

## QUALITY OF ESW ASSESSMENT FY02

<b>REGION</b>		<b>TASK TEAM LEADER</b>	
<b>RESPONSIBLE MANAGER</b>		<b>COUNTRY DIRECTOR</b>	
<b>TASK ID</b>		<b>TASK COMPLETED</b>	
<b>FIRST STAGE REVIEW:</b>		<b>DATE ASSESSED</b>	
<b>PANELISTS</b>		<b>QAG MODERATOR</b>	
<b>OBSERVER(S)</b>			
<b>PERSON(S) INTERVIEWED</b>		<b>OTHERS</b>	
<b>CLIENT/STAKEHOLDERS</b>			

**STAGE 1 RATING:**

**SECOND STAGE REVIEW:**

<b>PANELISTS</b>		<b>QAG MODERATOR</b>	
<b>PERSON(S) INTERVIEWED:</b>		<b>OTHERS:</b>	
<b>STAGE 2 RATING:</b>			

# I. OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXT

## PART A

(To be completed by the Task Team Leader)

### 1. Task Development Objectives

The TTL should note the contribution of the task towards broad development objectives listed below using the following categories: *H = High; M = Moderate; L = Low; and NA = Not Applicable*

Where possible, for each High-rated objective, the TTL should list appropriate leading (intermediate) indicators of success of the task in contributing to the objective. The indicators should be specific, measurable, and largely attributable to the task. The indicators will help the panel better assess *Likely Impact* of the task.

<p><b>i. Poverty Reduction</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>ii. Structural and Sector Policy Reform</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>iii. Private Sector Development</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>iv. Institutional Development/Capacity Building</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>v. Human Development</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>vi. Environmental Sustainability</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>vii. Infrastructure Development</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>viii. Macroeconomic Management</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><b>ix. Other (specify)</b> <i>Success indicator(s):</i></p> <p><i>Comments:</i></p>	
--	--

# I. OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXT

## PART A (cont'd)

*(To be completed by the Task Team Leader)*

### 2. Context

Listed below are categories of contextual circumstances/factors that can influence the quality of a task. The TTL should identify those circumstances that had a **significant** influence on the task and also the nature of influence (Favorable/ Unfavorable). A brief comment to explain the Favorable/ Unfavorable categorization would be helpful.

#### i. Country political context

*Comments:*

#### ii. Country institutional context

*Comments:*

#### iii. Existing country knowledge base and information systems

*Comments:*

#### iv. Status of Bank and/or other donor relations with the country

*Comments:*

#### v. Management changes in the Bank

*Comments:*

#### vi. TTL changes

*Comments:*

#### vii. Internal organization changes in the Bank

*Comments:*

#### viii. Other issues

*Describe issue and Comments:*

# **I. OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXT**

## **PART B**

*(To be completed by the Review Panel)*

### **1. Task Development Objectives**

Likelihood of meeting the success indicators identified by the TTL in Part A. Panelists should provide their judgment using the following categories: *L= Likely, UN = Uncertain, U = Unlikely, and NA = Not Applicable.*

- i. Poverty Reduction**
- ii. Structural and Sector Policy Reform**
- iii. Private Sector Development**
- iv. Institutional Development/Capacity Building**
- v. Human Development**
- vi. Environmental Sustainability**
- vii. Infrastructure Development**
- viii. Macroeconomic Management**
- ix. Other (specify)**

*Comments:*

### **2. Context**

The panel should record their own perspective of the impact of contextual factors on the quality of the task.

*Comments:*

**CLIENT PARTICIPATION**

**Guidance:** *This section is to be completed by the panel in consultation with the TTL. It is an attempt to characterize the nature and degree of client involvement in the task for analytical purposes. The level of task participation is assigned by the panel based on the indication provided by the task team and the panel's own reading of the documentation and interviews. If the panel disagrees with the views of the task team regarding the level of participation, the panel should provide a supplementary comment below.*

	<p><b>Overall Level of Client Participation:</b></p> <p>(a) <b>How active was client participation from inception through dissemination?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. In design stage</li><li>ii. In the analysis</li><li>iii. In dissemination</li></ul> <p>(b) <b>How active has been the interaction with other stakeholders?</b></p> <p>(c) <b>How extensive was the use of local institutions?</b></p>	
--	---	--

*Supplementary Panel Comments :*

## II. PANEL REPORT

<b>A.</b>	<b>Overall Assessment</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>Area of Strength</b>
<b>C.</b>	<b>Areas for Improvement</b>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Any Systemic Lesson</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>Any Task-Specific Suggestions for Action</b>

### III. SUMMARY RATINGS

**Assessment Rating**

1 = Highly Satisfactory

2 = Satisfactory

3 = Marginally Satisfactory

4 = Unsatisfactory

NA = Not Applicable

<b>1.</b>	<b>Strategic Relevance and Timeliness</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Internal Quality</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Dialogue and Dissemination</b>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Likely Impact</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Bank Inputs and Processes</b>	

## IV. GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

### ***Overall Guidance:***

The questionnaire is divided into two broad sections – A. Overall Quality and B. Bank Processes. The panelists should consider separately the assessment of these two aspects. However, where Bank Processes are rated less than Satisfactory while the Overall Quality is Satisfactory, or vice versa, the comments should clearly bring out the reasons for the difference.

