

EVALUATION OF ESCAP'S FLAGSHIP PUBLICATION

The Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific

PROGRESS REVIEW – 2006 and 2007 EDITIONS

Prepared for the
United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
Programme Management Division
Bangkok, Thailand

GROUP DIMENSIONS
INTERNATIONAL

Janet Mancini Billson, PhD, Director



Woolwich, Maine, USA
jmbillson@gdiworld.com

November 11, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE:.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Purpose of the Review	1
B. Approach to the Review	1
C. Organization of this Report	2
 PART TWO:	 3
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2005 EVALUATION	3
I. THE SURVEY'S STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES	3
II. SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
 PART THREE:.....	 5
INCORPORATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS INTO 2006/07 SURVEYS.....	5
I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS.....	5
II. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS	7
A. Finding: The Survey Lacks Priority	7
1. Elevate the <i>Survey</i> in ESCAP	7
a. Absorption of Evaluation into Survey Planning and Processes	7
b. Planning Cycle Issues.....	7
2. Strengthen the Core Team.....	9
3. Strengthen External Reviews	10
4. Strengthen Interdivisional Input, Collaboration (see IV.F). (3.75)	11
5. Build in a Five-Year Evaluation Plan	11
B. Improving the Survey's Strategic Relevance	12
1. Improve the Survey's Links to Development Realities	12
2. Improve Impacts on Policy Making	13
C. Broadening and Deepening the Survey's Impact	15
1. Strengthen Its Role as a Regional Advocacy Document (4.22).....	15
2. Improve the Survey's Impacts on Development Planning.....	16
D. Shaping More Powerful Content and Quality	17
1. Clarify and Strengthen Editorial Focus and Messaging.....	17
2. Clarify the <i>Survey's</i> Role in Relation to the Commission Theme Study.....	19
3. Blend the Survey and the MDG Report.....	20
E. Balancing Economic and Social Analyses	22
1. Strengthen Social Analysis	22
2. Balance and Link Economic and Social Analyses	22
4. Strengthen Economic Analysis	24
F. Facilitating Cross-Divisional Contributions	25
1. Remove the Barriers to Involvement, Consultation, and Collaboration.....	25
2. Make the Survey More Relevant to Division or Sector Work.....	27
G. Upgrading Data Collection, Management, and Presentation.....	28
1. Improve Data Collection and Management.....	28
3. Streamline the Relationship between SD (SISS) and PDD.....	29
3. Improve Data Presentation and Statistical Analysis.....	31
H. Modernising Production Quality and Processes.....	32
1. Improve the Editorial and Production Processes	32

2. Improve Format, Presentation, and Production Quality	33
I. Broadening the Survey’s Impact through Broader Dissemination.....	36
1. Improve Breadth and Depth of Dissemination.....	36
External Dissemination	37
Internal Dissemination.....	37
2. Increase Funding for Dissemination	38
J. Giving the Survey Resources Commensurate with Flagship Status	39
1. Improve the Survey’s Resources and Budgets.....	39
2. Specific Line Items to Increase	40
 PART FOUR:.....	 42
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	42
ANNEXES	43
ANNEX A FEEDBACK ON CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	44
ANNEX B PDD Memo Regarding Dissemination of 2007 Survey	46
ANNEX C 2006 WORKING GROUP REPORT	48

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This review of the 2006 and 2007 volumes of ESCAP's flagship publication follows on a more extensive evaluation carried out in 2005 of the 2000-2005 editions, reported in Billson and Steinmeyer, *Evaluation of ESCAP's Flagship Publication: The Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific* (referred to here as the "2005 Evaluation").

As stated in the present TOR, "Follow-up on findings and recommendations contained in evaluations is essential in ensuring that lessons learned are integrated into ESCAP's planning and implementation processes, with a view to strengthening the quality of ESCAP's work." This review assesses the extent to which recommendations contained in the 2005 Evaluation have been reflected in subsequent editions. Findings will provide further inputs into the process of strengthening the publication.

The 2005 Evaluation underscored internal and external respondent perceptions of the *Survey* as a highly useful publication, especially in the regional context. Several challenges were also noted by respondents and the evaluators, especially the absence of a general sense of ownership of the *Survey* within ESCAP, which was reflected in a marked lack of cross-divisional collaboration and a disconnect between those responsible for production of the *Survey* (PDD) and ESCAP's official organizational centre for preparing databases (SD). This also contributed to a relative absence of social data and analysis critical to regional development policy and planning, which hampered full realization of the *Survey's* potential relevance and impact.

The present evaluation concludes that, of the recommendations made in 2005, two were implemented with substantial progress:

- ♦ **Integrating the social dimensions of development more prominently; and**
- ♦ **Streamlining editorial and production processes (including presentation quality).**

Several recommendations resulted in notable improvement:

- ♦ *Create better links between macro- and micro-level analyses, economic and social analyses, and normative, analytical, and technical cooperation;*
- ♦ *Highlight policy implications of data trends;*
- ♦ *Incorporate best practices and examples of policy or implementation successes;*
- ♦ *Become the nexus between understanding regional data and sub-regional data through more intentionally linking data and policy making;*
- ♦ *Maximize the Survey's impact with improved dissemination generally and by conducting workshops and seminars throughout the region to highlight messages and to strengthen policy making.*

One key recommendation resulted in mixed implementation:

- ♦ Routinely involve more divisions to improve organizational ownership and depth.

Respondents generally reported improved coordination between PDD and ESID, and among PDD and TID and ESDD, in preparing the 2006 and 2007 editions.

These recommendations and their implementation are analyzed in detail in this report, based on the evaluator's desk review, as well as interviews and a questionnaire administered to Division Chiefs and *Survey* producers. General conclusions are that:

- Further improvement is required across the board, but especially in cross-divisional collaboration in conceptualizing, designing, and producing the Survey, which would help clarify ESCAP's flagship publication as a product of ESCAP rather than of one unit.
- The tension between responsibly producing a flexible, dynamic, and timely *Survey* on a one-year cycle and the need for divisional contributions to be planned on a two-year cycle continues to limit cross-divisional collaboration.
- Different approaches to statistical database construction between SD and PDD continue to complicate the relationship between PDD and SD.
- Insufficient funding of replacements that would enable ESID staff to be seconded to the Core Team in a meaningful and practical way remains an issue that demands resolution.
- The *Survey* requires further funding for design and dissemination to elevate it to its deserved place as a clear leader among flagship publications in the development world.

Final recommendations (Part Four) include several strategies:

- ✚ *Institutionalize Oversight.*
- ✚ *Strengthen the Core Team.*
- ✚ *Brand the Survey.*
- ✚ *Maximize Collaboration between PDD and SD; PDD and ESID.*
- ✚ *Involve All Divisions in Planning and Production.*
- ✚ *Expand Funding for Dissemination and the Core Team.*
- ✚ *Institutionalize Five-Year Evaluations.*

NOTE: This review focuses primarily on the 2007 Survey, since the original evaluation report was not issued until December 2006, when the 2006 Survey was already with the editors. Nonetheless, some improvements were made even to the 2006 edition, based on discussions held during the evaluation process.

**EVALUATION OF ESCAP'S
FLAGSHIP PUBLICATION**
The Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific

PROGRESS REVIEW – 2006 and 2007 EDITIONS

**PART ONE:
INTRODUCTION**

I. INTRODUCTION

This year's Survey has been very successful thanks to your suggestions...it has improved.¹

A. Purpose of the Review

As ESCAP's flagship publication, the *Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific* reflects the primary goals and objectives of the organization, provides a broad perspective on issues that affects a large segment of the world's population, and offers in-depth examinations, perceptions, and outlooks of relevant analysts and experts. Careful assessment of the *Survey's* progress will help it reach its full potential as a useful publication in the region and in the world. Therefore, ESCAP's Programme Management Division (PMD) requested this follow-up review, which was conducted by Group Dimensions International, Woolwich, Maine, USA, with PMD's logistical assistance. The evaluation is intended to help plan future volumes of the *Survey* and will contribute to its positioning within ESCAP.

B. Approach to the Review

This report involved a Desk Review that compared the extent to which the 2006 and 2007 *Surveys* incorporated recommendations from the 2005 Survey Evaluation. To access perspectives on the two most recent volumes, the evaluator also sent an email mini-survey during May-July 2007 to Division Chiefs and the present *Survey* producers, asking them to comment on implementation of specific recommendations (Annex A). Email or telephone interviews were also conducted with all Division Chiefs and the present *Survey* producers with a focus on resources, challenges, and potential solutions that will further elevate the *Survey's* quality, usefulness, and readability. The data from internal respondents were aggregated in order to protect respondent identities. Key findings from these respondents are included in Part Three.

Unlike the 2005 Survey Evaluation, this review did not include contact with external readers of the *Survey*. However, the evaluator undertook a short analysis of the 2007 media dissemination patterns (as provided by the *Survey* editor and by PMD, Annex B) and reviewed the 2006 report of the Working Group on the External Evaluator's Report (Annex C).

¹ All quotes in italics are verbatim comments given by respondents during the interviewing process. Names are eliminated to preserve confidentiality.

C. Organization of this Report

This report includes four parts: Part One, Introduction; Part Two, Key Recommendations from the 2005 Evaluation; Part Three, Incorporation of Recommendations in the 2006 and 2007 *Surveys*; and Part Four, Conclusions and Recommendations.

PART TWO: KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2005 SURVEY EVALUATION

I. THE SURVEY'S STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

The Survey is the only regional publication looking at economic and social issues together.

The 2005 Evaluation uncovered several important strengths in linking regional inputs to a global outlook, providing regional and sub-regional data and analysis, a user-friendly format, availability in hard copy or on-line, coverage of timely issues, solid data and analysis, and a strong staff with funding through the regular budget.

Equally important challenges were also documented, including low readership and weak dissemination, relative inattention to social issues in development, and several production issues. The evaluators found that the Survey at that time lacked priority within ESCAP, strategic relevance, editorial focus, and balance between economic and social analyses. Broad conclusions included:

- ◆ Cross-divisional involvement needs strengthening.
- ◆ Data collection needs upgrading.
- ◆ Production quality and processes need modernising.
- ◆ Dissemination is narrowly defined.
- ◆ Resources and budget are marginally sufficient.

It was within the context of these strengths and challenges that the Survey Evaluation concluded that future issues must address:

- The lack of analytical and other connections between macroeconomics and social issues, and the lack of broad-based priority given to the Survey within ESCAP.
- Low readership and use within ESCAP and modest readership outside the organization, which left its impacts on development planning, policy, or implementation unclear.

The lack of priority inside the organization weakens input (knowledge, skills, and sophistication of content); lack of buy-in from internal staff weakens the possibilities of strong word of mouth advocacy among member states; and relatively low visibility of the publication weakens its impacts and influence, both internally and externally. (2005 Evaluation)

II. SUMMARY OF ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

We need to do all these improvements but at the same time there should be more financial support for them.

This section presents the recommendations made in 2005 by respondents, synthesized by the evaluators, and placed into the context of the analytical framework of the evaluation: The *Survey's* Comparative Advantage, Impact, Relevance, Effectiveness, and Efficiency. The challenges are ordered in terms of relative importance in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Challenges and Recommendations (Overview)

[Table 4.1 in original Evaluation]

<i>Challenges</i>	<i>2005 Recommendations</i>
	I. IMPACT, POLICY, AND STRATEGY ISSUES
A. The <i>Survey</i> Lacks Priority within ESCAP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elevate the <i>Survey</i> in ESCAP 2. Strengthen the Core Team 3. Strengthen External Reviews 4. Strengthen Interdivisional Input and Collaboration (I.I.E) 5. Build in a Five-Year Evaluation Plan
B. The <i>Survey</i> Lacks Strategic Relevance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Links to Development Realities 2. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Impacts on Policy Making
C. The <i>Survey</i> Should Have Greater Impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen Its Role as a Regional Advocacy Document 2. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Impacts on Development Planning
	II. CONTENT AND QUALITY ISSUES
D. The <i>Survey</i> Lacks Editorial Focus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify and Strengthen Editorial Focus and Messaging 2. Clarify the <i>Survey's</i> Role in Relation to the Commission Theme Study 3. Blend the <i>Survey</i> and the <i>MDG Report</i>
E. The <i>Survey</i> Lacks Balance between Economic and Social Analyses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen Social Analysis 2. Improve the Balance/Linkages between Economic and Social Analyses 3. Strengthen Economic Analysis
F. Cross-Divisional Involvement Needs Strengthening	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the Barriers to Involvement, Consultation, and Collaboration 2. Make the <i>Survey</i> More Relevant to Division or Sector Work
G. Data Collection Needs Upgrading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve Data Collection and Management 2. Streamline the Relationship between SD (SISS) and PDD 3. Improve Data Presentation and Statistical Analysis
	III. PRODUCTION QUALITY AND PROCESS ISSUES
H. Production Quality and Processes Need Modernising	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the Editorial and Production Processes 2. Improve Format, Presentation, and Production Quality
	IV. READERSHIP AND DISSEMINATION ISSUES
I. Dissemination Is Narrowly Defined	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the Breadth and Depth of Dissemination 2. Increase Funding for Dissemination
	V. RESOURCE ISSUES
J. Resources and Budget Are Marginally Sufficient	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Resources and Budget 2. Specific Budget Lines to Increase

PART THREE: INCORPORATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS INTO THE 2006-2007 SURVEYS

The main body of this report examines the extent to which substance-related recommendations are reflected in and have been incorporated into the 2006 and 2007 *Surveys*. It should be noted that the 2006 volume was almost complete when the initial Survey Evaluation was being discussed by the Working Group²; thus, many recommendations were too late to be incorporated. For that reason, the 2007 volume is a better measure against the recommendations than is the 2006 edition.

