

**REVIEW OF SUPPORT TO STATISTICAL CAPACITY BUILDING  
IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA**

**FROM REPORTING TO COLLABORATION**

**Synthesis Report on the Light Reporting Exercise  
as of January 2006**

**VOLUME I**

**Draft**



January 2006



## Table of Contents

### VOLUME I : MAIN TEXT

Acronyms .....	4
Executive Summary .....	7
A. Background.....	11
B. Objectives of the Light Reporting Mechanism.....	12
C. Methodology and its Constraints .....	12
D. Limitations of the Results .....	14
E. Results of the Light Reporting Mechanism .....	15
1. By Beneficiary Country.....	16
2. By Development Partner .....	16
• European Commission .....	17
• UK (DFID).....	17
• World Bank.....	17
• African Development Bank .....	18
• Norway.....	18
• Sweden.....	18
• Denmark.....	19
• IMF .....	19
• Germany.....	20
• France... ..	20
3. By Statistical Areas .....	20
4. By Key Financing Source.....	21
F. Problems Encountered by Development Partners.....	23
G. The Way Forward: from Reporting to Collaboration .....	23
1. Lessons Learned.....	23
2. Way Forward – Discussion Points .....	24

Annex 1: List of Development Partners and Reporting Status

Annex 2: Questionnaire of Light Reporting Mechanism

Annex 3: Visits to Development Partners

Annex 4: Comparison of LRM and OECD's CRS

### VOLUME II: DETAILED PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE LIGHT REPORTING EXERCISE AS OF JANUARY 2006

Introductory Note

Table I: Support to Statistical Capacity Building, by Beneficiary Country

Table II: Support to Statistical Capacity Building, by Development Partner

Table III: Support to Statistical Capacity Building, by Major Statistical Activity

Table IV: Support to Statistical Capacity Building, by Key Financing Sources

Table V: General Information on Development Partners

## Acronyms

<b>ACBF</b>	African Capacity Building Foundation
<b>ACP</b>	African and Caribbean Program
<b>AfDB</b>	African Development Bank
<b>AFRISTAT</b>	Observatoire économique et statistique d’Afrique subsaharienne
<b>AFRITAC</b>	African Regional Technical Assistance Centre
<b>AIDCO</b>	Aid Corporation (European Commission)
<b>AIDS</b>	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
<b>BCEAO</b>	Central Bank of Western African States
<b>BEAC</b>	Banque des Etats de l’Afrique
<b>CEMAC</b>	Central Africa Economic and Monetary Community
<b>CODI</b>	Committee on Development Information
<b>COMESA</b>	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
<b>CPLP</b>	Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa
<b>CRS</b>	Creditor Reporting System (OECD)
<b>CWIQ</b>	Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire
<b>DAC</b>	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
<b>DANIDA</b>	Danish International Development Agency
<b>DIAL</b>	Développement des Investigations sur l’Assistance à Long-terme
<b>DQAF</b>	Data Quality Assessment Framework
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
<b>DHS</b>	Demographic and Health Survey
<b>EAC</b>	East African Community
<b>EASTC</b>	East African Statistical Training Centre (Tanzania)
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>ECOWAS</b>	Economic Community of West African States
<b>EMIS</b>	Education Management Information System
<b>ENEA</b>	Ecole Nationale d’Economie Appliquée (Senegal)
<b>ENSEA</b>	Ecole National Supérieure de Statistique et d’Economie Appliquée (Côte d’Ivoire)
<b>EUROSTAT</b>	European Statistical Office
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

<b>FASDEV</b>	Forum on African Statistical Development
<b>GDDS</b>	General Data Dissemination System
<b>GTZ</b>	German Technical Cooperation (Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit)
<b>HIV</b>	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
<b>HMN</b>	Health Metrics Network
<b>ICP</b>	International Comparison Program
<b>IDA</b>	International Development Association
<b>IHSN</b>	International Household Survey Network
<b>ILO</b>	United Nations International Labour Organization
<b>IMF</b>	International Monetary Fund
<b>INSEE</b>	Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques (France)
<b>InWent</b>	Capacity Building International
<b>ISSEA</b>	Institut sous-régional de Statistique et d'Economie Appliquée (Cameroon)
<b>LAS</b>	League of Arab States
<b>LRM</b>	Light Reporting Mechanism
<b>LSMS</b>	Living Standards Measurement Survey
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MAPS</b>	Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MICS</b>	Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey
<b>NORAD</b>	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
<b>NSDS</b>	National Strategy for the Development of Statistics
<b>NSO</b>	National Statistical Office
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>PARIS21</b>	Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century
<b>PRS</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy
<b>RRSF</b>	Reference Regional Strategic Framework for Statistical Capacity Building in Africa
<b>SADC</b>	Southern African Development Community
<b>SCB</b>	Statistical Capacity Building
<b>SIDA</b>	Swedish International Development Agency
<b>SSA</b>	Sub-Saharan Africa
<b>STATCAP</b>	Statistical Capacity Credit/Loan

<b>TFSCB</b>	Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNAIDS</b>	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNECA</b>	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
<b>UNECE</b>	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>UNESCO-UIS</b>	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization – Institute for Statistics
<b>UNFPA</b>	United Nations Population Fund
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children’s Fund
<b>UNSD</b>	United Nations Statistics Division
<b>US</b>	United States of America
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>US CDC</b>	U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention
<b>WAEMU/UEMOA</b>	West Africa Economic and Monetary Union
<b>WAMI</b>	West Africa Monetary Institute
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organization

## Executive Summary<sup>1</sup>

1. For the pilot light reporting exercise on development partners' support to statistical capacity building (SCB) in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), the PARIS21 Secretariat requested 56 partners to provide information on their statistical activities that were active during 2004-05.<sup>2</sup> The responses received from partners represent an inventory of existing activities in support of statistical capacity building and an estimate of total commitment value for these activities. Key results, based on the responses of 51 partners indicate that:

- seven countries are benefiting from 40% of the commitment value of the inventory of ongoing projects/programmes to support SCB in Sub-Saharan Africa;
- the five biggest financial contributors of SCB are the World Bank, the European Commission, the UK, Norway, and the African Development Bank;
- a number of key partners are increasingly funnelling their funds through sub-regional intermediaries;
- 40 SSA countries participate in the GDDS of the IMF;
- all countries (except for Somalia) benefit from the ICP-Africa program;
- Burkina Faso and Nigeria are implementing STATCAPs;
- 16 countries have received TFSCB grants for the design of a National Strategy for Statistical Development (NSDS);
- a number of partners have shifted or are shifting to budget and sector programs, implying that statistical support needs to be identified early in the project cycle to get funding;
- funding to statistical training centres and for student scholarships is decreasing, aggravating existing weak technical skills of staff in the national statistical system.

2. In reviewing the results, it is important to note that **the financing amounts reflect commitments for operations that were active during 2004-05, and thus cover the project life, not only the last two years. These figures are not final, but need to be verified with each partner, after which an estimate of annual flows to statistical activities by each development partner is envisaged in the spring of 2006. It should be also highlighted that more work is necessary to make these figures comparable and to allow their aggregation.** A few other points should be kept in mind when interpreting these results:

- statistical support could be higher than reported, since (i) identifying statistical support in operations with budgetary support or non-earmarked sector support is virtually impossible, (ii) determining the amount of financing to statistical activities in multi-sector operations is sometimes difficult, (iii) the increasing shift to decentralized decision-making at the field level makes it sometimes difficult to know the details of what is actually financed; (iv) a number of partners did not report the amount of financing for their activities, and (v) a few partners either provided partial information or did not respond to the questionnaire;

---

<sup>1</sup> For this exercise, the term “development partner” refers to a technical agency or to a donor who provides technical assistance and/or funding, and the term “beneficiary country” refers to an African country receiving support for statistical capacity building.

<sup>2</sup> The period 2004-05 refers to the two calendar years, 2004 and 2005, during which technical and financial partners had active commitments with beneficiary countries.

