office, World Bank (F)