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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Advisory Panel (AP) was created to conduct a yearly technical review of Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB) activities and report its findings and recommendations to the Consultative Group (CG) during its Annual Meeting. As decided at the Third Meeting of the Consultative Group (CG) of the TFSCB held in Paris on October 6, 2002 the AP consists of two “external advisors”.

The 11th AP meeting was held from February 24 to 28, 2014 at the Headquarters of the World Bank in Washington, DC. In its report, the AP concentrated its work on the repositioning of the TFSCB with a vision for 2015 through 2020, in the context of the objectives and goals based on the mandate established by the WB President Jim Yong Kim at the 2012 Annual Meetings and their statistical arm, i.e. the Busan Action Plan on Statistics (BAPS). The section II deals with the TFSCB funding and the recent restoration of the Fund by new donations and pledges. The section III discusses the mandate and the vision for the TFSCB future activities in the light of these new donations. A review of 2013 activities, including questions regarding the management of the TFSCB, is presented in the section IV of this report. Finally, the AP recommendations are summarized in section V. As in the reports of the previous meetings, an Annex presents and analyzes the project proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit since the 10th AP meeting held in January 2013.

The AP proposes that the TFSCB focuses its priorities on five growth areas: i) Preparation and implementation of NSDS; ii) open data; iii) gender statistics; iv) innovative approaches; v) measuring sustainable development.

During its 9th meeting, the AP recommended to the IMC to consider the submission of project proposals in two phases, the GFR being drafted after the agreement of the IMC on a letter of intention or a concept note explaining the objectives and expected results of the proposals is received. The AU produced in April 2012 new guidelines and procedures as a follow-up of this recommendation. With the experience gained from the proposals presented during the FY 2013, the AP continues to support the 2-stage procedure but recommends that as soon as possible an assessment of the new guidelines be carried out with the aim of improving its operation so that it remains efficient, transparent and flexible. The AP also recommends that the AU looks at the possibility of restoring a second Non NSDS Window.

The AP was provided with the list of thirteen proposals presented to AU for the stage 1 and eight GFRs finally proposed to the IMC. The AP was provided with the eleven proposed GFRs (eight proposals presented through the Non NSDS Window plus the three presented through the NSDS Window). The three proposals made through the NSDS Window were accepted by virtual IMC meetings. Three of the eight proposals presented through the Non NSDS Window were rejected. The total percentage of
proposals made through the Non NSDS Window that were not shortlisted after the stage 1 or rejected during the stage 2 is therefore 62 % (compared to around 50 % during the two previous periods).

The budget allocated for the sixteen approved or conditionally approved proposals was $ 2.14 million (compared to $3.92 between March 2012 and February 2013, $ 2.24 between March 2011 and February 2012, and $ 11.78 million for the two-year period between April 2008 and April 2010). The trend of the total funding has declined considerably during the past five years.

In short, based on the mandate for the future of TFSCB and the vision for 2015 through 2020, the AP proposes in the section V sixteen recommendations, the main ones are as follows:

- The TFSCB should focus its priorities on five growth areas: i) Preparation and implementation of NSDS; ii) open data; iii) gender statistics; iv) innovative approaches; v) measuring sustainable development.

- An open NSDS Window should continue to reiterate the importance of adopting strategies for building statistical capacities and their implementation.

- Building pilot sub-national strategies that can be replicated in large federal countries or unions of states should be given careful consideration.

- TFSCB proposals on Open Data Readiness Assessment and action plan would be pre-requisites and financing would be provided mostly for implementation. They should provide clear guidelines on the coverage of implementation.

- For transfer and loading of statistical indicators in Open Data Systems, funding could be from domestic sources or elsewhere as they could not be regarded as capacity building.

- TFSCB can finance gender statistics project proposals in four areas: i) assessments of the range of gender statistics available in administrative sources and technical advices on how they can be classified, tabulated and made accessible to the users; ii) creation of guidelines and modules on gender statistics to be utilized in the design and questionnaires of planned censuses and surveys; iii) best use of existing data and facilitation of the use of data by gender specialists; iv) building of partnerships.

- TFSCB is encouraged to provide support to small-scale projects that are likely to serve as catalysts for wider-scale improvements in the area of measuring sustainable development. Proposals may include training and organization of workshops by regional organizations.

- An assessment of the new guidelines and procedures produced by the AU in
April, 2012 should be carried out as soon as possible with the aim of improving its operation so that it is efficient, transparent and flexible.

- The IMC regional members, as well as the WB country representatives, should be more proactive in their respective regions with outreaching on the TFSCB program.

- Efforts should continue to be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the countries to prepare more comprehensive NSDS really adapted to the situation of the statistical system, to tie up with the developmental objectives of the countries and to update, or to re-draft the NSDSs of the first generation.

- For the project proposals to be submitted by non-IDA countries, a significant contribution from the requesting country comparable to the sum funded by the TFSCB should be asked.

- Whenever it is possible, sector specific projects should be financed through alternative facilities or by sources external to the World Bank.

### I. BACKGROUND

#### 1.1. Organization of the work of the Advisory Panel (AP)

The AP was created to conduct a yearly technical review of TFSCB activities and report its findings and recommendations to the Consultative Group (CG) of the TFSCB during the PARIS21 Annual Meetings. As decided at the Third Meeting of the CG held in Paris on October 6, 2002 the AP consists of two “external advisors”¹ who meet the Administrative Unit (AU) in charge of the management of the TFSCB once a year at the Headquarters of the World Bank. These meetings are organized some weeks before the meetings of the CG in order to prepare and present report based on the most recent facts and findings.

