

**Annex 1A****COUNTRY AAA APPROACH PAPER FOR PHASE I****BACKGROUND**

1. In March 2002, QAG commissioned an Advisory Panel chaired by David de Ferranti to review experience with the ESW assessment programs and recommend changes for the future. The Panel's main recommendation was to shift the focus of ESW quality assessment from individual ESW tasks to the entire country portfolio of AAA-ESW. The Panel saw this adjustment as both an important extension of accountability to the management level and a major opportunity for learning, notably as feedback in the preparation of a new CAS.<sup>1</sup> Subject to successful piloting of the methodology, management agreed to introduce an approach based upon Country AAA (defined as ESW and non-lending TA) assessments starting FY04.<sup>2</sup>

**THE PILOT**

2. In line with the recommendations of the Advisory Panel, in FY02 QAG launched a pilot exercise, in collaboration with volunteer country teams, to explore and assess the quality of AAA at the country level for Mozambique, Peru and Thailand. In FY03, six other assessments in two Country Units (Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova in ECA and Burkina Faso, Mali and Mauritania in AFR) were carried out to test whether there were additional synergies in reviewing the entire AAA program in all countries in a CMU.

3. The approach adopted for the pilot phase differed in several respects from that used for individual task assessment. The AAA program over a full CAS cycle was assessed against the agreed/updated objectives of the CAS. Panels tested a new country AAA questionnaire that focused on coherence of the overall AAA program, and integration of and synergies among individual tasks and clusters of tasks. Panels also used a simplified questionnaire for individual tasks (one for standard ESW and a customized questionnaire for non-lending TA). In addition to the standard review of key documents, the panels conducted extensive interviews both at Bank headquarters and with clients other stakeholders and key partners in the countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Subsequently, the QEA/QSA Review Panel chaired by Johannes Linn recommended an in-depth review of all lending activities in a country, initially with four pilots in FY04, focusing on new operational directions (results, scaling up, programmatic, multi-sector teams, capacity building, etc.). The Linn Panel also recommended exploring the possibility of eventually linking country-based AAA and lending reviews following the pilot phase. Consistent with its proposals for continuation of QEA/QSR, the Panel also recommended to maintain but reduce the frequency of, the task-by-task ESW assessment (e.g. every two-three years). This reflects, in part, concern that the culture of quality among staff might be diminished in the shift to more aggregated assessments and, in part, the recognition of the utility for management of monitoring ESW quality trends over time.*

<sup>2</sup> *Another recommendation of the de Ferranti Advisory Panel, to pilot thematic/sectoral assessments of AAA, will be undertaken separately by QAG in FY04.*

**LESSONS FROM THE PILOT ASSESSMENTS**

4. The pilot assessments were carried out to test:
  - (i) whether an integrated, multi-year approach at the country level would yield more robust quality assessment of the AAA program by providing greater insight into synergies among tasks that could not be captured by task-by-task assessments alone;
  - (ii) whether extensive interaction with both the client and other stakeholders as part of the field visit would enhance the assessment process; and
  - (iii) whether the proposed approach could also provide value-added beyond the individual task assessments for the country teams and program managers.
  
5. The main conclusion of the pilot phase is that each of these three questions can, indeed, be answered in the affirmative: the new approach is able to produce well substantiated quality assessments of AAA at the country level; the methodology as tested, including interaction with clients and stakeholders, is largely sound as well as manageable at a reasonable scale within the existing budget for ESW assessment; and, if the assessment is well timed in relation to CAS preparation, country teams may derive immediate benefits from the assessment findings in terms of lessons for AAA program formulation and management.<sup>3</sup> More specifically:
  - With the country AAA program as the unit of analysis, panels are better able to identify significant variation among countries, themes and tasks and draw attention to areas of relative strength and weakness that fall within the Bank's control;
  - Direct interaction with counterparts and stakeholders affords a stronger empirical basis for panel judgments on strategic relevance and likely impact of AAA; and
  - And informal feedback from the respective country teams confirms that the assessments were helpful. For example, the Peru, Thailand and Ukraine country teams report that the country AAA assessment has been used in CAS preparation.
  
6. In addition, the pilot identified a few areas for adjustment and clarified several issues in the implementation of country AAA assessments:
  - The country questionnaire and the questionnaires for assessment of individual ESW tasks worked reasonably well, although the questionnaire for Non-

---

<sup>3</sup> *The pilot also provided lessons of substance relating to the quality and management of a country AAA program. These have already been largely synthesized and reported in Quality of ESW in FY02: A QAG Assessment, April 16, 2003.*

Lending TA tasks required modifications to bring out more the capacity building dimension;

- The core panel should be chosen to ensure that at least one member has reasonable familiarity with the country. Resource persons, from national institutes or agencies, may be added as supplementary panel members to ensure the panel's access to local knowledge. Additional panel members from partners, such as major donors or other international institutions, would also be helpful;
- Assessing AAA in all countries under a CMU at the same time did not add significant value to the individual country AAA assessments. (Moreover, the CAS cycle across the countries in a CMU normally varies and timing the assessments to the CAS cycle is difficult.);
- In the view of panelists, a partial country AAA assessment (i.e., a thematic or sub-national slice of the program) would result in missing important elements in terms of program coherence and integration. It is therefore recommended that the assessment should cover the entire AAA program even for the large programs;
- The panels confronted a variety of information problems—for example, lack of a definitive inventory of AAA tasks and outputs, and the absence of reliable cost information for all AAA activity—that, in the roll-out phase, will require clarification from the corresponding CMUs at the outset of the assessment process; and
- Finally, both on effectiveness and efficiency grounds, prior to the field visit, preparation should be made by the field office in arranging a panel work schedule and interviews.

#### **ASSESSING COUNTRY AAA IN FY04**

7. Based on the results of the pilots carried out in FY02 and FY03, QAG plans to undertake a number of Country AAA assessments in FY04. The instrument will serve both accountability and learning purposes. QAG will review if any changes to the assessment approach are warranted at the end of the fiscal year—particularly in view of the on-going transition to results-oriented CAS as well as the piloting of the integrative lending assessments proposed by the Linn panel.

8. The average number of CAS or CAS-like documents deliveries to the Board for the FY04-06 period is expected to be about 35 per year according to the FY04-06 Strategy Update Paper.<sup>4</sup> In consultation with OPCS, QAG has selected 12 countries from the CAS schedules in the SAP for the next two years, taking into account regional

---

<sup>4</sup> *In FY04, 54 CAS documents and 5 Progress Reports are scheduled in the SAP to go to the Board for discussion with a heavy bunching in Q2. According to the SAP, in FY04, 29 out of 54 CASs to be discussed by the Board are scheduled for Q2. This list, however, thins out as the FY progresses and some of the scheduled tasks slip into the next fiscal year.*

balance, potential value added and logistics. Countries which are slated for Country Assistance Evaluation (CAE) by OED were excluded from the sample. Because Transitional Support Strategy (TSS) or Country Re-engagement Notes (CRN) could be interpreted to imply that no substantial program existed previously to evaluate, they were also excluded from the list. In addition, countries with AAA programs costing less than \$500,000 over a three-year period were excluded. (These programs accounted for only about four percent of the total AAA costs during FY01-FY03.)<sup>5</sup> Since the CAS timetables change considerably during the fiscal year, it is proposed that the list be revisited in December. The list of countries selected and the proposed dates for the FY04 assessments are provided below. (The list does not include any of the pilots for the Results-Based CASs.)

