



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

No.	SPI Secretariat Activity Aspect	General Assessment	Comments/suggestions
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

	Benefits	No. of points	% of max
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.