



1

#### STRENGTHENING THE COLLATION AND DISSEMINATION OF DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS, INCLUDING THE MDGs

#### Workshop on Sharing Best Practice in the Dissemination of National Development Indicators

29<sup>th</sup> July - 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2013 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

#### "To Choose or not to Choose One Figure: Reconciling National Data"

July 2013

13 August, 2013







- Origin and State of Numbers
- Drivers of Discrepancies
- The Numbers
- Influencers of Choice
- Current efforts by UBOS
- Plans
- Conclusion





- Origin: UBOS was a department under the Ministry of Finance
- Current: UBOS established through the UBOS Act 1998 as a semi autonomous body to produce official statistics, monitor and coordinate the NSS.
- Similarly, MDAs and Local Governments are mandated to provide services, plan, monitor, supervise, ....hence responsible for producing data/numbers that they require in service delivery.



Therefore numbers are collected, produced, availed and consumed by a wide scope of stakeholders known to be *the NSS*.

For a long time, the NSS was not coordinated nor supervised to determine and influence the choice of the numbers used for various purposes.

As a result, many numbers have been produced and used widely the NSS.







- UBOS has conducted assessments as part of the development of the Sector Strategic Plans for Statistics. The data production schedules and long term census and survey programs of each sector form key components of the Plans.
- It is very hard to take stock of all the numbers that are in use within the NSO and how they are produced.

# Much of what has been collected has not been processed, disseminated, nor published or documented.

13 August, 2013





Much of what has been processed and disseminated is greatly underutilised due to a number of reasons that tantamount to low quality i.e. limited access and relevance, untimely, unreliable, incoherent, inconsistent, poorly documented etc

By and large, the existing numbers have a number of gaps and discrepancies that hamper choice and usage.

13 August, 2013







### UBOS vs UBOS Sources: Indicator: Proportion of population that is Literate

#### Sources:

- 1. Population and Housing Census, 2002
- 2. Uganda Demographic and Health Survey, 2000-2001
- 3. Uganda National Household Survey, 2001-2002



## The Dilemma!!!!



#### UBOS vs Other NSS Sources: NER in Primary, Total (%)

Source	2000	2001	2002	2005	2006	2008	2009	2011	201
UNHS	84		85.8	81.8			83.2	81.1	
ESAPR, 2011	85.5	86.5	84.8	93	92.0	95	96.1	97.5	95.
MDG Report, 2010 based on ESAPR , 2010	86	101			92		<b>93</b>		

2013

Tel: +256(0)-41-4706000 <> E-mail: ubos@ubos.org





- 1. Uncoordinated providers, hence limited awareness, appreciation, coherence, harmonisation, dialogue, adherence to standards (documentation, metadata, release calendars, policies)
- 2. Unwillingness of providers to let go due to the income/cost, legal and political implications. Hence duplications and wastage
- 3. Conflicts and fights within NSO, NSS, regional, and international players, hence a proliferation of efforts in terms of censuses, surveys, studies, standards and systems







## **1.Target Audience**

2.Purpose-tap resources, resource allocation, accountability, research, estimation, monitoring trends,

- 3.Quality of Data: Timeliness, reliability, methodological soundness,
- **4.Trusted Source**
- **5.Ingredients of the Indicator**







1. Encourage use of Census numbers to the extent possible

2. UBOS does not publish same indicators collected from different surveys conducted around the same period. Internal harmonisation is now towards avoiding collecting same indicators using more than one survey.

3. Discourage the practice of publishing indicators with varying sources for same reference period





- 1. Have agreed on the responsible providers and sources for MDG indicators, particularly for the information published at regional and international level such as CountryData
- 2. Preaching the word whenever there is opportunity, we stress importance of statistics, justify the need for statistics, most of all-stress the need for EVIDENCE BASED decision making. The case for the pending Population and Housing Census.





- 1.Through the coordination arm-annually engage producers and users (producerproducer committees, producer-user committees)
- 2.Annually engage high level stakeholders-high level breakfast meeting
- 3.Statistical awareness to public (statistics week), the media (media workshops)



**Current Efforts by UBOS** 



1.Correct wrong citations of statistics in the media

1.Have conducted Institutional Environment Assessments for quality in MDAs and Local Governments



2013



- 1. Have included 2 new objectives with the update of the Plan for National Statistical Development (PNSD) -Uganda's NSDS. These are;
  - a. Improve the Usability of statistics
  - b. Mainstream Quality Assurance in statistical production
- 2. Have produced a national metadata dictionary and compendium of statistical concepts and definitions based on wide consultations and **13 August, involvement of producers and users**

16







4. We have encouraged and featured on agenda of MDAs and Local Governments under the PNSD when they are engaging high level, reviewing their statistical products, disseminations, etc



**Critical Efforts -ctd** 



- 5. We go an extra mile to extend our technical assistance and presence whenever there is opportunity, for example, UBOS has gained strong entry and recognition in the compilation of the national MDG report, the evaluation and development of previous and current development plans, a member of national M&E technical working group, etc
- 6. We peer review MDA publications, advise and guide on how to avoid and address inconsistencies, discrepancies etc.







1.Revision of the UBOS Act to become the Statistics Act

 Conduct studies/research to assess the level of discrepancy/difference between survey and administrative data - education statistics (gross and net enrolment)







#### Example: "Assessment of Health Facility Data Quality, Data Quality Report Card, Uganda 2010-2011, December, 2011, WHO".

- **Conclusion:** At the national level, it can cautiously be concluded that the health facility reporting produces data of good quality for most indicators of intervention coverage.
- For the assessment of performance in the 112 districts (up from 80 in the preceding year) results show that the intervention coverage estimates are often poor, and are likely to lead to incorrect rankings for at least one third of districts:
- **Completeness of district reporting is poor in 9% of districts.**
- Overall, the assessment shows that the data quality in 2010/2011 was somewhat lower than in 2008/09.
- Overall, only 71 of the 112 districts (63%) meet the quality criteria for inclusion in the ranking tables.



Plans - ctd



1.Publish more indicators on CountryData for analysis of discrepancy, document and disseminate the results

2. Mainstreaming Quality Assurance through the PNSD

3. Re-engineering the Business Processes of UBOS

13 August, 2013



# Conclusion



We always provide the numbers and statistics with the hope that they are used for the intended and rightful purpose i.e. monitoring, policy formulation and decision making.

- It appears that the choice of; *What numbers to use?*, *How to use them?*, *When to use them?*, is outside NSO's control.
- However we can determine and position ourselves to INFLUENCE this CHOICE and steer it towards the rightful direction.

Coordination, collaborations, and partnerships within the NSO, regional and international levels, are critical in realising this "wish"!!.





# Thank You.

## Looking forward to your experiences and practices in choosing one figure.