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You may recall that a few weeks ago, you kindly sent me three documents from the OECD on tied aid, which I have found very helpful for the WDR's analysis of aid to infrastructure. I have some specific questions about the report entitled "Recent Trends in Tied Aid: Note by the Secretariat", Working Party on Financial Aspects of Development Assistance, numbered DCD/DAC/FA (92) 5, draft dated 16 October, 1992. Can you refer me to the author, or somebody who might be familiar with the data used in some of the tables? Thank you again.
TO: Alberto Harth
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: Further to invitations to Paris consultation

We had communicated a couple weeks’ ago about a meeting we are planning in Paris to obtain feedback on the draft WDR, and I had asked you for suggested participants from your countries. Some further developments have changed the agenda slightly.

The meeting is now two days: February 3 will be on the draft (YC) WDR; February 4 will be on the Infrastructure Sector Review and will be a discussion of the operational implications of the WDR's and Sector Review's common messages, for the Bank and other donor activities in these sectors.

We are sending out the letters of invitation this week. I need to know whether you want to have either Minister Kpatoukpa or Gon Coulibaly receive an invitation. It hinges on their ability to read both documents in English (drafts will be sent to participants about 10 days before the meeting), and to follow the discussion in English. If participants want to present oral or written comments in French, that is acceptable since close to half of the participants (predominantly donors and NGOs) will probably understand French themselves, but we will not have simultaneous translation available.

THank you.

CC: EDUARDO LOCATELLI
CC: ROBERT CALDERISI
CC: JACQUES DANIEL
CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: November 12, 1993 12:21pm

TO: IAN HUME

FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR

EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: WDR - Invitation to Liberadzki

Ian - Let me explain the inquiry from Michael Geller regarding Mr. Boguslaw Liberadzki.

We are planning a consultation meeting on February 3 in Paris to discuss the yellow cover draft of the WDR (which focuses on infrastructure) with representatives of donor agencies, EC/OECD multilaterals, NGOs, and a number of senior government officials from our client countries. This type of consultation was conducted for the first time last year, and was well received. I asked the Regional SODs for suggestions, and both Hans Apitz and Tony Pellegrini suggested Mr. Liberadzki. We will pay for his travel and subsistence.

I am preparing the invitation letter, and needed confirmation of his title and address. I will of course copy the letter to you; or if you prefer, the letter can be sent to you to convey to him. Many thanks and best regards.

Christine

CC: Michael Geller
(CC: MICHAEL GELLER )

CC: WDR Files
(CC: WDR FILES )

CC: Institutional ISC Files
(CC: INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
TO: Alberto Harth
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR
EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: participants at WDR Paris Consultation

Alberto -
Eduardo Locatelli and I spoke this morning about Minister Kpatoukpa as a possible participant at this meeting, and Eduardo confirmed that his English is not good enough for him to participate without an interpreter. I asked Greg about this, and he feels we should not provide this, since the minister is the only candidate who is in this situation among the list of invitees we have collected. If it would help to ease the awkwardness of taking back the invitation, we would be happy to ask him to be an early "reader" of the draft and give us comments.

You had mentioned other candidates from your region, such as Gon Coulibaly. We would still be happy to have someone come whom you would designate--and we would need to take you up on your offer to pay the travel and subsistence.
I am planning to send the letters out next week. Thanks for your interest and help in this.

CC: EDUARDO LOCATELLI
CC: ROBERT CALDERISI
CC: Bernard Peccoud
CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: November 10, 1993 09:54am

TO: Sarwar Lateef
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR
EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: RE: WDR 1994

Sarwar - the reason to leave off the Japanese is that there is a parallel meeting in Tokyo on Feb 7, organized by the Japan Development Bank, that will include not only official Japanese aid of course, but also AsiaDB. By the same token, we propose to leave out AIDB and USAID in Paris, because we can meet with them here.

CC: Institutional ISC Files
CC: Sonia Benavides-Paz
The World Bank/IFC/MIGA
OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 10, 1993 09:51am

TO: Sarwar Lateef (SARWAR LATEEF)

FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR (CHRISTINE KESSIDES)

EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: RE: WDR 1994

Please add Canada (CIDA) to the list of bilateral aid agencies Sarwar gave you. Thank you very much.

CC: Institutional ISC Files (INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES)
CC: Sonia Benavides-Paz (SONIA BENAVIDES PAZ)
CC: Alexander Shakow (ALEXANDER SHAKOW)
CC: HANS WYSS (HANS WYSS @A1@PARIS)
CC: JULIAN GRENFELL (JULIAN GRENFELL @A1@PARIS)
Dominique - Regarding your concern that we appear to be inviting only "token" representation of clients in the WDR consultation meeting, we certainly want to avoid this but please consider the following.

We do have two real budget constraints of our own: one of money and one of time. Especially since we face at present a prospective 15% overrun on PUB's initial estimates of publication costs, over which we have little control, we cannot envisage paying to bring to Paris a sufficient group of borrowers (20-30?) to qualify as a truly representative sounding of their views. Note that no previous WDR, including the 92 or 93, has attempted to conduct borrower consultations on any such scale. Last year's WDR did hold quite a few meetings with various international health interest groups, donors, research institutes, etc., but these included a small minority of LDC health officials (e.g., 12 out of 71 participants in their Paris consultation); this was all paid by external funds. My EM to you suggested doubling the number of borrowers to 8 in our Paris meeting if we can get funding for them, and since some other regional units have already proposed possibilities for this it looks like we may be able to get 10-12 borrower participants out of about 40.

The time constraint between the YC review and preparation of the Green cover is extremely tight (not to mention the time spent now on the logistics of arranging international consultations). We are holding a parallel meeting in Tokyo on Feb. 7, and in response to OPRIE's concern that we get more NGO inputs, we will add a meeting in Washington with some NGOs which will not have any additional cost to us.

The dilemma is that if we attempt to do any external consultation at all, everyone's expectations rise and we can never appear to be doing enough. The WDR's schedule and budget have not been set to allow for any explicit consultation process, and certainly not more than we have planned here.

As noted above, if more country participants can be brought to Paris at no additional cost to us, it is not too late to adjust the list of proposed invitees from some of the other groups to accommodate them. But we will have to know in the next few days.

Regards,

Christine
The World Bank/IFC/MIGA
OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 3, 1993 12:37pm
TO: See Distribution Below
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: WDR consultation - Paris

Regarding the attached, I would appreciate any suggestions you can make especially concerning representatives from the Africa/ECA/MENA regions. We would like to invite up to 8 participants from borrowing countries but our budget can only cover about 4, so we would need suggestions as to other sources of travel funds for them.
It would be helpful if you would also suggest individuals from the non-borrower groups listed below who should be invited. We would also welcome participation by yourselves or your staff if you can fit this into your schedules.
Could you send your replies by next Monday, Nov. 8? Thank you.

DISTRIBUTION:
TO: Stephen Weissman
TO: Maryvonne Plessis-Fraissard
TO: Phyllis Pomerantz
TO: Jonathan Brown
TO: Dominique Lallement
TO: A. Amir Al-Khafaji
CC: Gregory Ingram
CC: Institutional ISC Files
As has been the practice for the last couple of years, we are planning to hold a consultative meeting early next year with donor counterparts on the yellow cover draft of the WDR. This EM is to request your advice regarding whom to invite. We would also welcome your own participation at the meeting.

The meeting would be intended to obtain feedback from the participants on a draft of the WDR which they will have received about 12 days earlier. (The internal Bank review of the yellow cover is scheduled for February 1.) The date we have reserved (at the Paris office) is Friday, February 4; this is the only date that fits into our tight schedule -- connecting to a similar consultation in Tokyo on the following Monday. The Tokyo meeting would involve participants with an East Asia or South Asia focus, and we are also thinking to include Latin America in that meeting (we have some funding from the Japanese to help with travel).

Our idea for the Paris meeting is to invite about 35-40 representatives from the following groups:

i) bilateral aid agencies (US, UK, France, Canada, Germany, plus Nordics, Swiss and Dutch; Japanese could wait for the Tokyo meeting)

ii) other multilateral institutions (including EBRD, EIB, AfDB, IDB, UNDP, UNCHS/Habitat, EC and OECD)

iii) certain professional or industry associations, provided they are not narrow "lobbyists" (possibly International Telecommunications Union, others as you would advise)

iv) NGOs, foundations, environmental and consumer representatives - there is an enormous potential list of such groups, so your guidance is especially needed here

v) academics (2-3)

vi) commercial finance institutions

vii) about 3 representatives (e.g. Ministers of Public Works) of borrowing country governments - for this meeting, from Africa, North Africa/Middle East, and/or East/Central Europe. We could, alternatively, seek a much larger contingent of developing country representatives to balance the donors at the meeting, but we are limited by funding. We will expect the above groups to finance themselves, and only have enough of our own budget to pay for 2-3 borrower representatives and the 2-3 WDR participants. If you have views on the issue of whether to invite more
borrowers, and ideas about how to fund them, please let us know.

We would like to notify participants about the meeting no later than the first week of November, so we need to draw up a list of potential invitees very soon. We would very much appreciate your suggestions. The individuals should be representatives of their organizations who are knowledgeable about, and even responsible for, activities in any of the infrastructure sectors. (Recall that for the WDR, infrastructure includes transport, power, telecoms, water and sanitation, with both a rural and urban focus.) We would particularly appreciate being directed to individuals whom you know could serve as informed and constructive discussants of the WDR, since we would like to ask some participants in advance to prepare a critique to present at the sessions.

We look forward to your suggestions. I will follow this EM with a call to each of you next week to discuss and compare lists of possible invitees.