The 11th meeting of the AP was held from February 24 to 28, 2014. The reports of the previous meetings are available on the World Bank Website.

---

¹ See the rationale behind this decision and the terms of the reference of the AP in the reports of the previous AP meetings.
1.2 Acknowledgments

The AP was provided with documents for review and discussions on project proposals submitted to the Internal Management Committee (IMC) of the TFSCB since the 10th meeting of the AP, in particular:
- the minutes of the IMC meeting held on December 2, 2013 for the proposals made under the Non NSDS windows;
- the Grant Funding Requests (GFR) for these proposals (with their Grant Financing Plans and Budget Tables), including the GFR prepared for the three proposals made under the NSDS window and submitted for virtual meetings by the TFSCB IMC in 2013;
- a note for discussion prepared by the AU for an IMC meeting held on February 18, 2014, to bring its attention on a set of issues linked to scaling up the TFSCB and refocusing it for the Post-2015 Data Revolution;
- some other relevant documents concerning the preparation of the short list at the end of the stage 1 of the new procedure according to the new TFSCB Guidelines and Procedures3
- the progress report on the First Round of Open Data Readiness Assessments (ODRA) and Action Plans prepared by the Open Data Policy Group at the demand of the IMC;
- a discussion paper on “Open Data Challenges and Opportunities for NSOs” prepared for a side event of the meeting of the 45th session of the UN Statistical Commission (New York, March 3, 2014).

The AP had comprehensive discussions with some members of the IMC in the World Bank: Grant Cameron (Manager, Development Data Group, DECDG, and Head of the IMC), Grigory Kisunko (Europe and Central Asia Region), John L. Newman (Africa Region), Ms Barbro Hexeberg and Olivier Dupriez (DDG, DECDG), Ms Amparo Ballivian (Open Data Unit, DECDG) and Ms Masako Hiraga (Gender Statistics Unit, DDG, DECDG). The AP also met with Ms Ingrid Ivins and Mustafa Dinc (AU and IMC) and made a courtesy call on Ms Haishan Fu, recently appointed as Director of the DECDG. These discussions were fruitful and served to look forward to the future of TFSCB. More than 13 years of operational knowhow and expertise supported by the decision-making process which is now well established allows for rapid and efficient clearance of project proposals.

1.3 Content of the AP Report

During its 11th meeting, the AP concentrated its work on the repositioning of the TFSCB in the context of the objectives and goals based on the mandate established by the WB President Jim Yong Kim at the 2012 Annual Meetings and their statistical arm, i.e. the Busan Action Plan on Statistics (BAPS) and with recently available resources.

2 The TFSCB Guidelines and Procedures were provided to the AP during its 10th meeting in January 2013.

3 See the section IV of the report and its Annex for the presentation of the new procedures.
The section II deals with the TFSCB funding. The section III discusses the mandate and the vision for the TFSCB future activities in the light of the new donations or pledges recently made to the Trust Fund. A review of 2013 activities, including questions regarding the management of the TFSCB, is presented in the section IV of this report. Finally, the AP recommendations are summarized in section V. As in the reports of the previous meetings, an Annex presents and analyzes the project proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit since the 10th AP meeting held in January 2013.

II. TFSCB FUNDING

TFSCB has evolved over a period of its operations into a sound financial and management tool for providing, in cooperation with the development partners, small grants to developing countries for statistical projects in a flexible manner. It has built up organization, management, guidelines and procedures for operations with well defined objectives. For years it was a multi-recipients fund supported by a significant number of donors. But now the number of donors has drastically decreased and the AP noted during its 10th meeting that the resources of the Fund have dwindled to a balance of about US $ 2 million of unallocated funds.

To address this gloomy situation, the AP recommended to the DECDG to develop a concerted strategy and pursue all the available avenues for funding in 2013. In the Fall of 2013, the DFID agreed to contribute almost $ 20 million to the TFSCB and transferred this sum in one single tranche. The Korean government also pledged to contribute $ 3 million over three years. Accordingly, at the TFSCB team request, the DEC Vice President of the WB approved an extension of the programmes supported by the TFSCB from the end of the year 2015 to the end of the year 2020. The last two other existing donors decided to exit from the Fund, as their contributions were mostly spent.

The AP welcomed this new situation despite its narrow donor base. It will allow to continue promotion of medium- to long-term system-wide vision, consistent with the BAPS, on statistical development in developing countries and to contribute to the design and creation of NSDS in a large number of countries, the implementation of a large number of smaller country or regional, sector specific and training projects on statistical capacity building.

During its 10th meeting in 2013, the AP recommended to explore the possibility of getting the support of the World Bank’s management for investment in statistical capacity building and Open Data Initiative, possibility of securing funding for the BAPS and importance being given to gender, vital and agriculture statistics. It was also informed that some non-governmental foundations have expressed interest in funding implementation of Open Government Data Programme in developing countries. Certain governments who were TFSCB donor partners in the past and some new prospective
donor emerging countries\(^4\) could also be drawn in as some of the proposed growth areas could be of interest to them. The AP strongly recommended continuing efforts to enlarge the list of donors and to approach new categories of donors.

Moreover the DECDG should periodically examine that the TFSCB remains closely aligned with Country Assistance Strategies (CASs) as well as with regional and sector strategies. Such strategic alignment can facilitate fund raising and eventual delivery of results that are targeted by the developmental objectives.

**III. TFSCB Future: Mandate and Vision 2015 - 2020**

“*Data are crucial to setting priorities, making sound policy and tracking results. Yet many countries have weak statistical capacity and lack reliable and updated economic and poverty data.*\(^5\)” To address this imbalance between demand and supply of timely and quality data, the World Bank President suggested in his speech to:

a. Invest in data and analytical tools building on the success of the Open Data Initiative; and

b. Work with partners (in building statistical capacity) to ensure virtually all developing countries have timely and accurate data.

