

Unclassified

GOV/PGC(2005)10/ANN



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques  
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

18-Nov-2005

English - Or. English

**PUBLIC GOVERNANCE AND TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE  
PUBLIC GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

Cancels & replaces the same document of 31 October 2005

**MANAGEMENT IN GOVERNMENT:  
FEASIBILITY REPORT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPARATIVE COUNTRY DATA  
TECHNICAL ANNEXES**

**32nd Session of the Public Governance Committee  
29 November 2005  
Van Kleffenszaal, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague**

*This document is presented to the Committee for discussion and approval.*

For more information, please contact Nick MANNING:  
Tel: +33 1 45 24 16 45; email: [nick.manning@oecd.org](mailto:nick.manning@oecd.org)

**JT00194378**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

GOV/PGC(2005)10/ANN  
Unclassified

English - Or. English

## TECHNICAL ANNEX 1: DEVELOPMENTS IN OUTPUT MEASUREMENT

The growing interest in measurements of government has been encouraged by the Eurostat work on price and volume measures for government output. Following a research programme undertaken across the European Union, the European Commission decision of 17 December 2002 (2002/990) clarified the principles for the measurement of prices and volumes of government services contained in an earlier decision (2223/96). The context was the increasing priority given to the harmonisation of GDP growth figures from 1997, and the lack of comparable data concerning non-market services which are an important contributor to GDP. The Eurostat Price and Volume Handbook, published in December 2001, identified four potential characteristics of output indicators:

1. full coverage of all services provided to external users;
2. cost-weighted;
3. defined in as much detail as possible;
4. adjusted for quality.

It also identified A, B and C methods for individual services:

- A methods: output indicators satisfying all four criteria;
- B methods: output indicators not satisfying all four criteria;
- C methods: methods based primarily on measuring inputs.

The bar was set slightly lower for collective services because of difficulties in defining outputs.

Broadly, Commission Decision 2002/990 outlawed the use of C methods from 2006. Eurostat is now checking the "Price and Volume Inventories" of member states to assess compliance.

The United Kingdom has been particularly prominent in developments in this area, largely through the well-regarded work of the Atkinson Review (*Measurement of Government Output and Productivity for the National Accounts*, Basingstoke, 2005, Palgrave). The review noted that how governments measure non-market output can make a considerable difference to the recorded growth rate of the economy, but the absence of market transactions means that it is hard to place a value on the services provided. It concluded that, despite the evident difficulties in data collection and management, improved measures are necessary to measure accurately the resources absorbed by the public sector, not least because there is an intrinsic case based on public accountability for seeking to measure what is achieved by spending on public services. The review proposed nine principles covering the measurement of outputs, inputs, and productivity, and set out checklists for the criteria to be applied when revising output measures and choosing price deflators. Above all, the committee concluded that measures of output growth should take account of quality change. This concern for improved measures has been reflected elsewhere in the UK Government, and the National Audit Office has developed new tools for assessing aspects of efficiency in order to contribute to embedding efficiency into the public sector (NAO Good Practice Briefing: Efficiency Special, Issue 15, July 2005, *Sharpening Performance Focus*).

Similar developments are reflected in recent work by the National Statistical Offices in France, Italy and the Netherlands.

The OECD already gathers extensive output data in both the health and education sectors (see for example OECD *Education at a Glance*, and STD/CSTAT(2004)5: *Making Education Statistics Count: An Overview of the Development of Comparative Data on the Performance of Education Systems at the OECD*).

## TECHNICAL ANNEX 2: DEVELOPMENTS IN OUTCOME MEASUREMENT

The Palermo OECD World Forum on Key Indicators held in November 2004 highlighted the growing interest of OECD member countries in measuring progress towards strategic national goals. The forum concluded that there is a significant potential community of interest in the issue of “key indicators”. This is reflected in national developments such as the US Key National Indicators (See Forum on Key National Indicators: Assessing the Nation’s Position and Progress, 2003, Government Accountability Office in conjunction with the National Academies).

There have also been extensive developments in outcome measurement at an international level:

**EU structural indicators.** The Lisbon European Council invited the European Commission to draw up an annual report of progress in relation to employment, innovation, economic reform, and social cohesion. In response, a list of 42 structural indicators was drawn up. These indicators have been incorporated into the European Commission’s Spring Report to the European Council since 2001. The indicators cover the following six domains:

1. general economic background;
2. employment;
3. innovation and research;
4. economic reform;
5. social cohesion; and
6. environment.

**EU Laeken indicators for social inclusion.** The use of indicators for measuring progress towards social inclusion was agreed at the Laeken European Council in December 2001. The Council approved an initial set of 18 common statistical indicators addressing four dimensions of social inclusion:

1. financial poverty;
2. employment;
3. health; and
4. education.

**Indicators for sustainable development.** Indicators for sustainable development have been developed by Eurostat in co-operation with the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (UNCSD) for the purpose of informing sustainable development policies and measuring progress towards sustainable development at a European level. The UNCSD framework for indicators on sustainable development is founded on the concept of four dimensions of sustainable development:

1. social;
2. environmental;
3. economic; and
4. institutional.

**OECD.** The OECD has developed social indicators for the purposes of international comparison and assessment of social trends and policies. These indicators are presented in *Society at a Glance* under four broad themes:

1. self-sufficiency;
2. equity;
3. health; and
4. social cohesion.

### TECHNICAL ANNEX 3: THE KEY DIMENSIONS OF “GOVERNMENT”

In defining the key dimensions of government to be measured, the System of National Accounts (SNA) provides a robust foundation as it reflects a well-established consensus concerning the components of the public sector. In essence, the SNA classifies public activities in two ways:

1. by institutional unit;
2. by function.

Data collected under all these classifications are useful – but the institutional sector classification provides the most practical approach to defining the dimensions that can be measured.

Viewed by institutional unit,<sup>1</sup> three categories can be identified which, taken together, constitute what is generally regarded as government:

- *Units within general government* is a well-defined set of organisations where the financial transactions are captured within category S.13 (called “general government”) of the System of National Accounts (SNA).
- The *public sector* is a somewhat broader set of organisations, encompassing public corporations in those settings where they are not already included in general government. This sector is an SNA sector, but only few countries deliver data under this definition.
- The *private sector in the public domain* (this is not an SNA definition) includes those non-governmental organisations whose public funding comprises more than 50% of total revenue, or private enterprises with a distinctive and statutorily privileged market position.

These are defined in relationship to SNA classifications in Table 1.

---

1. This reflects the SNA terminology, but many would argue that the entities in question are organisations rather than institutions in the technical sense of the terms.

Table 1. "Government" classified by institutional unit

Sectors in the SNA	Institutional units	Defining characteristics	Examples
Public sector	General government	Units financed from central government budget	<p>At each level of government, this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government units, by functional sub-sectors (e.g. Ministry of Economy)</li> <li>• Non profit institutions, financed and controlled by government; by sub-sectors (e.g. some universities, some charitable schools)</li> <li>• Government enterprises: market producer (e.g. mint, government printing shop, other enterprises without independent accounts)</li> </ul> <p>When available, this is a distinct category across all levels of government. When not available as a separate category this is included in the central, state and local government data.</p>
		Units financed from state budgets	
		Units financed from local government budgets	
	Social security	Social security funds	
Public sector	Public financial (quasi-) corporations	Units controlled by government, selling goods or services at an economically significant price	<p>This includes, for example, the central bank. It includes also large energy or transport public enterprises controlled by government.</p>
	Public non-financial (quasi-) corporations		
Private sector in the public domain*	Non-profit institutions, indirectly and significantly financed by public funds	Non-profit units whose public funding comprises more than 50% of total revenue.	<p>In the SNA, these can not be disaggregated by level of government. This category includes for example private hospitals (not for profit or for profit), nursing homes, etc.</p>
	Profit institutions indirectly and significantly financed by public funds	For-profit units whose public funding comprises more than 50% of total revenue.	
Part of S.11	Concessions and legal monopolies	Private enterprises with a distinctive and statutorily privileged market position	<p>This includes private enterprises with a statutory monopoly such as water, power or other utilities.</p> <p>In the SNA, these can not be disaggregated by level of government. This category includes some private schools and other grant-funded charitable institutions.</p>
Part of S.15	Non-profit institutions, financed but not controlled by government, by sub-sectors	Non-profit units whose public funding comprises more than 50% of total revenue.	

\*. There is a particular opportunity to collect comparative data on those central government organisations which exist with similar functions in most OECD member countries (such as Ministries of Finance, Revenue Authorities, Statistics Offices, Supreme Audit Institutions, etc.).

\*\* . This description has been devised specifically for this purpose and is not a recognised SNA term.

Government expenditures can also be classified by function, according to the nature of the tasks undertaken. Table 2 offers the main sectors defined in the Classification of Functions of Government (COFOG).

**Table 2. "Government" classified by function**

Primarily individual goods and services	<i>Education</i> : primary, secondary, post-secondary and tertiary education, etc. <i>Health</i> : public health services, hospitals and outpatient services, etc. <i>Social protection</i> : services linked to old age, unemployment, family and children, sickness and disability, etc. <i>Recreation, culture and religion</i> : cultural, sporting or recreational services, religious services, etc.
Mixed individual/collective	<i>Economic affairs</i> : general economic affairs, agriculture, fishing, energy, mining, transport, communication, etc. <i>Environmental protection</i> : waste and waste water management, pollution abatement, etc. <i>Housing and community amenities</i> : housing and community development, water supply, street lighting, etc.
Primarily collective goods and services	<i>General public services</i> : executive and legislative organs, general services, etc. <i>Defence</i> : military and civil defence, etc. <i>Public order and safety</i> : police, fire protection, law courts, prisons, etc.

Going further than SNA, having classified “government” along these two principal dimensions, in principle, for each group of organisations or function, we can define three types of measures:

*Inputs* – for example:

- government wages and salaries;
- government final consumption expenditures;
- numbers/characteristics of staff employed by type.

*Processes*<sup>2</sup> – for example:

- measures which characterise the budget and financial management systems (such as the degree of detail to which the budget is appropriated, or restrictions on parliamentary amendments to budget proposals, or the proportion of expenditures accounted on a full or partial accruals basis);
- measures which characterise the civil service management and oversight arrangements (such as staff mobility, openness of recruitment to lateral entry);
- wages, salaries and pensions levels;
- measures which characterise the arrangements for determining intergovernmental fiscal transfers.

*Outputs* – for example:

- numbers of children in full time education;
- numbers of older people receiving full time nursing care.

---

2. It is important to note that *processes* in this context are distinct from *activities*, a topic given much consideration in agency- or industry-specific analyses of productivity. *Processes* refer to cross-cutting institutional or managerial arrangements (e.g. types of civil service arrangement). *Activities* refer to a mechanical step in producing outputs (e.g. a specific surgical procedure or outpatient appointment).

Although “general government” is a more intuitively obvious set of organisations, when considering *inputs* and *outputs* of government, it is necessary to include data relating to both the “public sector” and to the “private sector in receipt of public funds”, largely because of the significance of organisations outside of general government which are financed by public funds in the health and education sectors.

In considering *processes*, it is feasible to focus more narrowly on what is traditionally regarded as government – as organisations within general government are the principal subject of analyses of public sector managerial arrangements.

There are two further dimensions which can be measured, but which do not readily map onto any groups of organisations: *outcomes* and *antecedents or constraints that contextualize government efficiency*.

*Outcomes* include, for example:

- public and business perceptions of “trust” in government;
- firm perceptions of the competitive environment;
- regulatory quality.

Although outcomes can be grouped by sector, they can not meaningfully be linked in any precise way to the outputs of specific organisations. If public policy is well-considered, then outcomes are undoubtedly affected in some way by individual government outputs, but those outputs interact with environmental issues to lead to the final outcomes, and the same output might contribute to several outcomes to varying degrees.

*Antecedents or constraints that contextualize government efficiency* are factors that are likely to have an impact on the relationship between outputs and outcomes. They include for example:

- scale (population size, GDP);
- scrutiny environment (media, civil service qualifications, public education and literacy, breadth of tax base);
- competition for skilled staff (labour market participation, wage levels);
- private investment in the sector.

Adding this together, the basic map of the areas in government which can be measured is provided in Table 3. The shaded area represents cells where data could in principle be collected but where, as argued above, it is unlikely to have immediate practical relevance.

**Table 3. The key dimensions of measurement**

		Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes	Antecedents or constraints that contextualize government efficiency
<b>Institutional classification</b>						
Public sector	General government					
	Other public sector					
Private sector in the public domain						
<b>Functional classification</b>						
Primarily individual goods and services						
Primarily collective goods and services						

#### **TECHNICAL ANNEX 4: RELEVANT OECD DATASETS**

The feasibility phase of the “Management in Government: Comparative Country Data” project has identified and reviewed available datasets concerned with inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes in government and in some central agencies, in key sectors (education, health care, law and order and public administration) and in some specified central agencies. Reviewing entailed a relatively light assessment of the quality, specificity and policy-relevance of available dataset in seven key areas, as defined by the Quality Framework for OECD Statistics (relevance, accuracy, credibility, timeliness, interpretability, coherence and accessibility). The individual reports on each dataset have been summarized in Table 4.

This initial assessment has served to determine which existing data could be appropriate for this project, and to initiate a dialogue with data owners.

Within each of the datasets potentially relevant indicators for the project in terms of inputs (financial, budgetary, staffing, etc.), processes (management system, arrangement, transfers, etc.), and outputs (quality of services, quantity, performance measures, trust, etc.) have been identified and summarized in Table 5.

