


Mid-Term Evaluation of the Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center (METAC)

Independent External Evaluation

Client: International Monetary Fund

Rotterdam, September 2014



Mid-Term Evaluation of the Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center (METAC)

Independent External Evaluation

Client: International Monetary Fund

Corina Certan
Chris August
Ahmad Shikh Ebid
Andrea Dijkstra

Rotterdam, September 2014

About Ecorys

At Ecorys we aim to deliver real benefit to society through the work we do. We offer research, consultancy and project management, specializing in economic, social and spatial development. Focusing on complex market, policy and management issues we provide our clients in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors worldwide with a unique perspective and high-value solutions. Ecorys' remarkable history spans more than 80 years. Our expertise covers economy and competitiveness; regions, cities and real estate; energy and water; transport and mobility; social policy, education, health and governance. We value our independence, integrity and partnerships. Our staff comprises dedicated experts from academia and consultancy, who share best practices both within our company and with our partners internationally.

Ecorys Netherlands has an active CSR policy and is ISO14001 certified (the international standard for environmental management systems). Our sustainability goals translate into our company policy and practical measures for people, planet and profit, such as using a 100% green electricity tariff, purchasing carbon offsets for all our flights, incentivizing staff to use public transport and printing on FSC or PEFC certified paper. Our actions have reduced our carbon footprint by an estimated 80% since 2007.

ECORYS Nederland BV
Watermanweg 44
3067 GG Rotterdam

P.O. Box 4175
3006 AD Rotterdam
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)10 453 88 00
F +31 (0)10 453 07 68
E netherlands@ecorys.com
Registration no. 24316726

W www.ecorys.nl

Table of contents

Preface	5
Acronyms and Abbreviations	7
Summary	9
1 Introduction	15
1.1 General overview of METAC	15
1.2 Evaluation context and objectives	15
1.3 Evaluation approach	16
1.4 Structure of the report	18
2 General Findings on METAC Governance	19
2.1 Context of the IMF Technical Assistance	19
2.1.1 Definition of the Fund's Capacity Building	19
2.1.2 The Fund's Technical Assistance	20
2.1.3 Planning and programming of the IMF TA to the region	22
2.2 Organization and delivery of METAC assistance	24
3 Relevance	27
3.1 Coherence and adequacy of the design and implementation approaches	27
3.2 Relevance to the national reform agenda and emerging needs	30
3.3 Complementarity & coordination with other initiatives	32
3.4 Survey Results	36
3.5 Conclusions	37
4 Efficiency	39
4.1 Process & implementation	39
4.2 Use of resources	41
4.2.1 Financial resources	41
4.2.2 Human resources	43
4.2.3 Cost-effectiveness	45
4.3 Monitoring and reporting	46
4.3.1 Results based monitoring and risk management	46
4.3.2 Transparency and accountability	48
4.4 Survey Results	49
4.5 Conclusions	50
5 Effectiveness	53
5.1 Actual achievements against plans	53
5.2 Likelihood of achieving expected outcomes	55
5.3 Survey Results	59
5.4 Conclusions	60
6 Impact	63
6.1 Likelihood of the expected impact	63

6.2	Relative contribution of METAC	65
6.3	Survey Results	66
6.4	Conclusions	67
7	Sustainability	69
7.1	Country ownership and institutionalization of the achieved METAC results	69
7.2	Promoting use of regional expertise	71
7.3	Survey Results	72
7.4	Conclusions	72
8	Overall assessment and recommendations	75
8.1	Overall assessment	75
8.2	Recommendations	75
	Annexes	79
	Annex 1. Evaluation questions	81
	Annex 2. The weighting system for the assessment of overall performance	83
	Annex 3. Evaluation rating system	85
	Annex 4. Status of recommendations of the 2009 Mid Term Evaluation	87
	Annex 5. METAC Financial Status (US\$)	91
	Annex 6. Actual costs per person-week by type of modality/activity (US\$)	93
	Annex 7. Illustration of possible METAC performance indicators and achievements	95
	Annex 8. TA and training survey results	101
	Annex 9. Training and workshops survey results	113
	Annex 10. List of persons consulted	121
	Annex 11. Reference documents	125

Preface

Ecorys was awarded the contract for conducting this evaluation following a competitive bidding process. The evaluation started in February 2013 with an Inception phase during which consultants developed the methodological approach. The evaluation approach was endorsed by the METAC Steering Committee. The evaluation team was led by Corina Certan, principal consultant at Ecorys specialized in public financial management and development cooperation. The other team members were: Chris August – specialist in financial sector, Ahmad Shikh Ebid – macroeconomist, and Andrea Dijkstra – junior consultant who assisted the team throughout the process and managed the electronic survey.

The team members would like to thank all those who facilitated the evaluation process and contributed to making it a pleasant experience and, hopefully, a useful exercise. Special thanks are directed to Holger Floerkemeier, who has managed the evaluation process within the Fund, and who was very supportive in facilitating the interviews in Washington. Special thanks go also to the METAC staff under the leadership of Mohamad Hassan Elhage, the Center Coordinator, who have been extremely kind and responsive to all our requests. We highly appreciate their time and efforts in sharing with us their views and experience with METAC operations and assisted in making logistical arrangements for and during the field missions.

We also want to thank all those who shared with us in an open and informative manner their views during face-to-face and telephone conversations, and all those who filled in the electronic survey.

The evaluators aimed to be as objective and accurate as possible. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position of the IMF, as contracting authority, or any other stakeholder consulted during the evaluation. Responsibility for any possible errors remains with the evaluators.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CAP	Capability Assessment Program
CC	Center Coordinator
CEF	Center for Economics and Finance
CD	Capacity development
DFID	U.K. Department for International Development
EIB	European Investment Bank
EQ	Evaluation Question
EU	European Union
FAD	Fiscal Affairs Department
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FY	Fiscal Year
HQ	Headquarters
GlZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
ICD	Institute for Capacity Development
IIP	International Investment Position
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LTX	Long-term experts
MCD	Middle East and Central Asia Department
MCM	Monetary and Capital Markets Department
METAC	Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center
OECD DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee
PD	Program document
PEFA	Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability
PFM	Public Finance Management
RA	Resident Advisor
RAP	Resource Allocation Plan
RBM	Results-Based Management
RRO	Resident Representative Office
RSN	Regional Strategy Note
RTAC	Regional Technical Assistance Center
SC	Steering Committee
STA	Statistics Department
STX	Short-term expert
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSA	Treasury Single Account
TTF	Topical Trust Fund
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
WB	World Bank
WBG	West Bank and Gaza
WP	Work Plan

Summary

Background

The Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center (METAC) was established in 2004 and is one of nine International Monetary Fund's Regional Technical Assistance Centers supporting recipient countries in strengthening human and institutional capacity to design and implement sound macroeconomic and financial policies that promote growth and reduce poverty. METAC activities are an integral component of the IMF's technical assistance and training, and are complementary to the other forms of technical assistance provided by the Fund. METAC is funded predominantly from external sources and is based on a five-year programming and funding cycle.

The current independent evaluation covers the third METAC cycle May 2010 – April 2015 and is a requirement of the terms and conditions governing the establishment and operation of the METAC multi-donor trust fund. The methodological approach for the current evaluation was developed to address the evaluation objectives detailed in the Terms of Reference, which was approved by the METAC evaluation sub-committee. It reflects the evaluation principles applied by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and related criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of development efforts.

The findings and conclusions of the evaluation are primarily informed by a review of program related documents, face-to-face and telephone interviews with selected stakeholders, field visits to Jordan, Lebanon and Sudan, and an electronic survey of a broader group of stakeholders including IMF and METAC staff, Steering Committee members, direct beneficiaries of METAC assistance, and other development partners who provide capacity development assistance to the METAC countries.

Overall assessment

The third phase of METAC cycle has been marked by very difficult circumstances in which METAC was operating as result of the political and security situation in the region. Despite this, METAC managed to be successful in delivering results and contributing to building capacity in the region. The interviewed beneficiaries of METAC assistance and the survey respondents were generally very satisfied with the flexibility and high quality of the METAC assistance, and its contribution to strengthening capacity in the countries which benefited from METAC assistance.

Since the last external evaluation of METAC performance covering the period 2007-2010, a number of measures were implemented in view of improving METAC performance, including as a result of the follow up on the evaluation recommendations. The main improvements relate to the steps undertaken to advance the results-based orientation and performance measurement of METAC activities, the development of a Field Manual for METAC operations, the extension of the Steering Committee representation to all beneficiary countries, the introduction of a new costing model based on actual costs, a new Fund policy which allows wider dissemination of information related to the IMF's technical assistance work and the increasing use of the METAC website as a mean for sharing information.

METAC success is to a large extent due to its well-organized operation and effective management. Being run in a lean and less formal administrative manner, METAC relies often on less formal and systematic arrangements. Nevertheless, METAC response to the political and security developments in the region appear to have been highly appropriate for delivering value for money.

Many of the factors which are determinant for the performance of METAC are beyond its control. In addition to the difficult political and security situation which characterizes the METAC countries, METAC performance in achieving the objectives and results defined in the Program Document and its Results Based Framework is to a large extent determined by the way the Fund formulates and manages its Capacity Development assistance. The opportunities for improvement of METAC performance and our recommendations are, therefore, rooted substantially on the Fund's policy and organization of Capacity Development assistance. The RTAC model is generally still appropriate to the region. In order to sustain its relevance to the region, METAC and the Fund Headquarters may consider to implement a more systematic analysis and management of risks, and identify feasible and effective alternative modalities to delivering CD assistance which respond to the complexities and needs of the fragile countries.

Relevance

The METAC assistance is assessed as fairly relevant. The program design and implementation approaches are generally coherent and adequate. The quality of the strategic logical framework included in the initial program document, which was prepared prior to the introduction of the Fund Results Based Management, was significantly improved with the development of the METAC Results Based Management framework. There remains, however, room for improvement particularly in respect to the definition of clear and measurable performance indicators and interlinkages between METAC activities and expected results at various levels (outputs, outcomes, impact) against which METAC performance has to be assessed. The Results Based Management framework is used predominantly for programming purposes. It has proved to be a useful instrument in delineating METAC role in capacity development process in the recipient countries, but it is not yet used as a basis for monitoring the implementation of the program and the extent to which METAC is on the way to deliver the expected results.

METAC has been demand-driven in the identification and prioritization of its work. It has been successful in pitching its assistance to the needs expressed by the recipient countries and flexible in responding to the emerging needs. The Fund and METAC procedures allow for a systematic consultation of the recipient countries on their technical assistance and training needs. The relevance of the METAC assistance could be improved, however, by strengthening and formalizing its risk management framework, which should facilitate METAC to better adjust its response to the capacity development drivers and constraints in the recipient countries. This relates not only to technical, but also other enabling environment factors such as socio-cultural and political factors, country ownership and absorption capacity. METAC's approach to risk analysis and management, as reflected by METAC's ability to deal with continuously changing environment and reallocation of available resources, is mainly informal although generally robust. This approach, however, is not necessarily sustainable and it does not allow METAC to manage risks in a transparent, systematic and proactive manner.

While being highly demand-driven and responding to the needs expressed by the recipient countries, METAC assistance may not necessarily be a fair reflection of the capacity development needs when considered from a more general capacity development perspective of the recipient countries and efforts conveyed in the national reform strategies, when such exist, and complementarity with the capacity development efforts of other providers. METAC assistance is not explicitly linked to national sector or capacity development strategies and is not informed by a systematic assessment of capacity development gaps and needs. In addition to the needs expressed by recipient countries, METAC assistance is predominantly informed by the assessments undertaken by Fund HQ diagnostic TA missions and by the Fund's bilateral and surveillance work. Such an approach is effective in implementation but misses the opportunity to

pursue a longer term strategic focus, particularly in unstable countries – which are most of METAC countries.

METAC is relatively well-coordinated and integrated with the Fund surveillance and program activities and with the work of the functional departments. There exists a reasonable degree of cooperation between METAC and the Regional Training Center in Kuwait which is to some extent influenced by the different programming cycles. The synergies with the Topical Trust Funds and the Resident Representative offices are less obvious. More synergies within the Fund could be achieved if all technical assistance and training would be integrated more clearly in one common strategic framework, such as the Regional Strategy Notes, regardless of the channels through which it is delivered.

METAC has been very active in intensifying its outreach activities including to other development partners and has been fairly successful in coordinating its assistance with them. Although fairly successful, avoiding duplication of work was mainly ensured by individual efforts rather by a systematic and structured coordination. The coordination with other providers has been more difficult in countries where there is not mechanism for donor coordination, and has been undermined by the limited coordination between METAC and IMF Resident Representative offices.

Efficiency

The overall efficiency of the METAC program has been fairly good. The delivery of the METAC assistance and training is well-organized and broadly follows the established rules and procedures. The Steering Committee has been generally well-organized in its oversight of the METAC activities. It has, however mainly served as a platform for sharing information and less as a mechanism for strategic discussions on future capacity development needs and how to strengthen METAC performance and impact. The organization of the Steering Committee after the start of its fiscal year and the lack of a single focal person who represents the interest of the recipient country, in addition to that of a specific organization, represent important factors which do not fully facilitate a more strategic focus of the Steering Committee.

The difficult situation in the region was the main factor responsible for the delays and deviations in program implementation. The need to adjust plans to changing circumstances resulted in some efficiency losses. Although METAC remained aware of the risks in the region and was very successful in redirecting resources to more stable countries, the absence of a systematic risk management framework, or alternative implementation scenarios did not facilitate METAC to adjust its work in a proactive manner so that to minimize the risks posed by changing circumstances and associated efficiency losses.

The monitoring and reporting of METAC is regular and comprehensive, although it is predominantly focused on activities and outputs, and less on achieved results and determining factors. This makes its accountability for achieved results less straightforward and transparent. There is a fairly good degree of transparency and visibility of METAC operations. However, the website is not yet used at its full potential for sharing information. During the current program cycle financial reporting on METAC expenses has improved. The information on the total actual costs related to METAC assistance has become more comprehensive. For an accurate assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the program more efforts are needed to capture all costs of providing METAC assistance by the Funds staff and breaking down the in-kind contributions to respective budget categories. As financial reporting does not fall under its mandate, these shortcomings cannot be attributed directly to METAC.

Effectiveness

The METAC Results Based Management framework makes a significant step forward in advancing the result orientation of the METAC assistance and training although, as mentioned above, the expected results are not always defined clearly and in measurable terms. This complicates the assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the METAC assistance. With that caveat in mind, effectiveness has been assessed mainly in respect to the expected outputs and intermediate outcomes.

Overall effectiveness of the METAC program has been fairly good. The major challenge is the ability of METAC to implement its original yearly work programs and to manage program performance on results basis. While METAC was not able to conduct all planned activities, the activities which it managed to deliver, are generally of high and distinctive quality.

METAC has achieved an implementation rate of about 73 percent when measured in terms of actual vis-à-vis planned person weeks. From the actually conducted activities, about one third of activities were not included in the original plans. When considering the originally planned activities which were implemented, the implementation rate is below 50 percent. The relatively high volume of conducted activities which were not planned reflects the highly demand-driven nature of the assistance and METAC's flexibility to respond to emerging needs. At the same time this situation points to the challenges which METAC faces in implementing the original plans. While the implementation of plans is significantly affected by the security situation in the region, often activities are also cancelled or postponed due to a change of authorities' priorities, or a lack of authorities' response on METAC inquiries. This, at its turn, strains the relevance of the requests and METAC ability to pursue a systematic, sequenced and prioritized approach to the long term capacity development and reform process in the recipient countries.

About 70 percent of the METAC recommendations are being implemented. Most of the factors influencing the implementation of the recommendations are beyond METAC's control. The quality of the delivered technical assistance and training is generally of very high quality. This is ensured by a systematic process and quality control through backstopping of regional experts and short term experts by the staff of the IMF functional departments. One of the quality aspects that leaves room for improvement is the pragmatism of the technical advice which requires to tailor it better to the country context and emphasize on what does it mean and require in practice.

METAC does not have a systematic approach for the follow-up and assessment of the effectiveness of its interventions. Performance of individual interventions are generally assessed up to the level of outputs and to some extent intermediate outcomes. Until there is a clear agreement on how to measure performance of METAC assistance in respect to the capacity development in the beneficiary countries, it will be difficult to systematically and consistently assess the effectiveness and impact of METAC and report on it. Monitoring and assessment of progress should recognize various channels through which IMF TA is provided and their individual scope, role and contribution. The METAC results based framework should be informed by, and emanate from, an overall results based framework for all IMF capacity development assistance and training. The Fund is currently working on such a general results based management framework. Having a METAC results based framework may be useful when defined correctly and applied at all stages of technical assistance, but it is of limited added value if it is not incorporated in an overall framework.

Impact

METAC assistance and training has played an important role and most likely is contributing to capacity development impact in the recipient countries. This conclusion is, however, subjective and not informed by an adequate impact assessment. Whereas assessing the effectiveness of the

METAC TA and training is relatively straightforward, assessing its impact at the METAC level only is more difficult. METAC is an integrated and complementary part of the overall IMF capacity development efforts. It makes more sense to assess the impact of the overall IMF assistance and as part of that the specific contribution and added-value of METAC. A more systematic approach to assessing the impact of METAC interventions would be required.

As METAC has been providing assistance for more than ten years, it is legitimate to expect to see some impact of its assistance on the capacity of the recipient countries to design and implement sound macroeconomic and financial policies. The question is how to measure the improved capacity in the absence of clearly defined expectations, and how to delineate it, not only from the capacity development assistance of other providers, but even from the other IMF assistance. As long as such an agreement will not exist, the assessment of the impact (and to some extent even effectiveness) will become subjective and speculative.

The definition of capacity development adopted by the IMF is specific and narrow in nature, and differs from more complex definitions adopted by other development organizations, including by few METAC donors. As this may lead to different expectations, the IMF may want to consider to reinvigorate its definition and approach to capacity development. This will allow METAC to develop a results based framework and define SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) criteria for measuring outcomes and impact which reflects this definition and approach for capacity development assistance. This will also facilitate METAC's accountability for delivering the expected results.

Given the complexity of the capacity development change process in a country, as well as the nature of METAC as a form of Fund TA, METAC can only contribute to advancing capacity development, but cannot be primarily responsible for achieving an impact. By identifying the assumptions and risks which are determinant for achievement of expected results and impact, METAC could determine potential mitigation measures. Continuous monitoring of these risks will allow METAC to be more aware of the changing environment and make timely adjustments necessary to realize the expected impact.

Sustainability

Overall METAC assistance is likely to be fairly sustainable. With some exceptions, METAC has been generally quite successful in ensuring country's ownership of the delivered TA and training, and promoting regional experience and expertise. METAC has facilitated country ownership by involving and consulting recipient countries during the planning of the work and during implementation, prior to the missions. There is, however, room for improvement when it comes to integrating METAC assistance into the overall capacity development efforts of the country, and investing more in getting the beneficiaries to understand and embrace METAC advice.

Sustainability challenges are to a large extent beyond METAC's control. However, METAC could contribute to strengthening the sustainability of its assistance by identifying and monitoring the enabling environment factors in a more formalized and systematic way in order to ensure a timely and adequate response to changes in the enabling environment. This insight requires shifting the focus of METAC assistance from short-term quick wins to a more longer-term and integrated approach informed by capacity needs assessments and which embraces the importance of country ownership and absorptive capacity.

Sustainability could be strengthened by improvements at all program stages i.e. from design to implementation and monitoring. Strengthening coordination with the assistance of other TA providers and embedding, or clearly linking it with the ongoing and envisaged capacity development

efforts, or sectoral reform strategies of the recipient countries when such exist, will most probably increase the sustainability of METAC assistance. In the same context, sustainability could be improved by tailoring assistance to specific challenges identified through systematic capacity needs assessments. The spin-off effect of the METAC training, and consequently its sustainability, could be strengthened by facilitating measures to institutionalize and capitalize on the acquired knowledge e.g. train-the-trainers and facilitating development of training plans. During implementation, METAC could contribute to strengthening country ownership of METAC assistance by intensifying its awareness raising and communication with beneficiaries beyond the focal persons and inform them not only on the upcoming missions and respective terms of reference, but also on the approved plans and respective changes, as well as other relevant activities.

Recommendations

Based on the above findings, the evaluators suggest a set of recommendations which may contribute to increasing the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the METAC assistance:

1. The Fund should develop medium-term strategies for its overall CD assistance to individual recipient countries informed by a systematic assessment of capacity gaps and needs;
2. METAC's assistance (as an integral part of the IMF's TA) should be better embedded in the overall package of assistance of development partners who support CD in the recipient countries;
3. The Fund should continue to strengthen the coordination and synergies between TA and training provided through METAC and other Fund channels;
4. Reinforce METAC's TA approach for engagement in fragile states;
5. The results-based orientation of the METAC assistance needs to be strengthened;
6. METAC should consider institutionalizing a dedicated Risk Management Framework for the design of its assistance and monitoring implementation;
7. METAC should increase the usability of its website as a platform for sharing knowledge and information, accountability and transparency of its operations;
8. The Fund should consider developing a unified conceptual framework for the evaluation of RTACs.

Given the nature of the recommendations, their implementation does not necessarily fall solely under the mandate of METAC. Where possible, the evaluators indicated how these recommendations could be operationalized and how various parties could contribute to their implementation. Consultations with all relevant stakeholders should lead to a decision on which recommendations should be adopted and an agreement on the best approach to operationalize them. Ultimately an agreement is needed on who should take the responsibility for the oversight of the implementation of the adopted recommendations.

1 Introduction

1.1 General overview of METAC

The Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center (METAC) is one of nine International Monetary Fund's (IMF) Regional Technical Assistance Centers (RTACs) established to help recipient countries strengthen human and institutional capacity to design and implement sound macroeconomic and financial policies that promote growth and reduce poverty. METAC was established in November 2004 in Beirut, Lebanon, to serve ten countries in the Middle East: Afghanistan, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Sudan, Syria, West Bank and Gaza, and Yemen.

Box 1.1 METAC goals and objectives

The Center's *strategic goal* is to strengthen the recipient countries' institutional *capacity* to design and implement sound macroeconomic and financial policies (METAC Program Document, 2009).


METAC's *mandate* is to provide *capacity building* assistance to facilitate the reform process in member countries, and support the region's integration into the world economy (METAC Program Document, 2009).

METAC's overall *strategic objective* is to improve the conduct of macroeconomic policy through *institutional and capacity building* (METAC, A Result Based Framework for Future Activities, 2013).

METAC is based on a five-year programming and funding cycle. METAC donors are: IMF, European Union (EU), the European Investment Bank (EIB), France, Germany through Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Kuwait, Oman, the United States through the US Agency for International Development (USAID), and seven contributing member countries¹. The current program cycle is the third in a row. It started in May 2010 and will end in April 2015. During its meeting in Jordan, on May 5, 2014, the METAC Steering Committee agreed to extend the current funding cycle by one year until April 2016. METAC current operations are guided by a rolling annual work plan within a results-based management framework (RBM). METAC's Technical Assistance (TA) and training is directed to the areas of banking supervision, public financial management (PFM), revenue administration, macroeconomic statistics and banking supervision.

1.2 Evaluation context and objectives

The terms and conditions governing establishment and operation of the METAC multi-donor trust fund call for independent evaluation of the Center's activities. Independent evaluations were conducted for the first and second phases of the program (see the figure below). The METAC Program Document (2009) envisages that an independent external evaluation to assess METAC's effectiveness and sustainability of its Technical Assistance (TA) will be conducted within a maximum of three years of operation. The current mid-term evaluation covers the third program cycle from May 2010 to end of April 2014.




¹ Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Jordan, Syria and outstanding pledges of Sudan and Yemen.

The scope and objectives of the current mid-term evaluation are clearly described in the Terms of Reference (TOR). The main objective is defined as “to assess the extent to which METAC is achieving its objectives efficiently and effectively and whether the TA delivered is sustainable” (specific objectives are presented in Box 1.2).

Box 1.2 Specific objectives of the METAC evaluation as defined in the TOR:

- Assess the extent to which METAC is achieving the advantages typically associated with delivering TA through Regional Technical Assistance Centers (RTACs);
- Consider the challenges and known risks that METAC has faced in conducting TA and training, and what has been done to address the challenges and mitigate the risks;
- Form a view of the extent to which METAC and the RTAC model are still relevant to the region, particularly whether METAC is operating at an optimal scale;
- Review how the recommendations of the 2009 METAC evaluation were addressed;
- Make recommendations for improvement based on the lessons learnt.

The key evaluation questions (EQ) for the current mid-term evaluation were formulated to address the evaluation objectives detailed in the Terms of Reference and to reflect the OECD DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance: *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of development efforts*. The main evaluation questions are:



1.3 Evaluation approach

The evaluation questions were assessed by considering a number of predefined evaluation sub-criteria and specific guiding questions. Annex 1 includes the main evaluation questions and specific sub-questions. Figure 1.1 presents the evaluation process and the main evaluation tools employed for data collection and analysis. The supporting evidence for the evaluation findings comes from semi-structured interviews conducted with various stakeholders, a survey of METAC stakeholders, and the review of METAC related documents such as METAC Program Document, Work Plans and Annual Reports. The evaluation also used documentary evidence from other supporting material (see Annex 11 for a full list of consulted documents).


The key tools employed for data collection and validation of information collected from various sources included:

- **Interviews** – Semi-structured interviews were conducted with IMF staff, METAC staff, beneficiaries in the case study countries, other TA providers, members of the Steering

Committee (SC). The face-to-face interviews were complemented with telephone interviews. The list of persons consulted is included in Annex 10;

- **Case studies** – The evaluators made country visits to Sudan, Jordan and Lebanon. The main selection criteria for the case studies were the size of the program activities. Other criteria considered for selecting the case study countries were representation in terms of income level, number of persons trained, and feasibility in terms of security and logistics;
- **Survey** - The surveys were distributed and analyzed through the Cvent system. The purpose of the survey was to gather additional views from a larger and more distant audience, to complement and validate the information collected from the interviews. Two main surveys were conducted: one for TA and another one for training and workshops. The questionnaires were tailored to reflect the role and involvement of various stakeholders and their respective affiliation to METAC. These included the following groups of stakeholders: members of the METAC Steering Committee; IMF staff; METAC staff and short-term experts; direct beneficiaries of the METAC assistance and training; other stakeholders such as other donors and relevant TA providers. The training questionnaire was sent to 604 persons and was filled in by 140 respondents; and the TA questionnaire was sent to 338 persons and filled in by 143 respondents. A response rate of 24.7% and 42.6% respectively may seem to be low, but in absolute terms the number of respondents is significantly higher than in the previous METAC evaluations. To increase the response rate, two survey reminders were sent out and follow up telephone calls were made. As the survey invitation landed in spam box of the potential respondents, personal e-mails containing a direct link to the survey were sent to those who indicated that they did not receive the invitation sent through the Cvent system.

Figure 1.1 Evaluation phases and main tools



The assessment of individual sub-criteria was based on a four scale rating system (see Annex 3)². The overall assessment was made through aggregating the scores of individual sub-criteria using the weights presented in Annex 2. The applied weighting system is broadly in line with previous METAC and other RTACs evaluations.

² Other evaluations used the same numerical scale, but it used other performance terms namely excellent, good, modest and poor respectively.

One of the methodological differences with the previous evaluations is the approach used for assessing the impact of the METAC assistance. Other evaluations did not consider “impact” as a separate evaluation criterion. It was addressed under effectiveness and sustainability criteria. The assessment of the impact of the program interventions on capacity development (CD) in the recipient countries is methodologically complex and, in its strict sense, beyond the scope of the current evaluation. Following the requirements of the TOR and in order to get a better understanding of the relative importance of the impact of the METAC program, “impact” was included as one of the evaluation criteria. Nevertheless, given the complexities associated with the assessment of the impact of any CD assistance, it has been allocated the lowest weight in the overall performance rating.

1.4 Structure of the report

This chapter introduced the scope and approach of the current evaluation. Before embarking and reporting on the main findings and in view of facilitating a better understanding of the evaluation findings, Chapter 2 provides more insight into the contextual background in which METAC operates. It touches upon issues pertinent to the governance, management, administration and delivery of METAC assistance.

The structure of the report is closely linked to the evaluations questions. Each evaluation question is dealt with in a dedicated chapter. Each chapter follows the same structure and includes main findings on the evaluation question, an analysis of the survey results and concluding remarks in respect to the evaluation question. The last chapter, Chapter 8, includes a summative assessment emphasizing the lessons learnt and provides a number of recommendations which could be considered to increase the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the METAC assistance.

2 General Findings on METAC Governance

2.1 Context of the IMF Technical Assistance

2.1.1 Definition of the Fund's Capacity Building

While the METAC's objective is not unambiguously defined (see Box 1.1), genuinely it could be interpreted as *"enhancing capacities of the recipient countries through TA and training to formulate and implement sound policies"*. There are many definitions and interpretations of "Capacity Development" and approaches adopted by development organizations engaged in supporting Capacity Development (see Box 2.1). In order to ensure a consistent understanding and interpretation of the findings of this report, we consider it necessary to highlight the definition and approach applied by the IMF, and the implications it has for the interpretation of the evaluation findings.

Box 2.1 Definitions of capacity development/building

Capacity development is *"the process through which individuals, organizations, and societies obtain, strengthen, and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time"* (UNDP, 2009).

Capacity development is *"the process whereby people, organizations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain capacity over time"* (OECD/DAC, 2011).


