



Independent Evaluation Office
of the International Monetary Fund

BACKGROUND PAPER



BP/15/03

Self-Evaluation in the Areas of Technical Assistance and Training

Marcelo Selowsky and Ling Hui Tan

IEO Background Paper
Independent Evaluation Office
of the International Monetary Fund

Self-Evaluation in the Areas of Technical Assistance and Training

Prepared by Marcelo Selowsky and Ling Hui Tan

August 26, 2015

The views expressed in this Background Paper are those of the author(s) 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.

Author's E-Mail Address: mseadowsky@worldbank.org; ltan@imf.org

| Contents | Page |
|---|------|
| Abbreviations | iv |
| Executive Summary | v |
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Technical Assistance | 2 |
| A. The Self-Evaluation Framework for TA | 3 |
| B. Assessment | 8 |
| III. Training | 11 |
| A. The Self-Evaluation Framework for Training | 12 |
| B. Assessment | 15 |
| IV. Conclusion and Recommendations | 17 |
| Boxes | |
| 1. Regional Technical Assistance Centers (RTACs) | 2 |
| 2. The TA Evaluation Program | 6 |
| 3. Regional Training Centers | 12 |
| Table 1. Assessment of a Sample of TAIMS Projects | 10 |
| Annexes | |
| 1. Recommendations on Self-Evaluation in the 2005 IEO Evaluation of IMF Technical Assistance | 22 |
| 2. TA Evaluations and Reviews, 2006–14 | 24 |
| 3. Self-Evaluation of Capacity-Development Activities in Other Organizations | 26 |
| 4. Selected TA Projects Drawn from the TAIMS | 28 |
| References | 20 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------|---|
| AML/CFT | Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism |
| CCB | Interdepartmental Committee on Capacity Building (IMF) |
| FAD | Fiscal Affairs Department (IMF) |
| FSAP | Financial Sector Assessment Program |
| ICD | Institute for Capacity Development (IMF) |
| ITP | Joint India-IMF Training Program |
| LEG | Legal Department (IMF) |
| MCM | Monetary and Capital Markets Department (IMF) |
| OECD-DAC | Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| OTM | Office of Technical Assistance Management |
| RBM | IMF-wide results-based management framework for TA |
| ROSCs | Reports on the Observance of Standards and Codes |
| STA | Statistics Department (IMF) |
| STI | IMF-Singapore Regional Training Institute |
| TA | Technical Assistance |
| TAIMS | Technical Assistance Information Management System |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Technical assistance (TA) and training of member-country officials are the major capacity-development activities undertaken by the IMF. This paper examines how well the IMF self-evaluates these activities with respect to relevance, effectiveness (outputs and outcomes), and impact.

Regarding the self-evaluation of TA, this paper finds that:

- The continuing relevance of TA is adequately self-assessed through formal and informal contacts with country authorities and TA donors, surveys of stakeholders, as well as regular consultations between TA and area departments in the context of deciding the annual allocation of TA resources.
- TA projects are assessed in terms of whether they met their stated objectives, by means of the web-based TA Information Management System (TAIMS) that provides for documentation of interim and project completion assessments. However, the TAIMS continues to suffer to some extent from implementation issues. Work is ongoing to improve the analytical structure of the system and develop an enhanced results-based management system for TA that will eventually replace TAIMS.
- Donor-mandated evaluations, which are increasing in number, also address issues of relevance and effectiveness of TA (generally by region and/or topic).
- Outcome and impact are the most difficult and least well covered aspects of TA evaluation. Some thematic evaluations undertaken by TA departments have tried to assess whether recipient agencies have been able to implement the knowledge/skills imparted through TA.

Regarding the self-evaluation of training, this paper finds that:

- Training relevance and outputs are well assessed through a variety of channels: client satisfaction questionnaires completed and discussed at the end of every course, a triennial survey of agencies that send their staff for IMF training, and periodic meetings of regional training directors.
- Assessing outcome and impact is even more challenging for training than it is for TA. While the IMF has traditionally relied on informal methods of assessing the extent of learning in its often group-centered and participatory training courses, it is now increasingly using before-and-after course quizzes to measure outcomes. A recently introduced program of follow-up surveys aims to assess the impact of training.

Overall, the existing self-evaluation systems for TA and training are broadly adequate and comparable to those used in other international organizations. Looking ahead, Management

has issued a statement on policies and practices to develop a unified approach to the evaluation of TA and training that would be coordinated by the Institute for Capacity Development (ICD). This paper offers the following recommendations to help fine-tune the existing systems and contribute to effective functioning of this framework:

- The plan to have a regular strategic review of capacity development activities, encompassing both TA and training, is a good one. These reviews should include self-evaluative elements.
- Ex post evaluations of TA should continue to be undertaken by TA departments on a regular basis. Of particular importance are evaluations that assess the outcomes and impact of TA. More systematic procedures should be put in place for disseminating lessons from these evaluations. ICD should pilot similar evaluations of training.
- Client satisfaction questionnaires should continue to be used as a channel of direct feedback for improving training design and delivery. This practice could be used more widely among TA departments as well.
- The triennial survey of training should be continued and the practice of organizing periodic heads of training meetings should be regularized and extended to all regions.
- The new results-based management system should aim to improve monitoring (in addition to providing a key management tool) and provide data for self-evaluation. The system should have sufficient flexibility to accommodate different types of TA projects and groups of projects and to allow for the significant inherent differences between TA and training.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. **Capacity development through technical assistance (TA) and training is one of the IMF's core activities, accounting for nearly one-quarter of its resources.**¹ The IMF's provision of TA and training is anchored in the Articles of Agreement and is seen as one of the benefits of membership.² Its purpose is to help member countries enhance their capacity to formulate and implement sound economic and financial policies. While some organizations contract out their capacity-development activities, the IMF's practice is to "own" its delivery of TA and training.

2. **This paper examines how the IMF undertakes self-evaluation of its capacity-development activities.** The time period under consideration is 2006–13, which is bookended by two reviews—the 2005 IEO evaluation of *IMF Technical Assistance* (IEO, 2005) and the 2013 Board paper on "The Fund's Capacity Development Strategy" (IMF, 2013a)—both containing major recommendations for self-evaluation of TA and training.³

3. **A good self-evaluation system for capacity-development activities should include components that assess the relevance, effectiveness, and impact of these activities.**⁴

- Relevance refers to the extent to which the TA/training is suited to the priorities and policies of the recipient countries and the IMF.
- Effectiveness refers to the quality of the TA/training output (i.e., whether the TA/training is designed well and delivered effectively, including through interaction and/or collaboration with country authorities and donors) as well as the TA/training outcome (i.e., the extent to which the TA/training improves the knowledge of the recipients and the extent to which recipients are able to utilize the knowledge gained).
- Impact refers to changes or effects resulting from the TA/training such as the impact on macroeconomic performance resulting from recipients' use of this knowledge.

¹ Within the IMF, training of member-country government officials is classified as external training. The IMF also engages in internal training (i.e., training of Fund staff), which is not the focus here. In this paper, training" refers to external training only.

² Article V, Section 2(b) allows the Fund to perform, upon request, financial and technical services, provided that these services are consistent with the Fund's purposes and that they do not impose any obligation on a member without its consent.

³ Annex 1 outlines the main recommendations on TA self-evaluation in IEO (2005).

⁴ This is based on the standard principles for evaluating development assistance developed by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD-DAC); see <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>. The OECD-DAC principles include two other criteria—efficiency and sustainability—which the IMF does not have the necessary information to assess for TA or training.

4. **This paper is organized as follows.** Section II describes the self-evaluation framework for TA and assesses it on the basis of the criteria above. Section III does the same for training. Section IV concludes with recommendations for TA and training.

II. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE⁵

5. **TA encompasses activities to support long-term institution-building in member countries as well as fact-finding, diagnostic, and consultative activities.** This paper uses the IMF's budgetary definition of TA, which excludes activities such as Financial Sector Assessment Programs (FSAPs), Reports on the Observance of Standards and Codes (ROSCs), and the G20 Mutual Assessment Program.

6. **TA delivery is primarily the responsibility of four functional departments:** Fiscal Affairs (FAD), Monetary and Capital Markets (MCM), Statistics (STA), and Legal (LEG). TA coordination is the responsibility of the Institute for Capacity Development (ICD), an IMF department created in May 2012 through a merger of the IMF Institute (INS) with the Office of Technical Assistance Management (OTM); prior to 2012, TA coordination was handled by OTM. Organization and oversight of the IMF's policy work in TA (and capacity building more generally, including training) is the responsibility of the Management-chaired interdepartmental Committee on Capacity Building (CCB).⁶

7. **TA is carried out through a variety of modalities,** including headquarters-based short-term missions, resident long-term experts, and peripatetic advisors based in regional TA centers (RTACs) (see Box 1). There is frequently an element of training embodied in TA projects/missions, such as coaching, on-the-job training, or workshops geared to support country-based reform activities.

Box 1. Regional Technical Assistance Centers (RTACs)

RTACs are partnerships between the IMF (the TA provider), participating countries (the TA beneficiaries), and donors (who finance some 75 percent of the operations on average). Each RTAC is governed by a steering committee composed of representatives of the IMF, the beneficiary countries, and the donors. There are currently nine RTACs: one in the Pacific (established in 1993), one in the Caribbean (established in 1999), five in Africa (established between 2002 and 2013), one in the Middle East (established in 2004), and one in Central America (established in 2009). The centers house a number of resident TA advisors who deliver TA and training throughout the region on a peripatetic basis. An external evaluation of each RTAC's work is conducted mid-way through each five-year funding cycle to inform the next program phase.

