TWINNING CONTRACT

JO/13/ENP/ST/23

Strengthening the capabilities of the Department of Statistics in Jordan

MISSION REPORT

on

Activity: 3.12 Follow-up on work done and recommendation for future work

Mission carried out by

Karin Blix, Statistics Denmark

19th April 2015 to 23rd April 2015

Version: Final

Expert contact information

Karin Blix
Statistics Denmark
Sejrøgade 11
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø
Denmark
Tel: +45 3917 3348
Email: kwb@dst.dk

Table of contents

List of Abbreviations

DoS   Department of Statistics of Jordan
ToR   Terms of Reference

Executive Summary

The mandatory result for this component was that statistics published by DoS are quality assured and documentation is improved. This mandatory result has been achieved in large. The five benchmarks that if achieved should facilitate the achievement for the mandatory result were all achieved.

The first benchmark to be fulfilled to reach the mandatory result for this component was an assessment report on the current situation in January 2014. This point is achieved as an assessment report was in place at the end of the first mission in January 2014. The second benchmark was to discuss the consequences of applying the European Code of Practice (CoP). DoS had filled in a self-assessment form on how they lived up to the CoP before the start of this component – by the end of 2013. This assessment report was discussed in the first mission in January 2014. The discussion was repeated in the final mission to elaborate on where DoS had moved in the course of this Twinning project. Compliance has during the course of this project can now be applied in 5 indicators were non-compliance was reported. In another 21 indicators DoS is as a result of the project now moving towards compliance.

The third benchmark was to develop a standard format for the quality declarations. This was done in the course of the third, fourth and fifth mission in this component. The starting point was the user oriented fields from the Single Integrated Metadata Structure (SIMS) developed by the EU. The fourth benchmark was to complete and publish a quality declaration for National Accounts. This has been done – not only for National Accounts, but also for 34 other surveys/statistics. The fifth benchmark was to develop a metadata strategy. This has been done and the metadata has been approved by the management of DoS. The last benchmark was to design and test a quality audit. The design of a quality audit has been discussed in several of the missions of this component and tested on the Livestock survey. A final design and the method to be used for conduction audits on surveys is yet to be decided upon.

Recommendations are given for DoS to ensure sustainability of the achievements:
-   Strengthen the organisation of the quality work in DoS e.g. ensuring an appropriate position for the Quality Divisions in the organisation
-   Make clear rules and responsibilities for QD, the QT and the survey/statistics Directorates
-   Make clear plans and responsibilities for updating quality declarations and the release calendar
-   Make clear plans for quality auditing of surveys

Recommendations for continual work with quality issues are given within organisational issues, courses/training, metadata and quality audits of surveys. Some recommendations relate to finishing ongoing processes of improving the quality related issues while others relate to areas that should be dealt with on a longer term. Examples on some of the recommendations:
-   The Quality Division should have better access to the top management in order to take quality into account in decisions.
-   Roles and responsibilities of the Quality Division, the Quality Team and the survey/statistics Directorates should be agreed.
-   DoS should consider creating a follow up course targeted statistical work. This should comprise of international standards and guidelines for quality management in statistics.
-   As part of developing a metadata strategy DoS should decide on scope, structure and detail for a standardised quality declaration where existing information can be reused.
-   DoS should decide on a method and organisation for carrying out quality audits at survey level.

1. General comments

This mission report was prepared within the Twinning Project "Strengthening the capabilities of the Department of Statistics in Jordan". It is the final mission to be completed within the Component Quality and Metadata of the project.

