

Round, Jeffery I.

Working Paper

Aid and investment in statistics for Africa

WIDER Working Paper, No. 2012/93

Provided in Cooperation with:

United Nations University (UNU), World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER)

Suggested Citation: Round, Jeffery I. (2012) : Aid and investment in statistics for Africa, WIDER Working Paper, No. 2012/93, ISBN 978-92-9230-577-4, The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER), Helsinki

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/80931>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



Working Paper No. 2012/93

Aid and Investment in Statistics for Africa

Jeffery I. Round*

November 2012

Abstract

Over many past decades countries in sub-Saharan Africa have received extensive bilateral and multilateral aid in support of the production of relevant, timely, and good quality data and statistics. But assessing aid effectiveness in the statistical area is a complex matter. Many datasets are effectively (global) public goods, as any restrictions on their availability and use are eventually relaxed. Hence it is extremely difficult to value or even measure the eventual impact of data production on general well-being. The aim of this paper is to review and scope how aid effectiveness might be assessed in this area. It sets out the context, the issues, and some possible approaches, going beyond existing measures of statistical capacity-building.

Keywords: aid, statistics, Africa

JEL classification: C80, C81, C82, O55

Copyright © UNU-WIDER 2012

*University of Warwick, UK. Email: J.I.Round@warwick.ac.uk

This study has been prepared within the UNU-WIDER project 'Foreign Aid: Research and Communication–ReCom', directed by Tony Addison and Finn Tarp.

UNU-WIDER gratefully acknowledges specific programme contributions from the governments of Denmark (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida) and Sweden (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency—Sida) for ReCom. UNU-WIDER also gratefully acknowledges core financial support to its work programme from the governments of Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

ISSN 1798-7237

ISBN 978-92-9230-577-4

Acknowledgements

This paper is based primarily on internet searches. I am very grateful to Datuk Ramesh Chander and Graham Eele for early guidance and very many suggestions, and to Tony Addison for his perceptive and helpful comments on an earlier draft. However, I am entirely responsible for its content.

The World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) was established by the United Nations University (UNU) as its first research and training centre and started work in Helsinki, Finland in 1985. The Institute undertakes applied research and policy analysis on structural changes affecting the developing and transitional economies, provides a forum for the advocacy of policies leading to robust, equitable and environmentally sustainable growth, and promotes capacity strengthening and training in the field of economic and social policy making. Work is carried out by staff researchers and visiting scholars in Helsinki and through networks of collaborating scholars and institutions around the world.

www.wider.unu.edu

publications@wider.unu.edu

UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER)
Katajanokanlaituri 6 B, 00160 Helsinki, Finland

Typescript prepared by Janis Vehmaan-Kreula at UNU-WIDER

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s). Publication does not imply endorsement by the Institute or the United Nations University, nor by the programme/project sponsors, of any of the views expressed.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AfDB	African Development Bank
ACS	African Centre for Statistics
ADF	African Development Fund
AFRISTAT	Economic and Statistical Observatory of Sub-Saharan Africa
BMZ	Federal Ministry for Economic and Social Development (Germany)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CWIQ	Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DDDS	Dakar Declaration on the Development of Statistics
DECDG	Development Data Group, World Bank
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
ESTA	AfDB Statistics Department
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FASDEV	Forum on African Statistical Development
GDDS	General Data Dissemination System
IAEG	Inter Agency Expert Group on MDGs
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
ICP-Africa	International Comparison Program for Africa
IHS	Integrated Household Survey
ILO	International Labour Organization
INSEE	National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (France)
MAPS	Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics
LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Study
NSDS	National Strategies for the Development of Statistics
NSS	National Statistical Systems
PARIS21	The Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
RRSF	Reference Regional Strategy Framework for Statistical Capacity Building in Africa
SIMPOC	Statistical Information and Monitoring on Child Labour
SNA93	1993 System of National Accounts
SRF	Statistics for Results
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
STATCAP	World Bank lending program
STATCOM-Africa	Statistical Commission for Africa
STATNET	Strengthening and Monitoring of National Statistics Network
TFSCB	Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building
UNAIDS	The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHSCP	United Nations Household Survey Capability Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Childrens Fund
UNSC	United Nations Statistical Commission
WFS	World Fertility Survey
WHO	World Health Organization

1 Introduction

Reliable, relevant and timely statistical information is now universally recognized to be essential for monitoring, analysis, policy formulation and to inform reasoned debate. We are now well-used to ‘evidence-based’ research and policy-making. Africa¹ is generally agreed to face many continued challenges both in absolute terms and relative to other regions in respect of development. However, countries in Africa have benefited from extensive aid—bilateral and multilateral—in support of the production of good quality statistics over several decades. As we shall see, in most recent decades the aid and technical support to Africa in statistics has intensified, not least due to the emergence of global antipoverty and development initiatives, such as the MDGs and the PRSs, and the need to monitor them. Whilst users have always had an insatiable demand for data, current global expectations, assessments and evaluations based on measurement and evidence has led to an unprecedented demand for more and better quality data. A central question is therefore: should these demands always be met and, if so, at what cost? In these respects it is reasonable to question how effective aid directed towards statistical activities in Africa has been. The aim of this paper is to scope how this might be assessed—we consider the context, the issues and some possible approaches.

The Busan High-Level Forum on Aid effectiveness in late 2011 took stock of the evidence on the impact of aid.² However Killen (2011) points out that the ‘measurement of results’ is itself an aid effectiveness issue. ‘Measurement’ implies not only the garnering of evidence (qualitative as well as quantitative) but also the development of methodologies to assess the evidence. In project and programme space there appear to have been few questions raised about aid spending on statistics in their widest form—that is, in conducting censuses and surveys, support in official statistics, statistical capacity-building, etc. Just by following an evidence-based approach to assessing aid effectiveness predicates a need to fund statistical activity to a significant degree. Killen (2011) asserts that ‘the Paris Declaration’s call for transparency has sparked significant improvements in the availability and quality of data’. Whether these improvements have been uniform across all regions (and in Africa in particular) is less clear.

Assessing aid effectiveness in the statistical area is a complex matter. Paradoxically, there are both quantifiable and non-quantifiable dimensions of aid in statistics. In recent years both OECD (i.e. PARIS21) and the World Bank (i.e. DECDG) have monitored aspects of statistical progress in countries in Africa as well as in respect of the African region *vis-à-vis* other global regions but, as we shall see, these assessments leave many questions unanswered. Many datasets, along with most official statistics, may be thought of as public goods as they satisfy the properties of non-rivalry and non-excludability (Tendulkar 2009). Governments and national statistical services often do exercise ownership rights over some datasets and other official statistics, thereby restricting access, so the property of non-excludability might not apply and they might be more accurately defined as ‘club goods’. Over time, many datasets do become public goods—global public goods even—as restrictions on their availability and use are eventually relaxed. However, some government and official datasets are never made generally available to the public, so as to protect national

¹ Throughout this paper ‘Africa’ is used to mean sub-Saharan Africa.

² <http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/>

security, commercial interests and the privacy of individuals. Obviously, private datasets are usually not so readily accessible. Hence, because the statistical information and datasets we consider in this context have all the hallmarks of public (or club) goods it is extremely difficult to value or even to measure the eventual impact of their production on general well-being. Along with data availability and access, data dissemination, data quality, periodicity, coverage and timeliness are key requirements from the user point of view. All of these aspects need to be carefully considered as part of the aid effectiveness debate in relation to statistics.

Clearly, statistics and information are a necessary input into delivering other aid initiatives; aid in statistics therefore has a special role in the aid portfolio. Any assessment of delivery is complicated by the fact that, in addition to dedicated aid programmes in statistics, aid programmes in other areas often include a provision for surveys and data provision. And there is very little by way of comprehensive or even summary information on the size of this provision.