Taking into consideration, this broad mandate established by the World Bank President, the growth areas proposed by TFSCB donors and the priorities resulting from the Bussan Action Plan for Statistics (BAPS) and from the future MDGs’ framework, and recent availability of funds, the AU prepared a note for discussion for the IMC meeting held on February 18, 2014. According to this note, special emphasis should be placed on:

1. Making government data more accessible by participating actively in the Bank policy on Open Data Readiness Assessment (ODRA) and Action Plan\(^6\);  
2. Improving the production and use of Gender Statistics  
3. Improving the data foundation for measuring sustainable development  
4. Funding innovative approach  
5. Improving TFSCB’s results focus.

---

\(^4\) The Russian Government has signed in April, 2012, a US$ 15 million grant with the World Bank to support its Multi-Donor Programmatic Trust Fund (ECASTAT) that will enhance capacity and address financial constraints of the statistical systems in Eastern Europe and the CIS, with an emphasis on IDA borrower countries. On another hand, the TFSCB staff is currently working on drafting the Administration Agreement for the Korean pledged contribution.

\(^5\) Remarks made by the World Bank President Jim Yong Kim at the Annual Meetings Plenary Sessions, Tokyo, Japan, October 11, 2012.

The AP welcomes this proposal but nevertheless reiterates the importance of pursuing its support to the preparation of new or updated NSDS and their implementation. According to the last PARIS21 progress report, 15% of IDA countries and 35% of low and lower-middle income countries have no strategy or an expired strategy. PARIS21 has prepared with the help of a Task Team\(^7\) an update of the NSDS Guidelines. Producing NSDS or new NSDS will therefore remain an important task. Efforts should also go on for implementing NSDS.

So the AP has discussed five growth areas: i) Preparation and implementation of NSDS; ii) open data; iii) gender statistics; iv) innovative approaches; v) measuring sustainable development.

### 3.1. Preparation and implementation of NSDS

PARIS21 produces twice a year a progress report presenting NSDS status in IDA countries and in Low and Lower-Middle Income Countries\(^8\). According to these progress reports, several countries have prepared or updated NSDS under the auspices of the TFSCB grants or with the support of some donors (e.g. regional development banks). Some of them have implemented these strategies through STATCAP loans, SFR facility, with the help of TFSCB grants for specific implementation needs or through their own funds or the funds granted or loaned by other donors.

However, the following tasks still need to be addressed:

a. The NSDS need to be prepared for the countries that have not done yet or have an expired strategy.

b. Prioritized implementation plans need to be prepared for the countries intending to commit to their implementation and having ability to line up funding.

c. Creating awareness and promoting implementation of strategies in remaining countries.

d. Examining the results of the preparation and contents of NSDS and experience gained through their implementation and delivery of results and prepare model country case studies and recommendations that can be utilized in the implementation of revised guidelines as well as for countries planning implementation\(^9\).

---

\(^7\) The Task Team was composed of representatives of the following countries or institutions: Canada (Statistics Canada, chair), Ethiopia, France, Pakistan, Saint-Lucia, UK (DFID), Eurostat, FAO, IMF, WB (DECDG)


\(^9\) During its 7\(^{th}\) meeting (May 2010), the AP supported recommendation nr. 8 of the Independent Evaluation Report made in 2009 which stated that some form of evaluation could help to highlight lessons learned for the benefit of future projects (expansion of the role of the AP to include ex-post evaluation of sample projects, thematic evaluations, and end-of-project evaluations of the largest projects). Therefore, the AP reiterated during its 10\(^{th}\) meeting (recommendation #11) its recommendation #5 of its 9\(^{th}\) meeting. Post-
In order to finance projects associated with these tasks, the TFSCB staff should have concerted action plan in collaboration with other TF existing within the WB, PARIS21, other bilateral or multilateral donors and NSOs. TTLs should be appropriately briefed and encouraged for project proposals in these areas.

Open NSDS Window should continue to reiterate the importance of strategies and their implementation.

Among the current criteria on the selection of projects for financing, there is no guideline on the consideration of sub-national projects. If any quality proposal on a sub-national (state/region) project targeting creation of a sub-national strategy of a model nature that can be replicated in other states or regions is received for TFSCB financing, it should be given careful consideration, in particular in large federal countries or unions of states. The AP nevertheless agrees that the TFSCB, with its limited resources, cannot afford to finance all sub-national projects in all large countries and that the concerned guideline has consequently to be restrictive and limited to pilots.

3.2. Open Data:

The AP was pleased to note that the DECDG has initiated several actions to promote open data initiatives, enhance preparation of open data assessment and action plans in selected countries in order to create further awareness on open data and put the initiative on a sounder methodological and strategic footing. High level as well as technical consultations have been carried out. In this connection a side event at the meeting of the UN Statistical Commission has been organized by the World Bank on March 3, 2014 in New York to get inputs of the NSOs and international and regional statistical agencies on the Report prepared by the Working Group.

The AP also noted and accepted that Open Data proposals will be mainstreamed and will not have a separate Window\(^1\) under TFSCB. The BAPS as well as the donors have given great importance to Open Data and it’s a high profile subject in the statistical world and transparent governance. Therefore in developing vision on allocation of resources for next five years consideration should be given to number of IDA and low middle income countries likely to participate and submit proposal on Open Data for TFSCB financing. The AP learnt from the DECDG Open Data Unit that an average cost for an initial assessment and implementation per country might be around $150,000, which allows developing and funding a significant number of pilot countries.