The discussion in this part focuses on results of the questionnaire distributed to Division Chiefs and the *Survey* producers; telephone or email interviews with Division Chiefs and the *Survey* producers; and the recommendations of the Working Group.

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The 2007 Survey captured a lot of attention regionally and globally. We took most of the recommendations into consideration. The Survey was on the right track but we needed to improve.

The results of the questionnaire are shown in Table 3.1, comparing the items to each other in terms of the mean (in this case, the most sensitive measure) and the range (the number of points between the highest and the lowest rating on a 5-point scale, where 5 is the highest possible score). Note that a wide range, for example 4 points between the highest rating and the lowest rating, indicates substantial disagreement among respondents. A narrow range, for example 2 points, indicates more agreement on an item.³

Table 3.1 displays for each recommendation the percentage of respondents who rated it as having been accomplished at the highest end (a 5 or a 4 rating) and the percentage who rated it at the lowest end (a 1 or 2 rating). The patterns of response indicate that substantial disagreement exists as to whether many recommendations have been implemented as of mid-2007. Those recommendations that received the highest means and the highest ratings are shown in darker grey. Those that remain especially problematic are displayed in lighter grey.

None of the respondents gave consistently high (5 out of 5) ratings to all items across the board; in fact, only three out of nine respondents used the 5 rating at all (and one of the three used it only once). One person gave almost consistently low ratings across the board. This means that:

² The Executive Secretary (ES) appointed a Working Group on the Evaluation Report of the *Survey* (WG), chaired by the deputy ES, Mr. Shigeru Mochida, to review the 2005 recommendations. Members were Mr. Ravi Ratnayake, Director, Poverty and Development Division; Ms. Thelma Kay, Director, Emerging Social Issues Division; and Mr. Pietro Gennari, Director, Statistics Division.

³ Although only nine responses were obtained (six Division Chiefs out of ten and three out of four producers), the response rate was high. In fact, because this was a very narrow, targeted set of respondents, concepts such as response rate or sampling are irrelevant. The point simply was to “take the pulse” in a measured way of those who know the document well. All who were sent the questionnaire were also invited to participate in a telephone interview (see next section), which most did.

- a) Division Chiefs and *Survey* producers (who responded to the questionnaire) agreed that much improvement remains to be accomplished on the *Survey* in all its aspects.
- b) There is a significant split between some stakeholders who are relatively pleased with the processes (editorial and production) that surround the *Survey* and others who feel that cross-divisional collaboration, quality, and content need fundamental improvement. This split must be resolved before the *Survey* can be expected to reach its full potential.

Table 3.1. Average and Distribution of Responses by Item on Questionnaire

<i>Item</i> (dark grey=highest ratings) (light grey=lowest ratings)	<i>Item Mean</i>	<i>Item Range</i>	<i>% with Highest Two Ratings⁴</i>	<i>% with Lowest Two Ratings</i>
<i>Survey question: Please indicate to what extent you believe the 2007 Survey reflects the following recommendations:</i>				
Elevate the Survey in ESCAP	3.87	2.00	75.0%	0%
Strengthen the Core Team	3.44	3.00	55.5%	22.2%
Strengthen External Reviews	3.44	4.00	55.5%	11.1%
Strengthen Interdivisional Input	3.75	4.00	75%	12.5%
Build in Evaluation Plan	3.37	4.00	50%	12.5%
Improve Survey's Links to Development Realities	4.00	3.00	87.5%	12.5%
Improve Survey's Impacts on Policy Making	4.12	2.00	87.5%	0%
Strengthen Role as Regional Advocacy Document	4.22	2.00	88.9%	0%
Improve Survey's Impacts on Development Planning	3.44	4.00	55.5%	11.1%
Clarify, Strengthen Editorial Focus, Messaging	3.77	4.00	66.6%	11.1%
Clarify Role Re Commission Theme Study	3.25	4.00	50%	25%
[Blend <i>Survey</i> and MDG Report] **	3.11	4.00	55.5%	33.3%
Strengthen Social Analysis	3.55	2.00	77.8%*	22.2%
Improve Balance, Links bet. Econ., Social Analyses	3.44	4.00	66.7%	22.2%
Strengthen Economic Analysis	3.55	3.00	55.5%	22.2%
Remove Barriers to (Cross-Divisional) Involvement	3.55	4.00	77.8%	22.2%
Make Survey More Relevant to Division, Sector Work	3.55	4.00	55.5%	11.1%
Improve Data Collection and Management	3.22	3.00	44.4%*	11.1%
Streamline Relationship between SD and PDD	3.11	4.00	44.4%	22.2%
Improve Data Presentation, Statistical Analysis	3.66	2.00	55.5%	0%
Improve Editorial and Production Processes	4.00	2.00	85.7%	0%
Improve Format, Presentation, Production Quality	3.87	3.00	62.5%	12.5%
Strengthen the Editorial Team	4.00	3.00	85.7%	14.3%
Improve Breadth, Depth of Dissemination	3.66	4.00	88.8%	0%
Increase Funding for Dissemination	3.66	4.00	66.6%	11.1%
Improve Survey's Resources and Budget	3.22	3.00	44.4%*	11.1%
[mean of means = 3.60]	93.82			

*There were no "Very Much" (5) ratings for these items.

**Recommendation was not supported by the WG, which confounds the responses.

⁴ The highest possible ratings were 5 ("Very Much") and 4 ("Quite a Bit"); the lowest possible ratings were 1 ("Not at All") and 2 ("A Little Bit"); 3 = "Somewhat" in the interpretation.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Survey keeps improving.

The series of tables below show key findings from the 2005 Evaluation and related recommendations. Each recommendation from 2005 is displayed in comparison to the findings from the 2006 WG recommendations, the 2007 desk review and interviews with ten Division Chiefs, *Survey* producers, and the secretariat, and the 2007 questionnaire. New (or reinforced) recommendations for future work appear at the end of each table.

A. Finding: The Survey Lacks Priority

1. Elevate the Survey in ESCAP

a. Absorption of Evaluation into Survey Planning and Processes

Generally, respondents were very positive toward the 2006 and especially the 2007 *Survey*. The publication obviously holds a unique place in the region and in ESCAP's productivity and purpose. Although not all the previous recommendations were accepted, they were generally viewed as "helpful" by the majority of respondents. Most importantly, the evaluation process itself appeared to have elevated consciousness of the *Survey* among ESCAP employees, stimulated discussion about the appropriate nature of divisional contributions and collaboration, and triggered new ideas about how to disseminate the *Survey* internally and externally.

The last report was helpful and had a positive impact on the Survey. Compared to the 2005 Survey, it is a different product. The report gave a sense of urgency to respond to the good recommendations. I'm pretty happy with elevating the Survey to a higher level.

Several interviewees commented that the appointment of the Working Group constituted in itself a positive step toward elevating the *Survey* to a more prominent place: "He [the ES] supported [improvements]...and asked for so many things to improve it."

b. Planning Cycle Issues

Elevating the *Survey* in ESCAP presents complexities, however, especially when it comes to finding ways appropriately to involve divisions that are not in the "Core Team" that resides in PDD. In order to be timely, the *Survey's* planning cycle evolves over a "short" one-year period. Rather, it should spread over a two-year cycle to allow more time for research, peer review, and production. This was noted by the evaluator during the 2005 site visit and was raised again by some interviewees during this evaluation. The issue rests not only on finding time for staff from other divisions to contribute but also on building a quality flagship publication, as one respondent described:

The World Bank, UNDP, all use a two-year cycle. Issues such as health or gender equality are not going to change. We compromise quality on the second part because people have to do a "rush job". The Survey will come out every year anyway. You can have in-depth discussion, peer review, etc. Send the draft outline around so people are more aware of it and have more time for meaningful peer review. Chapter 2, in particular, should be much better thought out and in depth. Say we decide a particular topic will appear in 2009, you start preparing now. There would have to be a period that you will have two teams working side by side during the two years [whose work] will appear after on-going discussions (e.g., on environmental sustainability).

Others said that while a two-year cycle would be sensible for Chapter 3, which should be thematic and topical, a contingency plan would be necessary to respond quickly as realities change in the region. Flexibility in selecting topics is paramount, which flies in the face of planning personnel commitments two or more years in advance through individual ePAS. Staff time from outside the Core Team would be in the budget but, as research and priorities change, those personnel might not be the most appropriate experts and contributors. The short cycle “pressurizes everyone” but it renders the *Survey* more responsive to regional issues and events.

Table 3.2. Elevate the Survey (M=3.87)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)⁵</i> ● Satisfactory but Requires further Development
◆ More clearly define targeted audience; include internal staff in definition.	◆	◆ External dissemination has improved. ◆ Internal respondents continue to complain about some lack of availability.
◆ Provide executive leadership for paradigm shift.	◆ Retain in substantive Division	◆ Indicated by appointment of WG, review of implementation, and some increased funding, especially for dissemination.
◆ Convene a meeting before launch; ask Econ. Officers and ESDD-Division Chief to discuss ESCAP views.	◆	◆ Unknown.

Recommendations:

- Maintain close overview of the *Survey* at the secretariat level, including through an on-going *Survey* Advisory Group (SAG) chaired by the DES, with membership from at least half of the divisions (rotating bi-annually, but including PDD, SD, and ESID), and a mandate to hold open meetings at least twice a year.
- Retain the one-year cycle to protect timeliness but ask other divisions to contribute topical, analytical pieces suitable for Chapter 3 that they can be working on over a two- or even three-year period. Proceed with the intention that such products will, in fact, become Chapter 3 in the year they are produced unless a *major* regional or international issue (such as an environmental or economic crisis) intervenes. This would afford both the benefit of flexibility and also the benefit of in-depth analytical work by non-core divisions.
- Chapters 1 and 2 can continue to respond in a timely fashion to emerging issues and events. If drafters utilized table-maker programs that automatically update figures from a database, redrafting in the event of delay would be simplified.
- Continue to improve funding for the *Survey*. Even with the recommendations made by the Working Group, the *Survey* remains under-funded in the evaluator’s opinion. For example, the amount suggested for consultant time to replace someone in ESID who might be seconded to the *Survey* seems minimal and probably unrealistic.
- Provide copies of the *Survey* to *all* ESCAP staff who would like one.

⁵ Based upon evaluator’s 2007 desk review of the 2006 and 2007 Surveys, and interviews with Division Chiefs and Survey producers (some overlap).

2. Strengthen the Core Team

A key recommendation in 2005 was to move the *Survey* into the OES, which would be one means of elevating its visibility, status, and perhaps resources. That recommendation was declined by both the WG and the ES. As one person said, “One division, i.e., PDD, should have overall control, with divisions supplying inputs as appropriate. Too many cooks managing the *Survey* will weaken it and dilute ownership.” The evaluator agrees with that statement, but also does not equate location in OES with a lack of leadership. In other words, the entire production staff that currently resides in PDD could be moved into a special unit in the OES, with the editorial freedom it has now, but with higher organizational status and greater ability to coordinate contributions from other divisions, including PDD. Although the recommendation was rejected for what are certainly other good organizational reasons, the fact that the *Survey* remains in PDD preserves the problem of how to strengthen the Core Team without adding new personnel.

