

Annex C: PFTAC Evaluation Survey Results

Table C.1: Number of Respondents By Organization

	Total Respondents	E-mails Not Delivered	Opted Out	Net Survey Population	Responses	Response Rate (%)
Ministry of Finance	134	17	1	116	43	37%
Central Bank	109	13	0	96	50	52%
Rev/Customs Administration	75	1	0	74	36	49%
Statistics Office	36	10	0	26	14	54%
Other Government Offices	33	5	0	28	9	32%
IMF	63	1	1	61	37	61%
Short-term Experts	51	1	0	50	24	48%
Donors	131	4	9	118	53	45%
Total	632	52	11	569	266	47%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.2: Number of Respondents By Country/Organization

	Total Respondents	Not Delivered	Opted Out	Survey Population	Responses	Response Rate (%)
Cook Islands	30	6	0	24	9	38%
Fiji	58	4	0	54	28	52%
FSM	11	0	0	11	3	27%
Kiribati	17	1	0	16	3	19%
Marshall Islands	12	2	0	10	4	40%
Nauru	9	3	0	6	1	17%
Niue	11	4	0	7	2	29%
Palau	16	3	0	13	4	31%
PNG	45	7	0	38	18	47%
Samoa	39	7	0	32	16	50%
Solomon Islands	40	4	1	35	19	54%
Tonga	32	1	0	31	13	42%
Tokelau	4	0	0	4	1	25%
Tuvalu	17	3	0	14	8	57%
Vanuatu	46	1	0	45	23	51%
IMF	63	1	1	61	37	61%
Short-term Experts	51	1	0	50	24	48%
Donors	131	4	9	118	53	45%
Total	632	52	11	569	266	47%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.3: PFTAC Evaluation Survey Respondents by Employer

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Government Ministry/Agency	58%	152
TA Provider	13%	34
IMF Staff	14%	37
IMF Expert	5%	13
Other	11%	30
Total	100%	266

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.4: Government Officials By Type of Organization

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Ministry of Finance	34%	52
Revenue/Customs Administration	24%	36
Central Bank/Financial Sector Supervision	28%	42
National Statistics Agency	9%	13
Other	6%	9
Total	100%	152

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.5: IMF Staff By Department

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Asian Pacific Department	3%	1
Fiscal Affairs Department	30%	11
Monetary and Capital Markets Department	14%	5
Statistics Department at Headquarters	11%	4
Other Departments	27%	10
PFTAC, including Resident Advisors	16%	6
Total	100%	37

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.6: IMF Short-term Experts By Department

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Asian Pacific Department	8%	1
Fiscal Affairs Department	54%	7
Monetary and Capital Markets Department	8%	1
Statistics Department	31%	4
Other Departments	0%	0
Total	100%	13

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.7: Familiarity with PFTAC's Assistance

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Very Familiar	28%	67
Broadly Familiar	41%	98
Somewhat Familiar	16%	39
Limited Interaction with PFTAC	14%	33
Total	100%	237
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		5
Grand Total		242

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.8. Familiarity with PFTAC Work By Employer

	Very Familiar	Broadly Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Limited Interaction with PFTAC	Not Familiar with PFTAC	Response Rate	Response Count
A Government Ministry/Agency	21%	43%	18%	15%	2%	90.1%	137
A TA Provider	24%	52%	15%	9%	0%	97.1%	33
IMF Staff	49%	31%	3%	17%	0%	94.6%	35
IMF Expert	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%	92.3%	12
Other	28%	28%	24%	12%	8%	83.3%	25
Total	28%	40%	16%	14%	2%	91.0%	242

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.9: Consistency of PFTAC's Assistance with Government Priorities

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Excellent	37%	82
Good	54%	120
Modest	8%	18
Poor	2%	4
Total	100%	224
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		19
Grand Total		243
Weighted Score	3.3	

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.10: Consistency of PFTAC Assistance with Government Priorities By Employer

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
A Government Ministry/Agency	33%	56%	9%	2%	3.2	83%	126
A TA Provider	28%	56%	13%	3%	3.1	94%	32
IMF Staff	50%	41%	9%	0%	3.4	86%	32
IMF Expert	50%	50%	0%	0%	3.5	92%	12
Other	39%	61%	0%	0%	3.4	77%	23
Total	36%	54%	8%	2%	3.2	85%	225

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.11: Government Officials' Assessment of Consistency of PFTAC TA with Government Priorities