- statistical support could be lower, since (i) for partners with long-term projects/programmes, the amount provided represents total commitments to the operation, which may cover a longer period than 2004-05; and (ii) there is some possibility of double-counting, especially for activities implemented by intermediary organisations for financial partners. Cross-checking efforts were taken to minimize this problem, but further verification with both financial partners and intermediaries will be necessary;

### **The Way Forward: from reporting to collaboration**

3. Key lessons that can be drawn from this exercise include the need to
  - **continue to raise awareness of SCB and improve collaboration among partners' agencies:** getting precise information on support to SCB is difficult under any system, but exchanging information on what assistance is being provided by different partners could ensure greater coherence of statistical activities at the beneficiary country level, as well as harmonise partners' collaboration;
  - **promote/advocate the importance of monitoring SCB for partners' own use:** in keeping with the move to results-based management, it would be advantageous for partners to "mainstream" statistics in their organisation and track the use and effectiveness of their assistance to SCB on the ground. This could be done in a number of ways through: (i) the monitoring system of operations; (ii) the partner's administrative accounting system, (iii) a project information system (based on field reports) which would allow searches on specific terms; and/or (iv) improvements in CRS to include more comprehensive activities related to statistical capacity building;
  - **verify information at country level:** verification of information at the country level, both with staff of the partner's country offices and with staff of the national statistical system and other government sources is essential.

#### *Way forward – Discussion Points*

4. The pilot exercise of the Light Reporting Mechanism (LRM) in SSA raises a number of points that require discussion among development partners and beneficiary countries in order to move forward on improved partner collaboration in the area of statistical capacity building. This debate should consider the following questions:
  - **What would be the use of the reporting mechanism to development partners?**
    - The reporting mechanism, by providing an overview of the support to SCB to individual countries, could be used as a management tool to identify where partner support could be used more efficiently, thus avoiding duplication, promoting complementarity in different efforts, and filling gaps (financial or in statistical areas not receiving sufficient support);
    - The reporting process, which has increased awareness at partners' headquarters to improve both reporting of SCB and coordination within their agencies, could be used as an advocacy tool to promote the importance of statistical development and its support by partners. It could lead to a development partner strategy to support SCB and the preparation of a periodic report on SCB by each development partner.

- **What could be the use of the reporting process to developing countries?**
  - The information from the reporting mechanism, along with ongoing NSDS work, would permit beneficiary countries to identify the gaps between their statistical needs and actual support. It would be useful in improving the design of their NSDS, particularly during discussions on funding of the strategy. Ideally, updating and monitoring this information could be done through the country's NSDS implementation monitoring system. The diagnostic phase of the NSDS includes a report describing financing sources and amounts, while the monitoring of the implementation of the NSDS should produce an overall report, including a section on actual financing;
  - The information can also be used to supplement GDDS – regular updates of countries' metadata and plans for improvement will keep development partners informed about improvements and future needs in statistical capacity;
  - At country level, it would also be possible to address not only the “input” side of partners' support, but also the outputs and outcomes of this support, and, in some cases, to discuss the impact evaluation of the support.
- **What could be the use of the reporting mechanism to the international statistical system and the development community?**
  - In recent years, the importance of “scaling up” of resources to support SCB has become a frequent issue of discussion in international forums. The reporting process could be a tool to monitor progress in support to SCB by the international community;
  - The reporting mechanism, as a complement to DAC's CRS, opens the discussion on how to improve the CRS, so that it could report more comprehensively on activities related to statistical capacity building;
  - The reporting mechanism could serve as a basis for reflection by partners to elaborate an International Strategy for Statistical Capacity Building (as Africa's RRSF). This would permit the definition of a common policy that could lead to the harmonisation of development partners' activities.
- **Should the Light Reporting Mechanism be continued and in which form?**
  - Verifying results of this pilot exercise in a few countries (select countries that have a variety of partners and statistical activities) with both government sources and field offices of development partners may be necessary to establish a country-specific baseline on support to SCB for future rounds of the reporting mechanism;
  - Placing more focus on planned activities and projects might render the reporting process more effective in the future;
  - Defining the frequency and geographical coverage of the reporting mechanism needs to be discussed. In view of the effort required to collect the information, it might be prudent to conduct the exercise every two years and extend it to other parts of the world one region at a time;
  - Monitoring the web-based database should also be discussed. Possible candidates to maintain it include the UNECA, the African Development Bank or others. PARIS21 could house the database, but the logistics of its maintenance (e.g., modalities, regularity of reporting, information access, and security issues) need to be discussed and agreed upon;
  - Taking into account the lessons learned from the pilot light reporting exercise;
  - Allocating adequate budget to carry out the necessary reporting tasks.



## **A Review of Support to Statistical Capacity Building in Sub-Saharan Africa: From Reporting to Collaboration**

### **Synthesis Report on the Light Reporting Exercise<sup>3</sup>**

#### **A. Background**

5. The *Forum for African Statistical Development (FASDEV)*, composed of representatives of donor institutions, UN specialized agencies, regional and sub-regional organizations, and national agencies, met for the first time in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from May 12-13, 2004. In keeping with FASDEV's goal of promoting statistical capacity building in Africa, the meeting highlighted the need for greater exchange of information among development partners that support statistical capacity building (SCB) in African countries (see box). In addition to contributing to a stronger collaboration among these partners, such an exchange would support the preparation of National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDS) in African countries, in line with the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS) of February 2004.

6. A meeting on coordinating statistical capacity building in Africa, held from January 31-February 2, 2005 in Tunisia and attended by the World Bank, IMF, the African Development Bank, the UNECA and PARIS21, as well as the *PARIS21 Steering Committee Meeting*, held from June 9-10, 2005 in Paris, endorsed this idea of greater information exchange, calling for a light reporting mechanism to be put in place that would record support to statistical capacity building activities in Africa by development partners. The PARIS21 Secretariat was requested to set up this Light Reporting Mechanism (LRM), which is very much in line with PARIS21's role of promoting effective collaboration among development partners so as to increase their support to statistical activities in developing countries.

7. In a broad manner, this request is also in line with the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*, adopted at the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness of March 2, 2005, which calls for strong commitments to harmonize and align aid delivery by multilateral and bilateral

#### ***What is SCB?***

For the light reporting mechanism, SCB is defined as support for agencies or organizations involved in the collection, compilation, processing and dissemination of official statistics, including administrative data systems). This reporting focuses on support to SCB by development partners either directly to countries or through regional and sub-regional organizations through:

- specific funding instruments (e.g., STATCAP);
- other investment projects (or components of a project)
- stand-alone technical assistance and/or training (e.g., as part of regional programs)

It does not regard support to monitoring and evaluations (M&E) systems as support to SCB. This support is generally seen as a project management tool. Similarly, the use of data for analytical purposes by a donor organization is not considered as SCB, if the analysis is for internal use.

<sup>3</sup> For this exercise, the term "development partner" refers to a technical agency or to a donor who provides technical assistance and/or funding, and the term "beneficiary country" refers to a Sub-Saharan African country receiving support for statistical capacity building.

development institutions. The results of the LRM would also provide relevant input for the annual report on IDA-14 negotiations.

## **B. Objectives of the Light Reporting Mechanism**

8. Under the broad objective of stronger collaboration among development partners, the specific objectives of the LRM are to:

- increase knowledge on what development partners are doing to support statistical capacity building ;
- provide information to improve donor harmonisation and collaboration in the statistical area with the aim of ensuring greater coherence at country level and minimizing duplication of efforts;
- increase visibility of statistical support within overall development assistance;
- identify countries or statistical areas where additional support is needed.

9. The results of the reporting mechanism will not only provide a better understanding of financial flows to statistical capacity building, but will also serve as a basis to improve the mobilisation of resources for the implementation of the NSDSs that most African countries are in the process of preparing. In addition, the mid-term evaluations of NSDS' implementation may identify future financing needs – information which could be useful for development partners in designing their assistance programs. Clearly, partner financial support to SCB is a complement to beneficiary countries' own funding efforts to support statistical capacity building in their country. The light reporting exercise will also be of use to national planners to formulate action plans for SCB activities in the international context. Thus the intended audience encompasses both national and international stakeholders, including the donor community, the NSDS design teams and other national policymakers and planners.

## **C. Methodology and its Constraints**

10. It should be emphasized that the Light Reporting Mechanism is not meant to replace the Credit Reporting System (CRS) of the OECD (see box). However, the CRS, which monitors new commitments to developing countries, cannot capture all aid to support statistical capacity building, despite the introduction of a purpose code for SCB in 1999. To assess the differences between the CRS and the LRM, a comparison of the information in each system was carried out (Annex 1). The analysis presents a general comparison of the elements of each system (definition, objective, statistical activity identified, reporting partner and type of data requested). The amount of funding by members of DAC to beneficiary countries for the period 2001-04 is also shown. In general, the analysis demonstrates the difficulty in comparing the data of the two systems from a financial perspective, mainly because the CRS permits only one code per project/program and so may not capture SCB components of projects, if they are not main components.

