



## **Summary Findings of the Evaluation of SPI Secretariat Activity**

**By Auction Procedures PWG members**

March 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. Low participation of PWG members in the evaluation shows a low mobilization capability of the SPI Secretariat;***
- 2. Improvement areas identified by the respondents:***
  - contribution in helping conduct the PWG meetings;*
  - quality of the analytical work;*
  - preparing the Regulatory Impact Assessment;*
  - providing international support for the project.*

### ***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 helping conduct the PWG meetings, specific aspects in the analytical work that require improvement, etc.)***

### ***SPI Secretariat follow up actions:***

- 1. Periodically remind PWG members to follow up with the SPI Secretariat evaluation***
- 2. Ask for PWG members' evaluations in the last meetings***
- 3. Presentation from the beginning of the project objectives as well as each party's specific role and responsibilities;***
- 2. Establish closer contacts with the PWG members and ensure their presence in the PWG meetings apriori;***
- 3. Call up PWG members to ensure better participation and use PMT authority and involvement more extensively***

- 4. Plan in advance the objectives and dynamics of the upcoming PWG meeting together with the PMT;*
- 5. Involve more PMT and other PWG members on several preparation stages of the analytical documents in order to avoid potential analytical weaknesses in the documents.*
- 6. Help PMT improve technique of conducting PWG meetings by outlining all expressed opinions and commonly agreed conclusion;*
- 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);*
- 8. Better calibration of PWG expectations for technical support.*

## **I. Statistics of the survey**

No. of PWG members:	12
No. of respondents:	4
Participation ratio:	33.3%

## **II. Summary findings of the survey**

<b>No.</b>	<b>SPI Secretariat Activity Aspect</b>	<b>General Assessment</b>	<b>Comments/suggestions</b>
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	none
4.	Contribution in helping conduct the PWG meeting	Good - Very good	50% good 50% very good
5.	The records (minutes) of the discussions held in the PWG meetings	Very good	none
6.	Quality of documentation and information	Very good	none
7.	Quality of the analytical work	Good - Very good	50% good 50% very good
8.	Quality of the background documentation	Very good	none
9.	Preparing the Regulatory Impact Assessment	Good - Very good	50% good 50% very good
10.	Providing international support for the project	Good	none
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	Good - Very good	50% good 50% very good
19.	Information on the progress with non-PWG activities	Yes	none

Main benefits of an “honest broker” supporting the Program

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>No. of points</b>	<b>% of max</b>
1.	To assemble and support a project working group	18	90%
2.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders	17	85%
3.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment	20	100%
4.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders	20	100%
5.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles	17	85%
6.	To help with consensus-building	18	90%
7.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper	15	75%
8.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	18	90%
9.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.	20	100%

**Other suggestions: None**

**III. Detailed results of the survey**

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

	No.	%
Very good	4	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

2. Preparation of the Project TORs by the SPI Secretariat

	No.	%
Very good	4	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	4	100%
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

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

	No.	%
Very good	2	50%
Good	2	50%
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	4	100%
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the evidence on the PWGs discussions: none

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

	No.	%
Very good	4	100%
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

Quality of the analytical work performed by the SPI Secretariat

	No.	%
Very good	2	50
Good	2	50
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

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

	No.	%
Very good	4	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

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

	No.	%
Very good	2	50
Good	2	50
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

	No.	%
Very good	1	25
Good	3	75
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

	No.	%
Very good	4	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

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

11. Correctness in reflecting opinions in the centralized documents

	No.	%
Yes	4	100
No		

12. SPI Secretariat's contribution in consensus building

	No.	%
Very good	4	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the consensus building activities: none

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

	No.	%
Yes	4	100
No		

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

	No.	%
Yes	4	100
No		

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

	No.	%
Yes	4	100
No		

16. 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	2	50
Quite Important	2	50
Not So Important		
Irrelevant		

17. 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				2	2				50	50
b.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders				3	1				75	25
c.	To assemble and support a project working group					4					100
d.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment					4					100
e.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions				3	1				75	25
f.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles			1		3			25		75
g.	To help with consensus-building			1	3				25	75	
h.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper				2	2				50	50
i.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.					4					100

	Benefits	No. of points	% of max
a.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders	18	90
b.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders	17	85
c.	To assemble and support a project working group	20	100
d.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment	20	100
e.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	17	85
f.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles	18	90
g.	To help with consensus-building	15	75
h.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper	18	90
i.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.	20	100



18. 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	4	100
No		

19. Additional suggestions for improving the SPI Secretariat work in supporting the PWGs: none