DISTRIBUTION:

TO: Michael Cohen
TO: Karl Jechoutek
TO: Ali Sabeti
TO: Sarwar Lateef
TO: Timothy Cullen
TO: John Briscoe
TO: Zmarak Shalizi
CC: Richard Stern
CC: Louis Poulilquen
CC: Magdi Iskander
CC: HANS WYSS
CC: Gregory Ingram
CC: WDR Files
CC: Institutional ISC Files

(MICHAEL COHEN )
(KARL JECHOUTEK )
(ALI SABETI )
(SARWAR LATEEF )
(TIMOTHY CULLEN )
(JOHN BRISCOE )
(ZMARAK SHALIZI )
(RICHARD STERN )
(LOUIS POULIQUE )
(MAGDI R. ISKANDER )
(HANS WYSS @A1@PARIS )
(GREGORY INGRAM )
(WDR FILES )
(INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
Following our conversation this morning, I discussed with Greg what strategy we should take to get more consultation with NGOs (remembering that this WDR involves both poverty and environment issues). He prefers the following combination:
a) the Paris consultation as currently planned, to involve the several European "umbrella" NGOs you mentioned,
b) a meeting of Washington-based NGOs as you suggested in late January (after our yellow cover goes to the print shop and before we leave for Paris - this is the comfortable window for an additional meeting), and
c) we may consider also using the occasion of the March meeting of the NGO advisory group, but that appears less desirable because it is too late for us to incorporate many comments (and you mentioned that the group is not enthusiastic to add the WDR to its agenda). By when would we have to decide this?
Greg does not want to try to mount an additional NGO-only meeting in Europe because we will be very pressed for time in February. The Tokyo consultation covering Asia and LAC (analogous to the Paris one) is also expected to involve a few NGOs, based in that part of the world or LAC.

We would need your guidance regarding the most representative NGOs to include in the Paris (and Tokyo) meetings, as well as whom to invite to the Washington meeting. To keep down the overall numbers in Paris, it also makes most sense for us to meet with USAID and IADB in Washington, so perhaps we could include them with the NGOs here unless that would be counterproductive in your view.

For the Washington meeting of NGOs, how much assistance could we expect from your unit in organization? Sending out invitations to your list is not a big deal for us to do, but since you have more experience with running these consultations it might help if you "facilitate" it.
As you know, we on the WDR have been trying to get together data on performance indicators for infrastructure. Whereas we started with a large "wish list" to cover major performance issues (operational and financial efficiency, capacity utilization, condition of assets, and service quality), what we have managed to assemble is a short list of only a few such indicators, on which we have gotten a reasonable sample of cross-country data for some of the subsectors. Our researcher, Kavita Mathur, has been in touch with some of you for these data.

I will send you later today a copy of a few pages of summary indicators, on which I would like your advice and comment. The tables show averages for regional and income groups; a list of the countries is attached, but we have not included the raw data. One question is that some of the averages appear rather anomalous, which may reflect outliers or even errors in the data. There do exist some additional indicators from the same sources, as you know well, but we have selected only the ones shown initially, since these seemed to be the most significant and representative for our purposes.

What we need to know, before we use these in our draft text, is:

a) do you see anything that looks patently wrong or implausible in the averages?

b) are these the best available quantitative indicators we could have used to represent the respective areas of performance -- if you think not, can you suggest specific sources of other indicators? (We will, of course, be including anecdotal evidence in the text as well.)

c) for these specific indicators, what in your judgement is the "benchmark" or norm of "good performance", against which we should measure the values for the respective countries represented?

I expect that it would take only a few minutes for you to go through these tables for your respective sector. Please call me or Kavita Mathur (or better, send an EM) to give your reactions. Can we trust these kinds of data much for our analysis? Are they
helpful or more misleading? Should we be trying to present these data differently to elicit their meaning? We would appreciate your guidance before we go farther and more public with analysis based on this.

It would be especially helpful to hear from you by early next week if possible. Thank you.

DISTRIBUTION:

TO: Lou Thompson
TO: Mike Garn
TO: Bjorn Wellenius
TO: Jamshid Heidarian
CC: WDR Files
CC: Kavita Mathur
CC: Julie Fraser
CC: John Besant-Jones
CC: Ritu Basu
CC: Institutional ISC Files

( LOU THOMPSON )
( MIKE GARN )
( BJORN WELLENIUS )
( JAMSHID HEIDARIAN )
( WDR FILES )
( KAVITA MATHUR )
( JULIE FRASER )
( JOHN BESANT-JONES )
( RITU BASU )
( INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
As we discussed, this is what I have requested as a "box" for the WDR. What I need is a specific illustration of the problem of labor redundancy in the restructuring/privatization of infrastructure, and how it can be dealt with. The example of Argentina railways is good both because it is a dramatically big case, (considered successful, I presume?), and because the Bank was involved in an innovative way. I would like 250-750 words (1-3 double-spaced pages) describing:

the extent/nature of the labor redundancy problem that existed in the railway(s);  
the various mechanisms used to deal with it (e.g., voluntary attrition, early retirement, etc., if relevant, but with at least half of the text explaining how Bank assistance was designed to help);  
evaluation of the apparent effectiveness of this (what was magnitude of labor shed -- was much of it hired back later? were there efforts to make sure that the best labor was not lost? how were workers prepared for this event? how long did it take? were there other sources of external financing);  
You may also include some references to labor shedding/severance schemes done in other infrastructure sectors in Argentina -- or for that matter, if you want to compare and contrast with other infrastructure restructurings in other countries you know, that is even better.  

Thank you very much (if the text is closer to 3 pages, it would help to send it on diskette, or attach it to an EM than can be down-loaded into the PC). If it is easier to put in a few extra paragraphs rather than meet the precise word length, that is OK, I can edit it later.
DATE: October 28, 1993 10:28am

TO: See Distribution Below

FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR

EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: WDR Paris Review

Regarding the attached message, I would be grateful for any suggestions you can give regarding (especially) a few participants from the Africa/ECA/MENA regions, as well as representatives from the non-borrower groups that you think would be good to invite to this meeting.

Since we are limited on budget for the borrowers, if you have ideas as to how their travel might be funded, that would help.

We would also welcome participation by yourselves or staff members you might wish to designate.

Could you send your replies by about next Tuesday (Nov 2) if possible? Thanks you very much.

DISTRIBUTION:

TO: Alastair J. McKechnie
TO: Anthony Pellegrini
TO: Ricardo A. Halperin
TO: Hans J. Apitz
TO: Alberto Harth
TO: James Wright
TO: Peter Watson
TO: Jean Doyen
CC: Institutional ISC Files
As has been the practice for the last couple of years, we are planning to hold a consultative meeting early next year with donor counterparts on the yellow cover draft of the WDR. This EM is to request your advice regarding whom to invite. We would also welcome your own participation at the meeting.

The meeting would be intended to obtain feedback from the participants on a draft of the WDR which they will have received about 12 days earlier. (The internal Bank review of the yellow cover is scheduled for February 1.) The date we have reserved (at the Paris office) is Friday, February 4; this is the only date that fits into our tight schedule -- connecting to a similar consultation in Tokyo on the following Monday. The Tokyo meeting would involve participants with an East Asia or South Asia focus, and we are also thinking to include Latin America in that meeting (we have some funding from the Japanese to help with travel).

Our idea for the Paris meeting is to invite about 35-40 representatives from the following groups:

i) bilateral aid agencies (US, UK, France, Canada, Germany, plus Nordics, Swiss and Dutch; Japanese could wait for the Tokyo meeting)

ii) other multilateral institutions (including EBRD, EIB, AfDB, IDB, UNDP, UNCHS/Habitat, EC and OECD)

iii) certain professional or industry associations, provided they are not narrow "lobbyists" (possibly International Telecommunications Union, others as you would advise)

iv) NGOs, foundations, environmental and consumer representatives - there is an enormous potential list of such groups, so your guidance is especially needed here

v) academics (2-3)

vi) commercial finance institutions

vii) about 3 representatives (e.g. Ministers of Public Works) of borrowing country governments - for this meeting, from Africa, North Africa/Middle East, and/or East/Central Europe. We could, alternatively, seek a much larger contingent of developing country representatives to balance the donors at the meeting, but we are limited by funding. We will expect the above groups to finance themselves, and only have enough of our own budget to pay for 2-3 borrower representatives and the 2-3 WDR participants.

If you have views on the issue of whether to invite more
borrowers, and ideas about how to fund them, please let us know.

We would like to notify participants about the meeting no later than the first week of November, so we need to draw up a list of potential invitees very soon. We would very much appreciate your suggestions. The individuals should be representatives of their organizations who are knowledgeable about, and even responsible for, activities in any of the infrastructure sectors. (Recall that for the WDR, infrastructure includes transport, power, telecoms, water and sanitation, with both a rural and urban focus.) We would particularly appreciate being directed to individuals whom you know could serve as informed and constructive discussants of the WDR, since we would like to ask some participants in advance to prepare a critique to present at the sessions.

We look forward to your suggestions. I will follow this EM with a call to each of you next week to discuss and compare lists of possible invitees.

DISTRIBUTION:
TO: Michael Cohen
TO: Karl Jechoutek
TO: Ali Sabeti
TO: Sarwar Lateef
TO: Timothy Cullen
TO: John Briscoe
TO: Zmarak Shalizi
CC: Richard Stern
CC: Louis Poulquen
CC: Magdi Iskander
CC: HANS WYSS
CC: Gregory Ingram
CC: WDR Files
CC: Institutional ISC Files

( MICHAEL COHEN )
( KARL JECHOUTEK )
( ALI SABETI )
( SARWAR LATEEF )
( TIMOTHY CULLEN )
( JOHN BRISCOE )
( ZMARAK SHALIZI )
( RICHARD STERN )
( LOUIS POULQUEN )
( MAGDI R. ISKANDER )
( HANS WYSS @A1@PARIS )
( GREGORY INGRAM )
( WDR FILES )
( INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
DATE: October 28, 1993 10:18am

TO: See Distribution Below

FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR

EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: Follow-up - WDR Paris meeting

This is a reminder of the attached request. Do you have any suggestions? Thanks in advance.