⁵ This section draws on IEO (2014) that revisited and updated the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the 2005 TA evaluation.

⁶ The CCB was established by Management in 2006. Since then it has met at least once a year to discuss the broad strategy for the TA, external training, and ROSC programs, in advance of the preparation of these programs; to approve the proposed programs, following the approval of the budget; to review the programs mid-way through the budget year; and to discuss relevant policy issues as needed (e.g., on evaluation, systems, approaches to delivery, etc.).

A. The Self-Evaluation Framework for TA

8. **The IMF evaluates TA according to Fund-wide procedures, donor-mandated procedures, and department-specific procedures.** These procedures apply to TA evaluation at various levels: at the project level, for various groupings of projects, and at the strategic level.

Monitoring TA projects

9. **The main Fund-wide tool for monitoring individual TA projects has been the web-based Technical Assistance Information Management System (TAIMS).** The TAIMS guidance note defines a TA project as a set of “one or more activities which within a specified time frame (and often within the constraints of a specified budget) contribute to the achievement of a specific objective or objectives” (IMF, 2008b). TA activities may include missions, the placement of short-term and peripatetic experts or long-term/resident advisors, seminars and workshops, and headquarters-based work. TA activities result in TA outputs, usually a set of recommendations specified in a TA report.

10. **All TA projects are supposed to be documented in the TAIMS.**⁷ The TAIMS set-up follows the results chain for project management. Each project’s documentation is intended to include, at a minimum, a project proposal at the start and an assessment at the end of the project. Project proposals follow a standardized format that requires specification of the objective(s) and expected outcome(s), with associated verifiable indicators and expected completion dates.⁸ Project completion assessments also follow a standardized format that requires assignment of an achievement rating and explanatory comments for each verifiable indicator specified in the proposal. For projects involving more than a one-off activity, TAIMS documentation should also include interim project assessments and/or staff memoranda/reports containing information on the project’s implementation status.

11. **Project monitoring is expected to take place at regular intervals during the life of the project;⁹ a final assessment is expected to be undertaken three to six months**

⁷ In practice, all externally financed projects are, but in interviews staff indicated that, as of end-FY 2013, compliance had not reached one hundred percent.

⁸ Each TA project must have at least one objective, i.e., “what the Fund and the beneficiary country seek to achieve as a result of the project” and each objective should have one or more verifiable indicators, i.e., observable events that can be used to monitor whether the objective has been achieved (IMF, 2008b). Each project objective must have at least one target outcome, i.e., “the expected result of actions to be taken by the country authorities in response to TA outputs—normally from the implementation of TA recommendations” and each outcome should have one or more verifiable indicators (IMF, 2008b).

⁹ The TAIMS guidance note distinguishes between short- and longer-term projects. A short project covering a one-off activity is essentially completed after the conclusion of that activity. A longer-term project, on the other hand, may include a series of activities, e.g., an initial diagnostic assessment and the preparation of

(continued...)

following the completion of each project.¹⁰ According to the TAIMS guidance note, information on a project’s implementation status may be obtained from a returning mission or expert, through the resident representative, or from the authorities directly. Candor is expected in reporting: “Where no progress has been made, or counterproductive measures have been taken by the authorities, this should be recorded. Similarly, if no information is available this should be recorded” (IMF, 2008b).

12. **Work has been ongoing for some time to improve on the TAIMS.** A working group was established in 2010 to develop an enhanced IMF-wide results-based management (RBM) framework for TA. The report from this group (IMF, 2011b) proposed the development of a new generic IMF logical framework (“log frame”) specifying a detailed results chain connecting IMF TA interventions to their final objectives. An interdepartmental steering committee has recently been established to operationalize the enhanced framework, with the goal of launching the new system—which is intended to replace the TAIMS—by the end of calendar year 2015.

Donor-mandated evaluations

13. **Donor-mandated evaluations are conducted for the activities of RTACs, TA projects financed by multi-donor topical trust funds, and TA projects financed by major bilateral donors.** These evaluations are supported by ICD (previously by OTM).

- Evaluations of RTACs are conducted every five years by external evaluators, typically midway through the funding cycle. These periodic evaluations are required by the agreements with the donors financing the centers. During 2006–14, there were 11 of these evaluations (see Annex 2).¹¹ RTAC evaluations assess the TA (and training) delivered through the center in the aggregate; in some cases, they also assess specific TA “clusters” (e.g., FAD TA, MCM TA, etc.).
- TA activities financed by topical trust funds are also required to be evaluated externally every five years.¹² Three such evaluations have been completed to date: the

recommendations which are followed up through expert visits or additional missions. This type of project should be subject to ongoing monitoring.

¹⁰ In cases where there are important lags between project completion and the implementation of recommendations the evaluation could be postponed for up to twelve months after completion of the project.

¹¹ In early 2015, four additional evaluations were ongoing, for RTACs in Central and South Africa, the Caribbean region, and the Pacific region.

¹² Topical trust funds support specialized TA on specific issues to multiple countries. As of 2014, five topical trust funds were in operation: AML/CFT, launched in 2009; Tax Policy and Administration, launched in 2011; Managing Natural Resource Wealth, also launched in 2011; Debt Management Facility Phase II, launched in 2014; and the Tax Administration Diagnostic Assessment Tool, launched in 2015. Topical trust funds are set up in a similar way to RTACs. Each fund has multiple donors and is guided in its work by a steering committee

(continued...)

mid-cycle evaluations of the Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT), Tax Policy and Administration, and Managing Natural Resource Wealth topical trust funds.

- Since 2008, 10 external evaluations of TA (and training) financed by large bilateral donors have been completed (see Annex 2). The coverage of these evaluations has varied. For example, the 2010 external evaluation of the Belgian TA subaccount focused on only four projects in two African countries while the 2011 external evaluation of the Japan Administered Account for Select IMF Activities encompassed over 150 projects in numerous countries across the world. These evaluations cover a relatively short time period—typically two to three years.

14. **The donor-mandated external evaluations usually follow the standard OECD-DAC criteria** of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.¹³ However, each evaluation tailors the criteria and sub-criteria to its own needs. For example, one evaluation may group relevance and impact together while others may exclude impact altogether; one evaluation may consider the extent to which the TA was consistent/integrated with the IMF’s strategic policy advice as an “effectiveness” issue while another may consider it a “relevance” issue; one evaluation may consider coordination with donors a “relevance” issue while another may consider it an “effectiveness” issue; and so on. Almost all of the evaluations are based on a review of IMF documents, reports, and memoranda (including what was available from the TAIMS, in some cases), supplemented with interviews, field visits, and, in several cases, surveys of various stakeholder representatives as well as direct TA/training providers and recipients.

Self-assessments in TA-providing departments

15. **TA-providing departments undertake their own evaluations of TA on an ad hoc basis.**¹⁴ Annex 2 lists all TA evaluations undertaken by TA departments during 2006–14. The majority are ex post evaluations although some interim assessments are also included. Until 2010, some of the ex post evaluations were coordinated by OTM under the so-called TA Evaluation Program (Box 2).

comprising the donors and IMF staff. The funding cycle is typically five years and an external evaluation of the trust fund’s work is conducted midway through the funding cycle to inform the next program phase.

¹³ Efficiency refers to whether the TA/training/RTAC uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. Sustainability refers to whether the benefits of the TA/training/RTAC are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. In some RTAC evaluations, sustainability is interpreted as keeping the center on a good financial footing.

¹⁴ This practice was strongly encouraged by the 2005 IEO evaluation of *IMF Technical Assistance* (see Annex 1). A number of Ex post evaluations by STA explicitly referred to IEO (2005) as a motivating factor.

Box 2. The TA Evaluation Program

The TA Evaluation Program was introduced in 2003 to provide a more formal framework for evaluation of TA and to serve as a vehicle for informing the Executive Board on the effectiveness and impact of IMF TA. OTM coordinated this program, which laid out a plan for forthcoming evaluations, including ex post evaluations (internal and external) by TA departments as well as periodic external evaluations of donor-funded TA evaluations, covering a mix of topics. Under this program, OTM prepared a report to the Board (initially every year, and then every two years) summarizing the findings of the completed evaluations and attempting to draw lessons for the management and operation of IMF TA. From 2003–10, five reports of the TA Evaluation Program were prepared, covering 25 evaluations in total (IMF, 2003; 2004; 2006; 2008c; 2010).

16. **The ex post evaluations typically focus on a specific aspect and/or topic of TA or on a long TA relationship with a single country** (e.g., bank supervision TA in Asia or TA for Peru in various areas of macroeconomic statistics over an 18-year period). Some of these evaluations are conducted by external evaluators; others are carried out by staff of the TA departments themselves, usually based on specific evaluation missions to the country or countries concerned. Some evaluations focus exclusively on the technical quality of the TA advice provided (i.e., the input part of the results chain) while others, particularly those based on a long TA relationship or engagement with a single country, look at the results chain more fully. Because these evaluations differ in focus and objective, there is a corresponding variation in the evaluation questions and criteria used. Different departments have different dissemination policies for these evaluations and their lessons; for instance, in 2013 FAD decided to translate lessons from an ex post evaluation of TA to East Africa into a departmental action plan.