To date, the organization has attempted to strengthen the Core Team through secondment only, whereas the 2005 Evaluation called for one or two *full-time* social scientists permanently hired into PDD (or whatever the production unit). Respondent feedback indicated that additional dedicated staff would be preferable to overloading another division (e.g., ESID), which already has its own mandates to fulfill:

We would like to have more staff but it is a matter of funding, as always. In the end it is basically the same team. We are trying within these constraints to mobilize other divisions to help us, i.e., ESID and SD. The way any division works, with individual work plans, [makes it difficult].

Nonetheless, there was moderate agreement that the *Survey* has gained ground because of attempts to strengthen the Core Team, especially in its appearance, dissemination and impact.

Table 3.3. Strengthen the Core Team (M=3.44)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Modify core team to inc. one or two full-time social scientists (expertise in health, education, gender, etc.).	◆ Core Team to <i>coordinate</i> preparation with other divisions. ◆ Strengthen Core Team into a permanent research unit to lead analytical work; conduct empirical studies on key socio-economic trends.	➤ Not achieved; staff assigned to Core Team through seconding only.
◆ Integrate social analysis throughout.		➤ Much improved through gender analysis in Chapter 3 and better integration in Chapters 1 and 2.
◆ Hire another macro-economist/statistician.		➤ Not done due to budgetary constraints

Recommendations:

- ◆ The initial recommendations continue to require OES consideration, especially the recommendations regarding hiring one or two more social scientists and another macro-economist/statistician who would be permanent members of the Core Team. These recommendations are not inconsistent with the WG recommendation that the Core Team (now in PDD) should be strengthened into a “permanent research team” that would coordinate contributions from other divisions.
- ◆ Continue to integrate social analysis throughout and to use Chapter 3 as a showcase for one or more social or cross-cutting issues. With the success of the “gender chapter”, the *Survey* now has an opportunity to make an important mark in the development community with a strong series of similar chapters.
- ◆ Continue to improve integration of social and economic analysis throughout the volume— this includes careful integration of *economic* analysis in Chapter 3 as well as integration of social analysis in Chapters 1 and 2.
- ◆ Future volumes could conclude or begin with a one-page “KEY SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRENDS” in the region that could be a stimulus for debate among government, research, and development agency readers, as well as for ESCAP staff to discuss with countries.

3. Strengthen External Reviews

Although funding was not provided to strengthen external reviews through paying substantive, external expert reviewers (first bullet), academics and policy makers participated in the external peer review of the 2007 volume on an unpaid basis. They were recognized in the Acknowledgements. While this is a laudable practice that should be an on-going, institutionalized practice in *Survey* review, the evaluator continues to support the suggestion of many respondents in 2005: To engage more fully regional experts in both drafting and reviewing.

Table 3.4. Strengthen External Reviews (M=3.44)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Enlist substantive, external (paid) expert reviewer with Asia-Pacific expertise.	◆ Invite regional experts to contribute inputs to specific chapters or sections.	◆ No funding for this activity
◆ Invite pre-eminent scholars to do an external review as an honour; highlight in Acknowledgements.	◆ Create an advisory board; involve eminent persons of the region.	◆ Well known academics and policy makers participated in the Survey 2007 external peer review. ◆ Highlighted in the Acknowledgements and involved them in country launches of the Survey
◆ Strengthen Editorial Unit to	◆ Considered outside <i>Survey</i>	◆ Outside Survey evaluation process

equivalent of 3 full-time positions. Support unit with capacity-building efforts.	evaluation process.	
---	---------------------	--

Recommendations:

- The *Survey* can only benefit from implementation of these three recommendations, which will combine to create excellence in both content and editorial presentation.
- The Editorial Unit, though outside of the immediate circle of the Core Team, affects the Core Team’s editorial processes greatly because of issues of timing, reliability, and thoroughness. An Editorial Unit that is stretched to the maximum (it has many other responsibilities in addition to the *Survey*) cannot be expected to be as responsive to the Core Team’s needs as desirable. Further exploration by the OES regarding the work load of the Editorial Unit and its position regarding *Survey* production might be useful.

4. Strengthen Interdivisional Input, Collaboration (see II.F)

5. Build in a Five-Year Evaluation Plan

The 2005 Evaluation suggested that ESCAP’s flagship publication would benefit greatly from annual monitoring of expenditures and editorial focus, but also from an evaluation conducted every five years to ensure that the publication continues to improve within the context of ESCAP’s mission and the *Survey’s* mandate, and to meet the needs of its constituencies. To date, this has not been put in place, although this review of the 2005 recommendations is a positive step toward building a culture of evaluation.

Table 3.5. Build in a Five-Year Evaluation Plan (M=3.37)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Annual monitoring of expenditures compared to resources.	◆	◆ Annual monitoring of resource gaps undertaken ◆ But resource gaps remain as Survey receives no new funding
◆ Annual evaluation, managed by PMD, on editorial focus.	◆	◆ Reflected in the current evaluation. ◆ Survey in back of publication invites public feedback, but apparently is rarely used. Perhaps could be replaced with a one-line invitation to send comments to an email address and use the pages for something else.
◆ A five-year evaluation of key factors.	◆ PDD, in cooperation with other Divisions, to prepare a 5-year Evaluation Plan for monitoring <i>Survey’s</i> effectiveness.	◆ Not yet formalized.

Recommendations:

- Continue the first recommendation in order to monitor adequacy of resources dedicated to the *Survey*, especially to its dissemination.
- Continue the second one in order to strengthen integration of social analysis with economic analysis while still creating a clear editorial focus.
- Add a five-year *Survey* evaluation into the ESCAP strategic plan or similar formal document, to begin in 2010.

B. Improving the Survey's Strategic Relevance

A great effort was made to make it relevant to issues of the day.

1. Improve the Survey's Links to Development Realities

The WG stated that “the Survey should maintain its key focus on producing high quality analysis of economic and social trends” as a more relevant role than taking advocacy or policy positions. While the evaluator tends to agree with this position, a significant sub-group of interviewees take the opposite stance: **The Survey should include advocacy and policy statements in order to establish and maintain strategic relevance. While this question turns on a matter of degree, the evaluator recommends that very high quality trend analysis should be viewed as the requisite foundation for interpretive analysis, advocacy, or policy statements.** The evaluator also agrees with the WG that advocacy or prediction should be rooted in solid data rather than speculation.

The *Survey* has a unique place among similar publications, as one person elucidated: “All World Bank, IMF, and ADB publications focus on macroeconomic performance – the *Survey* is the only regional publication looking at economic and social issues together. Others are more country driven and do not deal with linkages between economic and social issues.” In this sense, the *Survey's* very nature puts it in an excellent place to interpret (and influence) development in the region. While there is still room for improvement, several interviewees felt that the 2007 volume had more coverage of regional issues but that dissemination and post-release presentations are critical to improve links to development realities. In addition, the 2008-09 budget includes five sub-regional seminars to be held within a few months after the launch.

The *Survey* can only be as strong as the skills, insights, and knowledge of those who contribute to it. With broad respondent (and evaluator) agreement that all divisions should have the opportunity (and obligation) to contribute to the *Survey* at least some of the time and in some ways, the obvious conclusion is that personnel decisions must somehow be linked to the *Survey*. That is, candidates for open positions should be evaluated at least in part according to their potential for contributing meaningfully to the *Survey*. Annual appraisals of current staff who contribute to the *Survey* (in any capacity) should clearly remark on those contributions. In other words, if the *Survey* is to belong to ESCAP rather than to a narrowly defined band of producers, hiring decisions, annual evaluations, and promotion/retention decisions should take into consideration a person's present and/or potential relationship to the *Survey*. This will ensure a viable, influential flagship publication and will encourage cross-divisional collaboration.

The systemic needs analysis training and the ESCAP development seminars should contribute positively to linking the *Survey* to development realities.

Table 3.6 Improve the Survey's Links to Development Realities (M=4.00)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Hire new staff with strong analytical and perhaps modelling capacity as key criterion for employment.	◆	◆ Subscription to an econometric modelling service is an excellent step forward. ◆ Future hires should complement that investment.
◆ Conduct a <i>systematic</i> needs assessment among administrators, officers, and line staff to determine training and capacity-building requirements directly related to producing a high quality flagship publication.	◆	◆ Systemic needs analysis on training was done for Survey authors and several in-house training courses arranged in 2007, some staff were sent on outside training on substantive subjects in 2007.
◆ Hold monthly in-house analytical seminars to discuss analytical statements, proposed advocacy statements, best practices, or lessons learned. All employees and all divisions to participate. Rotate preparation, organizational responsibility among divisions.	[Maintain regional focus and improve links to development realities, as noted elsewhere by the WG.]	◆ Open to ESCAP-wide staff, the ESCAP Development Seminar Series was launched in 2006 to discuss analytical work , including those undertaken for the Survey

Recommendations:

- ◆ As attrition progresses, continue to build an ESCAP staff that can bring subject matter expertise *and* analytical skills to contribute to the *Survey* as required.
- ◆ Without a systematic needs assessment, capacity building requirements remain vague or unknown. Building capacity in, for example, methodology, statistical analysis, drafting, and/or content editing will help to broaden cross-divisional participation in various stages of *Survey* production.
- ◆ Establish a “seminar tradition” to discuss ideas that emanate from current or future *Surveys*. Inviting outside experts for honour, not an honorarium, will help focus the discussion and bring new perspectives into the discussions. Building and reinforcing a cross-divisional intellectual climate can only serve to facilitate production of a flagship publication.

2. Improve Impacts on Policy Making

Because the *Survey* is both regional in perspective and is not country-driven—which helps to guarantee its neutrality—the *Survey* is in an excellent position to have appropriate and meaningful impacts on policy making. For 2007, interviewees noted that Chapter 1 was more

accessible and readable, and that the *Survey* created “great impact” through improved content and through improved dissemination, especially at the highest levels.

[We had] over 300 newspaper articles within ten days of launch, twice as much as before. That shows the impact that we have created. People took it seriously. It was referred to on the World Bank web page, TV, CNN, etc. Never has there been this perspective on gender economic discrimination before.

As one respondent pointed out, however, “previous publications were all relevant...how strategically relevant is a question for internal discussion” and agenda-setting within the confines of ESCAP’s mission and goals. The question of the *Survey*’s impact on policy making or “strategic relevance” is also an empirical one that can only be answered by conducting a survey of readers and potential readers in the region who are in a position to influence policy themselves.

Nonetheless, one respondent noted that the *Survey* can improve its *potential* or likely impact simply by focusing more on current issues that have long-term relevance for the region:

We should focus more on...foreign reserves, e.g., South to South investment, etc. Treating "hot topics" is a tactical part of improvement but not necessarily the only approach. Lacking in previous pubs...e.g., select issues of long-term and mid-term importance as well.

For example, the Trade Minister of India came to the launch. Lots of exposure and quotations.

This is only the “visible part.” Respondents thought that researchers are paying more attention to the *Survey* and using it more than was true in the past.

Table 3.7. Improve Impacts on Policy Making (M=4.125)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The <i>Survey</i> should present best practice cases and/or policy recommendations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Derive policy implications from the analyses as an integral part of the <i>Survey</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Good examples of best practices: Box 2.1 on Sri Lanka, Box 3.6 on women’s representation. ◆ Good examples of improved attention to (or highlighting of) policy recommendations: “Policy analysis and conclusions” pp. 68-69 of Ch. 2, and “Policy research feature 2.3” on electricity, and “Policy conclusions” on p. 78. Each of these formats, slightly different from each other, give the reader a strong sense of the implications of data trends. Many others in the <i>Survey</i> indicate very good progress toward implementing this recommendation. ◆ Good example of policy recommendations coming at the beginning of a chapter (Ch. 3, p.

		103)...that is an excellent way to frame the reader’s experience with the chapter.
--	--	--

Recommendations:

- Continue to highlight, both with colour and with boxes or other text set-asides, lessons learned, major trends, best practice cases, and policy recommendations. USE THE SAME FORMAT, however, for policy recommendations, wherever they appear.
- In the event that policy recommendations (which lean toward advocacy) seem out of line, perhaps the softer term “policy implications” could be employed.