Capacity Development is *"a locally driven process of learning by leaders, coalitions and other agents of change that brings about changes in socio-political, policy-related, and organizational factors to enhance local ownership for and the effectiveness and efficiency of efforts to achieve a development goal"* (WB, 2009).

Although the strict definition of capacity development varies across organizations, most of the definitions accept that CD is a *process* that takes place at three levels: the individual level, the organizational level and the socio-systemic level - also called enabling environment (see Figure 2.1).

The transfer of knowledge and of best practices in the form of CD services is one of the Fund's core activities along with surveillance and lending (IMF, 2013a)³. The IMF definition of CD is relatively narrow in scope. The IMF calls "technical assistance and training together capacity development" (IMF, 2014a). While the Fund's TA and training is provided at all three levels it focuses predominantly on the "knowledge/technical" aspects of capacity development. "Softer" aspects of the transformational process such as change management and leadership, socio-cultural norms and values, complexity of systems for policies, procedures and practices, political powers, fall beyond the scope of the Fund TA. These factors, however, are particularly important for the assessment of relevance, impact and sustainability of the METAC TA and training.

³ IMF, The Fund's Capacity Development Strategy – Better Policies Through Stronger Institutions, May 2013.

Figure 2.1 Levels of Capacity Development and Technical Assistance



Source: Adapted from UNDP, Capacity Development Practice Note, October 2008.

2.1.2 The Fund's Technical Assistance

The Fund provides TA and training through multiple channels including through functional departments, Topical Trust Funds (TTFs), Regional Technical Assistance Centers (RTACs) and Regional Training Centers. The area departments, including the Middle East and Central Asia Department (MCD), are responsible for determining the overall TA vision and strategic priorities for the region. This is done in close coordination with the functional departments. Functional departments focus mainly on technical issues including providing strategic advice, conducting diagnostic analysis and reviews and conducting quality control. METAC strengthens and complements this advice with more operational hands-on implementation assistance.

The Fund's Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) is responsible for strengthening the IMF's strategic approach to technical assistance (TA) and training, delivery of training⁴, oversight of the network of RTACs and Regional Training Centers, capitalizing on synergies between TA and training, forging partnerships with donors⁵ and coordination of the fundraising. The Committee on Capacity Building is responsible for organizing and overseeing the Fund's policy work in capacity building.

The TTFs, RTACs and Regional Training Centers operate on a five-year funding cycle and are funded predominantly through external resources. As a result, external financing has implications on internal funding for the elements which are not financed by donors and/or when the funds are delayed or financial commitments not honored.


METAC operates on the basis of the RTACs model. The RTAC model is genuinely well-established although various recent evaluations suggest that there is room for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of RTACs. The operation of METAC, likewise other RTACs, is characterized by complex and multiple governance arrangements and accountability interrelationships involving the respective area department, TA departments, ICD, resident advisors, short-term experts, country

⁴ Most of training course are offered under the umbrella of ICD. The ICD training program includes mainly course delivered by the Regional Training Centers and ICD. Prior to the establishment of ICD training was provided by the IMF Institute (INS). Other departments, TTFs and RTACs, including the METAC, deliver a significant share of training and workshops but on more specialized or technical issues.

⁵ Source: IMF, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/INS/english/pdf/brochure.pdf>.

authorities, METAC donors and other TA providers. Understanding the relationships between various players and accountability lines is essential for understanding the performance of METAC. Figure 2.2 below sketches the complex interrelationships between relevant stakeholders in a simplistic manner. The delivery of METAC TA and training and interrelationships between METAC stakeholders is discussed in more detail in section 2.2.

Figure 2.2 METAC's Governance Arrangements and Accountability Interrelationships⁶



Source: Authors' interpretation.

Note: In this diagram the (thick) arrows indicate the (direct) lines of accountability and interaction, and (interrupted) lines indicate (indirect) interrelationships and interaction.

The Fund's TA was subject to a number of strategic reviews in the last years (IMF 2008, IMF 2011, IMF 2013a, IEO 2014) which led to various changes in the TA governance and management. While these changes did not have a direct impact on the delivery of METAC TA and training itself, they may have implicitly influenced the way METAC is operating and, potentially, its relevance and effectiveness. The main changes introduced during the current METAC operation cycle result from the 2011 TA review (IMF, 2011) which defined the FINE model⁷ for the Fund TA and training. These include:

- The establishment of the new department, the Institute for Capacity Development (ICD) in 2012. ICD was created⁸ to strengthen the Fund's capacity development governance and strengthening the synergies and complementarities between the Fund's TA and training activities;

⁶ Thick (thin) blue arrows depict direct (indirect) accountability relationships. Red lines depict working relationships.

⁷ Focused on the Fund's core macroeconomic and financial mandate, Integrated with its surveillance and program responsibilities, Nimble in its response to changes in country needs, Effective in providing outcome-focused, cutting-edge advice.

⁸ This is a result of the merger of the Office of Technical Assistance Management (OTM) and the IMF Institute.

- The establishment of the IMF-Middle East Center for Economics and Finance (CEF) in Kuwait. Since 2011 ICD organizes courses at the IMF-Middle East CEF for officials from Arab League member countries;
- Extension of Regional Strategy Notes (RSN)⁹ in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 to capture training;
- The introduction of a Result Based Management (RBM) Framework for the planning, monitoring and delivery of the Fund's TA at the regional and country levels in 2010. METAC prepared its first RBM framework in April 2012;
- Launch of the Fund's pilot Capability Assessment Program (CAP) in 2013 (see Box 2.2). The CAP is a tool/framework for assessing and prioritizing CD needs of the recipient countries and coordination with other CD providers.

Box 2.2 The Fund's Pilots on Capability Assessments

The Middle East and Central Asia Department (MCD), in cooperation with the Monetary and Capital Markets Department (MCM), the Fiscal Affairs Department (FAD), and ICD has launched pilot Capability Assessment Programs (CAP) in Libya and Tunisia. The objective of the CAP is to assess country institutions' ability to effectively formulate and implement sound monetary and fiscal policies in line with their macroeconomic objectives. The CAP aims at identifying priority areas for strengthening capacity at the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance, including through institutional and organizational reforms, and proposes an action plan that includes an assessment of technical assistance and training needs. CAP reports are under preparations.

Source: IMF MCD, RSN, 2013.

Other previous changes include:

- The introduction of a new costing model for the Fund's TA on May 1, 2010. The new model allows the recording and identification of all actual costs related to a TA intervention including the costs of Headquarters (HQ) staff related to TA delivery, project management and backstopping (IMF, 2010);
- A new Fund policy for the wider dissemination of technical assistance-related information (2008) and operational guidelines governing dissemination of TA information (2011)¹⁰.

2.1.3 Planning and programming of the IMF TA to the region

Regional Strategy Note (RSN) for Capacity Development is the Fund tool for short-term and medium-term programming of the TA priorities to the regions, including to the Middle East. The RSN is a rolling three-year plan with an annual cycle and is expected to cover all types of the Fund's TA and training regardless of the channels through which it is provided, METAC being part of it. The RSN includes general information on the IMF CD efforts and their link with Fund surveillance and lending activities, and country specific information on medium-term TA needs.

The RSN process is led by the MCD and coordinated with other (mainly functional) departments. The MCD prepares the initial draft list of TA needs identified by the country team and ranks them according to their perceived priorities. This draft is then sent to the TA departments which complement the list with additional TA needs (if relevant) and (re)rank the proposed priorities according to their capacity constraints in terms of expertise, staff and available funding, as well as countries' track record in following up on the previous TA support. Planning and prioritization of TA in specific areas is further informed by consultation with METAC. The focus of the TA is on the shortcomings in policies, institutional structure, processes and capacity identified on a continuous

⁹ RSNs were introduced in 2008.

¹⁰ This policy provides the opportunity to share TA advice/reports with other TA providers and donors with the consent of the TA recipient obtained on a 60-day non-objection basis in the case of "legitimate interest" provided that a Confidentiality Agreement has been signed and the understanding that the information should be kept confidential.

basis during surveillance and diagnostic and follow-up TA missions, or during the Fund's TA interventions and the evaluation of countries' track record of implementation. When available, standard diagnostic tools such as ROSC and PEFA, are also used to identify TA gaps and needs. Table 2.1 summarizes the relevant IMF-supported programs and standard diagnostic tools employed in addition to the regular TA diagnostic missions. Half of the METAC countries have an ongoing or recently finalized program with the Fund. All countries are involved in Art IV consultations. In Syria and Egypt the completion of the Art IV consultations are delayed due to the security or political situation. Most of the available formal diagnostic assessments were conducted prior to 2010 and therefore outdated as a source of information for METAC activities. In the case of Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessments the Fund was involved only in one, in Syria, and that was prior to 2010.

Table 2.1 IMF-supported Programs and Diagnostic Activities in METAC countries¹¹

Countries	IMF Programs ¹² & Art IV Consultations	FSAP	Fiscal ROSC	Data ROSC	SDDS ¹³	GDDS	PEFA
Afghanistan	ECF 2011-2014 Art IV 10/2011	2007	2001 2012	2003		√	2005 (WB) 2008 (WB) 2013 (WB)
Egypt	Art IV 12/2008 ¹⁴	2007	2001	2005	2005		2009 (EU)
Iraq	SBA 2010-2013 Art IV 05/2013					√	
Jordan	SBA 2012-2015 Art IV 04/2014	2008	2006	2004	2010		2007 (EU) 2011 (EU)
Lebanon	EPCA 2007 Art IV 12/2012 ¹⁵	2001 (FSSA) 2013 (WB)	2005			√	CFAA 2005 2011 (EU) ¹⁶
Libya	Art IV 05/2013					√	TA report ¹⁷
Sudan	Art IV 09/2013	2005				√	CIFA 2010 ¹⁸
Syria	Art IV 01/2009 ¹⁹					√	2006 (IMF)
West Bank and Gaza (WBG)	IMF Mission 02/2014 ²⁰				2012		CFAA 2004 2007 (WB) 2013 (WB)
Yemen	RCF 2012 Art IV 07/2013	2000				√	2008 (WB)

Source: Authors' compilation.

The preparation of Regional Strategy Note, which has a rolling three-year perspective, is followed by the Resource Allocation Plan (RAP), which is prepared annually. The RAP translates the RSN priorities into operational deliverables and determines the budget allocations for the identified

¹¹ In half of the METAC countries IMF has a Resident Representative Office. The Fund has no office in Egypt, Jordan, Libya or Syria. In Lebanon IMF has a local office.

¹² IMF, 2014c.

¹³ Countries subscribed to SDDS.

¹⁴ Delays in completion of Article IV consultations or mandatory financial stability assessment over 18 months due to unsettled political and/or security situation.

¹⁵ An Art IV Consultation Mission took place in May 2014.

¹⁶ Draft PEFA has been prepared with EU funding but not approved by the authorities.

¹⁷ IMF, 2013b. A joint WB/IMF assessment conducted at the request of the Libyan authorities to assess the PFM framework and systems and advise the authorities on addressing the immediate priorities in the wake of the recent revolution.

¹⁸ Country Integrated Fiduciary Assessment (CIFA) 2005-2007 conducted by the World Bank based on PEFA indicators and 4 OECD DAC procurement "pillars".


¹⁹ Delays in completion of Article IV consultations or mandatory financial stability assessment over 18 months due to unsettled political and/or security situation.

²⁰ While the IMF cannot provide financial support to WBG because it is not a member state, it provides policy advice and TA to support capacity building.

priorities taking into account the departmental budget allocations. Given the departmental budget envelopes, the TA needs can be prioritized within sectors but less so across countries. Internal financing constraints play an important role in determining the Fund's TA scheme even for externally funded TA. The Fund's budget constraints determine the maximum amount of TA that can be provided. Prioritization of TA needs in such a context, even when driven fully by country demand, is very important. The RAP envisages a 10% reserve to respond to unforeseen emerging TA needs.

Figure 2.3 summarizes the Fund's calendar and key milestones for the TA planning and programming emphasizing the METAC's role in the process. The Annual and Spring meetings are the key milestones and platform for integrating the countries' needs for TA and ensuring their ownership. METAC's planning calendar is generally consistent and linked with the Fund's calendar. It is worth noting that the METAC work plan is discussed and endorsed by the Steering Committee only in May, when the SC meeting takes place and after the RSN/RAP have been finalized. The programming cycle of the Regional Training Center in Kuwait is based on the calendar year.

Figure 2.3 Programming of the METAC assistance



Source: Authors' synthesis.

2.2 Organization and delivery of METAC assistance

Organization and Management Arrangements

METAC operations are governed by the Fund's regulations of the RTAC's operations and, as it is an IMF office, also by the general Fund rules. METAC has developed its own Management Field Manual to clarify the general procedures and to reflect on other METAC specific issues such as the legislation of Lebanon, where METAC resides. The Manual is a living document, updated as needed. The last update was in November 2013.

Financing and administrative arrangements

The budget for the third phase of METAC was estimated at USD 33 million. Financing is in principle sought prior to the commencement of the five-year cycle. Funding arrangements are established through a Letter of Understanding between the Fund and individual contributors, which is accompanied by Essential Terms and Conditions for the Administration of the METAC multi-donor Sub-account. All donor contributions are made into a METAC sub-account governed by the Fund Framework Administered Account for Selected Fund Activities established on December 23, 2009. IMF charges a 7% Trust Fund Management Fee to the METAC Sub-account for the administration

of the Sub-account and additionally project management²¹ and backstopping²² costs on the basis of actual costs.

Steering Committee

METAC delivers TA under the oversight of a Steering Committee (SC) composed of representatives of the Beneficiaries, Contributors, and the IMF. The SC function is to provide strategic guidance through endorsement of the annual work plans and commenting on the annual Steering Committee Reports. The SC meeting takes place every year at the beginning of May. The METAC coordinator serves as Secretary to the SC.

METAC staff

METAC is run by a Center Coordinator (CC) who is an employee of the Fund and is recruited by the area department in consultation with ICD and functional departments. The CC is responsible for the overall management of the METAC. The CC is assisted by an Office Manager and two Administrative Assistants who are recruited locally by the CC. The resident advisors (RA) are hired by the respective functional departments to which they are accountable, particularly on technical issues. The number of RAs is determined by the METAC Program Document and available budget. In the daily operation, the RAs work under the supervision and coordination of the CC. The RAs can generally stay at the same RTAC for up to 4 years.

Organization of work and implementation tools

METAC work is guided by the program document, annual work plans and its RBM Framework. TA and training are delivered through specific projects which are organized as a set of activities with predetermined outputs aiming to ultimately contribute to the achievement of the METAC objectives. The Fund-wide web-based TA Information and Management System (TAIMS) is used for recording and monitoring the METAC projects. An RBM framework to monitor and measure METAC performance has been introduced in 2012. The RBM framework is not integrated with TAIMS.

Other tools and Fund-wide information systems for TA employed by METAC include:

- TRS – Time Reporting System for recording/reporting staff time;
- TIMS - Travel Information Management System for recording and reporting on travel costs;
- FACTS - Financial Administrative Control and Tracking System.

Backstopping and quality control

The quality of METAC assistance is safeguarded by the quality control and backstopping provided by the HQ staff. The specific backstopping arrangements vary across TA departments. The extent to which the HQ can provide backstopping is determinant for the METAC response to new TA requests which were not included in the original plans. The backstoppers are responsible not only for the supervision and quality control of experts, but also for full coordination of TA delivery (IMF, 2011).

Mobilization of experts

METAC resident advisors cannot accommodate and respond to all TA requests. The work of RAs is complemented by Fund staff or by external short-term experts (STX). These are mainly hired from the Fund's roster of TA experts. The STX are selected by the RAs and formally contracted by METAC after the approval of the respective FD. There are two levels of backstopping of STX: initial

²¹ Project management concerns primarily administrative support, contract administration, security clearances and visas, and other related activities.

²² Backstopping concerns the support provided by IMF staff to ensure that the quality of the advice provided by the RAs and STX is consistent with the Fund standards and policies.

review by the RA and the final quality control by the RA's backstopper. A Fund-wide on-line evaluation system is used to assess the performance of the external experts.

Dissemination and sharing of information

METAC has a website where it shares work-related information with the general public. The website has a password protected area which is reserved for the use of the Steering Committee members and donors, subject to signing of the Confidentiality Agreement. The Fund has specific guidelines on the (minimum) information which RTACs should make available to the public.

3 Relevance

3.1 Coherence and adequacy of the design and implementation approaches

Adequacy of the strategic logical framework

The METAC strategic logical framework is determined by the program document (PD) developed during the programming of the third phase and the Results-Based Management Framework, developed in April 2012 and updated in September 2013. The PD and the RBM framework do not make any explicit reference to the RSN and how METAC specifically complements and contributes to the other TA and training provided by the Fund. Yet, METAC staff indicated that RSN was taken into account and the RBM framework mentions that “the work programs will be updated along with the RSN and according to countries’ evolving needs”. Given the lack of a general RBM framework for the overall Fund TA and training, METAC RBM framework has taken a bottom-up approach. It is informed by its past activities and expected needs and the Fund’s overall strategic vision. The lack of a RBM framework at the aggregate level makes it difficult to delineate the role of METAC assistance in the overall picture and to define appropriate results indicators at the impact level.

The original program document provides an extensive description of the METAC agenda and intentions for the third phase by topic and by country. The logical framework included in the PD fails however to clearly define the overall and specific objectives as well as SMART output and outcome indicators.²³ While it suggests some possible verifiable indicators of success (per country) these are not SMART (e.g. integrating the amount of donors’ funds into the Treasury Single Account (TSA); appropriate regulatory framework in the area of banking supervision through the development of prudential regulations; improving taxpayers’ compliance resulting in additional tax revenue collection). While the PD appreciates the importance of the complementarity of METAC with other Fund TA and training, it does not specify how this is achieved and how METAC TA and training fits into the overall TA for CD. It is the RSN which brings together all channels of technical assistance and training.

As the METAC Program Document was prepared before the introduction of Results Based Management at the Fund, the RBM framework for METAC activities makes a significant step forward in advancing the results orientation of the METAC assistance and training and the strategic logical framework (see Figure 3.1). It clearly specifies the overall and specific objectives and defines expected outputs and outcomes per area and country. However, there is still room for improvement. The RBM framework does not include any performance indicators except for general categories of indicators in the logical framework, and is not always consistent in defining/linking outcomes and outputs (e.g. in Afghanistan, METAC envisages assisting authorities in strengthening cash management and financial planning, but the summary logical framework however presumes support for improving comprehensiveness of the budget through integrating capital and recurrent expenditures).


The RBM framework gives a clear overview of the potential risks for the delivery of the METAC assistance and underlines the assumptions for ensuring achievement of the expected results. Regrettably, the identified risks and assumptions are quite general and give limited insight into the country-specific risks (e.g. commitment of country authorities, political conditions, security situation, sufficient funding, etc.). While the risks and assumptions are identified, the RBM framework does not include concrete measures for monitoring and mitigation of these risks. The lack of a formal

²³ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound (SMART).

framework (see section 4.3.1) to monitor these risks and initiate corrective measures during the implementation weakens the usefulness of identification of these risks in the RBM framework.

METAC's results-based framework has proved to be a very useful instrument in drawing the path for the METAC work and defining its role in the overall capacity development process. It facilitates a common language and is useful for maintaining strategic focus and avoiding deviations. RBM is, however, still at its infancy and its application is limited to the programming of the assistance. It is not used during the implementation of the program for assessing whether METAC is on track to deliver the expected results. Linking METAC Work Plans and annual reports to the RBM framework is not straightforward. The outcomes to which the interventions included in the work plans and annual reports are expected to contribute are not identical to the ones mentioned in the RBM framework. The specific objectives and expected results of individual interventions/projects mentioned in the back-to-office reports cannot be directly linked to the RBM framework. As a result, the framework seems to be a mechanical exercise which does not really serve its overall purpose.

Figure 3.1 Abridged METAC logical framework



Source: Authors' drawing based on METAC RBM framework.

Although the medium term outcomes mentioned in the work plans and annual reports are not identical with those mentioned in the RBM framework, the delivered TA interventions could be generally linked to and contribute to the METAC's logical framework philosophy.

METAC responsiveness to different country contexts

METAC has been fairly relevant and successful in pitching its assistance to the country needs (see the discussion below on the relevance to the national agenda) and flexible in responding to the emerging needs and changing circumstances (see section 5.1 on unplanned interventions).

The effectiveness and impact of the METAC assistance has been, however, influenced by the complex and constrained contextual environment in which it is delivered (see Chapter 5). METAC covers ten lower and upper middle-, and low-income countries as well as fragile states with a spectrum of diverse development challenges. The diversity of development challenges implies diverse CD needs. The CD assistance, including METAC, needs to be custom-made to the country characteristics and challenges associated with the respective stage of development. The METAC TA was well designed to respond to the diverse technical challenges. It has missed, however,

opportunities to be more relevant in incorporating “non-technical” challenges related to the enabling environment in its response.

Effectiveness and impact of the METAC assistance are more likely when the recipient institution has capacity to absorb the TA and apply it in practice at all three levels (see Chapters 5 and 6). The RSN 2014-2016 recognizes that “CD must be responsive to political, institutional, and capacity constraints, with careful sequencing that matches the degree of country ownership, overall capacity, and institutional strength”. In order to facilitate this it is important to know what are the institutional weaknesses and risks which influence the capacity and adjust the METAC TA strategic and delivery approach correspondingly. At the moment, identification of METAC TA needs and prioritization of TA is done at several levels including area department, TA departments and METAC advisor, but it is not informed by rigorous capacity needs assessments, or by a systematic analysis of the policy and political context for institutional transformation. In identifying country needs for TA, METAC is guided by its own country knowledge and requests received directly from the beneficiaries and by the Fund diagnostic TA missions that identify shortcomings in policies, institutional structures, processes and capacities. The Fund is currently piloting capability assessments in Libya and Tunisia (see Box 2.2). This may provide an opportunity for the future to design METAC assistance based on a thorough understanding of the drivers and constraints in the CD process. When constraints are substantial, METAC TA should adjust its ambitions and facilitate the transformation of constraints into drivers of change (see Box 3.1).

Box 3.1 Lebanon: adopting TA to country context

Sensitive political power-relationships are recognized to be one of the major impediments in the transformation process of the country. In such an environment METAC could be effective in delivering on outputs, but the likelihood of having an impact is questionable.

Success story:

Lebanon is characterized by a complex and polarized political environment which is both a threat to the CD as well as an opportunity. Because of the complex power relationships and lack of political consensus between various stakeholders, TA providers tend to narrow the scope and focus of the TA which leads to a silo approach to CD. While this may be effective in the short-term and build capacities at the individual level, it does not facilitate an integrated CD approach and does not deliver on longer-term systemic changes. In such a situation, it is of particular importance for the Fund to have a vision on its own approach and ensure that it is integrated internally and externally with other TA providers. In Lebanon METAC succeeded to deal with this aspects by providing support to the Ministry of Finance in the area of Cash Management in a longer term context and in close collaboration with the longer term World Bank (WB) project.

Less successful story:

As the Department of Customs had no Director General for some time, METAC recommendations could not be implemented and reforms could not be advanced in this area. Most of the assistance focused on technical aspects which do not require political consent e.g. development of guidelines, manuals, training and awareness raising.

Given the specific narrow nature of the METAC assistance, it does not address the capacity needs in an integrated and comprehensive manner. METAC assistance responds predominantly to the needs at two capacity building levels (see Chapter 3) through providing assistance and advice on reviewing and drafting the legal and regulatory frameworks, advising on required reorganization to increase the effectiveness of the organization or of the business processes, training of people, and less at the enabling environment level.

For IMF, and respectively METAC, assistance to have an impact, all three elements need to be considered even if they do not necessarily have to be dealt with by Fund assistance - this is where

strategic partnerships with other development partners could be considered (see discussion below). To accomplish this, a comprehensive framework for analyzing and determining the needs is necessary. Just responding to the demand-driven needs is not sufficient; the response should be informed by a comprehensive analysis of the weaknesses, be it at the country, sector, or organization level, and by a thorough sequencing of TA reflecting these weaknesses.

The way the RSN and METAC planning is currently organized (see section 2.1.3) allows a high degree of demand-driven identification and prioritization of TA needs at the country level (informed mainly by the Fund surveillance and lending activities) and at the sector level (informed mainly by the knowledge and assessments of the functional departments as well as METAC presence in the field). Less opportunities are available for making trade-offs across sectors and consequently prioritizing the TA at the aggregate level (IMF, 2013a). On the Fund side, this is constrained by the departmental budget ceilings, and on the METAC side this is constrained by its dependence on functional departments and overall budget (see Box 3.2). The available budget determines the number of RAs, and the number of RAs determines then what METAC can do. The assumption is that each RA is expected to deliver 60-65 person/weeks including STX input. There is little METAC can do to reallocate resources across sectors. ICD, through the Committee on Capacity Building, is expected to play an active role in managing TA prioritization at the aggregate level. A few interviewees suggested that the Committee on Capacity Building does not have yet the expertise and supremacy to do so in practice. A longer-term Fund's CD country strategy could avoid such a situation and would allow to better prioritize cross-sectoral country needs.

Box 3.2 METAC assistance in the area of public debt management

An illustration of the influence which budget constraints may have on continuity of METAC assistance is the discontinuation of activities in the area of debt management. In addition to the relatively low demand for TA, tight financial conditions were determinant in discontinuing the work.

METAC has been very responsive in reallocation of resources to emerging needs and especially across countries as result of changing country environment (see Chapter 5). This was possible as METAC covers a sensible mixture of stable and fragile countries. But even in such a context it was not possible to exploit all opportunities. Some interviewees argued in favor of increasing the pool of countries which can benefit from METAC assistance in order to facilitate a more pragmatic rationalization of resources when needed (in addition to mobilization of additional funds). This idea has been welcomed by the SC and is currently considered by the Fund as a real option. There are clear advantages to extending the number of countries. In addition to facilitating mobilization of resources and giving a higher degree of flexibility in adjusting to changing environments, it may bring new opportunities for the exchange of knowledge and experience between the recipient countries. The downside of extending the METAC coverage, however, is that due to the additional efforts needed to manage the assistance (at all stages from identification of needs, to planning and designing the TA, implementation, follow-up and managing relationships), METAC may not have the capacity to be as responsive and flexible as it is at the moment. This may become challenging in the current METAC set-up if the number of RAs remains the same and if no measures are taken to ensure continued, even though not equally intensive, involvement in all countries. Another challenge is the ability to cope with the increase in demand when the situation will ameliorate.

3.2 Relevance to the national reform agenda and emerging needs

Alignment with country needs and national reform priorities

Planning of the METAC TA is a combination of bottom-up (demand driven) and top-down (supply driven) approaches (see section 2.1.3). METAC assistance is demand-driven to the extent that it is

informed by TA requests received from country authorities during the Annual and Spring meetings, and by their response to the formal letter sent by the HQ and the METAC office. This bottom-up identification of TA needs is balanced against the Fund's institutional needs and constraints which are determinant in deciding what TA, including through METAC, will be delivered. Assessment of gaps and needs and the policy and political context was undertaken by Fund HQ diagnostic TA missions and by the Fund's bilateral and surveillance work. TA needs were to a lesser extent informed by other Fund systematic diagnostic assessments such as ROSCs and FSAPs (see Table 2.1). During the current METAC cycle no diagnostic assessments were conducted. One important source of information for determining the weaknesses and respective CD needs were the TA missions and the assessment of implementation of the previous TA.

METAC TA and training seems to be highly relevant to the needs expressed by country authorities. It is debatable whether these needs are a fair reflection of the current development challenges and CD efforts conveyed in the national reform strategies. Neither the RSN nor the METAC program documents (including RBMF) make any reference to the national development and CD strategies. Interviewees suggest that METAC TA is not directly linked to the existing National (Capacity) Development Plans although it is implicitly informed by the national reform agenda. The weak linkages between the METAC TA and national plans reflect lost opportunities in safeguarding the country commitment to follow-up on the received TA and strengthening the complementarity of the METAC assistance with the support of other TA providers (see Box 3.3).

Box 3.3 Illustration of lost opportunities in strengthening the relevance of METAC support in respect to the national CD strategies and cooperation with other TA providers

Many METAC countries have national/sector development plans and some even dedicated CD strategies. An example is the Afghanistan Capacity Development Plan for Statistics²⁴ which clearly underlines the existing weaknesses and includes a road map for CD. As underlined in the foreword, this strategy has been developed to address the capacity development needs of the Central Statistics Organization in an integrated and systematic manner at three levels - enabling environment, organizational and individual. It includes a road map of capacity development activities along with the expected outputs/indicators, budget and responsible agency. Neither the Fund nor the METAC assistance is referred to in this document.

While METAC is very useful in developing capacities and improving performance at the individual and organizational level, in the absence of structured capacity needs assessments and national CD plans, METAC misses the opportunity to link its assistance to a more general capacity development process. This limits its potential impact and complementarity with other CD activities. The CD needs in the METAC countries are huge. The assistance is often scattered across various providers. For these initiatives to be effective it is crucial that they are *well integrated and properly sequenced* in a general framework which matches the country constraints and drivers of change, and which appreciates the short-term gains of the interventions without undermining their long-term sustainability (see Box 3.1 for a METAC success story). Otherwise they risk becoming no more than piecemeal and fragmented inputs which, despite being relevant, may pose hindrances for ensuring sustainability in the long-term. This is particularly pertinent for fragile states which are focusing on state (capacity) building and struggle with fundamental governance issues.