17. **TA departments also engage in other informal means of monitoring and evaluating TA projects.** Practices vary across departments, perhaps reflecting the variation in the nature of TA across broad areas.¹⁵ For example:

- All TA departments seek direct feedback from recipients during and after country visits and in discussions at the Annual and Spring Meetings and other forums.
- FAD sends country authorities a questionnaire at the end of its missions which includes questions on whether they were given sufficient opportunity to provide input into the mission's tasks and outputs; whether the mission addressed all the issues agreed upon with them; and whether it provided adequate time to meet with them to seek feedback on its work program, findings, and recommendations.

¹⁵ In a survey of staff undertaken for this evaluation, 60 percent of respondents who were involved in capacity-development activities reported that mechanisms existed for following up on lessons learned from self-evaluations of these activities.

- FAD’s management assesses a sample of TA reports every quarter on various points including the clarity of presentation, quality of advice provided, and the extent to which it was part of an appropriate strategy of dialogue with the country to promote reform. Findings and lessons learned of relevance to a broader group of staff are discussed at a senior staff meeting.
- STA requires its TA missions to identify two-three benchmark actions to be taken by the authorities before the department commits follow-up assistance. Country authorities are asked to complete a self-assessment, indicating the progress achieved in the implementation of previous mission recommendations, their sustainability, and factors that may have hindered implementation.
- STA’s task force on TA management, chaired by STA management, meets on a biweekly basis to discuss issues on capacity building and formulate guidelines and procedures on the department’s capacity building activities. Meeting minutes are disseminated to the entire department on a regular basis.
- In 2013, MCM launched a quarterly “TA Forum” to share lessons from past TA and to help guide future work. Events have focused on: bank resolution and monetary policy in Nigeria, financial stability in Cambodia, multiple topics in Myanmar, banking crisis resolution, and debt management.

Broader strategic reviews of IMF TA

18. **Periodic strategic reviews of IMF TA are prepared for the Executive Board.** This practice dates back as far as the 1999 “Review of Fund Technical Assistance” prepared by the Office of Internal Audit and Inspection (IMF, 1999). Since then, IMF TA has been reviewed roughly every three years. These reviews, like some other thematic reviews in the IMF (Stedman, 2015) have included elements of self-evaluation although self-evaluation was not their primary purpose. For instance¹⁶:

- The 2008 report on “Enhancing the Impact of Fund Technical Assistance” (IMF, 2008a) assessed the TAIMS as having performed poorly and proposed reforms to implement “results-focused project management.”
- The 2011 “Report of the Task Force on the Fund’s Technical Assistance Strategy” (IMF, 2011a) drew on feedback from consultations with member countries, donors,

¹⁶ As noted in Stedman (2015), to contribute to learning in the institution, self-evaluation needs to draw lessons from experience and recommend how to move forward; and to close the learning loop, provisions are needed to monitor the implementation of recommended changes.

and other TA providers to develop the so-called FINE (Focused, Integrated, Nimble, Effective) model of IMF TA.¹⁷

- The 2013 paper on “The Fund’s Capacity Development Strategy” (IMF, 2013a) reviewed previous efforts by the IMF to prioritize TA and suggested ways to strengthen the process.

19. **A review of the RTAC delivery modality was prepared for the Executive Board in 2005** (IMF, 2005a). This review came in the wake of the IEO’s 2005 TA evaluation and the Board’s call for a thorough review of RTACs and their role going forward. It summarized lessons learned from early RTAC evaluations and provided an assessment of the effectiveness of the RTACs as a delivery modality.¹⁸ Updates on these issues were addressed in OTM reports to the Board on the TA Evaluation Program; the last update was in 2010.

B. Assessment

20. **In our view, the overall system for self-evaluation of IMF TA is appropriate and is serving the institution well**, considering the huge diversity in the types and modalities of IMF TA and the different purposes and objectives these evaluations have (e.g., improving TA delivery and effectiveness, securing donor funding, helping to allocate IMF resources, etc.). The evaluation systems are similar to those found in other international organizations (Annex 3). That said, some elements of the system would benefit from refinement.

21. **There are procedures to assess the relevance of TA on an ongoing basis.** Individual TA departments do so through regular contacts with country authorities and through systematic consultations with area departments on country/regional TA priorities. For TA delivered through RTACS and/or funded by major bilateral donors, such assessments are conducted informally in steering committee meetings and discussions of the work program and formally as part of their mandated mid-cycle evaluations. At the IMF-wide level, CCB meetings are the forum where TA relevance is discussed in the context of deciding the allocation of TA resources.

22. **The IMF’s mechanism for assessing TA effectiveness is a work in progress.** The TAIMS could be adequate but suffers from gaps in implementation.¹⁹ In a report updating the

¹⁷ An appendix in the report discussed TA quality control practices; the conclusion was that practices varied across TA-providing departments and that the emphasis had mostly been on assessing the quality of TA outputs as opposed to TA outcomes.

¹⁸ Effectiveness was assessed from the perspectives of value added to the main RTAC stakeholders and cost-effectiveness.

¹⁹ The donor-mandated evaluations address the issue of TA design and delivery, typically by supplementing the information from the TAIMS with interviews and surveys of recipient agencies; however, their results tend to be aggregated over a large number of different TA projects and recipients.

2005 TA evaluation, IEO reviewed the TAIMS documentation for a sample of projects to assess the extent to which it facilitated effective monitoring and evaluation of TA (IEO, 2014). Out of 98 TAIMS projects completed between January 2011 and June 2013, 22 projects by 4 departments were selected, spanning a wide range of durations and modalities (see Annex 4).²⁰ The results, shown in Table 1 (and summarized in Box 5 in IEO, 2014). Reporting was better for the project proposal (initial design) stage than for the project completion stage (assessing the outcome of the TA). The weakest results were for reporting on progress when projects were underway. It should be noted that the existing TAIMS set-up is rather cumbersome and not very intuitive, and this may partly explain the errors, gaps, and overlaps we found in the project documentation.²¹ While TAIMS will be replaced by RBM, these findings may help inform the configuration and fine tuning of the new system.

23. **The proposed new RBM system (IMF, 2011b) seems to suggest the need for a highly detailed, perhaps overly specific, monitoring framework.** Furthermore, this generic log frame is to be applied at different levels of aggregation, from the project level to the country and topic level and even all the way to the RTAC level. While this sounds efficient in theory, it is not clear that forcing a unified framework on the myriad types and groupings of TA projects is feasible in practice. For example, applying the proposed log frame or results chain to a specific TA project seems plausible, but applying a results chain to an RTAC, which covers TA to many countries and on many topics, seems less feasible since it would be difficult to define inputs and outputs at that level of aggregation.

24. **Assessing the outcome and impact of TA after project completion remains the weakest area of the monitoring and evaluation system for capacity building.** TAIMS documentation can only trace developments while the project is in execution and judge progress at the point when the project (financing) is finished. As noted above, TAIMS does this relatively well. But much of the outcome and impact of TA projects takes time to unfold and occurs after project completion, hence cannot be fully captured in the TAIMS monitoring system. This is particularly true for projects with lags between the delivery of TA recommendations and their adoption by recipient agencies. Donor-mandated evaluations cover a relatively short time span, thus are also limited in their ability to assess the impact of

²⁰ On average during 2006–12, some 1,285 completed projects were entered in TAIMS each year. TAIMS reporting compliance was patchy in the earlier years and gradually improved to close to 100 percent by 2013. The assessment in IEO (2014) focused on more recent projects (starting from 2010) and on projects consisting of more than one activity.

²¹ Similar observations have been made by other evaluators. For example, Enoch, Baldwin, and Ayrton (2012) noted that their evaluation was constrained by incomplete documentation; Abrams (2011) complained of the “considerable time and effort” it took to find requested documents and wished that TAIMS could be “used like a paper clip to hold all the documents relating to a given project;” Philipsen, Petrie, and Ugolini (2011) found missing documents as well as multiple versions of individual project proposals and project assessments in TAIMS and noted that this reduced the efficiency of information retrieval and complicated post-completion monitoring and review.

the TA under review.²² This is not a new issue; the need to improve the monitoring of the later stages of the results chain of a TA project and to identify factors impeding implementation progress and impact was a key issue raised by IEO (2005).²³

Table 1. Assessment of a Sample of TAIMS Projects

| Criteria | Assessments |
|---|--|
| <p>1. How well was the project defined at the start, when it was entered into the TAIMS? <i>Were the project objectives and outcomes clearly defined? Were the project activities clearly specified in terms of their purpose and timing? Were there intermediate milestones identified over the life of the project and was the time dimension well specified?</i></p> | <p>About two-thirds of the projects we reviewed described a reasonably clear sequence of activities.¹ Looking across projects, however, we found that even within individual TA departments, project objectives and project outcomes were not consistently specified at appropriate levels in the results chain.</p> |
| <p>2. How well was progress monitored while the project was underway? <i>Was there consistency between what was defined in the project proposal (verifiable indicators) and what was being monitored during project execution? How well were the original milestones and intermediate outcomes (if any) monitored and/or assessed? Was staff candid in reporting non-achievement or underachievement?</i></p> | <p>Evidence of within-project monitoring was generally scarce. Even taking into consideration the huge variation in the length and types of TA projects in the TAIMS, there were only a handful of projects that could be considered properly monitored and documented from beginning to end. In the majority of cases, intervening reports such as mission briefing papers and back-to-office reports and interim project assessments, were either missing or incomplete, and the tasks described in the briefing papers and back-to-office reports, where they could be found, were not clearly linked to the objectives and outcomes in the project proposal.</p> |
| <p>3. How well was the project assessed at completion? <i>Was there consistency between what was defined in the project proposal (verifiable indicators) and what was assessed at the end of the project? How well were the project objectives and final outcomes assessed? Was staff candid in reporting non-achievement or underachievement?</i></p> | <p>About three-fifths of the projects we reviewed had complete and reasonably candid final assessments of the extent to which the technical capacity of the recipient agency was improved at the point when the project activities were closed.</p> |

¹ The TAIMS guidelines do not require project managers to specify intermediate steps or milestones. Nonetheless, for projects involving more than two missions or activities, it seems reasonable to expect the activities and verifiable indicators to be laid out in a logical sequence towards the final outcome(s), and this is what we looked for in our review.