DISTRIBUTION:

TO: Ali Sabeti
TO: Timothy Cullen
TO: Zmarak Shalizi
TO: Arturo Israel
CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: October 19, 1993 11:35am EST
TO: See Distribution Below
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR (CHRISTINE KESSIDES)
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: Paris Meeting on WDR Draft

As has been the practice for the last couple of years, we are planning to hold a consultative meeting early next year with donor counterparts on the yellow cover draft of the WDR. This EM is to request your advice regarding whom to invite. We would also welcome your own participation at the meeting.

The meeting would be intended to obtain feedback from the participants on a draft of the WDR which they will have received about 12 days earlier. (The internal Bank review of the yellow cover is scheduled for February 1.) The date we have reserved (at the Paris office) is Friday, February 4; this is the only date that fits into our tight schedule -- connecting to a similar consultation in Tokyo on the following Monday. The Tokyo meeting would involve participants with an East Asia or South Asia focus, and we are also thinking to include Latin America in that meeting (we have some funding from the Japanese to help with travel).

Our idea for the Paris meeting is to invite about 35-40 representatives from the following groups:

i) bilateral aid agencies (US, UK, France, Canada, Germany, plus Nordics, Swiss and Dutch; Japanese could wait for the Tokyo meeting)
ii) other multilateral institutions (including EBRD, EIB, AfDB, IDB, UNDP, UNCHS/Habitat, EC and OECD)
iii) certain professional or industry associations, provided they are not narrow "lobbyists" (possibly International Telecommunications Union, others as you would advise)
iv) NGOs, foundations, environmental and consumer representatives - there is an enormous potential list of such groups, so your guidance is especially needed here
v) academics (2-3)
vii) commercial finance institutions
vii) about 3 representatives (e.g. Ministers of Public Works) of borrowing country governments - for this meeting, from Africa, North Africa/Middle East, and/or East/Central Europe. We could, alternatively, seek a much larger contingent of developing country representatives to balance the donors at the meeting, but we are limited by funding. We will expect the above groups to finance themselves, and only have enough of our own budget to pay for 2-3 borrower representatives and the 2-3 WDR participants. If you have views on the issue of whether to invite more
borrowers, and ideas about how to fund them, please let us know.

We would like to notify participants about the meeting no later than the first week of November, so we need to draw up a list of potential invitees very soon. We would very much appreciate your suggestions. The individuals should be representatives of their organizations who are knowledgeable about, and even responsible for, activities in any of the infrastructure sectors. (Recall that for the WDR, infrastructure includes transport, power, telecoms, water and sanitation, with both a rural and urban focus.) We would particularly appreciate being directed to individuals whom you know could serve as informed and constructive discussants of the WDR, since we would like to ask some participants in advance to prepare a critique to present at the sessions.

We look forward to your suggestions. I will follow this EM with a call to each of you next week to discuss and compare lists of possible invitees.

DISTRIBUTION:

TO: Michael Cohen
TO: Karl Jechoutek
TO: Ali Sabeti
TO: Sarwar Lateef
TO: Timothy Cullen
TO: John Briscoe
TO: Zmarak Shalizi
CC: Richard Stern
CC: Louis Pouliquen
CC: Magdi Iskander
CC: HANS WYSS
CC: Gregory Ingram
CC: WDR Files
CC: Institutional ISC Files
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(GREGORY INGRAM)
(WDR FILES)
(INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES)
As has been the practice for the last couple of years, we are planning to hold a consultative meeting early next year with donor counterparts on the yellow cover draft of the WDR. This EM is to request your advice regarding whom to invite. We would also welcome your own participation at the meeting.

The meeting would be intended to obtain feedback from the participants on a draft of the WDR which they will have received about 12 days earlier. (The internal Bank review of the yellow cover is scheduled for February 1.) The date we have reserved (at the Paris office) is Friday, February 4; this is the only date that fits into our tight schedule -- connecting to a similar consultation in Tokyo on the following Monday. The Tokyo meeting would involve participants with an East Asia or South Asia focus, and we are also thinking to include Latin America in that meeting (we have some funding from the Japanese to help with travel).

Our idea for the Paris meeting is to invite about 35-40 representatives from the following groups:

i) bilateral aid agencies (US, UK, France, Canada, Germany, plus Nordics, Swiss and Dutch; Japanese could wait for the Tokyo meeting)

ii) other multilateral institutions (including EBRD, EIB, AfDB, IDB, UNDP, UNCHS/Habitat, EC and OECD)

iii) certain professional or industry associations, provided they are not narrow "lobbyists" (possibly International Telecommunications Union, others as you would advise)

iv) NGOs, foundations, environmental and consumer representatives - there is an enormous potential list of such groups, so your guidance is especially needed here

v) academics (2-3)

vi) commercial finance institutions

vii) about 3 representatives (e.g. Ministers of Public Works) of borrowing country governments - for this meeting, from Africa, North Africa/Middle East, and/or East/Central Europe. We could, alternatively, seek a much larger contingent of developing country representatives to balance the donors at the meeting, but we are limited by funding. We will expect the above groups to finance themselves, and only have enough of our own budget to pay for 2-3 borrower representatives and the 2-3 WDR participants. If you have views on the issue of whether to invite more
borrowers, and ideas about how to fund them, please let us know.

We would like to notify participants about the meeting no later than the first week of November, so we need to draw up a list of potential invitees very soon. We would very much appreciate your suggestions. The individuals should be representatives of their organizations who are knowledgeable about, and even responsible for, activities in any of the infrastructure sectors. (Recall that for the WDR, infrastructure includes transport, power, telecoms, water and sanitation, with both a rural and urban focus.) We would particularly appreciate being directed to individuals whom you know could serve as informed and constructive discussants of the WDR, since we would like to ask some participants in advance to prepare a critique to present at the sessions.

We look forward to your suggestions. I will follow this EM with a call to each of you next week to discuss and compare lists of possible invitees.
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DATE: September 24, 1993 05:07pm

TO: ETIENNE LINARD

FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR

EXT.: 33945

SUBJECT: WDR information request

In connection with preparation of the 1994 WDR on infrastructure, I had asked Mr. Srinivasan for some advice regarding relevant procurement issues. He has suggested that I obtain through you some recent work by OECD/DAC on the question of direct aid driven by additionality of exports, and a recent convention or other agreement among the donors related to this matter. He said that some empirical evidence that has been collected and analytical writings on this issue.

I would very much appreciate if you would send me a copy of whatever material you have on this. If you need further specification of what should be included, he has suggested that you ask him for clarification. Please send the document(s) to me, however. My fax number is 202-676-0652 and my room number is T-7105. Thank you.

CC: Raghavan Srinivasan

CC: Institutional ISC Files
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---

The item(s) identified above has/have been removed in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information. This Policy can be found on the World Bank Access to Information website.

**Withdrawn by**
Chandra Kumar

**Date**
05-May-15
DATE: September 9, 1993 02:34pm

TO: Hakan Hallen

FROM: Gregory Ingram, WDR

EXT.: 31052

SUBJECT: Release Date for Ms. Rhoda Blade-Charest

This is to confirm that I have agreed to release Ms. Rhoda Blade-Charest from her responsibilities at the World Development Report at close of business on September 17, 1993 so that she can take up her new responsibilities in Legal on September 20, 1993.

My agreement on this early release date has been conditional on the willingness of all parties concerned to have Ms. Blade-Charest be available to work a few hours per month overtime at the WDR over the coming months.

CC: Catherine Cardona

CC: Rhoda Blade Charest

CC: Trinidad Angeles

CC: Cleone Hoover

CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: September 7, 1993 11:20am
TO: See Distribution Below
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR (CHRISTINE KESSIDES)
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: Information request for WDR

This is a request for your guidance and assistance in developing some of the detailed sectoral/subsectoral content for the treatment of two important topics in the '94 WDR: (a) maintenance and (b) technology. Below are summarized very briefly some issues which we think the WDR should address and illustrate -- if possible, given the constraints of time and easily available information. What we would appreciate from you is:

- your reactions as to whether the following are points on these two topics we should try to cover in the WDR (are they the right ones (or please suggest others), and is it practical to deal with them);
- directions to reference people or written materials, including both examples and analysis in country project/sector work and outside (non-Bank) research;
- if there are questions which are not immediately answerable, but could be with some very specific data analysis or literature review (NOTE: to be useful for us, we need inputs by mid-November at the latest), keep in mind that we have some limited budget remaining for short-term consultants; or we could assign a couple weeks of research assistants' time if that is a solution.

MAINTENANCE:

How Critical is Timing and Consistency of Maintenance?

In addition to generally indicating the scope and magnitude of the undermaintenance problem in most countries (for which country examples and box material are most welcome), the WDR should explain if possible the specific nature of maintenance issues in each sector/subsector. You may recall, for example, the Road Maintenance Policy Paper in 1988 which presented evidence that the physical deterioration profile of roads is nonlinear - i.e., if $X$ of annual maintenance expenditure is deferred for (say) 5 years, then it is not possible to catch up with expenditure of $5X$ in the sixth year, but rather some multiple (greater than unity) of $5X$ is required because the deterioration of the road will have accelerated after some point of neglect. A basic question is whether such nonlinearity of physical deterioration of the assets, due to deferred maintenance, is known to exist in
other subsectors.

The Trade-Off between Maintenance and New Investment -

The Road Maintenance Policy Paper also had some powerful illustrations of the $ amount of expenditure on rehabilitation needed because of $ in neglected and deferred maintenance. Are there good similar illustrations of this in other subsectors, either for a region as a whole, or even for individual countries?

Similarly, can you suggest examples to show instances where $X in new investment could have been delayed or deferred with $Y in maintenance (and perhaps better operation) to keep up an adequate capacity utilization of the existing facilities (or cite comparison in physical units rather than currency values if easier).