Response to challenges posed by the Arab Spring

Contextual factors, such as the political situation and its implications on the security situation, have been very influential for the delivery of the METAC assistance. The political situation and security in Afghanistan remains far from stable. More importantly, the third METAC cycle has been mostly influenced by the aftermath of the Arab Spring. All METAC countries were to a different extent affected by the Arab Spring events. Egypt, Libya, Yemen and Syria were affected the most. The

²⁴ Source: UNDP, 2011.

wave of civil unrest and protests which shook the Arab world at the end of 2010 changed the development pathway of the countries and has driven the international community to reshape its assistance. In some cases not only the countries affected by the unrest suffered from this situation but also neighboring countries e.g. Jordan and Lebanon were affected by the situation in neighboring Syria, too. All these developments had an impact on the scope and mode of delivery of METAC CD assistance (see Chapter 5).

METAC does not have a structured and systematic framework for determining and monitoring implementation risks. The METAC PD and RBM framework do not clearly integrate the immediate inputs into a longer term CD vision. Consequently, METAC response to the changing environment and emerging needs has a reactive, ad-hoc character. Given the large number of new and cancelled or postponed activities the relevance of the design in respect to the “contextual environment” is questionable. For the CD assistance to be effective and have an impact, it is of great importance not only to appreciate the contextual environment and promptly respond to changes, but also to adequately monitor and proactively manage it. Fragile states may require a different approach in CD. Given the multitude and complexity of factors which influence the delivery of the METAC assistance, it may be prudent to consider a couple of scenarios for the provision of assistance.

3.3 Complementarity & coordination with other initiatives

Coordination of METAC with other Fund activities

METAC is relatively well-coordinated and integrated with the Fund surveillance and program activities. This coordination is ensured through the top-down element of the RSN planning which involves consultations with METAC. Country teams seem to become increasingly aware of the work conducted by METAC although there still seem to be mission chiefs who are not very well-acquainted with the METAC work. Most of the mission chiefs regularly appeal to the knowledge base of the METAC, RAs in particular. Some interviewees suggested that cooperation between country teams and METAC has been strengthened during the current cycle; this is illustrated by the increasing number of joint missions particularly with FAD (e.g. METAC participated in seven FAD missions in FY2011, 4 FAD missions in FY2012, 4 FAD missions in FY2013) and the outreach activities of the CC (e.g. meetings with the mission chiefs during the annual meetings, presentations on the METAC activities, etc.). This has proved beneficial both for the country teams and RAs.

Coordination of METAC with relevant Topical Trust Funds (TTFs) is less obvious. The evaluators could not identify any examples of explicit collaboration or synergies between METAC and TTFs. The RSN and METAC program documents and work plans do not make any reference to the TTFs although a number of TTFs focus on countries and topics relevant to METAC e.g. Anti-Money Laundering /Combating the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT), Tax Policy and Administration (TTF), MENA Transition Fund (TF). In practice coordination of METAC and TTFs activities is generally ensured by the functional departments which are in the lead in the formulation of TTF work plans (subject to the general prioritization of area departments) and delivery of TA financed by the TTFs.

METAC is not a core training provider. It conducts training as an integral part of a TA project. It is specialized in nature, tailored to a specific situation and contributes to the effectiveness and impact of the TA project. The establishment of the IMF Regional Training Center in Kuwait, the Middle East Center for Economics and Finance (CEF), played a beneficial role in strengthening the synergies between the METAC assistance and the Fund training activities. During the current program cycle,

METAC organized three training courses in collaboration with CEF. Although still at its infancy, the collaboration between the two centers is perceived by both METAC and CEF as positive and has resulted in reciprocal benefits. The benefits of collaboration for METAC range from efficiency gains²⁵ to strengthening the potential impact of its assistance and training through learning from the experience of countries outside METAC²⁶, and extending the topical reach of the CEF training (e.g. on Islamic banking). To monitor the impact and sustainability on the ground, METAC could consider adopting some of the practices employed by CEF to follow up on its training²⁷.

As on occasions CEF may be fully booked, an issue of concern for potential future collaboration may be the ability of CEF to accommodate METAC training courses. Although in practice it does not seem to be a real problem, planning of activities may be challenging due to their different programming cycles. It is important that METAC considers and discusses opportunities for joint collaboration at early stage of its programming cycle so that CEF could fit it into its program. Such discussions at an early stage will also strengthen the relevance and complementarity of the METAC TA and training and CEF. The synergies between METAC and CEF could be strengthened if their activities will be designed in a common integrated framework informed by a systematic assessment of capacity development needs/gaps in each recipient country. While the RSN discusses CD needs and the Fund training and TA delivered through various channels, it does not seem to consistently and comprehensively integrate all of them in one framework. The RSN does not seem to embrace the capitalization on individual strengths and benefits of TA and training by, for instance, raising awareness and understanding of specific concepts, and subsequently providing hands-on TA on how to implement them in practice, or vice versa.

The coordination with the IMF Resident Representative Offices (RRO), in the countries where these exist, is limited to the dissemination of METAC work plans and the monthly newsletter. According to the IMF RTAC Guidance Note (2006), the RTAC Coordinator is expected to keep Resident Representatives in the beneficiary countries informed of the RTAC's activities, and maintain regular contacts with key donors in the beneficiary countries to promote coordination. IMF has offices in half of the METAC countries, and a local office in Lebanon. The IMF local office in Lebanon shares its premises with the METAC office, a fact which facilitates the exchange of information and coordination. Even in such a context, the exchange of information and coordination is still rather limited. In Sudan, where the IMF does have a RRO, it does not seem to be aware of the METAC activities. The involvement of METAC can apparently be quite confusing for some beneficiaries as visiting consultants are seen as coming from the IMF, even though the local office is often not aware of their missions. This also limits their ability to assist a "first timer" to the country to make the most of their visit.

Coordination of METAC TA with other providers

METAC has been fairly successful, with a few exceptions, in avoiding potential duplication and overlap of its assistance with other providers. Coordination with other TA providers takes place through two avenues:

- a structured cooperation based on established strategic partnerships; and
- a more ad-hoc cooperation through the METAC involvement in the field.

METAC worked closely and successfully with various donors during the current cycle. The METAC relationships are particularly close with the World Bank. Various WB experts were involved in the METAC workshops and assistance. A number of other strategic partnerships were established

²⁵ METAC can make use of CEF premises at no cost.

²⁶ CEF can finance the participation of representatives from non-METAC countries.

²⁷ In addition to conducting evaluation of the training immediately after the end of the course, CEF tracks post training performance through selective on spot checks. It also conducts electronic surveys and every three years it conducts an external assessment of its courses.

during the current cycle including the cooperation with USAID in a number of workshops which led to USAID's decision to provide funding to METAC. Another strategic cooperation at the Fund level was established with the U.K. Department for International Development (DFID) (see Box 3.4), but this is not linked to METAC. The relative lower available funding of METAC (as estimated in the Program Document) when compared with other RTACs except centers supporting island states (see Table 4.1) and the interviews suggest that there might be room for attracting more donors. This could be achieved by investing in raising awareness among the donors' community and exploring potential partnerships which could relate not only to METAC but possibly to other RTACs too.

Box 3.4 Example of a successful partnerships and cooperation

An example of a successful partnership is the Fund's cooperation with the U.K. Department for International Development (DFID) in the Conflict and Fragile States Program. The aim of this program is to support efforts to rebuild core macroeconomic capacity, help strengthen macroeconomic performance, and mobilize external support in six fragile countries/territories in the region: Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, West Bank and Gaza, and Yemen. The DFID support is mainly through funding six long term experts hired by the Fund. METAC did not have any specific links with the DFID funded experts.

METAC has been very successful in intensifying its outreach activities including to donors established in the recipient countries. While this bottom-up approach is necessary and has its benefits, it is not sufficient. Establishing partnerships at a higher and more strategic level could be more beneficial and have a multiplying effect across RTAC. The ICD could make more effort in intensifying the Fund's relationship with donors and look for opportunities for deepening the existing partnerships and building new ones.

Although fairly successful, avoiding duplication of assistance was mainly ensured by individual coordination efforts rather than by a systematic and structured coordination. This was possible due to the individual channels and communication established in the recipient countries by the RAs (e.g. with the EU in Cairo on PFM, with the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN-ESCWA), USAID, GIZ and British Embassy in Afghanistan, etc.). Such a practice, however, is effort-intensive and not necessarily effective and sustainable. Its effectiveness depends to a large extent on the motivation and dedication of the RAs, their interpersonal relationships with the respective donors counterparts, as well as the time which they have for such activities. Given the competing priorities and duties which RAs face on a daily basis and the short duration of their missions to recipient countries, coordination with donors is not necessarily on the top of the RAs' priorities list. It is done if and when the situation allows.

Establishment of partnerships with other TA providers and/or donors (see Box 3.5 for few examples) strengthens the effectiveness of the METAC support, its relevance to the country needs and facilitates donor coordination in the recipient countries.

Box 3.5 Examples of successful coordination with other TA providers:

- TA Customs in Lebanon (2012): Consultations between METAC and EU contributed to the finalization of the design of the EU Twinning Project;
- TA Tax Administration (2012): Consultations between METAC and EU have led to revision of the METAC Work Plan so that to avoid duplication with the EU Twinning project;
- Joint regional workshops, e.g. on "Internal Audit and Expenditure Control" organized in Cairo (2011) together with the USAID, France and the European Union. This successful cooperation has motivated USAID to provide \$ 1.3 million to METAC and initiate discussions on establishing a longer-term relationship with METAC, serving as a model potentially for other regions and donors;

- In FY2014 METAC provided follow-up TA to Sudan and conducted a workshop together with representatives from the Cash Management Unit of the Turkish Treasury in the area of PFM;
- Sudan Statistics (2012): With METAC guidance, which followed assistance provided by the Arab Institute for Training and Research in Statistics (AITRS), the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBSS) completed the compilation of a quarterly PPI for the industry sector;
- Lebanon Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) Statistics (2011): METAC participated in a workshop organized by Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) in September 2011 in Beirut, on FDI statistics in the region.

Coordination of TA in the recipient countries seems also to be undermined by the lack of initiative and responsibility of the country authorities to mobilize and coordinate the TA received from various donors. METAC coordination with other TA providers is facilitated by the existence of a donor platform in certain recipient countries e.g. Yemen and Afghanistan. In Yemen, METAC regularly receives an update from the donor group on the activities of all donors. In Egypt, donor coordination takes place on a weekly basis and the donors discuss among other things possibilities of financing METAC experts. In none of the three case study countries is there a donor-coordination platform. As mentioned above, METAC support is coordinated with other TA providers at sector level through the Regional Advisers. The risk of overlapping assistance seems to be generally higher in areas where relatively more donors are involved. In the banking supervision area, the IMF is one of the very few, if not the only TA provider. Also in the statistics area there are relatively few TA providers. The PFM (including revenue administration) is often one of the most crowded areas for donor TA and probably relatively more vulnerable for potential duplication. The evaluators, however, did not manage to find concrete records of overlapping assistance, except for Jordan in the area of supervision of private credit bureaus and Yemen in the area of cash management. Yet, in both cases duplication was ultimately avoided by cancelling the planned activities. During the field missions various stakeholders referred to a few other incidents of overlapping assistance e.g. in Lebanon in the area of statistics and PFM in Jordan in the area of external statistics.

The coordination with other TA providers is further undermined by the limited coordination between METAC and IMF Resident Representative Offices, which are present in half of the METAC countries (see the discussion above on the coordination with IMF RRO and the example of Sudan). The PD envisages for example that METAC will provide donor briefings through IMF's RROs. The evaluators could not identify any examples of cooperation with the RROs.


METAC managed to realize relatively limited synergies with other relevant bodies in the region. There are a number of organizations in the region with which synergies could be explored including:

- ArabStat - a regional statistical initiative in the Middle East and North Africa launched in 2013 to support development of statistical capacity and systems and support home-grown efforts to improve data compilation and dissemination in the region;
- Association of Tax Authorities of Islamic Countries (ATAIC) - which facilitates the improvement of tax administration within the Islamic countries through various capacity development activities;
- Arab Institute for Training and Research in Statistics (AITRS) – METAC collaborated with AITRS in FY2011 in the organization of a regional workshop on data quality, but this had not led to further cooperation;
- MEDSTAT – an EU Program to strengthen the capacity of the relevant authorities in the EU's Mediterranean Partner Countries (incl. in METAC countries: Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Syria) to collect updated, timely and relevant statistics, which ensure reliability and coherence.

Coordination with other donors could be improved by establishing more strategic partnerships and strengthening collaboration and exchange of information with IMF Resident Representative Offices. Building of strategic partnerships should be lifted to a higher level and get a more proactive as opposed to reactive character. METAC could contribute to this process by making a development partners' map and identifying potential synergies and partnerships in the recipient countries.

3.4 Survey Results


On the question “How would you rate the relevance of the METAC technical assistance and training to the IMF activities in the recipient country and to the overall national reform agenda?”, the majority of respondents rated METAC TA and training as relevant to the IMF activities in the recipient



country and to the overall national reform agenda.

Whereas the largest majority of respondents in all groups of stakeholders considered METAC TA as “relevant”, the respondents representing the other TA providers were more critical. About half of them considered that METAC assistance is “moderately relevant” (see Annex 8, Question 3). Most of the respondents consider that METAC assistance is relevant to the national reform agenda and emerging needs and is demand driven and flexible in responding to emerging needs of the recipient

countries (see Annex 8, Question 4). Only 7% of respondents who expressed an opinion consider that METAC did not play a major role in supporting the recipient countries to define their TA priorities and needs.




The unstable political situation and security in the recipient countries is seen by most of respondents as the most important factor influencing METAC responsiveness to the changing environment and emerging needs of the recipient countries (see Annex 8, Question 5). The majority of the respondents consider that human and financial resources and country ownership and commitment influence METAC responsiveness²⁸. Most of the respondents do

not see any challenges in the consultation and dialogue between METAC and recipient countries.

Considering the results orientation and linkages with other Fund activities, the largest majority of the IMF and METAC staff respondents seem to have a high opinion about the quality of the METAC RBM framework and its effectiveness in program implementation (Annex 8, Question 6). Similarly, most respondents consider that METAC has clear linkages with other Fund activities. The feedback is less positive on METAC’s complementarity and coordination with the initiatives of other TA providers. A significant part of respondents who expressed an opinion (55%) think that METAC assistance occasionally overlaps with the TA and training of other providers, and about 16% consider that it is not well coordinated (Annex 8, Question 7).

²⁸ The majority of METAC and IMF staff (about 80% of those who expressed an opinion) consider that METAC support is characterized by high ownership of the recipient country (see Annex 8, Question 6).



On the relevance of the regional workshops and training (Annex 9, Question 4), the overwhelming majority of respondents who expressed an opinion (97%) consider that their expectations were met, and that the topics were relevant to the priorities of their organization (95%) and their daily activities (91%). The message on the difficulty of the course is unclear as on two similar questions which were formulated slightly differently, about 70% of participants consider that the course was too advanced, and about 33% consider that it was too basic.

3.5 Conclusions

The METAC assistance is assessed as fairly relevant (see Table 3.1). The program design and implementation approaches are generally coherent and adequate. The quality of the strategic logical framework included in the initial program document, which was prepared prior to the introduction of the Fund Results Based Management, was significantly improved with the development of the METAC Results Based Management framework. There remains, however, room for improvement particularly in respect to the definition of clear and measurable performance indicators and interlinkages between METAC activities and expected results at various levels (outputs, outcomes, impact) against which METAC performance has to be assessed. The Results Based Management framework is used predominantly for programming purposes. It has proved to be a useful instrument in delineating METAC role in capacity development process in the recipient countries, but it is not yet used as a basis for monitoring the implementation of the program and the extent to which METAC is on the way to deliver the expected results.

Table 3.1 Assessment of METAC relevance

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Sub score	Weighted score
Relevance			
Coherence and adequacy of the program design and implementation approaches	40%	3	3
Relevance of the METAC objectives and implementation strategy to the national reform agenda and emerging needs	40%	3	
Complementarity & coordination with other initiatives	20%	3	

METAC has been demand-driven in the identification and prioritization of its work. It has been successful in pitching its assistance to the needs expressed by the recipient countries and flexible in responding to the emerging needs. The Fund and METAC procedures allow for a systematic consultation of the recipient countries on their technical assistance and training needs. The relevance of the METAC assistance could be improved, however, by strengthening and formalizing its risk management framework, which should facilitate METAC to better adjust its response to the capacity development drivers and constraints in the recipient countries. This relates not only to technical, but also other enabling environment factors such as socio-cultural and political factors, country ownership and absorption capacity. METAC's approach to risk analysis and management, as reflected by METAC's ability to deal with continuously changing environment and reallocation of available resources, is mainly informal although generally robust. This approach, however, is not

necessarily sustainable and it does not allow METAC to manage risks in a transparent, systematic and proactive manner.

While being highly demand-driven and responding to the needs expressed by the recipient countries, METAC assistance may not necessarily be a fair reflection of the capacity development needs when considered from a more general capacity development perspective of the recipient countries and efforts conveyed in the national reform strategies, when such exist, and complementarity with the capacity development efforts of other providers. METAC assistance is not explicitly linked to national sector or capacity development strategies and is not informed by a systematic assessment of capacity development gaps and needs. In addition to the needs expressed by recipient countries, METAC assistance is predominantly informed by the assessments undertaken by Fund HQ diagnostic TA missions and by the Fund's bilateral and surveillance work. Such an approach is effective in implementation but misses the opportunity to pursue a longer term strategic focus, particularly in unstable countries – which are most of METAC countries.

METAC is relatively well-coordinated and integrated with the Fund surveillance and program activities and with the work of the functional departments. There exists a reasonable degree of cooperation between METAC and the Regional Training Center in Kuwait which is to some extent influenced by the different programming cycles. The synergies with the Topical Trust Funds and the Resident Representative offices are less obvious. More synergies within the Fund could be achieved if all technical assistance and training would be integrated more clearly in one common strategic framework, such as the Regional Strategy Notes, regardless of the channels through which it is delivered.

METAC has been very active in intensifying its outreach activities including to other development partners and has been fairly successful in coordinating its assistance with them. Although fairly successful, avoiding duplication of work was mainly ensured by individual efforts rather by a systematic and structured coordination. The coordination with other providers has been more difficult in countries where there is not mechanism for donor coordination, and has been undermined by the limited coordination between METAC and IMF Resident Representative offices.

4 Efficiency

4.1 Process & implementation

METAC follows closely the Fund general rules and procedures which are guiding the operation of the RTACs. In addition to these general guidance, METAC office has elaborated a more detailed *Management Field Manual*, which complements the general guidance with specific procedures to reflect the legal and regulatory framework of Lebanon, the country where the office is located, and the specific operations related to METAC. The Management Field Manual is a living document and is adjusted as needed. Further, the staff is guided by the procedures agreed during the weekly staff meetings. These are documented in the minutes of the meetings. The staff finds the procedures clear and comprehensive. The office staff express themselves to be well aware of and satisfied with applying the relevant Fund-related procedures and systems. The RAs consider one-week briefing in HQ and the interaction with their predecessors very useful although this has not been always possible. In a few cases, the arrival in office of new RAs overlapped with the departure of the previous RAs. This has proved to be of particular importance for transferring institutional memory and passing on the established contacts with the counterparts as well as with the STX.

METAC's office manager and the two Administrative Assistants facilitate the smooth functioning of the center under the overall management of the Center Coordinator. During their field mission the evaluators witnessed a very collaborative and pleasant working atmosphere in the office.

The implementation of the METAC assistance is closely coordinated with the Fund's area and TA departments. At the implementation stage, the most intensive interaction is with the TA departments through the regular backstopping and accountability circuits. The interaction with the area departments is less intensive and takes place mainly through the exchange of information and knowledge in respect to the developments and challenges in the recipient countries. METAC distributes internally its Work Plans and annual reports. Occasionally the RAs or the CC participate in joint missions.

METAC has a continuous and effective collaboration with the counterparts at all stages of the project cycle. The procedures are to a large extent standard across the four areas of METAC assistance. Differences relate to the extent to which TOR and Curriculum Vitae (CV) of the STX are shared with the counterparts prior to the missions. Generally, however, only the TOR is shared with the counterparts and only in exceptional cases the CVs of the STX. Even when the CVs of the experts are shared, it is mainly for information purposes. The counterparts are normally not involved in the selection of the STX. While most of the interviewed stakeholders have confidence in METAC competence and do not see benefits of getting involved in the selection of the STX, a number of interviewed stakeholders have expressed their willingness to be involved in the selection of the STX. These stakeholders belong to the group which, without ignoring the excellence of international experts, would like to receive assistance from regional experts who have a better understanding of the specific country context, cultural and socio-political issues.

The delivery of METAC assistance is well-organized and generally timely, except for the unexpected delays which occur as a result of the security situation or delays in obtaining visas for experts. METAC ensures timely arrangements with the counterparts to facilitate the work of the experts on site. This is highly valued by the recipient countries. The main reservation which was expressed by multiple stakeholders is the short duration of the missions. The duration of the missions varies from one to two weeks, or even less. Especially one week missions, regardless of

the scope of the missions, are viewed as being too short and often ineffective. Stakeholders believe that one week may be enough to just establish relationships and get a superficial understanding of the current situation, challenges and specific environment in which the institution functions. Although the counterparts are generally satisfied with the quality of the advice and reports delivered, most believe they could benefit more if the missions would be longer and the reports shorter. The short duration of the mission does not necessarily allow the beneficiaries to have in-depth discussions with the experts on the report and raise practical questions on further steps. This argument is often used to explain why the recipient organization does not follow up on the assistance.

Presentation of METAC deliverables are predominantly in English which restricts the extent to which these could be further disseminated within the recipient organizations and thus diminishes their benefits. As a rule all reports are prepared in English; occasionally these are translated into Arabic. There were occasions when the counterpart requested METAC to translate the reports into Arabic but this could not be done due to financial restraints. This is a concern particularly in countries where the majority of staff do not speak English.

The Steering Committee has been generally well-organized in its oversight of the METAC activities. The SC meeting took place each year, except 2011 due to security concerns in Lebanon. The SC meetings have been focused more on the past rather than on the future and served more as a platform for information sharing and accountability rather than for strategic discussions on future TA needs and how to improve METAC performance, how to mobilize more funding and improve coordination with other TA providers.

The role of the SC in guiding METAC's activities and keeping it accountable for the achieved results is undermined by disruptions in the continuity and representation in the SC by the donors and recipient countries. A quick review of the list of participants at the SC meeting illustrates this point. In addition, the designated members of the SC could often talk on behalf of the organization they represent rather than on behalf of the country they represent. Such a situation could be avoided if the recipient countries would have a systematic approach to coordinate all TA they receive.

The current planning and calendar does not allow for the SC members to provide meaningful strategic guidance on the elaboration of the METAC's Work Plans. The Steering Committee meeting takes place generally in May which is after the RSN/RAP have been finalized. Although the METAC work program is sent to the SC members and country authorities for comments at least one month before the SC meeting, this seems to provide limited opportunity to make any changes based on the advice received from the SC members. Some interviewees opted for more frequent SC meetings. In Sudan, most interviewees thought that the SC should meet at least quarterly and SC representatives should provide feedback from beneficiary organizations obtained from regular country meetings. Having SC meeting twice a year could provide a platform for discussing more strategic issues. However, if the discussions are not lifted to a more strategic level then an additional SC meeting may not justify the additional costs. An alternative could be to hold a video-conference session with the interested SC members between the regular SC meetings, or use the METAC website for discussing any emerging issues which may be of importance for the planning of METAC work.

4.2 Use of resources

4.2.1 Financial resources

The initial METAC program budget for five years was estimated at about \$33 million. This estimation was done in 2009, prior to the Arabic Spring events of 2010. As result of the aftermath of these events TA needs in most of the recipient countries have presumably increased. Nevertheless, given the difficulty to mobilize funding, the original budget was reduced to about US\$ 21 million including US\$ 6.5 of in-kind contributions from Lebanon and IMF. A financial status of METAC is included in Annex 5. METAC has one of the lowest budgets per country when comparing with the other RTACs except for the Pacific Financial Technical Assistance Center and the Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Center which cover small island states.

Table 4.1 Overview of RTACs Program Document budgets, million US\$

	Afritac East	Afritac West	Afritac Central	Afritac South	PFTAC	CARTAC	METAC	CAPTAC- DR
Budget ²⁹	50.6	51.4	49.6	59	30.1	62.2	33	35.4
Nr. of countries	7	10	9	13	16	20	10	7
Average budget per country	7.2	5.1	5.5	4.5	1.9	3.1	3.3	5.1

Source: IMF, Interdepartmental work group report.

As of end of June 2014, pledged financial contributions amounted to about US\$ 19 million. About 71% of pledged resources have been disbursed. About half of the disbursed resources (44%) came from the region³⁰. Syria, Sudan and Yemen seem to have had the biggest difficulties in honoring their contributions as a result of the impact of turmoil in the region and changing environment. For example, due to the loss of 60% of revenues following the secessions of South Sudan in 2011, the government of Sudan was not able to fulfill its funding commitment although it remained committed to its contribution. Another factor affecting the mobilization of funds for the METAC activities is the restrictions posed by some donors in respect to the provision of funds/TA to specific METAC countries e.g. Sudan and Syria³¹.

Given the dependence on the external financing, shortfalls in financing can have significant implications for the METAC operations. This along with the increasing demand for TA as result of the Arab Spring events was threatening the implementation of the METAC work plans. The FY 2012 was a critical turning point from that point of view. As a result of insufficient funding, METAC was forced to undertake cost-cutting measures and scale back its operations by abolishing support in the area of debt management and, consequently, the RA position. Under those circumstances the future of the METAC was becoming uncertain and closing down of the center was a real threat.


On the supply side, security conditions in the region influenced METAC's ability to deliver TA in several METAC countries. During 2012 this led to a shifting of TA from fragile states to more stable countries such as Sudan and Jordan. The estimated budget has decreased significantly in 2012 (see Figure 4.1). It increased in the following years but it did not reach the level of 2011.

²⁹ The operational budget could differ as it depends on the available funding envelope e.g. the operational METAC budget per country is US\$ 2 million.

³⁰ These includes donor countries which do not benefit from METAC TA i.e. Kuwait and Oman.

³¹ USAID found a pragmatic way of providing METAC funding without undermining the existing restrictions. EIB provided funding in the second phase, but due to the restrictions it has in respect to the sectors and countries it can support (i.e. EIB money could be targeted only for banking supervision and specific countries) it did not renew its funding in the third phase. Unspent EIB funds were rolled over to Phase III.

Figure 4.1 METAC financial resources



Source: METAC data.


Budgeted expenses shows a decreasing trend throughout the duration of the third phase mainly due to security situation in the region. This picture suggests that, while more funding could be mobilized, the problem is not really the lack of funding, but rather, the ability to absorb available funding.

Being financed mainly by external funds, METAC sustainability of financing requires long-term planning. Given the fragile and

conflicting situation in the region and the restriction which some donors have in providing assistance to the countries in the region, ensuring sustainability of funding is crucial for the continuity of METAC assistance. This could be achieved by strengthening efforts to mobilize and secure funding, and by developing a few scenarios to reflect possible development situations.

A significant portion of funding represents the contributions of the METAC countries. This reflects a strong ownership and commitment to METAC TA and training. During the interviews some stakeholders expressed their concern that the countries with highest contributions benefited the most from the METAC assistance, a fact which may reflect a bias in prioritization of METAC funds. A quick analysis of the data, however, does not support this observation (see Figure 4.2). There seems to be no correlation between the amount of contributions and the amount of TA received. Most countries benefited relatively more than they have contributed, e.g. Iraq, Sudan, Afghanistan, Yemen and West Bank and Gaza did not make any contributions, but benefited from assistance even more than most of the countries which contributed.

Figure 4.2 Financial contributions (left) and TA received in person weeks (right), % of total




Source: METAC data.

As of end of April 2014, the actual cumulative METAC outturn amounted to less than \$10 million. The largest share of budget (i.e. more than two thirds) is spent on long term experts (LTX), i.e. the RAs, and STX. The financial difficulties and the respective cost-cutting measures explain the decrease in the STX inputs and increase of the RAs inputs. Also travel costs show a decreasing trend since FY2012.


In terms of estimates, the largest share of the budget was allocated to the banking supervision area (MCM). In terms of actual expenses, however, the highest share belongs to PFM and revenue administration. The actual cumulative expenses of METAC assistance were lower than budgeted in all areas except PFM and revenue administration (see Figure 4.3). This is explained mainly by the relatively higher inputs of STX in this area during all years e.g. in 2013 the expenses of STX was 50% higher than the estimate (see Figure 4.4).

Figure 4.3 METAC expenses as of end of April 2014 (cumulative – left; yearly – right, in US\$)³²



Source: METAC data.

Figure 4.4 METAC expenses by area, US\$³³



Source: METAC data.

4.2.2 Human resources

The RAs expressed satisfaction with the assistance which they receive from the HQ and the support in the office. Although the backstopping arrangements differ across TA departments (e.g. FAD provides one backstopper for each topic – PFM and revenue administration - and additional backstoppers for individual countries; the statistics department (STA) provides three backstoppers to accommodate different topics and regions; MCM provides two backstoppers), the backstoppers seem to be very responsive and supportive at all times.