²² As noted in one evaluation: “The [Trust Fund] was designed to deliver TA over a three- to five-year period with an expectation that results would not be clearly tested perhaps for some years after that. This Evaluation is being conducted at only about two years into the life of the [Trust Fund]. It is too early to evaluate the achievement of Objectives in any of the projects.... As with interim evaluations generally, the principal focus is on achievements of Outputs” (Woodbridge, Chatterji, and Myers, 2012).

²³ From the Fund’s point of view, the implementation of TA recommendations is the responsibility of the country authorities and “not the responsibility of the Fund, not of the other donors and TA providers” (IMF, 2008b). Hence, the Fund’s self-assessment of TA has tended to focus less on the outcome and impact stages of the results chain.

25. **In principle, ex post evaluations that take a longer time perspective should help to fill this gap.** However, we found only a handful of ex post evaluations by TA departments that addressed this area well—three good examples are the evaluation of FAD tax reform and administration TA in Mozambique (2009), the evaluation of MCM banking sector reform TA in Nigeria (2011), and the evaluation of STA macroeconomics statistics TA in Peru (2012). Furthermore, since the last report of the TA Evaluation Program in 2010, there has been no effort to summarize the lessons from ex post evaluations done across the IMF.

26. **There is very little attempt to evaluate the final impact of TA.** Even the ex post evaluations that covered TA over long periods of time rarely extended to this part of the results chain. For evaluations completed in the period 2006–13, we found only one example that did—the “Evaluation of Reforms in Tax Policy and Administration in Mozambique and Related TA, 1994–2007” (Castro and others, 2009), which discussed FAD TA in the context of the recipient country’s overall program of tax system and administration reforms.

III. TRAINING

27. **The IMF’s main training department is the Institute for Capacity Development (ICD), formerly the IMF Institute.** ICD is responsible for providing general policy-oriented training in macroeconomics and finance. As noted earlier, an element of training is frequently embedded in IMF TA but TA departments also conduct separate self-standing training courses for a wider audience on specialized topics within their purview and area of expertise—within the IMF, this is referred to as specialized training. ICD is responsible for coordinating both general and specialized training under the ICD training program.²⁴ Training activities include workshops, courses, and seminars ranging in duration from a few days to several weeks. These activities take place at IMF headquarters and, to an increasing extent, at regional training centers which are operated in collaboration with and co-financed by local partners and donors (Box 3); training has also been provided through distance-learning and, since 2013, through online learning.

28. **TA and training are complementary to a large extent, but there are also important differences between the two activities that affect how they are self-evaluated.** Although there is an enormous diversity of IMF TA projects, in general TA tends to be narrowly focused and designed to provide country-specific advice and instruction to address a particular issue or set of issues to the staff of a specific government agency charged with implementing the related work (for instance, assistance to the central bank of a particular country to strengthen its monetary operations). Training, on the other hand, tends to be much broader in coverage, focusing on the needs of participants from a range of countries and

²⁴ Training activities are also organized by other IMF departments and RTACs outside the ICD program. These courses typically target smaller groups of countries than courses in the ICD program and address more specific needs, often in connection with TA initiatives.

government agencies in a particular topic area (for instance, a course on monetary and exchange rate policies for 20–30 officials from a particular region). As such, the outcome and impact of training is more nebulous and harder to define, let alone evaluate, than is the case for TA in general.

Box 3. Regional Training Centers

Most training activities take place in the IMF’s regional training centers located around the world. There are currently seven regional training centers in operation: in Austria (since 1992), Singapore (since 1998), China (since 2000), Brazil (since 2001), Tunisia (since 2010), Kuwait (since 2011), and Mauritius (since 2013). Each regional training center is operated in collaboration with and co-financed by the local partner government (agency); certain centers also receive additional contributions from donors. The governance and management of each regional training center is different. Some local partners are directly involved in the administration of the training program; others provide oversight through the center’s governing board or executive committee. The larger regional training centers are headed by senior IMF staff and conduct their own in-house courses with resident economists as well as hosting headquarters-based training missions. The IMF has much less direct involvement in the smaller centers.

A. The Self-Evaluation Framework for Training

29. **ICD employs a variety of self-evaluation methods to assess the relevance of its training curriculum, the effectiveness of course delivery, and the impact of training.** The self-evaluation methods that date back the longest are quantitative and qualitative evaluations of training by the participants at the end of every course and a triennial survey of training participants’ sponsoring agencies. Donor assessments have played a smaller role in self-evaluation of training in comparison with TA. Part of the reason is that external financing for training has been mainly through partnerships with the government of the countries where the regional training centers are located (Box 3), and to date, the local partners have not required periodic external evaluations of their regional training centers.²⁵ Donors other than local partners at the regional training centers have, on the other hand, required regular reviews focused on value for money. And the RTAC evaluations discussed earlier have also covered any training activities conducted in the RTAC being evaluated.

30. **At the end of every training event, participant feedback is collected through a written/online questionnaire and through detailed discussion during a formal closing session.**²⁶ The questionnaire focuses on the appropriateness of the topics covered, whether the content of lectures met expectations, whether the lecturers were effective, whether the workshops and readings contributed to understanding, and how the various aspects of the

²⁵ Annual financial reports are prepared for the larger regional training centers but these typically do not include self-evaluative elements.

²⁶ Course evaluation questionnaires are used in all courses in the ICD training program, including specialized courses delivered by other departments.

course could be improved. A summary measure of the value of the course is generated by having participants rate (on a scale from one to five) the extent to which the knowledge/skills they acquired in the course will be used in their jobs, how strongly they would recommend the course to others, and their overall satisfaction with the course. This feedback (numerical ratings and written and oral comments) is reported in a memo to departmental management after every training event and scores below four are normally subject to further scrutiny.²⁷ The numerical evaluation scores are also included in annual reports to donors and regional training center partners.

31. **In response to donor interest in the sustainability of the benefits of IMF training, a program of follow-up surveys was introduced in 2011.**²⁸ The surveys, which cover a sample of donor-financed courses each year, are conducted by an external research firm 12–18 months after the conclusion of the courses. Questionnaires are sent to officials who participated in the selected courses and to the managers in their agencies who sponsored their participation. Survey questions include: whether the training had improved various aspects of job performance; whether it had resulted in the participant receiving increased responsibilities and/or more opportunity for career advancement; and whether the participant’s learning had been shared with others. The survey results are shared with the relevant donors but to date they have not been disseminated, discussed, or used within the department.

32. **The IMF also undertakes a triennial survey of member-country agencies that sponsor their officials for (i.e., send their officials to) IMF training courses.** Since 1995, an external research firm has been commissioned to conduct a survey of sponsors every three years. The most recent survey, concluded in 2012, solicited feedback from 579 central banks, ministries of finance, and statistical and other government agencies in 185 countries that had sent participants to the Institute training program during 2009–11; the response rate was 42 percent.²⁹ In addition to assessing the overall level of satisfaction with IMF training, the survey typically includes several questions to evaluate the extent to which the training has contributed to building capacity in member countries. For example, sponsoring agencies are asked whether the training has helped participants do their jobs better, improved the way their staff formulated and implemented policy, and facilitated their collaboration with the IMF; sponsoring agencies are also asked whether their staff have been given added

²⁷ As is always the case with client satisfaction surveys, the ratings feedback reflects respondents’ individual and collective idiosyncrasies to a certain extent but not such as to render it uninformative. This is based on a perusal of over 700 completed questionnaires from 25 training courses in various regions over the period 2006–13.

²⁸ The practice of follow-up surveys dates back to 2003 for one donor-financed distance-learning course. In 2011, the practice was expanded in a pilot program surveying seven courses that took place in 2009. The 2012–13 program surveyed 17 courses that took place during 2011–12. To date, follow-up surveys have been conducted only for ICD courses.

²⁹ The 2006 survey polled 516 agencies in 179 member countries that had sent participants to the Institute training program during 2003–05; the response rate was 58 percent.

responsibilities or promotions as a result of the training.³⁰ The 2012 survey also solicited sponsoring agencies' views on ways in which IMF training could better meet their organizations' training needs, facilitate their collaboration with IMF country teams, and contribute more to successful TA implementation.

33. **Another avenue for self-evaluation has been through periodic meetings of heads of training organized in certain regions/regional training centers.** These meetings allow senior officials in charge of training at central banks, finance ministries, and other government agencies to provide further input on some of the questions in the triennial survey of training.³¹ For example, among the issues examined in most recent meeting organized for the Asia-Pacific region by the IMF-Singapore Regional Training Institute (STI) in January 2013 were “evaluating the impact of training and technical assistance; and ways to make the dialogue between the STI, IMF and member countries more focused and efficient” (IMF, 2013b). According to the staff involved, these meetings have been a good forum for two-way learning (for the IMF as the training provider and country authorities as the ultimate beneficiaries) about how best to design, deliver, and utilize IMF training. Heads of training meetings have been held in the Asia-Pacific region (in 2007, 2010, and 2013), Europe (in 2012), the Western Hemisphere region (in 2012), and the Middle East region (in 2012 and 2013).