The purposes of the mission were:
o   To discuss any outstanding issues with relation to the topics in the component
o   To discuss the status regarding the component at the beginning of the project
o   To discuss the status of the project results
o   To prepare recommendations regarding the sustainability of the achievements
o   To prepare recommendations for the future work
o   To identify needs for further support

The expected outcome of this mission were:
o   Recommendations prepared for outstanding issues with relation to the topics in the component
o   Description of the status regarding the component at the beginning of the project
o   Description of the project results
o   Recommendations prepared on the sustainability of the achievements
o   Recommendations prepared on the future work
o   Description of needs for further support

The consultant would like to express her thanks to all officials and individuals met for the kind support and valuable information which she received during the stay in Jordan and which highly facilitated the work of the consultant.

Views and observations stated in this report are those of the consultant and do not necessarily correspond to the views of EU, DoS, Statistics Denmark or Istat.

2. Assessment and results

There were six mandatory results and benchmarks for this component:
-    Statistics published by DoS are quality assured and documentation is improved (Apr 2015)
-    Assessment report on current situation (Jan 2014)
-    The consequences of applying the European Statistics Code of Practice in DoS are discussed (Apr 2014)
-    Develop a standard format for a quality declaration (Jul 2014)
-    A quality declaration for the national accounts is completed and published on the DoS website (Jan 2015)
-    Develop a metadata strategy (Jan 2015)
-    Design and test a quality audit (Apr 2015)

2.1 Quality assurance and improved documentation

The mandatory result for this component was that statistics published by DoS are quality assured and documentation is improved. This mandatory result has in large been achieved. Already at the beginning of the project it was clear that much was done in DoS to assure quality. In Data Collection forms were tested and field workers trained before data collection started. In registering the data, procedures was in place to check the registration for logical errors and also some probable errors. Procedures were also in place to control random registrations. Procedures were also in place to assure the quality in the validation process and in the dissemination process. In the course of the project a standard checklist was developed. This is now adopted for agricultural statistics.

The documentation of the statistics published has been improved by the new quality declarations that have been developed in the course of this project. The new template is developed using the user oriented fields of the EU standard SIMS. For some of the fields, like sources and accuracy, standard texts have been developed. 35 surveys have filled in the new quality declarations using Word and these are now available on a dedicated DoS' web site as PDFs. A link to the relevant statistics is given in all the quality declarations.

2.2 Assessment of situation in the beginning of the component

The first benchmark to be fulfilled to reach the mandatory result for this component was an assessment report on the current situation in January 2014. This point is also achieved as an assessment report is in place. There were five points of outcome from the assessment mission:

1. The organization of quality management work in DoS seems to need a more concrete plan for the actual activities of the Quality Division seems needed. Also, strong and visible support from the top management is a key success factor which could be further strengthened.
2. It is recommended that the central quality function should be responsible for provision of quality management tools, procedures, training, support and coordination, and the survey divisions should be responsible for the application of these tools and procedures and responsible for the quality of 'their' data and metadata. This implies that the central quality function has a supporting role and not a controlling role.
3. Internal documentation (checklists, coding rules, validation/editing rules etc.) could be more comprehensive, up-to-date and standardized according to 'best practice' in DoS. Also, it is strongly recommended to add quality measurement to the processes.
4. DoS' self-assessment against the CoP actually showed a quite good level of compliance. The interpretation and assessment against certain indicators could be reconsidered when the consequences of applying the CoP are discussed.
5. It is recommended that DoS - as part of the development of the metadata strategy – decides on the scope, structure and detail for a standardised quality declaration where existing information can be re-used as much as possible.

Regarding 1)
The Quality division has since the start of the project been expanded with one person. The workload for the Quality Division has increased, but this increase in workload is primarily caused by review of news releases and such.

The top management of DoS express strong support to the quality management work of the Quality Division in DoS. Examples can, however, be found that indicates need to transform the top managements expressed strong support into systematic planning and guidelines for activities bringing the work of the Quality Division and the Quality Team in action in the whole organisation of DoS.

Regarding 2):
The role of the central quality function – the Quality Division is not yet completely clear and in place.