The broad aim of this paper is to consider how aid effectiveness in statistics in Africa has so far been considered—and how it might be investigated further. Section 2 looks at key stages in the development of data and statistics in Africa through the last thirty or forty years. Then, in section 3, we review the roles of key institutions in supporting statistics in Africa. This, in itself, is a complex matter: many institutions are heavily involved and these are already extensively and comprehensively documented by PARIS21. Recent initiatives are discussed in section 4. In section 5 we look at various approaches to assess aid effectiveness in statistics, including references to current and on-going reviews by agencies (UNECA, AfDB, etc.) on statistical capacity-building. In the penultimate section we set out three possible avenues in which further work might proceed on assessing aid effectiveness in statistics in Africa, in particular, focussing on a series of questions that might be raised. The final section concludes.

2 Landmark events: statistics in Africa

Starting from a very low base in the immediate post-colonial era, during the past four or five decades Africa has undergone very rapid statistical development (Lehohla 2008). As noted by Lehohla (2008: 5) after independence ‘all African countries either established a new statistics office or retained an office as part of an institution of government’. In the early stages, as far as the range of official statistics is concerned, population censuses and demographic statistics predominated, along with fairly rudimentary national accounts estimates. But a significant amount of data was also collected and disseminated by other agencies, mainly the line ministries, such as agriculture, mining, etc., the central banks, and regional institutions (Eele 1989 and Eele et al. 2009). It was all rather piecemeal; official statistics were not following a grand plan and there were few international guidelines. Initially, statistics offices were often neither strong nor autonomous institutions (Kiregyera 2006 and 2008). Data were not disseminated freely nor was the objective of ‘data use’ of paramount interest to producers of statistics, either in Africa or elsewhere for that matter.³

³ This has been a long-acknowledged situation in both developed and developing countries, and in Africa in particular, as noted, for example, in Kiregyera (2001) and Kiregyera et al. (2009).

After an initial flourish post-independence, the quantity (and quality) of data produced in many African countries declined quite markedly during the 1970s and 1980s.⁴ Wingfield-Digby (2007) suggests that this was due to a combination of factors including: low priority in the use of statistics for policy-making, cuts in public expenditure; loss of trained staff to the private sector; reduction in technical assistance from aid agencies;⁵ and generally poor management of statistical systems.

Nevertheless, in spite of these adverse conditions, the 1970s and 1980s did witness a number of important statistical initiatives. An initial major expansion of data production took place in the area of demographic and economic statistics. In this regard a significant early landmark in 1978 was the African Household Survey Capability Programme (a forerunner of the UNHSCP) and also the World Fertility Survey (WFS), which was initiated from 1977 onwards in Africa. It is noteworthy that of the 42 WFS participating countries worldwide, 14 were in Africa. Funding for the WFS was from UNFPA, USAID and UK Overseas Development Administration. The *Living Standards Measurement Study* (LSMS) which is a multi-purpose integrated household survey was initiated by the World Bank and was first piloted in the Côte d'Ivoire in 1985. There are now more than 18 LSMS (and Integrated Household Survey) surveys in seven or more African countries, many relating to the 1980s and 1990s, and continuing post 2000. All of these surveys have been almost entirely supported by donor funds, both bilateral (e.g. UK, via DFID) and multilateral (e.g. World Bank) aid.

Probably without question, *household surveys* have been the dominant new data source in Africa in the last thirty years, augmenting census data, civil registration and administrative records. Many variations of household surveys have been introduced besides the LSMS (these include household budget surveys, labour force surveys, demographic and health surveys, core welfare indicator questionnaire (CWIQ) surveys, multiple indicator cluster surveys) many of which have been conducted at regular intervals, and all require (and have received) donor funding (World Bank, USAID, UNFPA, DANIDA, etc.). Data generation has increased in other areas too, although not at the same rate as household survey data nor, indeed, uniformly across all African countries. For example, although there is some improvement in the availability of health statistics (especially HIV/AIDS)⁶ and environmental and energy statistics, due to the efforts of WHO, UNAIDS, FAO and AfDB, they are still in relatively limited supply⁷ (and the experience is not uniform across countries), and this is in spite of the much increased policy interest at a global level during the past decade.

Lehohla (2008: 4-5) also usefully noted that, during the first two post-colonial decades (approximately 1965-85), there were a series of initiatives to establish a statistical infrastructure in Africa. But then in the decade following (approximately 1985-98) there was a period of decay at both country and regional level. Then, largely as a result of the inception

4 See Wingfield-Digby (2007: 3-4).

5 Most aid in statistics (for statistical capacity-building or data generation) is linked, either directly or indirectly, to technical assistance projects or programmes.

6 Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007) point out that many of the African countries with inadequate statistical capacity and measurement systems are also those countries worst hit by diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria. The reasons for the lack of health statistics range from poor systems for civil registration to poor data (on immunization and child mortality rates).

7 See Gorfe (2009).

of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁸ at the Millennium Summit in 2000, new statistical initiatives and significant new data demands were created.⁹ The data needs and hence the statistical challenges in monitoring the progress in achieving the MDGs in Africa have, without question, been profound. On the basis of current evidence, not only is sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) falling behind other regions in its progress towards achieving the goals by 2015, but (a) there are significant gaps in the available data to assess this progress; (b) the data quality in Africa is poor relative to other regions; and (c) there is wide variation across African countries (Alvarez et al. 2011).

A second major demand for data stemmed from countries' preparation of poverty reduction strategies (PRSs), which were initiated in 1999. These papers are a necessary prerequisite for World Bank and IMF assistance and debt relief under the HIPC initiative, with loans being focussed on poverty reduction. Again, these data demands drew heavily on household surveys, the principal instrument for poverty monitoring and measurement.

A third major data collection and statistical initiative in Africa has been the International Comparison Program for Africa (ICP-Africa), which commenced in 2002/3, which is aimed at generating purchasing power parity (PPP) price comparisons across African countries. ICP-Africa has since broadened its objectives to include statistical capacity-building and to help member countries in implementing the 1993 System of National accounts (SNA93).

3 The roles of institutions in supporting statistics in Africa

Alongside the specific landmark events in terms of surveys and data collection outlined above, a major initiative in the last four decades involving significant funding and overseas aid has been in the area of statistical capacity-building. Notwithstanding the widespread use of the term 'statistical capacity' there are several interpretations and manifestations. Also, understanding the structure of these initiatives is complex; capacity-building has involved very many international organizations and the initiatives are continuing to evolve in various forms (e.g. surveys and censuses, training in methodology, training in administration, hardware and capital projects). However as a natural precursor for assessing aid effectiveness it is perhaps useful to outline, briefly, 'who does what?' in this area—and to summarize what transpires to be the vast range of institutional involvement in statistics in Africa.

3.1 PARIS21

PARIS21¹⁰ was set up to foster a 'dialogue between those who demand and use statistics and those who are responsible for their production' (PARIS21 2009: 3) and to assist in statistical capacity-building in all regions. A more specific aim was to help create a national strategy for the development of statistics (NSDS) so that each low-income country could have nationally owned and produced data for all MDG development indicators within a decade. Another aim of PARIS21 was to develop and promote a new statistical culture within countries by helping

⁸ For the MDGs there are 8 goals, 21 targets and 60 indicators: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx>

⁹ In fact, the MDGs were preceded by the 1996 OECD strategy paper 'Shaping the 21st Century' which set out some concrete and measurable development targets, later consolidated into the MDGs.

