

Annex E Background Data and Survey Results for Financial Sector Supervision Assistance

A. Background Information on the Fiscal Assistance

Table E.1: Financial Sector Supervision Assistance by Country (FY06-FY08)

Country	Advisory Missions		Seminar		Short Term		Secondments	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cook Islands	3	8.6	9	9.5				
Fiji Islands	3	8.6	12	12.6				
Kiribati								
Marshall Islands	2	5.7	3	3.2				
Micronesia, Federated States of	3	8.6	5	5.3			5	62.5
Nauru	1	2.9						
Niue	1	2.9	1	1.1				
Palau	4	11.4	2	2.1				
Papua New Guinea	2	5.7	14	14.7			1	12.5
Samoa	1	2.9	13	13.7	3	100.0	1	12.5
Solomon Islands	4	11.4	9	9.5				
Tokelau								
Tonga	4	11.4	5	5.3				
Tuvalu			1	1.1				
Vanuatu	7	20.0	21	22.1			1	12.5
Total	35	100.0	95	100.0	3	100.0	8	100.0

Source: PFTAC

B. Survey Results for Financial Sector Supervision Assistance

Table E.2: Assessing PFTAC Assistance for Financial Sector Supervision

	Percent Answering				Weighted Rating*/	Response Count	Response Rate
	Excellent	Good	Modest	Poor			
Consistency with Government	19%	74%	7%	0%	3.1	27	87%
Coordination of PFTAC's Activities with Those of Other TA Providers	16%	64%	16%	4%	2.9	25	81%
Coordination of PFTAC's Activities with Those of IMF Headquarters	23%	68%	5%	5%	3.1	22	71%
Use of the Outputs by the Institutions that They are Helping	7%	70%	22%	0%	2.9	27	87%
Quality of Formulation and PFTAC Engagement	22%	67%	11%	0%	3.1	27	87%
Practicality of the Recommendations	24%	72%	3%	0%	3.2	29	94%
Degree to Which the Recommendations were Implemented	15%	50%	35%	0%	2.8	26	84%
Effectiveness of PFTAC in Building Institutional Capacity	24%	55%	17%	3%	3.0	29	94%
Expertise and Assistance Available from PFTAC	27%	53%	20%	0%	3.1	30	97%
Timely Response from PFTAC to Provide Requested Assistance in Financial Sector Supervision Area	35%	58%	8%	0%	3.3	26	84%
Support for Regional Approaches in Financial Sector Supervision Area	23%	53%	17%	7%	2.9	30	97%
The Sustainability of the Benefits Associated with PFTAC's Work	18%	57%	25%	0%	2.9	28	90%
Average for All Criteria	21%	62%	15%	2%	3.0	27	88%

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

Source: 2009 PFTAC Evaluation Survey