Regarding 3):
In agricultural statistics 16 operations are now subject to the same kind of checklists that have been developed in the course of the project. No other areas than agricultural statistics have taken on the new checklists yet. 35 quality declarations have been updated to the template developed in the course of this project. These quality declarations are disseminated in the DoS web site.

Regarding 4)
Going through the self-assessment made by DoS against the CoP prior to the start of this project, the consultants found that in some indicators where non-compliance was reported, it could be argued that DoS actually complied. It was also found some indicators where compliance was reported where this could be questioned. It was recommended to go through the self-assessment again within DoS with

representatives of the different Directorates. As a part of this activity we will go through the self-assessment again to see what movements there has been as a result of this project.

Regarding 5):
A metadata strategy has been developed. There is a need to work on how to implement the strategy in DoS. Quality declarations are made in Word – and published as PDFs on the DoS web site. When the statisticians have changes to their quality declarations they make the changes in their own copy of the Word-file. There are not yet any systematic plans of reuse of the quality declarations. The Quality Division reads the quality declarations before they are disseminated.

2.3 Applying CoP in DoS

The second benchmark was to discuss the consequences of applying the European Code of Practice (CoP). DoS had filled in a self-assessment form on how they lived up to the CoP before the start of this component – by the end of 2013. This assessment report was discussed in the first mission in January 2014. The workshop held with the Quality Team and the Quality Division gave rise to useful discussions about the interpretation of some of the indicators and also discussion among DoS' participants about the actual status/compliance regarding some of the indicators. A discussion was repeated in the final mission to elaborate on where DoS had moved in the course of this Twinning project. This is the result of this discussion:

Principle 1: Professional independence
In the self assessment DoS made late 2013 they reported to comply with seven of these eight indicators. Indicator 1.5 regarding a statistical work program was the indicator they did not comply with. At present there has been some progress. There is not an actual work program and periodic progress reports published, but a release or publishing calendar has been introduced on DoS' new web page. For the time being only manufacturing price indices and consumer price indices are presented in the calendar for 2015.

Principle 2: Mandate for Data Collection
In the self assessment DoS reported not full compliance in indicator 2.2. Within another project run by the Ministry of Planning, department of statistics, Ministry of higher education with funding for USAID the use of administrative sources for statistical purposes is being explored, primarily in social statistics.

Principle 3: Adequacy of Resources
In the self assessment DoS made late 2013 they reported no compliance in indicator 3.3 and 3.4. Resources in the form of staff are in place in DoS, but not necessarily with the competences needed for an efficient statistics production. In connection to the census there have been great investments in tablets for the data collection. In other components in the present Twinning project achievements are made that can be of value to improving within this principle. The procedures that exist to assess and justify new statistics against their cost are in need of a revision. The need for discontinuing statistics has not yet been seen.

Principle 4: Quality Commitment
Much has happened regarding the quality commitment in DoS since the start of this project. When DoS filled in the self-assessment form in 2013 – there was not compliance on any of the five indicators.

Regarding the commitment to quality, a quality policy has been formulated, and is delivered as input to the coming DoS strategy. A Metadata strategy is also in place and has been approved by the top management, but not yet published on the DoS web site..

Quality declarations are in place for 35 surveys documenting the product quality.

Templates for reviewing processes are in place on the DoS intranet and have been tested for agricultural statistics. Indicator 4.3 is on the way of being in place.

In some aspects DoS complies with indicator 4.4. When data is sent to international organisations they are subject to thorough review and the close cooperation with the Central bank also ensures review of the data, but there has been no actual change in the situation during this project.

Principle 5: Statistical Confidentiality
In the self assessment DoS reported to comply with all the six indicators in principle 5.

Principle 6: Impartiality and Objectivity
In the self assessment DoS reported to comply with all indicators of principle 6 except indicator 6.6. In connection with the transition from SNA93 to SNA2008 notice was given in advance to users about changing of methods.