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Ministry of Finance	33%	55%	10%	2%	3.2	81%	42
Revenue Administration	34%	48%	14%	3%	3.1	81%	29
Central Bank or Financial Sector Supervisor	39%	53%	5%	3%	3.3	90%	38
National Statistics Agency	9%	91%	0%	0%	3.1	85%	11
Other	43%	43%	14%	0%	3.3	78%	7
Rating	34%	55%	9%	2%	3.2	84%	127

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.12: Consistency of PFTAC TA with Government Priorities By Familiarity with PFTAC

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Very Familiar	58%	39%	2%	2%	3.5	99%	66
Broadly Familiar	36%	55%	8%	1%	3.3	97%	95
Somewhat Familiar	18%	71%	8%	3%	3.1	97%	38
Limited Interaction	13%	58%	25%	4%	2.8	73%	24
Not Familiar	0%	100%	0%	0%	3.0	20%	1
Total	37%	54%	8%	2%	3.3	93%	224

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.13: PFTAC's Role in Helping Countries Define Priorities

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
The PFTAC played an important and a leading role	44%	94
The PFTAC played a role but was not a leader	47%	101
The PFTAC made some minor inputs	8%	18
The PFTAC did not play any role	1%	2
Total	100%	215
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		28
Grand Total		243

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.14: Effectiveness of PFTAC

	Quality of PFTAC Work Program		Use of TA Outputs		Effectiveness in Achieving Desired Results	
	Percent of Responses	Response Count	Percent of Responses	Response Count	Percent of Responses	Response Count
Excellent	31%	61	22%	47	28%	60
Good	61%	119	66%	143	58%	125
Modest	7%	14	10%	21	13%	28
Poor	1%	1	2%	5	2%	4
Total	100%	195	100%	216	100%	217
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		48		27		26
Grand Total		243		243		243
Weighted Score	3.2		3.1		3.1	

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.15: Effectiveness of PFTAC Assistance in Achieving Results By Employer

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Government Agency	30%	60%	8%	2%	3.2	65%	99
TA Provider	11%	64%	21%	4%	2.8	82%	28
IMF Staff	37%	52%	11%	0%	3.3	73%	27
IMF Expert	33%	44%	22%	0%	3.1	69%	9
Other	32%	58%	11%	0%	3.2	63%	19
Total	29%	58%	12%	2%	3.1	68%	182

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.16: Government Officials' Assessment of PFTAC Assistance in Achieving Results

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Ministry of Finance	23%	60%	14%	2%	3.0	83%	43
Revenue Administration	22%	63%	11%	4%	3.0	75%	27
Central Bank or Financial Sector Supervisor	35%	54%	8%	3%	3.2	88%	37
National Statistics Agency	40%	60%	0%	0%	3.4	77%	10
Other	17%	83%	0%	0%	3.2	67%	6
Total	28%	60%	10%	2%	3.1	81%	123

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.17: Effectiveness of PFTAC Assistance in Achieving Results By Familiarity with PFTAC

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Very Familiar	40%	51%	8%	2%	3.3	97%	65
Broadly Familiar	24%	63%	13%	0%	3.1	95%	93
Somewhat Familiar	23%	54%	17%	6%	2.9	90%	35
Limited Interaction	18%	55%	23%	5%	2.9	67%	22
Not Familiar	0%	100%	0%	0%	3.0	20%	1
Total	28%	57%	13%	2%	3.1	89%	216

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.18: Effectiveness of the Modes of Delivering PFTAC Assistance

	Percent Answering				Weighted Rating	Response Count	Response Rate
	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor			
Resident Advisors	38%	50%	11%	1%	3.2	152	67%
Short Term Experts	27%	50%	19%	3%	3.0	171	75%
Regional Workshops/ Training	31%	47%	19%	3%	3.1	180	79%
National Workshops/Training	22%	51%	24%	3%	2.9	124	54%
Professional Attachments	22%	44%	29%	5%	2.8	112	49%

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.19: Most Important Factors Contributing to PFTAC's Effectiveness

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
Location in the region	58%	140
Responsiveness to government priorities	31%	74
High quality expertise	51%	124
Sound TA formulation and design	12%	28
Flexibility in tailoring assistance to local needs	11%	26
Consistent engagement over a period of years	22%	52
Knowledge of client countries	34%	83
Personal relationships built up with clients over many years	25%	61
Good coordination with other development partners	22%	54
Good coordination with IMF Headquarters	24%	59
Use of regional expertise	14%	34
Provision of regional training	9%	21
Supporting regional initiatives	12%	29
Total		785
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		17
Total No of Respondents		202