C. Broadening and Deepening the Survey’s Impact

1. Strengthen Its Role as a Regional Advocacy Document

Partly because of the choice of gender as the focus of Chapter 3, the *Survey* “became very well known for that chapter...it moved the *Survey* closer to being a regional advocacy document”. Interviewees for the most part saw great improvement in the 2007 volume, but, once more, documenting its impact is problematic.

Some pointed to the need for increased public awareness of the formal launching and for sending copies of the *Survey* directly to policy makers (the network of focal points in ministries). As one person commented, “They are the beneficiaries of this publication. Government officials in economy and trade are the main audience. Connect [the messages] to development.”

Table 3.8. Strengthen Its Role as a Regional Advocacy Document (M=4.22)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Take an advocacy stance re: emerging or critical issues, gender analysis, and sustainable development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Emphasize this is a “survey”. ◆ An analytical report, policy report, advocacy report, but with proper balance; advocacy could be more problematic in economic issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Much improved in 2007 volume. Policy recommendations seemed generic enough not to cause repercussions against ESCAP (e.g., those at the end of Ch. 3).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Provide data on human rights and cross-cutting issues such as gender. Careful analysis and data-driven “advice” (linked to operations work) to help improve impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ More advocacy, esp. regarding internationally recognized social development issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Much improved, particularly by virtue of the gender focus in 2007’s Ch. 3. ◆ Some agreement among respondents that this should continue on an even more elevated level.

◆ Base <i>Survey</i> on a “consensus model” of experts who contribute to a web-based draft of solutions, best practices, policy advocacy statements, lessons learned.	◆	◆ Not undertaken as modalities are not clear.
◆ Address gender implications of economic growth, governance, and poverty. Include the gender dimension on core economic data for key tables, charts, databases.	◆	◆ Well represented by Ch. 3 in 2007. Probably not possible for most tables/charts in Chapter 1 and 2.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Given the positive response to the 2007 issue, the move toward gender analysis, cross-cutting issues, and immediately critical issues seems to be well conceived. Continue to move the *Survey* in this direction while ensuring that all analyses are empirically grounded in solid data with a regional and sub-regional focus.

2. Improve the Survey’s Impacts on Development Planning

Although similar to C.1, this recommendation from the 2005 Evaluation stemmed from many comments from interviewees that the *Survey* had to become more useful for hands-on development planning. The specific recommendations are similar and complementary to those in C.1, therefore the recommendations remain the same.

Table 3.9. Improve the Survey’s Impacts on Development Planning (3.44)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Adopt a multi-disciplinary rather than a primarily economic outlook.	◆	◆ Good improvement through more intense contributions from the social scientists (staff and consultants).
◆ Address cross-sectoral issues.	◆ Continue to contribute through Commission meetings	◆ Good improvement.
◆ Pay attention to gender differentials in all economic and social databases and analyses.	◆	◆ Excellent improvement.
◆ Compare sub-regional to regional trends, with examples from member states.	◆	◆ Excellent improvement; relates also to trend analysis and modeling.

Recommendations:

- Given the positive response to the 2007 issue, the move toward gender analysis, cross-cutting issues, and immediately critical issues seems to be well conceived. Continue to move the *Survey* in this direction while ensuring that all analyses are empirically grounded in solid data with a regional and sub-regional focus.
- Buttress the Core Team with full-time social scientist(s) and one more macro-economist.

D. Shaping More Powerful Content and Quality

1. Clarify and Strengthen Editorial Focus and Messaging

One of the strongest impacts of the 2005 Evaluation was to bring attention to the need for clearer messaging and editorial focus: “There’s more awareness that we should make the document clearer to our constituents.” Most respondents could see a significant improvement in terms of editorial focus. As one person pointed out, the *World Development Report* and the *World Investment Report* went through the same process: “Sharp criticism of focus brought much improvement. The *Survey* is improving and I’m sure next year will have more improvement.”

Messaging has a tendency to cross the line from reporting trends into forecasting. While consensus exists in ESCAP on presenting a clear focus regarding economic and social trends, “looking ahead” with projections is problematic. Some respondents thought that any “survey” must be true to its name by achieving balance between the analytical and the prophetic. Others agreed but acknowledged the difficulties in trying to forecast the future:

It is a challenge to try to forecast for every country in the region. How can we strike that balance so that we don't go too far wrong? There is public interest, but everybody is projecting, so whose projection is going to be right? We were looking at Thai projections at the Thai launch and spent a lot of time trying to defend it. Every country will be interested in looking projections. Do we have the capacity to make these projections? Forecasting?

Subscribing to the Oxford modelling service will help systematize forecasting, but, as one person said, “It helps but I hope the data behind it is good enough.” The *Survey* should engage in “credible projection” and strengthen economic modeling by not relying on “second-hand materials.”

An annual messaging workshop would help to engage all members of the ESCAP in clarifying the messages of future issues of the *Survey*.

Table 3.10. Clarify and Strengthen Editorial Focus and Messaging (M=3.77)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Give attention to issues being covered by the ADB and the World Bank, but showcase ESCAP's unique contributions to the analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Maintain key focus on producing high quality analysis of economic and social trends in region and beyond. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The presentation of best practice cases and regional analysis has improved, highlighting ESCAP's unique contribution to the regional and international dialogues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Hold annual "messaging workshop" to decide on prime messages; develop a story line that helps readers integrate social, economic, and cross-cutting issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Fully utilize the Asia-Pacific Development Journal, Policy Briefs and Working Papers series to develop in-house culture of research and debate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ No improvement: No funding for this activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prepare an Executive Summary for distribution with or in lieu of the <i>Survey</i>. Include at least one page of policy recommendations; print in companion format with <i>Survey</i> (i.e., same colour cover page, graphics, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Excellent improvement: The Executive Summary was internally printed (no colour) as a separate document to send to country launches. Translated into several languages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Include country profiles and/or Thematic Studies in the <i>Survey</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Good improvement, especially in graphical presentation of such profiles (e.g., 2.5 on poverty in Japan).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Address development intervention issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ SD to hold discussions with other Divisions to find out data requirements. ◆ No comparative assessment of previous forecasts made by other UN organizations and multilateral agencies. ◆ Forecasts and predictions should be sensible and measured to contribute to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Good improvement, with "Lessons Learned" at end of Ch. 2. Ch. 1, though it addresses development intervention issues, needs a strong concluding page on "Lessons Learned" from regional intervention strategies. Ch. 3 ends with Policy Recommendations, which is very useful, but could be preceded by a short "Lessons Learned" from intervention before addressing policy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Make <i>Survey</i> more scenario-based and more forward looking to provide benchmarks that countries can discuss. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Forecasts and predictions should be sensible and measured to contribute to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Good improvement in presentation. ◆ Needs reviewing: No RB post due to lack of funding.

	<p>policy debate by member states. No forecasts or predictions without thorough examination of their possible consequences.</p> <p>◆ Strengthen PDD's forecasting technique and capacity through HR development of an RB post to work with the <i>Survey</i> team.</p>	
--	--	--

Recommendations:

- Continue to work on implementation of all 2005 Evaluation and WG recommendations in this section, especially forecasting with solid data and modelling assistance.
- Strengthen PDD's forecasting technique and capacity through HR development of an RB post to work with the *Survey* team.
- Prepare one-page Executive Summary for all ESCAP staff to distribute as needed (see Table 3.10, third recommendation).

2. Clarify the *Survey's* Role in Relation to the Commission Theme Study

Although the recommendation to *clarify* the relationship between the *Survey* and the Theme Study came out of the 2005 internal interviews, the present respondents argued that the two documents do not need to be *linked*.

There is no need to link the two. If the Theme Study becomes part of the Survey, the depth of the Theme Study may be compromised as it may just end up as a chapter. It was done in the 1990s that the key topic of the Commission was the key topic of the Survey. Since then, the Survey has had a life of its own.

It would be cost-effective and effective on all fronts for the Theme Study to be reflected in the Survey' third chapter. Both are prepared for the Commission Meeting. But then we could not have the two-year planning cycle.

Thus, the Commission can set its own theme and the Core Team for the *Survey* can maintain its editorial independence and integrity by establishing its own theme.

Table 3.11. Clarify the Survey's Role in Relation to the Commission Theme Study (M=3.25)

Original Evaluator Recommendations	Working Group Recommendations	Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Hold a participatory planning exercise with all divisions in a horizontal fashion; led by the ES or designee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ For Survey 2007 participatory planning exercises were held through the Survey Advisory Committee that includes the ES, Directors of PDD, ESID and SD, a representative from TID, and the Survey Team Leader. ◆ For Survey 2008 in addition to the Advisory Committee, the ES has appointed focal points from each Division. Survey 2008 outline discussed with these focal points and comments from Divisions including Divisional inputs received through focal points.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Achieve consensus on the main theme, how divisional work might contribute to it, and how specific individuals might be involved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Core Team to coordinate contributions of other Divisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Good improvement: PDD coordinates contributions from other Divisions. Topics of contributions and research angles discussed by PDD with Divisions. Especially successful collaboration with ESID, ESDD and TID for Survey 2007.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Continue as two separate themes; if it makes sense to use the Theme Study's topic as the Survey thematic chapter (e.g., Ch. 3), then discussion should take place to see how much (if any) of the Theme Study might be incorporated into the Survey.
- ◆ The two documents should refer to each other in any case.
- ◆ More interdivisional discussion and debate are necessary to determine each Survey's theme in order to arrive at the most hard-hitting theme and to maximize cross-divisional buy-in and contributions.

3. Blend the Survey and the MDG Report

While some respondents in 2005 suggested blending these two visible ESCAP publications, and many in the present study found merit in doing so. However, the arguments for keeping them separate prevailed, at least for now. Reasons included the following:

The MDG Report is an extra-budgetary activity so cannot blend with Survey.

The data for economic elements is much more current. Social does not move so fast.

The Survey should be more forward looking.

The Theme Study and the MDG Report are supposed to be separate reports, as per the Survey advisory group recommendation.

The MDG Report has to focus on the MDG indicators and the Survey is more on macroeconomic issues (e.g., inflation). The MDGs focus more on infant mortality, etc.

Table 3.12... Blend the Survey and the MDG Report (M=3.11)

Original Evaluator Recommendations	Working Group Recommendations	Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Combine the <i>Survey</i> and the <i>MDG Report</i> to keep pressure and focus on MDGs, highlighting linkages, impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Exploit complementarity. ◆ Keep two distinct publications. Refer to Thematic Chapter (3) as a "special-feature/topic chapter"; topics chosen by OES after divisional suggestions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Not recommended by WG.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ If blending the two is not feasible, the executive summary of the <i>MDG Report</i> could be reproduced as an appendix to the <i>Survey</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Avoid duplication, esp. in view of the expected increase in MDG-related publications. ◆ Some issues not addressed in the MDGs could be included in the <i>Survey</i> as needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ This recommendation continues.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Both publications will benefit from cross-fertilization and cross-referencing. For example, the *Survey* main page (<http://www.ESCAP.org/survey2007/>) should be linked on the ESCAP website to the MDG main page (<http://www.mdgasiapacific.org/>). Their essential relatedness should be exploited in both directions. For example, the MDG main page features a photograph of women and a statement about MDG 3 (regarding gender equality and empowering women) but it does not link to the ESCAP *Survey*, Chapter 3 – this is a serious communication gap!
- ◆ As recommended by the WG, duplication of effort should be avoided whenever possible in order to conserve staff time and other resources.
- ◆ Link the two publications in multiple ways (on website, in brochures, announcements, etc.).
- ◆ Reproduce a one- or two-page executive summary from the *MDG Report* as an appendix to the *Survey*. If the feedback form were removed, as recommended earlier in this report, two pages would be freed up for this purpose.

E. Balancing Economic and Social Analyses

1. Strengthen Social Analysis

As respondents stressed, the *Survey* should function primarily as the nexus between understanding of the Asia and the Pacific region and sub-regions. It should show and analyze the connections between data and policy making within an overall strategic framework. The strengthening of Chapter 3 by focusing on gender analysis moved this recommendation in a substantial manner. This is probably the most significant change in the 2007 *Survey*: “The gender chapter stimulated a lot of interest everywhere.”

It will take time for the Core Team to raise visibility of the third chapter as the place where readers can find sophisticated analyses of social and cross-cutting issues, but *Survey* 2007 made an excellent start toward implementing this recommendation and laid a foundation upon which future volumes can be modeled.