\(^{1}\) During its 10\(^{th}\) meeting, the AP recommended to submit Open Data proposals through a specific Open Window (recommendation #3).

evaluations of countries’ NSDS work are necessary. DECDG and PARIS21 should collate and publish case studies for selected model countries (at least one for each region).
The AP was informed and recommends that for TFSCB proposals on Open Data readiness assessment and action plan would be pre-requisites and financing would be provided mostly for implementation. The TSFCB should possibly provide clear guideline on the coverage of implementation e.g. technical assistance, training, workshops, and software. For data transfer and loading, funding could be from domestic sources or elsewhere as they could not be regarded as capacity building.

The AP commends the IMC decision on not to approve global projects unless background report including results of the previously approved preceding global project are submitted together with the proposal. Availability of such results could eventually facilitate reporting on achievements of the BAPS.

3.3. Gender statistics

A steady flow of gender statistics may come out from administrative sources. They need to be meaningfully classified and aggregated regularly to be analytically useful. Some countries may need assessment of the range of gender statistics available in administrative sources and technical advice on how they can be classified, tabulated and made accessible to the users. TFSCB can finance proposals on such assessment requiring technical assistance and training.

The second important source of gender statistics is censuses and surveys. The gender specialists should be involved during their planning and design. The questionnaires to be utilized for censuses and surveys should carry analytically meaningful questions on gender so that when answers are tabulated they can yield required data. Therefore TFSCB could finance creation of guidelines and modules on gender statistics to be utilized in the design and questionnaires of planned censuses and surveys. Sometimes collected census and survey data are not appropriately classified and tabulated in time for compiling gender statistics. TFSCB could consider financing provision of technical assistance and training to IDA and low middle income countries on gender statistics in the context of censuses and surveys.

The AP found that gender specialists at the World Bank are interested in the analysis of gender statistics. Analytically useful gender statistics cannot be derived unless basic data are collected or available and appropriately classified and aggregated. These specialists should therefore be convinced to contribute to the improvement of data sources and statistics on gender. They can also provide their input on guidelines and modules on gender for censuses and surveys.

Finally, TFSCB may also support proposals aiming at best use of the existing data that are often already disaggregated by sex and facilitating the use of these data by gender specialists.

The AP in the Report of its 9th Meeting (March 2, 2012) pitched for collaboration with other institutions on several domains, in particular in gender statistics. In fact the BAPS endorsed the support for gender statistics. The launch of initiatives such as the
Evidence and Data for Gender Equality Initiative (EDGE) and the World Bank Umbrella Trust Funds will help fill some gaps in Gender Statistics. DECDG should continue to play an active role in building up partnerships in these areas and examine how the TFSCB could contribute to these efforts in a complementary way.

3.4. Innovative approaches

In the note for discussion prepared by the AU for an IMC meeting held on February 18, 2014, the TFSCB staff noted that the IT revolution over the last decade has provided an unprecedented opportunity not only to strengthen statistical data collection and production, but also for helping the users and decision-makers. An example of innovative activities can be found in the use of mobile phones for collecting and disseminating data\(^{11}\).

The AP agrees that TFSCB can help bridge the gap in these activities by supporting pilot exercises on small-scale innovations based on IT.

3.5. Measuring Sustainable Development

The BAPS also encourages countries to adopt the System of Environmental Economic Accounting (SEEA) in order to enable governments and businesses to be more accountable for their impact and sustainable development. It’s not up to TFSCB to fund the development and implementation of such system, which would be a long and costly activity exceeding the ceiling established by the Fund for each project.

However, taking into account the availability and the weak quality of environmental accounts in most developing countries, the AP may agree to encourage support in this area in the form of small-scale projects likely to serve as a catalyst for wider-scale improvements. TFSCB should approach UNSD to encourage regional organizations to submit proposals on training and workshops on environmental accounting for their regions for funding. The UNSD could suggest experts who could provide technical expertise for these events. Thus the Trust Fund could contribute to capacity building in this area.

IV. REVIEW OF 2013 TFSCB ACTIVITIES

4.1. Management of the TFSCB

As noted in the previous reports of the AP meetings, the TFSCB has successfully operated, since its inception in 1999, in promoting medium- to long-term system-wide vision on statistical development in developing countries. Its financing has also contributed to the design and creation of NSDS in a large number of countries. These

\(^{11}\) The use of mobile phones was included in the NSDS implementation proposed by Togo and approved by the IMC during the FY 13.
NSDS have provided the basis for STATCAP projects of the World Bank or for country projects that are being implemented with financing from the SFR Catalytic Fund. In addition, TFSCB financing has contributed to the implementation of a large number of smaller country or regional, sector specific, and training projects on statistical capacity building.

Improved communication media created through World Bank and PARIS 21 websites led to a better understanding of TF goals and resulted in a greater percentage of proposals in line with the main objective of statistical capacity building. The mechanism for making decisions within the IMC is now well established and runs efficiently and allows NSDS proposals to be immediately reviewed as they are received under the “NSDS Window”. The AP has found that all decisions made during the meetings of the IMC were generally decided according to the guidelines after a well-informed thinking and debate.

Following one recommendation made by the AP during its 9th meeting\(^\text{12}\), the AU introduced in April 2012 new guidelines and procedures. The new procedure consists of two-stages: during the stage 1, TTLs submit, in consultation with the agency who has expressed interest, a short proposal (2 pages following a template recommended in the guidelines). After review, a short list is established by the IMC and shortlisted proposals are notified to the TTLs. During the stage 2, for each proposal the prospective grant recipient and the TTL complete the GFR that is sent to the IMC for review and decision making. Decisions were made by the IMC during a face-to-face meeting (held on December 2, 2013). There was only one window in 2013 as well as in 2012.