<b>TENTATIVE SCHEDULE</b>		
<b>Country</b>	<b>Field Visit</b>	<b>Draft Report</b>
Lao's PDR	mid-October	Early November
Pakistan	mid-October	Early November
Slovak Republic	mid-October	Early November
Mexico	Early November	End November
El Salvador	mid-November	Early December
Guatemala	mid-November	Early December
Kazakhstan	mid-January	Early February
Uzbekistan	mid-January	Early February
Angola	Early February	End February
Egypt	mid-February	Early March
Tanzania	mid-March	Early April
Bangladesh	mid-April	Early May

9. While QAG will discuss with the CMU concerned the best timing for each assessment, QAG will endeavor to complete the review before the CAS Upstream Review date -- this would, in most cases, mean 3-6 months before the Board discussion date -- in order to allow the country management and country teams opportunity to consider the assessment report and the panel's recommendations in preparing the next CAS.<sup>6</sup>

#### **ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

10. The assessment will seek to cover a CAS-to-CAS cycle, usually about a 3-4 year period. In cases where the selection was made on the basis of the CAS Progress Report, the assessment may span two CAS periods. Based on a stratified sampling, QAG will

<sup>5</sup> *The size distribution of the AAA programs for FY01-FY03 indicate that there are 48 AAA programs costing less than \$500,000 over the FY01-FY03 period. Majority of these countries are the Caribbean and the Pacific Island States.*

<sup>6</sup> *If a CAS completion report is being planned, QAG assessment will be scheduled to provide a first draft to the country team about two months before the Upstream Review date.*

select the main AAA tasks to be assessed (para16). The panels may also look at the major analytical work done under project preparation, particularly under adjustment operations, to have a better sense of the overall picture. At the outset of the review process, the panel will meet with the country director/country program coordinator to confirm its understanding of the country context, the baseline and core expectations from the AAA program at the beginning of the assessment period and any major changes since the last CAS.

11. The individual task assessments will be conducted on the basis of a desk review, supplemented by interviews with the TTL/task team. To the extent possible, the panels will also interview sector managers. Many of these reviews will be held in HQ, with some fine-tuning in the field. However, for a significant number of tasks managed from the field, the work would be completed in the field. For all tasks assessed, there will be supplementary field interviews with clients/other stakeholders. As appropriate, tasks may be reviewed in groups of interlinked activities along a common CAS theme. The panels will need to make judgments around the quality of the interface/synergies between the AAA assessed and the overall country strategy, including the lending program and other donors' programs.

12. Each panel will use a country level and individual task questionnaires. The version of these questionnaires used in the pilot has now been updated. The *country questionnaire* (Annex I) will help shape discussions with CD/core CT/CAS-PRSP teams, strategic level country counterparts (e.g., central ministries) and key donors with a view to assessing the AAA program within the context of the strategic framework. For example, the panel will assess how well the AAA program served to advance/respond to the goals and conceptual framework of the CAS/PRSP, both as originally defined and as adjusted during implementation. In addition to the four standard quality dimensions of the individual task questionnaire, the country questionnaire includes the *Coherence and Integration* dimension which seeks to assess synergy of the AAA program between and across themes, sectors, instruments and across time. Panels will also record judgments on *Bank Inputs and Processes* in the country questionnaire. They will assess areas such as resource availability (\$, people), cost-effectiveness, the contribution in terms of guidance and oversight from key elements of Bank management (regions, networks, peers, etc).

13. Panels will also use an *ESW task assessment questionnaire* (Annex II). The focus will be on the *Strategic Relevance* (relevance to the CAS/PRSP, timeliness, and clearly defined objectives), *Likely Impact* (on the client, in the Bank in the formulation of strategic approach to the country) and *Dialogue and Dissemination* dimensions. Although The *Internal Quality* dimension will be reviewed, it will be a more rapid review than in the traditional ESW task assessment. (A *Non-lending TA questionnaire* will be used for assessment of non-ESW tasks. This questionnaire is in Annex III.)

14. All three questionnaires will use a four-point scale in rating quality. Based on their understanding of the country context and the program objectives, panelists should exercise judgment in deciding on the relative weights to be given, first to the individual sub-ratings, then among the five (four in the case of task assessments) assessment dimensions. Such a balanced set of judgments is a central responsibility of panelists.

15. Panelists will make use of the full range afforded by the scale in accordance with the standards described below. Within each rating category, they are encouraged to use the comments section for sub-ratings and the summary narrative text to differentiate among stronger and weaker performance.

<i>Highly Satisfactory (1)</i>	Best practice in several areas and no major deficiencies
<i>Satisfactory (2)</i>	Solid performance. What is normally expected of the Bank's work
<i>Marginal (3)</i>	Significant deficiencies in some important areas
<i>Unsatisfactory (4)</i>	A broad pattern of deficiencies

16. To keep the assessment process to a manageable scale, a stratified sampling process for task level assessment will be used. All tasks (ESW and other AAA) costing<sup>7</sup> over \$250,000 and all core diagnostic ESW tasks, a third of the tasks costing between \$100,000 and \$250,000 and a fifth of the tasks costing less than \$100,000 randomly selected will go through individual rapid assessments. Tasks costing less than \$30,000 will not be sampled, but panels should consider clustering some of the smaller tasks under CAS themes for a rapid review. For an assessment undertaken in the second quarter of FY04, tasks will only be sampled from those that have been delivered to the client by July 31, 2003. For an assessment in the last quarter of FY04, sampling will be among those tasks that were delivered to client by December 31, 2003. Any tasks already assessed by QAG will be incorporated and updated. Tasks not otherwise selected may be proposed for rapid assessment by the country team or CMU. QAG will consider their addition based on considerations of relevance and importance to country program and for purposes of institutional learning.

## OUTPUTS

17. Each assessment will include a completed Country AAA questionnaire, including a brief Summary Assessment, and a number of individual task assessment questionnaires. The draft Country AAA questionnaire will be made available to Country Management for comment. Individual task assessment questionnaires will be forwarded in draft to the corresponding task team leader, sector manager as well as the country director for comment. The panel is expected to consider the comments received in finalizing both the task assessments and the Country AAA assessment. In case of diverging views, the Region will be invited to provide a rejoinder that will be incorporated to the final report.

18. At the end of FY04, a Synthesis Report addressing the trends and systemic issues emerging from the FY04 exercise and the pilots carried out in FY02 and FY03 will be prepared. The draft synthesis report will be forwarded to the Managing Director, Operations and will be discussed by the OVPs before sending it out to CODE for discussion. Other emerging issues would be referred to the appropriate Bank units (e.g.,

<sup>7</sup> Budget, as with regular ESW exercise, will be SAP- recorded BB and Trust Funds.

Networks, SBs and WBI). Once a Country AAA assessment is completed, staff, managers and panelists will be invited to provide comments and feedback on the exercise. These will be incorporated in the Synthesis Report and will also be used to fine-tune the exercise for the subsequent fiscal years.

## **LOGISTICS**

### **(a) Panelists and Staffing**

19. Each Country AAA assessment will be carried out by a panel of two members, though the size of the panel may vary depending on the program. For large programs, a third panel member will be added. For small programs, the assessments will be bundled to contain travel costs. In cases where small programs cannot be bundled, the field visit could be handled by an experienced panel chair to contain costs. The panel chair will be a senior Bank staff or a recently retired consultant. Panel members will be selected among the senior Bank staff (or consultant) or representative of a partner institution or a bilateral donor agency. The panels will be encouraged to use nationals who have a good knowledge of the Bank's program as resource persons or supplementary panel members. The Country Management Units and Country Offices will be solicited to provide a list a potential resource person.

20. Individual task assessments will be carried out by a two-person panel that will include one of the members of the core panel to ensure consistency and validation of the assessment in the field and a technical specialist selected among the senior Bank staff or consultants.

21. A QAG Moderator will provide support and guidance to the core panels and CMUs during the exercise. A key role of the moderator will be to ensure consistency across assessments and that due process is followed.

22. The CDs will appoint a coordinator to liaise with and assist the Panel. In the decentralized CMUs, the coordinator would typically be the Country Program Coordinator.