We realize that there have been such examples in some Bank studies already published; if possible, we would like to find new and better (e.g., more comprehensive) examples if there are any. What we are looking for is quantifiable evidence of the trade-offs between maintenance and investment in your sector. If we must settle for anecdotes, we would prefer ones that have not been published before.

Gross vs. Net Capital Stocks -
Are there countries where estimates have been made of the differences between the accumulation of gross capital stocks (from new investment) and what actually exists net of premature depreciation due to inadequate maintenance? For example, if inventories of the condition of facilities have been made indicating that despite so many kms of new roads or pipelines, x kms have been lost due to deterioration that could have been avoided with appropriate maintenance (E.g., somebody has suggested comparing Zaire's road and waterway facilities at independence with those at present to illustrate differences between gross and net expansion of usable capacity. Any reactions or other suggestions?)

Impact on users of unreliable service -
Related to poor maintenance (and to inadequate O&M overall), do you know of data sources on indicators of service quality (that is, services as received and perceived by users), or evidence of how users are coping with poor service (such as provided by Kyu Sik Lee research on Nigeria)? As you know, performance indicators are spotty even for basic system coverage and efficiency variables in most of these subsectors, but tend to be very sparse for service quality. Preferably, we would like some cross-country data but new anecdotes would be useful too.

TECNOLOGY:
Appropriate Technology -
A number of reviewers of our draft outline suggested that we should revisit the question of what technological options in each subsector are more "appropriate" for some developing countries. "Appropriate" should mean not only with lower capital and/or maintenance costs, but also implementable by weak institutions, and conducive to involvement by private entrepreneurs and communities themselves. How much do we know about such options, and can you suggest ongoing illustrations?

Future Technological Developments -
Apart from the technological changes of the past decade or so which are already fairly widely in practice even in developing countries (e.g. in telecoms), are there foreseeable technological innovations in your subsector(s) which are worthy of note in the WDR -- new developments that are close enough on the horizon (at least for the more advanced developing countries) so that we should mention their possible implications? Again, the aspects driving our interest in them would be their potential impact on improving productivity and reducing costs; allowing for easier implementation by relatively weak institutions; increasing the scope for competition, or reducing the minimum economic scale of production; and/or making maintenance easier and cheaper.

I would be grateful if you could let me know by about Sept. 15 if, and in what way, your unit might be able to help us, and who you would designate as a follow-up contact. I would be happy to discuss our interests and needs in more detail.

DISTRIBUTION:
TO: Guillermo Yepes-WSS
TO: Kenneth Gwilliam-Transport
TO: Herve Plusquellec-Irrigation
TO: Karl Jechoutek-Power
TO: Ali Sabeti-Telecoms
CC: Gregory Ingram
CC: John Briscoe
CC: Mike Garn
CC: Lou Thompson
CC: John Flora
CC: David Steeds
CC: Louis Pouliquen
CC: Institutional ISC Files
CC: Institutional ISC Files

( GUILLERMO YEPES )
( KENNETH GWILLIAM )
( HERVE PLUSQUELLEC )
( KARL JECHOUTEK )
( ALI SABETI )
( GREGORY INGRAM )
( JOHN BRISCOE )
( MIKE GARN )
( LOU THOMPSON )
( JOHN FLORA )
( DAVID STEEDS )
( LOUIS POULIQUEN )
( INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
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DATE:  September 7, 1993  11:52am  
TO:  Ian Heggie  ( IAN HEGGIE )
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR  ( CHRISTINE KESSIDES )
EXT.:  33945
SUBJECT:  Inputs to WDR

Ian - I am forwarding to you the attached request for some sectoral information of use to the WDR; for convenience I am asking Ken Gwilliam as first "port of call" in transport, but I hope you can provide some advice on these questions as well. Box material is needed even if data are scarce.

On a specific point, it has been suggested by others (e.g. Snorri Halgrimsson) that the Sub-Saharan Africa Road Transport Initiative would be an excellent case study to illustrate stakeholder influence in road maintenance. Kavita Sethi in AF4IN has also proposed the Ghana Road Maintenance Fund as a positive example. What are your views on the desirability of one or both examples - and if the former, who should write it up?

Thanks a lot - Christine

CC:  Institutional ISC Files  ( INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
CC:  Institutional ISC Files  ( INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
This is a request for your guidance and assistance in developing some of the detailed sectoral/subsectoral content for the treatment of two important topics in the '94 WDR: (a) maintenance and (b) technology. Below are summarized very briefly some issues which we think the WDR should address and illustrate -- if possible, given the constraints of time and easily available information. What we would appreciate from you is:

- your reactions as to whether the following are points on these two topics we should try to cover in the WDR (are they the right ones (or please suggest others), and is it practical to deal with them);
- directions to reference people or written materials, including both examples and analysis in country project/sector work and outside (non-Bank) research;
- if there are questions which are not immediately answerable, but could be with some very specific data analysis or literature review (NOTE: to be useful for us, we need inputs by mid-November at the latest), keep in mind that we have some limited budget remaining for short-term consultants; or we could assign a couple weeks of research assistants' time if that is a solution.

MAINTENANCE:

How Critical is Timing and Consistency of Maintenance?

In addition to generally indicating the scope and magnitude of the undermaintenance problem in most countries (for which country examples and box material are most welcome), the WDR should explain if possible the specific nature of maintenance issues in each sector/subsector. You may recall, for example, the Road Maintenance Policy Paper in 1988 which presented evidence that the physical deterioration profile of roads is nonlinear - i.e., if $X$ of annual maintenance expenditure is deferred for (say) 5 years, then it is not possible to catch up with expenditure of $5X$ in the sixth year, but rather some multiple (greater than unity) of $5X$ is required because the deterioration of the road will have accelerated after some point of neglect. A basic question is whether such nonlinearity of physical deterioration of the assets, due to deferred maintenance, is known to exist in
other subsectors.

The Trade-Off between Maintenance and New Investment -

The Road Maintenance Policy Paper also had some powerful illustrations of the $ amount of expenditure on rehabilitation needed because of $ in neglected and deferred maintenance. Are there good similar illustrations of this in other subsectors, either for a region as a whole, or even for individual countries?

Similarly, can you suggest examples to show instances where $X in new investment could have been delayed or deferred with $Y in maintenance (and perhaps better operation) to keep up an adequate capacity utilization of the existing facilities (or cite comparison in physical units rather than currency values if easier).

We realize that there have been such examples in some Bank studies already published; if possible, we would like to find new and better (e.g., more comprehensive) examples if there are any. What we are looking for is quantifiable evidence of the trade-offs between maintenance and investment in your sector. If we must settle for anecdotes, we would prefer ones that have not been published before.

Gross vs. Net Capital Stocks -
Are there countries where estimates have been made of the differences between the accumulation of gross capital stocks (from new investment) and what actually exists net of premature depreciation due to inadequate maintenance? For example, if inventories of the condition of facilities have been made indicating that despite so many kms of new roads or pipelines, x kms have been lost due to deterioration that could have been avoided with appropriate maintenance (e.g., somebody has suggested comparing Zaire’s road and waterway facilities at independence with those at present to illustrate differences between gross and net expansion of usable capacity. Any reactions or other suggestions?)

Impact on users of unreliable service -
Related to poor maintenance (and to inadequate O&M overall), do you know of data sources on indicators of service quality (that is, services as received and perceived by users), or evidence of how users are coping with poor service (such as provided by Kyu Sik Lee research on Nigeria)? As you know, performance indicators are spotty even for basic system coverage and efficiency variables in most of these subsectors, but tend to be very sparse for service quality. Preferably, we would like some cross-country data but new anecdotes would be useful too.

TECNOLOGY:
Appropriate Technology -
A number of reviewers of our draft outline suggested that we should revisit the question of what technological options in each subsector are more "appropriate" for some developing countries. "Appropriate" should mean not only with lower capital and/or maintenance costs, but also implementable by weak institutions, and conducive to involvement by private entrepreneurs and communities themselves. How much do we know about such options, and can you suggest ongoing illustrations?

Future Technological Developments -
Apart from the technological changes of the past decade or so which are already fairly widely in practice even in developing countries (e.g. in telecoms), are there foreseeable technological innovations in your subsector(s) which are worthy of note in the WDR -- new developments that are close enough on the horizon (at least for the more advanced developing countries) so that we should mention their possible implications? Again, the aspects driving our interest in them would be their potential impact on improving productivity and reducing costs; allowing for easier implementation by relatively weak institutions; increasing the scope for competition, or reducing the minimum economic scale of production; and/or making maintenance easier and cheaper.

I would be grateful if you could let me know by about Sept. 15 if, and in what way, your unit might be able to help us, and who you would designate as a follow-up contact. I would be happy to discuss our interests and needs in more detail.
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DATE: July 29, 1993 12:53pm
TO: Malvina Pollock (MALVINA POLLOCK)
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR (CHRISTINE KESSIDES)
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: WDR - request for ODA data

Following-up on our conversation yesterday, I note below the kinds of data we would like to have on the trends and patterns in official development assistance for infrastructure:

Definition of infrastructure -
For purposes of the WDR, we are including transport, power and gas, telecommunications, water supply and major water works for agriculture (irrigation and drainage), sanitation and waste disposal. On the list of "purpose codes" given to me by Ms. Conty, we would be interested in numbers:

140000 to 142000 (re. electricity, gas and water)
170000 to 171910 (all modes of transport)
172000 (assuming this is the only category for telecommunications)
191081 - 191082 (irrigation, land dev. and reclamation)
191088 (rural water supply)
192000 to 192013 (sanitation, sewerage, waste disposal)

Time Periods -
Since infrastructure has been a major focus of the development banks and many bilaterals since "ODA" began, we would like to show at least one-year data going back to 1960 or earlier, or decade averages where this is relevant.