During its 10th meeting, the AP noted that some IMC members were not completely satisfied with the way in which this new procedure was implemented mainly as concerns the lack of flexibility and transparency. The limitation to a single window has considerably delayed the consideration of proposals submitted in 2012 and 2013. On the other hand, according to some IMC members, they were only asked to endorse in a very short time a list of shortlisted proposals prepared by the AU\(^\text{13}\), without any opportunity of having an in-depth discussion through a face-to-face IMC meeting.

The AP was not in position to assess the merits of these comments. It continues to support the 2-stage procedure but recommended during its 10th meeting that as soon as possible an assessment of the new guidelines be carried out with the aim of improving its operation so that it is efficient, flexible and transparent. The AP noted that, in 2013, the AU specified more clearly the criteria taken into account for shortlisting proposals for the stage 2. These criteria are the following:

- a. linkage with NSDS and evidence of demand from the recipient;

---

\(^{12}\) Recommendation #11

\(^{13}\) The AU sent to all IMC members by e-mail on September 10, 2013, a list of pre-selected proposals along with the criteria used to assess them. The IMC members were asked to endorse this list within a 10-days delay but had the option to ask the AU to reconsider its recommendations.
b. fit with priorities of the TFSCB and the BAPS;
c. likelihood of follow-up and sustainability;
d. innovative approaches and replicability;
e. measurable outcomes;
f. policy relevance;
g. absorption capacity, feasibility and implementation risks;
h. availability of alternative/additional financing sources; and
i. overall quality of the application.

The AP also recommended that the AU looks at the possibility of preparing the list of shortlisted proposals through a face-to-face IMC meeting and restoring the second non-NSDS Window.\(^{14}\)

Finally, the AP recalls its recommendation made during its \(^9\)th meeting: since the TTLs have generally very little time to really manage the projects, because of their small size that usually generates a problem for the cost/effectiveness of all the tasks to be done by TTL, it would be advisable to propose in the GFR some “tracking indicators” that could be used by the TTL to follow up easily the progress of each project.

### 4.2. Highlights of 2013

The AP was provided with the list of thirteen proposals presented to AU for the stage 1 and eight GFRs finally proposed to the IMC for final decision during its meeting of December 2, 2013. At the end of the stage 1, nine out of thirteen proposals were shortlisted, but one shortlisted proposal was not followed by the preparation and submission of a GFR. The AP was provided with the eleven proposed GFRs (eight proposals presented through the Non NSDS Window plus the three presented through the NSDS Window). The three proposals made through the NSDS Window were accepted by virtual IMC meetings. Three of the eight proposals presented through the Non NSDS Window were rejected. The total percentage of proposals made through the Non NSDS Window that were not shortlisted after the stage 1 or rejected during the stage 2 is therefore 62\(\%\) (compared to around 50\(\%\) during the two previous periods).

The budget allocated for the sixteen approved or conditionally approved proposals was \$ 2.14 million (compared to \$3.92 between March 2012 and February 2013, \$ 2.24 between March 2011 and February 2012, and \$ 11.78 million for the two-year period between April 2008 and April 2010). The trend of the total funding has considerably decreased during the past five years.

### 4.3. Outreach

\(^{14}\) In 2013, since few proposals were received because of the lack of financial resources, it would have been impossible to organize two non-NSDS Windows.
The AP supports the comments made by the AU in the note it prepared for the IMC meeting of February 18, 2014, about the role of the IMC regional members: it would be very helpful that the IMC regional members, as well as the WB country representatives, be more proactive in their respective regions with outreaching on the TFSCB programme. The recent decision to extend the TFSCB programme to the end of the year 2020 makes it even more necessary an increased commitment of these officials.

4.4. Post-evaluation of Projects

During its 7th meeting (May 2010), the AP supported recommendation #8 of the Independent Evaluation Report made in 2009 which stated that some form of evaluation could help to highlight lessons learned for the benefit of future projects (expansion of the role of the AP to include ex-post evaluation of sample projects, thematic evaluations, end-of-project evaluations of the largest projects). Therefore, the AP reiterates its recommendation #5 of its 9th meeting. Post-evaluations of countries’ NSDS work are necessary. DECDG and PARIS21 should collate and publish case studies for selected model countries (at least one for each region).

VI. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The TFSCB should focus its priorities on five growth areas: i) Preparation and implementation of NSDS; ii) open data; iii) gender statistics; iv) innovative approaches; v) measuring sustainable development.

2. An open NSDS Window should continue to reiterate the importance of adopting strategies for building statistical capacities and their implementation.

3. Building pilot sub-national strategies that can be replicated in large federal countries or unions of states should be given careful consideration.

4. TFSCB proposals on Open Data Readiness Assessment and action plan would be pre-requisites and financing would be provided mostly for implementation. They should provide clear guidelines on the coverage of implementation.

5. For transfer and loading of statistical indicators in Open Data Systems, funding could be from domestic sources or elsewhere as they could not be regarded as capacity building.

6. TFSCB can finance gender statistics project proposals in four areas: i) assessments of the range of gender statistics available in administrative sources.

15 This section includes some recommendations reiterated from the reports of the previous AP meetings. Several recommendations from the reports of the previous AP meetings are not reiterated but nevertheless still actual issues.
and technical advices on how they can be classified, tabulated and made accessible to the users; ii) creation of guidelines and modules on gender statistics to be utilized in the design and questionnaires of planned censuses and surveys; iii) best use of existing data and facilitation of the use of data by gender specialists; iv) building of partnerships.