Before assuming their duty at METAC, RAs have a one-week briefing at the HQ during which they have discussions with major Fund players including MCD, the functional departments and ICD. All RAs stressed the usefulness of this briefing week. While all RAs have benefited from one week's briefing at the HQ, not all of them benefited from having an overlap with their predecessor. In the case of the banking supervision advisor there was a gap of four months as result of delays in recruitment although the former RA continued to provide backstopping of STX from the HQ and transferred the knowledge to the new RA during the briefing week in the HQ. Those who could


³² This includes the evaluation expenses which were rolled over to 2015.

³³ The figure does not include the costs of FIN department (project management) and unallocated costs: seminars, trust fund management fee and evaluation costs.

benefit from such an overlap were extremely positive about it and suggested to make it a practice in the future. In the case of the revenue administration, the two RAs managed to conduct a couple of missions together; this served as an extremely effective opportunity to take over the work and relationships and ensure continuity of the METAC assistance.

Retreats for RTACs staff organized by the HQ have proved to be very beneficial for the exchange of experience, good practices and challenges and potential way to deal with them. Retreats for Center Coordinators are now organized on an yearly or 18 months basis. The retreats were also attended by the METAC CC and are perceived as extremely useful. Initiatives to organize retreats for RAs are also increasingly employed although it has not yet become a common practice. The STA had a retreat of RAs in FY2013 and is planning to continue this practice generally on a 18-months basis, unless an annual basis is justified like in the case of engaging many new RAs. FAD did not yet organize any retreat for the RAs; the first one is expected to take place in July 2014.

Figure 4.5 METAC assistance by type, in person weeks



Source: METAC annual reports.

Most of the METAC assistance is provided by the Regional Advisors (see Figure 4.5). The amount of TA (in person weeks) delivered by the STX varies across sectors i.e. from 21% in the area of statistics to 41% in the area of banking supervision.

The allocation of time across various activities is relatively homogenous. The RAs spend on average most of their

time on mission-related work (see Table 4.2). They devote between 6 and 30 percent of their time to backstopping of STX. The relatively broad difference can be largely explained by the varying share of assistance delivered by the STX in different areas. The CC spends more than half of his time on general administration and office management activities. Outreach activities take about 20% of his time; this reflects the significant efforts dedicated to building and maintaining relationships with beneficiary counterparts and other TA providers, raising awareness and promoting METAC activities.

Table 4.2 Allocation of time of RAs and METAC CC (%)

	PFM	Revenue administration	Statistics	Banking Supervision	CC
Missions related work including reporting ³⁴	60	55	66	40	35
Organization and provisions of workshops	12	10	10	10	5
Backstopping and management of STX work	15	15	6	30	not applicable
General administration	3	10	6	10	53
Leave incl. holidays	10	10	12	10	7
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Interviews with RAs.

Retention of Regional Advisors for a period longer than four years is not a common Fund practice. While this has definite institutional advantages, such a situation is not necessarily beneficial for the

³⁴ Outreach activities and reporting to HQ in the case of the METAC Center Coordinator.

continuity of the METAC work particularly in the case of outstanding performance of Regional Advisors. The replacement of the Regional Advisors results in efficiency losses even when all measures for a smooth transition are taken and it is of a short-term nature. The losses are reflected by the time needed to hire the RA, and subsequently to reestablish the relationship with the counterparts, and get an understanding of the countries' specific context and challenges, social-cultural and political environment. The losses are particularly noticeable when the previous RA established a strong working relationship with the counterparts and has an exceptionally good performance, or when the recipient country is characterized by frequent changes in personnel and lacks a historical memory and continuity.

The roster of TA experts is the formal mechanism for recruiting STX and part of the Fund's quality control mechanism. In practice the RAs generally tend to count on their own list of pre-selected experts who are part of the Fund roster and have a proven track-record of delivering high-quality TA. The use of a pre-selected list of experts is more efficient and diminishes the risks associated with engaging experts new to METAC even if they are part of the roster. Furthermore, the search in the Fund roster of experts often results in an exhaustive number of records and generally requires more time for identifying and selecting potential candidates than when using own networks.

4.2.3 Cost-effectiveness

METAC donors have questioned on various occasions the efficiency of the METAC activities particularly in view of, according to them, the relatively high project management and overhead costs. These costs represent about 14% of which about 7% for backstopping and project management of METAC activities which are billed on the basis of actual costs, and 7% for overheads (i.e. trust fund management fee) which are billed as a lump sum of the total TA delivery expenses. In order to answer their queries, they have expressed the need for more transparent and accurate costing information in order to be assured that they get value for money.

At the time of the previous evaluation, the Fund was not fully attributing TA costs at the project level. Some of the costs (e.g. HQ staff time spent on TA delivery and backstopping) were not recorded or recorded but not attributed to specific projects. During the current phase recording of the HQ backstopping time has improved as the backstoppers are obliged to accurately record their backstopping work on a weekly basis. In 2010 the Fund moved to actual costs model. As a result of this change, the financial reporting on METAC expenses improved although it remains incomplete. The reporting does not reflect all costs of providing METAC assistance by the Fund staff and does not specify and allocate the in-kind contributions by the Fund and Lebanon³⁵ to respective budget categories.

Assessing cost-effectiveness is not straightforward since the METAC budget is not comprehensive in reflecting all costs for provision of METAC technical assistance and training. Keeping in mind the shortcomings of the available information, the evaluators made a rough estimation of the costs per delivered person week of assistance. The results are presented in Annex 6. Since the calculations are not based on accurate and full costs, the information is presented for illustrative purposes only and has to be interpreted with care.

The unit costs vary across METAC areas of assistance and period. This is presumably a reflection of the different approaches employed by the TA departments in respect to backstopping of the

³⁵ IMF in-kind contribution includes the salary and travel to HQ for the Center Coordinator, rent of Coordinators residence, salaries of Office manager and Driver, METAC share of the resident security advisor salary, official car expenses, internet, communication, utilities of residence and office, representation, METAC share of UN security and medical costs and any purchase of office supplies and furnishing. Host Country in-kind contribution includes office space (rental), administrative assistants' salaries, and office depreciation.

METAC assistance. The LTX unit costs for the revenue administration are significantly lower than for the other areas. Surprisingly, these are lower than the LTX costs for the PFM component which falls technically under the same TA department. There are also significant differences across years. The higher unit costs in specific years could be linked to the relatively stronger need to guide and backstop the RAs during their first months in the office. The PFM RA assumed his duty in September 2011 – this could reflect the relatively higher LTX and STX costs in FY2012. The same applies for the other areas. The other three RAs assumed their duties in early 2014 and this is presumably reflected by the relatively higher costs in FY2014.

For the workshops, the available information covers only direct costs such as travel of the experts and participants but not the RAs' time, backstopping and HQ incurred costs. It is therefore not possible to make an estimation of the costs per workshop.

The annual reports and the interviews suggest a significant reliance on short-term missions which has an influence on the cost-effectiveness of the METAC assistance. The majority of the missions of STX are shorter than two weeks. While there are short-term missions which address specific issues and have their merits, the interviewed recipients of the METAC assistance suggest that, the shorter the mission, the less effective it is. This is particularly true for mission of less than one week as the first days are generally used to establish contacts and get an understanding of the current situation and challenges. This, together with the costs required for the organization of the missions regardless of their duration (i.e. recruitment of STX, making logistical arrangements for travel and meetings, travel time and costs) is one of the major factors influencing the efficiency of the METAC assistance.

While the METAC Center Coordinator is responsible for the overall management of METAC operations and accountable for the achievement of its intended results, he generally does not have the authority to take decisions in respect to the financial management of the METAC activities although he can approve missions which were not included in the original plans (as long as the total number of input-days agreed is respected) and can take some specific cost cutting measures during periods of tight funding. He monitors the budget based on the monthly expense reports which he receives from ICD. The METAC work plan is prepared on the basis of person-weeks and its implementation is monitored on this basis. METAC has direct responsibility for recording and reporting the costs incurred by METAC staff i.e. time spent by RAs and their travel costs. Financial reporting on the overall METAC activities is done by the ICD Global Partnership Division. Such a situation, in addition to the primarily top-down decision-making in respect to the METAC work plan, weakens METAC's ability to be accountable for its performance. Furthermore, when METAC has partial control over the budget implementation, METAC cannot identify areas and, consequently, take measures for attaining efficiency gains, except for those measures which fall under their mandate. An illustrative example is the purchase of tickets for METAC activities. Tickets for METAC staff and external STX are purchased by the METAC office while the HQ purchases the tickets for the Fund staff. METAC cannot be fully accountable for achieving (cost-effective) results under the current situation when it has no full managerial and administrative power on deciding what and how to deliver.

4.3 Monitoring and reporting

4.3.1 Results based monitoring and risk management

The Results Based Management framework reflects the strategic vision and logical framework for the METAC assistance. The quality of the RBM framework design is discussed in section 3.1. This section looks at the extent to which the RBM framework is used for the monitoring and reporting on

the implementation of the METAC assistance. The METAC RBM framework can become a powerful instrument when applied to all phases of the TA delivery. At the moment the framework is used only at the design stage and is not applied for monitoring implementation and performance. Monitoring of the implementation is done on the basis of the approved work plans and is predominantly input - and output-based.

Even when properly used at all stages, it is questionable whether the measurement of results, particularly in terms of achieved outcomes and impact, can be done at the level of METAC only. METAC is one of the multiple interconnected channels through which the Fund provides TA and training. Given the nature of the METAC assistance (i.e. input based, flexible assistance focusing mainly on technical aspects which can be quickly mobilized to respond to predominantly short-term and emerging needs) it can be accountable for immediate results (outputs and intermediate outcomes) of its activities and their contribution to the realization of the expected outcomes/impact of the integral TA package of the Fund, but on its own it cannot be accountable for delivering on expected outcomes and impact. Since the prioritization of the METAC assistance is guided and determined by the overall Fund TA to the region, it seems logical that the outcomes and impact are determined at the high level.

While there is a great awareness of the genuine risks in the region which may affect the provision of METAC assistance, METAC does not have a rigorous risk management framework (see section 3.1 on METAC RBM design). The lack of such a framework does not allow it to systematically monitor the identified risks and take pro-active measures to mitigate expected and unexpected risks. This is reflected by the relatively low implementation rate of the METAC activities in respect to the original work plans although in practice METAC manages to reallocate resources to new activities in more stable countries. Such a situation could be overcome if, in addition to identifying potential risks, METAC would determine measures which it can undertake to mitigate such risk in advance of their occurrence rather than after their occurrence. In addition to this, METAC could consider developing an alternative scenario for its TA delivery to reflect possible developments in the region and other emerging related circumstances, and deliver the assistance respectively.

METAC reporting in its current form does not sufficiently facilitate adequate monitoring and oversight of METAC assistance. The main reports prepared by METAC include annual reports, monthly newsletters and internal quarterly reports prepared by the RAs and CC. Annual reports which are made available through METAC website and distributed internally by e-mail are largely limited to reporting on execution of work plans. While they make some references to selected success stories and achieved results, this is not linked to the RBM framework and does not provide any insight into the capacity development progress in the beneficiary countries. The quarterly reports have essentially an administrative character and serve for accountability purposes to their respective TA departments. The quarterly activity reports prepared by the RAs are distributed to their respective backstoppers and TA department and report on the activities conducted in each country. The quarterly report prepared by the CC summarizes the overall METAC developments and emerging issues and is sent to MCD. Fragmented reporting does not facilitate a higher-level analytical synthesis of the capacity developments challenges in the region and a coordinated TA response.

There is no formal follow up on the implementation of the recommendations of the previous METAC evaluation. The program document (ref. paragraph nr. 28) includes an Action Plan which needs to be implemented by all METAC stakeholders including the SC and beneficiary organizations. The proposed action plan however does not specify any time frame and responsible persons/institutions for the implementation of the adopted recommendations. It is unclear who bears overall institutional responsibility for the implementation of the recommendations. This is particularly important for

those recommendations which fall beyond METAC's remit. A brief overview of the status of implementation of the recommendations of the previous evaluation is included in Annex 4. The main improvements following the evaluation recommendations relate to advancing METAC results-based orientation and performance measurement through the RBM framework, development of the METAC Field Manual, and extending the Steering Committee representation to all beneficiary countries. Further efforts are needed to strengthen the results oriented focus of METAC performance measurement, to increase the involvement of regional experts, extend dissemination of information to main beneficiary organizations in addition to the main focal organization, and facilitate strengthening of coordination among beneficiary organizations in the recipient countries.

4.3.2 *Transparency and accountability*

There is a reasonable level of transparency and accountability of the METAC assistance. The main channels are the METAC website - used for sharing information, and the Steering Committee meetings - for providing accountability. In addition to the website and the Steering Committee meetings, the METAC Center Coordinator spends about 20% of his time on outreach activities. Through these outreach activities the CC tries to reach specific groups of stakeholders:

- beneficiaries – aiming at strengthening the beneficiaries' understanding and buy-in to secure the effectiveness of the METAC TA;
- donors - aiming at ensuring continuity of funding and establishing new partnerships;
- other TA providers and general public – aiming at raising appreciation for the reform efforts in the beneficiary countries and strengthening the synergies with other TA providers.

The METAC website is well designed and contains valuable information. However there are a number of aspects which undermine its optimal use:

- First, all information posted on the website, except selective workshop materials, is to a large extent in English while most METAC countries are Arabic-speaking and have not yet reached a wide level of proficiency in English. Dissemination of information only in English limits considerably the outreach and the supportive capacity building role of the website.
- Second, important documents including annual reports and work plans are posted with delays and, when posted, no notifications are sent to the main user group (including Steering Committee members, donors and counterparts). These delays influence in particular the ability of beneficiaries of assistance to coordinate their agendas with the expected assistance. The interviewed beneficiaries indicated that while they send their TA needs to the METAC they are not informed on the TA needs which were included in the METAC annual plans until a few weeks prior to the TA mission. Several interviewees indicated that due to delays in posting information it has become inefficient to keep checking the website for updates and that they would welcome receiving notification on updates. Assuming that the recipients of such notification can unsubscribe from receiving it, sending notifications is a technical issue and should be plausible.
- Finally, METAC does not monitor and analyze the use of the website. As result, it does not have any information on the number and origin of website visitors, the time visitors spend on surfing the website, areas which are accessed, key search words, documents and number of downloads etc. This does not facilitate optimizing and tailoring the information posted on the website to the users' demand.

The transparency and accountability of METAC operations is challenged on both supply and demand side. On the supply side, the new Fund policy on dissemination of information allows METAC to disseminate information under clearly specified circumstances (see section 2.1.2). There is also a functional website (see Box 4.1) which is used as a platform for sharing information but, as discussed above, is not used optimally and the restricted area is still under development. On the


demand side, some Steering Committee members, in particular those who provide METAC funding, expressed their reservations about the amount of information which METAC shares with them and expressed their desire to have access to more information on METAC work and TA reports. On the other hand they never approached METAC with a request to provide them access to the password protected area or with a request to share a specific report. While METAC can definitely make more efforts to improve the volume, quality and user-friendliness of the disseminated information, it should not be seen as a METAC responsibility only. Donors and other potential users of the information should request specific information when this is not available and make more effort to share the respective information further within their organizations.

Box 4.1 Overview of the METAC website

The METAC website was launched in 2006. It has two paths, one restricted to METAC Steering Committee members, and another for public access. The public site provides quick links to general background information on METAC (objectives, organization, staff, donors, Steering Committee), the Result-Based Management framework, success stories, planned missions, outreach activities undertaken by the Center and METAC contact details. In addition, the home page contains quick links to METAC TA activities by country, or by area. Since October 2010, in addition to the information on the type of workshops delivered, METAC also started to upload the workshop materials. For slightly more than half of the workshops delivered, information is uploaded. The members' section provides a link to the IMF extranet where SC members and donors can access TA reports using specific credentials provided by METAC. This part is still under development and is not used by the donors and Steering Committee members.

Finally, to increase the usage and usability of the website as a mean to build capacity in the region through exchange of information and experience in the region, the website could build in an on-line platform or blog for knowledge sharing. It should be also possible to give those interested the opportunity to register for receiving notification when the respective materials are posted. Also sharing information through other social media could be considered.


4.4 Survey Results



On the question “How would you rate the overall efficiency of the process and implementation of the METAC activities?” (Annex 8, Question 8) the largest majority of those who expressed an opinion indicated to be satisfied (75%) and moderately satisfied (21%). The IMF HQ staff and beneficiaries seem to be more satisfied with METAC efficiency than representatives of the other TA providers as well as METAC staff who seem to have some reservations about the efficiency of

METAC operation.

Implementation capacity in the recipient countries and the lack of managerial decisiveness are considered by most of the METAC staff and STX as factors that influence the efficiency of the METAC support. A significant part of respondents considers that delays in implementation and unclear roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders influence the efficiency of METAC assistance. Inefficiency of the SC and lack of




managerial decisiveness at the METAC side are not considered to be an issue (Annex 8, Question 9).

With regard to the organization and management of METAC assistance, most stakeholders who expressed an opinion consider that it is generally efficient (95%) and that the support is provided in a timely manner (85%). A relatively significant share of respondents with an opinion consider that human resources (17%) and financial resources (39%) of METAC are not adequate (Annex 8, Question 10). Most of the respondents are positive about the visibility of METAC work particularly through the METAC website which is considered to be easily accessible (Annex 8, Question 11). A large part of respondents who expressed an opinion (about 35%) consider that there is limited information available on METAC work. More than 40% of respondents did not have an opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the METAC systems to monitor risks, and monitor and assess results (Annex 8, Question 12). This would normally be surprising as the respective question was addressed to METAC staff (including STX) and members of the Steering Committee who are supposed to be the most knowledgeable about it. As the STX are not expected to be aware of this, presumably, a large part of “no opinion” answers come from STX. When ignoring those with “no opinion” the largest majority of respondents are satisfied with the effectiveness of these systems. Still, a relatively significant part of respondents who expressed an opinion (13%) consider that the mechanisms to monitor and assess METAC results and impact are inadequate and ineffective.

The survey included three questions on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Steering Committee which were posed to the METAC staff (including STX) and the Steering Committee members (Annex 8, Question 13-15). More than half of the respondents, presumably STX, indicated that they have no opinion. About 90% of those who expressed an opinion regarded the SC as an effective mechanism for providing oversight and guidance to the METAC work. The respondents were, however, less positive about the understanding of the SC members of their role and responsibilities (18%), the frequency of the SC meetings (12%) and availability of a manual of rules and procedures as guidance to SC (23%). The overwhelming majority of respondents was satisfied with the volume (94%) and user-friendliness of the information provided to the SC (100%), whereas they were less positive about the quality and level of detail of the reports (11%), and the distribution of reports well in advance to allow their adequate review prior to the SC meetings (12%).

The workshop/training participants are highly satisfied with the workshop facilities, training material and facilitation techniques (Annex 9, Questions 5-7). A substantial number of participants who expressed an opinion (38%) is less positive about the duration of the training/workshop. From those who had reservations about the duration of the course, 31% followed a training on PFM and 6% on revenue administration. A significant number of respondents (28%) consider that insufficient time was offered for interaction and exchange of experiences, particularly in the case of workshops on banking and PFM.



4.5 Conclusions

The overall efficiency of the METAC program has been fairly good (see Table 4.3). The delivery of the METAC assistance and training is well-organized and broadly follows the established rules and procedures. The Steering Committee has been generally well-organized in its oversight of the METAC activities. It has, however mainly served as a platform for sharing information and less as a

mechanism for strategic discussions on future capacity development needs and how to strengthen METAC performance and impact. The organization of the Steering Committee after the start of its fiscal year and the lack of a single focal person who represents the interest of the recipient country, in addition to that of a specific organization, represent important factors which do not fully facilitate a more strategic focus of the Steering Committee.

Table 4.3 Assessment of METAC efficiency

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Sub score	Weighted score
Efficiency			
Process & implementation	40%	3	3
Use of resources	40%	3	
Monitoring and reporting	20%	3	

The difficult situation in the region was the main factor responsible for the delays and deviations in program implementation. The need to adjust plans to changing circumstances resulted in some efficiency losses. Although METAC remained aware of the risks in the region and was very successful in redirecting resources to more stable countries, the absence of a systematic risk management framework, or alternative implementation scenarios did not facilitate METAC to adjust its work in a proactive manner so that to minimize the risks posed by changing circumstances and associated efficiency losses.


The monitoring and reporting of METAC is regular and comprehensive, although it is predominantly focused on activities and outputs, and less on achieved results and determining factors. This makes its accountability for achieved results less straightforward and transparent. There is a fairly good degree of transparency and visibility of METAC operations. However, the website is not yet used at its full potential for sharing information. During the current program cycle financial reporting on METAC expenses has improved. The information on the total actual costs related to METAC assistance has become more comprehensive. For an accurate assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the program more efforts are needed to capture all costs of providing METAC assistance by the Funds staff and breaking down the in-kind contributions to respective budget categories. As financial reporting does not fall under its mandate, these shortcomings cannot be attributed directly to METAC.

5 Effectiveness

Effectiveness of capacity development assistance is ideally measured by outcomes in respect of policy and institutional changes in the recipient countries. Even when the assistance is fully relevant and efficient, its effectiveness may be undermined by factors which are beyond the control of the TA providers. To distinguish between these two aspects, we will consider below the effectiveness in terms of achieving the expected outputs, and the likelihood of achieving anticipated intermediate and final outcomes. Achievement of outputs will be assessed on the basis of actual activities and respective outputs against those envisaged in the original work plans. Achievement of (intermediate) outcomes will be assessed on the basis of the results (outcomes) defined in the RBM framework and the program document. The focus of the assessment in this chapter will be on quantitative and qualitative aspects of the delivered TA and training. Implementation efficiency and cost-effectiveness of METAC assistance were discussed in Chapter 4.

5.1 Actual achievements against plans

As of end April 2014, METAC has achieved an overall implementation rate of 73.2% measured in terms of actual vis-à-vis planned person-weeks. The lowest implementation rate (46.7%) is observed for debt management and the highest rate for revenue administration (101.8%). In the other areas, the implementation rate is above 50% (statistics – 57.3%, banking – 70.3%, PFM – 81.1%). In eight out of ten METAC countries, the implementation rate was above 50% - in Jordan the implementation rate was of 108.8%. The lowest implementation rates were observed in Egypt (36%) and Yemen (38%). The figure below shows the actual cumulative TA delivered against the original plan by country and by area.



Source: METAC data.


From the actually conducted TA, about 32 percent of activities were not included in the original plans. When calculating the implementation rate based on the volume of activities conducted which were included in the original plans as opposed to total actual conducted activities, the overall implementation rate is below 50% for all areas except PFM (55%) and revenue administration

³⁶ AP – actual planned (included in the work plans and actually conducted), AN – actual new (not included in the original plans but implemented), cancelled planned (included in the original plan but cancelled or postponed).

(61%). The implementation rate in this case is lower than 50% for half of the countries except Afghanistan, Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan and WBG.

Implemented (new) activities not included in the work plans represent about 25 percent (see Figure 5.2). This reflects the demand-driven character of the METAC assistance and flexibility to respond to emerging needs on the one hand, and the responsive character of the assistance on the other hand. It is difficult to assess, however, to what extent the new activities reflected “emerging” TA

Figure 5.2 Implementation of METAC work plans



Source: METAC data.

needs in the sense that they could not be identified at the programming phase. Most of the new activities seem to be a response to the changing environment mainly as result of the security situation and change in authorities' priorities. The relatively high volume of actual activities which were not planned also reflects the challenging environment

in which METAC operates. As METAC is not guided by formal longer-term capacity development strategies, the “unplanned” interventions, even if demand-driven, makes it difficult to pursue a longer-term vision in supporting the implementation of reforms in a systematic, sequenced and prioritized manner. Some unrealized activities, therefore, are deliberately included in the following year's work plans in order to underline their importance.

Although the reasons for cancelling or postponing a work plan activity vary, they could be clustered in three common categories:

- **Security situation.** The Arab Spring and its aftermath has led to increased security concerns in the region and consequently travel restrictions. In most cases, however, security concerns led to numerous rescheduling of missions, rather than outright cancellations. Nevertheless, when the security concerns abated, not all missions could be rescheduled within the FY and were postponed to the next FY. On the Fund side, it is worth noting that STA has internal security procedures which sometimes differ from the MCD procedures although these are in line with Fund security travel policies;
- **Change in priorities of authorities.** A significant portion of activities were postponed or cancelled as, during implementation, the authorities announced that the TA activity included in the work plan was no longer a priority for them. This reinforces our apprehensions (see section 3.2) in respect to the relevance of the demand-driven TA needs to the reality on the ground. It may also be a reflection of the nature of the METAC assistance which, unlike most other types of capacity development assistance, has no obligations for the recipient attached to it;
- **Lack of authorities' response.** Out of all the reasons for cancellation of activities, this seems to be the most strange. Assuming that the activities have been included in the work plan at the request of the authorities, it raises concerns in respect of the seriousness and commitment of the authorities to receive and eventually follow-up on the METAC TA, or, in respect to the deficiencies in the communication between METAC and the potential beneficiaries of assistance. While there may be legitimate reasons for a delayed response from the authorities, the lack of response (e.g. on revenue administration in Egypt, banking supervision in Iraq etc.) shows undoubtedly the lack of commitment to receive METAC TA.

Different Fiscal Years of the Fund and the beneficiary country may influence the implementation of METAC work plans if this is not considered in the development of the work plans. Ministries of Finance generally do not welcome any missions during the most intensive period of budget

preparation. The same applies for the Ramadan period when it is not possible to conduct field missions. The RAs use this period for preparing other missions.

Further, it can be observed that the implementation rate of the work plans is influenced by the implications associated with the time and effort needed for the replacement of the resident advisors who need time to become familiar with METAC activities and countries. This is illustrated by the relatively lower implementation rate in FY2012 in the area of banking and supervision which is linked to the appointment of the new RA in May 2011. In some cases the delay in replacement of the RA influenced the implementation of TA (e.g. delay in recruitment of a new banking supervision RA influenced the TA delivery in FY2014 from October 2013 to February 2014. The impact could have been even more substantial if the previous RA had not continued to backstop STX missions until January 2014 despite his formal departure from METAC in October 2013.

Given the advisory nature of the METAC assistance, the outputs of the TA are predominantly TA reports. According to the Fund procedures, these reports (i.e. briefing papers and back-to-office reports) have to be uploaded into TAIMS. Discussions with METAC staff and the evaluators' review of selected TA projects/activities suggest that the procedures are reliably obeyed. In addition, the METAC's resident advisors prepare qualitative³⁷ end-of-project assessments which include reporting against project objectives and indicators (if these are explicitly defined). As these assessments are prepared immediately after the completion of the activity, they cannot reflect achievement of any outcomes/impact. Some TA departments occasionally conduct assessments/evaluation of their TA, but this was not done for the METAC interventions. The information on METAC interventions in TAIMS is not, or rarely, updated in respect to the government follow-up on the delivered TA. The quality of the delivered outputs and the extent to which they are likely to deliver on expected outcomes is discussed in the next section.

5.2 Likelihood of achieving expected outcomes

The program document was developed prior to the introduction of the Fund Results Based Management and, thus, vaguely defines expected METAC results in terms of outputs and (intermediate) outcomes. It does not include verifiable performance indicators but defines the focus of assistance and a few possible verifiable indicators of success. The RBM framework, elaborated following the introduction of the Fund Results Based Management, advances the logical framework and defines outcomes per country and area of assistance but these are not necessarily always verifiable as base lines and performance benchmarks are missing. METAC work plans are not directly linked to the strategic logical framework of the RBM framework. While they include basic information on topic areas, outcomes, activities and the respective resources, they are not directly linked to the RBM outcomes. METAC reporting is predominantly input/output-based. There is no formal monitoring of and reporting on the extent to which METAC delivers or contributes to the objectives and results identified in the program document and/or the RBM framework. Information is limited to a few success stories included in the annual reports. The lack of a reporting on expected METAC results hinders the assessment of its effectiveness and impact.

The main outputs delivered by METAC can be regarded as:

- Knowledge sharing and awareness-raising which strengthens competencies and knowledge at the individual level;
- Policy advice on improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency mainly in respect to organizational structures, procedures, systems and tools.

³⁷ As the assessment is qualitative and does not include any ratings, it is not possible to make an assessment of the extent to which the objectives of all interventions were achieved.

The likelihood of achieving expected outcomes can therefore be measured by the extent to which the acquired knowledge and advice are likely to be translated into improved performance at individual and organizational level, and ultimately strengthened implementation capability to act towards generating development results. An illustration of (intermediate) outcomes of the METAC interventions is presented in Annex 7.

All METAC projects are documented in TAIMS and should include a final assessment of the achievement of results against the envisaged objectives according to the mission briefing papers. A quick review of a few selected projects in TAIMS indicates the availability of such assessments. The assessments, however, are limited to the specific project activities and are generally done at the output level when the project activities are completed. The assessment is qualitative and gives no numerical ratings³⁸. Despite the existence of qualitative assessments at the individual project level, the TAIMS does not allow an assessment of effectiveness and eventually impact at a higher, program, level and does not facilitate its linkage to the RBM framework.

At the Fund level, effectiveness and impact of the Fund's TA is assessed through ex-post evaluations. As the follow-up on the Fund's TA recommendations is not institutionalized and not done systematically, functional departments have different approaches for the evaluation of their TA. MCM and FAD used to conduct regular assessment missions to countries with intensive TA. FAD regularly asks for the beneficiary's feedback on the delivered TA. STA seems to have more systematic procedures. In addition to the end-of-mission assessments which are filed in TAIMS, within a year of completion of a TA project country authorities are asked to quantitatively assess the follow-up and sustainability of the delivered outputs on a scale of 1 to 4. All departments also occasionally conduct external evaluations. It is beyond of the scope of this evaluation to assess the extent to which departments follow these procedures. To our knowledge, no ex-post evaluations of specific TA provided through METAC were conducted at the project, sector or country level, except for the external evaluations of the overall METAC TA and training. Similarly, during the period under review no evaluations of overall Fund TA to any of the METAC countries were conducted.