Table 4. Review of OECD datasets

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>STD – Statistics Directorate</b> Lequillier François, Dupuis Jean-Pierre										
<b>Annual National Accounts</b> <i>LEQUILLER François</i> <i>LA ROSA Catherine</i>	Timely update of annual national accounts. Main aggregates (GDP by expenditure, GDP by kind of activity, GDP by income and disposable income, saving and net lending), detailed breakdown by kind of activity for gross value added (at current and constant prices), components of value added, and gross fixed capital formation and employment. It also includes final consumption expenditure of households by purpose and simplified accounts for general government.	29 OECD (without Turkey)	High	High quality	Objective	Permanent, 2003 is obtained during 2005	Data from 1970 if available. 1992 to 2003 and 1981-2003 for comparative tables	Quantitative data with clear definitions, mainly compiled on the basis of the 1993 System of National Accounts (SNA)  Most OECD countries switched from the 1968 version to the 1993 version of the SNA during 1999, with less long time series. Old data (SNA 68) is still available in an annex database. Turkey still did not transform to SNA 1993.	National Accounts – Main Aggregates (2005)	
<b>ANA General Government Accounts</b> <i>DUPUIS Jean-Pierre</i>	Part of preceding dataset (ANA). Timely update of annual national accounts data for sector of national government. Covers detailed revenues and expenditures by functions of general governments and sub-sectors (general, central, state and local government). Expenditure of general government by function (COFOG), at one digit level. Discussions have started to extend to two-digit level.	29 OECD (without Turkey)	High	High quality	Objective	Permanent, 2003 is obtained during 2005	1992-2003		General Government Accounts (National Account Vol.IV	

GOV/PGC(2005)10/ANN

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>ANA Financial Accounts</b> CHAVOIX- MANNATO Michele	Part of preceding database (ANA). Financial Accounts Flows and Stocks: consolidated flows for general government and central government. Harmonised data on financial accounts and balance	29 OECD (without Turkey)	High	High quality	Objective	Permanent, 2003 is obtained during 2005	1991-2002			NA Financial Accounts Flows (04) and OECD Financial Accounts Database
<b>Central Government Debt Statistics</b> CHAVOIX- MANNATO Michele	Central government debt (net lending/net borrowing) annual statistics on central government debt instruments in 30 OECD countries. The coverage of the data is limited to central government debt issuance, and excludes debt issued by local government and social security funds. Debt is valued at nominal value.	All 30 OECD	High	High quality	1990 to 2003	2003 and 2005	1990 to 2003	Quantitative data	Yes, OECD	Yearbook 1993-2002, Published 2004 and Central Government Debt database
<b>Annual Labour Force Statistics</b> MARTIN Catherine	Long time series for key annual statistics on population, labour force, employment and unemployment. Comprises: population, total employment, unemployment, civilian employment by sectors, part-time employment, and duration of unemployment.	All 30 OECD	High	High quality	Objective	2003 and 2004	1983 - 2003	Quantitative data	Yes, OECD	OECD Labour Force Statistics (2004) and OECD Stat

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>CTP – Centre for tax policy and administration</b>										
Revenue statistics RABESONA J. HEADY Christopher	Tax revenue detailed breakdown by: - main headings (income, profits and capital gains, earnings, payroll and workforce, property, goods and services (including VAT), and other bases; - levels of government (Supra-national authorities, Central government, State, Provincial or Regional government, Local government and Social security funds)	OECD countries	Yes for the analysis of tax policies.	High quality	Objective	2004 and 2005	1965 to 2004	Quantitative, common definitions	Yes	Revenue Statistics of OECD Member Countries (2005)
	Non-Tax revenue, capital and grants	OECD countries		Medium quality	Objective		1990 to 2003	Quantitative, common definitions	Yes	
<b>AGR – Directorate for food, agriculture and fisheries</b>										
Producer and consumer support estimate LEGG Wilfrid Veronique SAINT MARTIN	Data on support to agriculture in OECD countries- Agricultural support estimates	All OECD countries 11 non-members	High relevance	Good quality	Objective	Yearly	1986 to 2004 for OECD countries; period varies for non members	Quantitative indicators	Yes	Agricultural policies in OECD countries Monitoring and Evaluation(2005)

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>EDU – Directorate for education</b>										
<b>Education database</b> SCHLEICHER Andreas DAVIDSON Michael	Data cover the outputs of educational institutions, the policy levers that shape educational outputs, the human and financial resources invested in education and structural characteristics of education systems. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public expenditure on Education (% GDP)</li> <li>• Public expenditure on Education as % of total Public Expenditure</li> <li>• Public expenditure for educational institutions</li> <li>• Public expenditure per student</li> <li>• Public staff in education (1998-2001)</li> <li>• Lower secondary education by legal status of schools</li> <li>• Tertiary education by legal status of schools</li> </ul>	OECD countries and some non-OECD countries	Yes, highly used by politicians in combination with PISA	High quality	Objective	Data for 2003 collected in 2004-05 and published in 2005	Varies by data series. Finance data available back to 1985 but not all on consistent basis. Latest 2002-03	Mix of qualitative and quantitative data, good interpretability. Mainly quantitative	Yes	UOE data collection with raw data published in on-line Education database. Indicators published in OECD Education at a Glance.
<b>Other education data</b> SCHLEICHER Andreas DAVIDSON Michael	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular and ad-hoc collections of data on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Locus of decision making in schools</li> <li>o Teachers and the curriculum</li> <li>o Teacher salaries</li> <li>o Teacher working time</li> <li>o Instruction time</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	OECD countries	Yes, highly used by politicians	High quality	Objective	Decision making data every 5 years; teachers and the curriculum every year	2003	Mix of qualitative and quantitative data, good interpretability. Mainly quantitative	Yes	

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>PISA database</b> SCHLEICHER Andreas DAVIDSON Michael	Reading, mathematical and scientific literacy of 15-year-olds	OECD countries and some non-OECD countries	Yes, highly used by politicians	High quality	Objective	Every 3 years	2003	Mix of qualitative and quantitative data, good interpretability. Mainly quantitative	Yes	PISA data collection. Survey estimates published in PISA database and PISA reports
<b>ELS – Directorate for employment, labour and social affairs</b>										
<b>Labour Market Statistics</b> GRUBB David PASCAL Marianna	Labour statistics containing labour force, performance (i.e. earnings, etc.) and institutional variables (i.e. minimum wages, ALMP data, trade union membership, collective bargaining coverage, etc.) to enable labour market analysis • Public expenditure on labour market programs	17 OECD countries	Yes, highly relevant	Medium quality	Objective	2002-2004 data to be updated	Depends on data, 1980-2001	Mix of qualitative and quantitative data	Yes	Public Employment Service Database
<b>Social Expenditure</b> LADAIQUE Maxime	Trends in aggregate social expenditure as well as changes in its composition • Public and private gross total social expenditure (10 OECD countries only, medium quality) • Public social spending • Age-dependency ratio	30 OECD	Yes, highly relevant	Medium quality	Objective	2002-2004 data to be updated	1980-2001	Mix of qualitative and quantitative data	No	OECD Social Expenditure Database – online with Eurostat
<b>Social Indicators – Society at a Glance</b> PEARSON Mark	Development work on social indicators, using existing data, with a focus on social policy effectiveness and presenting data on policy interventions, on the one hand, and social outcomes, on the other.	30 OECD	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)	NR (using existing data)

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<p><b>ELS/HD – Health Division</b></p> <p><b>Health Statistics</b> LAFORTUNE Gaëtan SCHERER Peter</p>	<p>Core data on health care resources, their utilisation, expenditure and financing, complemented by a broader range of data on health status, lifestyle, and other data on the socio-economic environment of health care systems in OECD countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total expenditure on health</li> <li>• Public current expenditure on health</li> <li>• Public investment on medical facilities</li> <li>• Public spending on health care as % of GDP</li> <li>• Total current health expenditure per capita, public funding</li> <li>• Health expenditure by source of funds, general government excluding social security</li> <li>• Current health expenditure by provider, public and private</li> <li>• Public current expenditure on: personal health care, collective health care, prevention and public health, health R&amp;D, medical services by functions, in-patient care, out-patient, home care, ancillary services, medical goods, pharmaceuticals and other medical non-durable, therapeutic appliances and other medical durables</li> <li>• Health employment per 1000 inhabitants</li> <li>• Health care systems (1980-2004)</li> </ul>	30 OECD	High	High quality	Objective	2005	1990-2003	Qualitative and quantitative data	Yes	OECD Health Data

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>GOV – Public Governance and Territorial Development</b>										
<b>GOV/REG – Regulatory policy division</b>										
<b>Regulatory Quality</b>										
<b>Indicators</b> CHOI Chang-Won JACOBZONE Stephane	Indicators for regulatory policy, tools and institution (regulatory process indicator)	28 OECD (currently 21 for 2005)	Potentially high policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	Country Survey	1998, 2000, 2005	Data on new legislation 97-04 (planned series)	Good. Qualitative and quantitative data. Need to develop further outcomes.	Medium, amendments to questions	1998/2000 results published, 2005 data in process
<b>Business Survey</b> (closed but available for 1998 and plans to renew the work)	Administrative & regulatory burdens on Small & Medium-sized enterprises	11 OECD	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off	1998 (1999)	No series available	Good. Qualitative data.	No link to international sets.	Survey (closed). Published 1999.
<b>RIA Inventory</b> JACOBZONE Stephane	Regulatory impact analysis system inventory	14 OECD	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off	Inventory 2004	No time series available	Qualitative data. Institutional process.	Part of Regulatory Indicator	One time inventory involving one request to OECD countries.
<b>Regulatory Authorities</b> JACOBZONE Stephane	Governance and institutional frameworks of regulators in the electricity, financial sector and telecommunications	29 OECD	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	Objective	Inventory 2003-2004, Pub. 2005	No time series available	Qualitative and quantitative data. Institutional process.	Part of Regulatory Indicator	Draft document 2005. No full publication at this stage.
<b>GOV/REG-ECO</b>	Product market regulation in 1998, including some high quality regulation + competition+ state ownership	30 OECD	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	Highly objective	Product market regulation 03 (published 05)	Trends over 1998-2003	Very good. Qualitative and quantitative data.	No link to international sets.	Survey, Product Market Chapter 4 in Economic Policy Reforms
<b>Product market regulation indicators</b> CONWAY Paul	Product market regulation policies in 2003									

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>GOV/IID - Innovation and integrity division</b>										
<b>e-government statistics</b> <i>LAU Edwin, CRAIG Russell</i>	Use of electronic government services (individual use of the Internet to access electronic government services)	Country study (AUS, CAN, JAP, USA)	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off Electronic survey	2000's	2000's	Good. Qualitative data	Only case studies	Selective case studies published
<b>e-government demand side statistics</b> <i>CRAIG Russell</i>	use of ICT by households and by businesses (Household access to Internet; Businesses with 10 and more employees using Internet)	OECD selected countries and EU countries	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off Electronic survey	2002, 2003	According to year of country study	Relatively strong, easy to interpret	No international comparison	Selective case studies published
<b>Supply of e-government</b>	Supply of e-government	Country study (FI, MEX, DEN, TU, HU, NETH)	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off Electronic survey	2003-6	Yearly according to year of country study	Design coordinated within OECD	No international comparison	The case studies have been gradually published
<b>GOV/IID – Innovation and integrity division</b>										
<b>Ethics measures in public service</b> <i>BERTOK Janos</i>	Standards, processes, institutions for promoting ethics and preventing corruption in the public service	29 OECD	High policy relevance.	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off survey	2000	No time series	Good. Qualitative. Sensitive Data.	Yes. Unique data. Over-reporting.	Expert contributions. Trust in government publication (2000)
<b>Managing conflict of interest</b> <i>BERTOK Janos</i>	Strategies, policies, principles, standards, institutions and management procedures for identifying, managing and preventing conflict of interest	30 OECD member countries	High policy relevance Guidelines used	Common definitions Sensitive data.	Good, medium objectivity	2003 Planned 2005-6	No time series	Good. Qualitative data.	Yes. Unique dataset. Over-reporting.	Experts contributions
<b>OECD Survey of Government Offices 2004</b> <i>GUTIERREZ Mariano</i>	Organisation and staffing data at Centre of Government / Prime Minister Offices; Comparative Data of Centre of Government Co-ordination	27 OECD (CAN, MEX, USA not)	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off survey	2004	No time series	Good. Qualitative and quantitative data.	No international comparison.	OECD Survey of Government Offices 2004 – published August

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>Open government</b> GUTIERREZ Mariano	OECD Fact sheet on Legislation and Policy Measures for Open Government GOV/PGC(2004)18/ANN. Enabling conditions for Open Government	30 OECD Member countries	High policy relevance	Common definitions Ad hoc procedures	One off survey	2004, 2 months, Planning for future series	No time series	Concept very clear but no adequate definition	Variability, differences in definitions. No linkage to other data.	Information request on Legislation and Policy Measures. Published as a Factsheet.
<b>GOV/BUD – Budgeting and public expenditures division</b>										
<b>Reallocation</b> KRAAN Dirk	Micro-economic classification of public expenditure	12 member countries	High policy relevance	Good quality: common definitions, data checked	One off data collection	Updated every year	1980-2001	Strong	Yes, directly linked to National Accounts.	Files filled by correspondents in Finance Ministries
<b>Performance Information in the Budget Process</b> CURRISTINE Teresa	Performing information related to qualitative information database on budget management	26 member countries + 2 observers, sheet per country	High policy relevance	Good quality: common definitions data checked	One off data collection	Half a year, 2005, depends on the bud programme	No time series	Strong. Qualitative data.	Yes	Ad-hoc questionnaire to member countries, draft document to be published in 2005.
<b>OECD/WBI/ADB Budgeting database</b> KRAAN Dirk, CURRISTINE Teresa	Comparative information on 300 aspects of the budget formulation, approval, implementation and audit phases	30 OECD plus 30 other countries	High policy relevance	Good definitions, data checked	Planned series	Takes 8 months, 2003	No time series	Strong. Quantitative and qualitative data.	Yes	Electronic survey, access on the website
<b>GOV/RCG Regional competitiveness and governance</b>										
<b>Network on fiscal relations across levels of government</b> CHARBIT Claire – BERGVALL Daniel	Details on grants from central government to sub-national governments – split ear-marked and non-ear marked	30 OECD countries, 20 responded	High, countries asked for it	20 out of 30 responded, good definition	One off data collection	2005 with no future planned	No time series	Quite clear, clarifying questions answered	Matching the national accounts	Questionnaire sent to member countries, draft document 2005