7. TFSCB can finance pilot exercises on small-scale IT innovations that can improve statistical production and dissemination.

8. TFSCB is encouraged to provide support to small-scale projects that are likely to serve as catalysts for wider-scale improvements in the area of measuring sustainable development. Proposals may include training and organization of workshops by regional organizations.

9. An assessment of the new guidelines and procedures produced by the AU in April, 2012 should be carried out as soon as possible with the aim of improving its operation so that it is efficient, transparent and flexible\textsuperscript{16}.

10. The IMC regional members, but also the WB country representatives, should be more proactive in their respective regions with outreaching on the TFSCB programme.

11. The AU should look at the possibility of preparing the list of shortlisted proposals through a face-to-face IMC meeting and restoring a second Non NSDS Window\textsuperscript{17}.

12. “Tracking indicators” should be included in each GFR. They could be used by the TTL to follow up easily the progress of the projects\textsuperscript{18}.

13. Post-evaluations of countries’ NSDS work and implementation are necessary for future work. DECDG and PARIS21 should collate and publish case studies for selected model countries (at least one for each region)\textsuperscript{19}.

14. Efforts should continue to be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the countries to prepare more comprehensive NSDS really adapted to the situation of

\textsuperscript{16} Reiteration of the recommendation #7 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting.

\textsuperscript{17} Reiteration of the recommendation #9 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting. Restoring a second Non NSDS Window may be necessary if the number of proposals become again important, due to the new financial situation of the Fund.

\textsuperscript{18} Reiteration of the recommendations #7 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting and #12 of the report of the 9\textsuperscript{th} meeting.

\textsuperscript{19} Reiteration of the recommendation s #7 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting and #5 of the report of the 9\textsuperscript{th} meeting.
the statistical system, to tie up with the developmental objectives of the countries and to update, or to re-draft the NSDSs of the first generation\textsuperscript{20}.

15. For the project proposals to be submitted by non-IDA countries, a significant contribution from the requesting country comparable to the sum funded by the TFSCB should be asked\textsuperscript{21}.

16. Whenever it is possible, sector specific projects should be financed through alternative facilities (e.g. the TF ECASTAT) or by sources external to the World Bank (e.g. FAO)\textsuperscript{22}.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{20} Reiteration of the recommendation \#12 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting.

\textsuperscript{21} Reiteration of the recommendation \#14 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting

\textsuperscript{22} Reiteration of the recommendation \#15 of the report of the 10\textsuperscript{th} meeting
\end{flushleft}
ANNEX

UPDATE OF THE SURVEY OF THE RECENT PROJECT PROPOSALS RECEIVED BY THE TFSCB ADMINISTRATION UNIT (AU)

Since the 9th AP meeting held in February, 2012, and as mentioned in the section 4 of the report, new guidelines and procedures were proposed by the TFSCB Administration Unit in April 2012 to prepare TFSCB funding proposals. The new procedure consists of Two-Stage procedure.

During the Stage 1, TTLs submit, in consultation with the agency who has expressed interest, a short proposal (2 pages following a template proposed in the guidelines). After review, a short list is established by the IMC and shortlisted proposals are notified to the TTLs. During the Stage 2, the recipients and the TTLs complete the Grant Funding Request (GFR) that is sent to the IMC for review and decision taking. Decisions were taken by the IMC during a face-to-face meeting (held on December 2, 2013).

The proposals presented through the NSDS Window are not affected by these new procedures.

Results of the Stage 1

Thirteen proposals were received by IMC and nine were shortlisted. One shortlisted proposal (Support of ODRA and Action Plan in Peru) was not followed by the preparation of a GFR.

Results of the Stage 2

Three proposals were submitted through the NSDS Window and approved. Two proposals were related to the design of strategies in Myanmar and Sierra Leone on a no-objection basis (renewal of an expired strategy for Sierra Leone). The third proposal approved through the NSDS Window was related to support to the implementation of the NSDS 2011 – 2015 prepared by Mauritania. This proposal were presented in 2012 but was formally submitted after the deadline; during its meeting of September 19, 2012, the IMC decided that this proposal will be submitted in 2013 through the NSDS Window; the rationale for this approach was that the GFR was actually received before the deadline but not the formal Country Director approval. As such, the AU recommended treating

23 A list of shortlisted proposals was prepared by the Administrative Unit and sent to the IMC members for endorsement.
this proposal as an exceptional case and requested the IMC approval during a virtual NSDS Window meeting²⁴.

The AP was provided with the eleven GFR proposals (eight proposals presented for decision to the December 2013, IMC meeting plus the three approved through the NSDS Window). Three of the eight proposals discussed during the IMC meeting were rejected. The total percentage of proposals made through the Non NSDS Window that were not shortlisted after the stage 1 or rejected during the stage 2 is therefore 62 % (larger than for the two previous periods where it was around 50 %).

The geographical distribution of the thirteen proposals presented during the stage 1 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of proposals</th>
<th>Number of shortlisted proposals</th>
<th>Number of GFR received during the Stage 2</th>
<th>Number of accepted proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we include the three proposals presented through the NSDS Window, the geographical distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of proposals</th>
<th>Number of accepted proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁴ The AP welcomed this approach
The budget allocated for the 8 approved or conditionally approved proposals was $2.14 million (compared to $3.92 million between March 2012 and February 2013, $2.24 between March 2011 and February 2012, $11.78 million between April 2008 and April 2010, and $5.52 million between April 2010 and March 2011). The average funding was $2.77 million during the past three years, much below the funding observed in the previous periods that was over $5 million every year.