34. **The IMF has undertaken one tracer study**—in 2011—to determine the impact of IMF training courses on the work, careers, and sponsor agency performance of participants to the now-defunct Joint India-IMF Training Program (ITP).³² The study, which was requested by the Australian government (the donor) and conducted with the Reserve Bank of India (the local partner), targeted 44 officials who had attended two or more IMF courses at the ITP between 2006 and 2010.³³ Individuals surveyed were asked if their ITP training had improved their job performance, created additional career opportunities, and led to greater responsibilities for them. The survey results were shared with the Australian and Indian authorities but were not disseminated, discussed, or used within the department.

³⁰ The reasoning is that added responsibilities give officials more authority/opportunities to implement what they have learned, and promotions (better career prospects) increase the likelihood of officials remaining and utilizing their acquired skills in government service.

³¹ The information obtained from these meetings also complements the periodic feedback ICD receives from area departments and country officials, e.g., during the Annual and Spring Meetings.

³² A tracer study traces (finds or locates) a group of individuals “to systematically analyze the lasting or significant changes—positive or negative, intended or not—in [their] lives brought about by a given action or series of actions” (Roche, 1999).

³³ For reasons unrelated to the results of the tracer study, ICD decided not to seek renewal of funding from Australia and allowed the program to lapse in 2013.

35. **There has been one comprehensive strategic review of training in the period under review but it did not contain any element of self-assessment.**^{34,35} The review, “Training as Part of Capacity Building: Recent Initiatives and Strategic Considerations” (IMF, 2008d) described the systems that existed at that time to design the training curriculum, select participants, and allocate IMF training regionally. The review also devoted a section to describing the self-evaluation methods used for training. More recently, a narrower review—to assess whether inputs for the ICD training curriculum met course objectives and suggest potential priorities among courses—was conducted by an external expert in 2014.

B. Assessment

36. **In our view, ICD’s self-evaluation practices have been properly designed to assess the relevance of the IMF’s training curriculum and the effectiveness of course delivery (training output).** Training relevance and effectiveness are assessed through various channels including client satisfaction questionnaires completed and discussed at the end of every course, the triennial survey of training sponsors, and periodic meetings of regional training directors. The elements of the framework are comparable to practices in other organizations (Annex 3). Perhaps the only missing element has been a broad evaluation of the regional training center modality of training delivery. As noted in Box 2, the IMF has had more than twenty years of experience with regional training centers; over that time, some centers have ceased operations, some have expanded, and new ones have opened up. Given that the regional training modality is here to stay, an evaluation—along the lines of the 2005 RTAC review (IMF, 2005a)—to take stock of the experience to date and draw lessons about what works best would be a worthwhile endeavor.

37. **More could be done, however, to draw lessons for improving the design and delivery of training that can be shared across the IMF.** For example, more systematic procedures could be put in place for distilling and disseminating lessons from the follow-up surveys and heads of training meetings. And the key broad messages and/or lessons for training synthesized from the various surveys and other channels should be shared outside ICD, especially with TA departments that engage in specialized training under the ICD training program.

³⁴ In 2005, the Office of Internal Audit and Inspection reviewed the IMF Institute as part of its program of departmental audits. The review included a zero-based assessment of the Institute’s activities and an examination of the efficiency and effectiveness of the department’s organization and management. It found that the Institute’s training services were highly valued by the membership, and were well managed overall. It made a number of recommendations related to potential cost savings and recovery of costs (IMF, 2005b).

³⁵ The 2013 Board paper on “The Fund’s Capacity Development Strategy” (IMF, 2013a) included training within the broader scope of capacity development; there was no review of training per se.

38. **Assessing effectiveness in terms of training outcomes is much harder.** As noted in IMF (2008d), a hallmark of IMF training has been “intensive group engagement in workshops [which] is essential to the bond-building, network-encouraging, and learning-from-one-another aspect of courses.” It is difficult—and may be undesirable—to quantify effectiveness in such a context, hence relying on the impressionistic assessment of the teaching staff as documented in back-to-office reports or memos should be sufficient. ICD has recently adopted the practice of quizzing participants before and after its courses to measure the amount of knowledge acquired. This approach seems more useful for course material that is cut-and-dried than for courses that heavily emphasize group workshops and/or analyze policy issues in a seminar setting.³⁶

39. **Despite the reservations regarding impact analysis, serious efforts have been made to assess the impact of training.** Follow-up surveys are a useful addition to ICD’s array of self-evaluation tools. Tracer studies, on the other hand, seem less appropriate as self-evaluation tools for most types of training provided by the IMF. In educational research, tracer studies are usually conducted to assess the impact of degree programs or their equivalent on employment outcomes over the medium term.³⁷ In the case of IMF training which typically takes the form of short (two-week) courses, it is unrealistic to expect to be able to assess the effect of course attendance on an individual’s subsequent government career, let alone on the policy-making capacity of his/her agency. Tracer studies should be considered only for instances where a longer engagement and clearly specified objective of training can be identified, i.e., where the scale of the training intervention at the agency/country level is significant enough for a meaningful results chain to be traced out.

40. **Can more be done to assess the impact of training?** One possibility to consider might be occasional thematic ex post evaluations of training, along the lines of those undertaken by TA departments described earlier. Such ex post evaluations could examine the impact of training of government officials, for example, in a certain topic (e.g., finance, macroeconomic modeling, etc.) or from selected countries or groups of countries. What about econometric analysis to assess the final impact of training? Arezki, Quintyn, and Toscani (2012) is one such attempt which uses a panel regression to estimate the effect of IMF training and TA on structural reforms.³⁸ Ultimately, however, econometric analysis

³⁶ IMF (2008c) expressed concern that a refocusing on individual examinations would impair the “atmospherics of the course.”

³⁷ For example, the World Bank conducts a bi-annual tracer study of individuals who received scholarships for graduate studies under the Joint Japan/World Bank Graduate Scholarship Program and the Australian Agency for International Development has conducted tracer studies for its scholarship programs in Vietnam and the Pacific Island countries.

³⁸ Arezki, Quintyn, and Toscani (2012) estimate the average marginal effect of IMF training (measured by the number of officials trained in a given country), TA (measured by the number of person-years of TA field delivery to that country), and programs (number of years that the country is on an active program) on structural reforms (measured by indices of reform in six real and financial sectors in the country), including country and

(continued...)

would only be able to address the impact of training in the broadest sense at best, and would be of limited relevance as a learning tool for the IMF.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

41. **Both TA and training have, over time, developed self-evaluation systems that allow for an assessment of relevance, effectiveness, and, to the best of their ability, impact. These systems are similar to those in other capacity building organizations.**

42. **With TA and training now being coordinated by one department, ICD, staff has proposed, and the Board has supported, a unified approach to evaluation of these activities.** IMF (2013a) envisioned that this unified approach would “provide a framework to distill lessons and address outstanding issues [and] would enable comparisons across countries and subject areas so that lessons can be drawn to strengthen future activities.” A follow-up statement of principles governing the IMF’s provision of capacity development (IMF, 2014a) specified three key instruments for self-evaluation:

- IMF-wide evaluations of TA and training every three to five years that both review past work and outline a plan to increase their impact of TA and training by making them more effective and efficient;
- Self-evaluations of selected country cases or thematic areas by departments in the IMF providing TA or training, using a common evaluation framework and conducted by staff or external experts;³⁹
- External evaluations as mandated by donors, particularly of RTACs and topical trust funds midway through each arrangement’s funding cycle.

Since implementation is in the early stages, it is too early to assess any changes.

43. **Against this background, and on the basis of our assessments in the preceding sections, we provide the following recommendations.**

(a) For assessing relevance

- **A regular strategic review of capacity development activities, as laid out in IMF (2014a), is a good idea.** As noted earlier, TA has been subject to periodic strategic reviews but training has not. A regular overarching review covering both types of activities should include self-evaluative elements such as those incorporated

year fixed-effects and a variety of control variables. They find that IMF training leads to an increase in structural reforms but only through IMF programs and only when a significant share of public servants is trained.

