



Independent Evaluation Office  
of the International Monetary Fund

# BACKGROUND PAPER

---



BP/23-01/06

## **IEO Evaluation of IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Staff Survey Results**

Catherine Koh and Joshua Wojnilower

IEO Background Paper  
Independent Evaluation Office  
of the International Monetary Fund

IEO Evaluation of IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Staff Survey Results

Prepared by Catherine Koh\* and Joshua Wojnilower†

February 2, 2023

The views expressed in this Background Paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the IEO, the IMF, or IMF policy. Background Papers report analyses related to the work of the IEO and are published to elicit comments and to further debate.

---

\* Research Assistant, Independent Evaluation Office of the IMF.

† Economist, Independent Evaluation Office of the IMF.

Abbreviations _____	iv
I. Introduction and Survey Sample _____	1
II. Survey Results _____	3
A. Views on IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic _____	3
B. Effectiveness of IMF Emergency Financing (RFI and RCF) _____	6
C. IMF Assessment of the Economic Outlook and Policy Advice _____	10
D. IMF's Corporate Response _____	11
III. Conclusions _____	13
Figures	
1. Distribution by Grade Level _____	2
2. Distribution by IMF Tenure _____	2
3. Experience at the IMF by Department _____	3
4. The IMF's Preparedness to Deal with the Pandemic _____	3
5. Changes to the IMF's Lending Framework and Financial Resources _____	4
6. Sufficiency of Information to Guide Lending Engagement _____	5
7. Sufficiency of Guidance on Strategy and Risks _____	5
8. Reasonableness of Requests for Information _____	6
9. Features of Provision of Emergency Financing _____	7
10. Effectiveness of Emergency Financing _____	7
11. Intensity of Coordination on Providing Emergency Support _____	8
12. Coherence of Approaches to Providing Financing _____	9
13. Sufficiency of Information on Financing Gaps _____	9
14. Sufficiency of Information to Assess Outlook and Provide Advice _____	10
15. IMF Forecasts and Policy Advice _____	11
16. Sufficiency of Support for Country Teams _____	12
17. Work-related Strains and Adequacy of IMF Response _____	13
Appendices	
I. Survey Questionnaire _____	15
II. Staff Survey—Detailed Survey Response _____	24
References _____	32

**ABBREVIATIONS**

AFR	African Department (IMF)
APD	Asia and Pacific Department (IMF)
COM	Communications Department (IMF)
EUR	European Department (IMF)
FAD	Fiscal Affairs Department (IMF)
FIN	Finance Department (IMF)
ICD	Institute for Capacity Development (IMF)
LEG	Legal Department (IMF)
MCD	Middle East and Central Asia Department (IMF)
MCM	Monetary and Capital Markets Department (IMF)
RCDC	Regional Capacity Development Center
RES	Research Department (IMF)
RTAC	Regional Technical Assistance Center
SPR	Strategy, Policy and Review Department (IMF)
STA	Statistics Department (IMF)
TA	Technical Assistance
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank
WHD	Western Hemisphere Department (IMF)

## I. INTRODUCTION AND SURVEY SAMPLE

1. **Purpose and structure of the survey.** The IEO initiated a survey on May 31, 2022, through September 2, 2022, to understand how Fund staff perceived the IMF's emergency response to the COVID-19 pandemic. A total of 1,903 employees were invited to participate in the survey based on a list from the Human Resources Department of all active staff within the economist career stream in grades A12 to B5.<sup>1</sup> The survey contained six sections as shown below. Appendix I provides the complete list of questions posed in the survey:

- (i) Section 1: Introduction
- (ii) Section 2: Views on the IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic
- (iii) Section 3: Effectiveness of IMF Emergency Financing (Rapid Financing Instrument (RFI) and Rapid Credit Facility (RCF))
- (iv) Section 4: IMF Assessment of the Economic Outlook and Policy Advice
- (v) Section 5: IMF's Institutional Response
- (vi) Section 6: Staff Comments

2. **Response rate.** The response rate to the IEO survey was 12.3 percent, corresponding to a total of 234 completed responses.<sup>2</sup> Over 60 percent of respondents were involved in IMF work on countries that used or considered using emergency financing. In principle, the results could demonstrate an acquiescence response bias because most questions sought answers from respondents on a Likert scale of agree/disagree. A majority of respondents, however, selected disagree or strongly disagree for several answers which suggests this bias was not too strong.



3. **Distribution of respondents by grade and tenure.** The distribution of respondents based on grade level and tenure is displayed in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. The distribution of respondents by grade level broadly reflects the general distribution of Fund staff (IMF, 2022).<sup>3</sup> A14s are slightly overrepresented, despite being the largest cohort, while A12s and A13s are slightly underrepresented. About 58 percent of respondents have worked at the IMF for at least 10 years and 10 percent of respondents only started working at the IMF during the pandemic.

