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Questions may be referred to nfunke@imf.org or mwhankan@imf.org
Key findings (1/2)

- A good response rate for this type of survey (36 percent) underlines the importance donors attribute to Fund TA.

- Key findings along various dimensions: (i) motivation; (ii) TA effectiveness; (iii) Fund TA compared to other providers, and (iv) donor relations:

  - **Motivation**: About three-quarters of the respondents indicated that the Fund’s reputation and expertise were key factors in their decision to support Fund TA.
Key findings (2/2)

- **TA Effectiveness:** While Fund TA is generally assessed as effective, respondents appear to see some scope to improve TA follow-up, coordination with other TA providers, and its results orientation.

- **Compared to other providers:** Respondents rated IMF TA favorably on average with respect to its overall quality, the quality of TA experts, and outcomes. It is rated similarly in terms of costs and procedures and less favorably in terms of information on IMF TA available to the public.

- **Donor relations:** Close to 60 percent of respondents believe that Fund TA in its current form helps to a large or very large extent achieve their institution’s goals. But donor visibility remains an issue.
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Response rate was good

- Completed: 36.1%
- Partial: 5.0%
- Visited: 18.5%
- No Response: 40.3%
Roles of Respondents in the Survey

Decision makers and program / project managers are key respondents
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IMF Donor Survey
September 2011
Institutional reputation and expertise are key factors that play an important role in donor’s decision/consideration to support IMF TA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that play an important role in donor’s decision/consideration to support IMF TA (in percent)</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>No view/Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional reputation</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF’s areas of TA expertise</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkage with IMF surveillance and program</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement by the IMF staff</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF has more straightforward procedures (less bureaucratic)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IMF Donor Survey.
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Would you agree that IMF TA is sufficiently tailored to country-specific conditions and linked to recipient’s national / regional strategy?

About 60% of respondents think at least to a large extent that IMF TA is tailored to country-specific conditions and linked to recipient’s national / regional strategies

IMF Donor Survey
September 2011
Would you agree that advice given by IMF TA is backed by best-practice knowledge, cross-country experience and research? Is backstopping a real value added of IMF TA?

More than 70% of respondents believe that advice given by IMF TA is backed by best-practice knowledge, cross-country experience and research and many see backstopping as a real value added.
Would you agree that IMF TA is sufficiently coordinated with other TA providers and are there sufficient follow-ups on previous TA advice?

Respondents see some scope to improve coordination with other TA providers and to improve TA follow-up

Sufficient coordination with other TA providers?

Sufficient follow-ups?

IMF Donor Survey
September 2011
Would you agree that IMF TA is sufficiently results driven, and would you agree that IMF TA in its current form is effective for the beneficiary countries?

Respondents see some room for improvement in results orientation
Agenda

- Background on survey
- Motivation for support
- TA effectiveness
- Fund TA compared to other providers

Donor relations

IMF Donor Survey
September 2011
Please rate how the IMF compares with other TA providers in the following areas

### Comparison of IMF TA with other TA providers
(In percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Far below</th>
<th>Some-what below</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Some-what above</th>
<th>Far above</th>
<th>No view/ Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information available to public about IMF TA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of TA experts (Fund staff and consultants)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness of IMF TA</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of IMF TA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of interim and ex-post project assessment reports</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely submission of interim and ex-post project assessment reports</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of TA management in dealing with the donors</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of TA</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA outcome is beneficial to countries</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IMF Donor Survey.
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Do you prefer to be contacted by one IMF representative, who will contact other IMF staff when necessary, or directly by staff from different departments of the IMF depending on issues related to TA?

Mixed preferences of donors on preferred way of interaction with Fund staff
Would you agree that IMF is effective in seeking your views and provide your institution with comprehensive and clear information on the progress and outcome of the TA you supported?

More than half of respondents agree that IMF is effective in seeking their views and keeping them well-informed about TA programs their organization supports, and see some room for improvement on outcome reporting.

IMF Donor Survey
September 2011
Are you satisfied with current form and level of your institution’s visibility as a donor to IMF and the level of recognition by the recipient country(s) of your institution’s contribution through IMF TA?

About half of respondents that expressed a view are satisfied with current form and level of their institution’s visibility, but with some room for improvement, including in recipient countries.
Would you be interested in attending annual consultations/forums or a donor conference with other donors on IMF TA cross-cutting issues and strategy?

About 40 percent are very interested in a donor conference
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