



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

**By Consumer Financial Education PWG members**

June 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. more active participation of the PWG members through various incentives;***
- 3. better organization of the works;***
- 4. better records of the meetings;***
- 5. better background documentation;***
- 6. better access to international technical assistance.***

***SPI Secretariat response:***

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

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

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| No. of active PWG members: | 8   |
| No. of respondents:        | 4   |
| Participation ratio:       | 50% |

## **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                 | 75% very good; 25% good           |
| 2.         | Preparation of the Project TORs   | Very good                 | 75% very good; 25% good           |
| 3.         | Support in organizing PWG meetings  | Very good                 | none                              |
| 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                 | 75% very good; 25% good           |
| 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                 | 75% very good; 25% good           |
| 9.         | Preparing the Regulatory Impact Assessment  | Not applicable            |                                   |
| 10.        | Providing international support for the project   | Not relevant answers      |                                   |
| 11.        | Support in preparing the project reports  | Very good                 | 75% very good; 25% no rating      |
| 12.        | Correctness in reflecting opinions in the centralized documents                                       | Yes                       | none                              |
| 13.        | Contribution in consensus building  | Very good                 | 75% very good; 25% good           |
| 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            | 75% very important; 25% 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  | 17                   | 85              |
| 2. | To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders   | 16                   | 80              |
| 3. | To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment | 18                   | 90              |
| 4. | To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders  | 18                   | 90              |
| 5. | To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles                           | 18                   | 90              |
| 6. | To help with consensus-building  | 15                   | 75              |
| 7. | To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper   | 16                   | 80              |
| 8. | To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions   | 15                   | 75              |
| 9. | To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.                             | 18                   | 90              |

**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      | 3   | 75 |
| Good           | 1   | 25 |
| Satisfactory   |     |    |
| Unsatisfactory |     |    |

2. Preparation of the Project TORs by the SPI Secretariat

|                | No. | %  |
|----------------|-----|----|
| Very good      | 3   | 75 |
| Good           | 1   | 25 |
| 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: Short notice at times.

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

|                | No. | %   |
|----------------|-----|-----|
| Very good      | 4   | 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      | 3   | 75 |
| Good           | 1   | 25 |
| 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      | 4   | 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   | 100 |
| Good           |     |     |
| 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      | 3   | 75 |
| Good           | 1   | 25 |
| 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      |     |   |
| Good           |     |   |
| Satisfactory   |     |   |
| Unsatisfactory |     |   |

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

|                | No. | %  |
|----------------|-----|----|
| Very good      | 1   | 25 |
| Good           | 1   | 25 |
| Satisfactory   |     |    |
| Unsatisfactory |     |    |

Not relevant answers

Suggestions on how SPI Secretariat could improve the international support:

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

|                | No. | %  |
|----------------|-----|----|
| Very good      | 3   | 75 |
| Good           |     |    |
| Satisfactory   |     |    |
| Unsatisfactory |     |    |

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

One respondent didn't answer

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      | 3   | 75 |
| Good           | 1   | 25 |
| 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 | 4   | 100 |
| No  |     |     |

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

|     | No. | %   |
|-----|-----|-----|
| Yes | 4   | 100 |
| No  |     |     |

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

|     | No. | %   |
|-----|-----|-----|
| Yes | 4   | 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   | 75 |
| Quite Important  | 1   | 25 |
| 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 | 1 |   |   |    | 75 | 25 |
| b. | To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders  |              |   | 1 | 2 | 1 |   |   | 25 | 50 | 25 |
| c. | To assemble and support a project working group  |              |   | 1 |   | 3 |   |   | 25 |    | 75 |
| d. | To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment |              |   |   | 2 | 2 |   |   |    | 50 | 50 |
| e. | To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions   |              |   | 2 | 1 | 1 |   |   | 50 | 25 | 25 |
| f. | To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles                           |              |   | 1 | 2 | 1 |   |   | 25 | 50 | 25 |
| g. | To help with consensus-building  |              |   | 1 | 2 | 1 |   |   | 25 | 50 | 25 |
| h. | To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper   |              |   | 1 | 3 |   |   |   | 25 | 75 |    |
| i. | To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.                             |              |   |   | 2 | 2 |   |   |    | 50 | 50 |

|    | Benefits   | No. of points | % of max |
|----|--|---------------|----------|
| a. | To identify issues relevant to public-private stakeholders   | 17            | 85       |
| b. | To define a project scope to accurately reflect the needs of all stakeholders  | 16            | 80       |
| c. | To assemble and support a project working group  | 18            | 90       |
| d. | To prepare background information and analyses for the project working group, including Regulatory Impact Assessment | 18            | 90       |
| e. | To use technical expertise efficiently to find practical solutions   | 18            | 90       |
| f. | To keep the project working group work at good pace, anticipating and overcoming obstacles                           | 15            | 75       |
| g. | To help with consensus-building  | 16            | 80       |
| h. | To prepare a convincing SPI Committee decision paper   | 15            | 75       |
| i. | To keep attention on prompt enactment of issues decided under the SPI Albania framework.                             | 18            | 90       |

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:

All the work was organized very good and the SPI Secretariat informed for every thing.