11. Past efforts by the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) to obtain information on support for statistical development must be acknowledged. From the 1970s to late 1990s, the UNSD collected this information from bilateral and multilateral organisations on a two-yearly basis, presented it to the UN Statistical Commission, and distributed it to national statistical offices of UN member states. In addition to requesting information on the areas of statistical support, this reporting exercise covered expenditures of headquarters personnel involved in support operations, field staff, training, and other administrative expenditures. Since the

responses were mixed or incomplete, collection from bilateral organisations was eventually discontinued in 1989 and from other organizations in 1995. A second effort was carried out in 1997 in the form of an ad hoc large-scale survey, including 50 development partners and 158 beneficiary countries, and covering the period 1992-95. There was a two-thirds response rate from the development partners and a 25% rate from beneficiary countries. The development partners and the UN Statistical Commission recognized the problems in collecting the data and the poor quality of the data (there was little correlation between information provided by development partners and beneficiary countries). No final decision was made on the basis of the data collected and the exercise lapsed in 1997.

#### **Creditor Reporting System (CRS)**

The CRS Aid Activity database of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) includes commitment and disbursement data on Official Development Assistance (ODA) activities in developing countries. The information is submitted by members of the DAC and multilateral institutions (between 30,000–45,000 transactions in recent years). The objective of the Aid Activity database is to provide a set of readily available basic data to enable analysis on where aid goes, what purposes it serves and what policies it aims to implement, on a comparable basis for all DAC members. Generally, Aid Activity data are used to analyze sector and geographical breakdown of aid for selected years and donors or groups of donors. The database also permits the analysis of specific policy issues (e.g., tying status of aid) and monitors donors' compliance with various international recommendations in the area of development cooperation. In addition to the Aid Activity database, the CRS includes a database on non-ODA lending and officially-supported export credits.

12. For the LRM, the approach adopted by PARIS21 to collect the information was to contact those development partners considered supporters to SCB in Sub-Saharan Africa. Fifty-six (56) partners were contacted, of which 20 were bilateral donors, 17 multilateral agencies, 3 regional organizations, 11 sub-regional organizations, 4 statistical training centres, and one foundation (Annex 2). All partners received a questionnaire (Annex 3) for completion. The questionnaire, designed by the PARIS21 Secretariat, incorporates comments from a pilot exercise carried out in the spring of 2005 with the FAO, the European Union, and the World Bank. It comprises two parts: (i) a general information sheet on the partner and (ii) a project/program information sheet for each project/program that the partner was supporting during 2004-05<sup>4</sup> in a country. The information requested on each project/program includes the statistical area supported, the objectives, duration, the type of assistance provided, the type and amount of funding, problems encountered, and the institutional contact person.

13. Given the difficulty of designing a questionnaire suitable for all development partners, PARIS21 offered them the opportunity to submit the information in a form convenient to them, including existing reports. Moreover, for a number of the major partners, missions to their headquarters were scheduled (see Annex 4). It should be noted that the findings of the consultants' reports prepared in mid-2005 for the Reference Regional Strategic Framework (RRSF), under the aegis of the UNECA, the African Development Bank, the World Bank and PARIS21, contributed to the program of visits of the light reporting mechanism.

<sup>4</sup> The period 2004-05 refers to the two calendar years, 2004 and 2005, during which technical and financial partners had active commitments with beneficiary countries.

14. The selection of the above approach to collect information from development partners, rather than collecting the information at country level, was based on time and financial constraints. It was thought more efficient to request the information from the headquarters of the development partner providing the support, as a first step in raising awareness of statistical capacity building at a central level and in gaining better understanding of the partner's involvement in this area. Though sensible, this approach has some shortcomings, which have been confirmed while carrying out the exercise, namely:

- **statistics not always identified as a sector in their own right.** Statistical capacity building is sometimes part of broader programs (e.g. budget support, health, education), which cannot be easily identified and/or quantified;
- **few development partner agencies maintain a centralized system on details of their operations and on detailed use of their resources.** Development partners are increasingly moving towards budget support, putting control of decisions in the hands of partner governments and thus making it difficult to track activity-specific use of funds. Many are also moving to the decentralization of decision-making to their in-country offices, based on an indicative program between headquarters and beneficiary governments. Because of this, identification of statistical capacity building activities and their financing levels are generally difficult to identify at partners' headquarters;
- **reporting on statistical capacity building is not seen as priority.** Some partners do not recognize statistical capacity building as high priority for the policy agenda, and therefore do not give it a high profile in their accounting system. Moreover, they do not have resources to dedicate to additional work required for identifying/tracking SCB activities;
- **collaboration between a financial donor's aid agency and its statistical office is not always well-coordinated.** Aid agencies may not be aware of the support provided by their statistical counterparts and vice versa. Exceptions to this include Norway and Sweden, where there is close collaboration between NORAD and Statistics Norway and between SIDA and Statistics Sweden;
- **selection of development partners may not be complete.** There may be some other partners that were unintentionally omitted from the list. Identifying and contacting the correct person in a partner's organization is also a crucial issue, so as not to waste time and effort;
- **estimating the financial value of technical assistance is not always easy.** Partners who provide technical assistance (in the form of experts and training) as part of their regular work program have difficulty in converting the amount of time of technical assistance into financial terms.

## D. Limitations of the Results

15. The responses received from partners represent an inventory of existing activities in support of statistical capacity building and an estimate of total commitment value for these activities. The results presented below represent the responses of 51 of the 56 development partners contacted, of whom 12 had no ongoing SCB activities in Sub-Saharan Africa during 2004-05 (see Annex 2). In addition, two partners provided only partial information, namely UNDP and UNFPA, mainly because information on their statistical activities is kept at the field level, not at headquarters. UNEP and two sub-regional organizations (SADC, and ISSEA) did not respond to the request. Responses to the questionnaire are varied, reflecting the issues mentioned under the methodology section above.

16. More specifically, the following limitations should be kept in mind when reviewing the results of this exercise:

- statistical support could be higher than what is reported, since (i) identifying statistical support in operations with budget support and in non-earmarked sector support is virtually impossible, (ii) identifying the amount of financing to statistical activities in multi-sector operations is sometimes difficult, (iii) a number of partners did not report the amount of financing for their activities (US, Australia, FAO, UNESCO-UIS, UNCTAD, and UNICEF's MICS program), and (iv) a number of partners, as mentioned above, sent partial information or did not respond to the questionnaire;
- statistical support could be lower for 2004-05 than what is presented below, since for partners with long-term projects/programs (representing a large percentage of total financing support), the amount provided represents total commitments to the operation, which normally cover a longer period than 2004-05. This exercise reports on commitments rather than disbursements because disbursement information is often less readily available and more difficult to compare, given the different "fiscal years" used by partners;
- possibility of double-counting, especially for activities financed and implemented by different organizations. Cross-referencing efforts were taken to minimize this problem, but further verification with both financial partners and intermediaries would be necessary;
- the information provided represents planned activities at the approval stage, not necessarily actual activities implemented;
- the "results" (output and impact) of statistical activities are frequently difficult to know without verification at field level, especially for multi-year programs;
- for projects/programs that cover a group of countries, a simple arithmetic average was used to calculate the amount of financing per country (this does not apply to the ICP of the African Development Bank, for which amounts are country-specific).

## **E. Results of the Light Reporting Exercise**

17. The results of the light reporting exercise are broken down in four ways, by beneficiary country, by development partner, by statistical area, and by key financing sources – Volume II. In addition, Table V of Volume II presents general information on the partner agency, namely its principal areas of statistical support, the number of professionals involved in SCB activities, general problems encountered and the partner's contact person. For the moment, the responses to the questionnaire have been stored in a simple Excel-based database. It is clear that if the LRM is to continue, a web-based database will have to be developed to allow regular updating either directly by development partners themselves or by a facilitator relying on a formatted data sheet to be completed by each partner.