Table 3.13. Strengthen Social Analysis (M=3.55)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
♦ Offer objective analysis of social trend data as comparative advantage in regard to the ADO, WB.	♦	♦ Very good improvement.
♦ Offer objective analysis of social trend data.	♦ Strengthen forecasting techniques.	♦ Oxford modelling program is a strong step forward.
♦ Task ESID with analyzing core education and health data from SD, PDD.	♦ SD should develop new indicators (social development, globalization, environmental, infrastructure).	♦ Outside consultant was used for much of this work. Continue to recommend one or two full-time, RB staff in social sciences who are dedicated to the <i>Survey</i> .
♦ Include annual sectoral or cross-sectoral analysis, produced by a division; revisit in five years.	♦	♦ Impression from respondents is that most was done by PDD with inputs from Divisions.

Recommendations:

- 🌱 Continue to showcase social and cross-cutting issues in Chapter 3, with strong emphasis on trends across the region and sub-regions, accessible graphics and presentation, and clear policy implications or recommendations. Best practices and lessons learned from intervention experiences are crucial in this chapter.
- 🌱 Hire a full-time, RB social scientist to work on the *Survey*, in consultation with ESID.
- 🌱 Encourage all divisions to consider contributing an annual sectoral or cross-sectoral analysis that would shape all or part of Chapter 3; coordinated by the Core Team.

2. Balance and Link Economic and Social Analyses

Integration of economic and social issues was better in both the 2006 and 2007 *Surveys*, but was highlighted graphically with much more impact in 2007, especially in Chapter 2. A good

example of linkages in Chapter 1 can be found in the “Checklist for a better trade deal”, which included a recommendation to ask whether “any sectors in the economy and social segments [might] be adversely affected by the agreements, and what are the planned measures to ease those effects?” (pp. 14-15). Although this seems like a small statement, a checklist coming from ESCAP that includes attention to social sector impacts may reframe issues that were previously seen as purely economic (such as negotiating a trade agreement). On the other hand, discussions about declining investments or rising oil prices (for example) could benefit from another sentence that links those phenomena to probable social impacts.

Respondents were generally pleased with the greater attention to social and economic linkages, but see much room for further improvement:

Chapter 1 has never had any reference to social issues until 2007. Next year, Chapter 1 will highlight growth and conflict (impacts of growth; widening inequality; how much growth is pro-poor; how many countries are really benefiting; what are key policies that support pro-poor growth). We are getting people to look more at social issues in the research pieces.

The producers expressed commitment to continue to strengthen social analysis linkages:

We took the recommendation seriously. The balance has really increased. Some who did not know the report closely might have rated this at a lower level because of not understanding [our intent]. In the future, research pieces will be more on social issues. Chapter 1 could have even more on the social side, and integration and balance. Chapter 2 will be essentially macroeconomic. Chapter 3 will be social.

Some respondents were concerned that focusing solely on social and economic issues might obscure the need for the *Survey* to address “environmental sustainability dimensions” and other cross-cutting issues.

Table 3.14. Balance and Link Economic and Social Analyses (M=3.44)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Link conceptually Ch. 2 and Ch. 3.	◆	◆ Good improvement, but Ch. 1 needs a conclusion that leads the reader into Ch. 2; same from Ch. 2 to Ch. 3.
◆ Show inter-connections; e.g., economic growth/ environment; poverty and gender.	◆ Strengthen both; integrate social dimensions into economic analyses. ◆ Strike appropriate balance.	◆ Some improvement but more to be accomplished in this regard in first two chapters.
◆ Explore economic impacts of disasters, disease, beyond declines in growth or GDPs.	◆	◆ Some improvement, but needs further strengthening.
◆ Link special themes to policy dialogue and practical operational applications.	◆	◆ Good improvement, especially through boxes, checklists, tables that include “good practice model” column.

◆ Hold regional, national policy dialogues to sharpen <i>Survey</i> analysis. Involve key stakeholders.	◆ (see also dissemination)	◆ Some improvement: Some national dialogue at the <i>Survey</i> country-launches. Full implementation of the recommendation requires more funding. ◆ Continue recommendation.
---	----------------------------	--

Recommendations:

- Continue to keep linkages between social and economic in mind while drafting. Have those who draft a chapter read at least one other chapter for presence/strength of linkages.
- Hold regional and national policy dialogue conferences with key stakeholders.

4. Strengthen Economic Analysis

Much of the discussion in 2005 centered on buttressing social analysis, but some thought that the economic analysis could also be improved. In 2007, economic analysis was bolstered by the approval of an economic modelling program:

The economic analysis is good currently. There is always room for improvement, as in the case of any publication.

The program gives us much more statistical background behind the analysis and macroeconomic modelling.

Table 3.15. Strengthen Economic Analysis (M=3.55)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Ensure that treatment of “timely issues” is based on solid data and analysis.	◆ Yes.	◆ Good improvement in the form of the Oxford economic modelling service.
◆ Improve level and depth of data utilized in tables and diagrams and the quality of analysis.	◆	◆ Good improvement but still some data issues involving SD and PDD relationship and communication.
◆ Make analytical acuity the hallmark of the <i>Survey’s</i> chapters.	◆	◆ Good improvement.

Recommendations:

- Review in 2008 with the Core Team (including members of SD) the utility of the Oxford service.
- Continue to improve writing about economic issues to make the analysis more accessible to a wide range of readers who may not be economists (e.g., government staff, some political leaders, and media).

F. Facilitating Cross-Divisional Contributions

1. Remove the Barriers to Involvement, Consultation, and Collaboration

Although the intention of the 2005 Evaluation was for ESID to second someone full-time for four to six months to work exclusively on the *Survey*, PDD hired a consultant to write the chapter on gender, “which was the normal procedure.” Thus, Chapter 3 was still not located firmly in the grasp of ESCAP’s own social scientists, who presumably are the experts on social issues. ESID “was very much involved through commenting on the draft”:

We got some money for ESID to hire someone to write, but with the ESCAP system, it was not very practical. ESID also had to do the Theme Study for the Commission, so could not second someone to the Survey. We were not involved in the actual writing; we were involved in the Expert Group Meeting and commented on the draft, especially the chapter on gender. There are difficulties in ESID writing half of the Survey...it would have to be done by the Survey team. We could work together more closely during the drafting process – not really drafting but the planning. We were involved in the planning in the 2007 Survey and were party to the discussions that took place, especially the focus chapter on social costs of gender discrimination...the entire process.

The result for ESID reportedly was “more contribution than before” and there could be further contribution in the future if certain barriers can be minimized. First and foremost are the time constraints that work against the need for urgency and timeliness. The Core Team (PDD at this point) is working on a “very tight timeline” that makes it very difficult to consult other divisions. Another constraint is that the first two chapters are seen as very economic. ESID can try to make the draft more balanced by looking at it in terms of social consequences (for example, when talking about exports, ask “at what price?”), but there is doubt as to ESID’s capacity to become a full member of the Core Team.

It is noteworthy that the Acknowledgements in 2006 mentioned ESID as a division; this was not the case in 2007. The Acknowledgements of *Survey* 2007 mentions the substantive contributions from Bhakta Gubbaju and inputs from Beverly Jones, both at ESID. *Survey* 2007 has named all substantive contributors, those who provided smaller inputs, and those who sent comments by name. As in the past, the producers commented on the difficulties of getting staff members of other divisions to contribute to the *Survey* for reasons explored in detail in the 2005 Evaluation. Respondents this year reported widely varied experiences:

I maintain very close relations and contribute many articles, and will continue to do so. I’m more than satisfied with the collaboration with PDD.

It’s better than before but we can work on it further.

As with the 2007 edition, future *Surveys* will use Chapter 3 to afford “more space for inter-divisional contribution, so we need to encourage more contribution from all divisions.” One person suggested opening up the *Survey* beyond divisional contributions to staff members of Regional Centers of Excellence in Asia and other research centers (not just in the UN system: “We should open our eyes to the top class research centers to make contributions to the *Survey*.”

Table 3.16. Remove the Barriers to Involvement, Consultation, and Collaboration (M=3.55)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ PDD should discuss potential new topics with other divisions two years ahead to allow time to put proposed contributions into ePAS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Improve inter-divisional collaboration. ◆ Ensure ESID and SD staff ePAS reflect future planned contributions to <i>Survey</i>. ◆ Support “two-track” approach, formal and informal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Some improvement, but not all divisions are involved in planning, conceptualizing, or even brainstorming future volumes. ◆ Including <i>Survey</i> contributions in ePAS remains to be implemented on more than an ad hoc basis.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Enhance buy-in across divisions by giving credit for all contributors to the <i>Survey</i> to enhance accountability, transparency, and quality control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Support team work, interdivisional collaboration, incorporation of cross-cutting issues, and improving the analytical content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Acknowledgements of ESCAP divisional/individual contributions were absent. ◆ Survey 2007 has named all substantive contributors, those who provided smaller inputs, and those who sent comments by their name.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The ES can move people around in the existing positions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Not implemented.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Include a seconded expert from another division for 4-5 months, during the <i>Survey</i>'s most pressing production times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Second staff from ESID and SD for 4-6 months ◆ Involve ESID and SD in all phases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Not implemented. ◆ Not implemented fully.

Recommendations:

- Respondents in 2005 suggested several changes that would help remove barriers to in-house contributions; they remain virtually the same in 2007:
 - The annual Survey planning and conceptualisation should occur at the highest possible level, involving the broadest participation, in order to maximize contributions from across divisions.
 - The process should be bottom-up, with divisions bringing ideas and themes to the Core Team.
 - If divisions are involved from the beginning, their commitment to making quality contributions will be enhanced.
 - Contributions by persons outside the core team must be legitimised, planned, documented, and rewarded.
- Seconding an ESID staff member for half a year *or* hiring a new social scientist appears to be critical in building up the social dimension of the *Economic and Social Survey*. While consultants can be of obvious use and can take the pressure off division personnel, it seems

to this evaluator that continuing to rely on external consultants for the social analysis chapter continues to leave it as a residual function within ESCAP. To the extent that Survey 2006 and 2007 did not rely on external consultants to write the social analysis, but were written in-house, this is a positive step forward.

2. Make the Survey More Relevant to Division or Sector Work

The 2006 and 2007 *Surveys* included “many contributions from other divisions—ESDD, TID, ESID, SD.” However, the Core Team cannot go beyond the present level of involvement without new resources with which PDD and other Divisions can engage in further work.

While one can strengthen cross-divisional involvement, which many respondents requested in 2005, respondents acknowledged again in 2007 that the realities sometimes do not support such collaboration: “The level of analytical expertise in most divisions is inadequate, and if there are a couple of individuals who can perform, they are fully occupied with their own divisional work.” Often, when divisions are asked to contribute to the *Survey*, they do so in “a rushed manner, for the most part, and there is not much ownership.” As in 2005, the *Survey* continues to be viewed as PDD’s child, “not ours.” Issues of “rigor” also arise:

People in other divisions have not necessarily had enough exposure to [contribute] and are pressurized in their divisions by the one-year cycle. Even Chapter 3 was not done this year by ESID but entirely by PDD!!! Why? Time! They are used to a traditional way of writing. We can strive for cross-divisional input but it will be a long, long process unless another division was to take ownership of a specific chapter—but then they would have to keep on the same schedule as the Survey.

These comments refer to all divisions, potentially. From the viewpoint of some respondents, the issue of ineffective collaboration and contributions was especially pronounced regarding the Statistics Division (SD):

SD was not involved at any stage of the Survey production process. No consultation was initiated. Drafts of the Survey were never circulated. From the programmatic point of view, SD could not include the Survey into their Strategic Framework and Work Programme for 2008-09.

SD was acknowledged in 2007 as the producer of tables 10-29, and PDD of tables 1-9.

Table 3.17. Make the Survey More Relevant to Division or Sector Work (M=3.55)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Create a short “Guidelines for Contributing to the Survey.” Potential contributors require more explicit instructions as to the nature, context, and format of their contributions.	◆ Allow voluntary contributions. ◆ Contributions from other Divisions must be timely and satisfy the established quality standards.	◆ Guidelines not evident. ◆ Each division has a focal point for the <i>Survey</i> nominated by the ES for each division at the Section Chief level.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Improve working relationships and *structures that will facilitate* positive, effective working relationships between PDD and all divisions.
- ◆ Continue to encourage and facilitate contributions from all other divisions.
- ◆ Make it structurally possible and intellectually appealing for divisions to develop ideas into sections of the *Survey*—boxes, tables, lessons learned, intervention case studies, policy recommendations, etc., that are *relevant to their subject matter expertise*. PDD or external editors can edit this work as long as it is contributed in a timely fashion.