Types of data and tables needed:

From OECD sources -

1) Constant dollar amounts of total ODA commitments to infrastructure (defined as sum of above categories) over time (e.g., 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and maybe annual figures for decade of 1980s-92), by recipient country (according to WDI classification) and regional grouping.
   Indication of what percent infrastructure represented in total ODA throughout these periods.

2) Breakdown of the above by the various infrastructure subsectors, showing both constant dollar value and percentage shares allocated to each subsector. If details of purpose are sparse, all transport modes can be aggregated.
, sewage and solid waste can be aggregated as sanitation, the rural irrigation/land reclamation can be combined, etc. We would like this subsectoral distribution by individual country in WDI classification.

3) For loans only, show the breakdown by infrastructure subsectors (for the last decade only) separately for commitments and disbursements.

4) For the ODA to each infrastructure sector or subsector, show breakdown in type of assistance (loan versus grant, concessional vs. nonconcessional loan), by country and country groups.
   If possible show further analysis of type of operations or content of operations, e.g. investment aid, or "construction/civil works and equipment component", sectoral adjustment, technical assistance, debt relief, by subsector.

5) For the ODA by each infrastructure sector, show breakdown by donor type - bilateral, multilateral, etc.;

6) Other flows in the OECD data base (ODF, direct investment, export credits, private nonguaranteed flows, private voluntary flows) insofar as these can be identified for infrastructure purpose. (If these other data are better collected from sources other than OECD, then please refer us to the other sources).

From the Bank's own debt database:

7) Summary data for the infrastructure-related debt, by country groups (i.e., breakdown of debt flows and debt stocks for the loans identified as to infrastructure purpose), to show what part of countries' total external debt and debt flows are attributable to infrastructure. Also show breakdown by type of creditor, (public official sources and private creditors that are publicly guaranteed).

8) Summary data on average terms of new commitments for the debt attributed to infrastructure (compared to overall debt);

9) Portion of infrastructure debt involved in debt restructuring (compared to overall debt);

10) Distribution of long-term debt for infrastructure, by type of debtor institution/level of government (compared to overall debt).

I will be out between Aug 2-23, but Kavita Mathur and Ritu Basu will be following up on this request in my absence. Any further clarifications regarding our needs should be referred to them during that time, or to Greg Ingram.

Thanks very much for your division's help in this.
DATE: July 23, 1993 11:24am
TO: John Nebiker
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: retransmission - per conversation

CC: Institutional ISC Files
CC: Institutional ISC Files
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ALL-IN-1 NOTE

DATE: 12-Jul-1993 02:01pm EST
TO: See Distribution Below
FROM: Christine Kessides, WDR (CHRISTINE KESSIDES)
EXT.: 33945
SUBJECT: Procurement issues - WDR

For the 1994 WDR focusing on infrastructure, I will be writing the last chapter on priorities for donor aid. One of the topics to be discussed is procurement policies and practices in this sector. Procurement presents some important issues in this sector, especially -- relating for example to the prevalence of tied aid for equipment procurement from bilateral donors; the tendency of these sectors (more than others possibly) to become associated with corruption in construction contracting if transparent and competitive procurement practices are not followed; and the more recent issue regarding the need for flexibility in application of ICB requirements when there is competition for a package of services, such as in the case of BOTs, and where bids are compared inclusive of financing (i.e., not on cash basis only).

Some weeks ago I had discussed the last point with Jean-Louis Ginnsz, and he mentioned that a review paper is under preparation that would look at the case for increased flexibility in the application of the Bank's own procurement rules. I would be interested in seeing a draft of this paper when it is ready. More generally, I was wondering if you could guide me to sources of information on the procurement practices and issues (relevant particularly to infrastructure, but not necessarily only to this sector) of our borrowing countries and other donors. Are there, for example, any studies that keep track of the extent of "tying" of procurement, either qualitatively or quantitatively? I would appreciate any suggestions you might have about this general topic as it might be usefully treated in the WDR.

DISTRIBUTION:
TO: Raghavan Srinivasan (RAGHAVAN SRINIVASAN)
TO: John Nebiker (JOHN NEBIKER)
TO: Jean-Louis Ginnsz (JEAN-LOUIS GINNSZ)
CC: Gregory Ingram (GREGORY INGRAM)
This report devotes an impressive amount of analysis to a fairly unexplored topic in most ESW -- the spatial dimensions of development. This focus of the report leads to its very clear and concrete recommendations regarding investment priorities. The "definiteness" of these recommendations is very appealing, and may add to the report's potential influence with the government. However, because of this potential, I feel it is important that the conclusions be somewhat more qualified in a number of areas. The main issue is that some major points of analysis have been unexplored; and although no study can be expected to do everything, it is at least important to indicate at the outset these omissions, and suggest how they may affect the conclusions.

One general reaction about the spatial analysis and projections of long-term demand for infrastructure, is that it appears to ignore any economic factors that could influence or change these trends over time --- specifically, the role of incentives is missing in the report. Pricing (user charges) is discussed at the end mainly as a financing tool, but the potential for pricing to affect demand for infrastructure is not acknowledged much.

I share the concern expressed by other reviewers that the implications of the recommended strategy for poverty alleviation need to be discussed at least as an issue, even if it is not possible to be very specific about distributional impacts. The report sounds very "trickle down", which cannot be considered entirely acceptable as a Bank position for such a poor country. This is a question of showing awareness and concern for this issue, even if your strategic recommendations stay as is.

Institutional requirements and issues -- these are referred to only in passing in the discussion of the water sector. Even if other sector work is dealing with this topic in more detail, it is so important that it deserves some attention here, particularly as you are recommending some major increases and shifts in areas of investment, while problems of low efficiency in the use of existing infrastructure persist.

The report's relative absence of concern about efficiency
is illustrated in two specific places, where the opportunity to lead to some policy recommendations is missed. One is in the reference to heavy use of own account trucking, and the resulting high costs. The reader is left to conclude that these high transport costs are further evidence of infrastructure problems -- but I rather suspect it has to do with incentives, perhaps regulation or other policy issues. Second, the last section mentions that private sector irrigation is substantial and very much more efficient than public sector irrigation. But the report does not then make a strong case for supporting greater private sector activity, or for reforming the public sector operation, or removing the public sector from areas where it is highly ineffective. The there is thus a relative absence of policy (as opposed to investment) recommendations in the report, in areas where one suspects these are the main issues.

On a few smaller points:

The Summary (p ii, para. 5) suggests that the regression indicates clear causality (infrastructure promoting agricultural growth); but a reverse pattern of causality is at least equally plausible.

A dedicated road maintenance fund may be an especially questionable proposition where the opportunity cost of public resources (in such a poor country) is very high; and where some of the existing roads are admitted to be not economically justified by existing or future traffic (hence, they probably all shouldn't be equally maintained).

In the Summary (p. vii, para. 22) the reference to "planned development" in the western Terai to control for environmental damage sounds intriguing, but does not seem to be explained elsewhere in the report.
DATE: June 15, 1993 12:40pm

TO: Nancy Birdsall
FROM: Gregory Ingram, WDR
EXT.: 31052

SUBJECT: Secondment of Peter Lanjouw to the 1994 WDR Core Team

Pursuant to our conversations about this matter, this is to confirm that Peter Lanjouw will be seconded to the WDR from May 1, 1993 to April 30, 1994. Our budget officer, Trinidad Angeles, will be in touch with your budget officer to make the necessary administrative and budgetary arrangements.

I very much appreciate your support in this matter.

CC: Peter Lanjouw
CC: Emmanuel Jimenez
CC: Phi Anh Plesch
CC: Trinidad Angeles
CC: Catherine Cardona
CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: June 15, 1993 12:44pm

TO: Nancy Birdsall
FROM: Gregory Ingram, WDR
EXT.: 31052

SUBJECT: Secondment of Lant Pritchett to the 1994 WDR

Pursuant to our conversations about this matter, this is to confirm that Lant Pritchett will be seconded to the WDR from June 1, 1993 to March 1, 1994. Our budget officer, Trinidad Angeles, will be in touch with your budget officer to make the necessary administrative and budgetary arrangements.

I very much appreciate your support in this matter.

CC: Lant Pritchett
CC: Emmanuel Jimenez
CC: Phi Anh Plesch
CC: Trinidad Angeles
CC: Catherine Cardona
CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: June 14, 1993 09:54am

TO: Dominique Lallement
FROM: Gregory Ingram, WDR
EXT.: 31052

SUBJECT: RE: Follow up to Infrastructure Retreat

Thanks very much for your suggestions with respect to boxes. We will follow up on this end.

With respect to employment issues, we do have some ideas about those and they are pertinent. Let's have a conversation. Let me know when you are free for lunch after you return on the 23rd of June. I will be here.

CC: Institutional ISC Files
CC: Mariza Guimaraes
DATE: May 7, 1993 09:38am

TO: Varuni Dayaratna  
FROM: Jee-Peng Tan, WDR  
EXT.: 32925  

SUBJECT: RE: Quality of Education

Varuni:

I have asked a friend to look for data on teacher qualification for Thailand. She has to dig through her boxes. Hopefully she'll find something. I vaguely remember having had the data once upon a time, but seem to have misplaced them in the recent two office moves.

Regards,

Jee-Peng

CC: Institutional ISC Files  
CC: Richard Sabot  
CC: Nancy Birdsall  
CC: Elizabeth King
DATE: April 23, 1993 07:48pm

TO: See Distribution Below

FROM: Jose-Luis Bobadilla, WDR (JOSE-LUIS BOBADILLA)

EXT.: 32174

SUBJECT: Costs of the essential health package from BHA and WDR.

Conclusions on the BHA and 93 WDR approaches to the package of health services:

1. The two documents favor the idea (originally presented by BHA) that a two tier District Health System (based on a health center and a hospital) could meet the most relevant health needs of the population in developing countries.