Principle 7: Sound Methodology
In the self assessment DoS reported to comply with five of the seven indicators in principle 7. Regarding Indicator 7.4 DoS has applied international standards and nationalised them with more details, but keeping the structure of the international standards, which was also settled during activity 3.1. Regarding indicator 7.7 there has been no change.

Principle 8: Appropriate Statistical Procedures
DoS reported compliance in four of nine indicators in this principle, and partly compliance in one – indicator 8 which is still on the way.

Regarding indicator 8.1, there has been no movement. Regarding indicator 8.6 there is now documentation for revisions in the new quality declarations, but an actual policy for revisions does not seem to be in place.

Regarding indicator 8.7 and 8.9 there is some movement as agreements are on the way regarding administrative data. A signature is all there seems to be missing although the idea with using administrative data does not quite seem to be established.

Principle 9: Non-Excessive Burden on Respondents
In the self assessment DoS reported compliance in three out of six indicators. Regarding indicator 9.3 there is a mix of adapting to what e.g. businesses have in their accounts and what National accounts need. There is still no actual electronic collection of data except for some few data coming from a Ministry.

The use of administrative sources will probably be more extensive in the future as agreements are on the way regarding the use of administrative data for statistics.

Principle 10: Cost Effectiveness
In the self assessment DoS reported non- compliance in all of the four indicators and nothing seems to have changed in issues regarding this principle.

Principle 11: Relevance
In the self assessment DoS reported non- compliance in all of the three indicators. To some extent this project has however moved things. On several occasions meetings have been held with important users during the course of this project. An updated questionnaire is now posted on the web site for registered users to fill in about their satisfaction with statistics from DoS.

An actual work programme does not exist, but there is now a release calendar on the web site. This calendar is, however, not fully available in English and not all surveys' publication dates are present in the calendar.

Principle 12: Accuracy and Reliability
In the self assessment DoS reported non- compliance in all of the three indicators. On all three of these indicators there has been movement within this project. Indicator 12.1is now in place and regular revisions are made via the web page. Regarding indicator 12.2 the new quality declarations are taking care of this. As of indicator 12.3 – this is on the way.

Principle 13: Timeliness and punctuality
In the self assessment DoS reported compliance in all of the five indicators.

Principle 14: Coherence and Comparability
In the self assessment DoS reported compliance in all of the five indicators.

Principle 15: Accessibility and Clarity
In the self-assessment DoS reported compliance in two of the seven indicators.

Indicator 15.3 is now complied with as a result of the new dynamic web site. Indicator 15.4 is now in place. Indicator 15.5 is to some extent complied with as a result of this project as 35 quality declarations are now on the web site following the user oriented fields of the EU standard SIMS and documentation of variables is on the way in the context of Nesstar which is based on DDI 2.0. Indicator 15.6 and 15.7 are now complied with via the new quality declarations.

In summary compliance has during the course of this project now been applied in 5 indicators were non-compliance was reported. In another 21 indicators DoS is as a result of the project now moving towards compliance.

2.4 Developing a standard format for quality declarations
The third benchmark was to develop a standard format for the quality declarations. This was done in the course of the third, fourth and fifth mission in this component. The starting point was the user oriented fields from the Single Integrated Metadata Structure (SIMS) developed by the EU.

2.5 Quality declaration for National Accounts
The fourth benchmark of this component was to complete and publish a quality declaration for National Accounts. This has been done – not only for National Accounts, but also for 34 other surveys/statistics.

2.6 Metadata strategy
The fifth benchmark in this component was to develop a metadata strategy. This has been done and the metadata strategy has been approved by the management of DoS.

2.7 Quality audit
The last benchmark was to design and test a quality audit. This has been achieved. The design of a quality audit has been discussed in several of the missions of this component and tested on the Livestock survey. A final design and the method to be used for conduction audits on surveys is yet to be decided upon, but on the way.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

3.1 Recommendations on how to sustain achievements

DoS has come a long way since the beginning of the project. The mandatory results of the component have all but one been achieved – and the last one is in progress. It is now important to take measures to ensure that these achievements are sustained in the future. It is the experts' opinion that the most important issue in relation to sustaining the good achievements is the organisation of the quality management in DoS.