G. Upgrading Data Collection, Management, and Presentation

1. Improve Data Collection and Management

The Statistical Division was assigned by the ES and ESCAP's Survey Advisory Group to produce the new Statistical Annex. SD completed the output within the deadline, providing what it considered to be a compact, comprehensive, and informative picture of the region: "SD output is a technically rigorous product that adds value to the *Survey* and represents a significant improvement from the Annex published in 2006."

What was improved in the 2007 Statistical Annex? The long-term trends and the most recent evolution of 120 key economic and social indicators (as opposed to only 16 in 2006) were presented in 30 pages (the same as in 2006). Respondents said the indicators were "carefully selected and balanced by sector so as to cover the whole work programme of ESCAP" (including gender dimensions, demographic issues, MDGs, environment and natural disasters, trade, transport and infrastructure). Focus was placed on key development indicators that can be monitored over the years (a recommendation from many respondents in 2005), in order to "create an enduring product that can become an attractive and trusted source of information that readers expect to receive periodically and to use as a reference."

Only the official (or most authoritative) international series were used. This ensures broad inter-country comparability of data, in contrast with the previous annex that, for the sake of completeness, mixed different sources at the national and international levels, which resulted in a statistical portrait of the region that was "often inconsistent across countries and over time." This avoided duplication of effort in data collection, as strongly advised by the UN Statistical Commission and the Committee for the Coordination of Statistical Activities, as well as in the 2005 *Survey Evaluation*.

Table 3.18. Improve Data Collection and Management (M=3.22)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Ensure a formulaic approach to track data changes from year to year for certain data points; automatically update text.	◆ Scarce resources should not be spent on collecting data and information from the countries available in the public domain.	◆ Good progress.

	<p>◆SD to create a centralized data and information system on economic and social statistics to which ESCAP system would contribute and have access.</p>	
--	--	--

Recommendations:

- Keep most of the indicators consistent from 2007 forward across a time span long enough to allow for clear trend lines to evolve (e.g., five to ten years).
- Invest in table generating programs that will automatically update text.

3. Streamline the Relationship between SD (SISS) and PDD

PDD launched the Statistical Annex (SA) in 2006, as per the 2005 Evaluation recommendation. Respondents found this to be a “very useful” addition. For production of the 2007 *Survey*, PDD approached SD in recognition of its divisional expertise. The intention was to give SD a larger role through developing social indicators (paralleling Chapter 3) while PDD maintains up-to-date economic data.

Respondents described several tensions in producing the Statistical Annex, especially in 2007. The first source of tension was caused by different definitions of acceptable and reliable data. This was exacerbated by miscommunications between PDD and SD that resulted in SD producing an SA that was used only in part:

Regrettably, SD’s Statistical Annex was not fully adopted for the 2007 Survey, raising managerial and data management issues that need to be addressed before starting the work for the next edition.

This apparently stems from a long-standing problem based in the different types and sources of data acquired by PDD vs. SD. According to respondents, the regional statistical division acquires its data through established published sources: SD is (understandably) “hesitant to give current data because they need to validate every single number before they put their stamp on it.” By contrast, PDD can access more timely data than can SD for the first two chapters (national planning data, latest growth data, etc.). Because the *Survey* must be very current, statistics from 2005 on economic growth, inflation, and interest rates provided by SD were perceived as outdated:

We cannot write a report coming out in 2007 on 2005 data. We had to use 2007 numbers. This has been a problem everywhere. SD people were sitting in on the external peer reviews.

SD needs to realize that PDD has economists and has to respond to the countries’ needs for most recent data. That is at the heart of the controversy.

A second but related source of tension occurred around the nature of economic versus social indicators⁶:

Most of the tables that were called “missing” by SD were in Chapter 2 as figures. For economic data, we need trends rather than averages over five years. For social indicators, it is okay to get data for every five years because they don’t change fast. SD was informed early on that all economic data tables would be prepared by PDD as SD did not have most current economic data.

For historical data, PDD and SD go to the same sources (IMF, World Bank etc.). SD does not collect primary data. For the Survey we would like to create a new index similar to the HDI [Human Development Index] to make the Survey more critically relevant, that is where the value added of SD would come from.

A third source of tension came from the fact that SD respondents felt that they were left out of the loop: The SA draft was “not circulated with a specific invitation to comment.” Tables 1 through 9 were produced by PDD and 10 through 29 by SD:

PDD never called a meeting on the expected content of the new Statistical Annex. Given this lack of initiative, at the end of October 2006, SD organized a meeting attended by PDD staff to explain the production process of the Statistical Annex and clarify inconsistencies with the data used by PDD for preparing the Survey (i.e., international versus national data sources); at the beginning of November 2006, SD transmitted to PDD the latest available economic database in order to check its consistency with PDD database and use it to produce the 2007 Survey; on 24 November 2006, SD transmitted to PDD the complete list of indicators contained in the new SA; and on 17 January 2007, SD sent PDD the final new Statistical Annex.

Only at the end of January, after three months of hard work involving many SD staff, the PDD Director informed SD that PDD did not intend to make use of the new SA, except for one table containing gender indicators. In the meantime, PDD had prepared its traditional economic SA, using PDD databases (not consistent with the SD database), without informing SD. After some formal and informal consultations between SD and PDD, PDD proposed to include 14 tables out of the 30 prepared by SD. Even this solution was not acceptable to SD and only after ES intervention a compromise was reached in which 20 out of the 30 tables prepared by SD were included in the new SA, along with 9 tables of economic indicators prepared by PDD.

The two divisions have apparently been holding further discussions to ensure that these misunderstandings do not occur in future Survey production:

This year [for 2008], everyone seems to realize that it is important to have the latest data otherwise the countries will question certain numbers. We had a meeting with SD and they agreed. It was a misunderstanding. Different viewpoints. We are not worried about the future.

Monthly meetings between PDD and SD should help improve communication and build trust.

A fourth source of tension stemmed from the recommendation to reduce the overall size of the publication, to make it more readable, yet to include a fairly comprehensive SA.

⁶ Quote by the author of the report. The quote has been slightly rearranged.

Table 3.19. Streamline the Relationship between SD (SISS⁷) and PDD (M=3.11)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Give the SD major input into the <i>Survey</i> and the <i>MDG Report</i>, and supply data for divisional publications, as appropriate and with adequate notice. The SD should become a central repository of databases that all ESCAP employees can access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Improve relationship between ESID and SD. ◆ SD to nominate a “permanent” focal point to collaborate with PDD. ◆ Topic to determine nature of collaboration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Uncertain as to SAO/PDD relationship. More frequent discussions on data issues for Survey 2008 ◆ PDD/SD relationship needs continuing improvement.

Recommendations:

- ◆ Improve the working relationship between PDD and SD. This is key to producing a highly polished, comprehensive survey, and will require leadership at the ES level.
- ◆ PDD should conduct a self-analysis of its own statistical expertise, including a needs assessment for further training.
- ◆ It is important for PDD and SD to keep communication lines open and talk to each other more in depth about their varying approaches to and definitions of solid data. Institutional cooperation can only be built upon respectful appreciation of each division’s strengths and talents.

3. Improve Data Presentation and Statistical Analysis

The economic tables prepared by PDD contain data taken from different sources, at national and international levels. As a result, data consistency over time and across countries can be called into question, according to some respondents. In addition, data published in the *Survey* are not consistent with the data uploaded on ESCAP’s website. Comprehensiveness remains problematic for some respondents in that a number of key economic indicators that are crucial to understand the level of development in the region were omitted in the current version of the Statistical Annex (e.g., GDP per capita and composition of GDP by industry), their vulnerability (e.g., export concentration), or their dynamism (e.g., Foreign Direct Investment Inflows). The economic tables prepared by PDD contain only 9 indicators instead of 27, as in the SD version.

On the positive side, the tables are much more readable and attractive in 2007 (in 2006, the landscape presentation was somewhat awkward for the reader).

⁷ Statistical Information Searching System.

Table 3.20. Improve Data Presentation and Statistical Analysis (M=3.66)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Give the <i>Survey</i> a higher-end look.	◆	◆ Good improvement.
◆ Include links to data or data sources throughout the document, with sources for every for data on a page or in a table.	◆	◆ Good improvement.
◆ Format tables, graphs, charts, other figures for clarity when photocopied; add diamonds, dots, broken lines, and end point values to lines.	◆	◆ Very good improvement in 2007; line problem still in 2006.
◆ Use thematic data maps to display the profile of regional populations.	◆	◆ Good improvement.
◆ Make headings and sub-headings more dynamic.	◆	◆ Good improvement.
◆ Place highly detailed analyses on the ESCAP website, with appropriate links highlighted in the <i>Survey</i> text.	◆	◆ Still few links to web-based data sources (which can be added to the web version and in the printed version wherever feasible).
◆ Write an analytical paragraph for each table (not just narratives); summarize broad differences between countries.	◆	◆ Good improvement. ◆ Tables and boxes need to be consistently referenced in the text and <i>highlighted</i> with italics or colour in the text narrative (e.g., Table 1.5 may be referenced, but evaluator cannot find it).

Recommendations:

- ◆ In future, every table (or set of tables) should be complemented by a comprehensive and user-friendly documentation of the more technical definitions (such as “Real Gross Domestic Product”), methods for calculating the indicators, and data sources (with web addresses, if appropriate).

H. Modernising Production Quality and Processes

1. Improve the Editorial and Production Processes

A two-year production cycle would help improve editorial production processes, according to some respondents, but change occurs rapidly in the real world, which makes it difficult to plan two years in advance. This question relates also to how other divisions can be involved in the *Survey* processes (see section A.1.b). Some respondents thought that Division Chiefs could incorporate the *Survey* into divisional work plans two years in advance, even though they may

not be certain of the specific issues that might be relevant, i.e., include “contribution to Survey” as one of their outputs.

PMD ought to recognize that the Survey is the flagship publication to which all divisions should contribute and take the lead by telling the divisions to do so. They can easily include one output in the divisional work plan...a small piece of research, etc. It does not have to be a whole chapter.

Table 3.21. Improve the Editorial and Production Processes (M=4.00)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Strengthen the Editorial Unit to generate the equivalent of three full-time positions (4.00).	◆	◆ Although this may be outside the purview of the <i>Survey</i> producers, it was definitely on the minds of producers in 2005. The ES could possibly exert some leadership on this issue with the appropriate executives.
◆ Conduct [encourage?] capacity-building efforts to support the Editorial Unit.	◆	◆ Although this may be outside the purview of the <i>Survey</i> producers, the ES could exert some leadership on this issue with the appropriate executives.
◆ Strengthen compliance with suggested editorial changes from Editorial Unit / CSS.	◆	◆ Unknown.
◆ Re-examine and streamline the editorial processes.	◆ Enlist professional assistance.	◆ Strong improvement: A reputed, external editor was hired.
◆ Provide funding for substantive editing of all chapters prior to type-setting and coordinate with copy-editing process.	◆	◆ Communications Development Incorporated was contracted in both 2006 and 2007 for substantive editing of the entire report.

Recommendations:

This was one of the higher averages on the questionnaire.

Ensure that positive changes made to the Survey by strengthening the editorial process continue. In particular, funding for engaging an external editor should be secured for the coming years.

2. Improve Format, Presentation, and Production Quality

The 2007 *Survey* has made grade strides toward becoming a more sophisticated, visually pleasing, and highly readable publication.

Table 3.22. Improve Format, Presentation, and Production Quality (M=3.87)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Hire a professional, external graphic design company to recreate the cover, internal presentation, and format of the <i>Survey</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Use professional design expertise. ◆ Make RB resources available to hire external editor, graphics designer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Excellent improvement, more interesting to look through and to read, esp. 2007. ◆ Guided by Survey Team Leader, PDD staff and the printer (TR Enterprises) made improvements to the graphics, including the cover
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Emphasize interesting and readable text lay-out, dynamic headings and sub-headings; more sophisticated tables, charts, figures, maps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Improve layout, use two-column formats and by-lines, highlight key messages. ◆ No photographs inside. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Very good improvement. ◆ Two-column format used both years. ◆ No by-lines as of yet; no photos.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Sustain the new image for several years to reinforce recognition and market value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ 2007 cover is striking enough to be used as a template for future years with color change rather than image change.