³⁹ Discussions on the common evaluation framework were ongoing at the time of this evaluation.

in recent triennial surveillance reviews (see Stedman, 2015). These self-evaluative elements should address, inter alia, the issue of the extent to which IMF TA/training has been suited to the priorities and policies of the recipient countries.⁴⁰

- **The triennial survey of training should be continued, and the practice of organizing periodic heads of training meetings should be regularized and extended to all regions.** Greater and more active participation in these meetings by donors and local partners of the relevant regional training centers (as well as by TA departments that provide specialized training) should be encouraged. The results of the triennial survey and the information and lessons distilled from the heads of training meetings should be discussed within ICD and shared with the relevant IMF departments in order to inform future work programs for IMF training.
- (b) **For assessing effectiveness**
- **The new results-based management system should aim to improve monitoring (in addition to providing a key management tool) and provide data for self-evaluation.** It will be important to avoid the conceptual and implementation problems have plagued the TAIMS. The definition of a TA project needs to be clarified, and the concept of a results chain (or log frame) needs to be kept simple, as well as to be better explained and understood. The new system should be supported by formal training of relevant staff.
 - **Client satisfaction questionnaires should continue to be used as a channel for feedback for improving training design and delivery; TA departments should consider adopting this practice as well** (FAD is already doing so). Systematic procedures should be developed to analyze the information from these questionnaires and use it draw lessons for improving the effectiveness of training and TA.
- (c) **For assessing impact**
- **Ex post evaluations of TA should continue to be undertaken regularly by TA departments, as planned in IMF (2014a).** These evaluations should be well focused and should aim to provide the depth and texture on a project or topic that cannot be addressed in more wide-ranging donor-mandated evaluations. While TA departments should have flexibility in identifying the specific issues to be evaluated or areas that they consider could be improved, increased attention should be given to identifying factors influencing the impact of TA. This means that sufficient time should be allowed between project completion and the time of the evaluation. Ideally these

⁴⁰ The self-evaluative elements could also look back at issues of effectiveness and impact, by synthesizing the results and lessons from the various self-evaluation processes for TA and training.

evaluations should be led by experienced external evaluators or senior IMF staff and should incorporate input from the recipient country or countries. Evaluation lessons should be internalized by the department concerned—FAD’s recent initiative to translate lessons from its ex post evaluation of TA in East Africa into a departmental action plan to enhance TA traction is a good example.

- **The practice of ex post evaluations could also be extended to training.** As with ex post evaluations of TA, such evaluations could be undertaken for a sample of training projects, focusing on the technical quality of the training content on a particular topic or look at the results chain more fully in the case of an extended training engagement with a single country or group of countries. These ex post evaluations would complement the follow-up surveys and would provide a richer narrative from which to draw lessons than survey-based tracer studies.

44. **More broadly, in establishing a common standard to help guide preparation of evaluations across departments, the IMF should recognize the limits of uniformity.** While standardization across TA and training departments could “assist with project management” (IMF, 2013a), it remains to be seen if the IMF, donors, and country authorities can agree on a common evaluation standard for both for TA and training that goes beyond broad principles and if that would enable comparisons across countries and subject areas (given past experience with different interpretations of the OECD-DAC criteria by different evaluators).

45. **It is important to keep in mind the resource tradeoff between monitoring and evaluation activities and the actual delivery of TA and training.** A significant degree of self-evaluation is already in practice for capacity-development activities in the IMF. As noted also in IMF (2013a), these practices just “need to be coalesced into a more efficient and effective framework.”

REFERENCES

- Abrams, Richard, 2011, "Independent Evaluation of MCM Technical Assistance Cooperation in Banking Sector Reform in Nigeria" (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Arezki, Rabah, Marc Quintyn, and Frederik Toscani, 2012, "Structural Reforms, IMF Programs and Capacity Building: An Empirical Investigation," IMF Working Paper 12/232 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Castro, Patricio, and others, 2009, "Evaluation of Reforms in Tax Policy and Administration in Mozambique and Related TA—1994-2007" (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Enoch, Charles, Barbara Baldwin, and Ava Ayrton, 2012, "Evaluation of MCM Technical Assistance in Belize, Costa Rica, and Panama" (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Hallberg, Kris, 2012, "Evaluating Technical Assistance: Taking Stock of the Practices of International Financial Institutions" (Manila: Evaluation Cooperation Group).
- Independent Evaluation Office of the International Monetary Fund (IEO), 2005, *IMF Technical Assistance* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2014, *IMF Technical Assistance: Revisiting the 2005 IEO Evaluation* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- International Monetary Fund (IMF), 1999, "Review of Fund Technical Assistance," EBAP/99/59 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2003, "Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Fiscal Years 2003-05," SM/03/141 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2005a, "Review of the Fund's Regional Technical Assistance Centers," SM/05/239 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2005b, "The Internal Audit Function in the Fund—Background Information and Activity Report," EBAP/06/32 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2005c, "The Acting Chair's Summing Up: Independent Evaluation Office—Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Provided by the Fund, Executive Board Meeting 05/16," February (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2004, "Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program," SM/04/67 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2006, "Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program," SM/06/245 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

- _____, 2008a, “Enhancing the Impact of Fund Technical Assistance,” SM/08/97 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2008b, “TAIMS Guidance Note,” unpublished.
- _____, 2008c, “Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program,” SM/08/100 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2008d, “Training as Part of Capacity Building: Recent Initiatives and Strategic Considerations,” SM/08/114 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2010, “Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program,” SM/10/145 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2011a, “Report of the Task Force on the Fund’s Technical Assistance Strategy,” SM/11/282 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2011b, “Report of the Working Group on Implementing Results Based Management (RBM),” unpublished.
- _____, 2013a, “The Fund’s Capacity Development Strategy—Better Policies through Stronger Institutions,” SM/13/128 and Sup. 1 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2013b, “IMF-Singapore Regional Training Institute Hosts Triennial Asia-Pacific Training Meeting,” Press Release 13/12, January 15 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- _____, 2014a, “IMF Policies and Practices on Capacity Development,” SM/14/257 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Philipsen, Ferry, Murray Petrie, and Piero Ugolini, 2011, *Independent External Evaluation – Japan Administered Account for Selected IMF Activities (JSA)* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Roche, Chris, 1999, “Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change,” Oxfam Development Guidelines (U.K.: Oxfam – Practical Action Publishing).
- Stedman, Louellen, 2015, “Self-Evaluation in IMF Thematic Reviews,” IEO Background Paper No. 15/2 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Woodbridge, Robert, Subhrendu Chatterji, and Fred Myers, 2012, *The Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism Topical Trust Fund—Independent Evaluation (2009-Present)* (London: Consulting Base).

**ANNEX 1. RECOMMENDATIONS ON SELF-EVALUATION IN THE
2005 IEO EVALUATION OF IMF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

IEO (2005) made two major recommendations with regard to monitoring and self-evaluation of TA.

The first recommendation was that the IMF should develop more systematic approaches to track progress on major TA activities and to identify reasons behind major shortfalls.

- At the outset of major TA activities, IMF staff and the authorities should agree on how progress and success of the TA activity would be measured, and identify suitable indicators or markers of progress over time. This would avoid the emergence of divergent expectations and provide incentives for more timely reassessments if progress is seriously off track.
- To assist in this process, IMF staff should unbundle much more clearly the different stages (of the results chain) through which TA may have a final impact, and then explicitly monitor these stages. Specifically, distinctions should be made among: progress in improving the technical capacities of agencies receiving TA; whether agencies are making effective use of that increased technical capacity, as well as reasons as to why this may not be happening; and the impact on the ground in terms of relevant economic outcomes.
- Resident experts and headquarters staff in charge of backstopping activities should be candid in reporting obstacles to progress, including political interference or lack of support from the authorities that prevent agencies from making effective use of their improved technical capacity.
- A clearer articulation of benchmarks for measuring progress and the factors behind shortfalls is critical if past track records in implementing TA are to be a useful guide for future TA allocations. To have reallocations of TA across countries based on track records, these monitoring practices will have to be comparable and transparent across countries. The new TAIMS could be the vehicle through which enhanced monitoring practices become unified and more transparent across the institution.

The second recommendation was that the program of ex post evaluations of TA should be widened and more systematic procedures for disseminating lessons put in place.

- OTM, in collaboration with other departments, should continue to prepare and update a program of ex post evaluations of TA, including broad TA topics, sub-regions, or countries that have been heavy users of TA.
- While the TA-providing departments themselves should undertake self-assessments, there would be merit in continuing to undertake selected ex post evaluations by units

not directly involved in providing TA, in order to enhance accountability and give a fresh perspective.

- The findings of these evaluations should be made more widely available within the IMF to maximize their potential benefits and avoid the loss of institutional memory. A stock-taking exercise of past and ongoing evaluations throughout the IMF should take place periodically and be made available to management and the Executive Board.

The Executive Board “supported the recommendation that at the outset of major TA activities, staff and the authorities should agree on measurable indicators of progress covering all the major stages of the activity.” Directors “saw a need for better tracking progress by unbundling the different stages of the TA project life cycle, careful explanation of the shortfalls in project execution, and candid reporting by the staff on obstacles to progress” and noted that the TAIMS could become the vehicle for implementing “enhanced, transparent, and standardized monitoring practices ... across the institution.” On ex post evaluations, Directors concurred that external evaluations were “a useful tool to enhance accountability and provide a fresh perspective” and called on OTM to “continue to prepare and update its program of ex post evaluations” in collaboration with other departments. Directors also agreed that there was “a continuing role for self-assessments by TA-providing departments” but stressed that the tradeoff between TA evaluations and TA delivery needed to be “carefully weighed” (IMF, 2005c).