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>GOV/PSMP – Public sector management and performance</b>										
<b>Human Resource Management Survey</b> <i>PILICHOWSKI Elsa</i>	Mechanisms of human resource management in the civil service, trends and reforms	29 OECD (without Turkey)	High policy relevance	To be renewed for 2006	One off data collection	Survey sent 2002 – published 04, planned 06	No time series	Strong. Quantitative and qualitative data.	Definitions problems across countries	Paper HRMWP published in 10/2004
<b>Managing senior civil service reform</b> <i>PILICHOWSKI Elsa</i>	Specific study on senior civil service	12 members countries	High policy relevance	Good	One off data collection	2003	No time series	Qualitative data.	Yes, no international comparison. Qualitative.	Published in a working paper 2003.
<b>Performance Related Pay report</b> <i>LANDEL Dorothee</i>	Design and Implementation of PRP policies in a sample of OECD countries and Chile; lessons learned	13 member countries + Chile	High policy relevance	Good	One off data collection	2003-2004 Published in 2005	No time series	Qualitative data	Qualitative, no link to other data.	Experts contributions (country case study) based on OECD guidelines, OECD HRM survey (section 7 & 8)
<b>Public Sector Pay and Employment</b> <i>TURKISH Edouard PILICHOWSKI Elsa</i>	Numbers of employees in the civil service (by level of administration and function); qualitative data (women, ages, levels of posts), salaries and global costs; trends	28 OECD countries	High policy relevance	To be reviewed for 2006	Medium credibility – definition problems	1994, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2006	1990-2001	Qualitative and quantitative data.	Medium, to be reviewed for 2006	Trends in public sector pay in OECD countries, 1995, 1997 Paper published 2000, 2002
<b>Knowledge Management Survey</b> <i>PILICHOWSKI Elsa and LANDEL Dorothee</i>	Mechanisms of improvement and share knowledge	132 central government organizations of 20 OECD countries	High policy relevance	Good	Ad hoc data collection	Data from 2001-2002, published 2003	No time series.	Qualitative data.	Relatively coherent.	Paper published 2003, survey among central gov. organisations

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness		Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility - Source
						When collected (and published if different)	Period covered in the dataset			
<b>GOV/SIU</b>										
<b>Territorial Indicators SPIEZIA Vincenzo</b>	Regional statistics on population, employment, labour force, unemployment, gross domestic product	OECD member countries	High policy relevance	Good quality Maps	Objective	1980, 1990, 1995, 2000 and over	1980-2003	Qualitative and quantitative data.	Yes	Regular questionnaire to member countries

Table 5. Potentially relevant OECD data

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Potentially relevant data for "Management in government: comparative country data"		
		Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>STD – Statistics Directorate</b>				
<b>Analytical National Accounts (2005)</b> <i>LEQUILLIER François</i> <i>WOLF Florence</i>	Main aggregates – GDP, disposable income, population and employment, value added, employment by industry, agriculture. (Quantitative, available 1992-2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Government final consumption expenditure</li> <li>● Public expenditure as % of GDP</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Value added in public service sector, as % of total Value Added</li> </ul>
<b>General Government Account</b> <i>DUPUIS Jean-Pierre</i>	General government accounts General government expenditure by function (in general public services, defence, public order and safety, economic affairs, environmental protection, housing, health, recreation, education and social protection) Government budget outlays for R&D General government taxes and social contributions receipts (Quantitative, 1993-2003 for most OECD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Compensation of employees by function</li> <li>● Expenditure by function (general public services, defence, public order and safety, economic affairs, environmental protection, housing, health, recreation, education and social protection)</li> <li>● Employment in public service sector (public administration and defence, education, health and social and other)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Financial transactions in central, state and local government</li> </ul>	
<b>Central Government Debt Statistics</b> <i>CHAVOIX-MANNATO, Michele</i>				
<b>Annual Labour Force Statistics</b> <i>MARTIN Catherine</i>	Long time series for key annual statistics on population, labour force, employment and unemployment			
<b>CTP – Centre for tax policy and reform</b>				
<b>Revenue statistics</b> <i>RABESONA J.</i>	Tax revenue Non-Tax revenue, capital and grants (Quantitative, for OECD, 1965-2004)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Taxation policy process</li> </ul>	
<b>AGR – Directorate for agriculture</b>				
<b>Agriculture</b> <i>LEGG Wilfried</i>	Agricultural support estimates Government financial transfers for fishing			

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>EDU – Directorate for education</b>				
<b>Education Database</b> SCHLEICHER Andreas DAVIDSON Michael	Outputs of educational institutions, the policy levers that shape educational outputs, the human and financial resources invested in education and structural characteristics of education systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public expenditure on Education as % of total public expenditure</li> <li>● Public expenditure for educational institutions</li> <li>● Total expenditure per student</li> <li>● Public staff in education</li> <li>● Funding transfers between levels of government</li> <li>● School level resources and conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Funding transfers policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Composite effectiveness score, educational attainment, educational achievement</li> <li>● Graduation rates</li> </ul>
<b>PISA database</b> SCHLEICHER Andreas DAVIDSON Michael	Reading, mathematical and scientific literacy of 15-year-olds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teacher salaries</li> <li>● Teacher working time</li> <li>● Instruction time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School policies and practices</li> </ul>	
<b>Other education data</b> SCHLEICHER Andreas DAVIDSON Michael	Regular and ad-hoc collections of data on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Locus of decision making in schools</li> <li>● Teachers and the curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Teacher salaries</li> <li>– Teacher working time</li> <li>– Instruction time</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Locus of decision making in schools</li> </ul>	
<b>ELS – Directorate for Employment, labour and social affairs</b>				
<b>Labour Programme</b> David PASCAL Marianna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public expenditure on labour market programmes</li> </ul>			
<b>ELS/SPD - Social Policy Division</b>				
<b>Society at a Glance</b> LADATQUE Maxime	Public and private gross total social expenditure			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Societal response:</li> <li>● Education attainment</li> <li>● Student performance</li> <li>● Health care expenditure</li> <li>● Public social spending</li> </ul>

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<p><b>ELS/HD – Health division</b></p> <p><b>Health</b> LAFORTUNE Gaétan</p>	<p>Public expenditure on health Health care systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Health care resources:</li> <li>● Practicing physicians</li> <li>● Practicing nurses</li> <li>● Public current expenditure on health</li> <li>● Public spending on health care as % of GDP</li> <li>● Total current health expenditure per capita, public funding</li> <li>● Current health expenditure by provider, public and private</li> <li>● Public current expenditure on: personal health care, collective health care, prevention and public health, health R&amp;D, medical services by functions, in-patient care, out-patient, home care, ancillary services, medical goods, pharmaceuticals and other medical non-durable, therapeutic appliances and other medical durables</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Utilization of health care resources:</li> <li>● Confidence in health care by expenditure</li> <li>● Satisfaction with health care systems</li> </ul>
<p><b>GOV/REG - Regulatory policy division</b></p> <p><b>Regulatory Indicators</b> CHOI Chang-Won JACOBZONE Stephane</p>	<p>Indicators for regulatory policy, tools and institution (regulatory process indicator and it will cover some output dimension in 2005 data)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Whether explicit regulatory policy in individual countries exists</li> <li>● Communication on regulations, access to information</li> <li>● Transparency, consultation with business and citizen</li> <li>● Co-ordination procedures on regulations</li> <li>● Use of regulatory quality tools, such as RIA</li> <li>● Whether programme to reduce admin burden</li> <li>● Institutional arrangements to promote regulatory quality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reduced burdens to get business licenses and permits, number of RIAs for new laws, training sessions offered</li> <li>● Further development on outputs and outcomes (business environment, regulatory burdens)</li> </ul>

Dataset and where held		Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>Regulatory Authorities</b> <i>JACOBZONE Stephan</i>	Governance and institutional frameworks of independent regulators in the electricity, financial sector and telecommunications			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Institutional status of regulators</li> <li>● Independent regulatory agencies (IRA)</li> <li>● Heads of regulators</li> <li>● Institutional features to ensure independence</li> <li>● Financial sources of regulatory authorities</li> </ul>	
<b>GOV/REG-ECO</b>					
<b>Product market regulation indicators</b> <i>COMWAY Paul</i>	Product market regulation in 1998, including some high quality regulation + competition+ state ownership Product market regulation policies in 2003			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Product market regulation indicator (Size of public enterprise sector, administrative burdens for corporation, regulatory barriers)</li> </ul>	
<b>GOV/IID-STI/SU – Innovation and integrity division</b>					
<b>e-government statistics</b> <i>LAU Edwin, CRAIG Russell</i>	use of electronic government services (individual use of the Internet to access electronic government services)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Working with STI to develop sample questions on the use of e-gov by households, individuals and by business even to access the gov information – data to be received not before 2006/7</li> <li>● Planning for e-gov cost/benefit indicators</li> </ul>	
	e-government demand side statistics : use of ICT by households and by businesses (Household access to Internet; Businesses with 10 and more employees using Internet)				
	e-government cost/benefit indicators				
	Pilot project with Austria: Level of development of online services; E-Government legal framework; E-Government strategic planning				
	Supply on e-government				

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>GOV/IIID - Innovation and integrity division</b>				
<b>Ethics measures in public service</b> <i>BERTOK Janos</i>	Standards, processes, institutions for promoting ethics and preventing corruption in the public service		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Management measures to ensure high standards of conduct and assist prevention</li> <li>● Human resources management measures to develop an ethical environment</li> <li>● Information disclosure policy</li> <li>● Existence of bodies investigating misconduct and corruption in the public service</li> <li>● The eight most frequently stated core public service values in each OECD country.</li> </ul>	
<b>Managing conflict of interest</b> <i>BERTOK Janos</i>	Strategies, policies, principles, standards, institutions and management procedures for identifying, managing and preventing conflict of interest		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● General framework and principles for avoiding conflicts of interest in every OECD country</li> <li>● Mechanisms to prevent and resolve conflicts of interest</li> </ul>	
<b>OECD Survey of Government Offices 2004</b> <i>GUTIERREZ Mariano</i>	Organisation and staffing data at Centre of Government / Prime Minister Offices; Comparative Data of Centre of Government Co-ordination	Staffing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of permanent or seconded staff</li> <li>● Number of civil servants or political appointees</li> <li>● How many people are employed in the strategic budget planning units?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Typology of gov. offices: constitutional, functional, single party vs. coalition</li> <li>● Structure</li> <li>● Dimensions of coordination</li> <li>● Role in managing business: proactive or reactive?</li> <li>● Coordinating preparation of Gov programme and its fit with the budget: where are the strategic planning units located?</li> <li>● Where are the communication units located</li> </ul>	
<b>Open government</b> <i>GUTIERREZ Mariano</i>	OECD Fact sheet on Legislation and Policy Measures for Open Government - Enabling conditions for Open Government		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Overview of current legislation and institutions for open government in OECD countries.</li> <li>● Number of OECD countries with laws on access to information</li> </ul>	

		Potentially relevant data for "Management in government: comparative country data"		
Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>Citizen relationship</b> <i>GUTIERREZ Mariano</i>	Possible future indicators: Provisions for Open Government. Indicators on Transparency/ accessibility/responsiveness as proposed by Joanne Caddy on 12.01.2005 (see annex in following worksheet)			
<b>GOV/BUD – Budgeting and public expenditures</b>				
<b>Reallocation</b> <i>KRAAN Dirk</i>	Micro-economic classification of public expenditure	● How much governments spend on public and private goods – expenditure in the microeconomic perspective.		
<b>Performance information in the Budget Process</b> <i>CURRISTINE Teresa</i>	Performing information related to qualitative information database on budget management		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The types of budget performance measures that have been developed</li> <li>● The general institutional arrangements for developing performance measures (specific units)</li> <li>● Problems encountered when introducing the performance measures</li> <li>● Whether using performance measures in the budget process</li> <li>● Information on evaluation procedures</li> </ul>	

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<p><b>OECD/WBI/ADB Budgeting database</b> KRAAN Dirk, CURRISTINE Teresa</p>	<p>Comparative information on 300 aspects of the budget formulation, approval, implementation and audit phases</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How many professionals are employed by the central budget office?</li> <li>● What is the number of professional staff serving the budget or related committees?</li> <li>● What has been the magnitude of supplementary budgets?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What mechanisms are used to assess the efficiency, effectiveness and value for money of public activities?</li> <li>● Are performance results made available to the public?</li> <li>● Is there a central office for controlling and monitoring audits?</li> <li>● How are audits subjects determined?</li> <li>● What best describes the committee structure for dealing with the budget?</li> <li>● Can you change expenditure outside the budget process?</li> <li>● What are the activities related to implementation of budget policies?</li> <li>● Are their specialized recruitment and training programmes for procurement professionals?</li> <li>● Do you have a medium term expenditure framework?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>GOV/PSMP – Public sector management and performance division</b></p>				
<p><b>Human Resource Management Survey</b> PILCHOWSKI/Elisa</p>	<p>Mechanisms of human resource management in the civil service, trends and reforms</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● HRM policy formulation</li> <li>● Civil service classification and its status</li> <li>● Openness of government posts</li> <li>● Collective bargaining</li> <li>● HRM bodies and delegation of practices</li> <li>● Classification of HRM systems</li> <li>● Rules applying to different servants depending on function</li> </ul>	

Potentially relevant data for "Management in government: comparative country data"				
Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>Managing senior civil service reform in OECD countries</b> <i>PILICHOWSKI Elsa</i>	Specific study on senior civil service		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Characteristics of reforms of senior civil service systems</li> <li>● Centralisation and decentralisation tendencies of reforms according to senior civil service types</li> <li>● Size of senior civil service.</li> <li>● Degree of performance related pay</li> </ul>	
<b>Performance Related Pay report</b> <i>LANDEL Dorothee</i>	Design of PRP policies and implementation for government employees (central government). Lessons learned from experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Funds dedicated to PRP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Degree of centralization/decentralization of PRP</li> <li>● Flexibility of the system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Staff surveys (perception of PRP) trends in civil servants salaries following the introduction of PRP</li> </ul>
<b>Public Sector Pay and Employment</b> <i>TURKISH Edouard</i> <i>PILICHOWSKI Elsa</i>	numbers of employees in the civil service (by level of administration and function); qualitative data (women, ages, levels of posts), salaries and global costs; trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Total public employment</li> <li>● Public sector total employment in full time equivalent</li> <li>● Breakdown by level and function</li> <li>● Share of the public employment over the labour force</li> <li>● Age structure, women participation</li> <li>● Total compensation costs for public sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Dispersions of earnings in the public sector</li> </ul>	
<b>Knowledge Management Survey</b> <i>PILICHOWSKI Elsa</i>	Mechanisms of improvement and share knowledge		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Institutional arrangement for knowledge management: is it a priority of responding central government organisations</li> <li>● Training arrangements related to knowledge management</li> <li>● Use of intranets and common databases for knowledge management</li> <li>● Which organization has a strategy for improving e-government.</li> <li>● Which organization has a website</li> <li>● Changes in organization, i.e. cultural, due to knowledge management</li> <li>● Ministries with e-gov plan by staff size</li> </ul>	

GOV/PGC(2005)10/ANN

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
<b>GOV/RCG – Regional competitiveness and governance</b> Network on fiscal relations across levels of government DAVIES Andrew – CHARBIT Claire – BERGVALL Daniele/	Details on grants from central government to sub-national governments – split ear-marked and non-ear marked		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer arrangements</li> </ul>	
<b>GOV/SIU – Governance statistical unit</b> Territorial Indicators SPIEZIA Vincenzo	Regional statistics on population, employment, labour force, unemployment, gross domestic product			

## **TECHNICAL ANNEX 5: RELEVANT NON-OECD DATASETS**

The feasibility phase of the “Management in Government: Comparative Country Data” project has identified and reviewed available datasets concerned with inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes in government and in some central agencies, in key sectors (education, health care, law and order and public administration) and in some specified central agencies. Reviewing entailed a relatively light assessment of the quality, specificity and policy-relevance of available dataset in seven key areas, as defined by the Quality Framework for OECD Statistics (relevance, accuracy, credibility, timeliness, interpretability, coherence and accessibility). The individual reports on each dataset have been summarized in Table 6.