During its 7th meeting, the AP supported the 4th recommendation of the evaluation report and proposed to adjust the ceiling of the grants from $400,000 to $500,000 (corresponding to an inflation rate of 2.25% per year since 2000). Half of the proposals presented a request above the former ceiling of $400,000 but only one proposal was accepted over the former ceiling of $400,000.

Since the report of its 6th meeting, the AP classifies the proposals received by the TFSCB Administration Unit into six non-homogeneous25 categories:

1. NSDS proposals (1 new proposal identified in this category)
2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS (3 new proposals identified in this category)
3. Country proposals concerning sector specific activities (3 new proposals identified in this category)
4. Regional proposals made by multilateral institutions (3 new proposals identified in this category)
5. Proposals made by NGOs (no new proposal identified in this category)
6. Proposals aiming at facilitating the participation of statisticians from developing countries in international conferences, seminars or workshops (no new proposal identified in this category).

The statistics at the end of each section are presented with a reminder summary of the comparable ones presented in the reports of the previous meetings. In the column “Budget allocated”, the figures are presented in US dollars.

1. **NSDS proposals** (2 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section concern not only new NSDS proposals, but also updates of former NSDS (or Statistical Master Plans), or NSDS replacing “first generation” NSDS that did not comply with the guidelines proposed by PARIS21 after some years of experience.

The limited number of new proposals is due to the fact that a very large majority of developing or transition countries have now prepared SNDS or Statistical Master Plans. During its 6th meeting, the AP welcomed the initiative taken by PARIS21 to distribute a brochure on “NSDS Status in IDA and Lower and Middle Income Countries”

---

25 The three first categories are depending on the content of the proposals; the three last ones are depending on the different institutions (other than bilateral) having made the proposal.
in May 2009. This brochure was updated at several times. According to the last updated brochure (November, 2013), only 3.7 % of the IDA and low and middle income countries have no strategy or with strategy expired and not planning one (against 25.6 % five years ago) and 14.8 % have an expired strategy but currently planning a new one. But these percentages are somewhat misleading insofar as they confuse NSDS of the first and second generations. Efforts should continue to be made by PARIS21 and the WB to encourage the countries to prepare more comprehensive NSDS really adapted to the situation of the statistical system and to update, or re-draft the NSDSs of the first generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSDS Window</td>
<td>Sierra Leone – Developing a National Statistics Strategy</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>135,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar – Developing a National Strategy for Statistics</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>202,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>338,330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.5 % of the presented proposals
25.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
15.8 % of the budget allocated

Reminder: Statistics 10th AP meeting
3.7 % of the presented proposals
6.7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
1.5 % of the budget allocated

Consolidated statistics (8th and 9th AP meetings)
16.3 % of the presented proposals
23.5 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
17.0 % of the budget allocated

Consolidated statistics (6th and 7th AP meetings)
13.5 % of the presented proposals
17.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
14.4 % of the budget allocated

The NSDS proposed by Myanmar is the first one in the history of this country that has started a transition process towards more democracy and transparency.

2. Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS (3 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section concern methods on implementing validated NSDS but also focusing on the enhancement of NSDS through advocacy, evaluation, etc.
The ODRA proposals are included in this section since the Open Data Policy may be considered as one of the ways for strengthening statistical capacities in a country\textsuperscript{26}. Funding ODRA proposals enlarges the recommendation made by the AP during its 8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} meetings concerning the improvement of the dissemination of national statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non NSDS Window</td>
<td>Sudan – NSDS Implementation by strengthening key statistics</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Rejected, invited to resubmit for virtual review</td>
<td>(requested 500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia – Ulyanovsk ODRA Action Plan</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>(requested 100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>451,259</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*18.7% of the presented proposals
*12.5% of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
*21.1% of the budget allocated

\textit{Reminder: Statistics10\textsuperscript{th} meeting)}

\textit{Consolidated statistics (8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} AP meetings)}

\textit{Consolidated statistics (6\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} AP meetings)}

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.6% of the presented proposals</td>
<td>20.3% of the presented proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.4% of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</td>
<td>20.8% of the proposals approved or conditionally approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.7% of the budget allocated</td>
<td>26.5% of the budget allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS that have been approved or conditionally approved and of budget allocated to these proposals varies greatly from one period to another. The AP as well as the 2009 evaluation of the TFSCB drew the attention of the AU to the importance of such proposals, in particular in poor or fragile countries.

\textsuperscript{26} Three ODRA proposals were received by the AU: LAC region of the WB (regional implementation of Caribbean ODRA Action Plans), Peru (support of ODRA and Action Plan) and Russia (open data action plan in Ulyanovsk oblast). Only the last proposal is present in this section. The LAC is presented in the 4\textsuperscript{th} section (proposals made by inter-govermenttal institutions. proposal. The proposal from Peru was shortlisted during the phase 1, but no GFR produced.
The IMC rejected the Russian proposal on the basis that Russia is a middle-income country and a donor\(^ {27} \) to the WB.

3. **Country proposals concerning sector specific activities** (3 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section relate to specific statistical topics complementing the preparation or the implementation of NSDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non SNDS Window</td>
<td>Bangladesh – Enhancing Capacity for Urban Poverty Statistics</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Conditionally approved</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Djibouti – SCB for Macroeconomic and Poverty Work</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus – Business and Enterprises Surveys</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Conditionally approved</td>
<td>229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>799,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.7 % of the presented proposals  
37.5 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved  
37.4 % of the budget allocated  

**Reminder: Statistics (10th meeting)**  
22.2 % of the presented proposals  
40.0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved  
26.4 % of the budget allocated  

**Consolidated statistics (8th and 9th AP meetings)**  
26.6 % of the presented proposals  
17.6 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved  
19.6 % of the budget allocated  

**Consolidated statistics (6th and 7th AP meetings)**  
20.3 % of the presented proposals  
13.2 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved  
15.7 % of the budget allocated  

During its previous meetings, the AP noted that financing sector specific activities may be an interesting and valuable complement to the NSDS, provided that such proposals have been made in countries having adopted and validated a NSDS, which is the case for these three proposals.

