

Summary Findings of the Evaluation of SPI Secretariat Activity

By Reducing Cash Transactions PWG members

May 2009

Purpose of the evaluation: *to improve SPI Secretariat performance in order to make its activity more efficient and to bring it closer to the stakeholders' needs and expectations. The evaluation aimed at capturing the PWG's assessment on the role, responsibilities, and activities of the SPI Secretariat, and to gather suggestions on further improvements.*

Conclusions for improvement in SPI Secretariat activity:

- 1. better PWG composition, by asking decision level representatives;***
- 2. more active participation of the PWG members through various incentives;***
- 3. longer notices for meetings;***
- 4. summarized minutes of the meetings;***
- 5. more research in the international experience.***

SPI Secretariat response:

- 1. SPI Secretariat highly appreciates having received feedback on many aspects of its activities and performance. It helps understand how our work is seen by our immediate "clients".***
- 2. SPI Secretariat encourages the timely feedback from PWG members on critical project performance issues so that they are addressed immediately (e.g. specific contributions needed in better organization and reporting of the PWG meetings, etc.)***

SPI Secretariat follow-up actions:

- 1. Have a better Project Working Group composition by asking decision level representatives from the participating institutions;***
- 2. Ask for PWG members' evaluations in the last meeting organization (scheduling, minutes, relevance of the content);***
- 3. Provide longer notices for meetings;***
- 4. Presentation from the beginning of the project objectives as well as each party's specific role and responsibilities;***
- 5. Call up PWG members to ensure better participation and use PMT authority and involvement more extensively;***
- 6. Improve the quality of research on the international experience through consultations with the PMT.***
- 7. Step up efforts to mobilize international expertise for the projects, using also the PWG potential resources (experts from banks' or other stakeholders' parent companies).***

I. Statistics of the survey

No. of PWG members:	8
No. of respondents:	5
Participation ratio:	62.5%

II. Summary findings of the survey

No.	SPI Secretariat Activity Aspect	General Assessment	Comments/suggestions
1.	Role in organizing PWG activity	Very good	none
2.	Preparation of the Project TORs	Very good	none
3.	Support in organizing PWG meetings	Very good	40% good. Short notice at time
4.	Contribution in helping conduct the PWG meeting	Very good	none
5.	The records (minutes) of the discussions held in the PWG meetings	Very good	40% good. Sometimes too long
6.	Quality of documentation and information	Very good	none
7.	Quality of the analytical work	Very good	none
8.	Quality of the background documentation	Very good	none
9.	Preparing the Regulatory Impact Assessment	Very good	none
10.	Providing international support for the project	Good	More cases or best practices cases from countries with similar experience in the past or currently should have been considered
11.	Support in preparing the project reports	Very good	none
12.	Correctness in reflecting opinions in the centralized documents	Yes	none
13.	Contribution in consensus building	Very good	none
14.	Neutrality and objectivity during PWG discussions	Yes	none
15.	Support to PWG in reaching the commonly agreed solutions	Yes	none
16.	Correctness in outlining the issues in discussion and in providing solutions in the project documents	Yes	none
17.	Importance of the “honest broker” role played by the SPI Secretariat	Very important	
19.	Information on the progress with non-PWG activities	Yes	none

Main benefits of an “honest broker” supporting the Program

	Benefits	No. of points	% of max
1.	To assemble and support a project working group	22	88%
2.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders	24	96%
3.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment	22	88%
4.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders	20	80%
5.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles	16	64%
6.	To help with consensus-building	23	92%
7.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper	21	84%
8.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	24	96%
9.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.	22	88%

Other suggestions:

- I really appreciate the work done by SPI Secretariat to support PWG concluding on the project. I’d like to emphasize the necessity of a better participation from banks, not only physically, but also sharing information and contributing to the project. Taking into consideration the importance of the project, the number of members really working on the project (at least what I’ve perceived from the meetings) was quite symbolic. Further, the participation should be from the decision making staff in the banks, in manner to support the PWG recommendations being implemented in the banks, after being approved.
- Excellent Project Management!