23. Support functions would be provided largely by QAG. These would cover documentation/research, as well as logistics, and panel co-ordination. The country units will assist in the communication with clients and stakeholders. Country offices would provide both logistics and substantive support for the field mission phase. A country office staff member should be assigned to work with the panel during its field work.

### **(b) Management of Field Visit**

24. Since the panel is expected to visit the country to get the insights of government, donors and other stakeholders, country management will be asked to provide recommendations for in-country interviews with the panel and a main counterpart and administrative support in the country office. Before the panel's visit, QAG will send to the country office a briefing note and a sample letter, which would be used to explain the purpose of the panel interviews in the country. Subsequently, through the country office,

QAG will send a briefing note and standard letter for communication to country officials/donors explaining the role of QAG and the purpose of the QAG field visit.

25. The core panel would have a roughly 1-2 week's field visit, depending on the size and complexity of countries to be visited. Field work would comprise the following:

- meetings with CD (if decentralized) or the Country Manager (CM) + key country office staff (e.g. field-based TTLs, country/lead economist, etc.);
- supplementary ESW/AAA task panels for field-managed tasks; and
- discussions with client and other stakeholders;
  - core ministries (finance/planning) on relationship to overall national/Bank strategy, including CAS/PRSP/CDF;
  - line ministries/specialized agencies on their role in/impact of specific ESW/AAA products;
  - members/institutions of the civil society (private sector, academia, think tanks, NGOs); and
  - representatives of major donors.

## **DOCUMENTATION**

26. The Country AAA assessments will require a set of key documents for the panels to make judgments about the quality of the AAA program design and implementation. Most of the documents are available in the Bank's systems (i.e., IRIS, Reports) or other public domains and can be accessed by QAG staff. Every effort will be made to minimize the burden on the CMUs and task teams associated with assembling the key documentation and information. In addition to validating the inventory of AAA activities by type, cost, TTL, etc., as well as the FY00/01/02/03 and FY04 AAA budgets, the Regions will provide the following documents and information:

- country context;
- any strategy document or draft since the last CAS or the Progress Report;
- any I/PRSP/JSA/CDF and JSA documents or drafts;
- a listing of key IMF documents (for example, recent Article IV consultation);
- most recent CPPR; and
- core task report, concept paper, peer reviewer comments, minutes of the review meeting for the tasks selected for individual rapid assessment.

## **COSTS**

27. On the basis of estimates derived from the pilot stage, each country assessment is expected to cost on average \$90,000, ranging between \$50,000 and \$150,000, depending

on the size of the country and the assessed program (i.e., number of tasks which will be individually assessed). The cost estimates are based on the assumption that an average Country AAA assessment would include a core panel of two, eight individual rapid assessment of tasks, 10 days field visit by the core panel members. The cost of the assessments to the regional staff is estimated at about \$15,000, including about three staff weeks in addition to one week of the team assistant's time in the Country Office handling the logistics of the QAG team's field visit. For 12 countries, the total estimated cost to the regional staff is about \$180,000. These costs, to be borne by the regions, should be more than offset by the savings about \$300,000 from not doing the task-based ESW assessments by QAG.

28. The cost of the Country AAA assessment exercise for 12 countries and the preparation of the Synthesis Report are estimated at \$1.2 million for FY04.

**Annex 1B****COUNTRY AAA APPROACH PAPER FOR PHASE II****BACKGROUND**

1. We now have effectively four years of experience with Country AAA assessments, from the first pilots in FY02 to full-scale work in FY04-05. A review of this experience has just been completed and shared with a cross-section of Bank managers and staff. A Synthesis Report, dated September 2, 2005 (Annex I) has pulled together the findings of this Review as well as insights gained from some 36 individual country studies. The Review has concluded that the Country (C-) AAA approach is able to produce well substantiated quality assessments of AAA at the country level and the methodology is judged robust, as well as cost-effective at scale. The Review has also found the country-wide approach to have brought about a significant extension of accountability to the management level as well as providing a major opportunity for learning, notably through timely inputs into the preparation of a new CAS and as a contribution to the overall process of improving the planning, design and implementation of AAA. The Review has recommended a continuation, with some enhancements, of the more integrated, CAS-synchronized, multi-year approach that is now in place. These recommendations were fully endorsed at an OVP's Meeting held September 14, 2005.

2. This Approach Paper provides refined guidance for the next cycle of the C-AAA assessments, building on the Review's findings. The key areas of enhancement being reflected in the refined approach include: (i) a stronger focus on assessing the 'likely impact' and 'results/outcomes' orientation, including synergies with the rest of program, notably lending/dialogue; (ii) greater attention to assessing capacity building impacts on client countries; (iii) in countries with active partner-donors, greater efforts to gauge the scope and quality of collaboration with these development partners' pertinent activities, and (iv) greater attention to assessing efforts to improve managerial oversight of the overall AAA program. In terms of the assessment process, suggested enhancements include (i) greater attempts to take stock, as part of the review, of AAA-like activities carried out as part of project preparation, especially for adjustment lending and SWApS; (ii) a more explicit focus on thematic grouping of tasks; (iii) more deliberate and explicit efforts aimed at improving buy-in of any assessment exercise by the country team concerned and (iii) renewed efforts aimed at increasing the quality and effectiveness of dissemination of assessments results to the appropriate audiences. Finally, both the experience with the use of local resource persons and selective use of staff from other donors and specialized institutions in QAG panels is judged to have worked well and would be mainstreamed as appropriate. The following updated guidelines detail the C-AAA Assessment Approach for FY06-07.

**UPDATED COUNTRY AAA ASSESSMENT APPROACH FOR FY06-07.**

3. Based on the positive experience to date, QAG plans to continue with the program of Country AAA assessments in FY06 and FY07. The instrument will serve both accountability and learning purposes.

4. For FY06, there are presently just under 60 items on the CAS schedule compiled by OPCS, of which just over half (31) are CASs and some 15 are CAS-Progress Reports. The QAG country sampling frame is close to 100% once one nets out those cases where there would be an exceptional demand on the country team. The proposed basic screening should normally exclude the following CAS situations:

- An OED CAE completed or to be completed during CY or CY+1 or-1
- a QAG C-AAA review done in last 2 FYs

The country selection will also informally seek to ensure a good mix of program sizes, Regions and IDA/IBRD. It is also sensitive to potential value-added and logistics.

5. In consultation with OPCS and OED, QAG has been identifying countries/country groupings for FY06 assessments. The actual timing of each exercise will be agreed with the Country Director concerned. The objective will be to find the best fit with the timeline of the CAS, recognizing the need for consultations with clients and other partners. An important goal will be to endeavor to provide a working draft/informal debriefing to the Country/CAS team before the CAS Upstream Review date.

6. QAG would also seek to increase the level of engagement with Regional Chief Economists, both upfront in the selection of countries and in the dissemination process, especially of generic messages internal to the Bank.

**ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

7. The guiding principle of the C-AAA approach is to take an integrated perspective, examining the quality/effectiveness of AAA over a full CAS cycle. With the now routine 4-year cycle for a *Results*-based CAS, its explicit performance/outcome indicators will frame the QAG assessment. In cases where the QAG assessment is triggered by a CAS Progress Report, the assessment may span two CAS periods, although the analysis will be focused more on the current CAS.

8. The final country Synthesis Report by the QAG panel will draw upon two core building blocks: the review of a sample of individual AAA tasks (to be grouped thematically to extent possible) and a substantive field mission to obtain perspectives and insights from the client and key donor-partners.