2. The costs of such a system, estimated with different methodologies are similar; the differences stem from variations in the selection of health interventions and the human resources mix.

3. The conclusions from the two documents are the same for Africa: reallocation of resources will improve the coverage of essential health services, but more resources will be needed for most of the countries in order to pay for the District Health System.

4. Given that both documents use the cost estimates as illustrations of the essential package costs, the final figures are remarkably similar. Future collaboration in country specific studies should improve the quality and accuracy of the estimates.

DISTRIBUTION:

TO: A. Edward Elmendorf (A. EDWARD ELMENDORF)
TO: Paul Shaw (PAUL SHAW)
TO: Jean-Louis Lamboray (JEAN-LOUIS LAMBORAY)
TO: Zia Yusuf (ZIA YUSUF)
CC: Dean Jamison (DEAN JAMISON)
CC: Peter Cowley (PETER COWLEY)
CC: Anthony R. Measham (ANTHONY R. MEASHAM)
CC: Helen Saxenian (HELEN SAXENIAN)
CC: Philip Musgrove (PHILIP MUSGROVE)
CC: Robert M. Hecht (ROBERT M. HECHT)
CC: Institutional ISC Files (INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES)
One of the most important 93 WDR follow-up activities is to complete the Study of the GBD and to institutionalize its production. In my view the Bank should consider getting involved in three separate objectives:

I. FINISH THE BOOK. The editors, most of the authors and WHO have the right incentives to finish the book. Somebody from the Bank or WHO should manage the process, in order to ensure it is appropriately funded and on time. The editors believe they need $100,000 more, and have already have secured $25,000 from The Rockefeller Foundation.

II. UPDATING GBD. This may not be urgent, since the book needs to be produced first and the donor agencies will probably want to see these two activities in sequence. The incentives are not clear to me. WHO is very interested but maybe with a different approach from the one the editors would like to see. The Bank will probably be interested only if this probes to be useful for operational and sector work.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE TECHNOLOGY TO ESTIMATE THE NATIONAL BURDEN OF DISEASE. Currently, it is impossible to do this without access to all the files and spreadsheets from Harvard, and even then, the result may be sub-optimal if Chris Murray is not heavily involved. In order to make the method transferable, and therefore usable for Bank work, a computer program needs to be developed; this will have to make explicit all the adjustments that were done to the regional estimated of the GBD.

To me this is the first priority, but unfortunately the incentives to do it may not be in place. It is the first priority because we are already having expressions of interest from operations to help in estimating the NBD (Costa Rica, Mexico, South Africa, India, and maybe Tanzania). More importantly we will be inducing demand soon in many countries.

The computer program could be completed in less than six months, with four ingredients: Chris Murray collaboration, CDC or other institutions capable of checking the medical and epidemiological models, a private company with experience in developing computing programs like the one required (EPI-INFO, EPILOG and others), and about $200,000. Jeff Kaplan will prepare a preliminary budget for us, and is willing to consider taking over the management of this task, with data from two countries: US and Mexico. The US is needed for two reasons: first, the quality of the epidemiological data for most of the
diseases, but particularly for the noncommunicable is very good, and the biological constants of the model could be substantially improved; second, we could get several researchers from CDC involved without having to pay their time. Mexico is interested in doing it at the same time than the US in order to have comparable results, usable during the forthcoming NAFTA negotiations on health services.

If you agree with the arguments on the computer program, may I suggest that we meet with Jeff Koplan soon to explore feasibility and make some progress on the next steps.

CC: Institutional ISC Files (INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES)
DATE: April 23, 1993 12:42pm

TO: Janet de Merode

FROM: Jose-Luis Bobadilla, WDR

EXT.: 32174


Janet:

As far as I understand WHO will organize a meeting to discuss 93 WDR follow-up activities during the week of July 5-9; devoting one day (Thursday the 8th. to discuss the Global Burden of Disease and its institutionalization). I will probably attend this meeting since my main task is the National Burden of Disease.

The seminar we are being invited to, on Health Futures, is the following week. Dr. Sapirie needs an answer from me, in order to finalize the program. I am schedule to speak in two plenary session; in one I am supposed to summarize the findings from 93 WDR.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this matter.

Best regards,

Jose-Luis

CC: Anthony R. Measham
CC: Institutional ISC Files
I am sending (via paper mail) the revised program for this seminar. The organizing committee has commented on the previous version. In early May I will be discussing the program with the organizing committee; please let me know your reactions or comments.

Best regards.

Jose-Luis.

DISTRIBUTION:
TO: Carmen Hamann
TO: Philip Musgrove
TO: Dean Jamison
CC: Institutional ISC Files
DATE: April 9, 1993 05:40pm

TO: Nena Manley  
FROM: Jose-Luis Bobadilla, WDR 
EXT.: 32174

SUBJECT: Presentation of population and health data for Taiwan in the

Grateful for your advice and clearance for the presentation of data for Taiwan in the Statistical Appendix of the 1993 WDR. The tables that present data by country in this appendix list Taiwan, China and China in separate lines. China itself represents one of the eight demographic regions used in the appendix. Taiwan, China belongs to a different region, Other Asia and Islands. Please see a sample table (send via fax).

The World Development Indicators presented data for China, excluding Taiwan in the 1992 WDR. Sometimes, but not always, a footnote is included in the table to present the figures for Taiwan.

Population projections published by the Bank (Ed Bos et al. 1992) present data separate for China and China, Taiwan.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Regards.

CC: Dean Jamison  
CC: Ken Hill  
CC: Anna Maripuu  
CC: Institutional ISC Files

( DEAN JAMISON )  
( KEN HILL )  
( ANNA MARIPUU )  
( INSTITUTIONAL ISC FILES )
1. A Bankwide meeting to review the yellow cover draft (dated 2/24/1993) took place on March 3, 1992, chaired by Ms. Nancy Birdsall. Those present are listed in attachment A. Ms. Birdsall opened the meeting by inviting comments on (i) the clarity, correctness and persuasiveness of the messages; (ii) the balance and adequacy of discussion on various issues (e.g. health service delivery issues versus health finance issues; differentiation of the problems faced by countries at different stages of development); and (iii) specific areas in which the draft contradicts past statements by the Bank on the same issues. The ensuing discussion highlighted the following issues.

Clarity of messages

2. Several speakers felt the Report’s messages were correct and clear, but others felt there was still room for improvement. The richness of discussion in the chapters did not emerge sufficiently in the Overview. The Report is unclear about what interventions are being recommended. The concept of and justification for the package of essential package of health services need to be better articulated.

Discussion of public and private sector roles

3. More work is needed to define the government’s role with regard to traditional public health, essential clinical services, and discretionary clinical services. The equity rationale for government intervention does not feature strongly enough. The Report’s structure does not facilitate a careful discussion on this subject: chapters 1-2 should set up the scene for subsequent chapters; chapter 3, a crucial chapter, should provide a strong analytical framework and pave the way for elaboration in chapters 4 onward.
Use of cost-effectiveness analysis

4. The Report needs to recognize more explicitly the limitations of this analytical tool in setting priorities in spending allocations. Existing data on cost-effectiveness does not take into account people's behavior, and does not distinguish between marginal and average costs. More elaboration is needed on the influence of community characteristics on the effectiveness of health interventions. The Report should clarify the principles countries could use to define the "basic package" of health services.

Policy issues and reform of health systems

5. Developing countries have achieved remarkable gains in health. The Report needs to say what has contributed to these successes and to identify more clearly the nature and sources of problems faced by countries today. It should differentiate problems and solutions more sharply according to countries' income levels, and to steer away from "one-size-fits-all" messages. The Report could offer more advice to policymakers on the "how-to" aspects of policy reform—although one speaker felt that this could be done as a separate exercise along the lines of the poverty handbook which followed the 1990 WDR on poverty. It could give more examples of reform experience. Closing these gaps would facilitate the Bank's operational work.

Donors' role in health sector policy reform

6. Chapter 7 (which contains this discussion) still needs substantial work. The Report should identify potential instruments for donor support of countries' efforts to reform health sector policies. It needs to stress the need for comprehensive approaches to policy reform.

Miscellaneous issues

7. On the treatment of AIDS, one speaker felt the Report was on target in isolating it as a special problem deserving separate discussion. It is important, however, to view AIDS in the context of the entire health system. One speaker wondered why AIDS, tobacco, and helminths are receiving so much attention in the Report when they each contribute small percentages of the Global Burden of Disease. Other speakers felt that (i) nutrition is treated too scantily in the Overview; (ii) environmental factors on health should be dealt with in one place in the Report; (iii) use of I$ is confusing and should be dropped; (iv) treatment of technology is schizophrenic in that the Report argues for more investment in technology while pointing out that uncontrolled access to technology is responsible for cost escalation in the U.S.
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OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 17, 1993 01:27pm

TO: Anthony R. Measham (ANTHONY R. MEASHAM)

FROM: Jose-Luis Bobadilla, WDR (JOSE-LUIS BOBADILLA)

EXT.: 32174

SUBJECT: Tentative travel plans for 1993.

Tony:

This is my travel schedule for the rest of the year; some of these trips need to be cleared by you and Janet, as they are supposed to be paid by PHN. I would be grateful if you could give me your reactions.

I am planning to be back at PHN on May 11, after a week of annual leave (May 3 to 10).

May 20-21, Two day meeting to work on the methodology to estimate the National Burden of Disease; at the Harvard School of Public Health. This is an informal meeting with Chris Murray and Catherine Michaud, plus a group of researchers from Pakistan and Mexico, to apply the methodology used in the WDR to these two countries. This could be covered by PHN. This visit could be very productive; a recently created data base on cost effectiveness of clinical interventions has been created and the authors are willing to collaborate with us for the possible creation of a similar data base for developing countries.