III. Detailed results of the survey

1. SPI Secretariat’s role in organizing the activity of the project working group (PWG)

	No.	%
Very good	5	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

2. Preparation of the Project TORs by the SPI Secretariat

	No.	%
Very good	5	100

Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the planning of the SPI projects: none

3. SPI Secretariat's support in organizing PWG meetings

	No.	%
Very good	3	60
Good	2	40
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the SPI Secretariat' role in organizing the PWGs meetings: Short notice at times.

4. SPI Secretariat's contribution in helping conduct the PWG meeting

	No.	%
Very good	4	80
Good	1	20
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the SPI Secretariat role in conducting the PWGs meetings: none

5. The records (minutes) of the discussions held in the PWG meetings

	No.	%
Very good	3	60
Good	2	40
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the evidence on the PWGs discussions: sometimes too long

6. Quality of documentation and information provided by the SPI Secretariat for your Project

	No.	%
Very good	5	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the communication with the PWGs: none

7. Quality of the analytical work performed by the SPI Secretariat

	No.	%
Very good	4	80
Good	1	20
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the analytical contributions of the SPI Secretariat:
none

8. Quality of the background documentation provided by the SPI Secretariat (in case the project TORs provided such a responsibility)

	No.	%
Very good	4	80
Good	1	20
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on how SPI Secretariat could improve the quality of the background documentation provided: none

9. SPI Secretariat work in preparing the Regulatory Impact Assessment (if the case)

	No.	%
Very good	4	80
Good	1	20
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

10. SPI Secretariat activity in providing international support for the project (if the case)

	No.	%
Very good	2	40
Good	2	40
Satisfactory	1	20
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on how SPI Secretariat could improve the international support: More cases or best practices cases from countries with similar experience in the past or currently should have been considered.

11. SPI Secretariat's support in preparing the project reports

	No.	%
Very good	5	100

Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving SPI Secretariat's support in preparing the projects reports: none

12. Correctness in reflecting opinions in the centralized documents

	No.	%
Yes	5	100
No		

13. SPI Secretariat's contribution in consensus building

	No.	%
Very good	4	80
Good	1	20
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the consensus building activities: none

14. SPI Secretariat's neutral and objective position during PWG discussions

	No.	%
Yes	5	100
No		

15. SPI Secretariat's support to PWG in reaching the commonly agreed solutions

	No.	%
Yes	5	100
No		

16. SPI Secretariat's correctness in outlining the issues in discussion and in providing solutions in the project documents

	No.	%
Yes	5	100
No		

17. Importance of the "honest broker" role played by the SPI Secretariat (as illustrated in questions 11 through 16) in the implementation of the Albania Financial Sector Modernization Program

	No.	%
Very Important	3	60
Quite Important	2	40
Not So Important		

Irrelevant		
------------	--	--

18. Main benefits of a “honest broker” supporting the Program

	Benefits	No. of votes					%				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
a.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders				3	2				60	40
b.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders				1	4				20	80
c.	To assemble and support a project working group			1	1	3			20	20	60
d.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment			1	3	1			20	60	20
e.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	1		1	3		20		20	60	
f.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles			1		4			20		80
g.	To help with consensus-building				4	1				80	20
h.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper				1	4				20	80
i.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.				3	2				60	40

	Benefits	No. of points	% of max
a.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders	22	88%
b.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders	24	96%
c.	To assemble and support a project working group	22	88%
d.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment	20	80%
e.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	16	64%
f.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles	23	92%
g.	To help with consensus-building	21	84%
h.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision	24	96%

	paper		
i.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.	22	88%

19. Information on the progress with non-PWG activities (follow up with relevant authorities, SPI Committee decisions, project implementation, etc.) related to the project

	No.	%
Yes	5	100
No		

20. Additional suggestions for improving the SPI Secretariat work in supporting the PWGs:

- I really appreciate the work done by SPI Secretariat to support PWG concluding on the project. I'd like to emphasize the necessity of a better participation from banks, not only physically, but also sharing information and contributing to the project. Taking into consideration the importance of the project, the number of members really working on the project (at least what I've perceived from the meetings) was quite symbolic. Further, the participation should be from the decision making staff in the banks, in manner to support the PWG recommendations being implemented in the banks, after being approved.
- Excellent Project Management!