9. As a first and key input to the C-AAA Assessment, QAG will select a stratified sample of the AAA tasks. To the extent feasible, the panels will carry out a light review of the often substantial body of analytical work (quasi-AAA) done under project

preparation, particularly under adjustment operations and SWAps, or by the client /other donors, to gain a better sense of the overall picture for Bank-funded/CAS-related country analytical activities. At the outset of the review process, the panel will meet with the country director/country program coordinator to confirm its understanding of the country context, the baseline and the country team's expectations from the AAA program as established/planned at the beginning of the assessment period and any major changes since the last CAS. This will be facilitated by working with the CMU to catalogue the full array of analytical work mobilized by or otherwise associated<sup>8</sup> with the CAS/country program.

10. Individual task assessments will be conducted on the basis of a desk review of documents and other materials, supplemented by interviews with the TTL/task team. To the extent possible, the panels will examine tasks within a few 'clusters' or thematic groupings, with meetings to include sector managers. Many of these reviews will be held in HQ, with fine-tuning in the field. Optimally most of these task/theme level reviews will be completed ahead of the field mission. However, for a significant number of tasks managed from the field, the QAG work would need to be completed in the field. For the tasks/themes assessed, there will be supplementary field interviews with clients/other key stakeholders. The panels will need to make judgments on the quality of the interface/synergies between the AAA assessed and the overall country strategy, including the lending program and other donors' programs.

11. Each panel will be guided in its thinking by structured questionnaires which serve to provide both discipline and comprehensiveness in their work. This will apply to both overall country level and task/thematic/sectoral issues. These questionnaires have been enhanced to cover issues identified in the Synthesis Report; these new elements include such topics as outcomes/results, dissemination, country ownership, etc.

12. The *Country AAA questionnaire* (Annex II) will help shape discussions with CD/core CT/CAS-PRSP teams, strategic level country counterparts (e.g., central ministries) and key partners/donors with a view to assessing the AAA program within the context of the strategic framework. In addition to the four standard quality dimensions of the individual task questionnaire, the country questionnaire includes a *Coherence and Integration* dimension which seeks to assess synergy of the AAA program between and across themes, sectors, instruments and over time. Panels' comments on the CMU submission regarding contextual factors should also note their appreciation of the impacts political and social factors have had on the design and implementation of the AAA program. Panels will also record judgments on *Bank Inputs and Processes* in the country questionnaire. They will assess areas such as resource availability (\$, people), cost-effectiveness, the contribution in terms of guidance and oversight from key elements of Bank management (regions, networks, peers, etc).

---

<sup>8</sup> Most of course will be formally coded as AAA and funded by BB and established Trust Funds, but in some cases important analytical tasks may be identified that are directly co-financed/maybe even led by the client/other donors or 'embedded' in project preparation activities. The goal of harmonization would demand that Bank AAA be sensitive to these parallel activities carried out with non-Bank resources.

13. Panels will also use an *AAA Theme Assessment Questionnaire* (Annex III). The focus will be on the *Strategic Relevance* (relevance to the CAS/PRSP, timeliness, and clearly defined objectives), *Likely Impact* (on the client, in the Bank in the formulation of strategic approach to the country) and *Participation, Consultation and Dissemination* dimensions. The *Coherence and Integration* aspect has been reinforced in the new questionnaire. Although the *Internal Quality* dimension will be reviewed, it will be a more rapid review than in the traditional QAG single task AAA assessment (Annex IV). A *Non-Lending TA questionnaire* will be also used (Annex V).

14. Given the practical (cost) limits on panel time in the field, QAG will explore the option of using standard electronic or written surveys for supplementary client feedback. This option will depend upon local country perceptions on the value/acceptability of such surveys.

15. All questionnaires will use the now standard QAG six-point scale for rating quality, which is shown below. Panelists will be requested to annotate all the ratings, including the “satisfactory” ones as well as the outliers.

1. *Highly Satisfactory*: Best practice in several areas and no major deficiencies.
2. *Satisfactory*: Satisfactory or better on all key respects. What is normally expected of the Bank’s analytical work.
3. *Moderately Satisfactory*: Satisfactory on all key aspects, but showing some deficiencies and missed opportunities
4. *Moderately Unsatisfactory*: Significant deficiencies in a few key aspects.
5. *Unsatisfactory*: Significant deficiencies in several key aspects.
6. *Highly Unsatisfactory*: A broad pattern of deficiencies.

16. Based on their understanding of the country context and the program objectives, panelists should exercise judgment in deciding on the relative weights to be given, first to the individual sub-ratings, then among the five (four in the case of task assessments) assessment dimensions. Such a balanced set of judgments is a central responsibility of panelists.

17. Panelists will be encouraged to make use of the full range afforded by the 6-point scale. Within each rating category, they will be encouraged to use the comments section for sub-ratings and the summary narrative text to differentiate among stronger and weaker performance. In this regard, normal expectations are for the dimension of Strategic Relevance to be high, but if it were to be poor, it should count heavily in the assessment of dimensions.

18. To keep the assessment process to a manageable scale, a stratified sampling process will be used for individual rapid task level assessments. There will be 100% coverage of tasks costing<sup>9</sup> over \$250,000 plus one-third of tasks costing between

---

<sup>9</sup> Budget defined as SAP-recorded BB plus identified Trust Funds.

\$100,000 and \$250,000 and one-fifth of tasks costing less than \$100,000. Tasks costing less than 30,000 will not be formally sampled, but panels in looking at core CAS themes as ‘clusters’ for their work should be aware of/lightly review some smaller tasks. Any tasks already assessed by QAG through another exercise will where appropriate be incorporated and updated. Tasks not otherwise selected by QAG may be proposed for the assessment by the country team or CMU where they see particular merit /relevance to the task for a fuller perspective of the AAA work in the country; QAG will consider their addition based on considerations of relevance/importance or institutional learning. A special effort will be made to ensure that due consideration is given to issues of decentralization and community-led growth which figure prominently in an increasing number of CASs.

19. Over the last two years, QAG has piloted a few hybrid Country Assessments, in which AAA and Lending were assessed in parallel, better permitting an analysis of issues of horizontal cohesion within the totality of Bank programming. Looking forward such composite assessments will be initiated only at the request of a country team or senior management. The effort would be largely in learning mode; the OED CAE would be the Bank’s core country program evaluative process. This does not in any sense reduce the need for the QAG panel to examine the quality/effectiveness of the contribution of the AAA program as designed and as implemented to a sound lending portfolio (as well as to an effective policy dialogue).

## **OUTPUTS**

20. Each country assessment ‘report package’ will include a completed country level AAA questionnaire, a chapeau 6-8 page narrative Summary Assessment, plus as an annex a number of individual task/thematic assessment questionnaires, as per task sample. The draft Country AAA questionnaire/chapeau narrative will be made available to Country Management for comment. Individual task/thematic assessment questionnaires will be forwarded in draft to the corresponding task team leader, sector manager, as well as the country director for comment. The panel is expected to consider the comments received in finalizing both the thematic/task assessments and the main Country AAA Assessment. In case of diverging views, the Region will be invited to provide a rejoinder that will be incorporated to the final report.

21. Towards the end of FY07, a Synthesis Report will be prepared addressing the trends and systemic issues emerging from the FY06 and FY07 sample of Country Assessments. The draft Synthesis Report will be forwarded to the Managing Director, Operations and will be discussed by the OVPs. If appropriate it could be shared with CODE. Emerging generic issues would be reviewed with key Bank units (e.g. OPCS, Networks, CEs, OED). Once a Country AAA Assessment is completed, staff, managers and panelists will be invited to provide comments and feedback on the process aspects of the exercise. These will be incorporated in the Synthesis Report and will also be used to fine-tune the process for subsequent years.