---


<sup>1</sup> The invited participants exclude employees within the economist career stream in grades A12 to B5 that were stationed in the following departments: Africa Training Institute (ATI), Middle East Center for Economics and Finance (CEF), Office of the Deputy Managing Director (DMD), Human Resources Department (HRD), Independent Evaluation Office (IEO), Joint Vienna Institute (JVI), Knowledge Management Unit (KMU), Office for Asia and the Pacific (OAP), Office of the Executive Directors (OED), Office of Innovation and Change (OIC), Office of the Managing Director (OMD), Office of Risk Management (ORM), Secretary's Department (SEC), and Singapore Training Institute (STI).

<sup>2</sup> The response rate for this survey is lower than for previous IEO surveys, perhaps reflecting a combination of survey fatigue and the survey's initiation near the start of summer. Given the relatively low response rate, it is important not to draw strong conclusions solely from these findings.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the 2022 Review of Staff Compensation, the distribution of staff at the A12 to B5 grade levels was approximately as follows: A12 (14 percent), A13 (19 percent), A14 (38 percent), A15 (12 percent), B1 (3 percent), B2 (6 percent), B3 (4 percent), B4 (3 percent), B5 (1 percent).




4. **Distribution of responses by department.** Approximately three-fourths of respondents have worked in both Area Departments and Functional Departments excluding SPR, with a similar distribution in terms of tenure (Figure 3). Only about one-third of respondents have experience working in SPR and its predecessors. Appendix II provides the complete survey results, including the breakdown of respondents by experience with IMF-supported programs by function, for example, mission chief, member of staff team, reviewer (SPR), etc., and also by income level of IMF-supported program countries, such as, advanced economics, emerging markets, or low-income countries.




## II. SURVEY RESULTS

### A. Views on IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

5. **Preparedness.** The results show that most staff felt the IMF was prepared to handle the pandemic's unprecedented shock and effectively adapted its lending framework (Figure 4). About 74 percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the IMF was strategically and operationally prepared to deal with a shock of this magnitude. Similarly, around 72 percent of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the existing lending framework was adequate to deal with the shock. An even larger number, about 91 percent, thought that the IMF moved effectively to adapt the lending framework to meet the needs of an unprecedented shock.




6. **Changes to IMF lending and resources.** A large majority of respondents also expressed a favorable view of changes made to the IMF's lending framework and financial resources during the evaluation period (Figure 5). These changes include adaptations to existing instruments such as the CCRT, RFI, and RCF as well as introduction of the SLL and modifications of UCT access limits under GRA and PRGT. Approximately 91 percent of the respondents felt that the changes were appropriate to address countries' urgent financing needs. On the other hand, only approximately 70 percent of respondents thought the changes paid sufficient attention to the associated risks to the IMF's balance sheet.



7. **Sufficiency of information provided.** More than half the respondents thought they were provided sufficient information to guide engagement with members on the provision of IMF lending (Figure 6). More than 75 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that sufficient information was provided on: (i) the IMF's overall strategy for responding to the pandemic; (ii) the use of specific financing instruments; and (iii) adaptations to the IMF's lending framework in response to the pandemic. Meanwhile, only about 53 percent of respondents felt there was sufficient guidance on the availability of other sources of private financing.

**Figure 6. Sufficiency of Information to Guide Lending Engagement**

Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information provided to you as a means for guiding engagement with members on provision of IMF lending support to deal with urgent financing needs from the pandemic.




Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."

8. **Sufficiency of guidance on strategy and risks.** Additionally, more than half of respondents felt they received sufficient information and guidance about the rationale and calibration of strategies to minimize risks to IMF resources (Figure 7). Over 70 percent of respondents indicated that the information and guidance on access was sufficient. A lower proportion—slightly over 60 percent—however, thought that information and guidance was sufficient regarding governance commitments.


**Figure 7. Sufficiency of Guidance on Strategy and Risks**

Indicate your level of agreement regarding the sufficiency of information and guidance you received on the rationale and calibration of strategies to minimize risks to IMF resources through the following aspects of program design.



Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."

9. **Reasonableness of requests for Information.** Close to 80 percent of respondents indicated that the IMF's requests for information from them were reasonable given the difficult circumstances (Figure 8). Likewise, 70 percent of respondents thought the IMF's requests were well calibrated to their capacity to deliver on other fronts, like arranging emergency financing. These figures, nevertheless, demonstrate that a significant share of respondents felt the IMF's requests were excessive.