¹⁰ The Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century. <http://paris21.org/>. It was founded jointly by the UN, EC, OECD, IMF, and the World Bank in November 1999.

them to produce indicators to track development progress. At its inception, 21 indicators were selected to monitor progress in the initial seven OECD development targets, fewer than for the eventual MDGs,¹¹ but even this number of indicators revealed major gaps in the data. Subsequently, and jointly with other institutions (see below) PARIS21 has been involved in setting up the Reference Regional Strategic Framework for Statistical Capacity-Building in Africa (RRSF), which was founded in 2006.¹² This was designed as a framework for implementing the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS) (see later). The PARIS21 website is a comprehensive source of information on all aspects of international development statistics.¹³ On that website there is a comprehensive global directory of partners in statistical capacity development in Africa. Below we list, very selectively, some of the key players in that activity.

3.2 UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)

The statistics programme is one of the earliest programmes at UNECA having started at the inception of UNECA in 1958. The weakness of statistical infrastructures in UNECA member countries led to an early Conference of African Statisticians (in 1959). This has evolved in various forms through to the Committee on Development Information, CODI (in 1997) and, currently, the Statistical Commission for Africa (StatCom-Africa), from 2007. To date there have been two meetings of StatCom-Africa; in 2008 (in Addis Ababa) and 2010 (in Durban), with a third meeting scheduled to take place in 2012 (in Cape Town). The African Centre of Statistics (ACS) was set up in 2006 as an institution within UNECA to co-ordinate statistics across the region and to help strengthen statistical capacities for all countries of Africa.¹⁴ The ACS activities include providing technical assistance at UNECA and at country levels, assistance with censuses and surveys, awareness training for government officials, data management and development at country and regional levels, and with assistance with training and workshops. The ACS operates with a relatively small core staff and is a key statistical capacity-building institute.

3.3 AFRISTAT

AFRISTAT is essentially a francophone institution serving statistical capacity-building in member countries in Africa. Currently there are 19 member countries, up from the original 14 members when it was founded in 1993 and while membership is not restricted, all members are from the 'franc zone'. Members are expected to contribute towards the capital trust fund. AFRISTAT seems to provide a very similar statistical capacity-building role as ACS. It has a permanent staff of 23 and offers technical advice in the main areas of price statistics, household surveys, national accounts, institutional capacity-building, and training. AFRISTAT (2001) reviews the contribution of AFRISTAT to statistical capacity-building in the period 1996-2000 and highlights possible future problems to do with (a) relationships with other regional institutions and (b) funding. Further investigation is needed on how these issues are being dealt with.

¹¹ There were 21 DAC indicators as opposed to 70 MDG indicators.

¹² http://www.unece.org/statistics/docs/rssf/stat_RRSFDocument_final.pdf

¹³ See PARIS21 (2004a and 2004b).

¹⁴ <http://www.paris21.org/globaldirectory/Africa/UNECA>

3.4 African Development Bank (AfDB)

Donor aid is channelled to the African Development Bank via the African Development Fund (ADF). Like UNECA, AfDB went through a difficult patch as regards statistics in the 1990s (Wingfield-Digby 2007) but is now again prominently engaged in statistical work for the region. The Statistics Department (ESTA) has two divisions, one for economic and social statistics (ESTA1) and the other for statistical capacity-building (ESTA2). As regards capacity-building it provides technical assistance for the African region and, jointly with the UNECA, the World Bank and PARIS21, it has developed RRSF, a strategic plan for building statistical capacities in its member countries as a means of implementing MAPS (see later). In this regard the AfDB is currently the major institutional player in developing statistical capacity in its member countries. Indeed, this is the primary role of ESTA.

3.5 United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)

The UNSD and its parent decision-making body, the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC), do not have a significant *direct* involvement in aid-disbursing statistical activities in African countries. It does, however, influence and affect activities *indirectly*. Of the 24 members of the UNSC,¹⁵ five are from African countries.¹⁶ And UNSD does also establish the norms for statistical activities (i.e. standardizing methods, classifications, definitions, etc.), as well as providing technical co-operation, organizing programmes, and publishing and disseminating information (e.g. the MDGs).

The UNSC and the UN Economic and Social Council (ECSOC) were instrumental in stressing that statistical capacity-building (and associated technical co-operation) had to be a part of a national framework of development policies (Wingfield-Digby 2007). In particular, this entailed building a demand for statistics so that sufficient national resources could be secured to build and sustain statistical capacity. This underpinned the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS).

3.6 World Bank Development Data Group (DECDG)

In association with other international organizations, the World Bank Data Development Group (DECDG) also assists member countries in statistical capacity-building programmes. Resting on the observation that most data is generated from the statistical systems of member countries, the quality of these data depend on how well these national systems perform, so the main aim of DECDG is to help improve this capacity.¹⁷ One practical aspect of this is to help countries prepare their national plans for the Marrakech Action Plans for Statistics (MAPS). DECDG also work with other members of the international statistical community to participate in and promote PARIS21, MDG programmes and to disseminate other key development data.

Commencing in 2006 the World Bank supported a three-year capacity-strengthening project in Africa centred around the IMF's General Data Dissemination System (GDDS), specifically

¹⁵ Represented by chief statisticians of member states.

¹⁶ Currently, Botswana, Cameroon, Morocco, Niger and Tanzania are the UNSC members from SSA.

¹⁷ <http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20822038~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html>

this was to increase the awareness of good quality data and their dissemination, especially in the areas of monitoring macroeconomic policy and poverty reduction strategies (Eele and Chinganya 2005).

3.7 Other institutions

Two other groups of institutions are actively engaged in statistics in Africa: (a) bilateral governmental donor organizations; and (b) other international organizations and institutes.

(a) *Bilateral donors*

Significant levels of bilateral aid and technical assistance to countries in Africa has taken place in order to enhance statistical capacity, surveys, registers, statistical systems, etc. Amongst the major agencies involved directly in countries in Africa are USAID, Statistics Canada and CIDA, DFID (and UK ONS), DANIDA and Statistics Denmark, Statistics Norway, Statistics Sweden, Statistics Netherlands, INSEE, and BMZ Germany (plus other German agencies).¹⁸

(b) *Other international organizations*

Involvement by international organizations is not confined to the most prominent players outlined above. FAO and ILO have also been engaged in technical assistance, including survey work, in African countries (e.g. the ILO SIMPOC surveys),¹⁹ and UNICEF (i.e. multiple indicator cluster surveys, MICS) is also active in some countries.²⁰ Also IFPRI has played its part in producing and making available datasets in the area of agriculture, food and climate change—and household and community-level surveys. However, IFPRI and similar institutes (i.e. policy and research) are not aid providers—they are conduits and users of aid in the countries in which they work.

3.8 Some reflections on institutional involvement

There are a plethora of international organizations and institutions involved in enhancing statistical capacity of countries in Africa. However, in spite of this, there is still a marked lack of uniformity of statistical capacity across countries. Statistical systems in African countries vary considerably—some countries are weak in some areas and strong in others, while some are weak across the board (Wingfield-Digby 2007). Many international institutions and their activities have evolved piecemeal over time, rather than as some ‘grand design’, while there seems some similarity in their mission statements and the premises on which they were established. Casual observation might even suggest that there is some overlap (if not even superfluity) in the activities that the donor institutions provide, but there is no direct evidence in support of this view. There seems to be general agreement that:

¹⁸ A comprehensive list of bilateral partners with African countries and the nature of their statistical activities can be found at <http://www.paris21.org/globaldirectory/Bilaterals/>

¹⁹ A list of multilateral donors engaged in statistics in Africa can be found at <http://www.paris21.org/globaldirectory/Multilaterals>

²⁰ MICS3 was conducted in 17 African countries—both francophone and anglophone countries are represented.