ANNEX 2. TA EVALUATIONS AND REVIEWS, 2006–14

| TITLE | Date | Department |
|---|-----------|--------------------------|
| Evaluations undertaken by TA departments | | |
| Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Program (May 2001 to April 2004) and of Areas for Further Assistance to the Central Bank of Congo (SM/06/257, Sup. 3)* | Mar 2006 | MFD |
| Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism: Review of the Quality and Consistency of Assessment Reports and the Effectiveness of Coordination (SM/06/145) | Apr 2006 | MFD, LEG, and World Bank |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina: Assessment of MFD's Technical Assistance Program (SM/06/257, Sup. 4)* | Jun 2006 | MFD (external) |
| Kosovo: Assessment of MFD's Technical Assistance Program (SM/06/257, Sup. 5 Rev. 1)* | Jun 2006 | MFD |
| Evaluation Report on Technical Assistance in Statistics Provided in Ukraine by the International Monetary Fund | Jun 2006 | STA |
| Evaluation Report on Technical Assistance in Statistics Provided in Kosovo by the IMF Statistics Department | Jun 2006 | STA |
| Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Program (November 2001 to November 2004) for the Bank of Sierra Leone (SM/06/257, Sup. 2)* | Jul 2006 | MFD |
| IMF/Netherlands Program - Legal and Judicial Report in Indonesia 2000-2004 - External Evaluation Final Report (SM/06/257, Sup. 1)* | Jul 2006 | LEG (external) |
| Dominican Republic and Guatemala: Report on Technical Assistance Evaluation Mission | Aug 2006 | STA |
| Armenia: Report on Evaluation Mission | Sep 2006 | STA |
| Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal: Technical Assistance Evaluation | Dec 2006 | STA |
| Cambodia, Nepal, Timor-Leste, and Vietnam: Technical Assistance Evaluation Report | Jun 2007 | STA |
| Algeria: Report on the Technical Assistance Evaluation Mission | Sep 2007 | STA |
| Evaluation of the U.K. DFID-Financed Technical Assistance GDDS Project for Selected Anglophone African Countries (2001–06) (SM/08/85)** | Mar 2008 | STA |
| Honduras and Nicaragua: Report on Technical Assistance Evaluation Mission | Jun 2008 | STA |
| Afghanistan: Report on the Technical Assistance Evaluation Mission | Jun 2008 | STA |
| Evaluation of Technical Assistance to Post-Conflict Countries: Mozambique and Rwanda (SM/09/54)*** | Feb 2009 | STA |
| Evaluation of Technical Assistance on Bank Supervision by Long-Term Experts in Asia (SM/09/142)*** | Jun 2009 | MCM |
| Macro Policy Lessons for a Sound Design of Fiscal Decentralization (SM/09/208)*** | Jul 2009 | FAD |
| Evaluation of Reforms in Tax Policy and Administration in Mozambique and Related TA—1994–2007 (SM/10/145, Sup. 3)*** | Sep 2009 | FAD |
| Report on the Technical Assistance Evaluation Mission to the People's Republic of China (SM/09/273)*** | Nov 2009 | STA |
| Report on the Technical Assistance Evaluation Mission to Transition Economies: Albania and Georgia (SM/11/29) | Feb 2011 | STA |
| Evaluation Report of MCM Technical Assistance Program on Banking Supervision to Cambodia, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Philippines | Apr 2011 | MCM |
| Independent Evaluation of MCM Technical Assistance Cooperation in Banking Sector Reform in Nigeria | Jun 2011 | MCM (external) |
| Peru: Report on the Statistics Technical Assistance and Training Evaluation Mission (IMF Country Report No. 12/233) | Aug 2012 | STA |
| External Evaluation of FAD's Advice on Government Accounting | Aug 2012 | FAD (external) |
| Evaluation of MCM Technical Assistance in Belize, Costa Rica, and Panama | Dec 2012 | MCM |
| Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Report on the Statistics Technical Assistance and Training Evaluation Mission (IMF Country Report No. 13/118) | Mar 2013 | STA |
| DFID-EDDI Project Mid-Term Evaluation (April 1, 2010–September 30, 2012) | May 2013 | STA |
| An Evaluation of FAD's Tax Policy Advice to Europe's Crisis Countries | Apr 2013 | FAD (external) |
| Review of FAD Technical Assistance Across Three East African Countries | Apr 2013 | FAD |
| Bhutan: Report on the Statistics Technical Assistance and Training Evaluation Mission (IMF Country Report No. 13/233) | Jul 2013 | STA |
| A Selective Review of Ongoing Projects of the Tax Policy and Administration Topical Trust Fund | Nov 2013 | FAD (external) |
| Government Finance Assessment of SECO Project – STAGO | Oct 2014 | STA |
| Evaluation Report of the MCM Technical Assistance Project on Banking Supervision: Bangladesh | July 2014 | MCM |
| Evaluation Report of the MCM Technical Assistance Project on Banking Supervision: Maldives | July 2014 | MCM |
| Evaluation Report of the MCM Technical Assistance Project on Banking Supervision: Nepal | July 2014 | MCM |

| TITLE | Date | Department |
|---|----------|--|
| Evaluations undertaken for donor-funded TA (excluding RTAC evaluations) | | |
| Technical Assistance Subaccount for Iraq – Evaluation (SM/08/100, Sup. 1)** | May 2008 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – Switzerland: Support for IMF Capacity Building (SM/10/145, Sup. 3)*** | Jul 2009 | OTM (external) |
| Assessment of CARTAC Technical Assistance to Support VAT Implementation in Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Dominica, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SM/10/145, Sup. 3)*** | Jul 2009 | CARTAC (external) |
| The Framework for Technical Assistance in the IMF: A Qualitative Assessment of Benefits of the Approach to Backstopping and Project Management (SM/10/145, Sup. 3)*** | Sep 2009 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – Japan Administered Account for Selected IMF Activities (JSA) (SM/10/145, Sup. 3)*** | Feb 2010 | OTM (external) |
| Central Bank Modernization: The Technical Cooperation Program between the Reserve Bank of Malawi, the International Monetary Fund and Norges Bank, 2006-2009 | May 2010 | OTM (external) |
| Independent Evaluation of the Belgium Technical Assistance Subaccount | Sep 2010 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – Japan Administered Account for Selected IMF Activities (JSA) | Jun 2011 | OTM (external) |
| The Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism Topical Trust Fund Independent Evaluation (2009-Present) | Apr 2012 | OTM (external) |
| Making the Transition to a Program-Based Approach to Technical Assistance—Evaluation of Worldwide Technical Assistance funded by Japan and delivered by the IMF | Oct 2014 | ICD (external) |
| RTAC evaluations | | |
| Second Mid-Term Review of the Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Center (SM/08/100, Sup. 3)** | Sep 2006 | OTM (external) |
| Mid-Term Evaluation of the Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center (METAC) (SM/08/100, Sup. 2)** | Mar 2007 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – African Regional Technical Assistance Centers (AFRITACs) (SM/10/145, Sup. 1)*** | Mar 2009 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – Pacific Financial Technical Assistance Center (PFTAC) (SM/10/145, Sup. 2)*** | Jun 2009 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center (METAC) (SM/10/145, Sup. 2)*** | Oct 2009 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Center (CARTAC) (SM/10/145, Sup. 2)*** | Feb 2010 | OTM (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation – CARTAC Cost Effectiveness Evaluation | Jul 2012 | ICD (external) |
| Independent Mid-Term Evaluation—IMF West AFRITAC | Oct 2013 | ICD (external) |
| Independent Mid-Term Evaluation—IMF East AFRITAC | Nov 2013 | ICD (external) |
| Independent Mid-Term Evaluation—IMF CAPTAC-DR | Nov 2013 | ICD (external) |
| Independent External Evaluation—Mid-term Evaluation of the METAC | Sep 2014 | ICD (external) |
| Fund-wide strategic reviews of TA | | |
| Enhancing the Impact of Fund Technical Assistance (SM/08/97) | Apr 2008 | OTM (in consultation with other departments) |
| Report of the Task Force on the Fund's Technical Assistance Strategy (SM/11/282) | Oct 2011 | Inter-departmental task force |
| The Fund's Capacity Development Strategy—Better Policies Through Stronger Institutions (SM/13/128 and Sup.1) | May 2013 | ICD |

FAD: Fiscal Affairs Department; LEG: Legal Department; MCM: Monetary and Capital Markets Department (previously MFD); MFD: Monetary and Financial Systems Department; OTM: Office of Technical Assistance Management; STA: Statistics Department

* Included in the 2006 report of the *Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program*, (IMF, 2006).

** Included in the 2008 report of the *Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program*, (IMF, 2008c).

*** Included in the 2010 report of the *Technical Assistance Evaluation Program—Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program*, (IMF 2010).

ANNEX 3. SELF-EVALUATION OF CAPACITY-DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Technical Assistance (TA)

Most international financial institutions (IFIs) offer TA to improve the design and implementation of development projects or policy programs they finance, or to build institutional capacity, skills, and knowledge in their client countries. As reported in a March 2012 survey on self-assessment practices and policies in IFIs,¹ of the respondent institutions that provided TA, all carried out some form of self-evaluation of those activities; for a majority, self-evaluation of TA was mandatory. Nearly all survey respondents also reported that there were institution-wide self-evaluation guidelines specific to TA.

In practice, for TA that is linked to a lending operation, ex post self-evaluation takes place in the course of reviewing the particular operation through each respective project completion report. Ex post self-evaluation of TA can also be carried out separately, and a few IFIs do make use of free-standing TA self-evaluation products, particularly in the context of non-lending TA. The time between TA completion and self evaluation is usually six to twelve months. As a result, assessments often report on the achievement of outputs, or at best intermediate outcomes, rather than final outcomes. To assure an iterative learning environment, many IFIs rely on both TA monitoring and evaluation systems; a few IFIs also incorporate ex ante evaluation of TA. TA self-evaluation data and results also feature in annual institutional performance reports.

Most IFIs use the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, but some institutions have defined different criteria or sub-criteria that enable them to focus on the distinguishing characteristics of knowledge-based interventions and to capture the complex process of institutional change. World Bank TA self-evaluations have only two main criteria: activity performance and Bank performance. Some IFIs have also begun to define standardized performance indicators for TA, and the Evaluation Cooperation Group is in the process of developing harmonized good practice standards for self-evaluation of TA and training. See Hallberg (2012) for more detail.