## LOGISTICS

### *(a) Panelists and Staffing*

22. Each Country AAA Assessment will be typically carried out by a panel of two members. The size of the panel may vary; for large programs, a third panel member will be added. For small programs, two assessments may be bundled to contain travel costs or the field visit could be handled by one experienced panel chair. The panel chair and members will be senior Bank staff or retirees/consultants. Where viable and especially for larger, complex programs it may be beneficial to add a representative of a major partner institution or donor agency. The panels will be encouraged to use nationals who have a good knowledge of the Bank's program as resource persons or supplementary panel members. The Country Management Units and Country Offices will be solicited to provide a list of potential resource persons.

23. Periodic meetings will be held with panelists to compare experiences, fine-tune the methodology, etc. Panelists will be de facto peer reviewers of the Synthesis Report.

24. Individual task or thematic 'clusters' of assessments will be carried out by two-person panels that will usually include one of the members of the core panel to ensure consistency and validation of the assessment in the field and a technical specialist selected among senior Bank staff or consultants.

25. A QAG Moderator will provide support and guidance to the core panels and CMUs during the exercise. A key role of the moderator will be to ensure consistency across assessments, that due process is followed and to ensure quality of the panel report.

26. The CD involved will appoint a coordinator to liaise with and assist the Panel. In the decentralized CMUs, the coordinator would typically be the Country Program Coordinator.

27. Support functions would be provided largely by QAG. These would cover documentation/research, as well as logistics, and panel co-ordination. The country units will assist in the communication with clients and stakeholders. Country offices would provide both logistics and substantive support for the field mission phase. A country office staff member should be assigned to work with the panel across the duration of the assessment, but especially for the fieldwork.

### *(b) Management of Field Visit*

28. Country management will be asked to provide recommendations for in-country interviewees to the panel, as well as a core staff counterpart and administrative support in the country office. Before the panel's visit, QAG will send to the country office a briefing note and a sample letter for the client-government, which would be used to explain the role/purpose of the QAG exercise and the panel visit.

29. The core panel would typically have a 5-10 working days field visit, depending on the size and complexity of country to be visited. Major elements in the field visit would be:

- (a) meetings with CD (if decentralized) or the Country Manager (CM) if the CD is not located in the field + key country office staff (e.g. field-based TTLs, country/lead economist, etc.);
- (b) any supplementary AAA task/thematic panels for field-managed tasks; and
- (c) discussions with client and other stakeholders. These would include: (i) core ministries (finance/planning) on relationship to overall national/Bank strategy, including CAS/PRSP/CDF; (ii) line ministries/specialized agencies on their role in/impact of specific AAA products; (iii) members/institutions of the civil society (private sector, academia, think tanks, NGOs); and (iv) representatives of major donors (especially any involved in co-financing of projects or AAA, SWAp partners with Bank).

***(c) Dissemination***

30. The July 05 Synthesis Report has placed a heavy emphasis on the need for broader and more effective dissemination for each individual country assessment of the panel analysis/conclusions, notably with the client country/its agencies and within the country team itself. There is also a need for more effective dissemination of the generic/systemic messages from both the Synthesis Report and the next such overall assessment. With the client this focus is a natural extension of the desire for greater ownership of the AAA work itself by participation in task design and implementation.

31. The QAG panel should make best efforts to engage the country team throughout the assessment process, with the focus on learning. In particular it is suggested that they should offer to join CAS team working sessions. With the concurrence of the CD, there should normally be a debriefing workshop after the panel finishes their report. With a view to greater engagement of/sharing with the client and other major donor-partners, they should also be invited to these debriefings. (Costs and logistics considerations might mean these sessions should be via VC link.).

32. To foster the dissemination of generic lessons, it is envisaged that Chief Economists (CE) in each Region be actively involved. It is planned that QAG will hold an annual workshop with CEs to explore some of the emerging lessons from the most recent crop of AAA exercises. This approach to better disseminating generic lessons will need to also involve OPCS and OED.

**DOCUMENTATION**

33. The Country AAA Assessments will require a set of key documents for the panels to make judgments about the quality of the AAA program design and implementation. Most of the documents are available in the Bank's systems (IRIS, Reports) or other public domains and can be accessed by QAG staff. Every effort will be made to minimize the burden on the CMUs and task teams associated with assembling the key

documentation and information. In addition to validating the inventory of AAA activities by type, cost, TTL, etc., QAG will also review the (BB/SAP) budget heads over the 3-4 year span of the assessment.

34. Regions will be expected to provide the following documents and information: (a) country context; (b) any strategy document or draft since the last CAS or the Progress Report; (c) budget and other summary data on the lending as well as AAA portfolios; (d) any I/PRSP/JSA/CDF and JSA documents or drafts; (e) a listing of key IMF documents (for example, recent Article IV consultation); (f) most recent CPPR; and (g) core task report, concept paper, peer reviewer comments, minutes of the review meeting for the tasks selected for individual rapid assessment

### **COSTS**

35. On the basis of estimates from past years experience, country assessments are expected to cost on average \$100,000, including QAG overheads, with costs ranging between \$70,000 and \$175,000, depending on the size of the country and the assessed program (i.e. number of tasks which will be individually or thematically assessed). The cost estimates are based on the assumption that an average Country AAA assessment would include a core panel of two, ten or so individual rapid assessment of tasks under three broad CAS themes, ten days field visit by the core panel members. QAG overheads include services provided by moderators, support staff and other logistical support, program administration and quality assurance. The cost of the assessments to the regional staff is estimated at about \$15,000, including about three staff weeks in addition to one week of the team assistant's time in the Country Office handling the logistics of the QAG team's field visit.

36. Altogether, the total estimated cost for the Country AAA assessment exercise for the period FY06-07 would amount to about \$2 million for 20 country assessments. The yearly cost would represent less than 0.7% of the current annual AAA spending from the Bank Budget

**Annex 2A****List of Country AAA Panelists for Phase I**

Abdallah El Maaroufi	Florent Agueh	Nick Hope
Athar Hussain	Fred Swartzendruber	Parvez Hasan
Antoinette Sayeh	Gianni Brizzi	Pieter Bottelier
Anthony Elson	Hans Wyss	Praveen Kumar
Ataman Aksoy	Ian Hume	Ram K. Chopra
Basil Kavalsky	Inder Sud	Robert Drysdale
Ben Varon	Jim Hanson	Robert Liebenthal
Brian van Arkadie	John Hayward	Rino Schavo-Campo
Dan Ritchie	John Nellis	S. Javed Burki
David Pearce	John Sinclair	Sarwar Lateef
Derek Byerlee	Jose Sokol	J. Shivakumar
Eugene McCarthy	K. Tanju Yurukoglu	Sri-Ram Aiyer
F. Desmond McCarthy	Miguel Schloss	Xavier Legrain

**Task Assessment Panelists**

Ada K. Izaguirre	J. L. Ginnsz	Peter Ludwig
Alberto Harth	James Q. Harrison	Peter Russell Moock
Amnon Golan	James Sayle Moose	Peter Schuler
Anthony Churchill	James Socknat	Peter Thomson
Anthony R. Measham	Jane Loos	Piere Prosper Messali
Arsene M. Balihuta	Jean-Louis F. Ginnsz	Raj Krishna
Arvo Kuddo	Jeffery Schott	Ramgopal Agarwala
Behdah M. H. Nowroozi	Joseph R. Goldberg	Ricardo A. Halperin
Bruce Harris	Joan MacNeil	Roberto Zagha
Chantal Reliquet	John Holsen	Sandor Sipos
D. Cotlear	Jorge Claro	Shawki Barghouti
David R. Steeds	Keshav Varma	Stephen O'Brien
David Shand	Khalid Siraj	Sue Ellen Berryman
Dennis J. Mahar	Maria Amelia Freire	Sulaiman S. Wasty
Donald R. Winkler	Michael Gillette	Susan Marcus
Douglas I. Graham	Mohsin Alikhan	Syed Athar Hussain
Eugene Scanteie	Motoo Konishi	Tawhid Nawaz
F. Stephen O'Brien	Mozammal Hoque	Thomas B. Laursen
Giuseppe Zampaglione	O. Pannenbourg	Uri B. Dadush
H. Carlsson	Omer M. Karasapan	Vicente Galbis
Harold E. Wackman	Parminder Brar	Willy de Geyndt
J. Harrison	Paul Amos	