Note: Each respondent was allowed to indicate a maximum of four responses.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.20: Most Important Areas in Which PFTAC Can Improve

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
More frequent visits by the PFTAC Coordinator to countries	16%	37
More frequent visits by Resident Advisors to countries	14%	34
Increase the number of staff in PFTAC	25%	58
More use of short term experts	28%	67
Use of long term, in-country advisors	23%	53
More regional workshops/training and regional initiatives	41%	97
More attachments and secondments of Pacific Islanders	39%	93
Greater use of regional expertise	26%	62
More follow up to help implement recommendations including efforts to mobilize the financing needed for implementation of recommendations	42%	99
More support for regional initiatives	26%	62
Better coordination with other development partners	16%	38
Better TA formulation and design	9%	22
Better coordination with IMF Headquarters	2%	5
Better use of information technology to support distance learning, web based learning and video conferencing	3%	7
Focus on fewer areas	3%	8
Better monitoring and evaluation of TA outcomes and impacts	14%	32
Total		774
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		14
Total No. of Respondents		197

Note: Each respondent was allowed to indicate a maximum of four responses.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.21: PFTAC Assistance Compared to IMF Headquarters

	Percent Answering				Response Count	Response Rate
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
PFTAC responds more quickly to requests than IMF Headquarters	41%	47%	9%	3%	128	61%
PFTAC has a better understanding of the countries than IMF Headquarters based staff	41%	46%	11%	3%	152	73%
PFTAC is more effective in supporting regional initiatives than IMF Headquarters	37%	50%	10%	3%	147	70%
PFTAC supports the implementation of policies and strategies identified by IMF Headquarters TAs	27%	68%	4%	1%	114	55%
The quality of expertise provided by PFTAC is equivalent or better than that provided by IMF Headquarters	19%	50%	25%	6%	127	61%
The quality of expertise provided by PFTAC is significantly weaker than that provided by IMF Headquarters	3%	14%	59%	24%	124	59%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.22: PFTAC Assistance Compared to Other TA Providers

	Percent Answering				Response Count	Response Rate
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
PFTAC responds more quickly to requests than other TA providers.	27%	56%	16%	1%	144	69%
PFTAC is more flexible than other TA providers.	23%	56%	20%	1%	142	68%
PFTAC has a better understanding of the countries than other TA providers.	17%	53%	26%	4%	142	68%
PFTAC is more effective in promoting regional initiatives than other TA providers.	17%	57%	20%	6%	144	69%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.23: Success of PFTAC Assistance in the Following Areas

	Percent Answering				Response Count	Response Rate
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
The work of PFTAC is demand-driven and responsive to the needs of countries.	33%	62%	4%	2%	190	91%
There is strong country ownership of the work of PFTAC.	21%	57%	19%	3%	173	83%
The work of PFTAC is closely linked to IMF's surveillance work and program activities.	17%	75%	7%	1%	145	69%
The work of PFTAC complements IMF Headquarters TAs.	23%	69%	8%	0%	139	67%
PFTAC plays a key role in providing feedback from member countries to IMF Headquarters.	22%	68%	8%	2%	132	63%
PFTAC professional associations are useful for networking and learning (e.g., PIFMA; PITAA AFSPC).	42%	53%	4%	1%	158	76%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.24: Achieving PFTAC Objectives

	Percent Answering				Response Count	Response Rate
	Objective Fully Achieved	Despite Substantial Progress, Objective not yet Achieved	Only Modest Progress Made to Achieve Objective	No Significant Progress Made		
To build simple and efficient revenue instruments and effective tax administrations capable of increasing tax compliance, and modernized customs procedures to secure revenue and facilitate trade.	15%	53%	27%	5%	105	100%
To develop efficient, effective, transparent and sustainable budget formulation and presentation, budget execution and control, reporting and audit.	15%	45%	32%	8%	107	100%
To improve compliance with international standards and best practices in prudential supervision and regulation, including measures to deter and detect money laundering and terrorism financing.	24%	44%	24%	8%	118	100%
To improve the regular and timely compilation, analysis and dissemination of economic and financial statistics according to accepted international standards.	17%	43%	31%	9%	132	100%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.25: Quality of Training Courses/Workshops/Seminars

