

# IEO

Independent Evaluation Office  
*of the International Monetary Fund*



# 2019

ANNUAL REPORT

## ABOUT THE IEO

Established in 2001, the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) conducts independent and objective evaluations of the IMF's policies, activities, and products. In accordance with its terms of reference, it pursues three interrelated objectives:

- ▶ To support the Executive Board's institutional governance and oversight responsibilities, thus contributing to accountability.
- ▶ To enhance the learning culture within the Fund by increasing the ability to draw lessons from experience.
- ▶ To strengthen the Fund's external credibility by enhancing transparency and improving understanding of the work of the IMF.

Independence is the fundamental anchor of the IEO's work. It is completely independent from the IMF's management team and staff, and operates at "arm's length from the Executive Board." Its budget is separate from the Fund's (it accounts for about 0.5 percent of the institution's total budget), but subject to the same control procedures. The IEO is entitled to access any internal information and documents with very limited exceptions. The office's work is evaluated periodically by external experts.

For further information on the IEO and its ongoing and completed evaluations, please see our website [IEO.IMF.org](http://IEO.IMF.org) or contact the IEO at +(1) 202.623.7312 or at [IEO@IMF.org](mailto:IEO@IMF.org).

ISBN: 978-1-51350-881-8



IEO staff.



# CONTENTS

<b>MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR</b> . . . . .	<b>2</b>
<b>1. OVERVIEW OF RECENT ACTIVITIES</b> . . . . .	<b>4</b>
IMF Financial Surveillance . . . . .	4
IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies . . . . .	5
Governance of the IMF: Evaluation Update . . . . .	8
Outreach and Communication . . . . .	8
Budget and Staffing . . . . .	9
<b>2. FOLLOW-UP ON IEO EVALUATIONS</b> . . . . .	<b>10</b>
<b>3. FOLLOW-UP ON THE THIRD EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE IEO</b> . 12	
<b>4. ONGOING EVALUATIONS AND IEO WORK PROGRAM</b> . . . . .	<b>13</b>
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET</b> . . . . .	<b>16</b>
<b>OUTREACH ACTIVITIES</b> . . . . .	<b>17</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> . . . . .	<b>19</b>



## MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

The past year has been highly productive for evaluation at the IMF. The IEO has delivered three well-received reports on key issues for the institution. Good progress has also been made on following up on earlier evaluations and in putting in place a number of steps to strengthen the framework for evaluation at the Fund, implementing recommendations made by the *Third External Evaluation of the IEO* in July 2018. Thus I believe that the Fund is rising to the challenge set by the *Third External Evaluation* to increase the traction of the IEO's work through increased commitment by management, Executive Board and staff as well as the IEO itself.

As detailed in section 1 of this report, two full-scale evaluations completed over the past year have looked at IMF work on topics at the core of the Fund's surveillance mandate: IMF financial surveillance and IMF advice on unconventional monetary policies. Both evaluations recognize important contributions made by the Fund in recent years but also highlight shortcomings and call on the IMF to deepen its expertise to enhance its capacity to provide value for the membership.

The evaluation update on IMF governance recognizes some significant reforms over the past ten years, but also emphasizes continuing challenges to IMF representation and accountability that could over time undermine the IMF's legitimacy and effectiveness if not adequately addressed.

I am pleased that there has been substantial progress over the last year in following through with management implementation plans for recently completed evaluations of IMF work on fragile states and social protection, as outlined in section 2. This progress shows that the IEO can really make a difference in how the IMF works, building on its independent mandate while working closely with Board, management, and staff.

In addition, a number of significant changes have been made to our evaluation framework, following recommendations from the *Third External Evaluation*, which should help to further enhance the IEO's traction. Most important, as detailed in section 3, the IEO's product mix has been broadened and the follow-up process for IEO evaluations has been further strengthened.

Our IEO work program for the next year, laid out in section 4, includes four new ambitious and timely studies on important topics: full-scale evaluations of IMF advice on capital flows and of adjustment and growth

in IMF-supported programs; an evaluation of IMF collaboration with the World Bank on macrostructural issues, which will be a pilot for a new shorter evaluation format; and an update on the 2009 evaluation of IMF involvement in international trade policy issues.

We look forward to continue working together with all our stakeholders to deliver on our evaluation mandate to help the IMF to continue to increase its value and impact.