- (a) reliable, regular and timely statistics are necessary for informing policy debate;
- (b) data production (and ownership?) should be within each country's own domain;
- (c) it is best to build in-country statistical capacity (and not to rely on donor organizations for statistical expertise);
- (d) good quality data builds trust amongst users and is then more likely to be used.

4 Recent initiatives in statistics in Africa

Good, comprehensive reviews of statistical developments and initiatives in post-independence Africa have been undertaken by Lehohla (2008), Eele et al. (2009) and Wingfield-Digby (2007). We draw selectively from these reviews as well as other material, focussing especially on the most recent initiatives, as these are likely to be of most relevance in assessing aid effectiveness.

4.1 National strategies for the development of statistics

As already noted, the formation of PARIS21 in 1999 added much needed structure to statistical capacity-building, especially through the support it gave to countries in their national strategies for the development of statistics (NSDS). As Scott (2005) notes 'an NSDS strategy is both a product and a process'; it sets out the current status of the statistical system (NSS) and the country's objectives for improving the system over the medium term. It builds on what exists and involves a wide variety of users and user groups. However, we should note that the NSDSs usually have a primary focus; they tend to be geared towards serving the statistical needs of the MDGs and the PRSP. But at the inception of PARIS21, the remit was even more wide-ranging, embracing statistical needs for policy spanning the entire national statistical system.

Table 1: Summary table of NSDS status in low-income (IDA) countries (as of March 2011)

	Currently implementing a strategy		Currently designing a strategy or awaiting adoption		Without (or expired) strategy and currently planning an NSDS		Without (or expired) strategy and not planning one		Total
Africa	22	55.0%	15	37.5%	2	5.0%	1	2.5%	40
Asia & Pacific	11	40.7%	10	25.6%	6	22.2%	3	11.1%	27
Latin America & Caribbean	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	9
Europe	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3
Total	37	46.8%	25	31.6%	9	11.4%	8	10.1%	79

Source: PARIS21 (2011: 2).

In Table 1 it can be seen that Africa dominates the set of all IDA countries considered within the PARIS21 remit on the NSDS strategy; within this group 45 per cent of IDA are in Africa. However, latest figures suggest that African countries are doing relatively well in adopting an NSDS strategy; 92.5 per cent of IDA countries in Africa are either implementing an NSDS strategy or awaiting adoption, as compared with 78.4 per cent of IDA countries as a whole.²¹

Funding for work on the NSDSs is available through the Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB), set up in 2000, to provide such grants. Further funding was made available through STATCAP, set up by the World Bank in 2004, to provide loans for large scale investment in their statistical systems.²² And a further boost to the NSDS policy came with the formation of MAPS in 2004.

As Scott (2005) points out, the ideals of the NSDS strategy are beset by practical, institutional problems. For example, the National Statistical Office rarely (if ever) has the mandate to manage the poverty monitoring system—this is more likely to be in the managerial control of the finance ministry or even the president’s office. So the NSDS action plan does require a good deal of ‘inter-agency trust and goodwill’ (Scott 2005: 22). PARIS21 also facilitates a peer review system; a review team from other African countries focus on the governance of the NSS. To date, only nine countries have had a peer review carried out, which seems to be slow progress.

4.2 Marrakech action plan for statistics

The Millennium Summit in 2000 precipitated a series of International Round Table²³ meetings on ‘Managing for Development Results’, which have included statistical capacity. The second of these meetings in 2004 led to the Marrakech Action Plan for Statistics (MAPS).

This is generally recognized to have been a key milestone in data and statistical capacity-building. The main outcome was an agreement for six actions:

National actions

1. Mainstream planning of statistical systems (through the implementation of NSDS)
2. To prepare for the 2010 Population Census Round
3. To increase finances for statistical capacity-building

International actions

4. To set up an international household survey network
5. To undertake urgent improvements for MDG monitoring
6. To increase the accountability of the international statistical system

²¹ Additional data for middle-income countries are not shown here but pooling IDA and middle-income countries the figures are 84.9 per cent and 74.5 per cent respectively.

²² It would appear that few African countries have used STATCAP. Eele et al. (2009) cite only Burkina Faso and Kenya as recipients. Are donors doing enough to use these funds?

²³ At the Marrakech meeting there were 200 participants from aid organizations and developing countries, including representation from African countries.

The first three actions addressed national needs while the second three are viewed as international responsibilities.

MAPS has proved to be an important step because it provided the basic framework for more active participation of the World Bank and other partners in statistical capacity-building. Eele et al. (2009) outline the main programmes initiated by the World Bank to support MAPS. In particular, they point out that funds via TFSCB, STATCAP and UNSD have been made available in support of the three national actions, and that, in collaboration with other international agencies, funding and practical support.

MAPS also led to further initiatives within Africa. In 2004 UNECA set up a new advisory board and, subsequently, the Forum on African Statistical Development (FASDEV), with three stated aims: to keep an overview of statistical activities (including assistance and training); to set up a permanent system for monitoring statistical development in Africa; and to strengthen collaboration by relying on each partner's comparative advantage. Another recommendation by MAPS was the Accelerated Data Program (ADP-Africa), launched in 2007, primarily to assist in data dissemination and web access.²⁴

At a subsequent FASDEV meeting in 2006 a new programme, the Reference Regional Strategic Framework for Statistical Capacity Building in Africa (RRSF), was endorsed. The aim of this programme was to 'guide and accelerate' the improvement in statistical capacity across Africa by better co-ordination between countries and by adopting the NSDS approach. Along with the UNECA, co-sponsors of RRSF are AfDB, the PARIS21 consortium and the World Bank. RRSF is built around three themes: 'meeting user needs; improving management of statistical systems; and ensuring the sustainability and irreversibility of statistical development' (UNECA 2006). It is significant that, in the literature on RRSF (UNECA 2006 and 2008), there is an acknowledgement that earlier initiatives (e.g. Addis Ababa Plan of Action for Statistical Development in the late 1990s, AAPA; Committee on Development Information in 2001, CODI; FASDEV in 2004) were beset by problems that hindered the degree of success. RRSF is based on a detailed assessment of the state of statistics in Africa and it puts strong emphasis on transparency and accountability via periodic reviews. However, relying only on material available on the UNECA/RRSF website, the documents are noticeably dated: the links to 'Progress Report', 'Data dissemination', and 'funding and sustainability' are all empty. Within this context, much more work needs to be done to assess recent progress on the RRSF initiative. It would be worrying if this goes the same way as earlier statistical initiatives.

The continued perceived role of statistics in the aid effectiveness agenda is clearly illustrated by a panel discussion which took place at the Third High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra, in 2008. Statistics are seen as being 'relevant' to all Paris Declaration Principles and all Accra Agenda for Action roundtables.²⁵ As a result, a further PARIS21 initiative—Statistics for Results Facility (SRF)²⁶—was launched, with initial donor support from the Netherlands, the UK, and the World Bank, to help identify resource gaps to implement the

²⁴ In a recent assessment of progress of ADP-Africa, in which web access of datasets was attempted using a 'mystery shopper' approach, 14 of 27 countries were deemed 'active' with ADP, but in only 4 of these 14 countries was data download successful <http://www.scribd.com/doc/33816653/Assessment-of-the-Accelerated-Data-Program-July-2010>

²⁵ See <http://paris21.org/node/609>

²⁶ See <http://paris21.org/sites/default/files/sfr-brochure-en.pdf>

NSDSs and to fill these gaps as necessary. There is no immediately available evidence on how the SRF is evolving—funds, countries that have taken up this facility, etc.

