

ANNEX 6

Data on Staff Inputs and Staff Turnover in Prolonged and “Temporary” Users

This annex provides additional information to support the discussion in Chapter 5, section on “Results from Cross-Sectional Evidence.”

Annex Table 6.1 provides details of the extent of staff inputs, as measured by the number of missions and mission days, in program countries. The results indicate such inputs were actually higher for “temporary” users. The difference is particularly marked for ESAF arrangements, which involved on average 51 mission days (41 percent) more for “temporary” users than for prolonged users. Likewise, the total staff resources invested by the IMF in programs with prolonged users were, on average, smaller than in “temporary” users’ programs: in both ESAF and GRA

arrangements, the IMF’s effort, measured by the personnel costs of its UFR and TA missions, was over 40 percent higher in programs with “temporary” users.

Excessive turnover of mission chiefs appears to be a problem for many program countries, but has not been worse among the prolonged users (Annex Table 6.2).

As regards mission team staffing, continuity has also been low across all country groups—in most cases, less than half of mission members were involved in the same country in the two previous years—but it has been slightly better in prolonged user countries than in “temporary” user countries (Annex Table 6.3).

Annex Table 6.1. Data on IMF Effort¹

	Number of mission days		Number of missions		Administrative costs (In millions of U.S. dollars)	
	During program	Including three months before program approval	During program	Including three months before program approval	During program	Including three months before program approval
All arrangements						
Prolonged users	126	144	9	11	1.5	1.6
Nonprolonged users	163	186	12	14	1.9	2.1
ESAF arrangements						
Prolonged users	122	140	9	10	1.5	1.7
Nonprolonged users	173	189	14	15	2.2	2.5
GRA arrangements						
Prolonged users	117	138	9	10	1.2	1.4
Nonprolonged users	160	185	12	14	1.7	2.0

Source: Ivanova and others (2001).

¹In this table, data on the number of missions and mission days do not take account of the size of missions.

Annex Table 6.2. Mission Chiefs Per Member Country, FY1996–2001

	No UFR	TU/PRGF	TU/GRA	PU/PRGF	PU/GRA
	(Number of mission chiefs)				
Mission chiefs per member country					
Average	3.4	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.2
High	6	7	10	7	8
Low	1	2	2	2	1
Share of member countries with five or more mission chiefs during six-year period (in percent)	13	34	32	19	31

Source: Internal data compiled by the IMF's Office of Internal Audit and Inspection at the IEO's request, based on data collected for its review of mission organization and management.

Annex Table 6.3. Mission Staff Continuity, FY1996–2001

(In percent of total mission staffing)

	Current fiscal year area department staff active in prior two fiscal years				Current fiscal year FAD staff active in prior two fiscal years				Current fiscal year PDR staff active in prior two fiscal years			
	1998	1999	2000	2001	1998	1999	2000	2001	1998	1999	2000	2001
No UFR	41	46	39	40	0	0	25	20	33	0	67	33
TU / PRGF	47	44	39	42	31	40	33	39	36	46	48	28
PU / PRGF	52	55	48	47	47	42	41	39	23	32	40	41
TU / GRA	50	43	51	45	47	40	47	40	25	40	40	42
PU / GRA	49	52	59	55	50	33	50	57	23	36	50	36
All countries	48	47	47	45	43	38	41	41	27	38	45	36

Source: Internal data compiled by the IMF's Office of Internal Audit and Inspection at the IEO's request, based on data collected for its review of mission organization and management.

Note: FAD: Fiscal Affairs Department; PDR: Policy Development and Review Department.