18. A number of external factors, particularly the monitoring of Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS) and the monitoring of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), have raised the awareness of the world community for more reliable and timely statistics in Africa. These factors combined with the MAPS' action point on designing and implementing NSDS, have placed an increasing focus on the mobilisation of external funding for statistical development. A clear example is the creation of the Trust Fund on Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB) in 1999, financed by the UK, Netherlands, France and Germany, and administered and supervised by the World Bank. In fact, in recent years the TFSCB stipulates that 60% of the funds be used to support the design and preparation of NSDS.

## 1. By Beneficiary Country

19. Table I of Volume II presents a summary of the results of the light reporting exercise by beneficiary country. Some points to highlight are:

- most sub-Saharan African countries (except Somalia) benefit from the ICP-Africa program, under the aegis of the AfDB and financed by DFID, the World Bank, and AfDB;
- Burkina Faso and Nigeria have a STATCAP project, financed by the World Bank;
- as of end-December 2005, 16 countries have benefited from the TFSCB for the design of an NSDS (or Statistical Master Plan), amounting to roughly US\$ 1.9 million, while the proposal of one other country is under review;
- 40 Sub-Saharan African countries now participate in the IMF GDDS, of which 8 posted their metadata on the IMF's web-based Dissemination Standards Bulletin Board during 2004-05. The GDDS project for Anglophone countries now covers 15 countries, while that for Lusophone countries is assisting 4 countries, and the West Africa project serves 10 Francophone countries (see box on GDDS);
- UNDG's DevInfo software, managed by UNICEF, has been introduced in 18 Sub-Saharan African countries;
- 15 African countries are carrying out stand-alone MICS, while 14 other countries are participating in various activities of UNICEF's MICS program, including training;
- the role of sub-regional organizations (SROs) appears to be an important vehicle for partners' financing, principally for the EC and the AfDB. The IMF's creation of AFRITAC East and AFRITAC West also indicates a regional approach to SCB support;
- three statistical training centres (ENSEA, ENEA and EASTC) received financing of US\$ 2.2 million for the two scholastic years (2003-05)

## 2. By Development Partner

20. Of the 51 development partners who responded to the questionnaire, 39 indicated support to SCB in SSA during 2004-05 (Table II, Volume II). As a companion to the light reporting mechanism, a Directory of development partners, providing information on each partner's overall orientations, main areas of intervention, and institutional structure and contacts, is being prepared and will be distributed, once partners have reviewed it. (Distribution of the Directory is tentatively scheduled for April 2006). Table 1 presents a summary of the amount of funding to support SCB by key financial partners.

21. The following highlights the involvement of key partners in SCB:

**Table 1: Amount of Financing to Support SCB in SSA, by Selected Development Partner**  
(US\$ million)

Development Partner	Amount *	Number Benef. Ctries	Number Reg. Orgs.
Canada	9.3	8	1
Denmark	4.7	2	
France	9.2	6	5
Germany	5.1	7	
Italy	4.5	2	
Norway	18.6	5	
Sweden	15.2	5	
UK	66.7	9	
EC	67.1	11	5
IMF	6.2	28	
World Bank	67.9	28	2
AfDB	18.5	47	10
ACBF	6.8	8	1
UNDP	4.2		
UNAIDS	5.0		
UNSD	1.5		1
UNILO	2.1	11	

\* Financing amounts should not be aggregated until more work is done to bring them to a comparable basis.

- **European Commission**

At the European Commission, statistical capacity building in the context of EC aid, is handled by a policy arm, External Relations DG and Development DG, and its operational implementing agency, EuropeAid Co-operation Office, in Brussels. The statistical office, EUROSTAT, in Luxembourg is providing technical advice on statistical co-operation projects/programmes to Commission services in Brussels and the EC delegations. The policy arm, along with its country delegations and national governments, defines a strategy and an Indicative Programme of assistance for each country. It is then the EuropeAid Co-operation Office, country delegations and national governments that implement this Programme.

EC funding is provided mostly at the national level, with roughly 10% going through sub-regional intermediaries, particularly COMESA, UEMOA, CEMAC, SADC, and ECOWAS. The information provided for the light reporting exercise indicates an amount of US\$67.1 million going to SCB in SSA, making the EC one of the largest supporter in recent years. It should be emphasized, however, that this amount is strongly underestimated since it does not reflect the full amount of assistance at the national level. At present, there is no reporting system allowing the identification of statistical activities in EC's national programmes.

- **UK**

The UK through its development ministry, DFID, is one of the biggest promoter of SCB worldwide and the third largest in SSA, with US\$66.7 million, equivalent to 17% of SCB support during the 2004-05 period. The principal beneficiary countries in SSA are the Anglophone countries (Uganda, Nigeria, and Ghana) and the key statistical areas are institutional development of statistical systems, population census data, and GDSS. The UK's support to the IMF's GDSS Project in 15 Anglophone African countries covers the period 2002-2006 in two phases, with a contribution of US\$8 million, focusing on short-term technical assistance to improve statistics in countries and fostering of regional cooperation and south-south assistance. This Project is administered jointly by the World Bank and the IMF. A successor project is envisaged with a slightly wider coverage and with a stronger focus on SCB. In addition to co-funding the World Bank's TFSCB, the UK gives strong support to the PARIS21 Secretariat and UNDP by providing a seconded staff to each organization for a period of 2 years. It also funds experts from the US Census Bureau to assist in various aspects of census work.

- **World Bank**

The World Bank's support to SCB is provided by various financing instruments: (i) loans/credits for stand-alone projects (STATCAP program); (ii) loans/credits for components of projects/programs; (iii) grants under the TFSCB, the Institutional Development Fund; (iv) grants as part of the implementation of the MAPS funded by the Development Grant Facility (to start in 2006); and (v) other assistance through regional and sub-regional programs, such as the ICP (see AfDB).

**World Bank: Other DECDG activities**

Ongoing statistical activities include: (i) the management of the IDA-14 Results Measurement System; (ii) the administration of the International Comparison Program; (iii) the management of the Debt Reporting System; (iv) publication of the World Development Indicators and Global Development Finance; (v) development of data compilation and dissemination tools; (vi) support to the General Data Dissemination System (see IMF), focusing on socio-demographic statistics (population, health, education and poverty); (vii) the development, implementation and dissemination of household surveys; (viii) and partnerships with PARIS21. The Bank also supports monitoring and evaluation systems of Poverty Reduction Strategies.

Information on these projects is available through the Statistical Project Information Database on the Bank's website.

During the period 2004-05, more than half of SSA countries received some kind of SCB support. Burkina Faso, and Nigeria had stand-alone statistical projects on strengthening their statistical systems (STATCAP). The Bank's total support to SCB amounted to US\$ 67.9 million, of which US\$ 59.7 million was committed to projects or components of projects earmarked for SCB. In addition, 10 other projects included a statistical component, supporting both core statistical activities and a variety of surveys. The amount of financing for these components cannot be easily determined, but is estimated at nearly US\$ 6.3 million. Total TFSCB grants for the design and preparation of an NSDS and other statistical capacity building activities amounted to about US\$ 1.9 million.

In addition, to its operational support, the Bank's Data Group of the Development Economics Department (DECDG) is primarily focused on the implementation of the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS), which encompasses support to the development of NSDSs and Statistical Master Plans and for the implementation of related projects (such as STATCAP), support to 2010 population censuses, and the International Household Survey Network. Other non-SCB activities of DECDG are presented in the box.

- *African Development Bank*

The AfDB provides SCB support to all African countries (except Somalia) and sub-regional organizations under the International Comparison Program (ICP). The amount committed for the 3-year period, beginning December 2004 is US\$37.6 million of which US\$18.5 is allocated directly to SSA countries, sub-regional organizations and statistical training centres. The main areas funded are: core ICP activities; research on poverty measurement, based on Purchasing Power Parities; MDG monitoring and Statistical Literacy Program (with UNDP); implementation of the 1993 System on National Accounts; improvement in the systems of price statistics; development of the Reference Regional Strategic Framework for Statistical Capacity Building in Africa; assistance for the NSDS; and statistical training through Statistical Training Centres and Universities. This program is managed by the ICP-Africa Coordination Unit.

- *Norway*

The development agency, NORAD, maintains a close relationship with Statistics Norway, which implements all of Norway's technical assistance in SCB in SSA. In addition to the Mozambique project mentioned below (see Denmark), Norway supported four SCB operations for the period 2004-05, amounting to US\$ 14.1 million for: Angola, on strengthening National Statistical Institute; Eritrea, on economic statistics and national accounts; Malawi, on developing systems for household surveys; and Uganda, on agricultural and energy statistics. Norway's total support to SCB for the period is US\$ 18.6 million. Its main focus is on production of statistics, development of statistical standards and methodologies, training and dissemination.