4.3 General data dissemination system

The General Data Dissemination System GDDS is an IMF initiative, which was originally launched in 1995, to guide members in establishing data dissemination standards in four dimensions: (a) data: coverage, periodicity, and timeliness; (b) quality; (c) integrity; and (d) accessibility by the public. In Africa the system was launched in 2006 in 17 anglophone countries plus Mozambique with funding and support for an overview of the project by DfID. The IMF and the World Bank are carrying out a technical assistance and training programme to assist these countries in meeting their priorities. The project includes making metadata available to improve transparency of the data. Broadly, the IMF co-ordinates the project with regard to economic and financial data and the World Bank with regard to socio demographic data. Lehohla (2008) suggests that GDDS has not been wholly uncontroversial. He notes that international agencies may be seen as imposing pressures and unreasonable timeframes. However, while the demands are onerous the outcomes for countries might well be beneficial, promoting transparency and bringing about general awareness that political leadership needs.

5 Assessing aid effectiveness in statistics: some approaches

Following the creation of PARIS21 there was an early recognition of the need to measure the effectiveness of these various data and statistical initiatives—in Africa and other regions. In line with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, and the subsequent Accra Agenda for Action (OECD 2008), the approaches that have emerged are based on developing a series of indicators—continuing a similar use of indicators for the MDGs and, previously, combining indicators into the Human Development Index (HDI).

Evaluations of aid programmes or projects have often drawn upon the Logical Framework Approach (LFA), and either explicitly or implicitly using a logframe matrix. This method of project evaluation was originally developed by the Agency for International Development (AID) and has been used by many international development agencies and donors, including CIDA, DfID, SIDA, and by the OECD under its Aid Effectiveness Programme. The essence of the logframe matrix is represented in Figure 1.

The logframe matrix has a dual logic (Bakewell and Garbutt 2005). The vertical logic shows a hierarchy of objectives (inputs into activities deliver outputs, which contribute to outcomes, and which bring about the ultimate goal(s)). The horizontal logic shows how progress against each objective can be assessed (indicators and means of verification) along with external factors (assumptions). The arrows show the logical sequence of the analysis through the matrix. The essence of LFA is to establish the wider procedures of analysis. At each level the project analyst has to state what the project is attempting to accomplish (and why), what are the measurable indicators of success, and what other conditions must also exist (assumptions) along with the risks. Thus the logframe matrix is simply a way of setting out the ingredients of this analysis in a summary document. The LFA in general and the logframe matrix in particular has also been the subject of some debate. While LFA is seen as enforcing logic into an evaluation, the main criticism of it is that it rests on *linear* logic: that is, it encourages

thinking along the lines of ‘if we do this then this will happen, then that, and so on (providing our assumptions hold)’ (Bakewell and Garbutt 2005).

Figure 1: A simplified logframe matrix

Objectives	Measurable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
GOAL/IMPACT			
PURPOSE/OUTCOME			
OUTPUTS			
ACTIVITIES			
INPUTS			

Source: Adapted from Bakewell and Garbutt (2005).

In addition to its use in appraisals of effectiveness of aid projects LFA has been applied to some appraisals of programmes of statistical capacity-building in Africa and elsewhere. However the full methodology has not often been used explicitly; it has been used more on an informal basis as a framework for guidance.²⁷ Overall, LFA has proved to be a useful tool although several authors have noted that a full implementation is often constrained by the lack of expertise in using it. For example, it becomes increasingly difficult to specify, monitor and evaluate outcomes and impacts of programmes as one moves up and through the frame. Inputs are more easily measurable than outcomes or impacts. And, of course, this is a general problem in assessing all aid projects, not just statistical capacity-building.

We consider first how the generation of data and statistical activities might fit into the LFA framework, in simple terms. Clearly, the ultimate *output* of any statistical activity is the production of data and information. And the expectation is that these data will generate positive *outcomes*, which relate explicitly to the uses to which the data are put, such as informing, formulating and monitoring policy and policy outcomes, research (academic, government, NGO and commercial), etc. Outcomes will then have *impacts*, on growth, poverty, well-being, the environment, etc. But the specified outcomes and impacts may be more specific and hence more tangibly linked to the statistical programme. For example, in a statistical capacity-building programme per se outcomes might be ‘a strengthened institutional capacity in management and technical areas’; and impacts might be ‘increased government efficiency in meeting targets and public management’.


Many assessments of statistical capacity-building have often stopped well short of measuring or assessing the *results* of activities in terms of outputs (production of datasets, their timeliness and integrity, etc.), let alone of assessing outcomes or impacts. Instead, aid has sometimes been assessed solely in terms of the creation of *resources*; that is, those resources that will enhance statistical *activities*, which refer to the ability of NSSs to generate more

²⁷ It has been used informally as the basis for an evaluation of statistical capacity building in regional member countries of the AfDB (personal communication with Datuk R. Chander).

data. Resources in this context will typically include buildings, equipment (computers), other facilities (software and systems), technical and administrative personnel, and the training of personnel (including scholarships and other funding). Clearly, these resources are necessary *inputs* into the process of statistical capacity-building and of statistical activity more generally. But while they may be the most measurable elements of the logical framework sequence they are not always reliable indicators of outputs, still less of outcomes or impacts. Note that it is central to the LFA and the logframe approach to develop sets of *indicators* (columns 2 and 3 of Figure 1) in order to monitor and evaluate performance at each level.

Figure 2 (due to Ngaruko 2008a) summarizes the LFA sequence in schematic form. It starts with resource inputs (personnel, finance, equipment, etc.), through statistical activities, and through to results, which start at outputs and lead through to outcomes and impacts. It shows the importance of statistical capacity-building in influencing outputs, outcomes and, ultimately, impacts.

Figure 2: Capacity-building in the context of the results-chain framework



Source: Ngaruko (2008a). Figure reproduced here by permission of the African Development Bank/African Statistical Journal.

Notably, this schema does not view statistical capacity-building as an end product, but as part of a longer process. The LFA approach is effectively the same as the ‘results chain’ approach adopted by PARIS21 and other organizations. But this does not necessarily advance the problem of measuring, or even assessing, the *results* of statistical activities. A central issue in the statistics context is therefore for us to ask what could (or should) be measured in relation to the ultimate benefits that data production and statistical activities generate. This is especially problematic in relation to assessing outcomes and impacts. How can one realistically measure (or assess the value of) the availability of information for policy formulation, monitoring, evaluation and research? The chain format of the logframe suggests causality (and linear progression) but, as already noted, this might be unduly simplistic. But obviously, many other factors may contribute to outcomes and impacts besides improved statistics. And there may be inherent feedback mechanisms that conflict with the idea of linearity and linear causation.

5.1 Measuring statistical capacity

Statistical capacity has been defined in various ways—there is no universally accepted definition in the literature—and this has caused some basic confusion and continuing debate.²⁸ However, it is central to the aid effectiveness issue to have some way of assessing/measuring improvements in statistical capacity in a country. Put very simply, at the two extremes, the capacity to produce statistical information can be viewed either from an input or an output perspective. Traditionally, the input perspective has been equated with ‘statistical capability’—that is, it is an attempt to assess the resource inputs needed to produce statistics. So in practical terms this means measuring and monitoring changes in human and financial resources, equipment and facilities, etc. An alternative is to consider the output perspective, emphasizing effective or ‘realised statistical capacity’—that is to consider the quantity and quality of statistical output. Usually this is assessed by the availability of specific statistical data—time series that meet given quality standards, etc.