**CHARLES COLLYNS**

*Director, Independent Evaluation Office*



## OVERVIEW OF RECENT ACTIVITIES

Since the 2018 *Annual Report*, the IEO has completed two evaluations—*IMF Financial Surveillance* and *IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies*—and one evaluation update—*Governance of the IMF*. In addition, the IEO has initiated work on two new full-scale evaluations, one assessing Fund advice on capital flows and the other examining adjustment and growth in IMF-supported programs. The IEO has also launched the first pilot for the shorter evaluation format looking at *IMF Collaboration with the World Bank on Macro-Structural Issues*. The IEO is also preparing a new evaluation update, which re-examines IMF involvement in international trade policy issues ten years after the 2009 evaluation on this topic.



### IMF FINANCIAL SURVEILLANCE

The evaluation of *IMF Financial Surveillance* was completed in January 2019. The evaluation found that the IMF had substantially upgraded its financial surveillance work since the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) in 2008, but it also identified considerable room for further improvement.

Among the key IMF achievements identified in the report were:

- ▶ Delivery of high-quality, in-depth assessments of the most globally systemic financial jurisdictions under the Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP);
- ▶ Increased attention in Article IV surveillance to macrofinancial linkages;
- ▶ Contributions to the development of a broad range of diagnostic tools (such as stress tests) and new policy approaches (such as macroprudential instruments); and
- ▶ The establishment of the *Global Financial Stability Report* and the Early Warning Exercise as leading sources of analysis and insight on the global financial system.

Notwithstanding this progress, the evaluation concluded that the IMF's financial surveillance work has been uneven. There is still a need to strengthen financial and macrofinancial work in Article IV consultations. The allocation of resources in the FSAP is weighted toward systemic jurisdictions, where the program seems to be at risk of diminishing returns. Moreover, internal resource constraints and talent management policies have slowed the needed buildup of financial and macrofinancial expertise. These are important challenges, given the IMF's position as the only international financial institution with the mandate to conduct financial surveillance in all countries as well as for the global economy, and given that these issues are at the core of the IMF's responsibilities.

“...notwithstanding the real progress to date, the IMF should address a number of challenges to further strengthen the effectiveness of financial surveillance.”



Ruben Lamdany, Project Leader for the evaluation of IMF Financial Surveillance.

The IEO made six inter-related recommendations in the evaluation report, aimed at strengthening IMF financial surveillance through a combination of new initiatives and adjustments to existing programs—see box below.

#### MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

- ▶ Deepen financial and macrofinancial analysis in Article IV consultations, including by taking practical steps to better integrate FSAP analysis.
- ▶ Revisit the current approach to allocating FSAP resources to achieve a more flexible, risk-based allocation across countries and topics.
- ▶ Continue to enhance the traction of multilateral surveillance by increasing rigor and transparency and by deepening collaboration with international partners.
- ▶ Strengthen efforts to be a center of excellence for financial and macrofinancial research.
- ▶ Intensify efforts to attract, develop, and retain a deeper pool of financial talent.
- ▶ Consider devoting significant additional resources to financial surveillance.

The Managing Director welcomed the report, noting that it offered valuable and constructive insights on how to further improve the quality and impact of financial surveillance. Executive Directors appreciated the IEO’s recognition of the substantial upgrade to the Fund’s financial surveillance work as a result of the many initiatives launched to strengthen the Fund’s work in this area since the Global Financial Crisis. At the same time, they shared the view that there is scope to further enhance the quality and impact of the Fund’s financial surveillance. Executive Directors joined the Managing Director in broadly supporting the report’s recommendations.

An implementation plan (MIP) has been presented to the Board specifying actions proposed by management to follow through on the report’s recommendations, for discussion in September 2019. Already, the report’s findings and recommendations are feeding into the upcoming 2020 Comprehensive Surveillance Review, the FSAP Review, and the human resources strategy and compensation benefits reviews, as well as into budget discussions about resource priorities.

The full report, the statement by the Managing Director, and the Chairman’s Summing Up of the Executive Board meeting, along with supporting documents, are available on the [IEO website](#).