The interviewed country authorities were generally satisfied with the high quality and professional competence of the METAC assistance. In their view the high quality of assistance is due to the flexible and responsive nature of METAC to the country needs, the high professionalism and experience of the experts they employ and the systematic backstopping by the HQ which is seen as the guarantor for high quality TA, and which distinguishes METAC from other TA providers. In a few cases, the interviewees identified a number of quality aspects which influenced their ability to follow up on implementation of METAC recommendations.

Interviews with METAC staff and beneficiaries suggest that about 70% of recommendations are implemented. The reasons for not following up on recommendations are both internal and external to METAC. One of the main reasons for not following up on METAC recommendations, as suggested by the most interviewed recipients, is that often the proposed recommendations do not take into account the specific features of the country and the enabling environment (i.e. political feasibility, administrative and institutional capacity); they tend to be highly theoretical - reflecting best practice, rather than pragmatic - reflecting best fit practice. As discussed earlier (see Chapter 4), also the short duration of the missions does not facilitate an adequate dialogue between the experts and the authorities on various possible options. A more intensive interaction would not only help the experts to tailor their recommendations to better fit the enabling environment, but also to

³⁸ At the Fund-wide level, area departments are required to assign numerical ratings for overall and individual TA areas for countries that are intensive TA users. Source: IEO of the IMF, IMF Technical Assistance: Revisiting the 2005 IEO Evaluation, April 1, 2014.

raise their understanding and, consequently, ownership of the proposed approach. A good practice example on safeguarding follow-up of METAC TA on cash management is described in Box 5.1.

Box 5.1 Good practice example: safeguarding follow up

METAC assistance to PFM in Lebanon is a good illustration of how to increase the likelihood of achieving the expected outcomes. In the case of cash management in Lebanon, this has been achieved through internal measures (incorporation of follow-up activities in the METAC work plans) and external measures (coordination of follow-up TA with other TA providers). The results achieved in the area of cash management are to a large extent due to the WB TA which was directed to the implementation of the METAC recommendations, as well as to the incorporation in the Work Plans of follow-up missions to assist the authorities in developing implementation road maps and corresponding TA assistance. Implementation of follow-up on recommendations is incorporated in the work plans.

In Egypt, a METAC mission in collaboration with FAD and the World Bank developed an Action Plan for PFM reforms in 2011. At the end of the mission after discussions on the Action Plan, the Development Partners adopted this as a basis for providing assistance. The Action Plan included a list of measures along with the sources of TA.

The same approach was used in Libya in January 2014 as a result of the capacity gap assessment.

Officials also argued that METAC recommendations are often not accompanied with a clear “road map” and specific guidelines on how to implement the recommendations, and explaining what it means in practical terms. METAC TA focuses predominantly on providing strategic policy advice. For more advanced countries, policy advice generally serves its purpose. To implement the policy advice in less advanced countries, the beneficiaries often lack practical hands-on implementation guidance. This is particularly relevant for countries/institutions which lack implementation capacity. In order to reinforce the impact of its assistance, it is important that in providing recommendations METAC puts increasing emphasis on specific implementation issues.

Another aspect which was quoted in several cases was the communication and language barriers. Some METAC experts do not speak Arabic and the reports are in English. On some occasions, the recipients requested translation of the report into Arabic, but this was rejected as apparently there were no funds for that purpose.

Joint missions seem to be very beneficial for increasing the likelihood of follow-up from various perspectives. They facilitate sharing knowledge and experience, increase synergies between various forms of Fund TA and, most importantly, contribute to increasing METAC’s staff leverage with authorities. Particularly in countries where there is limited commitment to follow-up on METAC TA, it may be useful to increasingly consider the possibility of joint missions.

Ability of the recipients of assistance to translate the immediate METAC results in intermediate and end outcomes is challenging for different reasons. Most common are:

- **Political and economic situation.** In the aftermath of the Arab Spring events, political priorities were reshuffled putting emphasis on restoring basic good governance principles and ensuring basic service delivery to the population. Strengthening capacity and advancing performance in METAC specific areas seem to have been downgraded on the authorities’ priorities ladder. Follow-up on METAC recommendations in Sudan was influenced by the situation resulting from the separation of South Sudan;
- **Competing political interests and complex power relationships.** In some countries even when there is a genuine appreciation of the reforms needed in a particular area, complex power relationships do not facilitate finding a common agreement on the substance and form of the

respective reform measures. A good illustration is Lebanon which for years struggled with trying to reconcile various political interests. This has implications on the progress in various areas e.g. cash management as result of the difficulties of advancing the implementation of a single treasury account;

- **Changes in the management/leadership.** Changes in the leadership are often accompanied by changes in the essence and type of reform measures, or sometimes even the reform philosophy. For example, in Sudan the organizational structure of the debt management department proposed by METAC after an organizational review was not implemented due to changes in the leadership of the Ministry of Finance. In Lebanon, implementation of recommendations was influenced by the lack of political leadership as result of difficulty in appointing DGs (e.g. in the customs department);
- **Lack of resources.** This is particularly the case in the area of statistics as recommendations often are related to collection of data which is resource intensive. As an example, the Sudanese authorities have always welcomed TA provided by METAC in statistics, but due to lack of resources the implementation has been rather slow. The separation of South Sudan in 2011 led to a loss of a major source of revenue from oil;
- **Human and institutional capacity.** The nature of human and institutional capacity problems varies from country to country. In Sudan for example this is mainly linked to the aftermath of the separation of South Sudan.

Given the importance of exogenous factors for the effectiveness of METAC assistance, it is important to set not only relevant, but also realistic objectives and activities. For that it is important to clearly analyze and articulate the constraints (i.e. risks and assumptions) which are determinant for the effectiveness of the METAC TA. At the moment the identification and management of risks and assumptions is done in a less formal and structured manner (see section 4.3.1). While the risk are mentioned in the RBM framework, they are quite general and for informational purpose. They are not actively monitored and, therefore, do not allow the prevention of some risks through mitigating measures.

While no evaluation forms are systematically filled in by the recipient organization for TA, after each workshop the participants are asked to fill in an evaluation form and provide feedback. The individual evaluation forms are reviewed and processed by METAC, but the reports do not make a synthesis of the participants' feedback and do not explain how the lessons learned are used to improve the quality of the workshops in the future. METAC does not ask the participants to fill in a follow-up evaluation form, reasonable time after the workshop, to assess the sustainability of the training results and the extent to which the participants disseminated the knowledge within their organization as well as the extent to which they use the acquired knowledge and skills in their daily work.

A quick review of the evaluation forms suggests a relatively high appreciation of the workshops (see Table 5.1). The participants consider the main strength of the workshops to be the relevance of the topic for their daily work and the opportunity to exchange experience and share knowledge. One of the most common weaknesses and areas for improvement mentioned by the participants is the need to embed more practical examples and interactive cases in the workshops.


Table 5.1 Quality of the workshops: participants' evaluation (1 – the lowest score, 5 – the highest score)

	No.	Average	Content	Presentation Method	Value	Logistics
Statistics	3	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.4
Banking	4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.5
PFM	5	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.6

	No.	Average	Content	Presentation Method	Value	Logistics
Revenue Administration	5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.7
Debt Management	2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total / Average	19	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.5

Source: Authors' synthesis based on individual evaluation of workshops.


5.3 Survey Results



The majority of respondents who expressed an opinion rated the overall effectiveness of the METAC support as satisfactory (75%) and moderately satisfactory (22%) (Annex 8, Question 16). Generally, representatives of "other TA providers" seem to be more critical than other respondents.

About 95% of respondents with an opinion are (moderately) satisfied with METAC success in building capacity and strengthening institutions in the recipient countries (Annex 8, Question 17). Although still very high, the level of satisfaction with the METAC success in individual METAC areas seems to be relatively lower i.e. improvement of the quality of statistics (89%), and fiscal policy and revenue administration (82%). About 17% of respondents with an opinion consider that METAC did not contribute to informing the reform agenda in the recipient countries. Similarly, while a significant proportion of respondents consider that METAC was (moderately) successful in building a robust network of regional experts, about 13% of those who expressed an opinion think otherwise.


In respect to the effectiveness of various modalities of TA delivery (Annex 8, Question 18), all recipients of TA who expressed an opinion consider that the training and (regional) workshops provided by METAC were effective. While most respondents consider that the support provided by STX and RAs was effective, it seems that the level of satisfaction is slightly lower in the case of STX. About 8% of those who expressed an opinion are moderately unsatisfied with the support of STX. In the case of RA support this is about 4%.



When considering the factors influencing the effectiveness of METAC (Annex 8, Question 19), the respondents with an opinion consider that most important factors are the deficiency of financial resources (48%), insufficient understanding by the METAC experts of the country context (24%³⁹) and the inadequacy of the TA modality (20%). Relatively less respondents consider that poorly formulated scope of work (18%), impracticality of recommendations (15%) and the deficiencies of METAC organization are influencing effectiveness.

In respect to the training and regional workshops, the large majority of respondents rated the quality as (moderately) satisfactory (Annex 9, Question 6). The largest majority of respondents who expressed an opinion considers that the announced objectives of the training/workshops were met (92%) and indicates to be satisfied with the topics coverage (94%), and with the acquired

³⁹ Mostly country authorities.



knowledge (91%). The degree of satisfaction is relatively lower in respect to the level of interaction, and exchange of regional experience e.g. 11% were (moderately) unsatisfied with the balance between practice and theory, 15% - with the amount of time allowed for discussion (mainly in the area of banking and PFM), and 14% - with the inclusion of examples from the region.

An apparent majority of respondents highly rated the quality of the trainers (Annex 9, Question 7). It is interesting to note that about 6% rated the level of regional knowledge and experience of the trainers as (moderately) unsatisfactory.

5.4 Conclusions

The METAC Results Based Management framework makes a significant step forward in advancing the result orientation of the METAC assistance and training although, as mentioned above, the expected results are not always defined clearly and in measurable terms. This complicates the assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the METAC assistance. With that caveat in mind, effectiveness has been assessed mainly in respect to the expected outputs and intermediate outcomes.

Overall effectiveness of the METAC program has been fairly good (see Table 5.2). The major challenge is the ability of METAC to implement its original yearly work programs and to manage program performance on results basis. While METAC was not able to conduct all planned activities, the activities which it managed to deliver, are generally of high and distinctive quality.

Table 5.2 Assessment of METAC effectiveness

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Sub scores	Weighted score
Effectiveness			
Actual achievements against plans	40%	2	2.6
Likelihood of achieving expected outcomes	60%	3	

METAC has achieved an implementation rate of about 73 percent when measured in terms of actual vis-à-vis planned person weeks. From the actually conducted activities, about one third of activities were not included in the original plans. When considering the originally planned activities which were implemented, the implementation rate is below 50 percent. The relatively high volume of conducted activities which were not planned reflects the highly demand-driven nature of the assistance and METAC's flexibility to respond to emerging needs. At the same time this situation points to the challenges which METAC faces in implementing the original plans. While the implementation of plans is significantly affected by the security situation in the region, often activities are also cancelled or postponed due to a change of authorities' priorities, or a lack of authorities' response on METAC inquiries. This, at its turn, strains the relevance of the requests and METAC ability to pursue a systematic, sequenced and prioritized approach to the long term capacity development and reform process in the recipient countries.

About 70 percent of the METAC recommendations are being implemented. Most of the factors influencing the implementation of the recommendations are beyond METAC's control. The quality of the delivered technical assistance and training is generally of very high quality. This is ensured by a systematic process and quality control through backstopping of regional experts and short term experts by the staff of the IMF functional departments. One of the quality aspects that leaves room for improvement is the pragmatism of the technical advice which requires to tailor it better to the country context and emphasize on what does it mean and require in practice.

METAC does not have a systematic approach for the follow-up and assessment of the effectiveness of its interventions. Performance of individual interventions are generally assessed up to the level of outputs and to some extent intermediate outcomes. Until there is a clear agreement on how to measure performance of METAC assistance in respect to the capacity development in the beneficiary countries, it will be difficult to systematically and consistently assess the effectiveness and impact of METAC and report on it. Monitoring and assessment of progress should recognize various channels through which IMF TA is provided and their individual scope, role and contribution. The METAC results based framework should be informed by, and emanate from, an overall results based framework for all IMF capacity development assistance and training. The Fund is currently working on such a general results based management framework. Having a METAC results based framework may be useful when defined correctly and applied at all stages of technical assistance, but it is of limited added value if it is not incorporated in an overall framework.

6 Impact

6.1 Likelihood of the expected impact

Given the short time span of the program it is difficult to assess its impact. Further, the lack of specific impact indicators and baseline, as well as lack of a system to monitor and report on outcomes, does not facilitate the assessment of the METAC impact on capacity development in the recipient countries at the sector or country level. The success of the program could be measured in respect to the progress in delivering results which are likely to have a positive impact on transformational changes in the recipient countries.

In terms of accountability, it is difficult to hold METAC accountable for delivering end outcomes as their realization depends on factors which are beyond its control. As opposed to trying to draw casual links and attribute observed changes to specific METAC interventions, it should be possible to demand some kind of accountability at the outcome level by delineating METAC's contribution to delivering results. The focus of the analysis could then be on:

- how did METAC resources, outputs and intermediate outcomes contribute to end outcomes; and
- whether necessary measures have been taken to safeguard the achievement of the intended results.

In the absence of specific METAC outcome and impact indicators, we can consider the general performance changes in the METAC areas of assistance in the recipient countries. In the area of PFM and revenue administration, that could be done on the basis of the performance changes observed by PEFA high-level assessments at the level of respective performance indicators. Unfortunately, not all countries conducted a PEFA assessment and even less countries have conducted a repeat assessment (see Table 2.1). The impact of METAC assistance in the area of PFM and revenue administration could be informed by general fiscal indicators like fiscal deficit, public debt and domestic revenue as percentage of GDP.

In the area of statistics STA is developing a RBM framework that may be also applied for METAC. Alternatively, although not necessarily accurate the analysis of performance changes could be done on the basis of the WB statistical capacity building indicators (see Table 6.1). In half of the countries, the overall capacity building indicator improved between 2009 and 2013 while in eight the performance improved when compared to 2004. Significant improvements were observed in Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and WBG. This is not surprising given that these are the METAC countries which were relatively more stable. The situation appears to be different in less stable countries which were affected by the Arab spring. In Egypt (mainly on timeliness and periodicity), Libya, Sudan (mainly on methodology) and Syria (mainly on methodology and source data), the situation deteriorated in 2013 after booking some success in 2009. Yemen exhibits a deteriorating trend since 2004. Potential contribution of METAC to these results is discussed in the next section.

Table 6.1 Statistical Capacity building Indicator for METAC countries in 2004, 2009, 2013

Country	Overall			Methodology			Source Data			Periodicity & Timeliness		
	2004	2009	2013	2004	2009	2013	2004	2009	2013	2004	2009	2013
Afghanistan	24	47	53	0	30	50	20	40	40	53	70	70
Egypt	78	91	90	40	80	80	100	100	100	93	93	90
Iraq	32	41	50	0	10	20	40	50	60	57	63	70
Jordan	69	74	74	70	70	80	70	70	70	67	83	73
Lebanon	46	54	67	40	40	50	20	40	70	77	83	80
Libya	29	39	28	40	30	30	0	40	20	47	47	33
Sudan	36	42	40	20	30	20	20	30	30	67	67	70
Syria	58	54	47	60	50	40	40	40	20	73	73	80
WBG	-	39	83	-	10	80	-	50	100	-	57	70
Yemen	57	56	52	40	30	40	50	50	40	80	87	77
METAC countries	47	55	56	34	41	46	40	51	50	68	74	71

Note: " - " Information not available.

Source: World Bank, The Bulletin Board on Statistical Capacity (BBSC), <http://go.worldbank.org/UI0WGV6KW0J>.

While appreciating some signs of overall performance changes, the next question is to what extent METAC took necessary measures to secure the achievement of intended results.

The METAC assistance and training is designed to respond to specific needs and/or address emerging challenges in the recipient countries. Given its specific nature, when designing its activities METAC does not explicitly consider or make an assessment of:

- the organizational and institutional needs (including skills and capacity of staff) of the recipient institution and the extent to which existing arrangements can ensure the impact and sustainability of the METAC assistance;
- the efficiency and effectiveness of existing policy instruments (including legal foundations) which are necessary to follow up on the METAC recommendations;
- the socio-political context (including the role of political powers and relationships) and the extent to which it may influence the impact of METAC.

The above-mentioned aspects appear to be the major groups of risks which can affect the impact and sustainability of the achieved METAC results (see the discussion on the main external factors influencing the overall impact of the METAC results in Chapter 6). Some of the related risks are mentioned in METAC's RBM framework. However, in the absence of an adequate risk management framework, these risks are not monitored systematically (see section 4.3.1). As a result, dealing with challenges and mitigating risks is done on a reactive rather than pro-active basis. It is questionable whether such a practice is effective and sustainable. Capacity development is a transformational process and in order to intervene successfully one needs to manage changes adequately. Although the authorities should be primarily responsible to drive and manage this process, as an important TA provider, METAC could facilitate this process by focusing on TA which works best. Monitoring and management of change should be a continuous process rather than a one-off event.

6.2 Relative contribution of METAC

In chapter 1 we discussed the logical framework and its limitations. In chapter 5 we analyzed the achievement of outputs and the likelihood of achieving intermediate outcomes. In section 6.1 we pointed to some potential changes in the recipient countries. An adequate contribution analysis requires a specific methodological approach which is beyond the scope of the current evaluation. We will therefore attempt to provide only some illustration of probable METAC contribution.

All interviewed stakeholders recognized and appreciated METAC's added value and comparative advantage compared to the TA provided by other development partners. The contribution of METAC is generally perceived as highly beneficial. As some interviewees mentioned, "without METAC things would be a trial and error", "METAC plays an important role in validating our initiatives", "among other TA providers, METAC TA is very practical and quick in responding to our needs", "METAC is filling an important gap".

The interviewed stakeholders associate the added value and comparative advantage of the METAC assistance and training generally with the following aspects:

- METAC provides TA directly rather than by managing complex TA projects;
- Given its flexible and demand-driven nature, METAC assistance can be mobilized to respond to emerging needs of recipients more easily than the TA from other providers with cumbersome and long administrative procedures;
- Through the METAC resident advisors, the Fund enables maintenance of a continuous relationship with the recipient countries at the technical level;
- Having the advantage of working more closely with the institutions in the recipient countries and being closer to the developments in the field, METAC RAs can detect problems earlier and, therefore, respond more quickly to the emerging needs;
- Being located in the region, METAC is closer to the recipient countries and, having closer and more frequent contact with the recipient countries, the resident advisors are better placed to follow up on the implementation of the previous assistance;
- Through its specific high-level advice, METAC is an indispensable complement to the longer-term TA projects funded by other TA providers which focus predominantly on implementation issues;
- In some cases, due to its reputation and high-level advice, METAC was seen as an external "push" for the authorities needed to actually make the changes happen;
- Regional workshops contribute to establishing networking among country officials and share knowledge and experience in dealing with similar challenges and going through similar processes.


The role and contribution of METAC assistance can be better understood by considering a counterfactual situation under which no METAC assistance would have been provided. Discussions with beneficiaries provided some qualitative insights. METAC is not exclusive in being a driver for change. Most of the consulted beneficiaries indicated that, in the absence of METAC assistance, the observed changes would have happened anyway but maybe with delay, or would have taken a different form. Only in very few cases beneficiaries indicated that METAC assistance was crucial in undertaking changes. METAC's role is seen predominantly as reinforcing. It has a reinforcing effect at the political level through its advice which validates the decisions taken by the authorities, or emphasizes the importance of certain reform measures and which facilitates internal and external policy dialogue. At the operational level, the reinforcing effect is reflected by the extent to which METAC advice and transferred knowledge reinforce the understanding and appreciation of the need for reform which ultimately leads to speeding up the implementation of reforms or broadening their scope.

While it is difficult to draw explicit causal links between the METAC interventions and the achieved results, it is highly probable that through these interventions METAC contributed to bringing about performance changes. At a more specific level, METAC's contribution to end-outcomes could be evidenced by linking performance changes described above (see Table 6.1) to specific METAC interventions. For instance:

- In Afghanistan, METAC interventions in statistics led directly to the release of the extended and updated consumer price index by end of FY12 or early FY13, publication of BOP data in March 2013 for the first time ever, and submission for the first time of an International Investment Position (IIP) statement to the IMF which is being prepared for publication;
- In Iraq, the Central Bank of Iraq started compiling quarterly balance of payments statistics and annual IIP statistics based on BPM6 methodology;
- In Lebanon, the Banque du Liban launched a DI survey for the financial sector for the first time;
- In WBG, METAC interventions led to the first release of an international investment position statement in mid-2012 and formal application for subscription to the special data dissemination standard in December 2012.

6.3 Survey Results

When considering the factors which influence the impact of METAC assistance (Annex 8, Question 20), relatively more respondents consider that poor capacity of the recipient country to follow-up on recommendations (81%) and the general situation in the recipient country (91%) influence the impact more than the lack of follow-up measures (59%) and lack of commitment (71%) of the recipient country to implement METAC recommendations. About 75% of the respondents with an opinion consider that insufficient application of the accumulated knowledge by officials in day-to-day activities influences the impact.




When asked about the comparative advantage and added-value of METAC assistance vis-à-vis other TA (Annex 8, Question 21), the majority of the respondents consider that METAC:

- is better tailored to the needs of the recipient countries;
- is more flexible and responsive to emerging needs;
- can be mobilized faster and easier;
- provides a better understanding of the specific countries' context;
- is of a higher quality;
- is better placed to effectively follow up on the impact of the provided TA and training;
- facilitates a closer coordination with other TA providers in the region;
- strengthens and optimizes the use regional expertise.

From the respondents who expressed an opinion about 69% consider that METAC is more effective in enhancing country ownership and accountability than other TA providers, and about 23% consider that the same progress could have been achieved also without METAC assistance.

When inquiring about the difference between METAC training/workshops and the other training courses which the respondents attended (see Annex 9, Question 8), the majority of respondents who expressed an opinion indicate that METAC support was complementary to the other training/workshops (91%), was more relevant (92%), was better tailored to the regional context (94%), allowed more exchange of experience (92%), and that the overall quality was higher (89%). About 85% of respondents, particularly those who attended courses in the area of PFM and revenue administration, consider that METAC offers more specific expertise. More than half of respondent (52%), mainly who participated in debt management and banking courses, indicate that there was significant overlap between the subjects covered by METAC and the other trainings/workshops which they attended. This may indicate challenges in institutionalizing training in the respective recipient organizations and the lack of HR development plans.



6.4 Conclusions

METAC assistance and training has played an important role and most likely is contributing to capacity development impact in the recipient countries (see Table 6.2). This conclusion is, however, subjective and not informed by an adequate impact assessment. Whereas assessing the effectiveness of the METAC TA and training is relatively straightforward, assessing its impact at the METAC level only is more difficult. METAC is an integrated and complementary part of the overall IMF capacity development efforts. It makes more sense to assess the impact of the overall IMF assistance and as part of that the specific contribution and added-value of METAC. A more systematic approach to assessing the impact of METAC interventions would be required.

Table 6.2 Assessment of METAC impact

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Sub Score	Weighted score
Impact			
Likelihood of the expected impact	40%	3	3.6
Relative contribution of METAC	60%	4	

As METAC has been providing assistance for more than ten years, it is legitimate to expect to see some impact of its assistance on the capacity of the recipient countries to design and implement sound macroeconomic and financial policies. The question is how to measure the improved capacity in the absence of clearly defined expectations, and how to delineate it, not only from the capacity development assistance of other providers, but even from the other IMF assistance. As long as such an agreement will not exist, the assessment of the impact (and to some extent even effectiveness) will become subjective and speculative.

The definition of capacity development adopted by the IMF is specific and narrow in nature, and differs from more complex definitions adopted by other development organizations, including by few METAC donors. As this may lead to different expectations, the IMF may want to consider to reinvigorate its definition and approach to capacity development. This will allow METAC to develop

a results based framework and define SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) criteria for measuring outcomes and impact which reflects this definition and approach for capacity development assistance. This will also facilitate METAC's accountability for delivering the expected results.

Given the complexity of the capacity development change process in a country, as well as the nature of METAC as a form of Fund TA, METAC can only contribute to advancing capacity development, but cannot be primarily responsible for achieving an impact. By identifying the assumptions and risks which are determinant for achievement of expected results and impact, METAC could determine potential mitigation measures. Continuous monitoring of these risks will allow METAC to be more aware of the changing environment and make timely adjustments necessary to realize the expected impact.

7 Sustainability

7.1 Country ownership and institutionalization of the achieved METAC results

Sustainability is generally understood as the ability of the recipient institution to sustain the results achieved through the delivery of METAC assistance. Important aspects to consider in this context are i) the capacity of the recipient country to *absorb* TA when it is delivered, and ii) to *capitalize on* its benefits when it ceases. One of the main factors influencing the absorption of the TA and capitalization of the benefits by the recipient country is its commitment and ownership of METAC assistance.

There seems to be a mixed picture on the commitment and ownership of the METAC assistance by the recipient countries. Some stakeholders indicated that ownership and commitment is rarely an obstacle for the METAC assistance (see Box 7.1). Given the demand-driven nature of METAC assistance and that often countries contribute to funding METAC activities, this is not surprising. Other stakeholders quoted country ownership as one of the major factors which affects sustainability. One of the explanations is that METAC assistance comes at no “cost”, not only in monetary terms (at least for those who do not contribute to funding METAC) but also in terms of country obligations attached to it. Unlike some other forms of development assistance, there are no conditions attached to the METAC assistance which is demand-driven in nature. Even if authorities highly appreciate and value the received METAC assistance and training, they are not motivated by formal “triggers” to pursue and follow up on their achievement except for the fact that future assistance may be eventually reduced or ceased. Their motivation is driven by the commitment to absorb assistance and ownership of the delivered TA.

Box 7.1 Examples of country ownership of METAC assistance delivered off-site

On the request of Libyan authorities, METAC organized in 2014 a training on BOP statistics in Tunis. Libya paid for all workshop-related costs except for experts' costs which were covered by METAC. Libyan authorities were highly satisfied with the workshop. This also illustrates the feasibility and effectiveness of off-site training as an alternative for in-country assistance for countries facing security challenges but committed to absorbing and capitalizing on knowledge.

Following a request from Yemeni officials, in 2013 METAC provided TA in revenue administration in Lebanon. The assistance was partly financed by Yemen and partly by French funding. This TA opportunity was used also as a study visit to learn from the experience of Lebanon. The Yemeni officials highly appreciated the visit and the acquired knowledge.

Incorporation of measures to reinforce country involvement and ownership into the program design and implementation is, therefore, vital for sustainability of METAC assistance. Beneficiaries are routinely given the opportunity to express what their TA needs are and are consulted on the mission's Terms of Reference. There is however no, or very limited, evidence on efforts taken to integrate METAC TA in the beneficiary country's overall capacity development efforts and processes. Even when national capacity development or sector strategies exist, the dialogue on METAC assistance does not seem to be directly linked to these strategies. Furthermore, while the beneficiaries are consulted on their TA needs, most of them indicated that they are rarely informed on the approved METAC work plans except for the prior-to-mission consultations. Ownership could be reinforced by ensuring the beneficiaries' understanding of the offered recommendations and their implications. This could be achieved by providing pragmatic recommendations which take into

account specific country circumstances and to embed sufficient time during the missions for discussing the proposed solutions and provide guidance on implementation.

METAC is reasonably successful in ensuring that the recipients are able to absorb TA when it is being delivered. As a rule, missions take place only after getting clearance from the direct beneficiaries on the timing and the TOR, and focal persons are appointed. The hands-on training, which is embedded in the METAC projects, is delivered to the persons who are direct users of delivered assistance and directly involved in the follow-up. While METAC is not directly involved in the selection of participants at the regional workshops, it takes due care to ensure that the right persons attend the workshops and the training material is tailored to the specific target group. This is supported by the high evaluation scores of the workshops.

Whether direct recipients can maximize the benefits of the delivered METAC assistance depends essentially on the environment enabling the application and institutionalization of the acquired knowledge and skills which is largely beyond METAC control such as:

- Political indecisiveness and support does not allow the implementation of certain recommendations until the recommendations have political commitment and acceptance (e.g. IIP related recommendations);
- Political tensions in the country are also beyond METAC control. Political fragmentation in Lebanon is one of the many reasons for stagnation of reforms in the country, particularly in the area of human resource management. Any proposed regulatory and organizational reform measures which need parliament's endorsement have a high chance to fail. The bottleneck is not so much rejection of reform as such, but disagreement on its form;
- Frequently changing leadership which adversely influences continuous commitment of authorities (e.g. in Jordan three ministers changed in a year, in Egypt more than three a year, Sudan has also a high turnover of top management);
- Reforms are generally not funded and the lack of financial resources impedes implementation of recommendations (e.g. recommendations in the area of statistics which often imply new surveys to be conducted);
- In-country coordination and commitment of relevant institutions (e.g. qualitative improvements of the balance of payments statistics in Lebanon depends not only on correctly applying the recommended and adopted methodology, but also on the cooperation, quality and timeliness of inputs of other institutions);
- Lack of absorptive capacity within the recipient institutions. As one of the interviewed person articulated, "TA in a country works when you have skills, but when it does not have the necessary skills it does not work";
- High turnover of mid-level officials.