## B. Effectiveness of IMF Emergency Financing (RFI and RCF)

10. **Features of provision of emergency financing.** A large majority of respondents felt that the IMF provided clear guidance to countries on conditions for obtaining emergency financing. Ninety percent of staff felt that emergency financing provided valuable short-term financial support during the pandemic (Figure 9).<sup>4</sup> However, a sizable minority—30 percent—felt that access to emergency financing was not provided even-handedly. In this respect, staff views echo those of the authorities as noted in Kincaid, Cohen-Setton and Li (2023): authorities were deeply appreciative of the IMF's quick help and found it valuable, but some of them also expressed concerns about lack of even-handedness in decisions on access.

<sup>4</sup> As noted, over 60 percent of respondents were involved in IMF work on countries that considered using emergency financing.

**Figure 9. Features of Provision of Emergency Financing**

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding member countries' use of IMF emergency financing.




Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."

11. **Effectiveness of emergency financing.** Most respondents thought that emergency financing helped countries meet urgent needs to a large extent and that it was catalytic in mobilizing non-IMF official lending (Figure 10). Less than 40 percent of respondents, however, thought that emergency financing had a catalytic effect on private lending. A sizable minority—34 percent—disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that prior actions were well calibrated to ensure that emergency financing provided meaningful support to meeting a country's needs. Likewise, over 40 percent of staff disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that governance commitments helped ensure that emergency financing was used as intended to address urgent crisis needs.

**Figure 10. Effectiveness of Emergency Financing**

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding IMF emergency financing.




Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."

## 12. Collaboration with Bank and other institutions.

- Bank-Fund collaboration:* A large majority of respondents indicated the IMF's coordination with the World Bank in providing emergency support was intense or very intense (Figure 11). At the same time, nearly 40 percent felt that that the coherence of approaches to providing financing between the two institutions was either only somewhat effective or not effective at all (Figure 12). As noted in Ocampo and others (2023), interviews conducted for this evaluation suggest a lack of agreement in some cases on the appropriate country approach, as the Fund emphasized quick disbursements through emergency financing, while the Bank relied on policy-based instruments.
- Collaboration with other institutions:* A large majority of respondents indicated limited or no coordination on emergency support between the IMF and regional development banks and the UN system (Figure 11), and lack of coherence in approaches to financing (Figure 12). It is worth noting that the question pertains to coordination and coherence in provision of financing. At a broader level—such as sharing of information and interaction among country teams—interviews suggested that there was intense and well-appreciated engagement with the UN system at the senior levels, while collaboration varied across regional development banks (Ocampo and others, 2023).

**Figure 11. Intensity of Coordination on Providing Emergency Support**


Indicate the intensity of the IMF's coordination with the following institutions in providing emergency support during the evaluation period.



Note: Excludes the response "Don't know."

**Figure 12. Coherence of Approaches to Providing Financing**

Indicate the extent to which IMF coordination with the following organizations effectively encouraged a coherent approach to providing financing to countries during the evaluation period.




Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."

13. **Adequacy of information to assess financing gaps.** Only about two-thirds of respondents thought they received sufficient information to assess countries' financing gaps and the share of the gap to be covered by the Fund (Figure 13), which could partly reflect lack of information or uncertainty about the support provided by partner institutions.

**Figure 13. Sufficiency of Information on Financing Gaps**


Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information you received for assessing the countries' financing needs and appropriate IMF access.



Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."

### C. IMF Assessment of the Economic Outlook and Policy Advice


14. **Adequacy of information to assess outlook and provide advice.** Only about 60 percent of respondents felt the IMF provided sufficient guidance on the likely amount of non-IMF financing available to their particular region and country (Figure 14). A similar percent thought the IMF provided sufficient information related to epidemiological analysis and scenarios of possible courses of the pandemic as well as guidance on the relationship between health outcomes, health-related responses, and economic activity.



15. **Views on IMF forecasts and policy advice.** A much larger majority of respondents indicated positive views regarding various aspects of IMF forecasts and policy advice (Figure 15). Nearly 80 percent of respondents agreed that the top-down guidance provided during the forecast process was helpful and left enough room to calibrate forecasts to country circumstances. And nearly 90 percent thought IMF forecasts for their country were reasonable given available information at the time. More than 80 percent of respondents also felt their department promoted open internal discussions on alternative points of view and 75 percent felt that alternate global scenarios provided to them meaningfully affected their policy advice to countries. Staff also had a positive view of the IMF's Special Series of "How To" Notes—over 80 percent of respondents thought the notes had influenced the policy advice they provided to their countries during the pandemic.