	Percent Answering				Weighted Rating	Response Count	Response Rate
	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor			
Topics Covered	41%	53%	6%	0%	3.3	118	99%
Resource Persons/Presenters	48%	48%	3%	1%	3.4	118	99%
Quality of Presentations	40%	53%	8%	0%	3.3	118	99%
Time to Interact with Other Participants	26%	64%	9%	1%	3.2	118	99%
Quality of the Venue	45%	52%	3%	0%	3.4	118	99%
Balance Between Theory, Practical Suggestions and Country Studies	25%	57%	15%	3%	3.1	118	99%
Length of Course	15%	65%	18%	3%	2.9	117	98%
Post Course/Workshop Follow-up and Support	14%	38%	33%	15%	2.5	106	89%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.26: Use of the Knowledge Gained in Training Courses/Workshops/Seminars

	Percent Answering				Weighted Rating	Response Count	Response Rate
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree			
The topics discussed were relevant for my day to day activities.	38%	57%	5%	0%	3.3	105	88%
I used the knowledge gained nearly everyday on the job.	19%	50%	30%	1%	2.9	101	85%
I used the knowledge gained occasionally (once a week) on the job.	6%	46%	39%	9%	2.5	100	84%
I seldom use the knowledge gained on the job.	2%	16%	44%	37%	1.8	97	82%
The topics discussed were too advanced for my organization.	5%	11%	64%	21%	2.0	107	90%
The topics were too theoretical.	4%	17%	63%	16%	2.1	106	89%
Examples from Pacific countries were particularly useful.	38%	59%	3%	0%	3.4	105	88%
I have changed jobs so I no longer use the knowledge gained.	0%	6%	54%	40%	1.7	80	67%
My organization does not have access to the information technology, computer programs or systems necessary to use the knowledge gained.	3%	4%	57%	35%	1.8	96	81%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.27: Frequency of Tripartite Review Committee Meetings

	Percent of Total Responses	Response Count
More Frequent Meetings are Needed	26%	15
Frequency of Meetings is Appropriate	71%	41
Fewer Meetings are Needed	3%	2
Total	100%	58
No Knowledge/ No Opinion		5
Grand Total		63

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.28: Rating the Tripartite Review Committee

	Providing Oversight and Guidance		Promoting Country Ownership		Facilitating Donor Coordination	
	Percent of Responses	Response Count	Percent of Responses	Response Count	Percent of Responses	Response Count
Excellent	14%	8	21%	12	11.5%	6
Good	55%	32	51%	29	69.2%	36
Modest	28%	16	25%	14	13.5%	7
Poor	3%	2	4%	2	5.8%	3
Total	100%	58	100%	57	100.0%	52
No Knowledge/ No Opinion	8%	5	10%	6	17.5%	11
Grand Total		63		63		63
Weighted Score	2.8		2.9		2.9	

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.29: Overall Process and Implementation Efficiency of PFTAC

	Percent of Responses	Response Count
Excellent	33%	64
Good	57%	110
Modest	10%	19
Poor	1%	1
Total	100%	194
Weighted Rating¹	3.2	
No Response/No Opinion		15
Grand Total		209

¹ Based on ratings of Excellent=4, Good=3, Modest=2, and Poor=1.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.30: Assessing the Efficiency of PFTAC By Employer

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Government Agency	28%	63%	8%	1%	3.2	71%	108
TA Provider	25%	50%	25%	0%	3.0	82%	28
IMF Staff	57%	39%	4%	0%	3.5	76%	28
IMF Expert	44%	56%	0%	0%	3.4	69%	9
Other	33%	57%	10%	0%	3.2	70%	21
Total	33%	57%	10%	1%	3.2	73%	194

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.31: Government Officials' Assessment of PFTAC's Implementation Efficiency

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Ministry of Finance	27%	66%	5%	2%	3.2	79%	41
Revenue Administration	33%	57%	10%	0%	3.2	58%	21
Central Bank or Financial Sector Supervisor	29%	61%	10%	0%	3.2	74%	31
National Statistics Agency	22%	67%	11%	0%	3.1	69%	9
Other	17%	67%	17%	0%	3.0	67%	6
Total	28%	63%	8%	1%	3.2	71%	108

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.32 Assessing the Efficiency of PFTAC By Familiarity with PFTAC

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Very Familiar	42%	54%	3%	0%	3.4	88%	59
Broadly Familiar	32%	57%	10%	1%	3.2	84%	82
Somewhat Familiar	28%	59%	13%	0%	3.2	82%	32
Limited Interaction	21%	53%	26%	0%	2.9	58%	19
Not Familiar	0%	100%	0%	0%	3.0	20%	1
Total	33%	56%	10%	1%	3.2	80%	193