Training

In the literature on evaluating training programs, the classic model assesses interventions using four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. The criteria focus on the extent to which training changes the attitudes and behaviors of trainees, the extent to which newly acquired skills are put to use on the job, and the ultimate impact of the training on the larger organization (Hallberg, 2012).

¹ This survey was administered jointly by IEO and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development Evaluation Department (EBRD).

In order to measure these criteria, self-assessments have traditionally been carried out through survey questionnaires administered at the conclusion of delivery. In most cases, a follow-up survey is also conducted after a period of time. About half of all IEO-EBRD survey respondents reported that, while for the most part not mandated, self-assessment of external training activities was being undertaken by their institutions.

Among a smaller number of institutions, notably the World Bank and Asian Development Bank, there has been a shift from classes and online delivery of training to multiple formats of capacity development initiatives. Self-assessments for these activities include additional participatory tools beyond questionnaires; and the assessments attempt to determine the success of institutional capacity building operations in terms of their effect on intermediate behavioral outcomes as well as on broader institutional outcomes. As with the questionnaire method, the assessments are also based on a set of defined performance indicators.

Self-assessment results are used to improve training and capacity building initiatives. They also feed into departmental and institutional level management decisions and strategic processes.

ANNEX 4. SELECTED TA PROJECTS DRAWN FROM THE TAIMS

| Project ID | Project Title | Project Description |
|-----------------|--|---|
| FAD_BDI_2011_02 | Burundi: Public Financial Management | This TA project followed on earlier FAD TA in public financial management begun in 2008. It was part of a larger multi-donor project of 19 programs (to which the IMF had been assigned six) and it involved one headquarters-based mission and 6 short-term expert visits over a period of 10 months to assist the authorities in updating their public financial management (PFM) reform strategy and its corresponding action plan; reorganizing the Ministry of Finance; and developing the road map and training strategy linked to implementation of the new PFM Organic Law and corresponding regulations. |
| FAD_UGA_2010_02 | Uganda: Revenue Administration | This TA project consisted of one headquarters-based diagnostic TA mission and 2 short-term expert visits over a period of 19 months to strengthen the Uganda Revenue Authority's tax compliance management capabilities in relation to large- and medium-sized taxpayers. |
| FAD_MDV_2009_01 | Maldives: Government Integrated Financial Management Information System (GIFMIS) and Cash Management Development | This TA project was an extension of an existing project begun in 2007 that had consisted of a series of missions by a peripatetic expert to provide TA in cash planning and management and to design a fiscal reporting system (GIFMIS). It involved two additional visits over period of 18 months by a new short-term expert to continue to provide guidance on development of the GIFMIS and to focus on improving cash management, cash planning, and payment processes. |
| FAD_MKD_2011_01 | Macedonia: Tax Administration Reform | This TA project was an extension of a three-year TA program on tax administration begun in 2006. It involved the assignment of a resident advisor, as well as short term advisors and headquarters-based missions over a period of 12 months to assist the authorities in further strengthening tax enforcement; enhancing taxpayer segmentation; modernizing assessment and collection systems; further improving the integrated collection of social insurance contributions and the withholding of personal income tax on salaries; enhancing organizational accountability for results and incentives for high productivity/non-corrupt behavior; and strengthening the training capacity of the Public Revenue Office. |
| FAD_MRT_2009_02 | Mauritania: Public Financial Management | This TA project consisted of three short-term expert visits during period of 18 months to assist the Mauritanian authorities to rationalize their banking arrangements towards a treasury single account and to strengthen the cash flow planning and management system. |
| FAD_COL_2009_01 | Colombia: Debt and Treasury Management | This TA project involved the assignment of one resident advisor, 5 short-term expert visits, and 3 headquarters-based TA missions over a period of 32 months to assist the authorities in modernizing debt and treasury management. |
| LEG_THA_2011_02 | Thailand: AML/CFT Risk Assessment (Module 3) | This TA project involved missions (including seminars and workshops) by staff and short-term experts as well as offsite desk work over a period of 24 months to support Thailand's Anti Money Laundering Office and other relevant agencies in strengthening the AML/CFT regime through an assessment of the money laundering and terrorism financing risks in Thailand. |
| LEG_GEO_2011_02 | Georgia: AML/CFT Legislative Drafting (Module 4) | This TA project consisted of one mission and headquarters-/home-based work by one staff member and two short-term experts over a period of 10 months, to help Georgia to bring its legal framework in line with the key/core Financial Action Task Force recommendations. |
| LEG_EUR_2012_01 | European Countries: AML/CFT Risk Assessment | This TA project involved 3 short-term expert missions to seven countries—Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Poland, Romania and Serbia—over a period of 16 months to carry out preliminary national risk assessments of money laundering in those countries.. |
| LEG_CRI_2010_01 | Costa Rica: AML/CFT Diagnostic Supervisory Framework (Module 1) | This TA project consisted of 2 missions and additional headquarters-/home-based work by staff and experts over a period of 9 months to identify shortcomings and develop an action plan to strengthen the overall AML/CFT legal, regulatory, and supervisory/institutional frameworks of the Superintendent General of Financial Institutions. |

| Project ID | Project Title | Project Description |
|-----------------|---|--|
| MCM_CPV_2011_02 | Cape Verde: Enhancing Banking Supervision and Crisis Resolution | This TA project involved 4 missions by staff and short-term experts over a period of 18 months to help the Bank of Cape Verde enhance its capacity to safeguard financial stability in line with the 2009 FSAP recommendations by enhancing capacity in bank supervision, developing skills in assessing banking soundness, and developing a framework for effective crisis management and resolution. |
| MCM_MOZ_2011_03 | Mozambique: Monetary Policy Development | This TA project followed on earlier MCM TA to strengthen macroeconomic analysis, policy formulation, and policy implementation in the Bank of Mozambique (BM). It consisted of two short-term expert visits over a period of 18 months to assist BM with: data development and macroeconomic analysis; improving the forecasting cycle and associated benchmark model; strengthening internal reporting on macroeconomic developments and policy communication; and strengthening monetary operations. |
| MCM_NGA_2012_01 | Nigeria: Monetary Operations Advisor to the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) | This TA project was an extension of ongoing TA to the CBN begun four years earlier in the form of a resident monetary policy advisor. It involved extending the appointment of the resident advisor in the CBN for an additional 6 months to allow him to complete his work on refining the liquidity forecasting framework and further strengthening monetary operations and the development of financial markets. |
| MCM_RWA_2011_02 | Rwanda: Bank Supervision Capacity Building | This TA project consisted of 3 missions by two short-term experts over a period of 12 months to provide training to, and develop a training program for future in-house training for, the National Bank of Rwanda's banking supervision staff on fundamentals of bank supervision. |
| MCM_BGD_2012_01 | Bangladesh: Strengthening Internal Audit | This TA project followed on earlier MCM projects to assist the Bangladesh Bank (BB) in developing its internal auditing capacity. It consisted of 4 short-term expert visits over a period of 11 months to help the BB's Internal Audit Department adopt a risk-based auditing approach. |
| MCM_AFG_2011_03 | Afghanistan: Bank Crisis Management and Resolution | This TA project involved the appointment of a long-term advisor to the Da Afghanistan Bank (DAB) for a period of 12 months to help resolve the crisis in Kabul Bank and to improve DAB's resolution and rehabilitation framework. |
| MCM_DJI_2011_01 | Djibouti: Banking Supervision | This TA project followed on earlier MCM TA that had assisted the Central Bank of Djibouti (BCD) in drafting a new banking law and in training its officials to perform on- and off-site inspections. It involved 3 short-term expert visits over a period of 3 months to assist the BCD with the drafting of instructions for the new banking law, new inspection manuals, new regulations, and new reporting tools. |
| MCM_TJK_2010_03 | Tajikistan: Improving Accounting Controls at the National Bank of Tajikistan (NBT) | This TA project involved 4 short-term expert visits plus one IMF staff visit over a period of 17 months to strengthen the accounting framework at the NBT and improve management information and the governance of financial reporting and internal controls at the NBT. |
| STA_PFT_2010_01 | Pacific Financial and Technical Assistance Center (PFTAC): Regional Multi-sector Statistics Advisor | This TA project involved extending the appointment of a resident advisor in PFTAC for a period of 12 months to (continue to) provide statistics TA to the Pacific Island countries through missions, remote TA, training, and a regional seminar. |
| STA_VNM_2011_10 | Vietnam: External Sector Statistics | This TA project comprised 2 missions by short-term experts and IMF staff over a period of 21 months to assist the authorities in improving compilation of the balance of payments and to facilitate the development of international investment position statistics. |
| STA_AFG_2010_18 | Afghanistan: Monetary and Financial Statistics | This TA project consisted of 2 missions by a short-term expert to the Da Afghanistan Bank over a period of 22 months strengthen the collection and compilation of monetary and financial statistics and to improve data quality and consistency. |
| STA_MAR_2010_10 | Morocco: Monetary and Financial Statistics | This TA project involved 2 staff missions over a period of 14 months to improve Morocco's monetary statistics to be in line with the methodology in the IMF's Monetary and Financial Statistics Manual and to assist the Central Bank of Morocco's staff in implementing the reporting of monetary data based on the IMF's standardized report forms. |

FAD: Fiscal Affairs Department; LEG: Legal Department; MCM: Monetary and Capital Markets Department; STA: Statistics Department.