



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

**By Improving Banks Liquidity Risk Management PWG members**

October 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. brief executive summaries to lengthy documents;***
- 2. improve awareness building for the participating institutions;***
- 3. more accurate identification of stakeholder's needs;***
- 4. better access to international technical assistance.***
- 5. better pace of the PWG members' work***

### ***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. improved access to international technical assistance, better organization of the work , etc.)***

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

- 1. Ask for PWG members' evaluations in the last meeting organization (scheduling, minutes, relevance of the content, etc);***
- 2. Improve the awareness building through more frequent communications with the stakeholder institutions in order to have a coordination of responsibilities between PWG members' contribution and SPI Secretariat;***
- 3. Develop new techniques for better access to international technical assistance.***
- 4. Improve the drafting of the documents making them easier to understand and providing an executive summary for each lengthy document.***

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

No. of active PWG members: 12  
No. of respondents: 7  
Participation ratio: 58 %

## **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	Coordinated and managed the discussion appropriately
2.	Preparation of the Project TORs	Very good	86% very good; 14% good
3.	Support in organizing PWG meetings	Very good	86% very good; 14% good
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	Plausible level and technical records provided to working group members.  As far as the working group members are part of their daily work a brief preamble on the materials should be provided in the forthcoming projects in order the discussion could be more effective in case the whole material is not completely read by members.
6.	Quality of documentation and information	Very good	86% very good; 14% good
7.	Quality of the analytical work	Very good	71% very good; 29% good
8.	Quality of the background documentation	Very good	86% very good; 14% good
9.	Preparing the Regulatory Impact Assessment	Very good	none
10.	Providing international support for the project	Good	A kind of foreign expertise such as experts' experience from CEBS, etc could have been provided.
11.	Support in preparing the project reports	Very good	86% very good; 14% good
12.	Correctness in reflecting opinions in the centralized documents	Yes	none

13.	Contribution in consensus building	Very good	Excellent coordination of discussions
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	Quite important	43% very important; 57% quite important
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	25	71
2.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders	29	83
3.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment	31	89
4.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders	34	97
5.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles	29	83
6.	To help with consensus-building	31	89
7.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper	31	89
8.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	30	86
9.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.	30	86

**Other suggestions:**

### **III. Detailed results of the survey**

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

	No.	%
Very good	7	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

- Coordinated and managed the discussion appropriately

2. Preparation of the Project TORs by the SPI Secretariat

	No.	%
Very good	6	86
Good	1	14
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	6	86
Good	1	14
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	7	100
Good		
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	6	86
Good	1	14
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the evidence on the PWGs discussions:

- Plausible level and technical records provided to working group members.
- As far as the working group members are part of their daily work a brief preamble on the materials should be provided in the forthcoming projects in order the discussion could be more effective in case the whole material is not completely read by members.

➤ They were very helpful in guiding the discussion for the next meeting.

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

	No.	%
Very good	6	86
Good	1	14
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the communication with the PWGs:

➤ Very useful and helpful

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

	No.	%
Very good	5	71
Good	2	29
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the analytical contributions of the SPI Secretariat:

➤ It was in all cases well obtained and received.

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

	No.	%
Very good	6	86
Good	1	14
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	7	100
Good		
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

➤ RIA guideline (a short form) could be provided to members in order to better understand the way of analyzing the impact assessment into the regulatory framework.

➤ It provided excellent feedback.

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

	No.	%
Very good	3	43
Good	4	57
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on how SPI Secretariat could improve the international support:

➤ A kind of foreign expertise such as experts' experience from CEBS, etc could have been provided.

➤ Examples from Eastern European countries were taken.

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

	No.	%
Very good	6	86
Good	1	14
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	7	100
No		

13. SPI Secretariat's contribution in consensus building

	No.	%
Very good	5	71
Good	2	29
Satisfactory		
Unsatisfactory		

Suggestions on ways of improving the consensus building activities:

➤ Excellent coordination of discussions.

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

	No.	%
Yes	7	100
No		

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

	No.	%
Yes	7	100
No		

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

	No.	%
Yes	7	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	43
Quite Important	4	57
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		1	2	3	1		14	28	43	15
b.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders			1	4	2			15	57	28
c.	To assemble and support a project working group				4	3				57	43
d.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment				1	6				14	86
e.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions		1		3	3		14		43	43

f.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles			1	2	4			14	28	58
g.	To help with consensus-building		1		1	5		14		14	72
h.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper				5	2				72	28
i.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.				5	2				72	28

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>No. of points</b>	<b>% of max</b>
a.	To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders	25	71
b.	To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders	29	83
c.	To assemble and support a project working group	31	89
d.	To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment	34	97
e.	To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions	29	83
f.	To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles	31	89
g.	To help with consensus-building	31	89
h.	To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper	30	86
i.	To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.	30	86

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	4	100
No		

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

- In order to appreciate the good contribution evidenced over several projects performed by SPI Secretariat, much work needs to be done especially on the awareness of the working group members from banking industry concerning the importance of the SPI



Projects in order their feedback and the contribution (opinions, suggestions, etc). This would contribute to the efficiency of the projects.

- All the work was organized very well and the SPI Secretariat did an excellent job in keeping the PWG informed at all stages.