It has already been pointed out in the course of the project that there is a need for the Quality Division to have better access to the top management. The experts have taken note of the Director General's decision to change the organisation to enhance quality, and this action would benefit the organisation's readiness to improve. To ensure that the tasks of the Quality Division and the Quality Team is known and clear both for themselves and for the rest of the organisation there is also a need of clear rules and responsibilities for the Quality Division, The Quality team and the rest of DoS organisation regarding issues related to quality management. The recommendations for DoS to ensure sustainability of the achievements are to:

- Strengthen the organisation of the quality work in DoS e.g. ensuring an appropriate position for the Quality Divisions in the organisation
- Make clear rules and responsibilities for QD, the QT and the survey/statistics Directorates
- Make clear plans and responsibilities for updating quality declarations and the release calendar
- Make clear plans for quality auditing of surveys

3.2 Recommendations for the future

Even if almost all the mandatory result and benchmarks of this component have been achieved and the last being in progress there are still some outstanding issues to be dealt with and issues to focus on in the further development of the quality management of DoS. Recommendation for further work can be divided in four areas – organisational issues, courses/training, metadata and quality audits. The recommendations are:

Organisational issues
In the short run:
- The Quality Division should have better access to the top management in order to take quality into account in decisions
- Roles and responsibilities of the Quality Division, the Quality Team and the survey/statistics Directorates should be agreed. Some responsibilities that should be placed is:
  o Continuous development of the templates and guidelines so they keep fit for purpose
  o Follow/monitor the ongoing work in the statistical divisions
  o Create link between management, statistical domains and Quality division
- A program for quality assurance/quality management should be drafted
  o "What is to be done when by who"
  o Plan for implementing the quality checklist in the rest of DoS
- Make a plan for continuous meetings with segments of users
- Statistical calendar list should be implemented from 2015 for all statistical products in DoS and guidelines for updating the calendar should be developed
- DoS should apply to Eurostat for a Peer Review
  o Ms Claudia Juncker of Eurostat has expressed willingness of Eurostat to accommodate such an activity.

- DoS should carry out a Peer Review in 2016
    o This activity is strongly sponsored by the Director General, which is the key to success.

In the longer run:
- Employee quality awareness questionnaire should be differentiated for different personnel groups and ready for a new launch in the spring 2016
- CoP self-assessment should be updated involving people across DoS directorates and it should be approved by management
- An actual work programme for DoS should be developed
- DoS has no shortage of staff as such, but often find that they lack staff with the right competences. It is recommended that DoS investigates the possibilities of the current staff to achieve the competences that are in need. It is also recommended that DoS in future recruitment of staff seek candidates that possess the needed competences

Courses/training
In the short run:
- Prepare and carry out introduction courses for all new permanent employees, in which information is given about the general concepts of quality (such as timeliness, relevance, accessibility etc.) and statistics (such as overall concepts of sampling).
- Carry out a training course on CoP and QAF for middle management (Directors and Division heads). In order to be effective, this training should be sponsored by the Director General and should be carried out as soon as possible.

In the longer run:
- DoS should consider creating a follow up course targeted statistical work. This should comprise of international standards and guidelines for quality management in statistics

Metadata
In the short run:
- Link to relevant QD in Press releases and from tables and databases
- The Quality Team (QT) should develop more comprehensive guidelines for content of each item in the quality declarations. The guidelines should also include guidelines/rules for updating quality declarations in new waves of surveys.
- Quality declarations should include the latest date of updating
- DoS should draw up a QD in the established QD format for the new census
- DoS should publish the QD progressively as the census is carried out

In the longer run:
- As part of developing a metadata strategy DoS should decide on scope, structure and detail for a standardised quality declaration where existing information can be reused