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.33: Sustainability of the PFTAC Assistance

	Percent of Responses	Response Count
Excellent	21%	40
Good	56%	106
Modest	20%	38
Poor	3%	6
Total	100%	190
Weighted Rating¹	2.9	
No Response/No Opinion		16
Grand Total		206

¹ Based on ratings of Excellent=4, Good=3, Modest=2, and Poor=1.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.34: Assessing the Sustainability of PFTAC Assistance By Employer

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Government Agency	20%	64%	14%	2%	3.0	68%	103
TA Provider	7%	37%	44%	11%	2.4	79%	27
IMF Staff	30%	50%	17%	3%	3.1	81%	30
IMF Expert	44%	22%	33%	0%	3.1	69%	9
Other	19%	62%	19%	0%	3.0	70%	21
Total	21%	56%	20%	3%	2.9	71%	190

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.35: Government Officials' Assessment of the Sustainability PFTAC Assistance

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Ministry of Finance	15%	74%	8%	3%	3.0	75%	39
Revenue Administration	24%	52%	19%	5%	3.0	58%	21
Central Bank or Financial Sector Supervisor	30%	57%	13%	0%	3.2	71%	30
National Statistics Agency	13%	63%	25%	0%	2.9	62%	8
Other	0%	80%	20%	0%	2.8	56%	5
Total	20%	64%	14%	2%	3.0	68%	103

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.36: Assessing the Sustainability of PFTAC Assistance By Familiarity with PFTAC

	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor	Weighted Score	Response Rate	Response Count
Very Familiar	32%	49%	17%	2%	3.1	88%	59
Broadly Familiar	15%	58%	23%	4%	2.8	81%	79
Somewhat Familiar	23%	58%	16%	3%	3.0	79%	31
Limited Interaction	11%	58%	26%	5%	2.7	58%	19
Not Familiar	0%	100%	0%	0%	3.0	20%	1
Total	21%	56%	20%	3%	2.9	78%	189

Excellent=4; Good=3; Modest=2; Poor=1

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.37 : Factors Affecting the Sustainability of PFTAC Assistance

	Percent Answering				Response Count	Response Rate
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Staff turnover and loss of trained staff in beneficiary agencies	21%	60%	18%	1%	164	80%
Political changes	12%	51%	35%	2%	161	78%
Staff shortages in beneficiary agencies	23%	55%	21%	1%	166	81%
Budget shortages	15%	62%	21%	2%	161	78%
Most recommendations could not be implemented	6%	24%	64%	6%	148	72%

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.38: Importance of PFTAC in Promoting the Use of Pacific Expertise

	Percent of Responses	Response Count
Highly Important	51%	97
Important	30%	58
Modestly Important	16%	30
Not Important	3%	6
Total	100%	191
Weighted Rating¹	3.3	
No Response/No Opinion		15
Grand Total		206

¹ Based on ratings of Excellent=4, Good=3, Modest=2, and Poor=1.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.39: Success of PFTAC in Promoting the Use of Pacific Expertise

	Percent of Responses	Response Count
Excellent	7%	9
Good	35%	47
Modest	43%	59
Poor	15%	21
Total	100%	136
Weighted Rating¹	2.3	
No Response/No Opinion		69
Grand Total		205

¹ Based on ratings of Excellent=4, Good=3, Modest=2, and Poor=1.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey

Table C.40: The Importance that PFTAC Should Assign to the Following Objectives

	Percent Answering				Weighted Rating ¹	Response Count	Response Rate
	Highest Importance	Important	Modestly Important	Not Important			
To build simple and efficient revenue instruments and effective tax administrations capable of increasing tax compliance, and modernized customs procedures to secure revenue and facilitate trade	53%	43%	4%	0%	3.5	159	77%
To develop efficient, effective, transparent and sustainable budget formulation and presentation, budget execution and control, reporting and audit	47%	48%	4%	1%	3.4	168	82%
To improve compliance with international standards and best practices in prudential supervision and regulation, including measures to deter and detect money laundering and terrorism financing	37%	49%	11%	2%	3.2	179	87%
To improve the regular and timely compilation, analysis and dissemination of economic and financial statistics according to accepted international standards	42%	49%	7%	2%	3.3	187	91%
Average for All Criteria	45%	47%	7%	1%	336%	173	84%

Note: Respondents could assign the "Highest Importance" rating to a maximum of two objectives.

¹ Based on ratings of Excellent=4, Good=3, Modest=2, and Poor=1.

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey