

# Transport Results Measurement



## ASIA REGION CONSULTATIVE WORKSHOP

Organised by:

Lanka Forum for Rural Transport and Development [LFRTD]

for

The World Bank

at

Marawila, Sri Lanka

April 22<sup>nd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> 2005

## Table of Contents

Para. No		Page No.
1.0	<b>INTRODUCTION: THE TRANSPORT SECTOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING INITIATIVE</b>	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>ASIA CONSULTATIVE WORKSHOP</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Purpose and Objectives	3
2.2	Structure of the Workshop.	3
3.0	<b>WORKSHOP OUTCOMES</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Performance measurement versus Impact measurement</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1.1	Performance measurement	3 – 4
3.1.2	Key observable trends in performance monitoring	4
3.1.3	Impact Monitoring	4
3.2	Institutional arrangements for Transport Results Measurement	4 - 5
3.3	Key audiences and clients for transport sector performance and impact indicators	5
4.0	<b>NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>6</b>

### Annexes

#### Presentations

<u>Annex No</u>	<u>Name of document</u>
1	<b>Keynote address by Jayaweera, Dr. Don. S, Secretary, Ministry of Transport, Sri Lanka</b>
2	<b>Opening Address by Roberts, Peter - World Bank TUDTR</b>
3	<b>Headline Indicators –Roberts, Peter – World Bank TUDTR</b>
4	<b>Transport Sector Performance Indicators: Sri Lanka Existing Situation – Kumrage. Prof. Amal S. - chairman national Transport Commission Sri Lanka</b>
5	<b>Focus Presentation on Indian Transport Scenario – Chandrasekhar, Prof. B.P. Director (Technical), NRRDA, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India</b>
6	<b>Transport Indicators 2005-Indonesia</b>
7	<b>Vietnam Presentation</b>
8	<b>Measurement does matter but do we measure what really matters? Insights for transport sector indicators efforts from public sector performance measurement literature – Barter, Dr. Paul A., LKY School of Public Policy National University of Singapore &amp; SUSTAN Asia</b>
9	<b>Performance Indicators for the Transport Sector – Chandrasekhar, Prof B.P., Director (Technical), NRRDA, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India</b>
10	<b>Transport Results: Indicators for Performance and Impact, what next? – Roberts, Peter - World Bank TUDTR</b>
11	<b>A View of Institutional Relationships for Transport Sector Data: The Experience of the Partnership for Sustainable Urban Transport in Asia – Huizenga, Cornie - Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities</b>
12	<b>Managing for Transport Sector Development Results - at Asian Development Bank - Widowati, Ms. Sri, ADB, Manila</b>
13	<b>Highlights from Transport – Fuel Conservation and Efficiency – Transport, Sri Lanka Ministry of</b>
14	<b>PMGSY - Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (Prime Minister’s Rural Roads Programme) – Kumar, S. Vijay - Joint Secretary, Govt. of India and Director-General, NRRDA</b>
15	<b>A view of Institutional Relationships – Case: Indonesia – Manullang, Dharma</b>
16	<b>Transport Sector Performance and Impact Indicators - A Nepalese Case Study - Shah, Neeraj - Senior Divisional Engineer, Ministry of Local Development, Department of Local Infrastructure Development and Agricultural Roads</b>
17	<b>A view of institutional relationships- case study for Sri Lanka – Transport, Sri Lanka Ministry of</b>

#### **Workshop programme, Breakout session inputs & outputs and participant list**

<u>Annex No</u>	<u>Name of document</u>
18	Workshop Programme
19	List of Participants

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION: THE TRANSPORT SECTOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING INITIATIVE

The World Bank is working with various partners and stakeholders to take stock of the measures and indicators which are used and applied for the key transport sub-sectors and for the sector as a whole. A consultative workshop for Asia region was organised by the Lanka Forum for Rural Transport and Development [LFRTD], International Forum for Rural transport and Development [IFRTD] and the Transport and Urban Division (TUDTR) of the World Bank. The programme for the workshop is at Annex 18. It brought together a total of 31 participants drawn from 6<sup>1</sup> countries and 6 regional and international institutions<sup>2</sup>. It was opened by Dr Jon Jayaweera, Secretary of the Ministry of Transport of Sri Lanka. The list of all participants is at Annex 21.

The workshop is part of ongoing stakeholder consultations, which aim at sharing current findings, broadening ownership of the initiative, and updating progress based on regional practices. A similar regional consultative workshop was held in Kenya in June 2004, bringing together participants from Eastern and Southern Africa. A workshop is planned for Francophone West Africa later in 2005.

The Transport Results Initiative is one of several World Bank activities, including the Infrastructure Action Plan, that aim to strengthen the commitment for collecting and maintaining accurate transport sector data at country and regional levels, in order to support evidence-based analysis and decision making. Indicators assist decision makers with diagnosis of problems, quantification of solutions, prognoses and provide a basis for evaluating progress.

Initial assessments of available transport sector data at the international level confirm significant gaps in relation to both the priority needs of countries and the expectations of development agencies. In absence of an international inter-governmental body with a specific mandate in transport and development, there is a risk of continued deterioration of global transport data-bases.

Thus, strengthening the transport sector data aims at meeting the demand for agencies interested in both performance and impacts of the sector at various levels. Improved practices in data collection and use will help improve the performance of transport infrastructure and services, the impact of investments on growth and poverty reduction, and the recognition of the role that transport plays in overall development.

So far, the World Bank initiative is working with international, regional and national partners to develop a framework that will ensure development of coherent measures at the following 3 levels.

- **Headline indicators:** An indicator to be used at global and national level, giving a composite overview of the key issues relating to transport impacts in development. The Rural Access indicator is the first headline that has so far been established.
- **Sector diagnostics:** These would describe important aspects of national transport.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sri Lanka (Ministry of Transport, Department of National Planning, Ports Authority, National Transport Commission, Centre for Poverty Analysis, ITDG South Asia and Lanka Forum on Rural Transport Development), Vietnam, Cambodia, India, Indonesia and Nepal.

<sup>2</sup> ILO, World Bank, SUSTRAN ASIA, ADB, SIDA and Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities.

- **Core measures:** These aim at establishing a consistent definition of key aspects of infrastructure and operations in each sub-sector. Core measures provide a sound basis for the diagnostics and headline indicators.

All the presentations delivered and the findings of the workshop sessions are attached at Annexes (See the list of annexes)

## **2.0 ASIA CONSULTATIVE WORKSHOP**

### **2.1 Purpose and Objectives**

The broad purpose of the workshop was to promote awareness among key stakeholders on the transport indicators initiative, and to invite contributions on how the process could be strengthened in a way that takes into account national priorities and long-term sustainability.

The specific objectives were:

- a) To identify critical issues for the Region relating to transport sector data.
- b) To analyse the sector data presently available in relation to national, regional and global priorities and identify shortfalls.
- c) Determine national and sub-national responsibilities and capacity to update, analyse and report transport sector statistics in a sustainable manner and the scope for strengthening capacity to improve and sustain the publication of national sector data.

### **2.2 Structure of the Workshop.**

The workshop was structured into two main blocks. The first block aimed at setting the context, focussing on the broad picture of key transport sector policy orientations, priorities areas in respective countries and institutions and key trends in transport performance and impact monitoring. The second block focussed on institutional arrangements and existing practices for data collection, storage, sharing and analysis and key constraints in the countries and institutions represented. Each block was further broken down into plenary presentations and breakout sessions to allow closer examination of specific issues.

## **3.0 WORKSHOP OUTCOMES**

### **3.1 Performance measurement versus Impact measurement**

#### **3.1.1 Performance measurement**

The workshop pointed out the need to ensure that transport results indicators pay explicit attention to both performance and impact dimensions. Performance indicators can be measured within the transport sub-sectors and would capture various dimensions of inputs and outputs such as financial aspects, physical infrastructure and assets, technical performance and institutional designs.

Impact indicators on the other hand would be based on wider context of development outside transport sector, covering such issues as environment, social impacts, micro and macro economy and political dimensions

It was generally observed that since the early 90's, public sector performance monitoring has had increasing influence from the business management principles. However, despite the value of this, there is a risk for public agencies to focus

narrowly on performance measurement based on outputs, rather than on the more complex process of measuring outcomes and impacts.

There is no established tradition of linking transport performance to impacts. This is due to the fact that transport is not an end in itself, but a means to achieve national and sub-national objectives, through other sectors. As a consequence, in many countries, transport considerations are often insufficiently reflected in national plans and development strategies. In effect, there is often a lack of indicators connecting transport with other forward looking strategies like the MDGs, PRS, and other national development plans.

It was noted that in many countries, development of tools for performance measurement has been slow and uneven, and where progress is being made, it is limited to small 'islands' of donor supported programmes. This often creates a disconnection between tools development and application. Furthermore, performance monitoring is rarely driven by the need to provide information to the public, but rather, to account to the donors and financiers of various programmes.

Performance monitoring is seldom comprehensive for the whole transport sector. The sector is fragmented into sub-sectors, infrastructure types and modes. There is no agency with an overall mandate to oversee and ensure the development of integrated sector wide transport policies and strategies, including objectives and measures of achievement. Different agencies apply performance monitoring for different topics with different objectives and different methodologies. A key objective of many sub-sector agencies is related to production or preservation of assets, rather than achievement of higher level socio-economic objectives

### **3.1.2 Key observable trends in performance monitoring**

Trends towards privatisation have affected monitoring, with increased emphasis on financial performance parameters. This can especially be observed in ports and airports, where growing competition has compelled tighter financial monitoring.

The effects of September 11 have also had a consequence on transport sector monitoring. There is more scrutiny of passengers and freight at airports, ports and cross-border crossing areas.

### **3.1.3 Impact Monitoring**

In general, the impact monitoring in transport is not well established. Where it is carried out, it is from the point of view of environment and safety issues. The transport sector needs to be more pro-active and to interface better to national development strategies.

Mechanisms to disseminate indicators reflecting desired outcomes are needed. These need to be developed together with all the different stakeholders as a tool to stimulate improvement rather than to defend the status quo.

## **3.2 Institutional arrangements for Transport Results Measurement**

A key question here was whether there were any examples of institutional arrangements that yielded good results measurement practices. In general, it was observed that no country had a coherent system linking transport data across all the sub-sectors, and interfacing these with data from other sectors to which transport is an essential input.

Participants debated the need for a central co-ordinating agency that would take leadership in management of transport sector data, and the development of indicators. But there were questions about whether this is a role that could be played by an agency within the transport sector and what the incentive for results measurement would be for the sector.

Other autonomous institutional models for carrying out results measurement were also proposed, especially in order to ensure rigour, transparency and neutrality of the system. In particular, results measurement was seen as a dimension of governance that would ensure public interests are safeguarded and promoted. Thus, it would be important to consider an arrangement that ensured independence and represented key development interests.

Often, lack of systematised results based performance measurement is attributed to lack of resources to do so. How can transport agencies be convinced to integrate results measurement as normal and routine as financial auditing? Is there evidence that the “efficiency and effectiveness” gains from a result based system would eventually justify the costs?

### 3.3 Key audiences and clients for transport sector performance and impact indicators

As noted from previous discussions, performance monitoring is generally a more established practice than impact monitoring. Participants pointed out that

While it may not be possible to make clear-cut distinctions between clients for performance data as compared to impact data, some generalisations can be made. The table below gives an overview of the relative value that various stakeholders attach to performance and impact indicators, on a score of 1-3, where 3 represents the higher value.

In general, key audiences for performance indicators include providers of transport services, infrastructure development agencies, budgetary/financing agencies, and users of services. Impact indicators on the other hand are of interest to planning co-ordination ministries, issue based civil society and public watch dogs, academia, and people affected positively and or negatively by transport sector impacts.

Stakeholders	Performance	Impact
<b>Users of services and infrastructure</b>		
Passengers	1	3
Freighters/Haulers	1	3
Other Users	1	3
Consumer	2	2
<b>Special interests groups /Civil Society</b>		
Community Groups	1	3
Issue based NGOs	2	2
Media	2	2
<b>Investors</b>		
Tax Payers	2	3
Foreign	3	1
Domestic	3	1
<b>Operators of transport services</b>		
Public Sector	3	1
Private Sector	3	1
Informal Sector	3	0
Logistics	3	1

<b>Managers</b>		
Ministry of Finance	2	2
Ministry of Transport (Planning/Strategy)	3	3
Ministry Sub-sectors in transport	3	1
Ministry Dependent on transport Performance (Agriculture, Industry...)	2	2
<b>National Decision Makers – Political</b>	1	3

#### 4.0 NEXT STEPS

In concluding the workshop there was strong support from the participants for the objectives and approach of the Transport Results Initiative. From the World Bank perspective, the next stages will focus on key areas as follows;

- **Resource Development.** Develop information resources to enable wider sharing of current definitions for core and sector diagnostics. This will help identify gaps and redundancies, establish review and updating mechanisms. 'Transport Results Measurement' CD-ROM has been sent to all participants – this contains all the core measures and diagnostics which have been developed under the Initiative.
- **Sharing Results.** The CD also includes completed and interim outputs which have been developed in each of the Regions on the basis of the above resources; provide the opportunity for learning from the different approaches, to compare findings and establish benchmarks; identify resources for capacity building.
- **Headline Indicators:** To establish Urban Mobility and others; to extend the Rural Access indicator beyond the current 45 countries (35 of them IDA-eligible), to carry out further work on validation, and to establish the inclusion of relevant questions in routine household surveys.
- **International Partnerships:** broad consultation and communication will continue; strengthened cooperation is essential for the success of the initiative - GTZ, ICAO, IDB, IRF, Japan, UK and WHO have already provided or committed support; other have expressed interest in the Initiative, including: ADB, ADF, CAI, Danida, European Union, KfW SIDA, UIC, UITP and UN Habitat.