- *Sweden*

Like NORAD, the Swedish Development Agency, SIDA, has a close relationship with its national statistical office, Statistics Sweden, which has a service-level agreement to implement all technical assistance for Swedish SCB programs. During the period 2004-05,

Sweden had 5 ongoing operations in SSA: 2 supporting a population census (Tanzania and Namibia); one for a household income/expenditure survey (Namibia); one supporting an agricultural census (Cape Verde); and one for developing statistics for poverty monitoring (South Africa). These five operations and Sweden's share of the Mozambique project mentioned below (see Denmark) totalled to US\$ 15.2 million.

- **Denmark**

Financial support to SCB is provided through the cooperation program of DANIDA. In the past, Statistics Denmark was used as the implementing agency for Denmark's program, but this will no longer be the case in the future. Denmark has limited its intervention to mainly Eastern Africa (Tanzania, Uganda) and Western Africa (Burkina Faso, Benin), focusing on information technology and institutional development. Equally with Norway and Sweden, Denmark supports a large capacity-building project of the National Statistical Institute in Mozambique, totalling US\$ 13.7 million. While statistics are considered important at DANIDA headquarters, the shift to budget and sector programs implies that statistical activities need to be identified in these programs in order to get funding. With the emphasis on national ownership, it is expected that national governments will drive the direction and composition of future funding.

- **IMF**

The Statistics Department is active in the following areas of statistical capacity building: (i) promotion of the General Data Dissemination System (collection of metadata and preparation of plan for improvement of statistical system) – see box; (ii) enhancement of data quality through the Data Quality Assessment Framework (DQAF); (iii) coordinated compilation exercises, such as for Financial Soundness Indicators (FSIs) and the coordinated portfolio investment survey; (iv) technical assistance and on-the-job training in areas of national accounts and price statistics (real sector), government finance, monetary and financial, and balance of payments statistics; (v) formal training (series of lectures, discussions, practical exercises, and case studies) on relevant statistical methodology; (vi) development and maintenance of statistical methodologies to encourage international comparability, support efficient use of statistical

**IMF: General Data Dissemination System**

The IMF's GDDS projects in SSA provides guidance on good statistical practice, supplies tools to diagnose priority areas of the statistical system, and establishes processes to aid in the formulation and implementation of plans to improve statistical systems. At present, GDDS projects include a project for:

- 15 Anglophone countries, covering Botswana, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, financed mainly by the UK (see UK above);
- four Lusophone countries, covering Angola, Cape Verde, Mozambique, and Sao Tomé and Príncipe, financed primarily by a Japanese grant, to improve the capacity of participating countries' statistical systems.
- West Africa, covering Guinea, Mauritania, and the eight member countries of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Togo), financed primarily by the Japanese Fund for Technical Assistance. The IMF's regional Technical Assistance Center for West Africa (AFRITAC West) in Bamako, with 6 resident advisors (1 on statistics), provides technical assistance to the ten countries in the area of government finance, while AFRISTAT provides assistance in the area of real sector statistics;

The regional Technical Assistance Center for East Africa (AFRITAC East) in Dar es Salaam, covering Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, with 5 resident advisors (1 on statistics), provides advice, technical assistance, and training, and supervises short-term experts in implementing capacity-building projects.

resources, and promote analytical usefulness of statistics, principally for macroeconomic statistics; and (vii) publication of International Finance Statistics (IFS), Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook, Direction of Trade Statistics and Government Finance Statistics Yearbook.

The total amount of technical assistance provided during 2004-05 (excluding staff missions) to SSA amounted to 23.5 person/years, roughly equivalent to US\$ 6.2 million. Its support is provided through short-term experts and staff missions, as well as some long-term technical assistance. As of the end of 2005, there were 6 long-term experts in Africa, one in: Kenya for Anglophone countries, Mozambique for Lusophone countries, the DRC for the Republic of the Congo and DRC, Tanzania for AFRITAC-East, Mali for AFRITAC-West for the real sector and Mali for AFRITAC-West for multi-sectors.

- *Germany*

The German Ministry of Foreign Affairs works in close cooperation with its technical assistance arm, GTZ, to implement its development agenda. It also works with InWent (Capacity Building International) and the Centre for International Migration. As to SCB to SSA during 2004-05, Germany provided advisory services to the ministries of planning and finance in Burkina Faso, Guinea, Malawi, Mali and Mauritania, mainly related to poverty monitoring in the PRS process. It also supported the ACP with a special focus on Sub-Saharan Africa in the areas of HIV/AIDS, national accounts, governance and MDG monitoring. This package of assistance totalled US\$ 5 million.

- *France*

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the statistical agency (INSEE) of France support SCB to SSA mainly through the sub-regional organization, AFRISTAT, and the three statistical training centres, ENEA-Dakar, ENSEA-Abidjan, and ISSEA-Yaoundé. France provides 6 long-term experts at AFRISTAT, covering the areas of macroeconomics, national accounts, enterprises, social sectors, research, and information technology (there is no contractual time limit for experts), as well as 7 experts in SSA countries (Cameroon, Chad, Gabon, Mauritania (2) Senegal, Sudan) and one expert at SADC. France's commitments to SCB during the period covered amounted to US\$ 7.5 million. In addition, France has co-financed the TFSCB and is a major contributor to PARIS21. During 2004, INSEE offered training courses in the use of database management system for national accounts, as well as short-term technical assistance.

### **3. By Statistical Areas**

22. For the Light Reporting Mechanism, support to SCB was categorized into 6 broad categories: general support, production of statistics, statistical standards and methodologies, training, analysis, and dissemination. General support refers to institutional development of national statistical systems (including their legal framework, organizational structure, physical infrastructure and other areas, principally the design of NSDS). The production of statistics is broken down into censuses, surveys, administrative data system, economic statistics, and social/sector data. Training includes formal training (support to statistical institutes), workshops/seminars on specific issues, and on-the-job training.

23. Table III of Volume II presents the key statistical activities reported by development partners. Some key results indicate that:

- institutional development is highly supported in many partner activities;
- the elaboration of price indices, particularly for the ICP and national accounts, is supported by a number of partners;
- thirteen countries received support for population censuses during the period covered;
- the Demographic and Health Surveys, mainly financed by USAID and carried out by the US Census Bureau on a reimbursable basis, contribute significantly to statistical production in African countries. During the 2004-05 period, there were 12 DHS underway, of which 3 were completed (Cameroon, Madagascar, and Mozambique);
- support to sector statistics is limited to either sector programs (such as, World Bank sector operations) or to specialized programs of technical partners, such as UNESCO for education statistics, FAO for agricultural data, ILO for labour/employment statistics, and UNICEF for maternal and child health indicators;
- most partner interventions include some form of technical training;
- the three statistical training centres (ENEA, ENSEA, and EASTC) reported a total of about 390 students for the scholastic year 2004-05. Worries as to the unpredictability of external direct funding for scholarships are prevalent, since past funding from the EC stopped two years ago and that from France may stop at some point in the future. This situation raises questions about the viability of these schools and the future availability of qualified statisticians in beneficiary countries.

**Table 2: Support to Household Surveys, by Beneficiary Country, 2004-05**

Beneficiary Country	IES	LSMS	CWIQ
Angola	X	X	X
Burkina Faso	X		
Cape Verde	X		
Cameroon	X		
Chad	X		
Gambia	X		
Guinea-Bissau	X		
Malawi		X	X
Mali	X		
Mozambique	X		X
Namibia	X		
Nigeria	X	X	X
Sao Tome & Principe	X		
Senegal	X		
Sierra Leone	X		
South Africa	X		
Zambia		X	

24. As presented in Table III of Volume II and summarized in Table 2, 17 countries received support for household surveys (income/expenditure surveys (IES), Living Standards and Measurement Survey (LSMS), and Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire (CWIQ)). UNICEF supports stand-alone MICS in 15 countries and other MICS-related activities in 14 countries. The high cost of conducting household surveys, in both time and money terms, often distance partners from providing support. Yet, the scope of these surveys and their regularity are important considerations in the action plans of a country's NSDS. The International Household Survey Network, financed by the World Bank, may contribute to the harmonisation of partners' actions in this area. Other areas reported by development partners as requiring assistance are management training (organizational strengthening) and analysis and use of data.

