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I. Background
The Role of the IMF as Trusted Advisor

• “First off: The IMF must always be a trusted advisor.”  
  (The Managing Director’s Annual Meetings Speech, Tokyo, October 12, 2012)

• Another challenge facing the Fund is improving the value-added and relevance of Fund advice.

• Managing Director’s Management Implementation Plan on two aspects of the Fund’s institutional culture:
  1. Breaking down silos with more departmental collaboration and accountability on priorities.
  2. Promoting diverse views and candor by (i) accessing outside perspectives to avoid “groupthink”…

Greece is a Valued Partner to the IMF as Indicated by its Substantial Profit Contribution During the Past Six Years

(€, millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>NET OPERATIONAL INCOME</th>
<th>GREECE PROFIT CONTRIBUTION</th>
<th>GREECE PROFIT CONTRIBUTION AS A % OF NET OP. INCOME</th>
<th>NET OP. INCOME AS A % OF REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>€ 981</td>
<td>€ 1,104</td>
<td>(€ 122)</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>€ 973</td>
<td>€ 797</td>
<td>€ 176</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>€ 1,184</td>
<td>€ 926</td>
<td>€ 258</td>
<td>€ 70</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>€ 1,747</td>
<td>€ 897</td>
<td>€ 850</td>
<td>€ 385</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>€ 2,724</td>
<td>€ 1,000</td>
<td>€ 1,723</td>
<td>€ 589</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>€ 3,264</td>
<td>€ 994</td>
<td>€ 2,270</td>
<td>€ 813</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>€ 2,765</td>
<td>€ 1,058</td>
<td>€ 1,707</td>
<td>€ 938</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>€ 3,860</td>
<td>€ 1,131</td>
<td>€ 2,729</td>
<td>€ 764</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total since 2010 Program:</td>
<td>€ 9,537</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€ 3,558</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: IMF fiscal year end is 30 April; Greece profit contribution is calendar year. Conversion rates as of 30 April to conform with IMF fiscal year.
IMF's High Value Add is Illustrated by a Gross Margin that is a Multiple of the World's Leading Investment Banks

IMF vs. Major Bank Profit Margin Comparison 2015:
(Currency as indicated in billions except per employee.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BANK</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>NET INCOME</th>
<th>PROFIT MARGIN</th>
<th>NET INCOME PER EMPLOYEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>€ 3.9</td>
<td>€ 2.7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>€ 1,024,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan</td>
<td>$93.5</td>
<td>$24.4</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$104,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citi Bank</td>
<td>$76.4</td>
<td>$17.2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$74,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman Sachs</td>
<td>$33.8</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$165,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Stanley</td>
<td>$35.2</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$108,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Bank</td>
<td>€ 37.0</td>
<td>-€ 6.8</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-€ 67,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SDR converted to euros as of 30 April 2015 (IMF fiscal year end).
II. Ten IMF Best Practices Yet to be Applied to the Greece Program
Ten IMF Best Practices Yet to be Applied to the Greece Program

1. Make government financial transparency and accountability a top priority, and produce a full balance sheet.
2. Emulate IMF use of IFRS for its financial statements.
3. Follow GFSM recommendation to use IPSAS (IFRS) financial statements.
4. Request IMF IPSAS technical support similar to other successful countries.
5. Use IPSAS (IFRS) to correctly calculate Greece government debt burden metrics, which are much lower than peers, and debt relief.
6. Recognize present value of debt for measuring concessional financing.
7. Having admitted that future face value of debt is not meaningful, stop using for DSA primary balance targets.
8. Use net debt, in addition to gross debt, as an important metric.
9. Correctly calculate debt service and not confuse with gross financing needs.
10. Understand that 2008 SNA, to which IMF is a signatory, provides debt rescheduling and refinancing rules harmonized with IPSAS/IFRS.
Best Practice #1: Make Government Financial Transparency and Accountability a Top Priority and Produce a Full Balance Sheet (1 of 2)

• Transparency and accountability are essential to the centrality of IMF governance.

IMF Fiscal Transparency, Fiscal Performance and Credit Ratings (June 2012):
• We find that fiscal transparency has a positive and significant effect on ratings.

Fiscal Transparency, Accountability, and Risk (7 Aug 2012):
• “The degree of fiscal transparency has been shown to be an important predictor of a country’s fiscal credibility and performance.”
• The IMF has produced over 111 Fiscal Transparency Reports on Observance of Standards and Codes (ROSC).

• The stronger determinant of fiscal transparency scores appears to be the actual reporting of fiscal data covering general government, especially a full financial balance sheet.
Best Practice #1: Make Government Financial Transparency and Accountability a Top Priority and Produce a Full Balance Sheet (2 of 2)

• In 2014, the IMF produced the Fiscal Transparency Code with four transparency pillars.
• IMF has completed almost a dozen Fiscal Transparency Evaluations (FTEs).