This initial assessment has served to determine which existing data could be appropriate for this project, and to initiate a dialogue with data owners.

Within each of the datasets potentially relevant indicators for the project in terms of inputs (financial, budgetary, staffing, etc.), processes (management system, arrangement, transfers, etc.), and outputs (quality of services, quantity, performance measures, trust, etc.) have been identified and summarized in Table 7.

Table 6. Review of non-OECD Datasets

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance (to project)	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness (how collected)	Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility/ Source
<b>General Topics</b> EUROSTAT	National accounts, government expenditure and deficit/surplus, labour participation, unemployment, household income, income inequality, poverty	25 EU-countries, candidate countries, Norway, occasionally US and others	Very high	High	High	Yearly, with 1 year delay	High	High	Easy at Eurostat-website
<b>Development Indicators</b> WORLD BANK	Purchasing power parities, economic indicators, defence personnel and expenditure	208 countries	Very high	Generally high (defence personnel and expenditure sensitive to definition)	Generally high	Yearly, with 1 year delay	High	High	Downloadable from WB-website
<b>Labour Force Database</b> ILO	Employment by gender, age and economic activity; unemployment and wages also covered	204 countries	High	High	High	Yearly, with 1 year delay	High	High	Downloadable from ILO-website. Printed in Yearbook of Labour Statistics
<b>Population Data</b> US CENSUS BUREAU	Population data	more than 200 countries	High	High	High	Yearly, with 1 year delay	High	High	Downloadable from Bureau of Census website
<b>European and world values survey</b> WORLD VALUES SURVEY ASSOCIATION	Population survey on values, beliefs and opinions	83 countries	Very high	Moderate (shortcomings of survey data)	High	Once every 10 years, several years delay.	High	High	Data CD, website, summary document, many scientific papers
<b>Income Study</b> LUXEMBOURG INCOME STUDY	Household income survey	30 countries (20 EU, 10 other)	High	Moderate (shortcomings of survey data)	High	Once every 5 years, several years delay	High	High	Information on website, many scientific papers
<b>Defence data tables</b> NATO	Defence personnel and expenditure	18 NATO countries	High	Moderate (defence personnel expenditure sensitive to definition)	Moderate	Data for last year available	High	High	Data tables on NATO website

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance (to project)	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness (how collected)	Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility/ Source
<b>Educational systems</b> EURYDICE and INCA databases	Qualitative data on educational systems	Eurydice: EU countries; EU candidate countries, Norway, Switzerland and Norway INCA: 10 European countries, 3 far-eastern countries, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and US	Very High	High	High	Actual situation, with some delay	High	Moderate (difficult to compare different systems)	Information on websites; Eurydice publications
<b>R&amp;D and science indicators</b> CENTRE FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STUDIES	R&D and science indicators	30 countries	High	High	High	Yearly with 2 to 3 years delay	Moderate	High	Difficult to obtain; but see recent publication of EU, DG Research
<b>Education data</b> EUROSTAT	Participation, expenditure etc. graduation,	25 EU-countries, 12 other European countries, US, Canada and Japan	Very high	High	High	Yearly with on average 2 years delay	High	High	Downloadable from website, CD ROM available
<b>Mutual Information System on Social Protection in the EU</b> EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Qualitative information on systems of social protection	EU-25, Norway, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Iceland	Very high	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation in 2004	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet
<b>Health Care Systems</b> ARTZEKAMMER	Health care systems	EU-15	High	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation at end of nineties	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet
<b>Social Protection System</b> EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Social protection system	New entrants and applicant countries	High	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation at end of nineties	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance (to project)	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness (how collected)	Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility/ Source
<b>Health Systems and Policies EUROPEAN OBSERVATORY</b>	European health systems and policies	EU-25 (except Ireland), 18 other European countries and 19 non-European countries (including Australia, Canada and New Zealand, but excluding USA)	Very high	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation in some recent year (1 to 5 years ago)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Very easily by internet
<b>Health Care Data EUROSTAT</b>	Inputs, patients, treatment data	EU-25, applicant countries, Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Canada, USA and Japan	Very high	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences); many missing data	High	Yearly, with some delay	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet
<b>Social protection for dependency in old age PACOLET</b>	Data on dependent persons, residential, semi-residential and community services, expenditure, personnel	EU-15 and Norway	High	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Several years in the eighties and nineties	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Book to be bought
<b>Criminal Justice Systems WORLD FACTBOOK on Criminal Justice Systems</b>	Description of criminal justice systems	45 countries world wide	High	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation in 1993 or 2003	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet
<b>World Legal Systems UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA</b>	Description of criminal justice systems	more than 200 countries	Very high	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation around the turn of the century	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet
<b>Victims of crimes BRIENEN and HOEGEN</b>	Treatment of victims in criminal justice systems	22 European countries	High	Moderate-high (definition problems - institutional differences)	High	Situation around the turn of the century	Moderate (institutional differences)	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet

Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Country coverage	Relevance (to project)	Accuracy	Credibility	Timeliness (how collected)	Interpretability (Character of data)	Coherence	Accessibility/Source
<b>Crime and Criminal Justice EUROPEAN SOURCE BOOK 2003</b>	Data on personnel, crimes, offenders, prosecution, convictions, sanctions/measures, prisons	39 European countries, similar data on Australia, Canada, New Zealand and US from related sources (US sourcebook, Barclay and Tavares 2003)	Very high	Moderate-high (definition problems due to institutional differences)	Moderate-high	Yearly 1995-2000, available in 2003	Moderate	Moderate (institutional differences)	Downloadable from internet
<b>International Crime VICTIMIZATION SURVEY</b>	Population survey on victimization, reporting to police, police performance, safety feelings etc.	10 European countries, Australia, Canada, USA and Japan to be extended to 20 other countries in near future	Very high	Moderate (shortcomings of survey data)	High	Once every 5 years, several years delay	High	High	Reports and data can be downloaded from the internet
<b>Data on crime INTERPOL</b>	Data on crime, offenders, and clear up rate	184 member states	Moderate; missing data	Low-moderate (no screening of national data; definition problems)	Low-moderate	Yearly 1995-2002, several years delay	Moderate	Low (institutional differences, no screening)	Downloadable from internet by authorized personnel only
<b>World competitiveness yearbook WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM</b>	Objective and subjective data on economic performance and government efficiency	52 countries world wide	Very high	Objective data: high Subjective data: moderate	Objective data: high Subjective data: moderate	Yearly, with a delay of one year or less	High	High	Underlying data for one year from each successive Yearbook
<b>Corruption perception index TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL</b>	Corruption perception index	146 countries world wide	High	Moderate (a collage of different information for different subsets of countries)	Moderate	Yearly, based on multiyear average of previous years	High	Moderate	Easily downloadable from the internet

**Table 7. Potentially relevant non-OECD data**

Potentially relevant data for "Management in government: comparative country data"				
<b>Dataset and where held</b>	<b>Description of the processes or inputs measured</b>	<b>Inputs</b> (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	<b>Processes</b> (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service managements, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	<b>Outputs</b> (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
General Statistics EUROSTAT	National accounts, government expenditure and deficit/surplus, labor participation, unemployment, household income, income inequality, poverty	Expenditure and personnel for public services, government expenditure		
Development Indicators WORLD BANK	Purchasing power parities, economic indicators, defense personnel and expenditure	Purchasing power parities, economic indicators, defense personnel and expenditure		
Labor database ILO	Employment by gender, age and economic activity; unemployment and wages also covered	Personnel data, wages		
data AU OF CENSUS	Population data			
European and world values survey	Confidence of population in politicians, parliament, police, justice system, education system, health care system			Confidence as a subjective measure for quality
Luxembourg Income Study	Household income survey income inequality, poverty			
Defense Data Tables NATO	Defense personnel and expenditure			
Education Systems Eurymice and INCA databases	Qualitative educational systems			
R&D Centre for Science and Technology Studies	R&D and Science indicators			R&D and Science indicators
Education data EUROSTAT	Participation, graduation, expenditure etc.	Expenditure data		Participation, graduation, drop outs
Health Care Systems MISSOC	Health care systems			
Health Care Systems II ARTZEKAMMER	Health care systems			

Potentially relevant data for "Management in government: comparative country data"				
Dataset and where held	Description of the processes or inputs measured	Inputs (e.g. government wages, salaries and other consumption expenditures, resources invested, enabling environment, staff and transfers)	Processes (e.g. budget and financial management system, civil service management, e-government use, arrangements for transfer, functional responsibilities, working environment)	Outputs (Summary of key data on public and business perceptions of government, trust, firm perceptions of the competitive environment, etc.)
Social Protection System EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Social protection system			
Health Systems and Policies EUROPEAN OBSERVATORY	European health systems and policies			
Health care data Eurostat on-line	Expenditure, patients, treatment data	Health expenditure		Patients, treatment data
Social Protection for old age PACOLET	Expenditure, personnel, dependent persons, services	Expenditure and personnel		Services
Criminal Justice Systems WORLD FACTBOOK 2003	Description of criminal justice systems			
World Legal Systems UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA	Description of criminal justice systems			
Victims of crimes	Treatment of victims in criminal justice systems			
Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics EUROPEAN SOURCE BOOK 2003	Personnel, crimes, offenders, prosecution, convictions, sanctions/measures, prisons	Personnel		Convictions, sanctions/measures, prison population
International Crime VICTIMIZATION Survey	Population survey on victimization, reporting to police, police performance, safety feelings etc.			
Crime data INTERPOL	Data on crime, offenders and clear up rate			(Accused or convicted) offenders, clear up rate
World competitiveness yearbook WEF	Objective and subjective data on economic performance and government efficiency			Subjective opinion on quality of public management
Corruption perception TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL	Corruption perception index			Corruption perception index

## TECHNICAL ANNEX 6: DATA QUALITY AND RELEVANCE

### Approach for assessing data quality and relevance

The quality and relevance of the data for the “Management in Government” Project has been assessed using the OECD Quality Framework for Statistical Activities. The OECD Quality Framework provides a systematic mechanism for ongoing identification and resolution of quality problems. It focuses on improving the quality of data collected, compiled and disseminated by the OECD through an improvement of the Organisation’s processes and management.

The OECD views quality of data in terms of seven dimensions: relevance, accuracy, credibility, timeliness, accessibility, interpretability, and coherence, which are discussed below. Another factor is that of cost-efficiency. Although this is not, strictly speaking, a quality dimension, is still an important consideration in the possible application of one or more of the seven dimensions cited previously.

1. The *relevance* of data products is a qualitative assessment of the value contributed by these data. Value is characterized by the degree to which the data serves to address the purposes for which they are sought by users.
2. The *accuracy* of data products is the degree to which the data correctly estimate or describe the quantities or characteristics they are designed to measure. OECD context: Accuracy of the data is largely determined by the accuracy of the data received from the contributing organizations. On the other hand, the activities carried out by OECD can influence the overall accuracy.
3. The *credibility* of data products refers to the confidence that users place in those products based simply on their image of the data producer, *i.e.* the brand image. Credibility is determined in part by the integrity of the production process. Furthermore, once agreement between the OECD and countries has been reached on collection of specified data, the data subsequently collected cannot be withdrawn in response to political pressure.
4. The *timeliness* of data products reflects the length of time between their availability and the event or phenomenon they describe, but considered in the context of the time period that permits the information to be of value and still acted upon.
5. The *accessibility* of data products reflects how readily the data can be located and accessed from within OECD data holdings. OECD context: Internal and external users might have quite different perceptions of accessibility because of the differences in access methods.
6. The *interpretability* of data products reflects the ease with which the user may understand and properly use and analyse the data. The range of different users leads to such considerations as metadata presentation in layers of increasing detail. The adequacy of the definitions of concepts, variables, and terminology, information describing the limitations of the data, etc.

7. The *coherence* of data reflects the degree to which data are logically connected and mutually consistent. Distinction can be made between coherence within a dataset, coherence across datasets, coherence over time and coherence across countries. Ensuring coherence across countries is one of the major sources of value added provided by the OECD.
8. The cost efficiency with which a product is produced is a measure of the costs and provider burden relative to the output. Whilst the OECD does not regard cost-efficiency as a dimension of quality, it is a factor that must be taken into account in any analysis of quality as it can affect quality in all dimensions.

The feasibility phase of project has identified and evaluated every potential dataset using questionnaire with these seven quality categories. Each category was divided into a set of questions. Table 8 is an example of how datasets were reviewed. Information on each dataset was then compiled in a summary table, and indicators in each dataset divided among relevant inputs, processes and outputs.

