



UNDA 9th: Kick-off meeting

10-11 December 2014, Almaty

**New round of Global Assessments
/ Peer Reviews in the EECCA
countries**

Introduction

- Peer reviews in MS, EFTA countries and Eurostat in 2006-08
- LPRs and/or AGAs in enlargement countries 2009-2013
- AGAs in ENP-East, some Central Asian countries and Mongolia 2008-2014
- LPRs and/or AGAs in ENP-South countries launched in 2012
- New round of Peer Reviews in MS 2014-2015

New round of assessments – why?

- About 5 years have passed
 - **Change of professional and legal environment**
 - **Pending improvement actions might signal problem**
- Alushta seminar in June 2013 – support for a new round of assessments
- Member States are having a new round of Peer Reviews

New round of assessments – how?

- Eurostat A3 + UNECE + EFTA developed several options to be discussed – food for thought
- All countries to undergo the same exercise
- Possible to mix elements of different options or to develop a new one

Option 1 – No changes

- Same method of assessments as in last round
- +
 - **Results are directly comparable**
- -
 - **Any new info compared to annual monitoring?**

Option 2 – PR with GA-like elements

- Method of PR for CoP principles 1-6 and 15
- Some form of GA-like assessment for principles 7-14
- Option 2.1
 - **Principles 7-14 assessed through a simplified procedure**
 - **More detail than a PR but less than a GA**
- Option 2.2
 - **Principles 7-14 assessed like in a GA**
 - **True mix of PR and GA**

Option 2 - continued

- Option 2.1
 - + **both institutional aspects and statistical fields covered**
 - + **less burden than 2.2**
 - - **for countries that already had AGA – less info**
- Option 2.2
 - + **very thorough assessment**
 - + **combining advantages of both PRs and GAs**
 - - **more burden, more resources needed**

Option 3 – Audit-like approach

- Approach used in the new round of MS peer reviews
 - **Info provided backed by evidence**
 - **Structure of report similar to an audit report**
 - **Report focuses on weaknesses / issues to improve**
- +
 - **Stricter → more credible**
 - **Comparable with MSs**
- -
 - **Not comparable with previous assessments**
 - **Report highlights more improvement areas than strengths**
 - **No overview on the statistical system**

Option 4 – focus on outstanding actions

- Minimalistic approach – only focus on outstanding improvement actions
- Find reasons for difficulties – propose solutions
- +
 - **Less burden, less resources**
- -
 - **Value added compared to the annual monitoring?**
 - **New problems not detected**

Implementation of the new approach

- Improvement actions proposed by NSIs
- Decision on option based on discussion during the HLS in June 2015
- Pilot – 2nd half 2015/ 1st half 2016?
- HLS 2016 – Discuss results of pilot, fine-tune
- Full implementation – 2017 onwards

Questions for discussion

- What are the main objectives of a new round of assessments?
- What are the advantages / disadvantages of each option?
- What is the optimal way to identify the improvement actions?
- What other options could be defined, if any?