• The performance of government equity portfolios correlates with fiscal transparency to the extent that fully transparent governments are expected to generate between 6 and 8 percent higher returns on their equity portfolios than others.
Best Practice #2: Emulate IMF Use of IFRS for its Financial Statements

“The [IMF] consolidated financial statements of the General Department are prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).” (IMF 2015 Financials Statements p.9)

IMF Financial Statements externally audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) to be in compliance with IFRS. (IMF 2015 Annual Report p.70)
Best Practice #3: Follow GFSM Recommendation to Use IPSAS (IFRS) Financial Statements

**IPSAS [Public Sector Version of IFRS]:**
- General purpose financial statements are used to evaluate financial performance and financial position, hold management accountable, and inform decision making by users of the general purpose financial statements. (GFSM Box A6.1 p.343)

- “IPSASs are international standards and recognized as best practice for public sector financial reporting.” (GFSM p.341)

**Government Finance Statistics:**
- The GFS reporting framework was developed specifically for public sector input to other macroeconomic datasets. (GFSM Box A6.1 p.343)
Best Practice #4: Request IMF IPSAS Technical Support Similar to Other Successful Countries

Portugal: Fiscal Transparency Evaluation (October 2014) notes “remarkable progress”. IMF on site for technical assistance.

Ireland: Favorable Fiscal Transparency Assessment (July 2013) notes significant percentage of IPSAS standards existing or near compliance.


Other Countries: Long list of countries receiving IMF technical assistance on IPSAS.
Best Practice #5: Use IPSAS (IFRS) to Correctly Calculate Greece Government Debt Burden Metrics, Which Are Much Lower than Peers, and Debt Relief (% of GDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece as % of Peers</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>212%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: EC AMECO, Eurostat, IMF, Member State MOFs, Bloomberg, MostImportantReform.info.
Best Practice #6: Recognize Present Value of Debt for Measuring Concessional Financing

IMF Staff Guidance Note prepared by the IMF and the World Bank (April 2007):

1. Countries that primarily rely on concessional financing, the net present value (NPV) of debt is needed to be informative as a measure of a country’s effective debt burden. (p.25)

2. This [debt] burden is best measured using the net present value (NPV) of debt to capture the concessionality of outstanding debt. (p.7)

3. NPV debt ratios are summary indicators of the burden represented by the future obligations of a country and thus reflect long-term risks to solvency. (p.7-8)

DSA LIC Framework (5 Nov 2013):
Debt stock indicators in the DSF are in present value rather than nominal terms. (p.12)

IMF Factsheet (7 Apr 2016):
Discusses use of present value of debt. (p.1)
Best Practice #7: Having Admitted that Future Face Value of Debt is Not Meaningful, Stop Using for Primary Balance Targets

“Given the extraordinarily concessional terms that now apply to the bulk of Greece’s debt, the debt/GDP ratio is not a very meaningful proxy for the forward-looking debt burden.” (IMF Greece DSA, 26 June 2015, p.11)

The IMF should stop using a future face value of debt to GDP target of 110% by 2022 (IMF Greece DSA, 26 June 2015, p.1 and IMF Greece DSA Update, July 2015, p.1) and requiring a 3.5% primary balance policy target (IMF Greece DSA, 26 June 2015, p.4 and IMF Greece DSA Update, July 2015, p.2).
Best Practice #8: Use Net Debt, in Addition to Gross Debt, as an Important Metric

IMF Staff Guidance Note (May 2013):

1. Staff should consider three important issues including gross versus net debt. (p.8)

2. Complementary analysis based on net debt presented to show the impact of risk-mitigating factors. (p.8)

3. The use of a standard statistical definition of net debt in line with the Public Sector Debt Statistics Guide is recommended. (p.9)
Best Practice #9: Correctly Calculate Debt Service and Not Confuse with Gross Financing Needs

- IMF Staff Guidance Note (5 Nov 2013), p.11: “the evolution of debt-service ratios provides an indication of the likelihood and possible timing of liquidity problems.” Debt service defined as principal and interest payments.
- IMF Factsheet (7 Apr 2016) discusses use of debt service.
- Greece 2016 Debt Service, which is interest expense and principal payments less rebates and deferrals, is 43% of peers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMF Gross Financing Debt Service % of GDP</th>
<th>IMF Gross Financing Needs (GFN) % of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Average</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greece % of Peer Average** 43% 135%

*Notes: Debt Service is 2016 estimate based on Bloomberg, EC, and IMF data; Greece adjusted for deferred interest, SMP/ANFA rebates, and interest savings related to 2016 ESM funding.*
Best Practice #10 (1 of 2): IMF is a Signatory to 2008 System of National Accounts (2008 SNA)

At its fortieth session, the Statistical Commission unanimously adopted the 2008 SNA as the international statistical standard for national accounts. We encourage all countries to compile and report their national accounts on the basis of the 2008 SNA as soon as possible.
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Best Practice #10 (2 of 2): Understand that 2008 SNA Provides Debt Rescheduling and Refinancing Rules Harmonized with IPSAS/IFRS

- 22.106(b): Debt rescheduling and refinancing will result in a debt burden reduction when the present value is lower.
- 22.109: Debt rescheduling (or refinancing) is an agreement to alter terms and condition for servicing existing or new debt on more favorable terms to debtor.
- 22.110 and 22.112: Under both arrangements, the debt instrument that is to be rescheduled is considered to be extinguished and replaced with new instrument and difference in value is a type of debt forgiveness.
- 22.113: The transaction is recorded at the value of the new debt.
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