**Table 8. Example of an evaluation of a dataset**

Assessed Dataset	National Accounts of OECD Countries Maximum: 1970-2003
Respondent/Source	F. Lequillier, JP Dupuis, C. La Rosa
<b>Content of the dataset - comments on dataset and its contents, including the following information:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of processes measured</li> <li>• Country coverage</li> <li>• Qualitative/quantitative data</li> <li>• When published</li> <li>• Which period covered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most recent information available on the main aggregates of national accounts for all OECD Member countries and detailed national accounts for each country.</li> <li>• Breakdown by general government and sub-sectors of general government</li> <li>• Expenditure by function of general government and sub-sectors at COFOG level 1 digit (2-digits in discussion)</li> <li>• Data mainly compiled according to the 1993 SNA (System of National Accounts)</li> <li>• The electronic edition contains, when they are available, longer time series back to 1970</li> <li>• The constant price data are shown at the price levels of 2000.</li> <li>• Published in 2005.</li> <li>• Majority quantitative data</li> </ul>
<b>1. Relevance (evidence of relevance to government, OECD and academic work)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the data demanded by countries and governments?</li> <li>▪ What is the users' satisfaction?</li> <li>▪ Does the data get publicly quoted?</li> <li>▪ Is the data cited in government reports?</li> <li>▪ Do academics or media refer to the data?</li> <li>▪ Do other OECD directorates use the data?</li> <li>▪ What is the feedback from marketing activities?</li> </ul>	Highly relevant data. Demanded and used by external and internal users.
<b>2. Accuracy (data correctly estimate the true value – if not why)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Did all countries reply to all questions?</li> <li>▪ Which techniques have been used?</li> <li>▪ What types of questions have been used?</li> <li>▪ What is the accuracy of the data regarding non-response, response, processing, dissemination, etc.</li> <li>▪ Are used definitions clearly explained?</li> </ul>	High quality. Not all data is available for each country – some time series shorter.  Have any questions not been asked??
<b>3. Credibility (users place confidence in the data and it is objective and replicable)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the source of the data?</li> <li>▪ Are the data generally trusted?</li> <li>▪ Is the production process integrated?</li> </ul>	Yes.
<b>4. Timeliness and punctuality (time, availability, series)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ When were the data published/made available?</li> <li>▪ For which years are the data available?</li> <li>▪ Is time series available?</li> <li>▪ How frequently are the data produced?</li> <li>▪ How long does it take to be produced?</li> <li>▪ What is the planned future availability of the data?</li> </ul>	Published in 2005 For period 1992-2003. Yes, time series available. In some cases till 1970 in the electronic format. Data collected in permanence. Electronic update is immediate

<p><b>5. Interpretability (ease with which the user may understand, use and analyze the data)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do questions have the same meaning for all countries?</li> <li>▪ Are there any limitations describing the use?</li> <li>▪ Are the underlying data clearly defined?</li> <li>▪ Has there been any change in definition?</li> <li>▪ Are there any disadvantages or advantages to the use of the current method?</li> <li>▪ Are the data qualitative or quantitative..</li> </ul>	<p>Very good interpretability. Use of the SNA definitions. Mainly quantitative data. However does not cover the concept of public sector (general government + public enterprises)</p>
<p><b>6. Coherence (degree to which data logically connected and mutually consistent)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How many countries are covered</li> <li>▪ Has the data source change over time?</li> <li>▪ Have questions been modified over time?</li> <li>▪ Are data coherent within and across datasets?</li> <li>▪ Are the source and the year and the definition the same across countries?</li> <li>▪ Are the data linked with other OECD datasets?</li> <li>▪ Is there any international comparison?</li> </ul>	<p>Covering all OECD countries with the exception of Turkey. The data source has not changed over time – National Statistical Offices.</p>

The project data review methodology is consistent with quality evaluation methods in other organisation. Several international organisations producing statistics, such as Eurostat, IMF, FAO have also identified their dimensions of quality. As Table 9 indicates, there is broad agreement on the approach.

**Table 9. Eurostat and OECD approaches to measuring data quality**

<b>EUROSTAT</b>		<b>OECD</b>
Quality aspects	Indicators	Quality dimensions
Relevance (Completeness merged with relevance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ User satisfaction index.</li> <li>▪ Number of publications disseminated and/or accesses to databases</li> <li>▪ Rate of available statistics</li> </ul>	Relevance
Accuracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coefficient of variation</li> <li>▪ Unit response rates</li> <li>▪ Item response rates</li> <li>▪ Editing rates and ratios</li> <li>▪ Imputation rates and ratios</li> <li>▪ Over-coverage and misclassification error rates</li> <li>▪ Average size of revisions</li> </ul>	Accuracy and Credibility
Timeliness and punctuality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Punctuality of time schedule of effective publication</li> <li>▪ Average time between the end of reference period and the data of the first and of the final results</li> </ul>	Timeliness
Accessibility and clarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number and types of means used for disseminating statistics</li> </ul>	Accessibility and interpretability
Comparability (refers to cross country)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number and proportion of differences in concepts or/and measurement from the European norms</li> <li>▪ Number and length of comparable time series</li> <li>▪ Asymmetries for statistics mirror flows</li> </ul>	Coherence
Coherence (comparability over time or over datasets)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number and proportion of sets of statistics that satisfies the requirements for the main secondary use</li> </ul>	

**Approach for Ensuring Project Linkages with the OECD Statistical Work Programme**

To ensure optimal level of cooperation with other parts of the OECD, the project followed the Statistical Quality Guidelines and Quality Checklists for new statistical activities. The project team met with a number of ITN, PAC and STD experts in order to identify best practices already available within the OECD and to find the most appropriate and efficient technical and organisational solutions. Technical details of the project activities have been specified in the OECD Statistical Programme of Work questionnaire. Table 10 displays the project phasing as part of the OECD Statistical Work Programme.

**Table 10. Project phasing using OECD procedures for assuring quality of new activities**  
(as defined by the OECD Statistical Work Programme in the Quality Framework and Guidelines for OECD Statistical Activities)<sup>3</sup>

Phasing	Activity:	Approach	Potential problems	Resource implications:
		Guidance provided by the Quality and Framework for OECD Statistical Activities		
Feasibility Phase	<p>a) Initial definition of data to be included in the project, with requirements such as coverage, content, and use. Based on identification of demand for data.</p> <p>b) Identifications and assessment of data currently available within OECD and from other international and national organisations.</p> <p>c) Establishment of project network.</p>	<p>1. Discussion with users, including Committees, internal GOV users and other Directorates to obtain initial data requirements</p> <p>2. Review of literature</p> <p>3. Review of data readily available within the OECD</p> <p>4. Review of data available from other international organisations, e.g. using the UN/ECE Integrated Presentation of Statistical Work</p> <p>5. Review of data readily available from national organisations</p> <p>6. Use of OECD Statistical Glossary to ensure consistency of terms</p>	<p>1. Difficulties in evaluating relevance of data</p> <p>2. Difficulties in identifying and accessing data available within the OECD</p> <p>3. Difficulties in identifying and accessing data available outside the OECD</p> <p>4. Difficulties in interpreting data and metadata available.</p> <p>5. Lack of cooperation within OECD</p>	<p>Draws on existing OECD efforts – low costs.</p>
<p>By November/December 2006: Publication of Working Paper Edition 1</p>	<p>d) Extraction, collection and dissemination of data from databases within and external to OECD: collation of data on inputs (human and financial), processes (planning and budget preparation, budget execution, management of public employment, regulatory reform, and ethics infrastructure), outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>e) Planning and design of new data collection involving all stages of the statistical activity within the GOV Directorate<sup>4</sup></p>	<p>1. Assessment of resources and time required for data collection and publishing activities within GOV (IT aspects, skills required, and financial implications). Action plan designed.</p> <p>2. Establishment of contacts with experts in national and international statistical organisations.</p> <p>3. Direct access to data, i.e. without the need to involve data providers in data collection or transmission. Using the corporate procedures to extract data and metadata from existing sources.</p>	<p>1. Underestimating resources required</p> <p>2. Underestimating time required</p> <p>3. Poor choice of statistical methods</p> <p>4. Lack of communication with and involvement of national statistical experts responsible for coordination with international organisations</p> <p>5. Inefficiencies in accessing internal and external databases</p> <p>6. Difficulties in interpreting data and metadata</p> <p>7. Incoherence across databases</p>	<p>Draws on existing OECD efforts – relatively low cost but would require some reallocation of existing resources within GOV</p>

3. In accordance with the terminology of the OECD Statistical Work Programme, a statistical activity is interpreted as an activity that produces at least one statistical output, such as a dataset or database available to internal or external users through Internet, Intranet, OLISNet, CD-ROM, etc. or a publication (whether classified or no) that is statistical or is analytical with extensive statistical content.
4. This activity regards only internal GOV statistical processes and strategic planning. "All stages" implies the complete data life cycle - definition, feasibility study, collection, management, dissemination, etc. The problems uncovered and the design decisions made during this step are re-examined and elaborated in subsequent steps, i.e., there is interaction between steps.

Phasing	Activity:	Approach		Potential problems		Resource implications:
		Guidance provided by the Quality and Framework for OECD Statistical Activities				
By November/December 2007: Publication of Working Paper Edition 2	f) Collation and dissemination of an expanded set of data examining distinctive arrangements in key sectors and central agencies in more detail.	<p>Direct access to data, i.e. without the need to involve data providers in data collection or transmission</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contact with experts from OECD and other international and national organisations.</li> <li>Use of corporate procedures to extract data and metadata from existing sources.</li> <li>Use of OECD Glossary to ensure consistency in terminology</li> <li>Cooperation with a number of OECD directorates that own the health, education data, etc.</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inefficiencies in accessing internal and external databases</li> <li>Difficulties in interpreting data and metadata</li> <li>Incoherence across databases</li> <li>Lack of internal cooperation</li> </ol>		<p>Significant additional data collation efforts needed with some cost implications.</p>
By November/December 2008: Publication of Working Paper Edition 3	g) Collation and dissemination of data on outputs and the environment for government efficiency.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of data on government outputs.</li> <li>Contact with experts from OECD and other international and national organisations.</li> <li>Using corporate procedures to extract data and metadata from existing sources.</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inefficiencies in accessing internal and external databases</li> <li>Difficulties in interpreting data and metadata</li> <li>Incoherence across databases</li> <li>Lack of internal cooperation</li> </ol>		<p>Some significant additional costs for analysis. This might not be a task for the OECD and external research bodies could be encouraged to seek financing separately.</p>
Parallel activity 2006-2008	h) Implementation of new data collection mechanism for internal GOV statistics i) Work with new data and metadata: verification, compilation, storage, analysis and evaluation – working with OECDStat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contacts with data providers</li> <li>Preparation and test of questionnaire<sup>5</sup></li> <li>Dissemination of questionnaire</li> <li>Data and metadata collection/transmission</li> <li>Use of OECD Quality guidelines and international statistical guidelines</li> <li>Use of OECD.Statworks<sup>6</sup></li> <li>Use of corporate procedures to extract data and metadata from external sources</li> <li>Verification of individual data</li> <li>Evaluation of coherence of data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- across data items within datasets</li> <li>- over time</li> <li>- across countries</li> <li>- with other data sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>Overall evaluation of data relative to</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient contact with national data providers</li> <li>Incorrect or inefficient questionnaire design</li> <li>Use of inappropriate definitions</li> <li>Inefficient choice of systems for data, metadata transmission</li> <li>Inappropriate or inefficient statistical methods</li> <li>Different methods across countries for the same series</li> </ol>		<p>This should become a core GOV activity, budgeted separately from the project.</p>

- The questionnaire may be designed to collect macro or micro level data from national data providers or micro level data from enterprises, households, etc.
- OECD.Statworks is a set of IT tools for collecting, storing, validating and disseminating data and metadata.

Phasing	Activity:	Approach		Potential problems	Resource implications:
		Guidance provided by the Quality and Framework for OECD Statistical Activities objectives			
By November/December 2009: Publication of "Government at a Glance" Edition 1	j) Data and metadata dissemination – making data available in OECD Stat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Paper publications</li> <li>2. Offline databases</li> <li>3. Online databases</li> <li>4. Through the OECD Statistics Portal</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inefficient dissemination procedures</li> <li>2. Inconsistency across databases</li> <li>3. Inappropriate presentation of metadata</li> <li>4. Disclosure of confidential data</li> <li>5. Inappropriate data release procedures, affecting credibility</li> </ul>	Using existing OECD tools: OECD Style Guide, OECD Quality guidelines, Assistance from ITN and PAC, OECD.Statworks

## TECHNICAL ANNEX 7: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>7</sup>

### General

Adema, W (2001). Net Social Expenditure (second edition). Paris: OECD Labour market and social policy (occasional paper 52).

*A study on measurement and evaluation of social expenditure in OECD countries. Social expenditure includes social security benefits and public expenditure on health care. Public and private expenditure for health care and pensions are taken into account. However, direct and indirect taxes paid in connection with these benefits are subtracted. As a result, the initial pattern of gross social expenditure is modified to a considerable degree.*

Afonso, A., Schuknecht L. and V. Tanzi (2003). Public Sector Efficiency: An International Comparison. Frankfurt am Main: European Central Bank (ECB working paper 242, July 2003).

*Public sector performance is measured for 23 industrialised countries using seven indicators: these are related to public administration, education, health care, infrastructure and the Musgravian tasks: allocation, distribution and stabilisations. These outputs are related to inputs using a non-parametric production frontier technique.*

CBP/SCP (2003). *European Outlook 1: Social Europe*. The Hague: The Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis/Social and Cultural Planning Office.

CBP/SCP (2004). *European Outlook 2: Destination Europe*. The Hague: The Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis/Social and Cultural Planning Office.

CBP/SCP (2003). *European Outlook 3: European times*. The Hague: The Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis/Social and Cultural Planning Office.