There are a number of measures which METAC could consider in respect to the enabling environment. METAC could ensure that the recipients have followed the relevant general courses offered by the Fund in METAC-related areas. In cases where such courses are not part of the existing curriculum, METAC could indicate this to the HQ for consideration. METAC seems to make no use of train-the-trainer approaches which could contribute to establishing a core group of staff in the respective organizations assuming the responsibility for disseminating the knowledge and skills within their organizations. METAC could also consider making participation at a workshop or training subject to the commitment of the participants to make a presentation to their colleagues upon completion of the training/workshop, or that the training/workshop materials are published on the institution's website, or intranet when one exists.

7.2 Promoting use of regional expertise

Most of the consulted stakeholders indicate the use of regional experts as one of the distinctive features of the METAC assistance. Of particular added value are the STX who have explicit experience of working in similar positions or organizations as the direct recipients of the assistance. As a rule, regional experts have a better understanding of the socio-cultural and political sensitivities of the environment in which the assistance is delivered and needs to be followed up. Equally important is their knowledge of the Arabic language which not only eases communication, but also facilitates the clear articulation and understanding of subtle details which can be difficult to articulate through translation.

On several occasions, however, stakeholders expressed their discontent with the use of international consultants who have inadequate understanding and appreciation of the specific country characteristics. While their professionalism and quality of the delivered outputs is not questioned, some recipients indicate that their advice often lacks pragmatism and therefore discourages the recipient to follow up on it.

Figure 7.1 Number of international and regional STX employed



Source: METAC data.

Figure 7.1 provides an overview of the number of international (Int.) and regional (Reg.) short term experts which provided METAC assistance. As some STX conducted more missions, no straightforward conclusions on the use of regional experts can be drawn. Nevertheless, in absolute terms, the data suggest that the use of regional experts is much lower than of international experts in all areas. There are no

clear reasons for this. On the contrary, METAC advisors indicate that identifying regional experts is their first priority and preference is given to regional experts. The main difficulty is finding regional experts on specific topics. Part of the problem may be the relatively lower number of regional experts included in the roster of experts (see Chapter 4) and the difficulties in recruiting regional experts who are not included in the roster⁴⁰.


The use of regional STX is somehow more evident in the area of revenue administration. This, together with the relatively higher effectiveness of METAC assistance in this area, as well as the relatively higher autonomy in implementing revenue administration reforms, may indicate a relatively higher sustainability of assistance in this area.

METAC successfully promotes regional expertise by conducting regional workshops and exchange of regional experience through other ways (e.g. study tours, off-site TA etc.). Exchange of regional experience was indicated by most of the consulted stakeholders as the most useful and effective way of TA and training. As some interviewees indicated, "it works better when you see one time than hear hundred times", "the advice is more credible when it comes from first-hands". More of such activities are welcome.

⁴⁰ METAC cannot hire any experts which are not included in the roster. When METAC wants to hire a regional expert who is not in the roster, the expert needs to go first through the formal procedures to be included in the roster.


7.3 Survey Results

The largest majority of respondents who expressed an opinion consider that insufficient efforts of the recipient countries in institutionalizing the developed capacity (84%), insufficient absorptive capacity and high turnover staff (82%), and the unstable situation in the recipient countries (86%) to a large extent affect the sustainability of the METAC assistance (Annex 8, Question 22). Relatively



less, although still large, number of respondents consider that insufficient ownership and commitment to implement the METAC advice (71%) and insufficient follow up activities to strengthen and further share the acquired knowledge and experience (68%) of the recipient countries influences sustainability of METAC assistance and training.

From the training participants who expressed an opinion, more than half use the knowledge gained in the training on a daily basis (65%), occasionally (68%), or seldom (14%). From all respondents with an opinion 12% changed jobs and are no longer able to use the knowledge (Annex 9, Question 9). In respect to post-training activities (Annex 9, Question 10), about 50% of the respondents with an opinion benefited from METAC follow up support after the training. About 57% participated in follow up activities offered by other TA providers and 37% did not take part in any post-training activities. From those respondents who did not benefit from post-training activities, most are from Afghanistan, Lebanon, Sudan, WBG and other non-METAC countries, and are active in the area of revenue administration (21%) and statistics (40%).



A large part of the respondents with an opinion considered that the lack of capacity needs assessments (59%), the high staff turnover (60%), lack of institutionalized capacity development planning and implementation (53%) influence METAC's sustainability (Annex 9, Question 11). A large majority of the respondents shared the knowledge gained with their colleagues (83%) mainly by informing their colleagues about the course objectives and topics (95%) or by sharing the course material (90%) and main lessons learned (91%) (Annex 9, Question 12). A significant majority (68%) trained and/or guided other colleagues and suggested the METAC course to other colleagues (84%).

7.4 Conclusions

Overall METAC assistance is likely to be fairly sustainable (see Table 7.1). With some exceptions, METAC has been generally quite successful in ensuring country's ownership of the delivered TA and training, and promoting regional experience and expertise. METAC has facilitated country ownership by involving and consulting recipient countries during the planning of the work and during implementation, prior to the missions. There is, however, room for improvement when it comes to integrating METAC assistance into the overall capacity development efforts of the country, and investing more in getting the beneficiaries to understand and embrace METAC advice.

Table 7.1 Assessment of METAC sustainability

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Sub scores	Weighted score
Sustainability			
Country ownership of the delivered TA & institutionalization of the built capacity	50%	3	2.7
Promoting use of regional expertise	20%	3	
Mitigation of (external) factors affecting sustainability	30%	2	

Sustainability challenges are to a large extent beyond METAC's control. However, METAC could contribute to strengthening the sustainability of its assistance by identifying and monitoring the enabling environment factors in a more formalized and systematic way in order to ensure a timely and adequate response to changes in the enabling environment. This insight requires shifting the focus of METAC assistance from short-term quick wins to a more longer-term and integrated approach informed by capacity needs assessments and which embraces the importance of country ownership and absorptive capacity.

Sustainability could be strengthened by improvements at all program stages i.e. from design to implementation and monitoring. Strengthening coordination with the assistance of other TA providers and embedding, or clearly linking it with the ongoing and envisaged capacity development efforts, or sectoral reform strategies of the recipient countries when such exist, will most probably increase the sustainability of METAC assistance. In the same context, sustainability could be improved by tailoring assistance to specific challenges identified through systematic capacity needs assessments. The spin-off effect of the METAC training, and consequently its sustainability, could be strengthened by facilitating measures to institutionalize and capitalize on the acquired knowledge e.g. train-the-trainers and facilitating development of training plans. During implementation, METAC could contribute to strengthening country ownership of METAC assistance by intensifying its awareness raising and communication with beneficiaries beyond the focal persons and inform them not only on the upcoming missions and respective terms of reference, but also on the approved plans and respective changes, as well as other relevant activities.

8 Overall assessment and recommendations

8.1 Overall assessment

The overall performance of the METAC program during the third phase is assessed using the weighting system presented in Annex 2. Based on METAC performance in respect to individual evaluation criteria, the overall performance can be assessed as fairly good (see Table 8.1). METAC's performance is assessed higher in respect to its relevance, efficiency and impact of achieved results. The assessment points to more opportunities for improvement in respect to METAC effectiveness and sustainability.

Table 8.1 Overall assessment of METAC performance

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Sub scores	Weights criteria	Scores
Relevance				
Coherence and adequacy of the program design and implementation approaches	40%	3	30%	3
Relevance of the METAC objectives and implementation strategy to the national reform agenda and emerging needs	40%	3		
Complementarity & coordination with other initiatives	20%	3		
Efficiency				
Process & implementation	40%	3	20%	3
Use of resources	40%	3		
Monitoring and reporting	20%	3		
Effectiveness				
Actual achievements against plans	40%	2	25%	2.6
Likelihood of achieving expected outcomes	60%	3		
Impact				
Likelihood of the expected impact	40%	3	10%	3.6
Relative contribution of METAC	60%	4		
Sustainability				
Country ownership of the delivered TA & institutionalization of the built capacity	50%	3	15%	2.7
Promoting use of regional expertise	20%	3		
Mitigation of (external) factors affecting sustainability	30%	2		
Overall performance	100%		100%	2.9

8.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The Fund should develop medium-term strategies for its overall CD assistance to individual recipient countries informed by a systematic assessment of capacity gaps and needs (Lead: IMF HQ)

- The use of Capability Assessments can inform a longer-term comprehensive and well-sequenced Fund-wide approach to CD in a particular country, sector or institution.
- Development of medium-term CD strategies on the basis of capability assessments will safeguard the relevance and impact of the CD assistance (including through METAC), and will

encourage the maintenance of a focus on strategic support as opposed to responding to urgent needs. The current RSN offers a good basis for advancing the country strategies if the Fund CD assistance will address the gaps identified in capacity assessments and will clearly emphasize what the contribution of various channels for Fund TA and training is expected to be in the achievement of the set objectives.

- The strategy should be accompanied by a high level RBM framework which clearly sets the objectives and expected results. The RBM which is currently being developed by the Fund can serve this purpose if clearly linked to the strategy. METAC strategic framework and RBM framework should directly emanate from the high level RBM framework and be directly linked to it.
- To confirm their mutual longer-term commitment, the Fund and the respective recipient countries could endorse the CD strategy. The country strategies could be also shared with the development partners providing CD assistance to the respective countries.

Recommendation 2: METAC's assistance (as an integral part of the IMF's TA) should be better embedded in the overall package of assistance of development partners who support CD in the recipient countries (Lead: METAC)

- In the absence of a functioning platform for in-country donor coordination, stronger in-country coordination of all capacity development assistance could be achieved by moving from ad-hoc to systematic in-country coordination. Based on the experience and lessons learnt from the previous evaluations of the RTACs, ICD could include some guidelines and procedures for systematic coordination in the general RTACs guidelines.
- In the countries where there is a functioning platform for donor coordination, this should serve as a basis for coordination of METAC with other TA providers. In countries where such a platform does not exist, METAC should identify the major relevant TA providers and establish individual contacts.
- Given the various degree of (de)centralization of the operation of other development partners, ICD could produce a list of focal points and contacts of the other major TA providers at the HQ and/or their regional representation. METAC could use this list for sharing of information and coordinating its activities in the recipient countries.
- METAC should become more proactive in exchanging information with the IMF Resident Representative Offices in the recipient countries. The RROs should play a stronger role in facilitating the coordination of Fund assistance (incl. METAC) with other TA providers, as well as promoting METAC.
- METAC should encourage the recipient countries to nominate a single focal person responsible for dealing with METAC, representing the interests of and ensuring coordination among main national counterparts. Ideally this representative will be the member of the Steering Committee.

Recommendation 3: The Fund should continue to strengthen the coordination and synergies between TA and training provided through METAC and other Fund channels (Lead: IMF HQ).

- The functional departments could identify a set of training courses provided by dedicated institutions (e.g. the Regional Training Center) which need to be followed by potential beneficiaries of METAC assistance prior to receiving more specific hands-on TA and specialized training from METAC.
- Enhancing the added-value of METAC for other Fund actors could be achieved by fostering a stronger systematic coordination and exchange of information, and making more use of joint missions. The common high level RBM framework can be the main trigger for this.
- Based on the experience and lessons learned from the recent evaluations of other RTACs, TTF and RTCs, and taking into account the recent changes in the Fund strategy for TA, ICD should update the guidance for RTACs and make them more clear, inclusive and consistent in respect to the coordination between TA and training.

- The Fund should institutionalize the retreats of RTAC coordinators and regional advisors and timely plan for this in the budget.

Recommendation 4: Reinforce METAC's TA approach for engagement in fragile states (Lead: IMF HQ).

- METAC operation is influenced by a number of challenges specific to the region which influence the effectiveness of a traditional TA approach. As METAC assistance is provided to large extent to "fragile" states, the Fund may consider to develop a specific TA strategy for fragile states, or set some general guidelines on provision of TA in fragile states.
- For METAC, this may imply focusing more on what can be achieved, as opposed to what needs to be done and setting less ambitious objectives in some countries. While keeping the longer timeframes and vision in mind, the focus should be on short term incremental steps which build the ground for longer-term results.

Recommendation 5: The results-based orientation of the METAC assistance needs to be strengthened (Lead: METAC).

- METAC should make further efforts to improve the quality of its strategic logical framework, particularly in defining clear and measurable performance indicators and targets, in order to facilitate a better monitoring of the implementation.
- METAC should shift the focus of its monitoring and reporting from input-output to assessment of the likelihood of achieving expected results. More emphasis should be put on what benefits did the recipient country receive from METAC assistance and how did it contribute to strengthening the capacity of the institutions.

Recommendation 6: METAC should consider institutionalizing a dedicated Risk Management Framework for the design of its assistance and monitoring implementation (Lead: METAC).

- For the immediate outcomes of CD interventions to have an impact, they need to bring about behavioral changes and create value for the organization, sector or country as a whole. This can be only achieved if the TA and training is recognized as an indispensable, but not sufficient, part of the more complex CD process which needs to take into account the enabling factors of the change process i.e. socio-political environment, organizational effectiveness and capability to embrace changes. The enabling factors of the change process are determinant for the scope and modality of support and need to be systematically managed in order to allow a proper and timely response.
- Depending on identified risks and the ability to mitigate them, METAC could consider alternative scenarios when developing work plans.
- METAC needs to monitor risks and challenges systematically. Succinct information on main changes and implications for the implementation of the METAC activities should be included in the quarterly and annual reports.

Recommendation 7: METAC should increase the usability of its website as a platform for sharing knowledge and information, accountability and transparency of its operations (Lead: METAC).

- METAC could monitor the use of the website, the profile of the users and the information searched in order to adapt the available information to the needs of the users.
- METAC could consider ways of notifying the users, or at least the key stakeholders, when information is uploaded on the website. Ideally this should not imply additional burden to METAC; the website should make it possible to send automatic notifications.
- METAC could consider setting up a blog or forum for sharing METAC-related experience in the region.

- METAC should reinvigorate the scope and use of the password-protected and restricted areas of its website for sharing information with the members of the Steering Committee and other major stakeholders.
- METAC could use the website as a basis for more consultation and engagement with the Steering Committee in between the yearly SC meetings e.g. through a website forum or blog. This is particularly important for giving the SC members the opportunity to brainstorm on strategic TA needs and METAC approach and provide comments on preliminary work plans at an early stage so that their comments could be incorporated in the final versions which are presented at the SC meeting in May.

Recommendation 8: The Fund should consider developing a unified conceptual framework for the evaluation of RTACs (Lead: IMF HQ).

- A unified approach to RTACs' evaluations will increase the effectiveness and added value of the evaluations by ensuring a consistent approach for the evaluation of METAC over time which facilitates learning from the past as well as from the experience of other RTACs. A unified approach will lead also to efficiency savings when a standard Terms of Reference, methodology and stakeholders' survey for each individual evaluation, which capitalizes on the general knowledge of the overall RTAC governance and operation, will be developed. A common rating system could be applied. In order to safeguard the independence of such evaluations, the development of the methodological approach and the conduct of the evaluation could be done by external independent parties. Another consideration could be given to the scope of the evaluation of RTACs. Given the governance and implementation arrangements of the Fund's TA of which METAC forms part, the evaluation of METAC efficiency and effectiveness could be a self-evaluation. It may be more valuable to have an external evaluation of the relevance, impact and sustainability of METAC in a broader and higher-level IMF CD context. Such an approach will facilitate the results orientation and contribute to increased accountability. The unified conceptual approach could provide the Fund and evaluators with the flexibility to add specific evaluation questions.

Annexes

Annex 1. Evaluation questions

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Evaluation Questions and indicative sub-questions
Relevance	EQ 1: To what extent have the METAC TA and training activities been relevant?
Coherence and adequacy of the program design and implementation approaches	1.1. Is the underlying strategic logical framework (log frame) used in the METAC Program coherent and adequate? 1.2. To what extent are METAC's approach and intervention modalities responsive to the different contexts and capacities of the different countries?
Relevance of the METAC objectives and implementation strategy to the national reform agenda and emerging needs	1.3. Is METAC meeting the priority needs of member countries and is TA aligned with national reform priorities? 1.4. What were the challenges posed by the Arab Spring (e.g., authorities' commitment to reforms, rapid turnover of economics managers, etc.), and how has METAC reacted to these (in terms of engaging with new authorities, identifying new issues, etc.)? 1.5. Does METAC have the capacity to react to a spike in demand from a country once stability returns?
Complementarity & coordination with other initiatives	1.6. How does METAC TA complement TA provided by other donors or by other IMF TA programs (e.g., TTFs)? 1.7. How has METAC worked to leverage its assistance with other TA provided by the IMF and other donors?
Efficiency	EQ 2: Were the resources converted to achieved desired outcomes in an efficient way?
Process & implementation	2.1. Are METAC activities delivered efficiently in terms of process and implementation (e.g., timeliness in executing the work plan)?
Use of resources	2.2. Are METAC activities delivered efficiently in terms of use of the following resources (i.e., cost efficient): • Human resources and expertise; • Financial resources; • Time?
Monitoring and reporting	2.3. Are METAC activities delivered efficiently in terms of monitoring and reporting? 2.4. To what extent does the implementation of the new RBM tool contribute to improving efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring and reporting? 2.5. How responsive is METAC in adapting its strategies and approach to changes in the risk levels and to maximize its overall effectiveness and impact?
Effectiveness	EQ 3: To what extent are the objectives identified in the Program Document being achieved?
Actual achievements against plans	3.1. Is METAC TA captured sufficiently and measured accurately by the results framework? 3.2. To what extent have METAC TA and training led to tangible results? 3.3. What are the obstacles/challenges to achieving/not achieving objectives in implemented projects? 3.4. How is the Center helping to integrate TA and training?
Likelihood of achieving expected (intermediate) outcomes	3.5. To what extent are the achieved outputs likely to lead to the expected results and outcomes? 3.6. What is the quality of TA delivered and what factors add value to it?
Impact	EQ 4: Are the achieved outcomes likely to have an impact?
Likelihood of the expected	4.1. What are the main changes in the relevant development indicators in the

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Evaluation Questions and indicative sub-questions
impact	recipient countries? 4.2. What are the potential factors determining the changes in development indicators and ultimately METAC's intended and unintended results (e.g., positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in basic policy environment, general economic and financial conditions, etc.)?
Relative contribution of METAC	4.3. To what extent can any identified success in progress be clearly attributed to the work of METAC? • What difference did the METAC TA and training bring to the beneficiary countries? • Could the achievements have been realized without METAC interventions? • What is the specific comparative advantage and added value of the METAC TA and training?
Sustainability	EQ 5: Are the achieved outcomes likely to be sustained?
Country ownership of the delivered TA & institutionalization of the built capacity	5.1. Is the SC effective in ensuring strong country ownership of METAC activities? 5.2. How have beneficiaries incorporated lessons learnt from METAC TA into their daily operations?
Promoting use of regional expertise	5.3. What contribution has METAC made to building a robust network of local experts in the region, and to systematically identify and optimize the use of local and regional expertise? 5.4. Does communication and knowledge sharing contribute improving METAC performance and sustainability?
Mitigation of (external) factors affecting sustainability	5.5. What factors affect sustainability of TA and training delivered? How are these factors (e.g., absorptive capacity of beneficiary countries) incorporated into the planning of the METAC work programs? 5.6. What has been done to address these challenges and mitigate risks?

Annex 2. The weighting system for the assessment of overall performance

Evaluation Criteria and Sub-Criteria	Weights sub-criteria	Weights criteria
Relevance		
Coherence and adequacy of the program design and implementation approaches	40%	30%
Relevance of the METAC objectives and implementation strategy to the national reform agenda and emerging needs	40%	
Complementarity & coordination with other initiatives	20%	
Efficiency		
Process & implementation	40%	20%
Use of resources	40%	
Monitoring and reporting	20%	
Effectiveness		
Actual achievements against plans	40%	25%
Likelihood of achieving excepted outcomes	60%	
Impact		
Likelihood of the expected impact	40%	10%
Relative contribution of METAC	60%	
Sustainability		
Country ownership of the delivered TA & institutionalization of the built capacity	50%	15%
Promoting use of regional expertise	20%	
Mitigation of (external) factors affecting sustainability	30%	
Overall performance		100%

Annex 3. Evaluation rating system

Evaluation criteria	Ratings
Relevance	4 – Relevant; 3 - Moderately relevant; 2 - Moderately irrelevant; 1 - Not relevant.
Efficiency	4 - Satisfactory (no shortcomings); 3 - Moderately satisfactory (moderate shortcomings); 2 - Moderately unsatisfactory (significant shortcomings); 1 - Unsatisfactory (major shortcomings).
Effectiveness	4 - Satisfactory (no shortcomings); 3 - Moderately satisfactory (moderate shortcomings); 2 - Moderately unsatisfactory (significant shortcomings); 1 - Unsatisfactory (major shortcomings).
Impact	4 - Likely (negligible risks); 3 - Moderately Likely (moderate risks); 2 - Moderately Unlikely (significant risks); 1 - Unlikely (severe risks).
Sustainability	4 - Likely (negligible risks); 3 - Moderately Likely (moderate risks); 2 - Moderately Unlikely (significant risks); 1 - Unlikely (severe risks).

Annex 4. Status of recommendations of the 2009 Mid Term Evaluation

Nr	Recommendation from Independent External Evaluation 2009 ⁴¹	METAC response to recommendation ⁴²	Follow-up measures and current status
1.	The Phase III proposal should include a clear statement of METAC's objectives with defined performance indicators and an articulation of the linkages between METAC's activities and these objectives, and the key assumptions that these require. A more results-focused reporting system should be developed as part of this process which should include an assessment of the role that the Technical Assistance Information Management System (TAIMS) should play in monitoring and evaluation of performance.	The program document for Phase III sets out verifiable indicators in each of the areas of METAC's activities. These objectives are linked directly to activities in each of the countries that METAC serves. A results-based reporting system will help in assessing performance and in measuring results. METAC's annual workplan will be linked to the objectives and METAC will report on them at each SC meeting. Following recent improvements, TAIMS will play a more important role in monitoring and evaluating performance.	With the development of the RBM framework METAC has made a step forward in strengthening its result orientation. The RBM framework is however still at its infancy. On the design side, the interlinkages between objectives, results and activities need to be strengthened and verifiable indicators should be defined on a SMART basis. On the implementation side, reporting remains to a large extent activity/input based. A result-based reporting system has not been implemented yet and the developed RBM framework is not used for monitoring performance. The evaluators could not find any evidence on the active use of TAIMS for monitoring and evaluating performance.
2.	The preparation of the Phase III project should also address issues about improving the performance of METAC TA through more focus on support to implementation and to regional networking and information sharing and communication, including making an assessment of the costs and organizational requirements involved in strengthening this role.	The Phase III program document's regional focus has been strengthened through regional networking, including through the establishment of regional organizations that would promote information sharing and problem solving. Regional workshops/seminars will continue to be held on issues that are common to the region and METAC's website, which was revamped, will report on the main findings of these workshops. As for implementation, METAC will focus more on following up on its recommendations, although implementation remains ultimately in the hands of the beneficiary countries.	The Program Document is not explicit on its approach for strengthening regional networking and information sharing. METAC routinely reports on its outreach activities and regional workshops and other events. METAC staff report to rely heavily on regional experts. A commonly accepted "default" practice is to employ regional experts. Given the lack of information on regional experts employed in phase II it is not possible to provide a quantitative comparison with phase II. The data for phase III shows a mixed picture on the use of regional experts. Overall the use of regional experts did not increase.
3.	Financial reporting should cover the total cost of METAC's TA delivery and include explicit performance	Costing of METAC activities will be changed from standard to actual costs, and financial reporting will	Costing of METAC activities has changed from standard to actual costs. Financial reporting on METAC has

⁴¹ METAC Independent External Evaluation 2009.

⁴² METAC Program Document 2009.

Nr	Recommendation from Independent External Evaluation 2009 ⁴¹	METAC response to recommendation ⁴²	Follow-up measures and current status
	indicators, rather than being restricted to reporting on the use of donor resources, as it is understood should be possible with the new Selected Fund Activities (SFA) reporting system.	become more detailed under the IMF's new financing instrument, the SFA.	become more accurate and detailed (mainly through the narrative and footnotes). It does not however cover all Fund costs and in-kind contributions are not reported on in fully a transparent manner. This still makes an accurate assessment of cost-effectiveness of METAC assistance difficult.
4.	The increased focus on regional networking should be developed as part of the process of preparing and implementing information and training strategies, as should the more effective use of METAC's website for information sharing purposes. One route for increasing METAC's profile would be to hold events linked to Steering Committee meetings on issues of topical importance.	Please see the response to recommendation 2 regarding the administrative changes on regional networking. On the substantive focus for regional networking METAC's website has been upgraded and will include relevant documents produced by the IMF and METAC as well as others which would be useful for regional information sharing and networking. Regarding events on issues of topical importance, this has been practiced by METAC but linking these events to the SC meetings would be meaningful only when there is a large overlap between participants of the event and SC members. Increasing METAC's profile could be enhanced by issuing a press release on the outcome of the meeting as done for the SC meeting in May 2009 and in holding press conferences to highlight the work of METAC and its contribution to the region. Moreover, regional networking will more actively involve countries from the Gulf Cooperation Council and North Africa to enhance knowledge transfer in a wider regional context.	METAC has increasingly used its website to share information on the conducted workshops and the respective materials. Despite these improvements, the website could be further optimized. It is questionable whether holding events linked to Steering Committee meetings on issues of topical importance will facilitate the increase of METAC's profile. The Steering Committee has a specific mandate and representation which may not necessarily match the scope of other knowledge sharing events.
5.	To support this increased focus on information and training (and under the assumption that its level of activities will increase), METAC should consider strengthening its capacity for training coordination and management. This could be done in one of the following ways:	This recommendation needs further discussion. While strengthening the administration of training might be useful, the implementation of this recommendation would be expensive and may be too ambitious given the current training agenda. If donors were willing to provide funds in addition to the budget proposed in this	The rationale of this recommendation is unclear. METAC staff did not express any concerns about the existing capacity for training coordination and management. The evaluators found no evidence which points to the need for strengthening training coordination and management. More than that, as training is not the

Nr	Recommendation from Independent External Evaluation 2009 ⁴¹	METAC response to recommendation ⁴²	Follow-up measures and current status
	(a) Short-term hiring of a Training Coordination consultant to establish best practice training administration systems and processes and train the current Administrators on their use; (b) A new permanent Training Coordinator recruitment, probably on a part-time basis, the candidate possessing existing levels of required skills and experience; or (c) training and development of one or both Administrators in Training Coordination.	document, action on this recommendation could be reassessed.	core business of METAC the necessary investments may not necessarily justify the benefits.
6.	The initiative to develop an Office Procedures Manual should be built on by strengthening process management throughout METAC's operations to ensure consistency and provide a stronger basis for performance measurement. This should be driven by the development of a broader set of performance measures as part of the results framework.	A broader set of performance has been developed and included in METAC's program document for Phase III.	During the third phase a Management Field Manual was developed. By clarifying the rules and procedures of METAC operations, the Field Manual enables strengthening of the process management. The Manual does not touch upon performance monitoring and measurement. The RBM framework is a first attempt to set performance indicators but these are not defined in a SMART way. The RBM framework is not yet used to monitor performance. Performance monitoring is predominantly activity- and output-based.
7.	The Steering Committee needs to play a more effective role in representing all beneficiary organizations. There are a number of ways this could be done that could be considered including the appointment of an alternate Steering Committee member representing other organizations, or the development of a set of subcommittees or networks of beneficiary organizations in each technical area to inform decision making. It is also desirable for proposed Work Plans and Minutes to be distributed to designated authority and counterparts in each beneficiary organization ahead of and following SC meetings. It is probably feasible to continue having a	This is being addressed. The next SC will discuss the appointment of an alternate SC member from the next most important organization that METAC is dealing with in beneficiary countries. METAC will continue to encourage the SC members of beneficiary countries to strengthen their discussion with beneficiary agencies in each technical area in their country. The proposed work plans and minutes are already being distributed before and after the SC meetings to the SC members who are the focal contact points in their respective countries, who are responsible to distribute them to all counterparts in each beneficiary organizations. Communicating with the	This was discussed in the SC meeting FY2010 and it was agreed that each country was allowed to decide if they wish to appoint an alternate SC member. Starting with 2010 all beneficiary countries are represented in the Steering Committee. As not all beneficiary organizations are represented in the SC, communication and coordination among various beneficiary organizations within the beneficiary countries remains to be challenging. Given the poor coordination within the countries, dissemination of the METAC related information to the focal person only seems to be insufficient. Moreover, in many countries there is not a

Nr	Recommendation from Independent External Evaluation 2009 ⁴¹	METAC response to recommendation ⁴²	Follow-up measures and current status
	single annual Steering Committee meeting but this will need to be supplemented by better communication through the website and where necessary other forms of communication such as telephone conferencing and ad hoc meetings if there are major decisions to be made.	SC members is being done but will be enhanced in the future.	single focal person, but rather focal persons for each area of METAC assistance.