#### IMF ADVICE ON UNCONVENTIONAL MONETARY POLICIES

In June 2019, the IEO completed its evaluation on *IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies*. The report evaluated the IMF’s advice both to the countries which initiated unconventional monetary policies (UMP) and to countries—particularly



emerging markets—affected by spillovers from such policies. The Global Financial Crisis and the slow recovery from its aftermath prompted active and often innovative policy efforts over the past decade from central banks, which are only being gradually unwound. Many central banks in major advanced economies used UMP—quantitative easing and new forms of forward guidance, for instance—to stimulate their economies. Central banks in smaller advanced economies pioneered novel steps such as the introduction of negative policy interest rates and exchange rate ceilings. Emerging markets felt the effects of UMP through very easy global liquidity and swings in capital flows, to which they responded through a variety of policies, including macroprudential policies and capital flow management measures. Increased efforts were made to enhance international policy cooperation. Central bank activism triggered intense debates about the future role for central banks and the framework for monetary policy.

The IMF’s response to these developments has been wide-ranging, and in many respects, impressive. Notwithstanding the considerable uncertainty and limited previous experience on which to draw in formulating advice, the Fund provided early support and validation to the major advanced economy central banks leading the way on UMP and urged aggressive use in others moving more slowly. It monitored the potential buildup of financial stability risks from UMP and helped to develop a new macroprudential policy toolkit to manage such risks. Fund staff drew attention to and analyzed cross-border spillovers through new products and techniques. Staff also reconsidered advice to countries being affected by these spillovers in a new Institutional View (IV) on managing capital flows. The IMF contributed to the G-20’s effort to encourage greater international policy cooperation and introduced new precautionary financing instruments to help deal with, inter alia, volatile conditions in global capital markets.

While recognizing these achievements, the evaluation also identifies shortcomings in the IMF’s engagement on UMP, reflecting in part long-standing challenges that have limited the value added and influence of the Fund’s advice.



Prakash Loungani, Project Leader for the evaluation of IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies.

- ▶ The shortage of deep expertise on monetary policy issues limits the Fund’s ability to provide cutting-edge advice when it is most needed, namely when central banks are contemplating novel actions in the face of unprecedented circumstances;
- ▶ In area departments, country teams often rotate quite quickly and engagement through the Article IV consultation is quite discontinuous, limiting familiarity with country circumstances and the building of relationships;
- ▶ While discussions with Fund staff are appreciated as a useful dialogue with well-informed interlocutors, country officials typically turn elsewhere when looking for expert monetary policy advice;
- ▶ The Fund could have done more to draw lessons from experience with UMP and—once the immediate need for both monetary and fiscal stimulus in the initial years of the GFC had passed—to explore costs and benefits of alternative mixes between monetary and fiscal policies;



“The Fund could have done more to draw lessons from experience with UMP and...to explore costs and benefits of alternative mixes between monetary and fiscal policies.”

- ▶ In emerging market countries, some members still feel that the Fund has not gone sufficiently far to appreciate the policy challenges they face from financial spillovers and volatile capital flows; and
- ▶ There have also been long-standing limits on the IMF’s traction in encouraging international policy cooperation, and challenges to designing precautionary financing instruments that attract broad interest across the membership.

The recommendations of the evaluation aim to help the IMF raise its game on monetary policy issues— see box below.

#### MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

- ▶ Develop a small core group of top monetary policy experts at the IMF to keep abreast of and contribute to cutting-edge discussions in the central banking community, support institutional learning, and provide in-depth advice to country teams as and when needed.
- ▶ Deepen work on the costs and benefits of UMP and related policies to develop a playbook on policy responses for use in future downturns.
- ▶ Make sure that the Fund is at the forefront of financial spillover analysis and provision of advice on dealing with capital flows, drawing on its global multilateral mandate, universal membership, and breadth of country experience.
- ▶ Draw on lessons from this evaluation to consider steps to deepen and enrich country engagement in bilateral surveillance: longer tenure of mission chiefs, less turnover among country teams, more consistent handover procedures, and more engagement outside the Article IV cycle.

In the discussion by the Executive Board on June 5, 2019, Executive Directors welcomed the report’s finding that the Fund’s response to UMP had made valuable contributions. They appreciated the IEO’s insights on how the Fund can further improve the value added of its advice on monetary policy issues and traction with member countries, leveraging its comparative advantage and extensive country experience. Directors broadly endorsed the report’s recommendations while noting that any changes in the Fund’s monetary policy work should be coordinated with other workstreams, including the integrated policy framework (IPF) now being developed, the Comprehensive Surveillance Review (CSR), the human resources strategy, and budget discussions.