*Comparative studies of the EU-15 countries on subjects such as social expenditure, immigration and integration; public opinion and working hours. Some conclusions are: social policies need not to be detrimental to economic performance; open coordination is desirable in social policies development; a common European policy is preferable for asylum policy, however, open coordination seems to be preferable for migration and integration. The study addresses the question whether the influx of underprivileged immigrants will undermine the welfare state and how this problem can be addressed. It also analyses the surprising no-vote of the Dutch to the European and compares it with the opinions in other countries.*

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

*A comparative study of welfare state models, introducing liberal, corporatist and social-democratic models. The models differ in target group for collective provisions: limited to the poor in the liberal welfare state, to professional groups in the corporate welfare state and universal in the social-democratic welfare state. Entry conditions, duration, level of benefit are low in the liberal, intermediate in the corporatist and high in the liberal welfare state.*

---

<sup>7</sup> This annotated summary was prepared by the Social and Cultural planning Office, The Hague, Netherlands.

Gwartney, J., R. Lawson and R. Holcombe (1998). The Size and Functions of Government and Economic Growth. Joint economic committee study. US House of Representatives, April 1998.

*This study is based on data for 23 OECD countries and a wider dataset including 60 countries. The study concludes that government provision of legal and physical infrastructure for the market economy and a limited set of public goods can provide a framework conducive for economic growth. High government expenditure, on the other hand, has a strong negative impact on economic growth.*

Hoorn, W. van, N. van der Gaag and C. Huisman (1999). 'Population Development in Europe in the 21<sup>st</sup> century'. In: J. de Beer and L. van Wissen (eds.). Europe: One Continent, Different Worlds. European Population Scenarios for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

*This is the final summary chapter of a book on demographic developments in 33 European countries. The book deals with past developments, current situation and scenarios for future development. The 7<sup>th</sup> chapter, quoted here, integrates the results of the previous chapter, discussing fertility, mortality and migration. A distinction is made between northern, western, southern, central and eastern cluster of countries of which the former three have a relatively high positive migration balance and the latter two a more or less neutral migration balance. Moreover, the northern and the western clusters (still) have a positive natural increase, whereas the other clusters have a negative natural increase.*

IMD (2003). World Competitiveness Yearbook 2003. Lausanne: Institute for Management Development. *The yearbook benchmarks national competitiveness. Countries are ranked on the basis of 127 hard and 116 survey criteria, of which 81 deal with government efficiency. The hard criteria are based on the datasets of a number of international, national and regional organisations, private institutions and a network of 52 partner institutes. The survey data are based on a yearly Executive Opinion Survey, sent to a world wide selection of more than 4000 business executives who then answer the questionnaire for their country of residence.*

Osberg, L. (2001). Labour Supply and Inequality Trends in the USA and Elsewhere. Paper presented at CSLS/IRPP conference, Ottawa January 26, 2001.

Osberg, Lars (2002) Understanding growth and inequality trends: the role of labour supply in the USA and Germany. Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper No. 302.

*These studies analyse the relationship between income inequality and working hours in the USA, Germany and a number of other OECD countries. The author rejects the hypotheses that greater income inequality in the USA provides incentives that motivate greater work effort by Americans.*

Salamon, L.M. et al. (1999). Global Civil Society. Dimensions of the Non-profit Sector. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.

*This book describes and compares the (private) non-profit sector of 22 countries world wide. The non-profit sector comprises organisations which are private and not profit distributing and covers mainly industries such as education, health care, social services, culture and sports, housing and religious, political and professional organisations. Many of these, especially in education and health care, are mainly financed from public means.*

SCP (2000). Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2000: Nederland in Europa. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office. (In Dutch, English summary available)

*The Social and Cultural Report is the main biannual summary report of the Social and Cultural Planning Office. The 2000 edition on "The Netherlands in Europe" included comparison of the EU-15 countries in terms of demography, economy and public finance, public administration, social participation, norms and values, use of time, health and health care, labour, social security, housing, education, media, culture and criminal justice.*

SCP/CeRP (2004) (Social and Cultural Planning Office of the Netherlands/Centre for Research on Pensions and Welfare Policies). *Unequal Welfare States*. The Hague/Turin: SCP/CeRP.  
*This book deals with the financial sustainability of the ageing welfare states in Europe. It contains an in-depth analysis of future income inequality in six countries: France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, Denmark and the Netherlands. The distributive forecasts are based on demographic projections and economic modelling of various policy strategies.*

Wildeboer Schut, J.M., J.C. Vrooman and P.T. de Beer (2001). *On worlds of welfare: institutions and their effects in eleven welfare states*. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.  
*This book analyses institutional arrangements in eleven modern welfare states (USA, UK, Canada, Australia, Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark and Norway). Using quantitative data the authors first show that the institutional variety among these countries can be reduced to three main types (corresponding to the Esping-Andersen typology: liberal, corporatist and social-democratic welfare states). Next, they examine the impact of these three 'worlds of welfare': the effects on income redistribution, inequality, poverty and social welfare. The study shows that institutions matter, but also that the distributive results of welfare state types are not as straightforward as one might expect. The book provides an empirical basis for the policy debate on strong and weak points of welfare states.*

## Education

European Commission (2000). *Key Data on Education in Europe*. Luxembourg: European Commission, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.  
*This sixth edition provides an exceptionally wide-ranging overview of functioning of education systems and the participation of young people at all levels of education. It contains 153 indicators in six subject-based chapters. Besides data on the context, participation in education at all educational levels, graduation rates and human and financial resources, the book also offers detailed information on several key aspects of how education is administered and structured, e.g. decision-making structure, autonomy of schools and procedures for evaluating the education system in place.*

J. File and L. Goedergebuure (eds.) *Real-time Systems. Reflections on Higher Education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia* (p. 77-93). Enschede: University of Twente, Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS).  
*This book deals with the transition of higher education in four Central European countries from the socialist vision on society to that of Western Europe. Striking features are a sustained expansion of higher education participation and the restoration of the freedom to teach and the freedom to learn. The current educational systems and the numerical development of educational participation are documented and commented.*

Greenaway, Emma. *Lower secondary education, an international comparison*. International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks, 1999. Available at [www.inca.org](http://www.inca.org).  
*The overall aim of this study is to enhance our knowledge and understanding of the current issues affecting lower education by reviewing its aspects, such as structures, aims, organisation, curriculum and assessment, in the 16 countries of the INCA archive. The study concludes that many countries are facing similar problems and that their reforms of lower secondary education can only be successful if they take into account the lower education relationships with the preceding primary and the ensuing higher secondary education.*

Müller, W. and M. Wolbers (1999). 'Educational Attainment of Young People in the European Union. Cross Country Variation of Trends over Time'. In: W. Müller et al. (eds.). *A Comparative Analysis of Transition From Education to Work in Europe - Based on the European Community Labour*

*Force Survey* (p. 19-56). Mannheim/Maastricht/Marseille: MZES/ROA/CEREQ.

*This book provides a comparative analysis of school-to-work transitions in the EU member states. It shows how differences in both European education and training systems, as well as labour market institutions, generated significant variation in the experiences of young people entering European labour markets during the 1990s. This book compiles an integrated series of comparative empirical analyses of education-to-work transitions across the EU by drawing on the European Labour Force Surveys. Individual chapters describe the educational background of young people entering the labour market, address the scope of educational expansion in recent decades, and chart basic structures of transition processes in European labour markets. From these analyses it becomes apparent that the structure of education and training systems is the key institutional factor behind successful youth labour market integration.*

O'Donnell, Sharon *et al.*, International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks, 2002.

Comparative tables and factual summaries 2002 Available at [www.inca.org](http://www.inca.org).

*The INCA project aims at providing a succinct description of educational aims, structure and organisation, curriculum and assessment frameworks in 16 countries: Australia, Canada, England, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA. The paper summarizes the aims and outcomes of the INCA project and full data are available in the Internet Archives.*

## **Health Care Systems**

Bertels, J. and W. Cocquyt (1995a). De sociale gezondheidszorgstelsels in de landen van de Europese Unie, deel 1, België, Denemarken, Duitsland, Frankrijk. Reeks gezondheidszorgverzekering en Europa, deel 15. Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Maklu uitgevers.

*This report is part of a qualitative description of the legal structure of social healthcare systems in the EU-15 countries in 1995. It is produced by the Europe and Social Security Research Unit of Catholic University of Leuven. Each system is described by its general framework, administrative structure, entitlements, performance, providers and financing. No quantitative information is given. The quoted part describes the legal systems of Belgium, Denmark, Germany and France.*

Bertels, J., W. et al. (1995b). De sociale gezondheidszorgstelsels in de landen van de Europese Unie, deel 2, Griekenland, Ierland, Italië, Luxemburg. Reeks gezondheidszorgverzekering en Europa, deel 15. Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Maklu uitgevers.

*This report is part of a qualitative description of the legal structure of social healthcare systems in the EU-15 countries in 1995. It is produced by the Europe and Social Security Research Unit of Catholic University of Leuven. Each system is described by its general framework, administrative structure, entitlements, performance, providers and financing. No quantitative information is given. The quoted part describes the legal systems of Greece, Ireland, Italy and Luxembourg.*

Bertels, J., P. Schoukens and S. Vansteenkiste (1995c). De sociale gezondheidszorgstelsels in de landen van de Europese Unie, deel 3, Nederland, Portugal, Spanje, het Verenigd Koninkrijk. Reeks gezondheidszorgverzekering en Europa, deel 15. Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Maklu uitgevers.

*This report is part of a qualitative description of the legal structure of social healthcare systems in the EU-15 countries in 1995. It is produced by the Europe and Social Security Research Unit of Catholic University of Leuven. Each system is described by its general framework, administrative structure, entitlements, performance, providers and financing. No quantitative information is given. The quoted part describes the legal systems of the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the UK.*

Cocquyt, W. en W. Palm (1994). De gezondheidszorgstelsels in delanden van de Europese vrijhandelsassociatie. Reeks gezondheidszorgverzekering en Europa, deel 11. Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Maklu uitgevers.

*This report is part of a qualitative description of the legal structure of social healthcare systems in the EU-15 countries in 1995. It is produced by the Europe and Social Security Research Unit of Catholic University of Leuven. Each system is described by its general framework, administrative structure, entitlements, performance, providers and financing. No quantitative information is given. The quoted part describes the legal systems of Austria, Finland and Sweden.*

Bocken J., W. Kunstman and M. Butzlaff (2002). Free choice of doctors - an international comparison. In: *Gesundheitswesen* 2002 (64), p. 267-271.

*This international comparison study focuses on the issue of free choice between the primary care physicians and specialists and aims at learning from other countries' experiences. The study distinguishes between two different types of health care systems: state-administered health systems such as in Finland and Great Britain, and competition-based systems such as in Switzerland and the USA. Several restrictions of free choice among physicians are observed. Restrictions are to be found when changing the general practitioner as well as in the first contact to specialists. Both limitations do not seem to have a significant effect on the level of satisfaction with health care in general. From an international perspective free choice of doctors seems to be an exception in health systems.*

Brettenthaler, Dr. Reiner (2003). Comparison of European Health Systems. Consulted 12-2-2004 via <http://www.aek.or.at/EUSTUDPPT/insurance.htm> (website österreichische ärztekammer).

*This comparative study comprises three parts: survey of patterns common to all European health systems, evaluation of their advantages and disadvantages by respective national medical associations, and subjective evaluation of their national health systems by EU-citizens. The analysis is based on the EC Eurobarometer survey data. Particular attention is paid to the following issues: satisfaction with national health systems, demand for fundamental changes in national health systems, demand for an increase in state expenditure on health care, provision of services to low-income groups only, restriction to core services, impossibility of future financing of all medical services, excessive use of health care facilities and medical services, and neglect of preventive measures.*

EC (a). Mutual Information System on Social Protection (MISSOC) in the EU Member States and the EEA. Consulted February 2004 via

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment\\_social/missoc2001/index\\_chapitre2\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/missoc2001/index_chapitre2_en.htm).

*The report characterizes healthcare systems by statutory basis, basic principles, field of application, conditions, organization and benefits. No quantitative information is available.*

ECHP (a). (European Centre for Health Policy). Health Care Systems in Transition. consulted in June 2004 via <http://www.euro.who.int/observatory/Hits/TopPage>.

*This set of country-based profiles provides a description of health care systems and reform initiatives in progress or under development. The profiles provide relevant information to support policy-makers and analysts in the development of health care systems in Europe and can be used to learn about different approaches to the organization, financing and delivery of health services. It describes the process, content and implementation of health care reform programmes, and highlights challenges and areas that require more in-depth analysis. It is a useful tool for the dissemination of information on health care systems and the exchange of experiences of reform strategies between policy-makers and analysts in different countries.*

GVG (2003). (Gesellschaft für Versicherungswissenschaft und –Gestaltung). Study on the Social Protection Systems in the 13 Applicant Countries, financed by the European Commission (DG Employment and Social Affairs) (January 2003). consulted June 2004 via [http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment\\_social/soc-prot/social/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/soc-prot/social/index_en.htm).  
*The study analyzes social systems in EU candidate countries. It includes 13 country studies by independent institutions and a comparative synthesis report. The studies describe and analyze the social protection systems using common methodology, identifying the major challenges in the current social, economic and demographic context, assessing recent reform efforts and highlighting major current issues for further reform. The main areas analyzed include demographic developments, social and economic situation, pension system, poverty and social exclusion, and health care. The project was supported by the European Commission (DG Employment and Social Affairs) and was coordinated by GVG - Gesellschaft für Versicherungswissenschaft und -gestaltung e.V. in Germany (Köln).*

### Health Care Other

Gakidou, E. and G. King (2000). An Individual-level Approach to Health Inequality: Child Survival in 50 Countries. Geneva: WHO (discussion paper 18).  
*In this report, an extended beta-binomial model is used to estimate the distribution of risk of death in children under the age of two in the 50 developing countries, for which data from a Demographic and Health Survey are available. Inequality in these distributions is measured by the WHO health inequality index. The results are not very sensitive to the choice of the inequality measure. Measuring inequality at individual level data, rather than quantifying differences in average levels of health across social groups, enables meaningful comparisons of inequality across countries and analyses of the determinants of inequality.*

Gerdtham, U.-G. and B. Jönsson (2000). 'International Comparison of Health Expenditure'. In: A.J. Culver and J.P. Newhouse, Handbook of Health Economics (volume 1A, p. 11-49). New York: Elsevier.  
*Comparisons of aggregate health expenditure across different countries permit a systematic investigation of the impact of different institutional regimes and other explanatory variables. Over the years, several regression analyses based on cross-section and panel data have been used to explain 47 international differences in health expenditure. A common result of these studies is that aggregate income appears to be the most important factor explaining health expenditure variation between countries and that the size of the estimated income elasticity is high and even higher than unity which in that case indicates that health care is a "luxury" good. Additional results indicates, for example, that the use of primary care "gatekeepers" lowers health expenditure and that the way of remunerating physicians in the ambulatory care sector appears to influence health expenditure. Capitation systems tend to lead to lower expenditure than fee-for-service systems.*

Giarchi, G. (1996). Caring for Older Europeans: Comparative Studies in 29 Countries. Aldershot: Arena.  
*Topics of this comparative study include demography, socio-political and administrative background, social security: pension and benefits, housing, health care, mental health, institutional care, personal social services, voluntary agencies and support organizations, informal care, leisure pursuits and education, and rural aspects.*

Gil, J. and E. Gracia (2002). 'A Comparison of the USA Health Care Effort with other OECD Countries'. In: Revista de Economía Pública 161 (2) p. 31-48.  
*A sample of OECD countries is used in order to better understand why the US health care expenditure as a percentage of its Gross Domestic Product ("health care effort") is so far above any other. To this end a descriptive cross-country methodology is employed, based on econometric estimations, synthetic indicators and the Lerner's formula of market power. The exploratory*

*hypothesis is advanced that the availability of a universal public health coverage would increase the price elasticity of demand and thus would reduce the control of prices by suppliers.*

Health Consumer Powerhouse (2005). EuroHealth Consumer Index 2005.