**List of Resource Persons**

Guillermo Le Fort Varela	Gerald Kemp	Valery Dashkevich
Nilson C. Holanda	Samuel Wangwe	Leonid Kistersky
Alberto Harth	Arsene Balihuta	Brian Mtonya

**Annex 2B****List of Country AAA Panelists for Phase II**

Abdallah ElMaaroufi	Ataman Aksoy	Basil Kavalsky
Ben Varon	Dan Ritchie	Eugene Scanteie
Florent Agueh	Fred Swartzendruber	Harold Wackman
Ian Hume	James Hanson	Javed Burki
John Nellis	Jose Sokol	Peter Miovic
Pieter Bottelier	Ramgopal Agarwala	Ravi Kanbur
Rino Schiavo-Campo	Shankar Acharya	

**Task Assessment Panelists**

Anjali Kumar	Anthony Elson	Asad Alam
Augusto de la Torre	C.M. Vasudev	Claudio Loser
David Steeds	David W. Berk	Deepak Bhattasali
Douglas I. Graham	Emanuel Jimenez	Eugene McCarthy
F. Desmond McCarthy	F. Stephen O'Brien	Fred Swartzendruber
Fritz Fischer	Hermann A. von Gersdorff	Irfan Aleem
Jorge Claro	Maria Emilia Freire	Mario Aguilar
Matthias Meyer	Mauricio Carrizosa	Miguel Martinez
Miguel Schloss	Miguel Schloss	Mike Stevens
Moshin Alikhan	Ndiame Diop	Pamela Bigart
Parvez Hasan	Peter Harrold	Peter Ludwig
Peter Miovic	Ramgopal Agarwala	Ricardo Halperin
Richard Tobin	Robert Drysdale	Robert Liebenthal
Roberto Claro	Saeed Rana	Santiago Herrera
Smita Jassal	Sri Ram Aiyer	Steen Lau Jorgenson
Sudhir Shetty	Sue Berryman	Vinaya Swaroop
Wendy Cunningham	Willy de Geyndt	Yermal T. Shetty

**Annex 3**

## Quality of Country AAA (Phases I and II): Detailed Quantitative Results

### Results for Phases I & II Combined (UNWEIGHTED)

**TABLE 1. Results by Region**

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Region	Total Assessed	OA	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
AFR	18	78	94	100	72	76	67	72
EAP	5	100	100	100	80	75	100	100
ECA	12	75	75	92	75	67	75	75
LCR	9	89	78	100	78	78	89	100
MNA	5	80	80	100	40	60	60	40
SAR	4	100	100	100	75	50	75	75
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>

**TABLE 2. Results by IDA/IBRD Status**

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Status	Total Assessed	OA	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
IBRD	25	80	80	100	64	63	76	76
IDA*	28	86	93	96	79	78	75	79
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>

\* Two Blend countries in AAA (Phase I) and One Blend country in AAA (Phase II) is grouped under IDA.

**TABLE 3. Results by Size of the AAA Program Assessed**

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Size of the Program	Total Assessed	OA	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
a. >= 10 \$M	5	100	100	100	100	75	100	100
b. 5 \$M - 10	10	80	90	100	70	70	80	60
c. 2.5 \$M - 5	19	84	79	95	63	72	68	79
d. < 2.5 \$M	19	79	89	100	74	68	74	79
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>

**TABLE 4. Results by CPIA Ratings**

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

CPIA Group*	Total Assessed	OA	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
High CPIA	35	89	89	100	80	76	86	86
Low CPIA	18	72	83	94	56	59	56	61
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>

\* Countries with CPIA ratings more than 3.5 are grouped under "High CPIA", those with CPIA ratings below 3.5 are grouped under "Low CPIA".

**TABLE 5. Results by Location of CMU**

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Location	Total Assessed	OA	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
Field	32	81	84	97	72	70	75	78
Headquarter	21	86	90	100	71	71	76	76
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>

**TABLE 6. Results by Country Groupings**

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Country Groups	Total Assessed	OA	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
Group I	21	100	100	100	100	95	100	100
Group II	23	100	96	100	61	73	74	83
Group III	9	0	33	89	33	11	22	11
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>

**In Phase I**

\* Group I includes the countries that are rated as Moderately Satisfactory or Better on Overall Assessment, and with at least one of the Quality Dimensions rated as Highly Satisfactory and with no Quality Dimensions rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory or Worse.

Group II includes the countries that are rated as Moderately Satisfactory or Better on Overall Assessment and excludes those countries included in Group1.

Group III includes the Countries that are rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory or Worse on Overall Assessment.

**In Phase II**

\* Group 1 includes the countries that are rated as Satisfactory or Better on Overall Assessment.

Group 2 includes the countries that are rated as Moderately Satisfactory on Overall Assessment.

Group 3 includes the Countries that are rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory or Worse on Overall Assessment.

OA = OVERALL RATING

R1 = Scope And Strategic Relevance

R2 = Internal Quality

R3 = Dialogue and Dissemination

R4 = Coherence & Integration

R5 = Likely Impact

R6 = Bank Inputs and Processes

## Results WEIGHTED by Number of Tasks

TABLE 1. Results by Region

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Region	Total Assessed			OA			R1			R2			R3			R4			R5		
	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II
AFR	71	70	141	89	85	86	96	97	96	90	87	88	82	90	87	79	82	81	84	85	84
EAP	36	11	47	94	100	95	94	100	95	94	100	95	79	100	84	83	100	87	79	94	82
ECA	71	37	108	98	89	96	100	100	100	97	94	96	93	91	92	78	92	82	97	89	95
LCR	61	14	75	94	87	93	94	100	95	93	100	94	89	87	89	90	80	88	91	100	93
MNA	32	25	57	72	87	77	92	92	92	88	88	88	76	71	74	56	68	60	71	85	76
SAR	18	39	57	96	95	96	88	100	95	91	89	90	78	98	90	96	95	95	88	98	94
<b>Bank-wide</b>	289	196	485	91	88	90	95	98	96	93	89	91	85	90	87	80	85	82	87	89	88

TABLE 2. Results by Network

Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Network	Total Assessed			OA			R1			R2			R3			R4			R5		
	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II	I	II	I & II
ESSD	32	17	49	84	85	84	82	100	87	82	85	83	82	89	84	76	85	78	80	83	81
FSE	37	18	55	96	94	95	96	94	95	96	94	95	78	92	83	86	88	87	88	94	90
HDN	32	16	48	92	79	87	96	100	97	96	74	88	87	74	82	78	96	84	91	79	87
INF	34	21	55	93	95	93	100	100	100	93	95	93	80	91	83	81	84	81	85	100	89
ISN	1	1	2	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
OPCS	33	19	52	87	100	92	93	100	96	94	100	96	86	94	89	71	87	77	85	100	90
PREM	93	76	169	95	86	91	99	96	98	97	88	93	91	92	92	84	83	84	92	86	89
PSDN	27	27	54	85	81	83	98	100	99	82	96	88	81	88	84	75	77	76	78	89	82
Others	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Bank-wide</b>	289	196	485	91	88	90	95	98	96	93	89	91	85	90	87	80	85	82	87	89	88

OA = OVERALL RATING

R1 = STRATEGIC RELEVANCE

R2 = INTERNAL QUALITY

R3 = DIALOGUE & DISSEMINATION

R4 = LIKELY IMPACT

R5 = BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES

**TABLE 3. Results by IDA/IBRD Status**  
Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Status	Total Assessed		OA		R1		R2		R3		R4		R5						
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I & II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I & II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I & II	Phase I	Phase II				
																Phases I & II	Phases I & II	Phases I & II	Phases I & II
IBRD	184	50	234	92	82	90	96	96	94	93	85	77	84	80	73	79	84	88	
IDA*	105	146	251	90	89	90	98	90	90	89	85	93	90	79	87	84	84	90	87
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>88</b>

\* Two Blend countries in AAA (Phase I) and One Blend country in AAA (Phase II) is grouped under IDA.