The Managing Director also welcomed the report, noting that it offered valuable insights on how to further improve the timeliness and value added of the IMF’s advice on UMP. IMF management will work with staff to formulate a follow-up implementation plan.

The full report, the statement by the Managing Director, and the Chairman’s Summing Up of the Executive Board meeting, along with supporting documents, are available on the [IEO website](#).



Jun Il Kim, Project Leader for the IMF Governance Update.

## GOVERNANCE OF THE IMF: EVALUATION UPDATE

In September 2018, the IEO issued an update of the 2008 IEO evaluation of the *Governance of the IMF*.<sup>1</sup> The update concluded that, notwithstanding considerable advances since the publication of the IEO's 2008 evaluation of *Governance of the IMF*, the balance of the IMF's governance structure remained weighted in favor of effectiveness and efficiency; accountability and voice continued to raise concerns that could affect IMF legitimacy and effectiveness.

IMF governance had proved effective in supporting the IMF's capacity to respond in a timely and effective way to fulfill its mandate. However, while the quota and voice reforms in 2008 and 2010 were an important step, the alignment of "shares and chairs" remained a work in progress. The update also identified concerns regarding constraints on the Executive Board's capacity for strategic oversight, management's dominant role in the decision-making process, and the management accountability framework's limited practical impact. The selection process for top IMF management positions was considered by many stakeholders to be insufficiently transparent and merit-based and too limited by nationality considerations. The International Monetary and Financial Committee's provision of strategic direction to the IMF was seen by some members to be, at times, overshadowed by the less-representative Group of Twenty (G-20).

The report and the statement by the Managing Director are available on the [IEO website](#).

## OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION

Outreach is important for encouraging public awareness and discussion of the IEO's work, and for receiving feedback and gathering information on evaluation issues of relevance from a broad range of stakeholders. The IEO has continued to increase outreach to authorities and civil society in member countries over the last year. The IEO organized or participated in numerous events, with a particular focus on newly completed evaluations.

The IEO actively uses its website, along with email communication with subscribers, to publicize its work and to solicit public comments on ongoing, future, and completed evaluations. The website ([IEO.IMF.org](#)) serves as a one-stop source for all IEO reports as well as information on how the IEO works.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is part of a series of evaluation updates that return to past evaluations ten years after their completion and examine the current status and relevance of the initial evaluation's findings and conclusions.



IEO presentation to staff on the evaluation of IMF Financial Surveillance.



Charles Collins, IEO Director, and Prakash Loungani, IEO Assistant Director, present the evaluation of IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies at the Peterson Institute for International Economics.



Sargon Nissan, Finance Transparency Coalition, and Miriam Brett, Bretton Woods Project, participate in a seminar on the evaluation of IMF Financial Surveillance in the Civil Society Policy Forum during the 2019 Spring meetings.

## BUDGET AND STAFFING

The IEO spent \$6.5 million in FY2019, around 90 percent of its total budgetary resources, including the approved budget amount and the resources carried forward from FY2018 as authorized (see page 16 for details about the IEO's budget and expenditures). The budget underrun was largely a result of holding back from initiating new evaluations while the IEO worked with the Executive Board and staff in responding to recommendations in the *Third External Evaluation of the IEO* on topic selection and product mix. It also reflected staff turnover and lower than projected travel expenditures. The pace of expenditure is expected to pick up considerably in FY2020, as new evaluations move ahead.

In March 2019, the Executive Board approved the IEO FY2020 budget proposal of \$6.45 million, representing zero real growth over FY2019. This budget, along with a carryover of unspent funds from FY2019 of up to 10 percent of the authorized FY2019 budget, will allow the IEO to meet the needs of its FY2020 work program. The IEO also presented indicative budgets for FY2021 and FY2022, also based on zero real growth.

There continue to be fifteen staff positions (including the Director) at the IEO. Several staff members moved on and new ones were recruited during FY2019. The IEO team consists of a diverse group of professionals, of whom more than half come from outside the Fund. The IEO employs research assistants on a contractual basis, as well as benefiting from summer interns and a visiting scholar. In addition, the IEO continues to rely extensively on external consultants to bring expertise and fresh perspectives to its evaluation work.