#### 4. By Key Financing Source

25. Table IV of Volume II presents the financing committed to support SCB to SSA during the period 2004-05, by beneficiary country and principal financial partners, while the table below shows a summary of beneficiary countries receiving over US\$ 5 million of statistical support, by main financial partners. **It should also be noted that these amounts reflect commitments for operations that were active during 2004-05, and thus cover the project life, not only the last two years. Also, the figures are not final, but need to be verified with each development partner, after which an estimate of annual flows to statistical activities by each partner is envisaged in the spring of 2006. It should be highlighted that more work is necessary to make these figures comparable and to allow their aggregations.**

26. Caution must be strongly emphasized in the interpretation of these amounts reported, keeping in mind the caveats mentioned in the sections, “Methodology and its Constraints” and “Limitations of Results”. This is particularly true for development partners who are decentralized and do not have financial information readily available at headquarters. For World Bank and EC projects, which included components of SCB, but whose amounts were not specified, an estimate of 3% of total project cost was assumed. The technical assistance of the IMF, reported as person-years, was converted into financial terms by using the average annual cost for short-term and long-term experts for each year.

27. As shown in Table 3, countries benefiting from substantial SCB support include Nigeria (US\$ 48 million), Uganda (US\$ 30 million), Mozambique (US\$ 18 million), Burkina Faso (US\$12 million), Angola (US\$ 12 million), Malawi (US\$ 10 million), and Tanzania (US\$ 9 million). Based on the information provided, 40% of the commitment value of the inventory of ongoing projects/programmes is going to these seven countries. This represents 60% of the funding going directly to countries (excluding Africa-wide and sub-regional programmes not attributed to individual countries).

28. From the information received, key financial supporters to SCB are: the World Bank, the European Commission, the UK, Norway, and the African Development Bank, while the IMF contributes significant technical assistance and training. Table 3 presents the breakdown of the commitment value of the inventory of ongoing projects/programmes supported by the key financial partners.

**Table 3: Support to Statistical Capacity Building -- Amount of Financing by Main Financial Partner, 2004-05 \***  
(US\$ millions)

<b>Beneficiary Country</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>EC</b>	<b>UK</b>	<b>World Bank</b>	<b>AfDB</b>	<b>Norway</b>
Angola	<b>11.5</b>	2.9		4.9	0.4	3.0
Burkina Faso	<b>12.2</b>			10.1	0.4	
Eritrea	<b>6.4</b>				0.2	4.7
Ghana	<b>7.9</b>		7.3	0.2	0.3	
Kenya	<b>7.2</b>		5.1	0.2	0.4	
Malawi	<b>9.7</b>		4.2		0.4	3.5
Mali	<b>5.4</b>	1.0		1.5	0.4	
Mozambique	<b>18.3</b>	0.6			0.4	4.6
Nigeria	<b>48.1</b>		18.3	28.7	0.5	
Rwanda	<b>7.0</b>	2.3	2.8	0.2	0.3	
South Africa	<b>5.5</b>			0.4	0.3	
Tanzania	<b>9.0</b>	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.5	
Uganda	<b>30.0</b>		19.8	5.1	0.4	2.8
COMESA	<b>22.9</b>	21.9			1.0	
ECOWAS	<b>10.1</b>	7.6			0.7	
SADC	<b>7.6</b>	5.9		0.7	0.9	
UEMOA	<b>8.2</b>	8.2				
CEMAC	<b>2.0</b>	2.0				
Anglophone countries	<b>14.3</b>	3.7	5.8	1.2		
Sub-Saharan Africa	<b>11.2</b>		1.4	2.3		
World	<b>7.3</b>	3.7		0.3		
Financing amounts should not be aggregated until more work is done to bring them to a comparable basis.						

## F. Problems Encountered by Technical and Financial Partners

29. Development partners identified the following issues as requiring improvement in their support to statistical capacity building in Sub-Saharan Africa:

- **issues of human resources and training**, including high statistical staff turnover throughout the national statistical system, shortage of qualified staff, especially of managerial and professional staff in national statistical offices, and low levels of remuneration for statisticians;
- **weak coordination in national data collection**, mainly due to lack of resources and lack of coordination in the development of central and sector databases (partially due to connectivity problems);
- **insufficient donor collaboration**, leading to lack of information on donor support to statistical capacity building activities;
- **issues with development assistance**: sometimes projects/programs are not designed with capacity building as an objective, resulting in unsustainable activities once the project/program ends; shortage or availability of qualified experts; and delays in release of funds for specific activities, particularly surveys;
- **decreasing financial assistance for student scholarships** and for infrastructure development may aggravate existing weak technical skills of staff in the national statistical system.

30. In addition to these issues, the “Reference Regional Strategic Framework for Statistical Capacity Building in Africa” provides a wider range of constraints and challenges identified by partners, including those linked to statistical demand, statistical supply and institutional issues.

## G. The Way Forward: from Reporting to Collaboration

### 1. Lessons

31. The experience from the pilot light reporting exercise suggests the following lessons:

- **continue to raise awareness of SCB and to improve collaboration among partners’ agencies**: getting precise information on support to SCB is difficult under any system, but exchanging information on what assistance is being provided by different agencies could ensure greater coherence of statistical activities at the beneficiary country level, as well as harmonise partners’ collaboration. It is hoped that this exchange of information on support to SCB would also lead to the realization of the need to scale up this support;
- **promote/advocate the importance of monitoring SCB for partners’ own use**: in keeping with the move to results-based management, it would be advantageous for partners to “mainstream” statistics in their organization and track the use and effectiveness of their assistance to SCB on the ground. This could be done in a number of ways through: (i) the monitoring system of operations; (ii) the partner’s administrative accounting system, (iii) a project information system (based on field reports) which would allow searches on a given number of terms, such as “statistics”, “census”, “survey”, etc.; and/or (iv) improvements in CRS to include more comprehensive activities related to statistical capacity building;
- **verify information at country level**: due to the growing shift to decentralization of decision-making within partner agencies, it seems clear that the results of a reporting

mechanism on support to SCB need to be verified at the country level, both with staff of the partner's country offices and with staff of the national statistical system and other government sources. This is even more obvious when the information provided by partners represents activities planned at the beginning of a project/program and not necessarily activities actually implemented. This country level verification would not only give a better understanding of actual activities on the ground and their impact, but would also be a key element in supporting NSDS implementation;

- **agree on information to be reported:** to facilitate data collection and a timely response rate, it might be necessary to review what information would be most relevant and agree on definitions for the items selected:
  - *standard definitions and concepts of "statistical areas"*: in this regard, the new UNECE classification of International Statistical Activities could be the guide for the national statistical system;
  - *financial data*: to avoid duplication, it is necessary to distinguish between financing mechanisms among partners, namely (i) bilateral and multilateral assistance directly to countries; (ii) bilateral financing given to multilateral organizations (e.g. TFSCB); and (iii) bilateral and multilateral funding to countries through intermediary organizations (eg. ICP from AfDB to sub-regional organizations);
  - *the issue of commitments vs. disbursements* needs to be clarified. It might be best to collect commitment information (the amount committed for the life of a project/program) and the duration of the project/program, in order to estimate annual disbursement flows;
  - *cut-off date for reporting*: given that partners use different accounting periods (fiscal years covering different period), a cut-off date would need to be set;
  - *planned or envisaged activities*: determine whether these activities should be included as part of the reporting mechanism;
  - *a simpler questionnaire*: to be defined, once above points are agreed upon. One possibility would be to focus on basic data -- the project name, the statistical areas covered, the amount of commitment, and the project life. This would eliminate items, such as disbursements and results, which are more difficult and time-consuming to collect.

32. The light reporting exercise in Africa was carried out over a 5-month period from September 2005 to January 2006. It has required frequent follow-up with development partners to solicit responses, as well as processing the information received and analyzing it. Not counting the time of the development partners to gather their information, the cost of the exercise is estimated at 5 person-months, plus mission costs to a few partners' headquarters (see Annex 4). This estimate includes the start-up costs of setting up the mechanism (including the conception and design of the questionnaire and the format design for data inputting). It is expected that future updates would require fewer resources.