**TABLE 4. Results by Task Costs**  
Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)

Task Costs	Total Assessed		OA		R1		R2		R3		R4		R5						
	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I & II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I & II	Phase I	Phase II	Phase I & II	Phase I	Phase II				
																Phases I & II	Phases I & II	Phases I & II	Phases I & II
a. >= 250 k	76	75	151	96	92	94	97	100	98	96	86	89	87	82	87	84	91	89	90
b. 100 k - 250 k	97	77	174	93	92	92	97	100	98	93	89	92	90	81	85	83	88	94	90
c. < 100 k	116	44	160	89	84	87	94	95	94	91	88	89	85	78	84	80	85	85	85
<b>Bank-wide</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>88</b>

OA = OVERALL RATING  
R1 = STRATEGIC RELEVANCE  
R2 = INTERNAL QUALITY  
R3 = DIALOGUE & DISSEMINATION  
R4 = LIKELY IMPACT  
R5 = BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES

**TABLE 5. Results by Task CPIA Ratings**  
**Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)**

CPIA Group*	Total Assessed		OA		R1		R2		R3		R4		R5								
	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II							
															II	I & II	II	I & II	II	I & II	II
High CPIA	212	149	361	94	90	92	97	97	93	91	92	88	90	89	86	87	86	88	91	89	
Low CPIA	77	47	124	84	81	83	91	100	94	91	85	89	77	89	82	64	78	69	85	81	84
Bank-wide	289	196	485	91	88	90	95	98	96	93	89	91	85	90	80	85	82	87	89	88	

\* Countries with CPIA ratings more than 3.5 are grouped under "High CPIA", those with CPIA ratings below 3.5 are grouped under "Low CPIA".

**TABLE 6. Results by Location of the TTL**  
**Ratings by Dimension (% Moderately Satisfactory or Better)**

CPIA Group*	Total Assessed		OA		R1		R2		R3		R4		R5						
	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II	Phase I	Phases I & II					
															II	I & II	II	I & II	II
Field	22	13	35	94	100	97	94	97	96	91	83	97	84	100	93	97	100	99	
Headquarter	267	183	450	91	86	89	96	92	88	91	85	89	79	82	80	86	86	86	86
Bank-wide	289	196	485	91	88	90	95	98	93	89	85	90	80	85	82	87	89	88	

OA = OVERALL RATING  
R1 = STRATEGIC RELEVANCE  
R2 = INTERNAL QUALITY  
R3 = DIALOGUE & DISSEMINATION  
R4 = LIKELY IMPACT  
R5 = BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES

<b>C- AAA (Phases I &amp; II) : QUALITY OF C-AAA (%MS) (Unweighted)</b>			<b># Rated</b>	<b>% MS+</b>
OA	OVERALL RATING		53	83
R1	Scope And Strategic Relevance		53	87
1.1	Appropriateness of overall coverage/scope of the AAA program in the context of the CAS framework?		50	82
1.1A	Extent to which the CAS themes are adequately covered		17	94
1.1B	Extent to which the key sectors are adequately covered		17	82
1.1C	Selection criteria for individual tasks		17	82
1.1D	Appropriateness of the share of AAA expenditures within the Country Services Budget		16	63
1.2	AAA program objectives		50	80
1.2A	Clarity of objectives (as articulated in the CAS or CAS updates)		50	90
1.2B	Extent which the program has clearly defined success indicators		50	72
1.3	Relevance of the AAA program to the Bank's CAS?		50	94
1.3A	To the Bank's overall poverty alleviation objectives?		50	92
1.3B	To the Bank's gender and inclusiveness objectives?		17	82
1.3C	To initiating/moving dialogue forward?		50	86
1.3D	As an underpinning to lending operations?		47	81
1.3E	As an instrument for knowledge-sharing and capacity building?		49	86
1.4	Relevance of the AAA program to the country's development framework (as articulated in a PRSP, Development Plan or a Government Strategy document)		49	88
1.5	Relevance of the AAA program vis-à-vis other development partners		17	100
R2	Internal Quality		53	98
2.1	Quality of analysis		50	100
2.2	Quality of the empirical evidence, and quantitative and qualitative information		50	94
2.3	Quality of conclusions and recommendations of the overall AAA program context?		50	88
R3	Dialogue and Dissemination		53	72
3.1	Contribution of AAA program to promoting policy dialogue and institutional development in the country.		50	76
3.1A	Quality of engagement and interaction with key counterparts		50	84
3.1a(i)	in the core ministries		17	94
3.1a(ii)	in the technical ministries		17	100
3.1b	in the technical ministries		17	94
3.2	Quality of client participation in:		50	76
3.2 i	defining the scope of the work		50	78
3.2 ii	Carrying out the work (in participatory tasks)		50	80
3.2 iii	Formulating conclusions and recommendations		50	70
3.2 iv	In dissemination and consensus building		49	65
3.3	Quality of overall consultation on findings, conclusions and recommendations with key stakeholders in the country (e.g. parliamentarians, the media, professional constituencies, private sector, public officials, civil society groups, etc.)		50	64
3.3 (i)	with the private sector		17	88
3.3 (ii)	with the academia		15	100
3.3 (iii)	with the professional bodies		16	81
3.3 (iv)	with the NGOs		16	75
3.3 (v)	with the media		17	71
3.3 (vi)	with the political structure (the parliament, opposition)		16	44

<b>C- AAA (Phases I &amp; II) : QUALITY OF C-AAA (%MS) (Unweighted)</b>			<b># Rated</b>	<b>% MS+</b>
3.4	Quality of partnership arrangements with other donors		48	77
3.4a	Mechanisms and opportunities for donor consultation and coordination on AAA?		47	81
3.4b	Consideration of other donors' comparative advantage, requirements and needs?		48	81
3.4c	Extent to which the AAA work of other donors has been utilized?		17	94
3.4d	Extent with which joint AAA work is undertaken with other donors?		17	100
3.5	Appropriateness of planned/actual arrangements for dissemination?		50	58
3.5a	Is there a dissemination and outreach strategy developed and shared by the Country Team?		17	71
3.5b	Are the dissemination efforts adequately funded? Is there ex ante funding available for dissemination at the task level?		16	81
3.5c	Extent to which the dissemination efforts go beyond the immediate official circles?		17	53
3.5d	Extent to which the dissemination efforts are undertaken within the Bank?		17	59
3.5e	How well is internet used as a dissemination tool?		17	76
R4	Coherence & Integration		51	71
4.1	Coherence of AAA program in terms of inter-linkages across other AAA tasks and sectoral/thematic areas		50	62
4.2	Integration of the AAA with the lending program		49	80
4.2 i	with investment lending		15	93
4.2 ii	with adjustment lending		15	93
4.3	Synergies of the AAA program to the other donors' programs		48	81
4.4	Coherence over time and consistency of effort		50	70
R5	Likely Impact		53	75
5.1	Likely impact on the Client		50	74
5.1 i	Building ownership and coalitions for change		50	72
5.1 ii	Meaningful changes in government policy, spending and investment programs, project design		50	70
5.1 iii	improvements in project design		16	94
5.1 iv	Enhancements in areas of capacity-building, knowledge transfer, or institutional change		49	78
5.2	Likely impact on the Bank		50	86
5.2a	Its strategic approach to the country, notably CAS/PRSP		50	88
5.2b	Design of adjustment lending		40	88
5.2c	Project lending operations (design and implementation)		48	85
5.2d	The country knowledge-base of the Bank and its staff		50	90
5.3	Likely impact on donor community and other donors' programs		48	88
5.4	Likely impact on other stakeholders and beneficiaries (NGOs, civil society, private sector)		50	58
R6	Bank Inputs and Processes		53	77
6.1	How adequate is total funding in view of objectives and scope of the ESW/AAA program?		50	66
6.2	Overall efficiency of resource use, given findings, and size and complexity of the ESW/AAA program		50	82
6.3	Overall timeliness of the AAA outputs		17	94
6.4	Quality of participation of the Country Team in planning, designing and implementing AAA tasks		50	78
6.5	Quality of participation of Country Office staff in AAA tasks		44	89
6.6	Overall skill-mix of the country team		17	94
6.7	How effectively was local capacity (e.g. think-tanks, academia, consulting) utilized as part of the design and implementation of AAA tasks		17	94