**Figure 15. IMF Forecasts and Policy Advice**

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding IMF forecasts and policy advice.




Note: Excludes the response "Not applicable."


#### D. IMF's Corporate Response

16. **Adequacy of support for country teams.** Nearly 70 percent of respondents that worked in an area department indicated that country teams were provided needed technical support to ensure a smooth shift to working from home as well as work effectively with country authorities using virtual communications (Figure 16).<sup>5</sup> In contrast, only about 50 percent of respondents thought country teams had access to needed expertise to address new issues arising from the pandemic. And, more concerning, less than 40 percent of respondents felt country teams were staffed adequately to meet extraordinary country needs.

<sup>5</sup> Just under one-half of all respondents worked in an area department during the evaluation period.



17. **Work-related strains and adequacy of IMF response.** Finally, most respondents indicated concerns regarding work pressures stemming from the pandemic as well as the IMF's responses to those work pressures (Figure 17). Over 90 percent of respondents thought that significant, additional overtime hours were required to complete their tasks, which led to extraordinary stress and hindered their work-life balance. The IMF put in place multiple initiatives to address crisis-related staffing needs and alleviate these pressures (Batini and Wojnilower, 2023). Unfortunately, less than half of respondents felt the process of shifting staff resources to departments and countries with the greatest need was handled effectively and less than 40 percent of respondents felt it was handled without excessive stress on individuals. And only 43 percent of respondents thought the IMF adjusted its HR policies and practices in meaningful ways to help reduce excessive strains on work-life balance.



### III. CONCLUSIONS

18. Overall, most respondents believe that the IMF effectively handled the large shock from the pandemic and adjusted its lending toolkit as well as forecast and policy formulation processes well enough to meet the urgent needs of member countries. Some salient findings include:

- *Provision of emergency financing:* Staff felt that countries that considered accessing emergency financing received sufficient guidance on conditions for providing access to the RCF and RFI instruments. Ninety percent of staff felt that emergency financing provided valuable short-term financial support during the pandemic; however, a sizable minority—30 percent—felt that access to emergency financing was not provided even-handedly.
- *Bank-Fund collaboration:* A large majority of respondents indicated the IMF's coordination with the World Bank in providing emergency support was intense, but nearly 40 percent felt that the coherence of approaches to providing financing between the two institutions was either only somewhat effective or not effective at all.
- *Forecasts and policy advice:* Nearly 80 percent of respondents agreed that the top-down guidance provided during the forecast process was helpful and left enough room to calibrate forecasts to country circumstances. More than 80 percent of respondents also

felt their department promoted open internal discussions on alternative points of view. Staff also had a positive view of the IMF's Special Series of "How To" Notes—over 80 percent of respondents thought the notes had influenced the policy advice they provided to their countries during the pandemic.

- *Work-related strains and corporate response:* A large majority of respondents reported extraordinary stress and disruptions to their work-life balance due to heavy work pressures and changes to the working environment. Unfortunately, less than half of respondents felt the process of shifting staff resources to departments with the greatest need was handled effectively. And only 43 percent of respondents thought the IMF adjusted its HR policies and practices in meaningful ways to help reduce excessive strains on work-life balance.

## APPENDIX I. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

### **Staff Survey Questionnaire on IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic**

*The aim of this survey is to seek staff views with respect to the Fund's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. The questions follow the organization of the [Issues Paper](#) and are thus arranged by "bucket."*

#### **Introduction**

This survey seeks IMF staff views regarding how the Fund adapted its lending framework and processes for economic assessment and policy advice to help countries during the evaluation period of the COVID-19 pandemic. For the purposes of this survey, the evaluation period is defined as January 2020–December 2021. The information will be used for the IEO evaluation of "The IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic." Survey responses are anonymous, and findings will be published only in summary form without attribution to any individual or mission team.

Completing the survey is estimated to take about 10–20 minutes. Your participation is greatly appreciated and is an essential contribution to the evaluation.

Click the **Start Survey** button to get started.