Annex 5. METAC Financial Status (US\$)

	Year Signed	Pledges	Contributions Received	Balance
Phase III - Signed Agreements		18,371,257	\$13,684,440	4,686,817
A. Under multi-donor SFA		17,792,705	13,105,888	4,686,817
European Commission	2009	1,849,005	1,647,000	202,005
Libya	2010	1,500,000	900,000	600,000
Syria	2010	500,000	100,000	400,000
Kuwait	2010	250,000	250,000	
Egypt	2010	1,000,000	600,000	400,000
Jordan	2010	500,000	400,000	100,000
Sudan	2010	500,000		500,000
Lebanon ⁴³	2011	5,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000
France	2011	2,459,664	1,974,852	484,812
Oman	2011	500,000	500,000	
Germany-GIZ	2012	2,434,036	2,434,036	
USAID	2013	1,300,000	1,300,000	
B. Under FAA		578,552	578,552	
European Investment Bank	2008	578,552	578,552	
Phase III - Pending Pledges		890,000		890,000
Syria	Sent 2011	250,000		250,000
Yemen	Sent 2010	500,000		500,000
Jordan (2nd LOU)	n/a	140,000		140,000
GRAND TOTAL		19,261,257	13,684,440	5,576,817

Source: ICD Global Partnership Division.

⁴³ Lebanon contributes \$1.5 million in-kind for hosting the Center, in addition to its contribution to TA, and has disbursed US\$ 0.9 million thereof as of April 2014.

Annex 6. Actual costs per person-week by type of modality/activity (US\$)

	2011	2012	2013	2014
LTX unit costs	5,525	10,531	7,384	8,742
Public Finance Management (FAD)	9,848	11,198	7,012	6,336
Revenue Administration (FAD)	2,109	5,325	5,815	7,134
Banking Supervision (MCM)	8,283	14,986	6,827	19,813
Public Debt Management (MCM)	1,847	12,436	17,778	-
Statistics (STA)	7,390	13,810	8,181	10,596
STX unit costs	10,013	9,446	7,354	10,064
FAD	9,285	11,199	9,171	10,858
MCM	5,998	7,085	4,371	6,706
STA	12,392	7,267	8,899	11,876
Backstopping of LTX unit costs				
Public Finance Management (FAD)	2,574	1,866	374	241
Revenue Administration (FAD)	426	580	208	762
Banking Supervision (MCM)	254	546	280	1,614
Public Debt Management (MCM)	290	333	412	- ⁴⁴
Real Sector Statistics (STA)	111	337	162	451
Backstopping of STX unit costs				
FAD	95	125	83	-
MCM	184	65	-	862
STA	815	1,256	700	2,467
Project management unit costs				
FAD	147	117	21	103
MCM	206	243	244	798
STA	484	232	144	396
STX/LTX unit costs ratios				
FAD	78%	68%	71%	81%
MCM	59%	26%	18%	34%
STA	168%	53%	109%	112%
STX/LTX backstopping unit cost ratios				
FAD	3%	5%	14%	0%
MCM	34%	7%	0%	-
STA	733%	373%	432%	547%

Source: Authors calculations based on information on person-weeks from annual reports and actual expenditures from METAC.

⁴⁴ While no TA was delivered in this area in 2014 the financial report on METAC expenses includes backstopping expenses in this area.

Annex 7. Illustration of possible METAC performance indicators and achievements

Country/area	Possible indicator sand achievements
Afghanistan	
Banking	Achievements: • New prudential regulations were drafted and the enforcement manual was reviewed and enhanced; • Development of a quick performance self-assessment with Based Core Principles for effective banking supervision in order to develop a medium-term action plan for strengthening banking supervision; • The development of a medium-term action plan for strengthening banking supervision that outlines the main objectives and milestones to be achieved in five years.
Statistics	Indicators: • Production of an improved consumer price index (CPI); • Production of IIP statistics. Achievements: • Release of the extended and updated CPI; • The IMF has published BOP data for Afghanistan for the first time ever, in March 2013; • For the first time, DAB submitted an IIP statement to the IMF for publication.
PFM	Indicator: • Improving the spreadsheet for cash forecasting including by moving from monthly to daily forecasting, and increasing the proportion of national staff in relation to international consultants. Achievements: • Development of new processes and procedures to introduce, on a pilot basis, financial planning; • Progress achieved with the CMU and establishment of a template for cash flow forecast submissions and a template for presenting three month forecast.
Revenue administration	Achievements: • Development of comprehensive IT strategy and partial automation of tax operations.
Debt management	Achievements: • Establishment of a roadmap to move ahead expeditiously with the issuance of Islamic securities (Sukuk).
Egypt	
Banking	No or limited progress.
Statistics	Indicator: • Conduct a FDI Survey for Egypt. Achievements: • A pilot survey conducted by the General Authority for Investment (GAFI) on a limited sample of companies, from its financial statements database. Work in progress.
PFM	Indicator: • Selecting a new GFMIS, and reducing the number of accounting units within the Central Finance Offices (CFO)'s network (the objective is to reduce the number of accounts from more than 40,000 to some 4,000).

Country/area	Possible indicator sand achievements
	Achievements: A comprehensive review of the budget execution function, highlighted key issues constituting pre-requisites required to have a functioning CMU and recommended a number of actions to address those issues. Expected results in the area of cash management not achieved; additional efforts on the commitment preventive controls is needed as a pre-requisite to have a reliable cash plans from line agencies.
Revenue administration	Indicator: Enacting a modified Sales Tax (VAT) law.
Debt management	No or limited progress.
Iraq	
Banking	Indicators: - Higher level of compliance with IAS through the development of new financial statements. Achievements: - Enactment of prudential regulations; - No (little) has been done on IAS.
Statistics	Achievements: The Central Bank of Iraq (CBI) started compiling and publishing quarterly balance of payments statistics. The CBI started to report quarterly balance of payments and Annual IIP statistics based on BPM6 methodology.
PFM	No or limited progress.
Revenue administration	No or limited progress.
Debt management	No or limited progress.
Jordan	
Banking	Achievements: Establishment of a manual for licensing private credit bureaus.
Statistics	No or limited progress.
PFM	Indicator: - Integrating the amount of donors' funds into the TSA based on information provided by the central bank, and reducing payment arrears based on monthly accounting data. Achievements: - Improvement of capital expenditures management by specifying the role and function of the new Expenditure Policy Analysis Division; - Establishment of an expenditure analysis unit and building capacity of relevant staff; - Improvement of the CCS by limiting the budget appropriations to be released quarterly based on the treasury cash position.
Revenue administration	Indicators: - Setting up a modern unified tax administration with a function based HQ; - Improving taxpayers' compliance resulting in additional tax revenue collection. Achievements: - METAC provided assistance to strengthen the organizational structure and role of the central tax compliance division and the corresponding compliance units in tax offices; - Development of a comprehensive collection enforcement strategy for effective processing of tax collection and arrears.

Country/area	Possible indicator sand achievements
	The ISTD has enjoyed some success in tackling serious cases of VAT refund fraud.
Debt management	No or limited progress.
Lebanon	
Banking	Achievements: - Major progress achieved in establishing a risk-based approach, including a manual, for the supervision of Non-Bank Financial Institutions (NBFIs); - The completion of a new risk-based supervisory manual for examining NBFIs. The manual was well received by the authorities.
Statistics	Indicator: - Production of IIP statistics. Achievements: - For the first time, the BDL launched a DI survey for the financial sector; - Preparation and the review of a preliminary IIP statement for Lebanon still work in progress.
PFM	Indicators: - Improvement in cash management; - Increasing the amount of funds channeled through the TSA; - Budget execution more consistent with the initial budget. Achievements: - Improvement of budget classification and chart of accounts in line with GFSM2001 and COFOG; - Preparation of an action plan for PFM reform over the period 2012-2015; - METAC conducted a review of the structure, organization and output of the newly established Macro-Fiscal Department and provided training; - METAC conducted a review of the organization and output of the Cash Management Department (CMD) and analyzed ways to move towards a fully-fledged Treasury Single Account (TSA); assisted the CMD to develop further cash plans and forecasts; and proposed improvements to internal coordination and policy integration.
Revenue administration	Indicators: - Setting up a modern unified tax administration with a function based HQ; - Improving taxpayers' compliance resulting in additional tax revenue collection. Achievements: - Development of an action plan to integrate VAT and income tax departments and positive progress achieved in the integration process of Income Tax and VAT departments; - Development of a comprehensive collection enforcement strategy for effective processing of tax collection and arrears; - Central Risk Management Unit (CRMU) established at customs; - Good progress made by the VAT Directorate in strengthening refund management, and cooperation with Customs to prevent refund fraud has commenced.
Debt management	No or limited progress.
Libya	
Banking	Indicator: Higher level of compliance with IAS through the development of new financial statements.

Country/area	Possible indicator sand achievements
	Achievements: • Full implementation of inspection manuals by on-site examiners; • No (little) done on IAS.
Statistics	• Release of the first Producer Price Index.
PFM	No or limited progress.
Revenue administration	No or limited progress.
Debt management	No or limited progress.
Sudan	
Banking	Indicators: • Effective credit risk monitoring through the development of a new credit registry system; • Better enhancement of banks' safety and soundness by improving the risk-sensitivity of regulatory capital requirements; • Strengthened on-site supervision through the development of Risk Based inspection manual. Achievements: • Major progress achieved in the credit registry enhancement e.g. improved the existing credit registries, supported strengthening the function of the credit registry at the Central Bank of Sudan (CBOS) and in expanding and upgrading its credit registry; • Substantial progress has been achieved in expanding and upgrading CBOS credit registry and this project is close to completion; • New draft regulations on liquidity measurement and liquidity risk management developed; • A new manual for assisting onsite supervisors; • METAC continued discussing with the CBOS ways to enhance its onsite inspection process including through introducing a new risk-based approach and manual.
Statistics	Indicators: • Production of a PPI; • Production of IIP statistics; • Conduct a FDI survey for the banking sector and for the private sector. Achievements: • First publication of a full IIP statement. The CBSS released its first PPI in January 2013; • Compilation of a quarterly PPI for the industry sector; • Follow up on the implementation of a DI survey. Work in progress.
PFM	Indicator: • Increasing the amount of funds channeled through the TSA; and a budget execution more consistent with the initial budget. Achievements: • Preparation of an action plan for presenting general government data in a consolidated manner. The objective of this consolidation is to evaluate the total revenues and expenditures of the Republic of the Sudan starting from the fiscal year 2012 by eliminating positions and flows between different levels of government; • A detailed action plan for the implementation of the TSA, and guidance and hands-on training to enhance the implementation of cash planning; • Assistance in implementing the main necessary measures to adopt the functional classification compliant with the COFOG, and consolidate the final accounts.

Country/area	Possible indicator sand achievements
Revenue administration	Indicators: - Implementing automated systems for integrated tax administration; - Improving taxpayers' compliance resulting in additional tax revenue collection. Achievements: - Development of comprehensive IT strategy and partial automation of tax operations; - Central Taxpayer register moved from customs to the Taxation Chamber. Similarly, commendable progress achieved in cleansing and firming-up the taxpayer database; - Development of a draft TPC to streamline and harmonize tax procedures across all tax types; - Central taxpayer register moved from customs to the TC. Similarly, commendable progress achieved in cleansing and firming-up the taxpayer database; - Outstanding issues have been resolved with the draft TPC, and the Minister is to appoint a Tax Reform Committee which will consider the proposed new law; - Developed a risk based audit methodology and techniques and to build capacity in developing compliance programs.
Debt management	Achievements: Delivered a prioritized and sequenced action plan for the development of an interbank market.
Syria	
Banking	No or limited progress.
Statistics	No or limited progress.
PFM	Indicators: - Reorganizing gradually the budget department to ensure integration of current and capital expenditure. At the budget process level, implementing new procedures for preparing the budget (issuance of budget ceilings for all agencies combining both types of expenditures) and for executing it (fiscal reporting according to a sectoral or program approach). Achievements: - Improvement of budget classification and chart of accounts in line with GFSM2001 and COFOG.
Revenue administration	Indicators: - Enacting a Tax Procedure Code; - Implementing a full self-assessment system for tax administration covering all segments of taxpayers; - Introducing VAT. Achievements: - Development of Tax Procedure Code (TPC) and Business Activity Classification (BAC); - Development of comprehensive IT strategy and partial automation of tax operations; - Assist development of plans to introduce self-assessment for large and medium-sized tax payers; - METAC organized on-site workshops to present VAT critical issues and develop an action plan covering major components of the preparatory phase.
Debt management	No or limited progress.
WBG	
Banking	Indicators: Effective credit risk monitoring through the development of a new credit registry system;

Country/area	Possible indicator sand achievements
	- Strengthened On-site supervision through the development of Risk Based inspection manual. Achievements: - Launch of credit registry and credit scoring. METAC performed an assessment of the PMA credit registry and confirmed the compliance of its data, reports and functions with international best practices; - A new risk-focused approach and a manual for supervising banks is still under development.
Statistics	Indicator: - Production of IIP statistics. Achievements: - First release of an international investment position statement in mid-2012; - Formal application for subscription to the special data dissemination standard in December 2012; - METAC apprised the authorities of the forthcoming changes in the requirements for Special Data Dissemination Standard (SDDS) subscribers and provided guidance for the compilation of the IIP on a quarterly basis.
PFM	Indicator: - Consolidating all donors funds and ensuring timeliness, coverage, and accuracy of fiscal reporting, notably issuing the final accounts to the Audit Office. Achievements: - FAD mission and review of TA options to address new cash management challenges in the context of scarcity of donor funds.
Revenue administration	Achievements: Development of comprehensive IT strategy and partial automation of tax operations.
Debt management	Achievements: Fulfilled the basic prerequisites for the successful issuance of the government securities, including establishing suitable rules and procedures and building local capacity of staff.
Yemen	
Banking	Achievements: - Full implementation of inspection manuals by on-site examiners; - Major progress achieved in establishing a prompt corrective framework for dealing with weak and problematic banks.
Statistics	Indicator: - Production of an improved CPI. Achievements: - No or limited progress.
PFM	No or limited progress.
Revenue administration	No or limited progress.
Debt management	No or limited progress.

Annex 8. TA and training survey results

1. Please indicate what is your affiliation with METAC:		
	Response Percent	Response count
Member of the Steering Committee	4.9%	7
METAC staff or expert	38.2%	55
Recipient of METAC technical assistance or training	26.4%	38
IMF staff member in headquarters	18.1%	26
Representative of an institution which provides funding to METAC	5.6%	8
Other, please specify:	12.5%	18
• TA provider; • Short term expert; • Partner United Nations Office; • The World Bank; • Former METAC staff; • Employee at the United Nations Development Programme in Sudan; • Previous METAC staff; • IMF IPSAS expert providing Technical Assistance; • IMF external expert; • IMF STE for one week; • Advisor; • Consultant; • ESCWA; • IMF staff member in Beirut; • Employee at the Ministry of Trade in Sudan); • Staff of a partner organizations (UN-ESCWA); • Former METAC Coordinator; • ESCWA.		
Responses		152

2. Please indicate what is your field of activity:		
	Response Percent	Response count
Public financial management	25.0%	36
Fiscal policy and revenue administration	18.8%	27
Banking and financial sector	23.6%	34
Macroeconomics and statistics	31.9%	46
Other, please specify:	14.6%	21
• Customs risk management; • Balance of payments statistics; • Debt management; • IPSAS (International Public Sector Accounting Standards); • In the field of Organizations and international cooperation; • Director; • TA and resource management; • Customs expert; • Assistant Officer of the Funds file; • Economic analysis and reporting; • Country Economist; • supervision and regulation; • Assistant to AFR Director; • MIS, FMIS; • Administrative assistant; • Technical Assistance Officer/Assistant Project Manager; • Trust fund management; donor relations; • Resource management; • Energy, PPPs and fiscal reform; • Coordinator.		
Responses		164

3. How would you rate the relevance of the METAC technical assistance and training to the IMF activities in the recipient country and to the overall national reform agenda?					
Irrelevant	Moderately irrelevant	Moderately relevant	Relevant	No opinion	Response count
0.0%	1.4%	7.8%	84.5%	6.3%	142

4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The METAC assistance is relevant to the national reform agenda and emerging needs.	26.2%	62.3%	1.6%	0.0%	9.8%	61
The recipient country is extensively consulted in determining the scope and form of the METAC support.	24.6%	54.1%	3.3%	1.6%	16.4%	61
METAC played a major role in supporting the recipient countries to define their TA priorities and needs.	21.3%	52.5%	9.8%	1.6%	14.8%	61
METAC support is demand driven and flexible in responding to emerging needs of the recipient countries.	26.2%	62.3%	3.3%	0.0%	8.2%	61
<i>Target groups: recipients of METAC assistance, other TA providers and "others".</i>						

5. The responsiveness of METAC support to the changing environment and emerging needs in the recipient countries is influenced by the following factors:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
Insufficient human resources.	11.9%	35.8%	19.3%	6.4%	26.6%	109
Insufficient financial resources.	13.8%	38.5%	17.4%	4.6%	25.7%	109
Limited country ownership and commitment.	6.4%	47.7%	28.4%	2.8%	14.7%	109
Unstable political situation and security in the recipient countries.	32.1%	45.9%	8.3%	2.8%	11.0%	109
Deficient consultation and dialogue between METAC and recipient countries.	2.8%	16.5%	37.6%	16.5%	26.6%	109
<i>Target groups: IMF staff, METAC staff and experts and recipients of METAC assistance.</i>						

Comments:

- I don't think these questions are clear. Is it insufficient human or financial resources in the country concerned - or in METAC? I assume the former. And does it matter whether the response is negative or positive?
- In some countries in the M-East the situation is fluid with civil unrest;
- Some special training which was very productive in the past like hands on training, should be taken in account again. This kind of training will be very useful to learn from other countries and participants will see practically whatever other countries are doing and will never be forgotten;
- The first two questions do not specify whose resources. It is probable that insufficient human resources on the country side limit effectiveness. But not on the METAC side;
- There is great demand for assistance to improve real sector statistics (national accounts and price statistics) and a real sector statistics advisor is needed to more fully meet this demand;
- It is highly importance to keep clause to recipient countries to assure whether they implement technical advises, for more benefits;
- METAC has not had sufficiently committed staff from the IMF Stat to carry out its work. Those who were appointed to METAC were spent forces from the STAT who were just counting their retirement deadline. The only outstanding employee it ever had was Sabir al Harbi from Oman who is now Director General of GCC Stat;

- METAC is appropriately resourced, security has been a problem in delivering TA. However we feel that METAC do an excellent job overall very proactive.

6. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
METAC is closely linked and complementing the IMF's surveillance work and program activities.	33.8%	47.3%	6.8%	1.4%	10.8%	74
The METAC results based framework clearly establishes the overall objectives and intended results of the METAC support.	24.3%	52.7%	4.1%	1.4%	17.6%	74
METAC support is characterized by high ownership of the recipient country.	9.5%	54.1%	13.5%	1.4%	21.6%	74
The METAC results based framework serves as an effective tool for monitoring the program implementation.	18.9%	48.6%	8.1%	1.4%	23.0%	74
<i>Target groups: IMF staff and METAC staff and experts.</i>						

7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response counts
METAC support is well coordinated with the activities of other technical assistance providers.	26.9%	44.2%	9.6%	3.8%	15.4%	52
METAC is part of the overall IMF TA package rather than a distinct channel of providing TA in the region.	38.5%	50.0%	1.9%	0.0%	9.6%	52
METAC work overlaps occasionally with the technical assistance and training of other providers.	1.9%	38.5%	28.8%	3.8%	26.9%	52
There is a good integration between METAC technical assistance and training and workshops.	23.1%	63.5%	1.9%	0.0%	11.5%	52
<i>Target groups: IMF staff, other TA providers and "others".</i>						

8. How would you rate the overall efficiency of the process and implementation of the METAC activities:					
Unsatisfactory	Moderately unsatisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Satisfactory	No opinion	Response count
2.2%	0.7%	20.0%	73.3%	3.7%	135

9. Please indicate which factors influence the efficiency of the METAC support:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
Lack or inadequate operational tools for implementation (IT, website, knowledge sharing etc.).	1.9%	21.2%	51.9%	7.7%	17.3%	52
Poor continuous monitoring of implementation risks.	1.9%	17.3%	34.6%	13.5%	32.7%	52
Ineffective and inefficient Steering Committee.	5.8%	1.9%	19.2%	17.3%	55.8%	52
Delays in implementation.	3.8%	40.4%	26.9%	11.5%	17.3%	52
Deficient implementation capacity in the recipient country.	15.4%	59.6%	11.5%	7.7%	5.8%	52
Lack of interest in the recipient country.	9.6%	28.8%	38.5%	11.5%	11.5%	52
Inefficient communication lines.	1.9%	21.2%	40.4%	11.5%	25.0%	52
Unclear roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders.	1.9%	34.6%	32.7%	9.6%	21.2%	52
Lack of managerial decisiveness on the METAC side.	1.9%	11.5%	38.5%	25.0%	23.1%	52
Lack of managerial decisiveness on the recipient country's side.	15.4%	48.1%	21.2%	3.8%	11.5%	52
Target groups: METAC staff and experts.						

Comments:

- My experience relates only to Lebanon customs, who are very reluctant to move forward with modern customs practices, and largely seem to ignore advice from METAC/IMF. This is only my impression, gained during a 2 week assignment in 2013;
- Uncommitted and uncaring METAC employees especially from IMF STAT;
- METAC staff spread too thinly in relation to number of recipient countries. This limits capacity for timely follow up with recipient countries and ability to urgent TA requests.

10. How would you rate the organization of the METAC work:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The organization and management of METAC work is efficient.	25.2%	54.8%	3.5%	0.9%	15.7%	115
METAC human resources are adequate for achieving its objectives.	14.8%	45.2%	10.4%	1.7%	27.8%	115
METAC financial resources are adequate for achieving its objectives.	7.8%	31.3%	21.7%	3.5%	35.7%	115
METAC support was mobilized and provided in a timely manner.	17.4%	56.5%	8.7%	0.9%	16.5%	115
Target groups: IMF Staff, METAC staff and experts, recipients of METAC assistance, Steering Committee.						

11. How would you rate the visibility and accessibility of information regarding the METAC activities:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The METAC website provides comprehensive information on METAC activities.	10.6%	58.8%	4.7%	0.0%	25.9%	85
The METAC website can be easily accessed and is user-friendly.	18.8%	50.6%	3.5%	0.0%	27.1%	85
There is a high visibility and awareness of METAC work.	18.8%	50.6%	3.5%	0.0%	27.1%	85
There is limited information available on METAC work.	2.4%	24.7%	40.0%	9.4%	23.5%	85
<i>Target groups: IMF Staff, recipients of METAC assistance, Steering Committee, other TA providers and "others".</i>						

12. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
METAC uses an adequate system to monitor the persisting and emerging risks affecting the effectiveness of its support.	6.9%	43.1%	3.4%	1.7%	44.8%	58
METAC uses an adequate and effective mechanism to monitor and assess METAC results and impact.	8.6%	43.1%	6.9%	1.7%	39.7%	58
METAC is very responsive in adapting its strategies and approach to emerging changes and needs in recipient countries.	15.5%	48.3%	3.4%	3.4%	29.3%	58
<i>Target groups: METAC staff and experts, and Steering Committee.</i>						

13. The Steering Committee is an effective mechanism for:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
Providing strategic guidance to the METAC work.	17.2%	27.6%	5.2%	0.0%	50.0%	58
Providing the oversight of the program implementation.	13.8%	31.0%	5.2%	0.0%	50.0%	58
Facilitating recipient country's ownership of METAC support.	12.1%	32.8%	0.0%	1.7%	53.4%	58
Facilitating cooperation among various TA providers.	10.3%	29.3%	3.4%	1.7%	55.2%	58
Facilitating accountability to the sponsoring partners.	12.1%	31.0%	1.7%	0.0%	55.2%	58
<i>Target groups: METAC staff and experts, and Steering Committee.</i>						

14. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The METAC governance model is adequate and effective.	12.1%	31.0%	1.7%	1.7%	53.4%	58
The role and responsibilities of the METAC Steering Committee is clearly defined.	13.8%	22.4%	1.7%	0.0%	62.1%	58
Members of the Steering Committee have a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities.	10.3%	20.7%	5.2%	1.7%	62.1%	58
The work of the Steering Committee is guided by a manual of rules and procedures.	8.6%	8.6%	5.2%	0.0%	77.6%	58
The Steering Committee is guided by the results-based framework in monitoring and assessment of the METAC results and impact.	8.6%	17.2%	1.7%	1.7%	70.7%	58
<i>Target groups: METAC staff and experts, and Steering Committee.</i>						

15. Please rate the usefulness of the Steering Committee (SC) meetings:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The volume of information provided for the SC meeting is adequate.	12.3%	15.8%	0.0%	1.8%	70.2%	57
The information provided for the SC meeting is user-friendly.	12.3%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	71.9%	57
Reports are of sufficient level of detail and quality.	14.0%	15.8%	1.8%	1.8%	66.7%	57
Information for the SC meeting is distributed well in advance to allow an adequate review.	15.8%	8.8%	3.5%	0.0%	71.9%	57
The frequency of SC meetings is adequate.	7.0%	17.5%	3.5%	0.0%	71.9%	57
Duration of SC meetings is adequate.	12.3%	14.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.7%	57
There is sufficient time for discussion of strategic issues.	12.3%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	71.9%	57
There is a good level of continuity of the representation in the Steering Committee meeting.	8.8%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	71.9%	57
<i>Target groups: METAC staff and experts, and Steering Committee.</i>						

16. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the METAC support?					
Unsatisfactory	Moderately unsatisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Satisfactory	No opinion	Response count
0.8%	1.5%	21.1%	72.9%	3.8%	133

17. Please indicate the degree to which METAC was successful in the recipient countries in:						
	Unsatisfactory	Moderately unsatisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Satisfactory	No opinion	Response count
Building capacity and strengthening institutions in recipient countries.	1.2%	3.7%	36.6%	51.2%	7.3%	82
Improving fiscal policy and revenue administration.	0.0%	9.8%	17.1%	26.8%	46.3%	82
Strengthening financial sectors and banking supervision.	0.0%	2.4%	23.2%	31.7%	42.7%	82
Improving the quality of macroeconomic statistics.	2.4%	6.1%	26.8%	39.0%	25.6%	82
Informing the reform agenda.	1.2%	8.5%	17.1%	31.7%	41.5%	82
Building a robust network of regional experts.	3.7%	6.1%	34.1%	29.3%	26.8%	82
<i>Target groups: IMF Staff, recipients of METAC assistance, Steering Committee, other TA providers and "others".</i>						

18. Please assess the effectiveness of the following METAC modalities of providing support:						
	Unsatisfactory	Moderately unsatisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Satisfactory	No opinion	Response count
Training and workshops organized for a specific recipient country.	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	78.1%	3.1%	32
Regional training and workshops.	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	59.4%	6.3%	32
Support of METAC regional advisors.	0.0%	3.1%	34.4%	40.6%	21.9%	32
Support of short term experts.	0.0%	6.3%	21.9%	53.1%	18.8%	32
<i>Target groups: recipients of METAC assistance.</i>						

19. Please indicate which of the following factors influence the effectiveness of METAC support:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
Poorly designed and formulated scope of the work.	4.9%	9.8%	36.1%	29.5%	19.7%	61
Insufficient understanding by the METAC experts of the country context.	4.9%	16.4%	42.6%	26.2%	9.8%	61
Inadequacy and impracticality of METAC recommendations.	0.0%	13.1%	45.9%	27.9%	13.1%	61
Inadequate modality of support.	1.6%	14.8%	44.3%	21.3%	18.0%	61
Deficiencies in the organization and management of METAC work.	1.6%	8.2%	39.3%	27.9%	23.0%	61
Insufficient financial resources for providing METAC support.	4.9%	32.8%	31.1%	9.8%	21.3%	61
<i>Target groups: IMF Staff, recipients of METAC assistance, Steering Committee</i>						

Comments

- I feel METAC could be doing a much better job of providing regular and more detailed updates and reporting on past, current, and upcoming activities;
- METAC should follow the past procedures and support some workshop and training which gathering countries expert or staff to share experiences in one place;
- The work is good and METAC has great fingerprints in our working field;
- Inadequate modality of support - unable answer because not clear whose support is referred to - authorities, HQ, experts...;
- Keeping in mind how to get on with METAC points of views, to progress work in the supported countries;
- Recipient countries: (1) political instability; (2) high staff turnover; (3) disconnect between civil servants at technical & administration levels (recipients of TA) and political decision makers (whose support is needed for implementation of TA recommendations and reforms);
- The financial resource was the issue at the beginning but has resolved recently. However, lack of fulfilment of financial resources limited the ability to execute METAC's strategy in the most effective manner.

20. Please indicate which factors influence the impact of the METAC support:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
Lack of follow-up measures to implement the METAC recommendations.	7.9%	41.7%	26.8%	7.1%	16.5%	127
Lack of commitment of the recipient country to implement METAC recommendations.	11.8%	50.4%	20.5%	4.7%	12.6%	127
Poor capacity of the recipient country to follow-up on recommendations.	10.2%	63.0%	15.0%	2.4%	9.4%	127
General situation in the recipient country (e.g. political, economic, financial).	22.0%	59.1%	6.3%	1.6%	11.0%	127
Insufficient application of accumulated knowledge by the officials in their daily activities.	7.9%	53.5%	19.7%	1.6%	17.3%	127

Comments:

- There will be a different mix of these factors in different circumstances;
- Lack of follow-up measures - again not sure whose are referred to. Possibly the countries... could be METAC own experts but I would not conclude that from the evidence;
- I refer to the area of statistics. Officials (statisticians) of the recipient countries are to a large extent motivated to implement new surveys, methods and techniques, follow-up on recommendations and apply the accumulated knowledge;
- The responses are for TA in statistical areas where country limited resources hamper the timely implementation of recommendations, especially when they require actions by non-direct counterpart. For example to improve balance of payment methodology, it requires better surveys. Survey is responsibility of other work unit/agency.