<http://www.healthpowerhouse.com/>

*This index has been introduced for the first time in 2004. It is used to compare 11 EU member states and Switzerland on the basis of an index based on 20 characteristics dealing with patient rights and information, waiting time, outcomes, customer friendliness and regulations concerning pharmaceuticals. The ranking obtained differs strongly from the ranking on the basis of outcome criteria alone. An example is Sweden, which scores high on medical outcomes, but low on consumer position.*

Hughes Tuohy, C., C.M. Flood and M. Stabile (2001). How Does Private Finance Affect Health Care Systems? Toronto: University of Toronto (report 46/1000, June 2001).

*The impact of private finance on publicly funded health care systems depends on how the relationship between public and private finance is structured. This essay first reviews the experience of five nations and exemplifies different ways of drawing the public/private boundary to address particular questions raised by each model. This review is then used to interpret aggregate empirical analyses of the dynamic effects between public and private finance in OECD nations over time. The findings suggest that while increases in the private share of health spending substitute in part for public finance (and vice versa), the result depends on a complex mix of factors having as much to do with cross-sectoral shifts as with deliberate policy decisions within sectors and that these effects are mediated by different dynamics of distinctive national models.*

Kooiker, S. and L. van der Wijst (2003). Europeans and Their Medicines. Dongen/The Hague: GfK/SCP.

*This book explores the relationship between culture and utilization of pharmaceuticals. The lack of empirical research prompted researchers from the Social and Cultural Planning Office of the Netherlands (SCP) and GfK Panelservices Benelux to carry out this international explorative study. The mainstay is a survey carried out among 40 experts in the field of pharmaceuticals in nine European countries: Sweden, Denmark, the UK, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands*

Kreier, Rachel (2001). Costs, equity, and quality in the health care systems of the developed nations. (Comparative International Health Systems Supervised reading course, May, 2001).

*This paper describes the experiences of four countries – the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Germany – with different health care system models. While no system is a pure system, the U.S. health system is the closest to a market model. The focus of this paper is on health care delivery systems of the developed countries, and how they have succeeded and failed in meeting the goals of policy makers and populations. In general, other countries have been more successful than the United States at controlling health care spending, providing equitable and comprehensive access to health care, and achieving good health outcomes for their populations as a whole. Ironically, a number of countries borrowed U.S. ideas about harnessing incentives and market mechanisms to achieve their policy goals, and it seems that their health care systems enable them to get better results from these tools than the U.S. system will permit.*

Mathers, C. et al. (2000). Estimates of DALE for 191 Countries: Methods and Results. Geneva: WHO (discussion paper 16).

*The report estimates healthy life expectancy (DALE) for 191 countries in 1999 using estimates of the incidence, prevalence, and disability distributions for 109 disease and injury causes by age group, sex, and region of the world, and an analysis of 60 representative health surveys across the world. Sullivan's method is used to compute healthy life expectancy for men and women in each WHO*

*member country. Years of healthy life lost due to disability represent 18% of total life expectancy in the bottom countries, and decrease to around 8% in the countries with the highest healthy life expectancies. Although women live longer, they spend a greater amount of time with disability. As average levels of health expenditure per capita increase, healthy life expectancy increases at a greater rate than total life expectancy.*

Mobley, L.R. and J. Magnussen (1998). 'An International Comparison of Hospital Efficiency: Does Institutional Environment Matter?' In: *Applied Economics* 30, p. 1089-1100.  
*In this paper, empirical evidence from a public, highly regulated Norwegian hospital sector and a private, highly competitive and unregulated California hospital sector are used to demonstrate whether institutional environment and level of market competition significantly affect the degree of productive efficiency in hospitals. Heterogeneity in output definition is used to control for other dimensions (age distribution of patients). The results show that regulation of Norwegian hospitals improves long-run efficiency, primarily due to better utilization of capital. Health economists established that no meaningful performance differences exist among for-profit and non-profit hospitals in the US, but this topic has continued to be a matter of academic, judicial, and public policy interest. A similar debate has ensued internationally, regarding the potential efficiency gains from privatization of public enterprises.*

Pacolet, J. et al. (1999). *Social Protection for Dependency in Old Age in the 15 EU Member States and Norway*. Brussels: EC, DG Employment and Social affairs.  
*This book presents the results of a European comparative study organized in 1997-1998 by the Higher Institute for Labour Studies on behalf of the European Commission and the Belgian government. The study investigated the social protection arrangements for the elderly in the fifteen member states of the EU and Norway. In addition to providing an up-to-date overview of the systems of social protection for the elderly across the fifteen EU states, this book also presents a comparative analysis of the residential, semi-residential and community services available. The study is complimented by a discussion on policy reform of the social protection systems of dependent older persons, and particular attention is given to the topic of long-term care insurance.*

WHO (2000). *The World Health Report 2000; Health Systems: Improving Performance*. Geneva: World Health Organization.  
*This report examines and compares aspects of health systems around the world. It provides conceptual insights into the complex factors that explain how health systems perform, and offers practical advice on how to assess performance and achieve improvements with available resources. To assess the performance of health systems and to understand the factors that contribute to it, a framework is used that distinguishes among four key health system areas: provision of services, development of resources required for the system to work, mobilizing and channeling financing, and ensuring that the individuals and organizations that compose the system act as good stewards of the resources and trust given to their care. There seem to be some clear conclusions about the organizations, rules and incentives that best help a health system to use its resources to achieve its goals. How much can be accomplished with currently available resources depends greatly on the past investment and training that created those resources?. There are comparable conclusions about what is desirable in the financing of the system. Finally, the health system as a whole needs comprehensive oversight, to stay directed to its goals and to ensure that the tasks of financing, investing and delivering services are adequately carried out.*

WHO (2002). *Summary Measures of Population Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.  
*This book addresses a wide array of critical issues regarding the measurement of population health using comprehensive indices combining information on mortality and ill-health. Summary measures of population health are used by the World Health Organization to report on levels of health and*

*inequalities in health for its Member States, to report on the causes of loss of health in terms of diseases, injuries and risk factors. The various uses of such summary measures of population health are described, and the appropriate measurement framework and specific ethical and social value choices are discussed and debated. The contributors include leading experts in epidemiological methods, ethics, health economics, health status measurement and the valuation of health states.*

## **Law and Order Systems**

Delmas-Marty, M. and J.R. Spencer (2002). *European Criminal Procedures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Leading scholars describe and discuss criminal procedures in England, Belgium, France, Germany and Italy, providing up-to-date analyses of the main differences and similarities of each system in historical context. They examine the accusatorial and inquisitorial traditions, cross influences between the two traditions, and current pressures for harmonisation. Extended essays include topics on public prosecutors, the rights of victims and defendants, evidence, negotiated justice, and media influence.*

Djankov, S. et al. (2002). *Courts: The Lex Mundi Project*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Institute of Economic Research, Harvard University (discussion paper 1951, March 2002).

*Based on the cooperation with Lex Mundi member law firms in 109 countries, the book measures and describes the exact procedures used by litigants and courts to evict a tenant for non-payment of rent and to collect a bounced check. These data are used to construct an index of procedural formalism of dispute resolution for each country. The findings are that such formalism is systematically greater in civil than in common law countries. Moreover, procedural formalism is associated with higher expected duration of judicial proceedings, more corruption, less consistency, less honesty, less fairness in judicial decisions, and inferior access to justice. These results suggest that legal transplantation may have led to an inefficiently high level of procedural formalism, particularly in developing countries.*

Kangaspunta, K. (ed) (1995). *Profiles of Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America*. Helsinki: Tampere (publication series 26 of European Institute for Crime Prevention and control, affiliated with the United Nations).

*This is a companion volume to publication no. 25, and has been prepared by the same expert working group. It contains brief descriptions of the criminal justice systems of some fifty European and North American countries, including - for the first time in print - all of the constituent republics of the former USSR. The data includes information on criminal and criminal procedural law, the structure and operation of the police, prosecution, courts and corrections, and information from the Fourth United Nations Survey on crime trends from 1986 to 1990. The length of individual profiles varies from two or three pages to over twenty pages.*

## **Law and Order Other**

Barclay, G. and C. Tavares (2003). *International Comparisons of Criminal Justice Statistics 2001*. London: Home Office (bulletin 12/3, 24 October 2003).

*This bulletin brings together statistical information on criminal justice collected by the Home Office and the Council of Europe. The data covers all the European Union Member States, the EU accession countries and selected other countries. It reflects the co-operation that exists between countries both in the sharing of data but also in exploring the different definitions used within statistical collection systems. The majority of the data have been collected from official sources in other countries. There is considerable overlap with the European Sourcebook (2003), described as database Law and Order, nr 4.*

Blank, J. et al. (2004). *Bench Marking in an International Perspective: An International Comparison of the Mechanisms and Performance of the Judiciary System*. Rotterdam: Ecorys research.

*The project's objective is to design and implement a method to periodically compare the judiciary system in The Netherlands with those in other countries, using quantitative indicators for the utilisation of resources (i.e. expenditure and staff) and performance (i.e. number of cases concluded per euro spent or per employee). The data apply to the judiciary system as a whole and are, where possible, differentiated according to sector (civil, administrative and criminal). The key research questions are:*

- *How do the judiciary systems perform (expressed in terms of the number of cases concluded per euro spent)?*
- *To what extent and in what way are resources in terms of staff and expenditure used?*

*In addition to The Netherlands, the study involves ten other countries: Germany, Austria, Poland, France, Italy, Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, England/Wales and Finland.*

EMCDDA (2004). *Annual Report on the State of the Drugs Problem in the European Union*. Lisbon: European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction.

*The reports on the state of the drugs problem in the European Union and in the accession and candidate countries present the EMCDDA's yearly overview of the drug phenomenon in these countries. These are essential reference books for policy-makers, specialists and practitioners in the drugs field or indeed anyone seeking the latest findings on drugs in Europe. Published every autumn, the reports contain non-confidential data supported by an extensive range of figures. A dedicated website is available in 20 languages. The site contains the report, tables, data sources, additional explanatory material and graphics, news releases and pdfs for download. It offers users improved possibilities to explore the Annual report's content, enabling them to retrieve information efficiently, according to their needs.*

ESPAD/MTF (1999). *Data Based on European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Drugs and Monitoring the Future*. Council of Europe/University of Michigan. <http://monitoringthefuture.org>.

*The European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Drugs (ESPAD) is a set of school surveys, coordinated by sociologist Bjorn Hibell at the Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and other Drugs. This second ESPAD study was conducted in 1999 among approximately 95,000 students in 10th grade in 30 participating countries. The survey in each country is representative of the national 10<sup>th</sup> grade student population. The findings suggest that cigarette smoking and alcohol use is less prevalent among 10th grade students in the United States than in almost all European countries. The lifetime use of marijuana and other illicit drugs in the United States is higher than in any European country.*

European Sourcebook (2003). *European Source Book of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2003*. Meppel: Boom (report 212 of the Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice)

*This report sets out a European agenda for reducing everyday violence and presents the conclusions and results of the Integrated Project “Responses to violence in everyday life in a democratic society”, carried out by the Council of Europe in 2002-04. Building on the Council's earlier work against violence, the Project focused on comprehensive policy development and preparation of a new set of practical tools to prevent violence in everyday life. The objective of the report is to assist member states in their continuous task of confronting violence and making the lives of their citizens safer. Chapter 1 presents twelve policy principles which can be used in action plans for preventing and reducing violence in everyday life. Chapter 2 probes the extent of our knowledge about national*

*situations related to everyday violence concluding. Chapter 3 discusses structural and contextual factors of violence with reference to inter-cultural and inter-faith dialogue, social cohesion, the mass media and fear of violence. Chapter 4 lists the results of the Integrated Project.*

Kesteren, J. van, P. Mayhew and J.J.M. van Dijk (2000). Criminal Victimization in Seventeen Industrialised Countries; Key Findings from the 2000 International Crime Victims Survey. The Hague: Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice.  
*The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) is the most far-reaching programme of fully standardised sample surveys looking at householders' experience of crime in different countries. The first ICVS took place in 1989, the second in 1992, the third in 1996 and the fourth in 2000. Surveys have been carried out in 24 industrialised countries since 1989, and in 46 cities in developing countries and countries in transition. This report deals with seventeen industrialised countries which took part in the 2000 ICVS. The reason for setting up the ICVS was the inadequacy of other measures of crime across countries. (Figures of offences recorded by the police are problematic due to differences in the way the police define, record and count crime. And since victims report most crimes the police know about, police figures can differ simply because of differences in reporting behaviour. It is also difficult to make comparisons of independently organised crime surveys, as these differ in design and coverage).*

