

DOCUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND NOT FOR PUBLIC USE

MASTER FILES

ROOM C-130

14

EB/CAM/87/ 31

May 21, 1987

To: Members of the Committee on
Executive Board Administrative Matters

From: The Committee Secretary

Subject: Electronic Data Processing (EDP) - Individual Budgets
for the Offices of Executive Directors

The attached paper on Individual EDP Budgets is circulated at the request of the Chairman. It will be taken up at a meeting of the Committee to be held on Tuesday, May 26, 1987 at 3:00 p.m. in the Committee Room, 12-120.

Att: (1)

Other Distribution:
Members of the Executive Board

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Individual EDP Budgets for the Offices of Executive Directors

Prepared by the Staff

May 20, 1987

1. At the meeting on October 29, 1986, the Committee on Executive Board Administrative Matters (CAM) requested that a study be made of the feasibility of establishing separate budgets for electronic data processing (EDP) for individual Executive Directors' offices. This paper responds to that request.

2. The introduction of a Fund-wide dollar budget for EDP expenses in FY 1984 has made it possible that a similar budget could be established for each Executive Director's office. Under the present arrangement for staff, individual departments submit their EDP budget requests on a project-by-project basis to the Bureau of Computing Services (BCS). After discussion and consolidation, these requests are presented to the Executive Committee for Computing Services (ECCS), a committee of senior staff chaired by the Deputy Managing Director. The departmental requests are reviewed by the ECCS within the framework of the overall Administrative Budget; departments have the right to appeal the decisions of the ECCS to the Chairman. The individual project budgets include salaries and other personnel costs of staff and consultants, as well as the costs of the purchase of contractual services, equipment, and software. Expenses of each project (a total of 296 projects at present) are monitored by BCS on a monthly basis, and expenditure data are sent to the concerned departments for review and information. Any requests for additional funds or transfer of funds between projects must be approved by the ECCS.

3. The establishment of individual budgets to cover the EDP expenses of Executive Directors' offices would not present any particular difficulties. For some time, projects of these offices have been incorporated into the Fund-wide EDP budget; but no information is maintained on expenses by individual offices. The establishment of a separate budget for each Executive Director's office could be achieved by instituting the following procedure:

a. The requests of each Executive Director's office would be aggregated initially into a single budget. Adopting the procedures followed by departments, this task would be performed by a designated EDP coordinator or Systems Executive for Executive Directors' offices, whose primary responsibility would be to ensure that computing resources are properly planned, cost-justified, and managed effectively to support the goals and functions of each Executive Director's office. As an alternative to a single EDP coordinator, the coordinating function could

be performed by a committee comprising several Advisors and Assistants to Executive Directors; such a group has functioned very successfully recently in the preparation of the memorandum contained in EB/CAM/86/45. As a counterpart to the coordinator, be it an individual or a committee, BCS would assign a staff member knowledgeable both in Executive Director's office needs and data processing matters to be available for consultation in developing and administering the individual EDP budgets.

b. Following the consolidation of individual requests, a consolidated request would be sent by the coordinator or coordinating committee through BCS to the ECCS.

c. The ECCS would evaluate the request in the context of the EDP budget as a whole. In reviewing the consolidated request, the ECCS would be guided by the same guidelines that are used for reviewing departmental EDP requests. It would then send CAM its recommendations with an appropriate explanation of any suggested modification.

d. Should the recommendation of the ECCS not be acceptable to the Executive Directors, the Executive Board could on its own provide for additional funding to reach the desired level.

4. The above outlined procedure would appear to provide for both an orderly process for coordinating the requests and adequate safeguards for ensuring that the needs of each office in this area are reasonably provided for.

5. The adoption of such a procedure would require that a basic methodology be established for the allocation of funds among offices. First, with respect to the development of new, or major modifications of existing, systems, the procedure would be similar to that currently applied to development projects proposed by individual departments, i.e., there should be an evaluation of the costs and benefits of the project over the useful life of the installation and a comparison of alternatives and their costs in meeting the specified needs. Second, with respect to ongoing production activities, there are a number of parameters that could be considered for allocating funds; these range from a simple equal allocation of the budget appropriation for each office to a more complex formula that would be based upon the work load of each office. The work load could be measured by the number of country constituents in each office and/or the staff levels in each office. An indication of the outcome of using staff levels as an indicator of EDP production requirements is shown in Attachment I. Based on this allocation parameter, the share of each office would vary from 3.5 percent to 7.5 percent of the total EDP production budget for Executive Directors' offices; these percentages compare with an average of 4.5 percent if each office were allocated an equal share of the EDP production resources available.

Staffing Levels of Executive Directors' Offices

Staff of Executive Directors Offices (including Bank Staff)								Individual Office Staff as a Percentage of Total Staff	
	Executive Director	Alternate	Advisor	Assistants			Total	All Staff	Staff excl. Exe.Dir Alternate
				Technical	Secretarial	Clerical			
I	1	1	2	3	3	1	11	5.51%	5.90%
II	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
III	1	1	1	2	2.5		7.5	3.76%	3.61%
IV	1	2	2	5	5		15	7.52%	7.87%
V	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
VI	1	1	1	3	3	1	10	5.01%	5.25%
VII	1	1	1	1	3		7	3.51%	3.28%
VIII	1	1	1	1	3		7	3.51%	3.28%
IX	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
X	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
XI	1	2	0	5	5		13	6.52%	6.56%
XII	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
XIII	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
XIV	1	1	2	1	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
XV	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
XVI	1	2	2	2	4	2	13	6.52%	6.56%
XVII	1	1	0	2	3		7	3.51%	3.28%
XVIII	1	1	1	2	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
XIX	1	1	1	3	3		9	4.51%	4.59%
XX	1	1	4	3	3	1	13	6.52%	7.21%
XXI	1	1	1	1	3		7	3.51%	3.28%
XXII	1	1	0	3	3		8	4.01%	3.93%
Total	22	25	26	51	70.5	5	199.5	100.00%	100.00%

1

.