May 26-27, meeting of the Population Committee of the National Academy of Science. I am a member of this committee.

June 19-23 or the week after, WDR dissemination (press conferences and seminars); still not clear where I am going. WDR will pay for this trip.

July 19-23, WHO consultation on Studies in Health Futures. I have been invited to present material on the epidemiologic transition, and results from the WDR on GBD and other projections of mortality in one of the plenary sessions. This seems as a good opportunity to disseminate WDR results among an important network of policy analysts. If you agree that this is worth attending, it could be paid by PHN.

July 30, Seminar on the WDR and implications for Mexico. Only part of the cost would be cover by PHN. Preliminary agenda is available in case you are interested.

September 13, Harvard School of Public Health. I have been invited to participate in a seminar on the Health Sector Reform. I am schedule to discuss paper from one of the sessions on the topic "Objectives of the health system". Still unclear about sources of finance for my travel and per diem.

August 2-27, home leave.
Best regards,

Jose-Luis.

CC: Dean Jamison
CC: Institutional ISC Files
World Development Report 1993 - Donor Consultation Meeting
Paris February 9 - 10
Back to Office Report

1. As agreed with you, we represented the WDR team at the above mentioned consultation. The meeting was attended by about 70 officials from the bilateral aid agencies, development banks, foundations, WHO, UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA. In addition, there were current or recent health ministers or permanent secretaries from the Philippines, Chile, India, China, Nigeria, Mexico, and Mozambique, and representatives of several important international and LDC-based NGOs (see attached list of participants and meeting agenda). Janet de Merode led the Bank delegation. Jim Socknat (ASTHR), Ed Elmendorf (AFTHR), and Anne Tinker (PHRHN) were with us throughout.

2. The meeting’s objectives were to obtain comments and suggestions from the donor/NGO community on the January 13 “White Cover” draft of the WDR, and to discuss donor aid flows for the health sector and related donor policies to improve the effectiveness of aid for health.

3. On the first day, Rob presented our main messages as contained in the WDR Overview chapter and our findings on health systems (Chapter 5 and 6). Jose-Luis summarized the WDR’s conclusions on demography, epidemiology, and the Global Burden of Disease (Chapter 2), and Catherine Michaud, our consultant from Harvard, presented the Report’s findings on aid flows. On the second day, Tony outlined the main issues and recommendations on donor policies in the health sector (Chapter 7), and our observations and suggestions for improving international health research. For each session, we had several pre-selected discussants and plenary discussion.

4. In general, the meeting went very well. The atmospherics were strongly positive: most participants praised the draft Report and commended the Bank for undertaking a WDR on health. Even the strongest critics presented their views in a highly constructive way. It was clear from the meeting that the donor and NGO communities and developing countries have high expectations for the Report, and see it having a major impact on their health policies. Many of the meeting participants are already beginning to look beyond the July publication of the WDR to its dissemination and future use at regional, national, and sub-national levels (more on this below).
5. Donors and LDC participants strongly endorsed a number of the Report’s main messages, including:

- the general principles of a major public sector role in financing health care, and of mixed (and increasingly private) delivery of health services;
- the importance of investing more in girls’ education as a way of improving health;
- the fact that countries undertaking structural adjustment achieve greater health gains than non-adjusting countries.

Participants were also pleased to see the Bank proposing a strong stand on the issues of tobacco and cigarette smoking, abortion, and violence against women. There was widespread support for the Bank’s pioneering attempt in the WDR to estimate the global, regional, and national burden of disease and the cost-effectiveness of alternative health interventions.

6. There was a strong plea from the meeting participants to expand and sharpen the discussion of health reform throughout the Report, and especially in the Overview and in Chapter 7. This should include an analysis of both the content and process of such reform; of key policies at the macro and sectoral levels (including education and the environment); and of the relationship between structural adjustment and reform of the health sector. The tailoring of health reforms to the varied circumstances of low and middle-income LDCs should also be examined more fully.

Donors were generally eager to support national programs of health sector reform, and were looking to the Bank to take the lead in this area.

7. On the issue of international health research, there was broad agreement that the currently fragmented and under-funded system was inadequate and in need of a major overhaul. The approach to international health research based on the model of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) was seen as inherently problematic (weak links with national research centers, difficult to sustain and adopt over time, too much of a donors’ club). A different approach, using a consortium or “network” of donors, developing country governments, and researchers to assess, plan, and fund research priorities (rather than given research centers) was viewed as preferable. Such a consortium for international health research should be led by WHO, UNDP, OECD and the Bank.

8. Throughout the consultation, participants expressed a strong interest in assisting with the dissemination of the Report and its follow-up. They viewed the WDR as a first step in a larger process of informing the public and decision-makers, and re-thinking and re-shaping health policies. A large number of developing country officials (e.g. from India, the Philippines, Nigeria, and Chile) and donors (Norway, Sweden, Australia, Canada, and Germany) indicated their desire to collaborate with the Bank on workshops, seminars, and the development of new donor agency and developing country government health strategies and policies. Several participants
also asked how the WDR would affect the way the Bank does business in the health sector and in the other sectors that impinge on health. As the WDR 93 team will disband in July, this longer-term responsibility for carrying forward the messages of the Report will fall on the Bank's regular PHR units and staff.

9. Meeting participants made a number of suggestions for improving subsequent drafts of the Report. Among the most important:

♦ The Overview and the entire WDR need to make a clearer and more persuasive case for increased investments in health, in order to convince ministries of finance and planning and other non-health decision-makers. The case should be made along macro (health and productivity), sectoral (potential improvements in the efficiency of health sector spending) and moral-ethical (health as a basic human right) lines;

♦ The Overview should highlight more clearly the link between health and poverty alleviation (Chapter 1) and the equity objectives of health policy (Chapter 5);

♦ The Overview and the Report generally need to achieve a better balance and integration between the analysis of diseases and intervention cost-effectiveness on the one hand, and the discussion of health systems and their reform on the other. Otherwise, the WDR 93 could give the misleading impression that the Bank is advocating the creation and funding of "vertical" disease control programs, when in many (but not all) cases a "horizontal" or integrated approach to dealing with these health problems is more appropriate and consistent with cost-effectiveness and sustainability.

♦ The Report should stress more the role of communities, households, and individuals in improving their own health, through a combination of self-care, personal behavior change, and community-based health workers. Education and information were seen as the keys to community and household action.

♦ The Bank should make a stronger case for pharmaceutical quality assurance, medical technology assessment, and effective government regulation of both drugs and medical equipment.

♦ The Bank should drop the term "fertility regulation" in Chapter 3 and should emphasize more the links between family planning, STD/AIDS prevention and treatment, and safe motherhood, under the heading of "women's reproductive health".

cc: Messrs/Madames: Choksi, Psacharopoulos, de Merode, Birdsal, Walton, Merrick, Verspoor, Jimenez, van Nimmen, Husain, Crown, Maas, Colliou, Porter, Fredricksen, Grawe, Socknat, Babson, Ecevit, Gilpin, Karcher, Skolnik, Cuca, Harbison, Liebenthal, Heyneman, Hees, Keare, Schweitzer, Lee, van der Gaag, Adams, de Geyndt, Elmendorf, Rosenhouse, Campos, WDR Team Members, PHN staff
Revised Draft Agenda

Tuesday, February 9, 1993

9:00-9:15 Introduction - Meeting Objectives and Program
    Chair: A.R. Measham

Session 1: Overview of WDR 1993

9:15-10:45 Overview of WDR93: Setting Priorities for Intervention in the Health Sector
    Chair: O. Ransome-Kuti
    Presenter: R. Hecht
    Discussants: A. Bengzon, J. Barzelatto, E. Elmendorf

10:45-11:00 Coffee

11:00-12:30 Changing Epidemiology and Disease Burden - New Challenges
    Chair: J.-P. Jardel
    Presenter: J.-L. Bobadilla
    Discussants: J. Jimenez-de-la-Jara, R. Lawrence

12:30-14:00 Lunch (free time)

14:00-15:30 Financing and Delivery of Health Services
    Chair: G. Dahlgren
    Presenter: R. Hecht
    Discussants: R. Misra, S. Simon

Session 2: Aid Flows to the Health Sector

15:30-16:15 Levels and Allocation of Aid
    Presenters: C. Michaud

16:15-16:30 Coffee
16:30-17:45  Panel and General Discussion
Panel: L. Simao, D. Nabarro, E. Jesperson

18:00  Reception at Bank Office

Wednesday, February 10, 1993

Session 3:  Role of the International Community in the Health Sector
Chair: J. de Merode

9:00-9:30  Findings from WDR 93
Presenter: A.R. Measham

9:30-10:30  Developing Country Views
Panel: O. Ransome-Kuti, A. Soberon, Z. Chowdhury

10:30-10:45  Coffee

10:45-12:00  Donor Perspectives
Panel: L. Guerrato, G. Chedeville-Murray

12:00-13:00  Lunch at Bank Office

Session 4:  Reforming International Health Research
Chair: V. Ramalingaswami

13:00-14:00  Options and Recommendations in WDR 93
Presenters:  A.R. Measham (General Findings)
            M. Pinero (Lessons from the CGIAR Experience)

14:00-15:30  Donor Reactions and General Discussion
Discussant: T. Rothermel

15:30  Close
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TO: Jose-Luis Bobadilla

FROM: Seth Berkley, WDR

EXT.: 32057

SUBJECT: RE: Revising WDI Table 28: Health and Nutrition

Just a slight correction. HIV infections are rarely reported to WHO and when they are, they are completely inaccurate. The only useful HIV infection data is from occasional surveys and estimations made from sentinel surveillance. AIDS cases are reported from all countries and even these are inaccurate in many areas. In some countries in Africa, only 10-30% of AIDS cases are reported.