21. Please indicate which is the comparative advantage and added value of METAC support compared to other IMF support and support from other TA providers:						
Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
METAC is more effective in enhancing country ownership and accountability.	10.0%	26.7%	16.7%	0.0%	46.7%	30
METAC is better tailored to the needs of the recipient countries.	10.0%	46.7%	13.3%	0.0%	30.0%	30
METAC support is more flexible and responsive to emerging needs.	10.0%	46.7%	10.0%	0.0%	33.3%	30
METAC support can be mobilized faster and easier.	6.7%	56.7%	3.3%	0.0%	33.3%	30
METAC experts have a better understanding of the specific countries' context.	6.7%	36.7%	13.3%	0.0%	43.3%	30
METAC support is of a higher quality.	6.7%	30.0%	13.3%	0.0%	50.0%	30
METAC is better placed to effectively follow up on the impact of the provided TA and training.	3.3%	46.7%	6.7%	0.0%	43.3%	30
METAC facilitates a closer coordination with other TA providers in the region.	6.7%	40.0%	13.3%	0.0%	40.0%	30
METAC strengthens and optimizes the use regional expertise.	3.3%	50.0%	10.0%	0.0%	36.7%	30
The same progress in the area of banking supervision, PFM, revenue administration, and statistics could have been achieved without METAC support.	0.0%	13.3%	33.3%	10.0%	43.3%	30
<i>Target groups: recipients of METAC assistance</i>						

22. Please indicate which of the following factors influence the sustainability of the METAC training and technical assistance:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Weighted response
Insufficient ownership and commitment of the recipient countries to implement the METAC advice.	10.7%	47.1%	20.7%	2.5%	19.0%	121
Insufficient efforts of the recipient country in institutionalizing the developed capacity.	11.6%	61.2%	13.2%	0.8%	13.2%	121
Insufficient absorptive capacity and high turnover staff in the recipient countries.	14.0%	56.2%	14.0%	1.7%	14.0%	121
Unstable situation in the recipient country.	24.0%	49.6%	10.7%	0.8%	14.9%	121
Insufficient follow up activities to strengthen and further share the acquired knowledge and experience.	8.3%	50.4%	24.0%	3.3%	14.0%	121

Comments

- We think, METAC advisory work should take further steps to let recipient countries get fruits of works, more follow-ups;
- The fault is chiefly of the METAC staff and not so much of the recipient country's fault. It is difficult to put that in a survey like this. Would you like to conduct a one on one direct interview with me? I will be available if you are serious with this survey;
- Given the complexity of the political situation in the region, there were occurrences, when continuity of statistical development was interrupted by instability and political changes. However, I would not generalize this situation to the entire region;
- Not all countries are politically unstable and there are stable countries where the training and the support provided by METAC can be sustained.

23. Please indicate which factors could contribute to increasing the effectiveness and impact of the future METAC support:						
Choice	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
Stronger country involvement.	34.2%	52.5%	3.3%	0.0%	10.0%	120
Better alignment of METAC support to country needs.	16.7%	51.7%	18.3%	1.7%	11.7%	120
Better coordination of support with other TA providers.	19.2%	48.3%	15.8%	0.8%	15.8%	120
More adequate modalities of support.	7.5%	55.0%	13.3%	0.8%	23.3%	120
Greater use of regional experts.	15.0%	40.8%	20.8%	4.2%	19.2%	120
Better organization and management of METAC support.	4.2%	36.7%	24.2%	7.5%	27.5%	120
Increase of financial resources available for METAC support.	20.0%	48.3%	9.2%	0.8%	21.7%	120
Improved monitoring of METAC results and impact against a well-developed logical framework.	9.2%	51.7%	14.2%	2.5%	22.5%	120

Comments:

- As a donor agency representative, I could direct our assistance to support METAC priorities if I was better informed;
- Planning of TA missions much longer in advance. At present too much is organized at very short notice. Also need for METAC to exert pressure for serious, full and timely responses to pre-mission questionnaires;
- METAC has been relatively short of resources compared to other RTACs - this is reflected in my answer re financial resources. However, I think this has now been corrected;
- Imprecise understanding of some of the evaluation questions may sometimes affect some of the answers;
- METAC effectively provides high quality technical assistance to meet country needs. A real sector statistics advisor would enhance the ability of METAC to meet huge demand for assistance to improve national accounts and price statistics;
- Get committed METAC staff. That is all that is needed against all other odds;
- METAC coordinates with my organization (UN-ESCWA), and I witnessed that METAC's work is based on knowledge of needs of countries in the region. Modalities of the support have to develop continuously. By saying that I agree that "more adequate modalities of support can contribute to effectiveness and impact", it is not a criticism, just agreeing that each of us has to evolve continuously;
- On "Improved monitoring of METAC results and impact....", it is important that assessors put RBM in a correct context. The RBM is only at the beginning stage of development.

Annex 9. Training and workshops survey results

1. Please select the country where you come from:		
	Response Percent	Response count
Afghanistan	10.1%	15
Egypt	8.1%	12
Iraq	6.0%	9
Jordan	2.7%	4
Lebanon	16.8%	25
Libya	3.4%	5
Sudan	10.1%	15
Syria	0.7%	1
West Bank and Gaza	10.7%	16
Yemen	7.4%	11
Other, please specify:	24.2%	36
- Saudi Arabia	4.7%	7
- Tunisia	3.4%	5
- Algeria	2.0%	3
- France	2.0%	3
- Oman	2.0%	3
- Palestine	2.0%	3
- Bahrain	1.3%	2
- Djibouti	1.3%	2
- Kuwait	1.3%	2
- Morocco	1.3%	2
- United States	1.3%	2
- Qatar	0.7 %	1
- Not specified	0.7%	1
Total responses		149

2. Please indicate the subjects of the METAC training courses and workshops you attended:		
	Response Percent	Response count
Banking Supervision and Financial sector	22.4 %	28
Public Financial Management	26.4 %	33
Revenue Administration	13.6 %	17
Statistics	16.8 %	21
Debt management	8.0 %	10
Other, please specify:	25.6 %	32
• Stress testing, macro models, systemic risks; • Management of extractive oil and gas; • Budget Process; • ITRS Issues & uses; • Islamic Bond; • Effective management of VAT; • Financial Stability; • Medium-Term Frameworks for Fiscal Policy and Budgeting; • Macro prudential Policy and Financial Stability; • Financial programing; • Islamic Sukuk; • Trade Policy; • Balance of payments; • Budget Execution and Cash Management; • Taxes on extractive industries; • Monetary operations and liquidity management; • Petroleum fiscal regime; • Cash Management; • IPSAS; • BoP Seminar; • Consistency of macroeconomic statistics; • Macroeconomic Frameworks for Lebanon; • FMIS; • Banking regulation and supervision; • Balance of payments; • Tax Administration; • Application of the integrated systems, the financial management, risks and solutions; • Taxes; • I did not attend any course by METAC; • National Account training courses.		
Total responses		141

3. Please indicate how did you join the training/workshop:		
	Response Percent	Response count
I have a personal development plan and this course was offered by my organization.	38.1%	45
I don't have a personal development plan, but the course was offered by my organization.	25.4%	30
I was invited to participate in the course by METAC directly.	22.9%	27
I was invited to participate in the course by another party.	7.6%	9
Other, please specify:	5.9%	7
- I made presentations; - Invitation through the Ministry of Finance); - Ministry of Finance - General Directorate of Collection Control; - I was nominated to attend this workshop by the organization that I work for; - Invitation to a 3 hrs workshop; - Banque du Liban; - This course was co-sponsored by the USAID project I worked on.		
Total responses		118

4. Please rate the relevance of the training /workshop. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
My expectations of the training/workshop were met.	34.0%	62.3%	2.8%	0.0%	0.9%	106
The topics covered were relevant to the priorities of my organization.	43.4%	50.9%	2.8%	1.9%	0.9%	106
The topics covered were relevant to my day to day activities.	22.6%	67.0%	8.5%	0.0%	1.9%	106
The content of the training/workshop was well adapted to the situation in the region.	18.9%	67.9%	7.5%	0.0%	5.7%	106
The course was too advanced.	16.0%	50.0%	26.4%	1.9%	5.7%	106
The course was too basic.	2.8%	26.4%	49.1%	11.3%	10.4%	106

5. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The duration of the training/workshop was adequate.	7.7%	53.8%	34.6%	3.8%	0.0%	104
The venue and training facilities were of adequate quality.	35.6%	63.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	104
The training material and documentation was clear and sufficient.	30.8%	66.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	104
The training/workshop involved adequate use of modern presentation and facilitation techniques.	30.8%	63.5%	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%	104
There was sufficient time to interact and share experiences with other participants.	26.9%	43.3%	24.0%	3.8%	1.9%	104

6. Please rate the overall quality of the training/workshop. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:						
	Unsatisfactory	Moderately unsatisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Satisfactory	No opinion	Response count
The course covered all subjects needed for a good comprehension of the subject.	2.9%	2.9%	37.0%	57.3%	0.0%	103
The announced objectives were fully met.	2.9%	4.9%	30.1%	61.2%	1.0%	103
During the course I learned and acquired skills relevant for my current job.	5.8%	2.9%	19.4%	68.9%	2.9%	103
The training course combined a balanced mix of theory and practice.	2.9%	7.8%	36.9%	51.5%	1.0%	103
There was sufficient time allowed for raising questions during the training.	3.9%	10.7%	25.2%	58.3%	1.9%	103
The training included ample examples from the METAC region.	2.9%	10.7%	27.2%	53.4%	5.8%	103

7. Please rate the overall quality of the trainers and/or facilitators:						
	Unsatisfactory	Moderately unsatisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Satisfactory	No opinion	Response count
Knowledge of the subject.	0.0%	1.9%	10.7%	87.4%	0.0%	103
Experience in and/or knowledge of the region.	1.0%	4.9%	27.2%	65.0%	1.9%	103
Ability to transfer knowledge.	0.0%	1.0%	22.3%	75.7%	1.0%	103
Facilitation and communication skills.	0.0%	1.9%	18.4%	78.6%	1.0%	103

8. What is the main difference of the METAC training/workshop which you attended with the other training courses you attended:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
The METAC training/workshop was complementary to the other training/workshops I attended.	13.9%	59.4%	5.9%	1.0%	19.8%	101
There was significant overlap between the subjects covered by the METAC training/workshop and the other training/workshop I attended.	6.9%	36.6%	34.7%	5.0%	16.8%	101
The METAC training/workshop was more relevant to my immediate needs.	18.8%	64.4%	6.9%	0.0%	9.9%	101
The METAC training/workshop was better tailored to the regional context.	22.8%	57.4%	4.0%	1.0%	14.9%	101
The METAC training/workshop allowed more exchange of experience with other participants.	28.7%	56.4%	6.9%	1.0%	6.9%	101
The overall quality of the METAC training/workshop is generally higher.	15.8%	60.4%	9.9%	0.0%	13.9%	101
METAC has more specific expertise on the subject compared to other providers.	15.8%	49.5%	11.9%	0.0%	22.8%	101

Comments:

- I believe the methods of offering the courses by my organization is unfair, I am interested in economic modelling and methods of adopting the packages of the financial programming, however, I had never participated in such an important training programs. There is no direct invitations from METAC;
- Open the floor for more discussions and topics covered by the training subjects to enrich those subjects and gain more knowledge and exchange of experiences ... and this needs follow up and future participations... we hope to have opportunities in the future to follow up on the developments of the Fund's policies to support developing and the least developed countries... sincerely;
- Since this was my first training related to extractive industries therefore is difficult to compare and the topics covered were not directly rather indirectly related to my current job;
- The workshops relevant to the topic should be organized in close periods to keep up with the rapid developments in the economic and financial fields in the region;

- The subject of the course was the first [time] for me and it was specialized to some extent. Therefore, the comparison is not possible;
- As this is the first workshop on the subject, I am not able to compare;
- I think that the duration of the course or workshop is inadequate.

9. Please rate the extent to which you use the knowledge gained during the METAC training/workshop in your daily activities:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
I use the knowledge gained nearly every day.	7.9%	49.5%	28.7%	2.0%	11.9%	101
I use the knowledge gained occasionally.	10.9%	54.5%	26.7%	4.0%	4.0%	101
I seldom use the knowledge gained.	3.0%	9.9%	56.4%	21.8%	8.9%	101
I have changed jobs so I no longer use the knowledge gained.	4.0%	6.9%	44.6%	36.6%	7.9%	101
My organization does not have the facilities to apply the knowledge gained.	3.0%	12.9%	48.5%	27.7%	7.9%	101
The lessons learned during the training have contributed to implement reforms within my organization.	8.9%	50.5%	14.9%	4.0%	21.8%	101

Comments:

- There are a lot of circumstances that prevent the application of the knowledge obtained from these courses and each country has its own circumstances... and you have sufficient knowledge about the circumstances of Yemen... but we are trying to apply what is possible of it in reality;
- Currently the percentage of revenue gained from extractive industries is not that much and hence affect the associated importance but in future since Afghanistan has huge potential such trainings will be of very much importance but for the base building such training are useful;
- The knowledge gained is an experience for dealing with the new statistics and classifications used internationally. Therefore, benefitting from them is limited and its importance lies in its role in developing the skills for dealing with statistics).

10. Please indicate your participation in any post-training activities which have advanced your knowledge and experience in the field:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
I benefited from follow-up support from METAC staff after the training.	6.1%	34.3%	36.4%	5.1%	18.2%	99
I participated in other (follow-up) training courses/workshops offered by METAC.	2.0%	15.2%	48.5%	17.2%	17.2%	99
I participated in follow-up training courses/workshops offered by other providers.	5.1%	44.4%	27.3%	10.1%	13.1%	99
I did not participate in any post-training activities.	7.1%	25.3%	35.4%	19.2%	13.1%	99

11. Please indicate the factors which influence the sustainability of the benefits of the METAC training/workshop you attended:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
High turnover of staff in the government institutions.	13.7%	35.8%	24.2%	9.5%	16.8%	95
Lack of institutionalized capacity development planning and implementation in my organization.	8.4%	35.8%	31.6%	8.4%	15.8%	95
Lack of capacity needs assessments which determine the training needs.	8.4%	42.1%	29.5%	6.3%	13.7%	95
METAC training/workshops are ad-hoc and/or not necessarily determined by the existing capacity needs.	1.1%	18.9%	49.5%	8.4%	22.1%	95
Lack or limited sharing of training materials by the participants to other colleagues within the organization.	6.3%	31.6%	41.1%	11.6%	9.5%	95
The subject of the training/workshop is not relevant to the ongoing reforms.	3.2%	10.5%	46.3%	27.4%	12.6%	95

Comments:

- What has been mentioned is sufficient;
- I have attended the course of IPSAS and I was thinking to get the knowledge of preparing mentioned statement for my own country but due to shortage of course time I couldn't get detailed knowledge of the IPSAS statement;
- Ideas that may help in further increasing the effectiveness and sustainability of the great effort done in METAC: aiding the governmental entities in acquiring sound capacity building techniques + follow-up on a technical/ informational level with participants via a info sharing forum under METAC supervision with a kind of experience/ knowledge data bank. Continuous reading and further fruitful discussions with a mix of expertise.

12. How did you share the knowledge/skills gained at the training/workshop with your colleagues:						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Response count
I did not share the knowledge gained with other colleagues.	2.1%	14.9%	54.3%	26.6%	2.1%	94
I informed my colleagues about the course objectives and the topics.	20.2%	71.3%	4.3%	1.1%	3.2%	94
I shared the course material with my colleagues.	23.4%	66.0%	7.4%	2.1%	1.1%	94
I shared the main lessons learned with my colleagues.	16.0%	73.4%	6.4%	2.1%	2.1%	94
I have trained and/or guided other colleagues.	9.6%	53.2%	25.5%	4.3%	7.4%	94
I suggested METAC workshops to other colleagues.	18.1%	55.3%	13.8%	0.0%	12.8%	94
I suggested to the management and/or Human Resource Department to consider a similar course for other staff members.	18.1%	51.1%	10.6%	1.1%	19.1%	94

Comments:

- We hope that the Fund's policies touches on and support the capacities of the poor in the developing countries and do not align too much to the private sector at the expense of the poor and their needs ... and even humiliating them [the poor] in the absence of values that provide them with some protection from [against] the authorities and the private sector!!
- The course was good but due to shortage of time, I didn't get the IPSAS statement preparation knowledge so I couldn't train anyone in my organization and I myself could not prepare the mentioned statement after the course attendance but I hope one day I be able to prepare this statement for my country and it is a require statement for our management as well as for our government better financial picture and controls.

Annex 10. List of persons consulted

Name	Organization	Position
METAC office		
Mohamad Elhage	METAC	Center Coordinator
Jacques Charaoui	METAC	Public Financial Management Advisor
Charles Jenkins	METAC	Revenue Administration Advisor
Malik Bani Hani	METAC	External Sector Statistics Advisor
Ahmad El Radi	METAC	Banking Supervision Advisor
Sawsan Saidi	METAC	Office Manager
Mona Demian	METAC	Administrative Assistant
Nathalie Tawil	METAC	Administrative assistant
IMF Headquarters		
Dominique Desruelle	IMF Institute for Capacity Development (ICD)	Deputy Director
Holger Floerkemeier	IMF ICD Global Partnership Division	Deputy Division Chief
Xiangming Li	IMF ICD Global Partnership Division	Deputy Division Chief
Hali Edison	IMF ICD Strategy and Evaluations	Deputy Division Chief
Katarzyna Kardas	IMF ICD Global Partnership Division	Senior Technical Assistance Officer
Nune Pambukhchyan	IMF ICD Global Partnership Division	Budget analyst
Mark A. Horton	IMF MCD	Assistant Director
Kristina Kostial	IMF MCD	Assistant Director Mission chief for Jordan & Lebanon
Eric Motty	IMF MCD	Senior economist Mission chief for Egypt
Christopher J. Jarvis	IMF MCD	Advisor
Christoph Duenwald	IMF MCD	Deputy Division Chief Mission chief for West Bank and Gaza
Edward R. Gemayel	IMF MCD	Deputy Division Chief Mission chief for Sudan
Carlo Sdravovich	IMF MCD	Deputy Division Chief Mission Chief for Iraq
Paul S. Ross	IMF MCD	Mission chief for Afghanistan
Khaled Sakr	IMF MCD	Division Chief Mission Chief for Yemen
Brian Christensen	IMF Fiscal Affairs Department (FAD) Resource Information Management	Division chief
Benoit Chevauchez	IMF FAD PFM I	TA advisor
Peter Barrant	IMF FAD Revenue Administration	Deputy Division Chief
Paul Martens	IMF FAD	PFM Advisor
Roberto Rosales	IMF Statistics Department (STA)	Deputy Director
Rainer Köhler	IMF STA, Resource Management Division	Division Chief
Michaela Erbenova	IMF Monetary and Capital Markets Department (MCM) Financial Supervision and Regulation Division	Division Chief
Mary Zephirin	IMF MCM Technical Assistance Division	Deputy Division Chief

Name	Organization	Position
Mohamed Afzal Norat	IMF MCM Financial Analysis Division	Senior economist / senior financial expert
Brenda Sylvester	IMF MCM TA division	Technical Assistance Officer
Ling Hui Tan	IMF Independent Evaluation Office	Advisor
Ulrich Jacoby	IMF African Department	Assistant to the Director
Jordan		
Ziad Ghanma	Central Bank of Jordan, Banking Supervision Department	Executive Manager
Arafat H. Al Fayoumi	CBJ, Banking Supervision Department	Assistant Executive Manager
Maha I. Al-Abdallat	CBJ, Banking Supervision Department	Assistant Executive Manager
Mohamad Subhi Amaireh	CBJ, Financial Stability Department	Executive Manager
Dr. Adel Al-Sharkas	CBJ	Deputy Governor
Jamal Al Masri	CBJ, Research Department	Assistant Executive Director
Shadi Khawaja	CBJ, Open Market Operation Department, Analysis Division	Head of Division
Abdelhakim Shibli, PhD	Ministry of Finance, Studies and Economic Policies Department	Director
Qassem Bashabsheh	General Treasury	Director
Najem Aldien Ghraibeh	Ministry of Finance, Macro Fiscal Unit	Head of Unit
Eyad J. Kodah	Income and Sales Tax Department	Director General
Dr. Wael Odeh Al-Akasheh	Income and Sales Tax Department	Assistant of Director General
Majdi Alshuraiqi	Ministry of Finance, General Budget Department, Expenditure Policy Analysis Division	Assistant Director General, Head of Division
Firas Al Mallah	MoF, General Budget Department, Studies and Information Directorate	Director
Dr. Jalal M. Al-Debei	Ministry of Finance, General Accounts Department	Director
Dr. Qasem Al Zoubi	Department of Statistics	Director General
Ikhlas Aranki	Department of Statistics	Technical Assistant to the Director General
Moawiah Zghool	Department of Statistics, Directorate of National Accounts	Head of Directorate
Abdel Wadoud Matouk	Department of Statistics, Directorate of Economic Statistics	Head of Directorate
Lebanon		
Dr Saad Andary	Banque du Liban	Vice Governor
Claude Mokhbat Saadeh	Banque du Liban, Statistics & Economic Research Department	Director
Maroun Keyrouz,	Banque du Liban	Statistics & Economic Research Department
Souad El Haddad	Banque du Liban	Statistics & Economic Research Department
Khaleb Bohsali	BDL, Foreign Affairs Department	Executive Director
Mohamad Jabri	BDL, Training & Development Department	Executive Director
Ziad Abdullah	Presidency of the council of Ministers, Central Administration for Statistics, Department of Computer Centre P.I. (Price	Statistician, Head of the Department

Name	Organization	Position
	Index)	
Najla Nakhle	IMF, Local Office in Beirut	Economist, Head of Office
Charles Abdallah	Delegation of the European Union to Lebanon	Economist
Usama R. Mikdashi	Banking Control Commission	Chairman
Amine Awad	Banking Control Commission	Member
Rabih H. Nehme	Banking Control Commission	Head of Risk Assessment Department
Elie Karam	Banking Control Commission	Head of None-bank Financial Institution Department
Dr Mounir Rached	Lebanese Economic Association	Vice President Advisor to Ministry of Finance, Macro Fiscal Unit
Kawthar Dara	World Bank FMR II Project	Project Manager
Christian de Clercq	Ministry of Finance	UNDP Project Manager Advisor to the Minister
Mireille Mouawad	Ministry of Finance Macro-Fiscal Department	Head of Department
Rita El Achkar	Ministry of Finance Macro-Fiscal Department	Senior Economist
Katrina Antoun	Ministry of Finance Debt Management Department	Donor coordination
Hoda Kilani	Ministry of Finance Cash Management Department	Head of Department
Rana Bissar	Ministry of Finance Cash Management Department	Deputy Head of Department
Dr Toufic Gaspard	Consultant in Economics	Former Advisor to the Minister of Finance
Georges S. Maarawi	Ministry of Finance General Director of Land Registry and Cadastre per Interim	Head of Tax Office Mount Lebanon
Jacques de Lajugie	Embassy of France in Lebanon Minister Counsellor for Economic Affairs	Head of Economic Department for the Middle East
Hisham Abou Ibrahim	General Directorate of Customs	Chief Inspector
Hani El Hajchade	General Directorate of Customs	Chief Inspector
Sudan		
Eitidal Riziq	Ministry of Finance	Budget Control Department
Ehab	Ministry of Finance	Budget Control Department
Zeyn Abdeen	Ministry of Finance	Budget Control Department
Widad Abdulrahim	Ministry of Finance	Sudan Representative, METAC Steering Committee
Ebtisam Ali Mohammed Osman	Ministry of Finance	Director, Budget Control
Osman Mohamed	State Minister's Office	
Elhadi Salih Mohd Elsalih	Central Bank	General Manager, Banking Supervision
Asmaa A. Elrahman Khairi	Central Bank	Inspection Manager
Abdelaziz Mohammed	Central Bank	Manager, Prudential Supervision

Name	Organization	Position
Abdalla Takroon	Central Bank	Deputy Manager, Inspection Department
Somia Amir Osman	Central Bank	General Manager - Policies, Research & Statistics
El alim Abd Elghani Mohamed	Central Bureau of Statistics	Dir of Financial & Economic Surveys & Statistics
El Alim Salih El Dwo	Ministry of Finance	TSA, Tika Programme Coordinator
Abdalla Elmasaad Idris Ahmed	Taxation Chamber	Secretary General
Mohammed Elfadl Ibrahim Elhaj	Taxation Chamber	Director of Tax Treaties & Foreign Relations
Nadir Elrayah Awad	Ministry of Trade	Head of COMESA Unit
Eisa Shatter	Ministry of Trade	Director of Strategic Planning
Huda Salih Mohamed	Ministry of Trade	
Mohammed Elmutaz Sir El Khatim Ismaiel	Ministry of Trade	
Lea Swanson	USAID	Assistant Mission Director
Amir Eltayeb	USAID	Development Assistance Specialist
Ahmed Mohamed Elhag	UNDP	Head, Poverty Reduction, MDGs, HIV/AIDS
Abdalatif Hassan	UNDP	Economic Analyst
Louis Erasmus	IMF	Resident Representative
Amin Salih Yasin	IMF	Economist
Other		
Philippe Karam	IMF Middle East Center for Economics and Finance (CEF), Kuwait	Director
Tyler C. Holt	USAID Office of Middle East Programs	Director
Clinton D. White	USAID Bureau for Management	Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator
Lawrence K. Daum	USAID	Public Finance Management Advisor
Dr. David Nguyen-Thanh	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH	Head of Competence Center Public Finance and Administrative Reform, Department of Good Governance and Human Rights
Silvia Crescimbeni	European Commission DEVCO F.2 Geographical Coordination Neighborhood South	International Cooperation Officer - Relations with International Financial Institutions and Arab donors

Annex 11. Reference documents

International Monetary Fund (IMF), "The Institute for Capacity Development", brochure retrieved from <http://www.imf.org/external/np/INS/english/pdf/brochure.pdf>.

____, 2006, "IMF Regional Technical Assistance Centers: Operational Guidance Note for Staff".

____, 2008, "Enhancing the Impact of Fund Technical Assistance", prepared by the Office of Technical Assistance Management.

____, 2010, "Technical Assistance Evaluation program, Findings of Evaluations and Updated Program", prepared by the Office of Technical Assistance Management.

____, 2011, "Report of the Task Force on the Fund's Technical Assistance Strategy".

____, 2013a, "The Fund's Capacity Development Strategy - Better Policies Through Stronger Institutions".

____, 2014a, "Factsheet Technical Assistance and Training".

____, 2014b, "A Handbook for Long-Term Technical Assistance Experts (LTXs)".

____, 2014c, "Lending Arrangements as of April 30, 2014", retrieved on <http://www.imf.org/external/np/fin/tad/extarr11.aspx?memberKey1=ZZZZ&date1key=2020-02-28>.

____, Middle East and Central Asia Department (MCD), 2013, "Regional Strategy Note for Capacity Development".

IMF Middle East Technical Assistance Center (METAC), 2009, "Middle East Technical Assistance Center Program Document".

____, 2010a, "Middle East Technical Assistance Center Annual Report".

____, 2010b, "Minutes of METAC Steering Committee", Beirut, Lebanon, June 8, 2010.

____, 2011, "Middle East Technical Assistance Center Annual Report".

____, 2012a, "Middle East Technical Assistance Center Annual Report".

____, 2012b, "Minutes of METAC Steering Committee", Beirut, Lebanon, May 9, 2012.

____, 2013b, "Management Field Manual".

____, 2013c, "Middle East Technical Assistance Center Annual Report".

____, 2013d, "Minutes of METAC Steering Committee", Beirut, Lebanon, May 14, 2013.

____, 2013e, "Stepping Back and Looking forward: a results-based framework for future activities".

____, 2014a, "Middle East Regional Technical Assistance Center Third Funding Cycle (Phase III) May 2010 - April 2015: Consolidated Financial Status".

____, 2014e, “Minutes of METAC Steering Committee”, Ishtar, Jordan, May 5, 2014.

____, 2014f, “Steering Committee Report”.

____, 2014g, “Updated Work Plans FY11-14 from SC reports”.

OECD/DAC, 2011, “Perspective Notes: The Enabling Environment for Capacity Development”.

Otoo, S., N. Agapitova and J. Behrens, 2009, “The Capacity Development Results Framework: a strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development”, The World Bank.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2008, “Capacity Assessment Practice Note”.

UNDP, 2009, “Supporting Capacity Development: the UNDP approach”.

UNDP, 2011, “Capacity Development Plan (2011-2014) Central Statistics Organization Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Kabul”, National Institution Building Project.



P.O. Box 4175
3006 AD Rotterdam
The Netherlands

Watermanweg 44
3067 GG Rotterdam
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)10 453 88 00
F +31 (0)10 453 07 68
E netherlands@ecorys.com

W www.ecorys.nl

Sound analysis, inspiring ideas