# 2

## FOLLOW-UP ON IEO EVALUATIONS

Effective follow-up is critical to ensure that the IMF gets full benefit from IEO evaluations. For this purpose, since 2006, management has been required to present to the Executive Board for its approval, within six months of the Board discussion, a detailed Management Implementation Plan (MIP) that explains how it expects to implement Board-endorsed recommendations. Progress in implementing these MIPs is reviewed each year by the Board based on a Periodic Monitoring Report (PMR) prepared by the Office of Internal Audit. Starting with the upcoming Tenth PMR, PMRs will be discussed in formal Board meetings, strengthening oversight of the follow-up process.

Staff presented the MIP for the evaluation of *The IMF and Fragile States* to the Board in September 2018 (IMF, 2018a). The ambitious plan lays out interlinked actions to further strengthen the IMF's engagement with fragile and conflict-affected states (FCS), including an institutional mechanism to coordinate IMF work on these countries, development of country engagement strategies, commitment to consider options to provide more sustained financial support, actions to increase the impact of IMF capacity development in FCS, and steps to strengthen staff incentives to work in FCS.



IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde launches the new strategy for IMF engagement on social spending on the occasion of the International Labour Organization's 100th anniversary.

Photo by International Labour Organization.

A number of significant actions have already been taken place to follow up this MIP.

- ▶ The MD issued a statement on the role of Fund engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states (IMF, 2018c), which was endorsed by the International Monetary and Financial Committee.
- ▶ A high-level interdepartmental committee on FCS was established to assess progress made in delivering the MIP through end-2020. This committee is supported by a Technical Taskforce, which will review FCS guidance, and conduct policy and analytical work on FCS issues.
- ▶ Executive Directors supported the reallocation of resources toward country work on FCS in the FY2020-22 Medium-Term Budget in April 2019. This reallocation will entail an increase of 10 percent in resources for FCS for FY2020 (IMF, 2019c).
- ▶ In line with the commitment to continue to improve the tailoring of financing facilities to FCS needs in the 2018 Review of Facilities for Low-Income Countries, the Executive Board approved an increase in the Rapid Credit Facility (RCF) access limit in May 2019 (IMF, 2019d; e).

The IMF has also made good progress on the 2017 evaluation of *The IMF and Social Protection*. In May 2019, the Executive Board approved a new strategic framework to guide IMF engagement on social spending (IMF, 2019f; g). The new strategy is based on best practices for more effective and systematic engagement, including: (i) engagement guided by an assessment of the macro-criticality of a specific social spending issue and its consideration in an IMF-supported program context, and by the existence of in-house expertise; (ii) enhanced collaboration with international development institutions; (iii) strengthened program design and conditionality; (iv) clearer guidance on the use of targeted and universal transfers; and (v) better communications, including by leveraging input from a broad set of stakeholders. This new strategy was launched by the Managing Director in July 2019 (IMF, 2019h).



## FOLLOW UP ON THE THIRD EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE IEO

Every five years, the Board commissions a group of outside experts to do an external evaluation of the IEO. This exercise provides a very useful stocktaking of the IEO's relevance and impact and provides useful recommendations for the IEO itself and the broader framework for independent evaluation at the Fund.

The *Third External Evaluation of the IEO*, completed by a panel of external experts led by Donald Kaberuka in July 2018, found that the IEO had cemented its reputation for high-quality and independent work (Kaberuka and others, 2018). Nonetheless, the report concluded that there was room to enhance the traction of IEO work further and called for greater commitment from all parties. In discussing the report, Executive Directors agreed that enhancing the IEO's impact is a joint responsibility and concurred on the need to strengthen the process for following up on IEO evaluations (IMF, 2018b).

The last year has seen good progress toward following up on these recommendations.

- ▶ The IEO refined its process for selecting topics for future evaluations, in particular to enhance transparency and inclusivity (IEO, 2019a). In this context, the Executive Board endorsed an IEO proposal to introduce a new, shorter evaluation product on a pilot basis to allow the IEO to respond more nimbly to Board concerns. The first pilot – looking at the Bank-Fund collaboration on macrostructural issues – is underway.
- ▶ The Board approved a framework to deal with the significant number of actions to follow up on past IEO evaluations that have remained outstanding for a long period of time (IMF, 2019a). This framework provides the basis for sorting through outstanding actions and determining which are on track, which need reinforcement, and which should be retired or monitored through other mechanisms. This “triage” process will be carried out later this year in the context of the Tenth Periodic Monitoring Report on the status of IMF actions to implement past Board-endorsed IEO recommendations.
- ▶ Several other helpful procedural changes have been made (IMF, 2019b). The IEO now has greater involvement in the preparation of Summings Up for Board discussions of IEO evaluation reports. In designing follow-up on IEO recommendations, the IMF will work to make actions more specific, measurable, actionable, and relevant. To further strengthen oversight of the follow-up process, PMRs will be discussed in formal Board meetings.