<b>C- AAA (Phases I &amp; II) : QUALITY OF C-AAA (%MS) (Unweighted)</b>			<b># Rated</b>	<b>% MS+</b>
6.8	Managerial attention		50	72
6.8a	By CMU Attention to quality at entry		50	82
6.8a	By SMU Attention to quality at entry		50	90
6.8a	By RM Attention to quality at entry		11	82
6.8b	By CMU Attention to quality during implementation and dissemination		50	76
6.8b	By SMU Attention to quality during implementation and dissemination		50	70
6.8b	By RM Attention to quality during implementation and dissemination		10	80
6.8c	By CMU Attention to impact on results		17	76
6.8c	By SMU Attention to impact on results		17	76
6.8c	By RM Attention to impact on results		10	80
6.8d	By CMU Overall		17	88
6.8d	By SMU Overall		17	88
6.8d	By RM Overall		10	90
6.9	Were decisions and mid-course corrections, if any, taken timely?		46	70
6.1	Did the program elements make good of use of the peer review process?		50	94
6.11	Contribution of networks anchors to the AAA program		49	86
6.12	Quality of effort to obtain client and stakeholder feedback on the completed AAA?		50	68
6.13	How effectively was monitoring and evaluation of the AAA program undertaken?		50	58
6.14	Quality of information provided in Activity Completion Summaries (ACS)		17	47
6.15	Quality of information in the SAP and BW?		50	44
CF_1	Country Political Context		49	49
CF_2	Country Institutional Context		48	42
CF_3	Existing country knowledge base and information systems		49	59
CF_4	Status of Bank and/or other donor relations with the country		48	73
CF_5	Internal Organization and Management changes in the Bank		46	43

<b>C-AAA (Phases I &amp; II) : QUALITY OF ESW (%MS) (Weighted by Number of Tasks)</b>		
	<b># Rated</b>	<b>% MS+</b>
OA OVERALL RATING	379	89
R1 Scope And Strategic Relevance	379	96
1.1 Clarity of task objectives	377	92
1.2 Relevance of the task to the Bank's Assistance Strategy for the country	377	96
1.2a How well aligned to CAS/PRSP?	376	95
1.2b How supportive of the policy dialogue?	374	96
1.2c How effective as an underpinning to lending operations?	340	88
1.3 Degree of client interest	377	89
1.3a Degree of government ownership at inception	378	87
1.3b Timeliness	378	93
R2 Internal Quality	379	91
2.1 Appropriateness of coverage	377	92
2.2 Quality of analysis	375	92
2.3 Quality of the empirical evidence, and quantitative and qualitative analysis	370	88
2.4 Quality of conclusions and recommendations	373	82
R3 PARTICIPATION, CONSULTATION AND DISSEMINATION	379	85
3.1 Quality of client participation in implementing the task	375	86
3.2 Quality of consultation with other key stakeholders in the country (e.g. legislators, local government officials, civil society groups, local academics, private sector, etc.)	371	83
3.3 Quality of partnership with other donors	350	85
3.4 Quality of the actual/planned arrangements for dissemination	372	81
3.5 Quality of presentation	370	89
R4 Likely Impact	379	80
4.1 Are the output(s) likely to meet the objectives and success indicators defined at the inception?	374	83
4.2 Likely impact on changes in government policies and programs	377	78
4.3 Likely impact on the development institutional capacity	147	85
4.4 Likely impact on the Bank's strategy and operational products	370	90
4.5 Likely impact on donor community and other donors' programs	338	82
4.6 Likely impact on other stakeholders (NGOs, civil society, private sector)	353	80
R5 Bank Inputs and Processes	379	87
5.1 How reasonable was the time to complete the task?	373	82
5.2 How effectively were the resources used?	377	91
5.3 Skill-mix of the team	378	94
5.4 Managerial attention	373	83
5.4aByCMU Attention to quality at entry (concept paper stage)?	374	85
5.4aBySMU Attention to quality at entry (concept paper stage)?	375	86
5.4bByCMU Attention to quality during implementation (decision draft and dissemination stages)	377	84
5.4bBySMU Attention to quality during implementation (decision draft and dissemination stages)	375	84
5.5 Peer review process	359	88

<b>C-AAA (Phases I &amp; II) : QUALITY OF TA (%MS) (Weighted by Number of Tasks)</b>		
	<b># Rated</b>	<b>% MS+</b>
OA OVERALL RATING	105	93
R1 STRATEGIC RELEVANCE	104	96
1.1 Clarity of task objectives	102	95
1.2 Relevance of the task to the Bank's Assistance Strategy for the country	102	98
1.2a How well aligned to CAS/PRSP?	103	99
1.2b How supportive of the policy dialogue?	103	95
1.2c How effective as an underpinning to lending operations?	78	86
1.3 Degree of client interest	103	95
1.3a Degree of government ownership at inception	101	94
1.3b Timeliness	102	97
R2 INTERNAL QUALITY	104	94
2.1 Quality of design and implementation as a process	102	93
2.2 Quality of content and analysis	103	93
2.3 Quality of capacity building efforts	93	86
2.4 Quality of conclusions and recommendations	100	95
R3 PARTICIPATION, CONSULTATION AND DISSEMINATION	104	92
3.1 Quality of client participation in implementing the task	101	88
3.2 Quality of consultation with other key stakeholders in the country (e.g. legislators, local government officials, civil society groups, local academics, private sector, etc.) in designing the task	97	89
3.3 Quality of partnership with other donors	86	87
3.4 Quality of the dissemination and scaling-up efforts (if any and relevant)	94	89
R4 LIKELY IMPACT	104	87
4.1 Are the output(s) likely to meet the objectives and success indicators defined at the inception?	102	84
4.2 Likely impact on changes in government policies and programs	100	72
4.3 Likely impact on the development institutional capacity	38	93
4.4 Likely impact on the Bank's strategy and operational products	95	88
4.5 Likely impact on donor community and other donors' programs	85	87
4.6 Likely impact on other stakeholders (NGOs, civil society, private sector)	92	83
R5 BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES	105	88
5.1 How reasonable was the time to complete the task?	101	93
5.2 How reasonable were the resources allocated to undertake AAA activities under this theme?	39	94
5.3 How effectively were the resources used?	102	93
5.4 Skill-mix of the team	103	96
5.5 Management attention to quality	103	86
5.5aByCMU Attention to quality at entry?	102	92
5.5aBySMU Attention to quality at entry?	103	92
5.5bByCMU Attention to quality during implementation	101	86
SummCon SUMMARY COMMENT	0	
5.5bBySMU Attention to quality during implementation	102	88
5.6 Peer review process	69	83
5.7 Contribution of networks anchors	26	97