Ngaruko (2008a) argues however, that, within the context of the PARIS21 result-chain framework, statistical capacity ought to be viewed as determining the *resources* available to carry out statistical activities—that is, explicitly, from the input side. His suggested list of resources includes:

- human resources (technical, administrative, support, plus data-producing agency staff);
- infrastructure (buildings, power, etc.);
- human resources management practices (hiring, firing, promotion, training, etc.);
- finance and its characteristics (level, sources, stability);
- computing facilities (availability, maintenance, and updating of IT infrastructure);
- transport, communication and office equipment;
- statistical practices and the regulatory framework.

Indeed, a full application of the PARIS21 result-chain would generate assessments of the level and change in all these resources and, of course, much more. An alternative to this, the

²⁸ This paragraph has greatly benefited by discussions with Datuk R. Chandar.

‘output’ approach is represented by the World Bank DECDG statistical capacity indicator(s) although, as we note subsequently, there are some other important differences in degree between it and the PARIS21 results-chain approach.

5.2 World Bank (DECDG) statistical capacity indicator

DECDG at the World Bank has created a measure of statistical capacity via a set of selected indicators. DECDG has been rating countries worldwide in terms of their statistical capacity since 2004. The approach has been to develop a composite indicator of statistical capacity based on publicly-available information in three particular dimensions:

- (i) statistical methodology
- (ii) source data
- (iii) periodicity and timeliness.


Quoting DECDG (World Bank 2008), the first dimension, *statistical methodology*, measures a country’s ability to adhere to internationally recommended standards and methods. The second dimension, *source data*, reflects whether a country conducts data collection activities in line with internationally recommended periodicity, and whether data from administrative systems are available and reliable for statistical estimation purposes. The third dimension, *periodicity and timeliness*, captures the availability and periodicity of key socioeconomic indicators (nine of which are MDG indicators).

In the DECDG statistical capacity indicator *statistical methodology* is measured with 10 indicators; *source data* by 5 indicators; and *periodicity and timeliness* by a further 10 indicators. Within each dimension a set of indicators are constructed on the same scale (0 to 1) and are then combined with equal weights. A composite statistical capacity indicator is then calculated as a simple arithmetic mean of the three dimension indicators. There have been only minor revisions to the indicators since their inception; around 2008 the three dimensions were renamed (as above) and there has been some refining of the scores on one sub indicator (‘access to water’). A key advantage is that the indicators do not require data collection from countries; they are based on existing databases of international organizations. The indicators are calculated and published annually by country and by region. Full details of the DECDG indicators are appended in Annex 2.

Figure 3 shows some overall results derived from World Bank data, comparing changes in the composite statistical capacity indicator by region for 2004 and 2011. For SSA the overall statistical capacity indicator increased from 55 to 59, as compared with an increase globally from 64 to 68. Sharper and more marked differences occur with finer groupings and over different time spans.

The indicator has been subject to some debate (Wingfield-Digby 2008; Ngaruko 2008b; Fantom and Watanabe 2008), the essence of which is whether the indicator is a sufficiently good indicator of statistical capacity and whether it performs sufficiently well as a comparison either over time or across countries. In particular, it has been noted that, in practice, the indicator has shown huge variations over quite short periods of time, even though one might expect statistical capacity to be more stable and change only incrementally. The debate really centres again on the definition of ‘statistical capacity’.

Figure 3: World Bank statistical capacity indicator: a comparison



Source: World Bank Bulletin Board on Statistical Capacity <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/bulletin-board-on-statistical-capacity>.

Ngaruko (2008a) makes two criticisms of the DECDG statistical capacity indicators. First, as already mentioned, the ‘dynamics’ of statistical resources are multifaceted, so that changes in statistical capacity (which in turn affects the level at which statistical activities can take place) can arise from any or all of the resource inputs, and these are not captured by the index. Ngaruko is emphasizing that it is essentially an output and not an input measure.²⁹ Second—and this is Ngaruko’s central point—the DECDG indicator overlooks *capacity utilization*. So a country can increase its statistical activity and output by using dormant capacity rather than acquiring fresh capacity. The aid effectiveness implications are clear: if the purpose of aid is to enhance statistical capacity then it might not show up in the form of increased activity or outputs until the enhanced capacity is utilized. Ngaruko goes further by suggesting that this might be a major contributing factor to the volatility of the index—although this argument is by no means clear. It could be argued, for example, that the existence of under-utilized capacity might smooth out changes in statistical activity and data production.

Potentially, the indicator approach could be extended to include more components based on resource inputs but the DECDG indicator has probably been devised to highlight activities and outputs. From the standpoint of assessing aid effectiveness in statistics by focussing on outcomes, albeit in a limited sphere, the DECDG indicator does serve a useful purpose.

The PARIS21 results-chain (LFA) approach to assessing statistical capacity-building has been and is being pursued both explicitly and informally, in Africa and elsewhere. There is

²⁹ Ngaruko (2008b) indicates that 19 of the 25 component indicators relate to statistical activities and outputs.

no doubt that the approach is both expensive and time-consuming—requiring country visits and intensive, comprehensive reviews of NSSs. This imposes an additional burden on the already limited capacity of low-income African countries, drawing on the time and resources of staff who are needed elsewhere. For this reason, in spite of his reservations and criticisms Ngaruko sees merit in the World Bank indicator approach, as it uses readily-available evidence and is low-cost. This is a compelling argument.

Further enquiries need to be made with PARIS21 and the World Bank to ascertain the state of play with regard to measuring statistical capacity and assessing aid in statistics more generally. Indications are that much work on this is already underway in Africa by the AfDB, DECDG and UNECA, and other organizations.

6 Avenues for future work

This exploratory review of existing work, though still cursory suggests several immediate observations and some possible avenues for further work. Three broad approaches could be pursued.

6.1 Further reviews of existing literature

The exploratory review of material already found to be in the public domain has uncovered an unexpectedly large literature on aid-supported work on statistics in Africa. Many institutions are involved, and PARIS21 has compiled an inventory of institutions that are active in this area. Much more work could be done on the information that is already available. In particular, the following questions and issues could be investigated:

- (i) Determine what estimates exist of the level and extent of donor aid in statistics (in both statistical capacity-building and data collection) by country and over time. This could include both bilateral aid as well as aid from international aid organizations.
- (ii) Which countries are the principal donor countries and which countries are the principal recipients of aid in statistics?
- (iii) What are the principal conclusions that emerge from recent (though possibly yet unpublished) reviews of statistical capacity-building by donor organizations or by African institutions (AfDB, UNECA, etc.)?
- (iv) Assess whether there is any scope for undertaking a cursory empirical analysis of estimates of aid spending on statistical capacity building in Africa as compared with ‘outcomes’ via the DECDG statistical capacity indicators (2004-2010).
- (v) Are donors doing enough to encourage the use of unspent funds (e.g. STATCAP)?

6.2 Case studies

A much more thorough and in-depth analysis of the relationship between aid in supporting statistics and statistical outcomes could be pursued via case studies of selected countries. The problems with the case study approach are well-known. In particular, the question should be addressed as to whether it is possible to select a small number of countries that are sufficiently representative so that generalized conclusions can be drawn? Several possible

criteria for selecting the case studies could be considered. Bearing in mind that AfDB and other institutions (e.g. World Bank STATCAP) allocate funds for statistical capacity building on the basis of need, it might therefore be sensible to choose countries according to the level of statistical activities and outputs they have achieved (e.g. high versus low) and then to pursue enquiries about the aid and resource inputs (including their capacity utilization) that have supported these activities. Specific issues and questions that could be raised in the case studies are:

- (i) Details of aid support and assistance for statistical capacity building, data initiatives (data collection and surveys) and for dissemination—over, say, the past 10 years—to cover support for MDGs, ICP-Africa and PRSPs.
- (ii) Has the country submitted an NSDS? If so, in what specific ways has this been useful in identifying resource needs and establishing priorities for the future? Has this been effective in securing multilateral and/or bilateral country aid?
- (iii) Identify what are the perceived resource constraints in order to satisfy data needs.
- (iv) Does the country participate in GDDS? If so, what are the experiences to date? Has this helped in using aid more effectively?