### Section 1. Information about Yourself

1. Which of the following describes your current level in the IMF?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	A12
<input type="radio"/>	A13
<input type="radio"/>	A14
<input type="radio"/>	A15
<input type="radio"/>	B1
<input type="radio"/>	B2
<input type="radio"/>	B3
<input type="radio"/>	B4
<input type="radio"/>	B5

2. What is your current department?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	AFR
<input type="radio"/>	APD
<input type="radio"/>	EUR
<input type="radio"/>	MCD
<input type="radio"/>	WHD
<input type="radio"/>	COM
<input type="radio"/>	FIN
<input type="radio"/>	FAD
<input type="radio"/>	ICD
<input type="radio"/>	LEG
<input type="radio"/>	MCM
<input type="radio"/>	RES
<input type="radio"/>	SPR
<input type="radio"/>	STA

3. How long have you worked at the IMF?	
<i>Select one.</i>	
<input type="radio"/>	Less than 2 years
<input type="radio"/>	2-5 years
<input type="radio"/>	6-9 years
<input type="radio"/>	10 or more years

4. Experience at the IMF by Department (in years; counting current department)				
<i>Select one per row.</i>				
	<i>0 years</i>	<i>1-2 years</i>	<i>3-5 years</i>	<i>5+ years</i>
Area Departments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SPR (and predecessors)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other Functional Departments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Experience with IMF-supported Programs by Income Level (in years; counting current department)				
<i>Select one per row.</i>				
Income Level	<i>0 years</i>	<i>1-2 years</i>	<i>3-5 years</i>	<i>5+ years</i>
AE	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EME	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
LIC	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Experience with IMF-supported Programs by Function (in years)				
<i>Select one per row.</i>				
	<i>0 years</i>	<i>1-2 years</i>	<i>3-5 years</i>	<i>5+ years</i>
Mission Chief	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Member of Staff Team (including Resident Representative)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Front Office Reviewer (Area Department)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reviewer (SPR)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reviewer (Other Functional Departments)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Section 2. Views on the IMF's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

7. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the IMF's emergency response to the pandemic.				
<i>Select one per row.</i>				
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
The IMF was strategically and operationally prepared to deal with a shock of this magnitude.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In particular, the IMF's existing lending framework was adequate to deal with the shock.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IMF moved effectively to adapt the lending framework to meet the needs of an unprecedented shock.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding changes made to the IMF's lending framework and financial resources during the evaluation period (e.g., adaptations to existing instruments like the CCRT, RFI and RCF as well as introduction of the SLL and modifications of UCT access limits under the GRA and PRGT).

*Select one per row.*

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
The changes were appropriate to address countries' urgent financing needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The addition of a new financing tool (the SLL) was helpful to fill a gap in the precautionary financing instruments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The changes paid sufficient attention to the associated risks to the IMF's balance sheet.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The initial changes introduced in March/April 2020 were well targeted to meeting the urgent needs of the crisis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The changes introduced were appropriately based on learning from experience.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information provided to you as a means for guiding engagement with members on provision of IMF lending support to deal with urgent financing needs from the pandemic.

*Select one per row.*

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
The IMF's overall strategy for responding to the pandemic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The use of specific financing instruments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adaptations to the IMF's lending framework in response to the pandemic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The availability of other sources of official financing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The availability of other sources of private financing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The availability of debt relief (including DSSI).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Indicate your level of agreement regarding the sufficiency of information and guidance you received on the rationale and calibration of strategies to minimize risks to IMF resources through the following aspects of program design.

*Select one per row.*

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Prior actions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Governance Commitments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding requests to you for information on your country and region through the evaluation period.					
<i>Select one per row.</i>					
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
The IMF's requests on me were reasonable given the difficult circumstances.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IMF's requests on me were well calibrated to the needs/my capacity to deliver on other fronts (like arranging emergency financing).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Section 3. Effectiveness of IMF Emergency Financing (RFI and RFC)

12. Were you involved in IMF work on countries that considered using emergency financing?
- (a) Yes (Continue in Section 3)
- (b) No (Jump to Section 4)

13. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding member countries' use of IMF emergency financing.					
<i>Select one per row.</i>					
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
The IMF provided clear guidance to countries on conditions for access to emergency financing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to emergency financing was provided even-handedly across countries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to emergency financing provided valuable short-term financial support in an emergency.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to emergency financing was balanced appropriately to meet urgent financing needs while recognizing the lack of ex post conditionality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



16. Indicate the extent to which IMF coordination with the following organizations effectively encouraged a coherent approach to providing financing to countries during the evaluation period.

*Select one per row.*

	<i>Very effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Somewhat effective</i>	<i>Not at all effective</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
World Bank	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional Development Banks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
UN or specialized agencies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional Central Banks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
International standard setting bodies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bilateral donors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other regional organizations (excluding RTACs/RCDCs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information you received for assessing the countries' financing needs and appropriate IMF access.

*Select one per row.*

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
The way to calculate the Balance of Payments financing gap.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The share of the Balance of Payments financing gap to be covered by the IMF.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Section 4. IMF Assessment of the Economic Outlook and Policy Advice

18. Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information you received for assessing the economic outlook and providing policy advice during the evaluation period.