\(^ {27} \) The Russian Federation is funding the ECASTAT TF for strengthening statistical capacities in the CIS countries.
The TTL for one of the proposal (Belarus) has requested an execution by the Bank; in conditionally approving the proposal; the IMC suggested a Recipient execution. The AP approves this condition. The AP has also noted that it would now have become possible to finance this proposal through the TF ECASTAT funded by the Russian Federation. For the project proposals presented by non-IDA countries, one recommendation presented by the AP in some of its past reports was to ask a significant contribution (say 50%) from the country comparable to the sum funded by the TFSCB.

4. Regional/international proposals made by inter-governmental institutions (3 new proposals)

Proposals presented in this section refer to regional or multilateral proposals made by inter-governmental institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non NSDS Window</td>
<td>WB – Second Round of Open Data Readiness Assessment and Action Plans (ODRA)</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Conditionally approved, then approved through a virtual meeting&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAC – Caribbean ODRA Action Plan</td>
<td>Latin American and Caribbean</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCAP – Regional Program for Improvement of Economic Statistics</td>
<td>South Asia, Eastern Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>(requested 484,770)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 550,000 (requested 1,034,770)

<sup>28</sup> During its meeting of December 2, 2013, the IMC decided to conditionally approve this proposal until the project team provides more background information (outcomes, outputs, country selection criteria, etc.) on the first Open Data TFSCB Grant. See the report of the AP 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. The AP was provided with a Progress Report, dated January 30, 2014, produced by the Open Data Policy Group. The IMC has consequently accepted this proposal for the amount requested ($350,000) through a virtual meeting on a no-objection basis.
Two proposals were presented to the IMC by units in charge of Open Data policy within the World Bank, respectively DECDG (SIOD) and the TWICT Unit (Capacity Building for Open Government Statistics and Data Analytics in Developing Countries).

However, the AP recalls that, during its 6th meeting, it recommended that specific rules for making decisions on proposals submitted by World Bank units have to be prepared and submitted to the Donor’s Committee.

5. Proposals made by NGOs (no new proposal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminder: Statistics 10th meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consolidated statistics (8th and 9th AP meetings)**

- 20.7% of the presented proposals
- 16.7% of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
- 20.3% of the budget allocated

**Consolidated statistics (6th and 7th AP meetings)**

- 25.0% of the presented proposals
- 27.4% of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
- 34.5% of the budget allocated

No proposal has been made by NGOs for more than two years. The last proposals received by the Administrative Unit were not approved and no budget was allocated. However, during its 7th meeting, the AP noted that NGOs’ proposals conducive to promote national statistical capacity building and generation of demand for statistics should be considered carefully if any.

6. Facilitating participation in international conferences (no new proposal)

Requests submitted by organizers of international conferences or seminars to facilitate developing countries’ participation in these events are discussed in this section:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Budget allocated in $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 % of the presented proposals
0 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
0 % of the budget allocated

Reminder: Statistics (10th meeting)
3.7 % of the presented proposals
6.7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
6.3 % of the budget allocated

Consolidated statistics (8th and 9th AP meetings)
4.1 % of the presented proposals
5.9 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
5.8 % of the budget allocated

Consolidated statistics (6th and 7th AP meetings)
15.5 % of the presented proposals
21.7 % of the proposals approved or conditionally approved
9.0 % of the budget allocated

During its previous sessions, the AP recognized that funding participation of statisticians from developing countries to international conferences or seminars through the TFSCB can contribute to international co-operation by encouraging the participation of developing countries in the dialogue on the development of policy, framework, standards and methodologies on statistics. There is merit in funding such participation provided there is an effective contribution by the sponsored participants in the development of standards, methodologies and innovations in statistics and they become vehicles for knowledge transfer to the developing countries. During its 2010 Fall meeting, the IMC took decisions on the principles, the budget allocation, the event selection process and the administrative process. The TFSCB Guidelines and Procedures will be revised to reflect the changes.

In 2012, the ISI presented a project proposal presented that was consistent with these decisions. But ISI has presented a global plan covering the two calendar years 2013 – 2014. It is the reason why it did not make a new request also in 2013.

Additional remark:

As regards the proposals that were not shortlisted at the end of the stage 1 or not followed by a GFR presented to the IMC meeting of September 19, 2012, these proposals might be classified as follows:

---

29 The details of these decisions could be found in the report of the 8th meeting of the AP (March 28, 2011 – page 20).
1. **NSDS proposals & Update of NSDS:**
   - India: SCB for sub-national and local governments in selected lagging States\(^{30}\) of India

2. **Country proposals concerning the implementation of NSDS:**
   - AFRISTAT: Institutional and technical capacity building for AFRISTAT and the NSSs of its member states
   - Peru\(^{31}\): Support of ODRA and Action Plan

3. **Country proposals concerning sector specific activities:**
   - South Africa: Getting sectoral Carbon Pricing Right: an Open Source Marginal Abatement Cost Curve and Data
   - Indian Ocean Commission: Improving fisheries statistics in the South-West Indian Ocean

\(^{30}\) namely Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal

\(^{31}\) This proposal was shortlisted but the AU has not received the GFR.