6.3 Expert opinion

As noted earlier, there are many institutions involved in disbursing aid for developing statistical capability in Africa. And within these institutions there exist a relatively small number of individuals with substantial and wide-ranging expertise in this area. It would be opportune to seek and garner their considered opinions covering the whole sphere of aid in statistics, supported wherever possible by evidence. The following questions could be raised:

- (i) Comment on the efficacy of the institutional arrangements, including organization and inter-institutional co-ordination, in respect of aid support for statistical capacity building for Africa.
- (ii) In the light of the comments by Scott (2005) how is the development of an NSDS strategy (PARIS21) working out for countries in Africa? Are there any interim lessons to be learned that might be helpful to donors?
- (iii) How are new survey and data production initiatives that form part of *other* aid projects (e.g. health, agriculture, mining, etc.) accommodated within programmes of aid in statistics and NSDS strategies? Are there conflicts?
- (iv) Statistics in Africa used to be considered of low quantity (i.e. sparse or non-existent estimates) and low quality (i.e. weak integrity, coverage, periodicity and timeliness). Where does the balance now lie between the demand for and supply of statistics? Which areas are still in greatest need for support?

7 Conclusions

In little over two decades the pace of effort into building an improved capacity to produce more and better databases (higher quality, with more coverage, timeliness, periodicity and higher integrity) has been substantial. In this regard many African countries started from a very low base; even basic economic, health, environmental and socio demographic data were fragmentary and incomplete. As outlined in the earlier part of this paper there have been a plethora of initiatives both from international organizations (especially PARIS21, the World Bank, IMF, UNSD) and from African institutions (especially AfDB, UNECA, AFRISTAT) working in three main areas. The first is a major initiative in statistical capacity building: to develop the capability of countries in Africa to produce high-quality statistics to satisfy the demand for such data to formulate and monitor policies and to sustain research. The second is to develop appropriate data programmes; that is, to assist in the collection of high-quality data and information. The third initiative is to assist in the dissemination of data and information appropriate to the status of official statistics as a (global) public good.

These initiatives have been heavily supported by foreign aid (multilateral and bilateral), often channelled through African and donor institutions. Aid and investment in statistics is not easily identified in DAC statistics and, in some instances, such aid has been included as part of project or programme assistance. So all of this creates difficulties and will hamper our ability to carry out an assessment of aid effectiveness in this area.

In preparing this scoping paper we have carried out an intensive, though still cursory review of the literature that exists on support for statistics in Africa. The literature is already vast and is still growing. It has become clear that dedicated reviews—especially of statistical capacity building in Africa—are well underway. Whether these reviews will adequately address the broader and more fundamental questions of aid effectiveness in this area is far from clear. Most official statistics are global public goods. There is an insatiable demand for more and better data by data users for policy formulation, monitoring and research and there are difficult balances to be struck between aid spending in this versus other areas in Africa. So, in spite of the inherent difficulties, a good case can be made for further inquiry.

References

- AFRISTAT (2001). ‘AFRISTAT Contribution to Statistical Capacity Building in Member States During the 1996-2000 Period’. Seminar on the launching of the study ‘AFRISTAT after 2005’, Bamako.
www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/852.doc
- Alvarez, G.D., M. Tran, and R. Raina (2011). ‘MDGs: Sub-Saharan Africa: Overcoming Data Gaps and Ranking Progress’. Discussion Paper 2011-01, Department of Economics, Fordham University, New York.
http://www.fordham.edu/images/academics/graduate_schools/gsas/economics/dp2011_01_alvarez_tran_raina.pdf
- Bakewell, O., and A. Garbutt (2005). ‘The Use and Abuse of the Logical Framework Approach’. Report for SIDA, INTRAC.
<http://www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=LFA-review.pdf&a=21025#search=%22sida%20log%20frame%22>

- Eele, G. (1989). 'The Organisation and Management of Statistical Services in Africa: Why Do They Fail?'. *World Development*, 17(3): 431-38.
- Eele, G., and O. Chinganya (2005). 'Using the GDDS to Build Statistical Capacity in Africa'. *African Statistical Journal*, 1(3): 18-28.
http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/African.Statistical.Journal_Vol1_3.Articles_2.UsingGDDS.pdf
- Eele, G., N. Fantom, and M. Dinc (2009). 'Financing Statistics for Development Results'. IPMS, The 57th Session of the International Statistical Institute, Durban, South Africa
<http://www.statssa.gov.za/isi2009/ScientificProgramme/IPMS/1110.pdf>
- Eurostat (2010). 'Analysis of the 10 Core MDG Indicators: Countries of ECOWAS (including UEMOA)'. European Commission.
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/!PORTAL.wwpob_page.show?_docname=2358277.PDF
- Fantom, N., and N. Watanabe (2008). 'Improving the World Bank's Database of Statistical Capacity', *African Statistical Newsletter*, 2(3), September: 21-22.
http://www.uneca.org/statistics/statnews/ACS_Newsletter_Sept_2008.pdf
- Gorfe, N. (2009). 'Work of ECA in the Area of Statistics and Climate Change'. Expert Group Meeting on Environmental Accounting in the ESCWA Region, Beirut, Lebanon, African Centre of Statistics, UN ECA.
<http://css.escwa.org.lb/sd/1097/PresentationAfrica.pdf>
- Killen, B. (2011). 'How Much Does Aid Effectiveness Improve Development Outcomes?: Lessons from Recent Practice'. Busan Background Papers, OECD, Paris.
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/22/45/48458806.pdf>
- Kiregyera, B. (2001). 'Advocacy for Statistics and Statistical Governance'. Paper presented at the PARIS21 Workshop for East Africa and the Horn on 'Supporting Development Policy with Statistics', Kampala, Uganda, 23-26 July.
www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/934.doc
- Kiregyera, B. (2006). 'Strengthening National Statistical Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa—Some Lessons from Ugandan Experience'. The African Capacity Building Foundation, Harare.
<http://www.acbf-pact.org/SharedFiles/Download.aspx?pageid=88&mid=161&fileid=27>
- Kiregyera, B. (2008). 'Reforming National Statistical Systems in Africa: a Case for Making Statistics Offices Autonomous'. Statistics Working Paper Series I, Economic Commission for Africa, Addis Ababa.
http://www.uneca.org/statistics/docs/ReformingNSS_Final.pdf
- Kiregyera, B., C.L. Lufumpa, and M. Mouyelo-Katoula (2009). 'Statistics to Support Africa's Special Development Needs'. IPMS Session, 57th Session of the International Statistical Institute, Durban.
<http://www.statssa.gov.za/isi2009/ScientificProgramme/IPMS/0196.pdf>
- Lehohla, P. (2008). 'Statistical Development in Africa in the Context of the Global Statistical System'. Paper prepared for the 39th Session of United Nations Statistical Commission
<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/doc08/BG-AfricaStatDev.pdf>