Ministry of Justice (2000). Juridische infrastructuur in internationaal perspectief. Criminaliteitsbeheersing. Report offered with letter to House of Representatives (5014737/500/RR), 2 March 2000. The Hague: Ministry of Justice. (in Dutch)  
*In this report the performance of the Dutch Law and Order system is viewed in an international perspective. The text of an unpublished update of this report has been integrated in the SCP report on Public Sector Performance.*

Smit, P.R. et al. (2003). Het ophelderingspercentage nader beschouwd. Meppel: Boom (report 213 of the Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice).(in Dutch)  
*In the Netherlands, the clear-up rate of crimes has been steadily diminishing since 1960. By now it is almost the lowest in Europe. In this report, it is investigated how useful and accurate this clear-up rate is as a measure for success in the prosecution of offenders. It is investigated whether more useful alternative measures are available, which are more suitable for an analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the police force in different countries.*

UNODC (2005) (United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention). World Drug Report 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
*The negative impacts of the illicit drug trade touch every society in the world. This year's World Drug Report estimates that 200 million people, or 5% of the global population age 15-64, have consumed illicit drugs at least once in the last 12 months. The drug trade is pernicious and large. UNODC estimates its retail value at 321 billion US\$. It impacts almost every level of human security from individual health, to safety and social welfare. Its consequences are especially devastating for countries with limited resources available to fight against it. The World Drug Report 2005 provides one of the most comprehensive overviews of illicit drug trends at the international level. The analysis of trends, some going back 10 years or more, is presented in Volume 1. Detailed statistics are presented in Volume 2.*

## **Public Administration**

ASPA and UN (2002). American Society for Public Administration and United Nations. Benchmarking E-government: A Global Perspective. Assessing the Progress of the UN Member States.  
[www.unpan.org](http://www.unpan.org)

*A survey focusing on measuring readiness for e-government development. While in 1996 there were some 50 official web pages, there were approximately 50,000 in 2001. 89% of countries were present on the web. 21% developed a single entry point and 10% had on-line transaction capacity. A distinction is made between countries in an emerging stage, an enhanced stage and an interactive stage of e-government. Developing countries are generally lagging behind, therefore e-government may become a powerful vehicle for deepening the existing digital divide in the world.*

Banisar, D. (2003). The [www.freedominfo.org](http://www.freedominfo.org) Global Survey. Freedom of Information and Access to Government Record Laws around the World.

*A new era of government transparency has arrived. It is now widely recognized that the culture of secrecy that has been the modus operandi of government for centuries is no longer feasible in a global age of information. Over fifty countries have adopted comprehensive laws to facilitate access to government records and processes and over thirty more are in the process.*

Hajnal, G. (2003). 'Diversity and Convergence: A Quantitative Analysis of European Public Administration Education Programs'. In: Journal of Public Affairs Education 9 (4) p. 245-258.

Hooghe, L. (2002). The European Commission and the Integration of Europe: Images of Governance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janssen, D., S. Rotthier, and K. Snijkers (2004). If You Measure It They Will Score. An Analysis of International E-Government Benchmarking. paper presented at the 4th European Conference on e-Government, Dublin Castle, 17-18 June 2004.

Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kaay and Massimo Mastruzzi. Governance matters III: Governance indicators for 1996-2002. Available at [www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance](http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance).

*This paper presents estimates of six dimensions of governance covering 199 countries and territories for periods 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2002. These indicators are based on several hundred individual variables measuring perceptions of governance, drawn from 25 separate data sources constructed by 18 different organizations. These individual measures of governance are assigned to categories capturing key dimensions of governance. An unobserved components model is used to construct six aggregate governance indicators in each of the four periods. The point estimates of the dimensions of governance are presented together with the margins of error for each country for the four periods. The paper also addresses various methodological issues, including tests for potential biases, and the interpretation and use of the data given the estimated margins of errors for developed indicators as well as for others. The data, as well as a web-based graphical interface, are available at [www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/govdata2002/](http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/govdata2002/).*

Loughlin, J. (1994). 'Nation, State, and Region in Western Europe'. In: L. Bekemans (ed.), Culture: Building Stone for Europe 2002: Reflections and Perspectives, Brussels: Peter Lang Publishing.

Mamadouh, V. (1999). 'National Political Cultures in the European Union'. In: M. Thompson, G. Grendstad and P. Selle, Cultural Theory as Political Science (p. 138-53), London: Routledge.

Mendel, T. (2003). Freedom of Information: A Comparative Legal Survey. New Delhi: UNESCO ('OECD Corporate Data Environment: Labour Market Statistics'. [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)).

*The right to freedom of information, commonly understood as the right to access information held by public bodies, is now widely recognised as a fundamental human right. There is a massive global trend towards legal recognition of this right as countries around the world that aspire to democracy either have adopted, or are in the process of preparing, freedom of information laws. This represents an enormous change from even ten years ago, when less than one-half of the freedom of*

*information laws now in place had been adopted. This UNESCO study analyses freedom of information laws in Bulgaria, India, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom and the United States. The study outlines nine principles governing effective freedom-of-information laws.*

Pollitt, C. and G. Bouckaert (2004). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. (second edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*This textbook presents a comparative analysis of recent changes in Public Management and Public Administration in Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, the UK, the USA, and the European Commission. In the second edition, empirical data have been brought up to date, so as to cover many key developments of the last few years. The theoretical framework includes a challenging new interpretation of the trends in continental Europe, which are seen here as markedly different from the Anglo-American style 'New Public Management'. It includes a multi-dimensional analysis of the results of reform, and a chapter reflecting on the dynamic relationship between management reform and politics.*

Transparency International (2003). Framework document 2003. Background paper to the 2003 Corruption Perception Index. <http://www.transparency.org>

Document on the methodology, sources and validity of the corruption perception index of Transparency International.

Uslaner, E.M. and G. Badescu (2003). 'Honesty, Trust, and Legal Norms in the Transition to Democracy: Why Bo Rothstein Is Better Able to Explain Sweden than Romania'. In: J. Kornai, S. Rose-Ackerman and B. Rothstein (eds.), *Creating Social Trust: Problems of Post-Socialist Transition*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

*Trust is a blessing, corruption is a curse. In countries with a high level of trust there is less corruption (based on data of Transparency International and the World Values Survey). It may seem that by reducing the level of corruption we can increase the level of trust as Bo Rothstein (2001) argues. The authors do not share this view and argue that the causality works the other way around: high trust leads to low corruption.*

Walle, S. van de, et al. (2004). *What You See Is Not Necessarily What You Get: Een verkenning van de mogelijkheden en moeilijkheden van internationale vergelijkingen van publieke sectoren op basis van indicatoren*. Leuven: Instituut voor de Overheid. (in Flemish).

*This study investigates the possibilities and difficulties of an international comparison of the public sector on the basis of indicators. Indicators only reflect part of public sector performance. Moreover, subjective perceptions are sometimes taken to be objective measures of performance. Many indicators are dated or unreliable. Sometimes they do not measure what they pretend to measure. Moreover, comparisons are complicated as a result of institutional differences.*

## TECHNICAL ANNEX 8: COMPARABLE OECD PUBLICATIONS

### **By thematic area**

*(Most recent available publications are italicized)*

#### **Pensions at a Glance**

812005021P1

*Pensions at a Glance: Public Policies across OECD Countries 2005 Edition*

*Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264018719*

*01/06/2005*

#### **Society at a Glance**

812005031P1

*Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators 2005 Edition*

*Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264007121*

*24/03/2005*

812003051P1

Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators 2002 Edition

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264197974

28/02/2003

812001061P1

Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators 2001 Edition

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264186743

07/09/2001

#### **Education at a Glance**

962005061E1

*Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2005 Edition*

*Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264011919*

962005061P1

Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2005 Edition

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264011900

962004081P1

Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2004 Edition

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264015671

14/09/2004

962003061P1

Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2003 Edition

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264102337  
17/09/2003

962002031P1  
Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2002 Edition  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264198903  
29/10/2002

962001051P1  
Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2001 Edition  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264186689  
13/06/2001

962000041P1  
Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2000 Edition  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264171991  
16/05/2000

961998041P1  
Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264161279  
23/11/1998

961997041P1  
Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 1997  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264156224  
12/11/1997

961996101P1  
Education at a Glance: Analysis 1996 Edition  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264153578  
15/11/1996

961995021P1  
Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 1995 Edition  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264144056  
16/04/1995

991950211P1  
Education at a Glance  
Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264164510  
21/01/1950

**Agricultural Policies at a Glance**

512004061P1

*Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: At a Glance - 2004 Edition*

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264016031

05/07/2004

**Health at a Glance**

812003131P1

*Health at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2003*

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264104046

22/10/2003

812003131P4

OECD Policy Briefs: Health at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2003

Language: English Medium: Print (Policy Brief in Paper format)

16/10/2003

812001091P1

Health at a Glance

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264187138

19/10/2001

**Economies at a Glance**

111996011P1

OECD Economies at a Glance: Structural Indicators

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264148051

30/04/1996

**Regions at a Glance**

042005011P1

OECD Regions at a Glance

Language: English Medium: Print (Paperback) ISBN: 9264018638

## Overview<sup>8</sup>

There are five major data publications prepared by the OECD which are comparable in that they offer quantitative insights into key government inputs, processes and outputs in major sectors. Table 11 summarizes these and the major classification that they employ.<sup>9</sup>

In each case, they offer more than a one-dimensional listing of available indicators. For example, the set of education indicators published in *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators – 2004 Edition* is structured into outputs and impacts (outcomes), financial and human resources invested in the sector (inputs), access to education (outcomes), learning environment (processes) and contextual data. *Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators - 2005 Edition* groups indicators into three areas: social context (variables that are not usually the direct target of policy, at least in the short to medium term but which are crucial for understanding the context within which social policy is developed); social status (social outcomes that policies try to influence); and societal response (indicators that illustrate what society is doing to affect social status).

As the latter notes, while social indicators are attributed to one of these three groups, the distinction in practice between context and status is not always straightforward. For example, fertility rates may be an objective of pro-natalist policies in some countries, while they are part of the context of social policy in others. Similarly, family breakdown can be regarded as a failure of public policies in some countries, whereas it may not be an explicit policy concern in others. The conclusion must be that any dividing line between different indicators is to some extent arbitrary.

Overall, and very broadly speaking, there are two types of “At a Glance” data publications. One type classifies the available data within a framework that is recognisable to policy makers while remaining discursive overall, with no overarching normative assertion about “best practice” in the sector or on the issue. In effect, this type of publication provides the data and leaves the reader/policy maker to draw her or his own conclusions. The second type is more evaluative and contrasts current arrangements or policy stances with a preferred model. In order to facilitate the evaluation, the more normative/evaluative publications use more complex data analysis with the construction of aggregate indicators.

---

8. The first part of this section draws on the analysis of other OECD data publications provided in *Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators 2005 Edition*.

9. *Economies at a Glance* was published once in 1996, and *Regions at a Glance* is forthcoming.

**Table 11. Classification of data within existing "At a Glance" publications**

	<b>"At a Glance" Publications</b>	<b>Classification of Data</b>
Less evaluative	Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators - 2005 Edition	Social context Social status Societal response
	Health at a Glance: OECD Indicators – 2003 Edition	Health status Health care resources and utilization Expenditure on health Non-medical determinants of health Demographics and economic context
	Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2004 Edition	Outputs and impact of learning Financial and human resources invested in education Access to education, participation and progress Learning environment Antecedents or constraints that contextualise policy
More evaluative	Pensions at a Glance: Public Policies across OECD Countries - 2005 Edition	Pension-system Typology Comparing Pension-system Parameters Modelling Pension Entitlements Replacement Rates Relative Pension Levels Pension Wealth
	Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: At a Glance - 2004 Edition	Evaluation of support policy developments <sup>10</sup> Country level data

The less evaluative publications have more similarities to the proposed project “Management in Government: Comparative Country Data” as they focus less on the degree to which objectives/policy outcomes have been achieved. In consequence, as Table 12 highlights, there are more cross-linkages between these publications and the proposed move towards “Government at a Glance”.

10. The methodology for preparing these data are described in a separate OECD note: *Methodology For The Measurement of Support and Use in Policy Evaluation*.

Table 12. Potential relevance of data within existing "At a Glance" publications

	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes	Antecedents or that contextualize government efficiency
Less evaluative	Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators - 2005 Edition		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Social status (e.g. employment, unemployment, relative poverty, life expectancy, teenage births)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Societal response (e.g. out of work benefits, benefits of last resort, public social spending, health care expenditure)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Social context (e.g. net income per capita, age dependency ratios)</li> </ul>
	Health at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2003 Edition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expenditure on health (e.g. health expenditure)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expenditure on health (e.g. life expectancy)</li> <li>● Health care resources and utilization (e.g. % of children vaccinated against diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Health care resources and utilization (e.g. provision of acute care beds, consultation with doctors)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expenditure on health (e.g. pharmaceutical expenditure)</li> <li>● Non-medical determinants of health (e.g. tobacco and alcohol consumption, body weight)</li> <li>● Demographic and economic context (e.g. total population, share over 65, GDP per capita)</li> </ul>
	Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators - 2004 Edition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Financial and human resources invested in education (e.g. annual expenditure on educational institutions per student)</li> <li>● Learning environment (e.g. teacher salaries)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Learning environment (e.g. instruction time, class size)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outputs and impact of learning (e.g. literacy performance)</li> <li>● Access to education, participation and progress (e.g. participation in secondary education)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Outputs and impact of learning (e.g. tertiary graduations)</li> </ul>

	Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes	Antecedents or constraints that contextualize government efficiency
More evaluative	Pensions at a Glance: Public Policies across OECD Countries - 2005 Edition		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pension-system Typology</li> <li>● Comparing Pension-system Parameters</li> <li>● Modelling Pension Entitlements</li> <li>● Replacement Rates</li> <li>● Relative Pension Levels</li> <li>● Pension Wealth</li> </ul>		
Agricultural Policies in OECD Countries: At a Glance - 2004 Edition			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Producer Support Estimate (including market price support), General Services Support Estimate (including research and development etc.) and Consumer Support Estimate (including transfers from consumers, excess feed cost)</li> </ul>		