*Select one per row.*

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Guidance on non-IMF financing likely to be available to the region and the specific country.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Epidemiological analysis and scenarios of the possible course of the pandemic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guidance on the relationship between health outcomes, health-related responses (e.g., lockdowns), and economic activity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding IMF forecasts and policy advice.					
<i>Select one per row.</i>					
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
The top-down approach to guiding forecasts in the context of an unprecedented shock was (i) helpful and (ii) provided adequate room to calibrate for individual country circumstances.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Forecasts and information from other sources outside the IMF meaningfully influenced your forecast.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IMF forecasts for your country were reasonable in light of available information at the time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your department promoted open internal discussions on alternative points of view.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alternative global scenarios provided by the IMF meaningfully affected policy advice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IMF policy advice was well-tailored to your country's situation in responding to an unprecedented pandemic-related shock.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IMF policy advice meaningfully influenced your country's policy decisions and/or implementation in response to the Covid-19 shock.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IMF's Special Series of "How To" Notes meaningfully influenced policy advice to your country on issues arising from the pandemic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Section 5. The IMF's Institutional Response

20. Did you work in an Area Department during the evaluation period?

- (a) Yes (Continue in Section 5)  
 (b) No (Jump to Section 6)

21. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your country teams.					
<i>Select one per row.</i>					
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Country teams were staffed adequately to meet extraordinary country needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Country teams had access to needed expertise to address new issues arising from the pandemic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Country teams were provided needed technical support to ensure a smooth shift to working from home.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Country teams were provided needed technical support to work effectively with country authorities using virtual communications.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Requests from functional departments were greater than normal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

22. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your work-related strains during the evaluation period.

Select one per row.

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Not applicable</i>
Significant additional overtime hours, beyond the pre-Covid norm, were required to complete your tasks.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your work-life balance was hindered by time differences with counterpart country officials.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The process of shifting staff resources to departments and countries with the greatest need was handled effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The process of shifting staff to departments and countries with the greatest need was handled without excessive stress on individuals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
IMF HR policies and practices were adjusted in meaningful ways to help reduce excessive strains on work-life balance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I personally felt extraordinary stress as a result of the very heavy work pressures during the evaluation period.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Section 6. Final Comments**

23. Based on your experience, how can the IMF better serve its members?


## APPENDIX II. STAFF SURVEY—DETAILED SURVEY RESPONSE

		Total Responses	Distribution of answers in percentage
<b>SECTION I – INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF</b>			
1. Which of the following describes your current level in the IMF?	<i>Number of responses</i>	234	
	A12	23	10
	A13	32	14
	A14	106	45
	A15	28	12
	B1	5	2
	B2	13	6
	B3	13	6
	B4	12	5
	B5	2	1
2. What is your current department?	<i>Number of responses</i>	234	
	AFR	32	14
	APD	16	7
	EUR	23	10
	MCD	18	8
	WHD	18	8
	COM	0	0
	FIN	8	3
	FAD	35	15
	ICD	10	4
	LEG	2	1
	MCM	22	9
	RES	13	6
	SPR	19	8
	STA	18	8
3. How long have you worked at the IMF?	<i>Number of responses</i>	234	
	Less than 2 years	24	10
	2-5 years	41	18
	6-9 years	33	14
	10 or more years	136	58

		Total Responses	Years of Experience (Distribution of answers in percentage)			
			0 years	1-2 years	3-5 years	5+ years
		<i>Number of responses</i>	270	92	118	222
4. Experience at the IMF by Department (in years; counting current department)	Area Departments	234	28	12	15	44
	SPR (and predecessors)	234	66	8	16	11
	Other Functional Departments	234	21	19	20	40
		<i>Number of responses</i>	280	151	146	125
5. Experience with IMF-supported Programs by Income Level (in years; counting current department)	Advanced Economy	234	69	15	10	6
	Emerging Market Economy	234	32	23	25	21
	Low Income Country	234	19	27	28	26
		<i>Number of responses</i>	755	119	137	159
6. Experience with IMF-supported Programs by Function (in years)	Mission Chief	234	76	8	7	9
	Member of Staff Team (including Resident Representative)	234	21	19	24	35
	Front Office Reviewer (Area Department)	234	94	2	1	3
	Reviewer (SPR)	234	79	6	10	5
	Reviewer (Other Functional Departments)	234	52	16	16	16

		Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)			
			Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>SECTION II – VIEWS ON THE IMF’S EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC</b>						
7. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the IMF’s emergency response to the pandemic.	<i>Number of responses</i>		187	366	124	25
	The IMF was strategically and operationally prepared to deal with a shock of this magnitude.	234	18	56	22	4
	In particular, the IMF’s existing lending framework was adequate to deal with the shock.	234	17	55	25	3
	The IMF moved effectively to adapt the lending framework to meet the needs of an unprecedented shock.	234	44	46	6	3
8. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding changes made to the IMF’s lending framework and financial resources during the evaluation period (e.g., adaptations to existing instruments like the CCRT, RFI and RCF as well as introduction of the SLL and modifications of UCT access limits under the GRA and PRGT).	<i>Number of responses</i>		229	704	186	51
	The changes were appropriate to address countries’ urgent financing needs.	234	29	62	7	2
	The addition of a new financing tool (the SLL) was helpful to fill a gap in the precautionary financing instruments.	234	15	63	18	3
	The changes paid sufficient attention to the associated risks to the IMF’s balance sheet.	234	15	56	21	9
	The initial changes introduced in March/April 2020 were well targeted to meeting the urgent needs of the crisis.	234	23	61	14	3
	The changes introduced were appropriately based on learning from experience.	234	16	60	19	5
9. Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information provided to you as a means for guiding engagement with members on provision of IMF lending support to deal with urgent financing needs from the pandemic.	<i>Number of responses</i>		242	694	210	51
	The IMF’s overall strategy for responding to the pandemic.	214	28	61	9	2
	The use of specific financing instruments.	209	25	63	11	1
	Adaptations to the IMF’s lending framework in response to the pandemic.	210	23	64	12	0
	The availability of other sources of official financing.	197	13	56	27	5
	The availability of other sources of private financing.	173	12	45	33	10
The availability of debt relief (including DSSI).	194	18	56	18	8	

10. Indicate your level of agreement regarding the sufficiency of information and guidance you received on the rationale and calibration of strategies to minimize risks to IMF resources through the following aspects of program design.	<i>Number of responses</i>		79	301	128	58
	Prior actions	181	12	54	24	10
	Access	192	15	59	18	8
	Governance Commitments	193	15	47	25	12
11. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding requests to you for information on your country and region through the evaluation period.	<i>Number of responses</i>		229	704	186	51
	The IMF's requests on me were reasonable given the difficult circumstances.	203	13	65	16	6
	The IMF's requests on me were well calibrated to the needs/my capacity to deliver on other fronts (like arranging emergency financing).	196	12	58	24	6
		Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)			
			Yes		No	
<b>SECTION III – EFFECTIVENESS OF IMF EMERGENCY FINANCING (RFI AND RCF)</b>						
		<i>Number of responses</i>	234	132	102	
12. Were you involved in IMF work on countries that considered using emergency financing?			56	44		
		Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)			
			Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding member countries' use of IMF emergency financing.	<i>Number of responses</i>		123	278	75	36
	The IMF provided clear guidance to countries on conditions for access to emergency financing.	128	24	58	14	4
	Access to emergency financing was provided even-handedly across countries.	127	17	53	20	10
	Access to emergency financing provided valuable short-term financial support in an emergency.	128	34	55	8	2
	Access to emergency financing was balanced appropriately to meet urgent financing needs while recognizing the lack of ex post conditionality.	129	21	51	16	12

		<i>Number of responses</i>	111	281	181	80
14. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding IMF emergency financing.	Emergency financing helped countries meet urgent country needs to a large extent.	129	30	57	11	2
	Emergency financing was catalytic in helping mobilize non-IMF official lending.	122	20	43	27	9
	Emergency financing was catalytic in helping mobilize private lending.	102	8	29	42	21
	Where used, prior actions were well calibrated to ensure that emergency financing provided meaningful support to meeting a country's needs.	91	18	48	24	10
	Where used, prior actions led to unwarranted delays in meeting a country's needs.	83	8	27	47	18
	Governance commitments were useful to help ensure that emergency assistance was used for the very urgent purpose of addressing the immediate crisis and not diverted for other purposes.	126	13	46	24	17
		Total Responses				
			Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)			
			Very intense	Intense	Limited	None
15. Indicate the intensity of the IMF's coordination with the following institutions in providing emergency support during the evaluation period.	<i>Number of responses</i>		56	185	254	129
	World Bank	115	21	56	18	5
	Regional Development Banks	98	8	30	52	10
	UN or specialized agencies	87	5	18	47	30
	Regional Central Banks	82	9	28	34	29
	International standard setting bodies	72	3	8	44	44
	Bilateral donors	100	5	39	44	12
	Other regional organizations (excluding RTACs/RCDCs)	70	9	11	53	27

	Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)				
		Very effective	Effective	Somewhat effective	Not at all effective	
	<i>Number of responses</i>	31	188	180	94	
16. Indicate the extent to which IMF coordination with the following organizations effectively encouraged a coherent approach to providing financing to countries during the evaluation period.	World Bank	10	52	29	9	
	Regional Development Banks	5	43	40	13	
	UN or specialized agencies	5	27	39	30	
	Regional Central Banks	7	44	27	22	
	International standard setting bodies	40	5	18	35	43
	Bilateral donors	82	5	39	44	12
	Other regional organizations (excluding RTACs/RCDCs)	50	6	22	44	28

	Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)			
		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<i>Number of responses</i>	32	105	51	20
17. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the sufficiency of information you received for assessing the countries' financing needs and appropriate IMF access.	The way to calculate the Balance of Payments financing gap.	15	51	23	11
	The share of the Balance of Payments financing gap to be covered by the IMF.	15	50	26	9

#### SECTION IV – IMF ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK AND POLICY ADVICE

	<i>Number of responses</i>	75	243	171	30
18. Indicate your level of agreement on the following topics regarding the sufficiency of information you received for assessing the economic outlook and providing policy advice during the evaluation period.	Guidance on non-IMF financing likely to be available to the region and the specific country.	16	47	33	4
	Epidemiological analysis and scenarios of the possible course of the pandemic.	14	47	34	6
	Guidance on the relationship between health outcomes, health-related responses (e.g., lockdowns), and economic activity.	14	47	32	7

		<i>Number of responses</i>				
		320	852	236	58	
19. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding IMF forecasts and policy advice.	The top-down approach to guiding forecasts in the context of an unprecedented shock was (i) helpful and (ii) provided adequate room to calibrate for individual country circumstances.	184	21	57	16	7
	Forecasts and information from other sources outside the IMF meaningfully influenced your forecast.	179	16	58	23	3
	IMF forecasts for your country were reasonable in light of available information at the time.	177	22	67	10	2
	Your department promoted open internal discussions on alternative points of view.	193	26	58	15	2
	Alternative global scenarios provided by the IMF meaningfully affected policy advice.	180	18	57	21	4
	IMF policy advice was well-tailored to your country's situation in responding to an unprecedented pandemic-related shock.	187	20	63	12	5
	IMF policy advice meaningfully influenced your country's policy decisions and/or implementation in response to the Covid-19 shock.	181	20	57	19	3
	The IMF's Special Series of "How To" Notes meaningfully influenced policy advice to your country on issues arising from the pandemic.	185	31	50	13	6

SECTION V – THE IMF’S INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE

		Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)				
			Yes	No			
		<i>Number of responses</i>	234				
20. Did you work in an Area Department during the evaluation period?			110	124			
			47	53			
		Total Responses	Choices (Distribution of answers in percentage)				
			Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
		<i>Number of responses</i>	541	88	252	137	64
21. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your country teams.	Country teams were staffed adequately to meet extraordinary country needs.	109	6	31	39	23	
	Country teams had access to needed expertise to address new issues arising from the pandemic.	108	6	48	32	13	
	Country teams were provided needed technical support to ensure a smooth shift to working from home.	110	15	53	21	12	
	Country teams were provided needed technical support to work effectively with country authorities using virtual communications.	109	11	59	22	8	
	Requests from functional departments were greater than normal.	105	44	42	11	3	
		<i>Number of responses</i>	203	191	127	88	
22. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your work-related strains during the evaluation period.	Significant additional overtime hours, beyond the pre-Covid norm, were required to complete your tasks.	109	68	25	6	1	
	Your work-life balance was hindered by time differences with counterpart country officials.	107	57	24	18	1	
	The process of shifting staff resources to departments and countries with the greatest need was handled effectively.	91	7	38	29	26	
	The process of shifting staff to departments and countries with the greatest need was handled without excessive stress on individuals.	86	6	29	37	28	
	IMF HR policies and practices were adjusted in meaningful ways to help reduce excessive strains on work-life balance.	107	7	36	23	34	
	I personally felt extraordinary stress as a result of the very heavy work pressures during the evaluation period.	109	46	36	17	2	

**REFERENCES**

- Batini, Nicoletta, and Joshua Wojnilower, 2023, "The IMF's Institutional Response to the Pandemic," IEO Background Paper No. BP/23-01/05 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- International Monetary Fund, 2022, "2022 Review of Staff Compensation," (EBAP/22/9), April (internal, Washington).
- Kincaid, G. Russell, Jérémie Cohen-Setton, and Jiakun Li, 2023, "Operational Aspects of IMF Emergency Financing in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic," IEO Background Paper No. BP/23-01/02 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Ocampo, Jose Antonio, and others, 2023, "The IMF's Response to the Pandemic: Strategy and Collaboration with Partners," IEO Background Paper No. BP/23-01/04 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).