# 4

## ONGOING EVALUATIONS AND IEO WORK PROGRAM

The IEO is currently working on a new round of evaluations. As a first step, the IEO consulted with stakeholders about its future work program. A list of possible topics was published on the IEO website in January for public comment and discussed with Executive Directors (IEO, 2019c). In February, the IEO announced topics for its next set of evaluations (IEO, 2019d).

An **update** of the 2009 evaluation on **IMF Involvement in International Trade Policy Issues** is now well underway and is on track for completion by the end of this year. The update will revisit the 2009 evaluation in light of the considerable developments that have taken place since, including increased tensions in the multilateral trading system, the proliferation of regional and plurilateral trade agreements, the rising role of global value chains, and rising concerns over the distributional effects of globalization. It will provide a stock-taking of progress made in addressing concerns raised in the 2009 evaluation and highlight new issues that have emerged and how the IMF has responded.

Two new full-scale evaluations are underway. The evaluation of the **IMF Advice on Capital Flows** will assess the value added and influence of Fund work on capital flows for its member countries and for the global monetary system and draw lessons for the Fund's work in this area. Key issues include whether advice: (i) balances the long-term gains from liberalization against potential short-term costs from exposure to volatile capital flows; (ii) is well rooted in analysis and empirical support; (iii) has adapted to shifts in the environment and experience; (iv) is coherent and evenhanded; and (v) strikes a balance between countries' individual circumstances and the broad interest of the membership. This evaluation should provide useful input to the IMF's continuing work on these and related issues, including a possible future review of the Institutional



IEO workshop on the ongoing evaluation of IMF Advice on Capital Flows.

View on Capital Flows approved in 2012 and the new work stream on an integrated policy framework to offer a more systematic assessment of an effective policy mix, particularly to deal with external shocks. The draft issues paper was presented at a Board Seminar in July 2018 (IEO, 2019g), and the report is targeted for completion in the summer of 2020.

The evaluation of **Adjustment and Growth in IMF-Supported Programs** will assess how well IMF-supported programs have helped to sustain economic growth while delivering necessary adjustment for external viability. This evaluation will consider the experience with adjustment and growth in program design and outcomes over the past ten years and draw lessons for the Fund's lending and conditionality framework. The evaluation will examine: (i) how the design of IMF-supported programs sought to achieve growth objectives while also ensuring external stability; (ii) how realistic was the underlying analysis used in setting growth objectives and adjustment policies and what available evidence was used to substantiate the analysis; and (iii) whether IMF-supported programs helped countries meet growth objectives better than otherwise during and after the program and what were the growth payoffs of the alternative strategies used to support growth. The draft issues paper will be presented at a Board Seminar by the end of August. The IEO expects to present a report to the Executive Board in FY2021.

The evaluation on **IMF Collaboration with the World Bank on Macro-Structural Issues** will be the first evaluation in the shorter evaluation format, adopted on a trial basis to allow the IEO to respond more nimbly to Board concerns. The evaluation will assess how well the Fund has collaborated with the World Bank and other international organizations in its work on macrostructural issues where the Fund can benefit from expertise of partner institutions and draw lessons on what works well. The evaluation will seek to provide a holistic perspective on key factors affecting the outcome of collaboration between the two institutions. The draft issues paper was presented at a Board Seminar in March 2019 (IEO, 2019e). The IEO aims to present this evaluation to the Board in March 2020.



IEO workshop on the recently launched evaluation of Adjustment and Growth in IMF-Supported Programs.