- Ngaruko, F. (2008a). 'The World Bank's Framework for Statistical Capacity Measurement: Strengths Weaknesses and Options for Improvement'. *African Statistical Journal*, 7: 149-69.
<http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/8-worldbankframe.pdf>
- Ngaruko, F. (2008b). 'The World Bank's Approach to Statistical Capacity Measurement: The Missing Link', *African Statistical Newsletter*, 2(2): 16-18.
<http://www.uneca.org/statistics/statnews/ACSNewsletterJune2008.pdf>
- OECD (2008). 'Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action', Paris.
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>
- Okonjo-Iweala, N., and P. Osafo-Kwaako (2007). 'Improving Health Statistics in Africa'. *The Lancet*, 320(9598): 1527-28.
[http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(07\)61644-4/fulltext](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(07)61644-4/fulltext)
- PARIS21 (2004a). 'A Guide to Designing a National Strategy for the Development of Statistics'. PARIS21 Secretariat, OECD Development Cooperation Directorate.
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SCBINTRANET/Resources/NSD_Guide-Nov04.pdf
- PARIS21 (2004b). 'Better Data for Better Results: An Action Plan for Improving Development Statistics'. Second International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results, Marrakech, Morocco.
<http://www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/MAPS.pdf>
- PARIS21 (2009). 'PARIS21 at Ten: Improvements in Statistical Capacity since 1999'. PARIS 21 Secretariat, OECD Development Cooperation Directorate.
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/34/44071413.pdf>
- PARIS21 (2011). 'National Strategies for the Development of Statistics: A Progress Report'. PARIS 21 Secretariat, OECD Development Cooperation Directorate, March.
http://paris21.org/sites/default/files/NSDS_report_march2011.pdf
- Scott, C. (2005). 'Measuring Up to the Measurement Problem: The Role of Statistics in Evidence-based Policy-making'. PARIS21 Secretariat, OECD Development Cooperation Directorate.
<http://paris21.org/sites/default/files/MUMPS-full.pdf>
- Tendulkar, S. (2009). 'Demand for Better Statistics and Use of Data'. PARIS 21 Secretariat, OECD Development Cooperation Directorate, October.
<http://paris21.org/sites/default/files/datause-Tendulkar-Consortium09.pdf>
- UNECA (2006). 'Better Statistics for Improved Development Outcomes'. Reference Regional Strategy Framework for Statistical Capacity Building in Africa.
http://www.uneca.org/rrsf/statBrochure_ENG_Final.pdf
- UNECA (2008). 'Coordination of Statistical Capacity Building Efforts in Africa: An African Perspective', First Joint Meeting of African Union ... and UNECA ...
<http://www.uneca.org/cfm/2008/docs/CoordinationofStatisticalCapacity.pdf>
- Wingfield-Digby, P. (2007). 'Towards Reforming National Statistical Agencies and Systems: a Survey of Best Practice Countries with Effective National Statistical Systems in Africa'. The African Capacity Building Foundation, Harare.

<http://www.pwdigby.co.uk/pdf/ACBF%20Best%20Practice%20Study%20-%20BPP%20No.1%20STATNET,%20Sept%2020071.pdf>

Wingfield-Digby, P. (2008). 'Africa's STATS League—The Movers and Shakers 2006-2007'. *African Statistical Newsletter*, 2(1) March: 26-28.

<http://www.uneca.org/statistics/statnews/ACSNewsletterMar08final.pdf>


World Bank (2008). 'A Note on the Statistical Capacity Indicator'. DECDG.

http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/EXTWBDEBTSTA/0,,contentMDK:22260537~menuPK:6345105~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:3561370,00.html#Statistical_Capacity_Indicator

Annex 1: Progress in data availability for the MDGs

Eele et al. (2009) report and comment on the major data gaps for seven of the MDG indicators across all developing countries (in all regions). The figure below shows the percentage of countries (in 2009) with no data, just one data point and two or more data points. Obviously, with no data or just one data point it is not possible to effectively address whether or not there has been any progress. Their main comment is that, despite major efforts in data collection, six years from the MDG target date there are still major gaps.

Figure A1: Data availability for selected MDG indicators for developing countries



Source: Eele et al. (2009).

Based on a detailed report on data availability³⁰ it is possible to update this chart to 2010 and, moreover to present comparable charts for Africa (and to distinguish Northern Africa and SSA). The situation—especially for SSA—is markedly worse than for other regions for most indicators.

A related, though quite different, study has been carried out by Eurostat (2010) for member countries of ECOWAS (15 countries) and UEMOA (8 countries). As a contribution to ‘user satisfaction and improvement of third-country statistics’ the study collected data for 10 core MDG indicators from different national and international sources and analysed their quality as well as their comparability.

³⁰ <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/DataAvailability.aspx>

Annex 2: World Bank statistical capacity indicator: criteria summary description

1. Statistical methodology indicators	1	0	Max. score	Weight
1. National accounts base year	Within last 10 years or annual chain linking	Otherwise	1	10
2. Balance of payments manual in use	Balance of Payments Manual, the fifth edition	Otherwise	1	10
3. External debt reporting status	Actual or preliminary	Otherwise	1	10
4. Consumer Price Index base year	Within last 10 years or annual chain linking	Otherwise	1	10
5. Industrial production index	Produced and available from IMF	Otherwise	1	10
6. Import/export prices	Produced and available from IMF	Otherwise	1	10
7. Government finance accounting concept	Consolidated central government accounts	Otherwise	1	10
8. Enrolment reporting to UNESCO	Annual or missed reporting only once in the last 4 years	Otherwise	1	10
9. Vaccine reporting to WHO	Nationally reported data on measles vaccine coverage consistent with WHO estimates	Otherwise	1	10
10. IMF's Special Data Dissemination Standard	Subscribed	Otherwise	1	10
<i>Maximum total score is 100</i>				

2. Source data indicators	1	1/2	0	Max. score	Weight
1. Periodicity of population census	≤10 years		Otherwise	1	20
2. Periodicity of agricultural census	≤10 years		Otherwise	1	20
3. Periodicity of poverty related surveys (IES, LSMS, etc.)	≤ 3 years	≤ 5 years	Otherwise	1	20
4. Periodicity of health related surveys (DHS, MICS, Priority survey, etc.)	≤ 3 years	≤ 5 years	Otherwise	1	20
5. Completeness of vital registration system	Complete		Otherwise	1	20
<i>Maximum total score is 100</i>					

3. Periodicity and timeliness indicators	1	2/3	1/2	1/3	0	Max. score	Weight
1. Periodicity of income poverty indicator	≤ 3 years	≤ 5 years		> 5 years	Not available/ accessible	1	10
2. Periodicity of child malnutrition indicator	≤ 3 years	≤ 5 years		> 5 years	Not available/ accessible	1	10
3. Periodicity of child mortality indicator	National or international estimates available				Not available/ accessible	1	10
4. Periodicity of Immunization indicator	Annual				Not annual/ available/ accessible	1	10
5. HIV/AIDS indicator	National or international estimates available for at least one year out of the last 3 years				Not available/ accessible	1	10
6. Periodicity of maternal health indicator	≤ 3 years	≤ 5 years		> 5 years	Not available/ accessible	1	10
7. Periodicity of gender equality in education indicator	Observed for at least 5 out of 5 latest years	Observed for at least 3 out of 5 latest years		Observed for 1 out of 5 latest years	Not available/ accessible	1	10
8. Primary completion indicator	Observed for at least 5 out of 5 latest years	Observed for at least 3 out of 5 latest years		Observed for 1 out of 5 latest years	Not available/ accessible	1	10
9. Access to water indicator	Observed for 2 out of 6 latest years		Observed for 1 out of 6 latest years		Not available/ accessible	1	10
10. Periodicity of GDP growth indicator	Annual	≤ 1.5 years		> 1.5 years	Not available/ accessible	1	10
<i>Maximum total score is 100</i>							

Source: World Bank

http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/EXTWBDEBTSTA/0,,contentMDK:22260537~menuPK:6345105~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:3561370,00.html#Statistical_Capacity_Indicator