

**PARIS21 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
OECD, 3 OCTOBER 2001**

1. Welcome by the Chairman

1. The Chairman, Guest Charumbira, opened the meeting and welcomed the new members of the Steering Committee - Oladejo Ajayi (alternate for Anglophone Africa) and Maria Arteta (Latin America and the Caribbean). Apologies were received from Paul Cheung, Lucie Laliberté, Richard Leete, Cletus Mkai, and Jan Vandemoortele.

2. Role and working of the Steering Committee

2. Brian Hammond suggested that in 2002 the Committee should concentrate on advancing the work programme, the interim review, classification of membership, and possible representation of NGOs, academia and the private sector on the Steering Committee. After some debate it was agreed that the Steering Committee should not be enlarged for 2002.

3. Oladejo Ajayi commented that the Steering Committee is the channel for the membership to influence the actions of PARIS21. We need to clarify the means of communications and the methods of getting feedback from the members we are representing. Members from the South must also play a part in influencing the donors and particularly in influencing the information that international organisations are demanding from countries.

3. Work programme adjustments following the Consortium Meeting.

4. **Task teams:** Antoine Simonpietri recommended a revised programme for all five of the task teams, with an advisory board to monitor their work. Oladejo Ajayi agreed the need for review to improve the quality of the work of some of the task teams. Sub-groups of the Steering Committee were proposed to steer their future work. The Secretariat will try to implement the work programme agreed by the advisory board/sub-groups.

5. **Advocacy:** The mandate for advocacy needed to be clarified. Simple fact sheets and tools are required. Brian Hammond and Philippe Pommier agreed to work on a revision to the advocacy brochure.

6. **Deepening:** Hasan Abu-Libdeh proposed going beyond the regional workshops, to look at what the Steering Committee wanted to achieve. We have to look harder at countries' obligations and the role of the South in the Consortium. The work programme needs to be extensively reviewed, and we need to prepare a road map on what we should achieve at the regional and country level and how it should be approached.

7. **Workshops:** It was agreed that a paper was needed to set out simply how regional workshops and country workshops should be prepared, the main outputs that can be expected, and the lessons and messages we have learned to date. Mary Strode would prepare this.

8. We should consider switching the Caribbean workshop with the first Asian regional workshop. Members in the Caribbean should be contacted to confirm this.

9. **Membership:** It was agreed that the membership lists of the Consortium would be improved to ensure that all key institutions are involved. Key contact points in the major ministries in governments would be approached to nominate a representative to the Consortium. These members would be institutional members; other members would be “ordinary members”. It was agreed that the Committee needed to clarify membership of NGOs. The membership lists should be updated at least annually.

Funding and donor contact

10. It was agreed that there is a need to expand donor support by targeting donor agencies with key messages. Brian Hammond volunteered a paper for the DAC Senior Level Meeting. This would reach the second tier of management in 23 donor organisations.

Priorities for the future

11. The following action points for the future were agreed:

- a) The priority is promoting our message by better advocacy to senior policy makers in developing countries, donor agencies and international organisations. There must be more aid for monitoring and evaluation. Funds being allocated at present, such as the IDA replenishment and EC funds under the Cotonou agreement, should be tapped.
- b) Donor co-ordination is a necessity; a simple indicator is required to measure progress on co-ordination.
- c) Deepening country follow-up to workshops. Workshops are the central activity. These should establish a firm commitment from countries to develop a strategy. Donors should then co-ordinate around this strategy, ideally approved by the Ministry of Finance.
- d) Steering Committee operates by consensus – it should not be widened at the moment.
- e) We should look at membership and nominate contact points in key ministries.
- f) In April we should meet to take stock of where we are and prepare for the interim evaluation.
- g) We need to advise each representative in the Steering Committee who the members are in his/her region.
- h) Sub-groups are required to help the Secretariat with the work programme. The Secretariat will ask members to sign up once the sub-groups have been determined.
- i) A strategy paper is required on what we are to do and how we go about it. This road map should spell out what the resource requirements are.

- j) Progress reports are required back from countries.
- k) The work on indicators of statistical capacity has to speed up.
- l) DFID will help to draft a paper that links the various initiatives - GDDS, MDGs, PARIS21, and WB TFSCB - in a coherent way.

4. Comments on the draft report to UNSC/ECOSOC

12. The annual report should be finalised in time for UNSC in March to then submit to ECOSOC. It was agreed that the sections on task teams needed to be filled out and more needed to be said about what follow-up work would entail. The goals and aims of PARIS21 should be included, as set out in funding proposal. The report should be open about the funding gap, but contain less detail of income and expenditure.

13. Members were asked to assist in building closer links to UNSC. UNSD would be asked for the results of the letter that was sent to the members of the Statistical Commission earlier in the year asking for reactions to PARIS21.

5. Proposals for the interim evaluation of PARIS21

14. The proposals for evaluating PARIS21, prepared by a working group chaired by Roger Edmunds, were discussed. It was agreed that a seventh area of evaluation should be added—improved co-ordination among data producers. The Committee also suggested including an evaluation of the impact of PARIS21 and seeking qualitative indicators to reflect increased partnership and ownership.

15. The working group should look at including these two additions and also suggest how the evaluation should be carried out. The Steering Committee recommended a light evaluation. A team of two or three people should make the preparations for the review. The review would take the form of a workshop with the evaluators and a facilitator – possibly the day before the next Steering Committee meeting in April. The interim evaluation should determine the criteria for a full evaluation. These evaluation criteria must match the log frame set out in the funding proposal.

6. Topics and dates for the next Steering Committee Meeting

16. The next Steering Committee would be held in April in Paris.

The agenda would include;

- The results of the interim evaluation.
- Work programme and budget update, including results of workshops
- Agenda for the 2002 Consortium Meeting
- Interim report on the task teams, with their achievements

7. Other business

17. The Chairman was thanked for his contribution to PARIS21 and for chairing the Steering Committee. He should continue to serve as an *ex-officio* member.

Attendance:

Chairman

Guest Charumbira

Members/Alternates

Hasan Abu Libdeh
Oladejo Ajayi
Maria Arteta
Shaida Badiee
Misha Belkindas
Lamine Diop
Roger Edmunds
Bernd Förstner
Brian Hammond
Jürgen Heimann
Zarylbek Kudabaev
Philippe Pommier

Secretariat

Antoine Simonpietri
Ben Kiregyera
Mary Strode
Bahjat Achikbache
Makiko Harrison