## 2. Way Forward – Discussion Points

33. The pilot exercise of the Light Reporting Mechanism (LRM) in SSA raises a number of points that require discussion among development partners and beneficiary countries in order to move forward on improved partner collaboration in the area of statistical capacity building. This debate should consider the following questions:

- **What would be the use of the reporting mechanism to development partners?**
  - The reporting mechanism, by providing an overview of the support to SCB to individual countries, could be used as a management tool to identify where partner support could be used more efficiently, thus avoiding duplication, promoting complementarity in different efforts, and filling gaps (financial or in statistical areas not receiving sufficient support). In this regard, it can be used to plan and coordinate technical assistance;
  - The reporting process, which has increased awareness at partners' headquarters to improve both reporting of SCB and coordination within their agencies, could be used as an advocacy tool to promote the importance of statistical development and its support by partners. It could lead to a development partner strategy to support SCB and the preparation of a periodic report on SCB by each development partner.
- **What could be the use of the reporting process to developing countries?**
  - The information from the reporting mechanism, along with ongoing NSDS work, would permit beneficiary countries to identify the gaps between their statistical needs and actual support. It would be useful in improving the design of their NSDS, particularly during discussions on funding of the strategy. Ideally, updating and monitoring this information could be done through the country's NSDS implementation monitoring system. The diagnostic phase of the NSDS includes a report describing financing sources and amounts, while the monitoring of the implementation of the NSDS should produce an overall report, including a section on actual financing;
  - The information can also be used to supplement GDDS – regular updates of countries' metadata and plans for improvement will keep development partners informed about improvements and future needs in statistical capacity;
  - At country level, it would also be possible to address not only the “input” side of partners' support, but also the outputs and outcomes of this support, and, in some cases, to discuss the impact evaluation of the support.
- **What could be the use of the reporting mechanism to the international statistical system and the development community?**
  - In recent years, the importance of “scaling up” of resources to support SCB has become a frequent issue of discussion in international forums. The reporting process could be a tool to monitor progress in support to SCB by the international community;
  - The reporting mechanism, as a complement to DAC's CRS, opens the discussion on how to improve the CRS, so that it could report more comprehensively on activities related to statistical capacity building;
  - The reporting mechanism could serve as a basis for reflection by partners to elaborate an International Strategy for Statistical Capacity Building (as Africa's RRSF). This would permit the definition of a common policy that could lead to the harmonisation of development partners' activities.
- **Should the Light Reporting Mechanism be continued and in which form?**
  - Verifying results of this pilot exercise in a few countries (select countries that have a variety of partners and statistical activities) with both government sources and field offices of development partners may be necessary to establish a country-specific baseline on support to SCB for future rounds of the reporting mechanism (see Lessons above);
  - Placing more focus on planned activities and projects might render the reporting process more effective in the future;

- Defining the frequency and geographical coverage of the reporting mechanism needs to be discussed. In view of the effort required to collect the information, it might be prudent to conduct the exercise every two years and extend it to other parts of the world one region at a time;
- Monitoring the web-based database should also be discussed. Possible candidates to maintain it include the UNECA, the African Development Bank or others. PARIS21 could house the database, but the logistics of its maintenance (e.g., modalities, regularity of reporting, information access, and security issues) need to be discussed and agreed upon;
- Taking into account the lessons learned from the pilot light reporting exercise;
- Allocating adequate budget to carry out the necessary reporting tasks.

### Comparison of Creditor Reporting System and Light Reporting Mechanism

	<b>Creditor Reporting System</b>	<b>Light Reporting Mechanism</b>
<b>Definition</b>	The Creditor Reporting System (CRS) is a database on official development assistance (ODA) and other lending to developing countries	The "Light reporting Mechanism" is a pilot mechanism put in place by the PARIS21 Secretariat to inventory ongoing projects that support statistical activities in sub-Saharan Africa.
<b>Objective</b>	To provide on a regular basis data on donor countries' financial commitments and disbursements.	To determine "who is doing what where" in statistical capacity building.  The ultimate objective is greater effectiveness of development assistance through better coordination of partners providing statistical assistance in sub-Saharan Africa.
<b>Notification Methods</b>	The notification is carried out by a statistical correspondent to the DAC who follows CRS Directives, which members update regularly.	The request is made to a PARIS21 contact by development partners (through a questionnaire, which includes some guidance).
<b>Type of statistical activity included</b>	CRS has a code for SCB in national statistical offices and any other government ministry. Statistical components of broader sector projects/programmes are usually NOT separately identified.	Assistance to all statistical activities in a country (stand-alone operations or statistical components of larger projects/programs) is included.
<b>Type of partner</b>	The OECD DAC member states and some international institutions	The OECD DAC member states and some international institutions, sub-regional organizations, African economics/statistics training centres, and PARIS21.
<b>Type of data</b>	New financial commitments and disbursements	Financial commitments, covering life of project/program

**Creditor Reporting System (CRS) Aid Flows, 2001-04**  
(US\$)

Donor	Amount (USD)	Number Beneficiary Countries	Number Regional Organizations
Australia	0	0	0
Austria	248 480	0	1
Belgium	33 640	1	0
Canada	1 212 670	1	0
Denmark	10 271 370	1	0
EC	152 674 480		0
Finland	124 240	0	1
France	3 743 680	4	0
Germany	186 380	2	0
Greece	0	0	0
Ireland	0	0	0
Italy	4 363 120	2	0
Japan	5 849 110	17	0
Luxembourg	0	0	0
Netherlands	2 373 380	1	1
New Zealand	0	0	0
Norway	16 703 700	5	0
Portugal	1 204 420	5	1
Spain	0	0	0
Sweden	10 507 100	1	0
Switzerland	417 520	0	0
United Kingdom	33 817 490	6	1
United States	2 201 000	2	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>245 931 780</b>		

**Support to Statistical Capacity Building – Light Reporting Mechanism  
List of Development Partners and Reporting Status**

<b>Development Partner</b>	<b>Reporting Status</b>	<b>Development Partner</b>	<b>Reporting Status</b>
<b>Bilateral</b>		<b>Multilaterals</b>	
Australia	Submitted	EC	Submitted
Austria	No activities	IMF	Submitted
Belgium	No activities	PARIS21	Submitted
Canada	Submitted	UNAIDS	Submitted
Denmark	Submitted	UNCTAD	Submitted
Finland	No activities	UNDP	Partial
France	Submitted	UNEP	Not submitted
Germany	Submitted	UNESCO	Submitted
Ireland	No activities	UN FAO	Submitted
Italy	Submitted	UNFPA	Partial
Japan	Submitted	UNHabitat	Partial
Luxembourg	Submitted	UNICEF	Submitted
Netherlands	Submitted	UN ILO	Submitted
Norway	Submitted	UNSD	Submitted
Portugal	Submitted	UN WHO	No activities; general info
Spain	No activities		
Sweden	Submitted	WHO HMN	No activities
Switzerland	Submitted	World Bank	Submitted
UK	Submitted		
USA	Submitted		
<b>Regional organizations</b>		<b>Sub-regional organizations</b>	
African Development Bank	Submitted	AFRISTAT	Submitted
UNECA	Submitted	BEAC	No activities
ACBF	Submitted	BCEAO	No activities
		CEMAC	Submitted
		COMESA	Submitted
		CPLP	No activities
		EAC	Submitted
		ECOWAS	Submitted
		LAS	No activities
		UEMOA	Submitted
		SADC	Not submitted
<b>Statistical Institutes</b>		<b>Foundation</b>	
ENEA	Submitted	Gates Foundation	No activities
ISSEA	Not submitted		
EASTC	Submitted		
ENSEA	Submitted		

**Support to Statistical Capacity Building****Light Reporting Mechanism -- Questionnaire**

The light reporting mechanism requests the completion of the attached information sheets, which may be supplemented or replaced by your own documents or reports from which the information can be extracted:

- general information – brief description of principal areas of statistical capacity building (SCB), total financing committed and disbursed for SCB in Africa during 2004-05, number of professionals involved in SCB in the organization, key partners in SCB, general problems encountered, and details of the contact person in the partner institution.
- the Project/Program Information Sheet – one sheet for each project/program. Please complete a sheet only for projects/programs that were ongoing during 2004–05.
- an explanatory note to the Project/Program Information Sheet, to clarify the following items: (i) statistical areas; (ii) amount of financing; (iii) type of assistance, (iv) type of financing; (v) other technical/financial donors involved; (vi) main results achieved; (vii) documentation; and (viii) follow-up project.