Recommendations:

- ◆ The *Survey's* recognition level would be enhanced by a consistent, attractive, and recognizable cover, internal presentation, and format. It is closer to achieving a unique style but the recommendation stands – hire a professional graphic designer to review the 2007 issue and to work with the staff to create a standard “look”.
- ◆ Use the *text design* of the 2006 cover rather than 2007; 2006 emphasizes the words SURVEY 2006 whereas 2007 emphasizes ASIA AND THE PACIFIC 2005. To help with branding, the word “SURVEY” should always be prominent.
- ◆ Use 2007 design but change colour from year to year in order to establish a *Survey* “look” (or change in 2008 and adopt for use through 2010 review period).
- ◆ The evaluator does not recommend chapter-by-chapter by-lines. “Submission lines” at the bottom of boxes or cases might be effective, but are not necessary if *all* who contribute text and/or tables are properly and individually recognized in the Acknowledgements.
- ◆ Care must be taken to avoid charts with different coloured lines, which do not photocopy well, as in Figure 1.1 or Figure 1.8; broken or dotted lines are superior in this regard. Also, Figure 1.11 the lines are so thin that the colours are hard to separate (and impossible to photocopy).
- ◆ More specific observations on presentation are included in Table 3.23 below:

Key

-- Needs significant improvement

+ - Notable improvement but needs further development

+ Good improvement on the right track

++ Significant improvement since 2005

Table 3.23. Comparison of 2006 and 2007 Surveys

ASPECT	2006 SURVEY	2007 SURVEY
<i>Credits (acknowledgements)</i>	+ Improved. Credits given by name and division, including staff and substantive editing (by CDI).	++ Improved over 2005. Credits given by name and division, including staff and substantive editing (by CDI).
<i>Executive Summary</i>	+ - Much improved over 2005. Offers policy implications for main points. Needed a strong concluding statement.	+ - Refers to policy briefs in <i>Survey</i> – safer than offering short statements of advice that could be misinterpreted in context of an Executive Summary. Active headings in red helpful. Strong points: “Key Economic Issues on the Watch List” for policymakers– why not “Key SOCIAL Issues,” too? Needed a strong concluding statement.
<i>Contents</i>	+ - Good headings for most part, but not active in all cases.	++ Good <i>active</i> and <i>explanatory</i> headings for most part. Red ink good in Contents and throughout.
<i>Highlighted Quotations from Text</i>	-	+ - Good addition, but placement should not be immediately below line in main text. Good example appears on p. 11.
<i>Figures</i>	-	+ - Figure 1.1: Powerful figure that affords reader opportunity to compare years and regions – much stronger than 2005 Table 1.1. Figure 1.2: Data for 2006 is “estimated” – is it proper to estimate when there are only two data points present? Still some serious data presentation issues. “Estimates” means that countries have only the estimates for GDP growth etc. at the time report goes to the printer. Countries issue firm numbers only around mid-year.
<i>Tables</i>	-	+ - Table 1.5: An excellent tool, but needed a more prominent “Best Practices” heading. Data presentation issues remain.
<i>Active Headings</i>	+ -	+ - Good format for active table and figure headings but inconsistently employed; could be even stronger in content and impact. Call-outs well placed.
<i>Readability</i>	+ - Prefer print to that used in 2007.	+ - Lighter, smaller print was harder to read throughout but text was more gripping and accessible. It would be helpful to reader if DOHA had been defined at the first mention – NOT in List of Abbreviations. Doha is not an abbreviation. It is the place where the WTO negotiations began, Doha, Qatar.
<i>Cover Design; Colour, etc.</i>	+ - Improved over previous years; clever use of photos on graph, but stretching them vertically lost some of their impact.	+ - Improved over both 2005 and 2006; the 2007 cover design could be continued as standard, changing the colour from year to year; would prefer, however, use of one carefully selected photograph, since none are used inside.

I. Broadening the Survey's Impact through Broader Dissemination

1. Improve Breadth and Depth of Dissemination

Respondents reported that dissemination was particularly broad for the 2007 *Survey*. The ES jump-started the process by traveling to media centers (this year in India), which helped to garner much more attention from government. The *Survey* was also launched in New York and other major cities. Smaller launches were held in other countries, to make 20 launches overall. This is still not the same level as the *ADB Outlook* launching (which was held in all G7 capitals as well as almost all regional capitals). Still, the limited budget constrains the number of launches.

According to a memo dated 10 May 2007 to all Heads of Divisions/ Sections/Centres from Ravi Ratnayake (Annex C), the 2007 *Survey* was “successfully launched” with help from Divisions/Sections/Centres in showcasing “ESCAP's comparative advantage in its multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral approach to addressing development challenges.” Points made in the memo include that

- ◆ The 2007 *Survey* was launched in 19 locations, including Australia and Kazakhstan (new).
- ◆ It received “unprecedented media coverage”, garnering 300 news articles at the time of the memo, which was “double the coverage received in 2006” (154 articles).
- ◆ It was covered in prestigious publications such as *The Economist*.
- ◆ The Executive Secretary's editorial and Chapter 3 on gender equality received wide recognition and usage.
- ◆ A “dedicated” website drew higher numbers of visitors than was previously the case during the first three weeks.
- ◆ Several prominent readers noted the *Survey's* improved quality, relevance, and presentation as well as its continuing independence.

Chapter 3 on gender inequality and its impacts helped to bring greater visibility to the 2007 *Survey*. Sending authors to launch in four countries (Indonesia, Sri Lanka, China, and Japan), plus the main launch in India, raised interest:

Dissemination has greatly improved. There were launches in several countries at the same time. The national launches are very useful. Eventually, we should strive for a better audience, however. There was an article on “womenomics” in The Economist, which picked it up from press releases. For a conference in Hong Kong, the organizers invited ESCAP because they had read the chapter on gender in the Survey.

Even with this very positive response to the 2007 *Survey*, interviewees called for *broader dissemination efforts*. Respondents agreed that the *Survey's* content, production quality, and usefulness are fine and improving, but “dissemination is the deeper issue” (which was stressed during the 2005 interviews, as well):

It's more a problem of dissemination. If you want to catch the eyes of the public, make linkages to the region but also improve the distribution strategy. The articles are basically of high quality. The Survey needs more distribution. The key word is distribution. Commissions have a fundamental analytical work to do, so the Survey is critical. It is advisable to strengthen the Survey in resources.

Some respondents argued that the *Survey* is still not disseminated to “the right people” (currently to foreign ministries and economic and social development ministries):

It must be taken to the regions and sub-regions. Discuss the findings. Engage in policy dialogue in a more organized way. Bring in all your economists and social policy people together in a one-day event. Focus now is on the media, which is good, but it needs to go beyond that. New resources should come on the downstream side (dissemination).

External Dissemination

Table 3.24. External Dissemination (4.33)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Revamp the <i>Survey Summary</i> from photocopy into a slick, spin-off publication (two pages).	◆ Enlist professional assistance.	◆ Good improvement: Executive Summary separately photocopied and translated into several languages.
◆ Develop a Précis version in multiple languages.	◆ Well focused dissemination with built-in capacity to be replicated across countries at varying stages of development.	◆ Good improvement: For the press, two-pager on <i>Survey</i> highlights, and one-page country notes were printed in colour, and translated into local languages for the launches.
◆ Maintain and vet the central mailing list to eliminate outdated addresses and duplicates. ◆ Add new organizations to the list.	◆	◆ Good improvement: Added new organizations to the list ◆ Good improvement: <i>Survey</i> sent to all Finance and Planning Ministers and Central Bank Governors in the region with a personal letter from the ES highlighting main policy messages

Internal Dissemination

Table 3.25. Internal Dissemination (not asked on questionnaire)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Distribute a personal copy to every ESCAP staff member. Those who do not wish to retain them in their offices can place in divisional libraries.	◆	◆ No improvement: Not achieved as of yet, but very important to do in future. Limited number of copies printed due to budget constraints.
◆ Hold cross-divisional meetings to discuss the <i>Survey</i> as it is launched; expect all staff to participate.	◆	◆ Some improvement: All staff invited to the launch. DES, Principal Officer to ES, Director ESID launched <i>Survey</i> .

Recommendations:

- Dedicate even more funding for dissemination of the *Survey* as a highly valuable resource that governments, researchers, and planners should have in their development kits.
- Staff should be closely involved in dissemination at the country level and hold more follow-up policy dialogues with planners and other target groups. Workshops should be expanded.
- Greater utilization of the ESCAP website could further expand the *Survey's* dissemination and impact. Consider video clips on the website.
- Consider interactive videoconferencing with government staff and researchers in smaller countries or large media centers. Involve ES, Core Team, specialists.
- Ensure that every ESCAP staff member has his/her own copy of the *Survey* for personal use and for use in working with clients.

2. Increase Funding for Dissemination

The 2007 dissemination was “a very good start...the limitation is the funding.”

Involve UN New York, just as they involve us to launch their publications. Pick up certain aspects of the Survey to focus on, e.g., demographic issues. Cover many grounds with one Survey.

Table 3.26. Increase Funding for Dissemination (M=3.66)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Launches in a few member countries, adequately funded (core countries annually, others rotating); professional, media.	◆ PDD with UNIS to prepare a dissemination/ communication strategy to leverage strengths and influence policy formation at all levels.	◆ Some improvement.
◆ A line item for mailing the <i>Survey</i> , in addition to printing it.	◆	◆ Not done as PDD is not responsible for mailing.
◆ Allow non-profits, other international development agencies, research institutes to request mailing waiver, discount.	◆	◆ No information on this item.
◆ Governments of member states receive as many free copies as they wish.	◆	◆ No improvement, given limited funding for printing and dissemination. Since only a limited number of <i>Surveys</i> are printed, they are sent to relevant Ministries only.

Recommendations:

- Continue to work with the ESCAP communications team to *broaden* the dissemination effort.

- Supply more funding for divisional personnel to conduct sub-regional workshops to *deepen* the dissemination effort through dialogue.
- Update and add to the mailing list.
- Continue recommendations in Table 3.26.

J. Giving the Survey Resources Commensurate with Flagship Status

1. Improve the Survey's Resources and Budgets

In a situation of “very limited” financial resources, how to mobilize more resources for the dissemination still remains a question. In-house printing was suggested but the colour is not as high quality as external printing, so reducing that cost is unlikely, although it might be possible to look into the availability of UN/New York printing services.

At the OES level, the possibility could be explored of acquiring a higher budget allocation from UN/New York in the first place. It might take time to make that a reality, but in comparison to other flagships of the World Bank and ADB, for example, the *Survey's* budget is low in proportion to its quality and impact—and its potential influence in the region. In Africa and Latin America, extra-budgetary funding is available for the flagship publications; this possibility could be explored through the OES:

The current funding is miserly for a flagship publication. We have tried so hard. It is so meager. Look at funding for ADB – twenty times more! When I see what is produced by what kind of money...we maximize use of staff. The UN is emphasizing that agencies have to learn how to work within existing resources. We could reduce printing costs but then colour would have to go. Tables could be done without colour, possibly...it depends on how professionally it is done.

Another budget issue stems from the two-year cycle and from locating the *Survey* in a division that has other mandated responsibilities. The budget is biennial, so PDD has to “tighten the belt” in order to give more resources to the *Survey* by drawing from other areas in PDD.

We need to do all these improvements but at the same time there should be more financial support for them. Impact, policy relevance, etc., [does not fit] with tightening the belt. Competing with ADB, who are spending millions doing this! We are spending peanuts and our team is working day and night. They are not even giving even one dollar more.

Give them more resources!

The WG made some recommendations regarding the budget (estimated resource requirements of approximately \$268,600 (an increase of \$155,000 over the existing allocation of \$113,600 for 2006-2007, as per the WG's Appendix 1). The fate of those recommendations is not entirely clear, both in terms of actual allocations and of results:

External editing, dissemination, launches. We have to look at the impact of this year's Survey to see which budget increase made the most impact

Table 3.27. Improve the Survey's Resources and Budgets (M=3.22)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ The budget needs to be expanded to more realistically address the content issues and the heavy reliance on secondary data.	◆ Provide funding to hire consultants to cover ESID and SD staff seconded to PDD for <i>Survey</i> .	◆ No funding increase.

Recommendations:

■ As recommended in the 2005 Evaluation, the budget needs to be expanded to add another economist and at least one social scientist to the core team: “Weakness is inherent. There are too many issues, too many countries.” The budget should be increased to broaden dissemination further.