## COMPLETED AND ONGOING IEO WORK PROGRAM

EVALUATIONS	STATUS
Evaluation of Prolonged Use of IMF Resources	Completed 08/02
The IMF and Recent Capital Account Crises: Indonesia, Korea, Brazil	Completed 05/03
Fiscal Adjustment in IMF-Supported Programs	Completed 08/03
Evaluation of the IMF's Role in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility	Completed 07/04
The IMF and Argentina, 1991–2001	Completed 07/04
IMF Technical Assistance	Completed 02/05
The IMF's Approach to Capital Account Liberalization	Completed 05/05
IMF Support to Jordan, 1989–2004	Completed 11/05
Financial Sector Assessment Program	Completed 01/06
Multilateral Surveillance	Completed 03/06
The IMF and Aid to Sub-Saharan Africa	Completed 03/07
IMF Exchange Rate Policy Advice	Completed 05/07
Structural Conditionality in IMF-Supported Programs	Completed 12/07
Governance of the IMF: An Evaluation	Completed 05/08
IMF Involvement in International Trade Policy Issues	Completed 06/09
IMF Interactions with Member Countries	Completed 12/09
IMF Performance in the Run-Up to the Financial and Economic Crisis: IMF Surveillance in 2004–07	Completed 01/11
Research at the IMF: Relevance and Utilization	Completed 06/11
International Reserves: IMF Concerns and Country Perspectives	Completed 12/12
The Role of the IMF as Trusted Advisor	Completed 02/13
IMF Forecasts: Process, Quality, and Country Perspectives	Completed 02/14
Recurring issues from a Decade of Evaluation: Lessons for the IMF	Completed 06/14
IMF Response to the Financial and Economic Crisis	Completed 10/14
Self-Evaluation at the IMF: An IEO Assessment	Completed 09/15
Behind the Scenes with Data at the IMF: An IEO Evaluation	Completed 03/16
The IMF and the Crises in Greece, Ireland, and Portugal	Completed 07/16
The IMF and Social Protection	Completed 07/17
The IMF and Fragile States	Completed 03/18
IMF Financial Surveillance	Completed 01/19
IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies	Completed 06/19
IMF Collaboration with the World Bank on Macro-Structural Issues	In Progress
IMF Advice on Capital Flows	In Progress
Adjustment and Growth in IMF-Supported Programs	In Progress
EVALUATION UPDATES	STATUS
Prolonged Use of IMF Resources: Revisiting the 2002 IEO Evaluation	Completed 07/13
Fiscal Adjustment in IMF-Supported Programs: Revisiting the 2003 IEO Evaluation	Completed 07/13
IMF Technical Assistance: Revisiting the 2005 IEO Evaluation	Completed 03/14
Revisiting the IEO Evaluations of The IMF's Role in PRSPs and the PRGF (2004) and The IMF and Aid to Sub-Saharan Africa (2007)	Completed 08/14
The IMF's Approach to Capital Account Liberalization: Revisiting the 2005 IEO Evaluation	Completed 02/15
Multilateral Surveillance: Revisiting the 2006 IEO Evaluation	Completed 02/17
IMF Exchange Rate Policy Advice, 1999–2005: Evaluation Update	Completed 10/17
Structural Conditionality in IMF-Supported Programs: Evaluation Update	Completed 5/18
Governance of the IMF: Evaluation Update	Completed 11/18
IMF Involvement in International Trade Policy Issues: Evaluation Update	In Progress

# ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

(In U.S. dollars)

	FY2018		FY2019		FY2020
	Budget	Outturn	Budget	Outturn	Budget
<b>Total resources including carry-forward</b>	6,599,543	6,293,496	6,807,510	6,073,116	7,080,301
Of which carry-forward <sup>1</sup>	285,440	...	309,109	...	641,015
<b>Administrative resources</b>	6,314,103	6,293,496	6,498,401	6,073,116	6,439,286
Regular staff allocation <sup>2</sup>	4,978,239	4,658,903	5,137,513	5,073,206	5,050,550
Discretionary budget	1,335,864	1,634,593	1,360,888	999,910	1,388,736
<i>Of which:</i>					
Contractual services (including overtime)	673,433	958,227	688,248	514,843	706,831
Business travel and seminar program	420,296	482,714	424,209	303,593	427,761
Publications	26,024	13,409	26,700	16,090	27,315
Other administrative items	216,111	180,243	221,731	165,384	226,829

<sup>1</sup> Resources carried forward from the previous year under established rules, aside from FY2020 when a higher carry-forward was approved on a one-time exceptional basis.

<sup>2</sup> In FY2017, IEO returned \$200,000 of available resources to the central budget. In FY2018 and FY2019, available resources were increased by \$111,529 and \$148,253, respectively, as a one-time augmentation to manage the transition costs related to turnover of B-level staff.

# OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

(September 2018 – August 2019)

- ▶ September 2018, Chengdu, China – Seminar on the evaluation of *The IMF and Fragile States* at the 2018 Asia Evaluation Week.
- ▶ October 2018, Bali, Indonesia – Seminar on “Building a Better IMF– Strengthening the IMF’s Legitimacy and Credibility” during the Civil Society Policy Forum at the 2018 Annual Meetings.
- ▶ November 2018, Washington, DC – Workshop on “Independent Evaluation at the IMF – Where Next?” at the Center for Global Development.
- ▶ December 2018, Oxford, UK – Presentation on “Assessing the Role of the IMF in Fragile States” during a workshop on Macroeconomic Policy in Fragile States held at the Blavatnik School of Government at Oxford University.
- ▶ December 2018, London, UK – Workshop on “Independent Evaluation at the IMF – Where Next?” at the Bretton Woods Project.
- ▶ February 2019, London, UK; Frankfurt, Germany; Basel and Zurich, Switzerland; and Madrid, Spain – Seminar on the evaluation of *IMF Financial Surveillance* at the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Deutsche Bundesbank, the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements, the Swiss National Bank, and the Banco de España.
- ▶ February 2019, Madrid, Spain, and Milan, Italy – Presentations on the “Role of Evaluation” at the Ministry of Public Administration and at Bocconi University.
- ▶ April 2019, Washington DC – Seminars on the evaluation of *IMF Financial Surveillance* during the Spring Meetings Civil Society Policy Forum and the G-24 Deputies Meeting.
- ▶ June 2019, Washington, DC – Presentation on the IEO evaluation of *IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies* at the Peterson Institute for International Economics.
- ▶ July 2019, Singapore – Presentations on “Assessing IMF Policy Advice: Lessons from Two Recent Evaluations” and on “Advice on Capital Flows – Issues for an Evaluation” at Asean+3 Macroeconomic Research Office (AMRO).

- ▶ July 2019, Bali, Indonesia – Presentations on the IEO evaluation of *IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies* and on “IMF Advice on Capital Flows – Issues for an Evaluation” at the 41st Meeting of SEACEN Directors of Research and Monetary Policy.
- ▶ July 2019, Beijing, China – Presentation on “Assessing IMF Policy Advice: Lessons from Two Recent Evaluations” at Center for International Finance and Economic Research, Tsing Hua University.

## REFERENCES

Independent Evaluation Office of the International Monetary Fund (IEO), 2018, *Governance of the IMF – Evaluation Update* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019a, “Selection of IEO Evaluation Topics and IEO Product Mix” (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019b, *IMF Financial Surveillance* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019c, “Possible Topics for Future IEO Evaluations” (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019d, “Independent Evaluation Office – 2019 Work Program” (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019e, “IMF Collaboration with the World Bank on Macro-Structural Issues – Draft Issues Paper” (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019f, *IMF Advice on Unconventional Monetary Policies* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019g, “IMF Advice on Capital Flows – Draft Issues Paper” (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

International Monetary Fund (IMF), 2018a, “Implementation Plan in Response to the Board-Endorsed Recommendations for the IEO Report – The IMF and Fragile States” (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2018b, “The Acting Chair’s Summing Up – External Evaluation of the Independent Evaluation Office,” EBM/18/62 (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2018c, “Managing Director’s Statement on the Role of Fund Engagement in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States,” Press Release No. 18/378 (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019a, “A Framework to Address Open Management Actions in Response to Board-Endorsed IEO Recommendations” (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019b, “Implementing Board-Endorsed Recommendations from the 2018 External Evaluation of the Independent Evaluation Office” (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019c, “FY2020-22 Medium-Term Budget” (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019d, “2018 Review of Facilities for Low-Income Countries” (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019e, “IMF Executive Board Approves Reform Package to Enhanced Support to Low-Income Countries,” Press Release No. 19/202 (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019f, “A Strategy for IMF Engagement on Social Spending” (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019g, “IMF Supports New Strategy for Engagement on Social Spending,” Press Release No. 19/217 (Washington).

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019h, “Forging a Stronger Social Contract – the IMF’s Approach to Social Spending,” speech by the Managing Director at the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Geneva, Switzerland.

Kaberuka, Donald, Chia Der Jiun, and Pernilla Meyersson, 2018, *The Third External Evaluation of the Independent Evaluation Office: Time for a Reboot at a Critical Time for Multilateralism* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).