**Support to Statistical Capacity Building (SCB) in Africa**  
**General Information Sheet**

1. **Partner's Name:** (pre-filled) \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Brief description of principal areas of concern in statistical capacity building**

3. **Estimated total financing for SCB in Africa in 2004-05:**

(a) commitments

(b) disbursements

4. **Number of professionals involved in the design and implementation of SCB activities in your organization**

5. **Your key regional and country partners in SCB**

6. **General problems encountered** (e.g., donor collaboration, availability of experts, etc.)

7. **Contact person** (person responsible for completing this information sheet)

**Name:**

**Position:**

**Address:**

**Tel.:**

**Fax:**

**Email:**

7. **Date sheet was completed:**

**Project/Program Supporting SCB  
Information Sheet**

**Partner's Name**

**1. Beneficiary Country or region:**

**2. Project/Program Name:**

**3. Beneficiary Institution:**

**4. Statistical areas (check applicable area(s))**

- **General support**
  - Institutional development of regional or national statistical systems
    - Legal framework
    - Organizational structure
    - Physical infrastructure
    - Other (specify)
- **Production of statistics**
  - Censuses
    - housing and population
    - agriculture
    - other (specify)
  - Household surveys
    - income/expenditure surveys
    - demographic, health surveys
    - MICs
    - Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS)
    - Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire (CWIQ)
    - labor force surveys
    - agricultural surveys
    - other (specify)
  - Other surveys
    - establishment survey
    - Other (specify)
  - Administrative data system (from administrative sources)
  - Economic statistics
    - national accounts
    - price indices
    - employment
    - balance of payments accounts
    - trade statistics
    - government accounts

- monetary
  - debt
  - other (specify)
- Social/ sector data
  - education statistics
  - health statistics
  - environment
  - other (specify)
- **Statistical Standards and methodologies** (specify)
- **Training**
  - Formal (statistical schools)
  - Workshops/seminars on specific issues
  - On-the-job training (e.g., study abroad)
- **Analysis:** analysis of statistical results
- **Dissemination**

**5. Project main objectives (including SCB component of broader projects)**

**6. Amount of financing to SCB (*state currency*)**

**a. Amount committed**

**b. Amount disbursed so far**

**c. Amount disbursed in latest year**  
(*please indicate fiscal or calendar*)

**d. If amount of financing to SCB is not quantifiable, give approximate percentage of project cost**

**7. Type of assistance**

Technical (TA and training)   
Financial

**8. Type of financing**

Loan/credit   
Grant

Direct financing   
Other (specify)

**9. Start and end date/year**

**10. Other technical/financial donors involved**

**11. Main results** (if not available, percentage of results achieved or percentage of financing disbursed)

**12. Documentation** (include how to access)

**13. Follow-up project/program** (indicate likelihood on drop-down list below)

*Drop-down list: Select from this list...*

**14. Institutional contact** (name and Email of person responsible for implementation of given activity)

**Technical and Financial Support to Statistical Capacity Building (SCB)****Explanatory Note on Completing the Project/Program Information Sheets****Background**

For the light reporting system, statistical capacity building (SCB) is defined as support for agencies or organizations involved in the collection, compilation, processing, and dissemination of official statistics. This light reporting focuses on support to SCB by technical and financial donors at the country or regional level as follows:

- support to SCB through specific funding instruments (e.g., STATCAP)
- through other investment projects (or component of a project)
- through stand-alone technical assistance and/or training, for instance as part of regional programs

For this exercise, support for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems is not regarded as support to SCB, if the above definition does not apply (see also “type of assistance” below). M&E systems are generally seen as a project management tool. Similarly, the use of data for analytical purposes by a donor organization is not considered as SCB, if the analysis is for internal use.

This note provides an explanation of the information requested on the “Project/Program Information Sheet”, namely (i) statistical areas; (ii) amount of financing; (iii) type of assistance; (iv) type of financing; (v) other technical/financial donors involved; (vi) main results achieved; (vii) documentation; and (viii) follow-up project/program.

**Statistical Areas** (#4 above – Information Sheet)

For the light reporting mechanism, donor support to SCB at the country or regional level falls in the following areas (indicate the statistical area(s) supported in each project/program):

- **General support**
- **Production of statistics**
- **Statistical standards and methodologies**
- **Training**
- **Analysis**
- **Dissemination**

**Amount of financing** (#6 above – Information Sheet)

If the amount of financing to support statistical capacity building is not easily quantifiable (e.g., the support is part of a project/program component whose costs are not available in detail), an estimate of the share of financing, in percentage terms, can be provided.

**Type of assistance** (#7 above – Information Sheet)

The forms of donor support to SCB include:

- **Technical assistance and training:** provision of advice and technical assistance including provision of short and long-term personnel, consultants and training for e.g. improvement in methodologies (e.g., sampling methods, questionnaire elaboration, base year, etc); data processing and tabulation; data analysis (assistance in analysis of results); dissemination and use of statistics
- **Financial assistance:** including direct budgetary support through government budgets and payment of operating costs for specific statistical activities, (e.g., remuneration of surveyors, petrol expenditures, equipment (computers, photocopiers, vehicles), publication and distribution costs

**Type of financing** (#8 above – Information Sheet)

Indicate the type of donor financing, namely:

- **Loan/credit:** financing that is reimbursable over time to partner
- **Grant:** financing that is not reimbursable
- **Direct financing:** financing provided either (a) by the donor country itself or (b) by a direct credit from the supplier or the country of the supplier
- **Other:** combination of above financing instruments (in this case, indicate amount or percentage of each type of financing)

**Other technical/financial donors involved** (#10 above – Information Sheet)

Indicate other technical and financial donors involved in the project/program, whose support is in addition to your organization's contribution

**Main results achieved** (#11 above – Information Sheet)

Provide any results already achieved by the project/program. If this is not possible, then a percentage estimate of results achieved and/or financing disbursed can be provided.

**Documentation** (#12 above – Information Sheet)

List any documents relevant to the project/program. It would be most useful to provide information on how to access these documents (such as websites).

**Follow-up project** (#13 above – Information Sheet)

If possible, indicate – in the drop-down menu provided – the likelihood of your organization supporting a follow

**Support to Statistical Capacity Building – Light Reporting Mechanism  
Visits, by Partner**

<b>Technical/Financial Partner</b>	<b>Person contacted</b>	<b>Mission Dates</b>
IMF	Alfredo Leone Wipada Soonthornsima Robin Kibuka Claudia Mariel	Sept. 14-15
EC/Eurostat	Gilles Hervio Virginia Braunstein James Whitworth Jurgen Heimann	Sept. 29-30
UNDP	Jacques Loup, ex-Director	Oct 12 (in Paris)
UNICEF	Nicolas Pron	Oct. 14 (in Paris)
World Bank	Misha Belkindas Naoko Watanabe	Sept. 6-10
Denmark	<i>Statistics Denmark</i> Bent Thage, Director Lars Erik Gewalli Henrik Bulow-Hansen Anja Lokka Still	Oct. 3
Germany	<i>BMZ</i> Annika Wandscher <i>GTZ</i> Henning Twesten	Oct. 10-12
Norway	<i>NORAD</i> Halvard Lesteberg Hege Fisknes <i>Statistics Norway</i> Bjorn Wold	Oct. 6-7
Sweden	<i>SIDA</i> Lennart Nordstrom <i>Statistics Sweden</i> Lena Astrom Christina von Bahr Ronnie Andersson	Oct. 5
UK	<i>Poverty Analysis &amp; MDG Monitoring (PAM)</i> Rachael Beaven/Emily George Christine MacKintosh Rachael Beaven	August/Sept  Oct. 19 (in Paris)
USA	William McCormick, USAID Jacob Adetunji, USAID, DHS Elizabeth Taylor, BLS Diana Lopez-Meisel, CB Jay Keller, CB	Sept. 6 Sept 22 Sept. (phone calls) Sept-Oct (phone calls) Nov. 1 (phone calls)
African Development Bank	Michel Mouyelo-Katoula	Sept. 21-22 (in Washington)
AFRISTAT	Birimpo Lompo	Sept. 21 (in Paris); Oct. 26-28