2. Specific Line Items to Increase

As was stated in the 2005 Evaluation, “the bravest publication will have little impact if potential readers do not see it.” Thus, the evaluator recommends improving funding for sub-regional workshops. In order to elevate the *Survey* to a more prestigious level internationally, funding for the Eminent Persons meetings should be reviewed, as in Table 3.28, and funding should be extended for consultants to prepare parts of the publication that divisions (including PDD) cannot incorporate into their work plans.

Table 3.28. Specific Line Items to Increase (Not on questionnaire)

<i>Original Evaluator Recommendations</i>	<i>Working Group Recommendations</i>	<i>Level of Achievement (Desk Review and Interviews)</i>
◆ Staff Travel: Include staff travel (every staff member in the two sections go to one country at least per year, about \$2,000US per trip average); reinstate about \$20,000US to obtain member states’ data and latest policies, and to conduct workshops based on <i>Survey</i> .	◆ Conduct 5 sub-regional workshops. ◆ Total of \$60,000USD recommended for workshops, plus \$5,000USD for press materials. ◆ [Plus staff travel, \$3,000 per trip, noted elsewhere].	◆ No improvement due to budgetary constraints: Highly recommended.
◆ Meetings: \$27,000US including \$7,500US for peer review by 15 eminent persons (not government officials). Invite only ten top Eminent Persons but	◆	◆ No improvement: No additional funding received.

pay \$1,000US per day.		
◆ DSA and travel for Eminent Persons Meeting- add to NYC budget (10 Eminent Persons at \$2,000US each for 2 days = \$20,000US).	◆	◆ No improvement: No additional funding received.
◆ The Expert Group Meeting: \$15,000US.	◆	◆ No improvement: No additional funding received.
◆ Consultants: Honorarium for preparing country papers: \$19,500US.	◆ \$15,000US (to replace those seconded; and to float consultant to PDD).	◆ No improvement: No additional funding received.
◆ Substantive editor (between 10 and 15 days @ \$1,000US per day up to 20 days. = \$10,000- \$15,000US).	◆ \$20,000US (two months or more).	◆ Good improvement: Substantive editor hired.
◆ External Printing and Design: (cover, photos, CD-Rom, other format improvements would cost \$10,000US or more).	◆ \$10,000US	◆ Limited improvement: No additional funding received.
◆ No recommendation, as this item was not mentioned in the evaluation interviews.	◆ \$25,000USD (\$18,000 for annual subscription to econometric/ forecasting model +\$7,000USD startup).	◆ Good improvement: Subscription to forecasting model. No startup costs.

Recommendations:

- Improve the *Survey's* budget as per the WG recommendations, especially for staff travel and other expenses for sub-regional workshops and for external professional assistance in design.
- Continue to move resources into the Core Team (as per earlier recommendations regarding additional full-time economist and social scientist).

PART FOUR:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2007 Survey had more focus on regional issues in Chapter 1. More on country issues, and in Chapter 3, gender discrimination and its economic costs.

In conclusion, the evaluator recommends several strategies for how to maximize the *Survey's* quality, usefulness, and readability. First, the *Survey* can continue to improve through full implementation of recommendations made in the 2005 Evaluation. Second, the recommendations based on the Desk Review and perspectives provided by ESCAP staff and managers who contributed their opinions during this 2007 review, will help guide further improvement. Third, the Working Group's recommendations (encapsulated in this report's tables) provide more detailed guidance.

General recommendations relate to seven strategies:

- ✦ *Institutionalize Oversight:* The Working Group apparently did not meet again after the WG Report was presented to the ES. The group should become a fixed working group at ESCAP, meeting at least twice a year to monitor the *Survey's* implementation of agreed-upon recommendations and its progress in general. This is in addition to other appropriate executive/managerial oversight.
- ✦ *Strengthen the Core Team:* Make the *Survey* stronger in the social dimension and expand PDD's capacity through hiring at least one full-time, RB social scientist and one macroeconomist.
- ✦ *Brand the Survey:* Introduce a standard cover design and interior design in order to create a *Survey* "look" that is highly recognizable and valued. The 2007 cover is a good model.
- ✦ *Maximize Collaboration between PDD and SD; PDD and ESID:* More resources and staff should help reduce some of the stress involved in producing the *Survey*; close and positive working relationships among PDD, SD, and ESID are crucial for supporting high quality economic and social analysis.
- ✦ *Involve All Divisions in Planning and Production:* Find a solution to the two-year work plan issue and routinize contributions from all divisions, according to their interests and expertise and to the *Survey's* topical foci.
- ✦ *Expand Funding for Dissemination:* To make the *Survey* more visible, achieve greater strategic relevance and policy impact, the publication must be 1) read and 2) used. Dissemination can help with the first part; follow-up workshops can help with the second part.
- ✦ *Institutionalize Five-Year Evaluations:* The evaluation process has stimulated a great deal of discussion and much improvement in the latest issues of the *Survey*. Continuing, institutionalized evaluation on at least a five-year cycle will help elevate the publication in ESCAP and will continue to improve its quality, production values, and relevance in the development community.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A

Feedback on Challenges and Recommendations

Conclusions from the 2005 Survey Evaluation appear in boldface, with recommendations following each one. Please indicate the extent to which you believe the 2007 Survey reflects these recommendations. We welcome your comments and suggestions for improvement of future issues—just type them in the space provided. If you have no information or opinion about an item, just leave it blank. Please reply to jmbillson@gdiworld.com with this form appended as an attachment. Thank you!

A. The Survey Lacks Priority within ESCAP, Which Hampers its Comparative Advantage

		▽				▽
	①	Not at all	②	③	④	Very much
1. Elevate the <i>Survey</i> in ESCAP	①	②	③	④	⑤	
2. Strengthen the Core Team		①	②	③	④	⑤
3. Strengthen External Reviews		①	②	③	④	⑤
4. Strengthen Interdivisional Input and Collaboration		①	②	③	④	⑤
5. Build in a Five-Year Evaluation Plan		①	②	③	④	⑤

Comments and Suggestions:

B. The Survey Lacks Strategic Relevance

1. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Links to Development Realities	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Impacts on Policy Making	①	②	③	④	⑤

Comments and Suggestions:

C. The Survey Should Have Greater Impact

1. Strengthen Its Role as a Regional Advocacy Document	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Impacts on Development Planning	①	②	③	④	⑤

Comments and Suggestions:

D. The Survey Lacks Editorial Focus

1. Clarify and Strengthen Editorial Focus and Messaging	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. Clarify its Role in Relation to Commission Theme Study	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. Blend the <i>Survey</i> and the <i>MDG Report</i>	①	②	③	④	⑤

Comments and Suggestions:

E. The Survey Lacks Balance between Economic and Social Analyses

1. Strengthen Social Analysis	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. Improve Balance and Linkages between Economic and Social Analyses	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. Strengthen Economic Analysis	①	②	③	④	⑤

Comments and Suggestions:

▽
Not at all

▽
Very much

F. Cross-Divisional Involvement Needs Strengthening

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Remove the Barriers to Involvement,
Consultation, and Collaboration | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. Make <i>Survey</i> More Relevant to Division, Sector Work | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

Comments and Suggestions:

G. Data Collection Needs Upgrading

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Improve Data Collection and Management | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. Streamline the Relationship between SD (SISS) and PDD | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 3. Improve Data Presentation and Statistical Analysis | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

Comments and Suggestions:

H. Production Quality and Processes Need Modernising

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Improve the Editorial and Production Processes | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. Improve Format, Presentation, and Production Quality | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

Comments and Suggestions:

I. Production Quality and Processes Require Modernising

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Strengthen the Editorial Team | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. Improve the Editorial and Production Processes | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

Comments and Suggestions:

J. Dissemination Is Narrowly Defined

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Improve the Breadth and Depth of Dissemination | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. Increase Funding for Dissemination | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

Comments and Suggestions:

K. Resources and Budget Are Marginally Sufficient

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Improve the <i>Survey's</i> Resources and Budget | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments and Suggestions:

Other Comments...

ANNEX B
PDD Memo Regarding Dissemination of 2007 Survey

United Nations



Nations Unies

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Heads of Divisions/Sections/Centres (as listed below) 10 May 2007

From: Ravi Ratnayake
Director
Poverty and Development Division PDD/7/14(07)

Subject: **Launching of the Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific 2007**

I would like to thank you and your colleagues for close cooperation and valuable contribution to the preparation of the *Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific 2007*, which was successfully launched on 18-19 April 2007. Contributions from your Divisions/Sections/Centres helped to showcase ESCAP's comparative advantage in its multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral approach to addressing development challenges.

As you know, in line with the recommendations made by the external evaluation of the *Survey* and the Internal Working Group that the Executive Secretary established in 2006, *Survey* has undergone significant changes to improve its quality, presentation, relevance and impact in the region. Some highlights of the launch are as follows:

(a) *Survey 2007* was launched in 19 locations around the world including new locations of Australia and Kazakhstan.

(b) *Survey* received unprecedented media coverage. With about 300 news articles from around the world to date, it has doubled the coverage received in 2006 with 154 articles (see attached).

Administrative Services
Emerging Social Issues
Environment and Sustainable Development
Information, Communication and Space Technology
Poverty and Development
Programme Management
Statistics
Trade and Investment
Transport and Tourism

United Nations Information Services
LDC Coordination Unit/MDG Centre

UN-EPOC
APCAEM
APCICT
APCTT
CAPSA
SIAP

cc: Mr. Kim Hak-Su
Mr. Shigeru Mochida
Mr. Raj Kumar
Ms. San Yuenwah

ESCAP Staff Association
Central Support Services
Conference Services
Editorial
Financial Services
Human Resources Management

cc: All Professional Staff of PDD

(c) For the first time the *Survey* was covered in the prestigious *Economist* magazine and the main webpage of the World Bank that captures the top news stories of the world. It was also covered extensively by internationally prominent media organizations such as the *International Herald Tribune* (6 stories), the *Washington Post*, *Boston Globe*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, BBC, Dow Jones, Bloomberg, Voice of America, Radio Australia and Deutsche Welle, among others.

(d) The Executive Secretaries' opinion editorial on gender inequality research in the *Survey* was placed in 12 regional daily newspapers and in the *UN Chronicle*. The chapter on gender inequality received extensive media coverage as well as the attention of policy makers as this was the first time that the economic cost of gender gap was estimated.

(e) To reach a broader audience, a dedicated website for the *Survey 2007* was developed that can be compared to UNDP's "Human Development Report" website and the World Bank's "World Development Report" website. During the last 3 weeks, the *Survey* website, at www.unescap.org/survey2007, has been visited by more than 2,500 people. The full report has been downloaded more than 1,400 times during the same time.

(f) Many government officials and participants at the launches have noted the improved quality of the *Survey* and its role as a regional advocacy document. H.E. Mr. Kamal Nath, the Minister for Commerce and Industry of India, said "As the region's oldest and most comprehensive annual review of economic and social developments, this 59th edition builds on the unique strengths of the *Survey*. It is the only independent source of analysis which covers all countries in our vast and diverse region, and considers both the social and economic spheres of development." In his statement at the launching of the *Survey 2007* in Jakarta, Indonesia, Dr. Adrianus Mooy, the former Executive Secretary of UNESCAP mentioned that *Survey 2007* is a much improved publication in terms of the relevance of content, quality of analysis and presentation. He mentioned that the *Survey 2007* has retained its independence in analysis while other such reports are done by donors with self interest.

I am looking forward to continuing the successful collaboration between our Divisions/Sections/Centres that led to the success of *Survey 2007*, and improving further *Survey's* quality and outreach in the future.

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Kim Hak-Su
Executive Secretary

DATE: 6 June 2006

FROM: Shigeru Mochida 
Deputy Executive Secretary
and Chairman, Working Group on the
Evaluation Report of the *Survey*

REF: WGR-Survey

SUBJECT: **Report of the Working Group on the External Evaluator's report
on the Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific**

The Executive Secretary may kindly recall that he constituted a four-member Working Group to examine and report on the recommendations contained in the report of the external evaluator on ways to improve UNESCAP's annual publication: *Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific*.

After a thorough examination of the external evaluator's report, the Working Group is pleased to submit its report for the kind consideration and approval of the Executive Secretary.

Attachment

cc: Mr. Ravi Ratnayake, Director, Poverty and Development Division
Ms. Thelma Kay, Director, Emerging Social Issues Division
Mr. Pietro Gennari, Director, Statistics Division