Quality audits of surveys
In the short run:
- DoS should decide on a method and organisation for carrying out quality audits at survey level.
- A suitable self-assessment form should be developed, based on DESAP and using examples given in the course of this project as a starting point.
- A structured question frame for evaluation processes should be developed – taking account of "Guidance for quality control".
- The method chosen should include
    o Plan for auditing
    o Plan for involved and responsible persons/functions
    o A reference standard
    o An evaluation of whether DoS quality checklist can be used as an auditing question frame
    o Template for evaluation report on strengths, weaknesses and improvement actions

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

EU Twinning Project JO/13/ENP/ST/23

19-23 April 2015

Component 3: Quality and metadata

Activity 3.12: Follow-up on work done and recommendation for future work

0. Mandatory results and benchmarks for the component
- Statistics published by DoS are quality assured and documentation is improved (Apr 2015)
- Assessment report on current situation (Jan 2014)
- The consequences of applying the European Statistics Code of Practice in DoS are discussed (Apr 2014)
- Develop a standard format for a quality declaration (Jul 2014)
- A quality declaration for the national accounts is completed and published on the DoS website (Jan 2015)
- Develop a metadata strategy (Jan 2015)
- Design and test a quality audit (Apr 2015)

1. Purpose of the activity
o   To discuss any outstanding issues with relation to the topics in the component

o   To discuss the status regarding the component at the beginning of the project
o   To discuss the status of the project results
o   To prepare recommendations regarding the sustainability of the achievements
o   To prepare recommendations for the future work
o   To identify needs for further support

2. Expected output of the activity
o   Recommendations prepared for outstanding issues with relation to the topics in the component

o   Description of the status regarding the component at the beginning of the project
o   Description of the project results
o   Recommendations prepared on the sustainability of the achievements
o   Recommendations prepared on the future work
o   Description of needs for further support

Annex 2. Programme for the mission

Programme for the mission

Time		Place	Event	Purpose / detail
Sunday, morning	08.30 – 10.00	DoS	Meeting with RTA	To discuss the programme of the week
Sunday, morning	10.00 – 12.00	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions of the week's programme Discussions of any outstanding issues regarding the topics in the component.
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Sunday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions regarding the status of the topics in the component at the beginning of the project
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
Monday, morning	08.30 – 09.00	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.00 – 12.00		Crowne Plaza hotel	Participation in the Closing Ceremony of the Twinning project.
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Monday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions of the status of the project results
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
Tuesday, morning	08.30 – 09.00	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.00 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions on how the achievements can be sustained
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Tuesday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Continued.
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing

Wednesday, morning	08.30 – 09.00	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.00 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions about future work
	12.00 – 01.00		Break / Preparations / Report writing	Break / Preparations / Report writing
Wednesday, afternoon	01.00 – 03.30	DoS	Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Discussions of needs for further support
	03.30 – 04.00		Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
Thursday, morning	08.30 – 09.00	DoS	Preparations / Report writing	Preparations / Report writing
	09.00 – 12.00		Meeting with BC Component Leader and BC Experts	Final clarifications with BC Experts, preparation of report and presentation for BC Project Leader
	12.00 – 01.00		Debriefing with BC Project Leader	Conclusions and decisions and their consequences

Annex 3. Persons met

<u>DoS:</u>
Mr. Abed Wadood Matouk, BC project leader
Mr. Mohammad Khalaf, Head of Quality Division (Component leader)
Mr. Duraid Al-Shawasreh, Quality Division
Mr. Abdul Nasser K.N Tahat, Quality Division
Mr. Bassam Al-Zain, Agricultural Survey Directorate, member of Quality Team
Mr. Mohammad Damrah, Economic Survey Directorate, member of Quality Team

<u>RTA Team:</u>
Thomas Olsen, RTA
Christine Salman, RTA-assistant
Deena Moghrabi, Interpreter