Seth Berkley
Both of you have inquired about the cost of treating AIDS patients. The three attached figures summarize current knowledge. In most cases the estimate is for total lifetime cost of treatment. None of the estimates includes the cost of travel time or the time of household members.

The equation of the fitted line is

\[ C = 1.5 \cdot \left( \frac{\text{GNP/POP}}{} \right)^{0.04} \]

Thus, expected cost is about twice GNP per capita when GNP per capita is close to $1000. Thailand is below the trend line.

Attachments

cc.: Ms. M. Ainsworth, AFTPN
TREATMENT COST & GNP PER CAPITA IN 16 COUNTRIES

Sources: Ainsworth & Over (1992), Tolley & Gyldmark (1991)
TREATMENT COST IN DCs
(In 1989 US Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNP PER CAPITA</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>21500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>29301</td>
<td>32067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>36643</td>
<td>61102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>19500</td>
<td>38685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>29628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>33217</td>
<td>43657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>19275</td>
<td>38354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>85333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tolley & Gyldmark (1991)
## TREATMENT COST IN LDCs
(In 1989 US Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>11800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Ainsworth & Over (1992), Hanson (1992)
DATE: January 19, 1993 11:42am

TO: Anthony R. Measham
TO: Janet de Merode

FROM: Jose-Luis Bobadilla, WDR

SUBJECT: 1993 WDR White Cover Review Meetings

Dean asked me to pass on to you all the information regarding the organization of meetings to review the 1993 WDR White Cover Draft. I was asked to speak with Robert Liebenthal, Stephen Heyneman and Julian Schweitzer.

Robert Liebenthal suggested eight names to review the draft and to participate in a review meeting. They include: John Holsen, Mario Blejer, Costas Michalopoulous, Isabel Guerrero, Paulo Vieira Da Cunha, Timothy King, Michael Mills and Antonio Campos. He agreed that a joint meeting with people from Ralph Harbison Division (and Departments' served) would be sensible. Antionio Campos was designated as the focal point for his region.

Stephen Heyneman will send us names and dates for a meeting to review the draft report. As soon as I get a response I will send it to you.

Julian Schweitzer said that Jaques Van Der Gaag will serve as a focal point for LAC; Jaques has already names for the review process.

Please let me know if I can be of any further help to organize these meetings.

CC: Dean Jamison
CC: Robert M. Hecht
CC: Philip Musgrove
CC: Institutional ISC Files
In response to your EM and to follow up on our conversation of January 6, I have drafted a brief note on how Table 28 of the WDI could be changed to be more consistent with the current understanding of health and nutrition issues and with the overall approach followed in the 93 WDR to assess health and nutritional status and the respective services.

A. Let me start with a summary of the changes. The following two columns present the old indicators and the new, proposed set of indicators, in order to compare what is being proposed for inclusion and deletion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current 92 WDI</th>
<th>Proposed for 93 WDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Population per physician 1965</td>
<td>Median age at death 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Population per physician 1984</td>
<td>Years of life lost (per 1,000 p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Births att. by health staff</td>
<td>Babies with low birth weight '90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Infant mortality rate 1965</td>
<td>Consumption of tobacco (Kg per capita) 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Infant mortality rate 1990</td>
<td>Coverage of DPT 3 vaccine 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Population per hospital bed 88-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Births attended by health staff</td>
<td>Births attended by health staff 86-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The justification for each new indicator follows.

1. Median age at death summarizes the age structure of mortality. The main reason to include it is that no other indicator of mortality (currently used) does that. In addition, the variation between countries is dramatic: from about 2 in many African countries to 80 in many developed countries and more than 70 in many developing countries. In 10 years many countries will show progress in this indicator. Its interpretation is straightforward, the higher number, the better. Interestingly this indicator is independent of the age structure of the population.

2. Years of life lost conveys the burden of mortality in absolute terms. It is composed of the sum of the years lost to premature death per 1,000
population. Years of life lost at some age x are measured by subtracting the remaining expected years of life at age x, given a life expectancy at birth fixed at 80 years for men and 82.5 for women. This indicator depends on the effect of three variables: the age structure of the population, the overall rate of mortality and the age structure of the mortality. It is the closest approximation that one can get to the measure used in the 93 WDR of the Global Burden of Disease; expressed in Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs), that combines the years of life lost due to death with those lost due to disability. This indicator is also related to the measurement of cost-effectiveness of health interventions, as they are expressed in dollars per DALYs gained.

3. Under five mortality rate is much more reliable than the infant mortality rate and is used by UNICEF as the key indicator to assess progress in child health. It is already included in Table 32 by sex, but should be moved to this table, since the differences by sex are useless in indicating progress of women and development (essentially because in 99 percent of the countries the rate is higher for men, as would be expected). If it is impossible to move this indicator from Table 32, then it should not be duplicated in Table 28.

4. Adult mortality rate is the equivalent to the under five mortality rate; it is the probability that children aged 15 survive to age 60, per 1,000 population. The Bank has made a substantial contribution to the understanding of health status in developing countries by bringing to the surface the problem of adult ill-health and premature mortality; mainly, but not exclusively, through the preparation and publication of the book "The Health of Adults in the Developing World". The main indicator available to monitor this important age group is the adult mortality rate.

A note on sources of information and process: Indicators 1 to 4 can all be constructed with routine information produced by PHN. Probably some of the figures derived from models (particularly on adult mortality) can be revised with data from vital statistics; only of course for countries where the vital registration system is complete and reliable.

5. Babies with low birth weight is already included in Table 28. Our recommendation is to reduce the cut off point to 2,000 grams, instead of the current 2,500 gram cut off point. The reason for this is that babies weighing from 2,000 to 2,499 grams at birth, often do very well and in many countries with high levels of low birth weight they constitute the majority, making the indicator difficult to interpret. A separate note will be sent explaining in more detail the reasons for this change. In the proposed form the indicator will be interpreted as a good predictor of mortality around the time of birth.

6. HIV prevalence rate provides information about the magnitude of the epidemic, which is currently spreading most rapidly in Africa and Asia. The fast increase and the variability per country of this rate warrants its annual update. HIV infection will, in a few years, be the main cause of mortality in many age groups of many countries. HIV infection is reported every year to the Global Program on Aids at WHO. Staff from that program could provide the information to the Bank.

7. Consumption of tabacco refers to the main health risk factors in developed countries today, the main cause of death in China as projected for the period 2005-2010, and one of the fastest growing risk factors in many developing
countries. Howard Barnum from PHN and Richard Peto (expert epidemiologists on the effects of tobacco on health) have estimated through different methods that for every 7 tons of tobacco consumed, one death occurs as a consequence of smoking. Data can be obtained regularly from balance sheets from FAO.

8. Coverage of DPT3 and 9. Coverage of Measles vaccine are useful indicators of the most successful program to improve child health in developing countries (The Expanded Program on Immunizations, WHO). The coverage rates have increased from levels below 20 percent in the late 60's, to 80 percent in 1990. There are signs that the levels are going slightly down and many countries in Africa still have low levels of coverage. These two vaccines are the most difficult to apply and are therefore the most sensitive to changes in the resources applied to this program. WHO and UNICEF receive reports from countries every year and are willing to share them with the Bank. The quality of the estimates has improved considerably in the past 5 years and is likely to improve even further.

10. Population per physician is already included in the WDI.

11. Population per hospital bed is already collected by the Bank in the Social Indicators, presumably from WHO. It is systematically reported in Bank Reports and is the only indicator available on health infrastructure. In addition, hospitals consume between 40 and 70 percent of the health budget in developing countries and are likely to become more important in the next decade. A book from the Bank (PHN), that will be published soon, stresses the importance of hospitals for the health sector.

12. Births attended by health staff is already in WDI.

Together these indicators cover with the most relevant components of health and nutrition: health and nutritional status, risk factors, and available resources and services.

C. Finally here are some notes on why some of the indicators in Table 28 are less useful than the proposed indicators:

Population per physician and nursing person for two years; these are now being replaced by one (Pop. per Physician 1990); nursing persons and physicians show a strong correlation (except in LAC), so that they convey the same information; the quality of data for physicians is slightly better than that of nursing persons.

The next two indicators (births attended by health staff and babies with low birth weight) are proposed to stay.

Infant mortality rate is being covered by the under five mortality rate.

Daily calories supply indicates nothing and is very difficult to interpret. Except for a few countries most of them consume on average the necessary calories per capita daily; the main problem is how these calories are distributed among the population. Even then there are other factors like infection that will influence substantially the level of nutrition of the population.
D. In relation to your question on the responsibility of updating the new proposed indicators, I think that PHN would be prepared to: a) prepare the indicators on mortality; b) review and correct when necessary the figures received from WHO, UNICEF and FAO. I have not cleared this with PHN, and by sending a copy of this EM to Dr. Anthony Measham and Ed Bos I am requesting their opinion on the indicators and the responsibility of PHN in assisting with the production of Table 28.

E. I hope that this information is useful and convincing to change the indicators of Table 28. I am extremely interested in seeing Table 28 with better indicators, so please don't hesitate to call me if more or different information is needed.

Best regards.

CC: David Cieslikowski
CC: Ibrahim Levent
CC: Vilay Soulatha
CC: Boris Blazic-Metzner
CC: Anthony R. Measham
CC: Eduard R. Bos
CC: Anna Maripuu
CC: Ken Hill
CC: Dean Jamison
CC: Caroline Cook
CC: Jose-Luis Bobadilla
CC: Seth Berkley
CC: Peter Cowley
CC: Robert M. Hecht
CC: Ken Hill
CC: Dean Jamison
CC: Anna Maripuu
CC: Christopher Murray
CC: Philip Musgrove
CC: Alexander Preker
CC: Karima Saleh
CC: Helen Saxenian
CC: Jee-Peng Tan
CC: Abdo Yazbeck
CC: Lecia Brown
CC: Vito Tanzi
CC: Institutional ISC Files