Aggregate rating for a dimension is not meant to be a simple average of the rating of individual questions, just as the overall rating is not a simple average of ratings on the four dimensions. The panelists should instead arrive at an aggregate rating through implicit weighting of different questions (sections) keeping the context and objectives of the task in mind.

Where several discrete products exist, the panelist should arrive at an average rating using implicit weights for the products, based on their importance to the task objectives.

Panelists should be sensitive to the context – country capacity, data issues etc. while assigning ratings.

Panelists should also keep in mind any explicit guidance from the Sector Boards on rather standardized products such as CFAA/CPAR/FSAP.

*Questions below may not be equally relevant for all tasks. Panelists should record NA where a question is not relevant*

## 1. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE AND TIMELINESS

**Guidance:** In assessing this section, the panelists should look at the Concept Paper or its equivalent, as well as the larger context as reviewed in the CAS, etc. In some cases objectives are consciously changed midway to reflect new realities. The task should then be assessed with reference to the objectives as they were formally redefined.

### 1.1 Task Objectives

(a) Clarity of task objectives

(b) extent to which the task has clearly defined indicators of success


**Comments:**

### 1.2 Timeliness of the task in terms of

**Guidance:** Client receptivity is gauged in relation to economic or political situation. A decision to undertake the task may be partly based on a **window of opportunity** within the country - actual or perceived. For some tasks, timeliness may also be weighed in relation to the sequence of Bank or donor related programmatic decisions.

(a) client receptivity

(b) Bank's programming agenda

--


**Comments:**

### 1.3 Relevance of the task objectives to the Bank's assistance strategy for the country

**Guidance:** Not all listed elements may be relevant to each task; score NA where appropriate. The most important reference point is, of course, the CAS under implementation at the time the task was initiated. The panelists should look for a **specific** justification under CAS objectives - which themselves may be defined very broadly. Apart from CAS, panelists should also be sensitive to explicit guidance of the Country Director.

(a) towards initiating/moving the policy dialogue forward

(b) as an underpinning to strategy development (Next CAS/PRSP)

(c) as an underpinning to lending operations

(d) as an instrument for capacity-building, knowledge-sharing

--


**Comments:**

### 1.4 Consistency of the task objectives with the Bank's sector/thematic strategy and corporate objectives linked to the MDGs

**Guidance:** The idea is not to penalize innovation or exploration of new directions. But does the case for undertaking this task also square with the broader corporate vision and poverty alleviation agenda of the Bank?

**Comments:**

--

## 2. INTERNAL QUALITY

2.1 Appropriateness of coverage/scope of the task, in view of the objectives (focus, range of issues addressed, areas covered)

**Guidance:** For example, given the objectives of the task, comprehensive vs. selective; for a regional strategy paper – countries covered; for a PER – sectors covered etc. Some products may have specific requirements in terms of coverage.

**Comments:**

2.2 Clear identification of critical issues

**Comments:**

2.3 Quality of the analysis

**Guidance:** Look for analytical/methodological rigor expected of similar Bank products. (If specific “product” guidelines exist, were they respected?). Check if the weight given to analysis of individual topics is consistent with their relative importance to the objectives of the task. Give extra credit for state of the art, innovative work. Keep the objectives and size (cost) of the task, specific country context and previously available knowledge in mind.

**Comments:**

2.4 Quality of the empirical evidence

(a) quantitative and qualitative information accumulated under the task per se

(b) use of knowledge available inside the Bank - from Network, e.g. anchor thematic groups, DEC, from other Regions, etc.

(c) use of knowledge from outside the Bank, notably within the country, (e.g., think-tanks, universities, NGOs, donors)

  
  

**Guidance:** The extent to which the team sought and assimilated information from various sources. Give due allowance for availability of information in the country, and check if the team made sufficient efforts to get to the right information. Keep the size of the task in mind.

**Comments:**

2.5 Appropriate consideration of/sensitivity to the poverty reduction dimension. For example, discussion of (i) how current policies/program affect the poor? (ii) how the proposals made by the task will affect the poor

**Comments:**

2.6 Appropriate consideration of/sensitivity to the gender dimension

**Guidance:** Were the different needs of males and females considered? [ e.g. Was the data used disaggregated by sex? Were the barriers to inclusion/access discussed?] Did the report attempt to identify gender issues that might affect implementation of the policy advice or recommendation? Did the report consider the different roles played by men and women in making recommendations? Did the report consider the different impact of the recommendations on men and women?]

**Comments:**

2.7 Quality of conclusions and recommendations

- (a) conclusions and recommendations appropriately specific and consistent with the analysis?
- (b) recommendations adequately selective/prioritized?
- (c) appropriateness of the recommendations, particularly in the light of social, political, and administrative realities?


**Guidance:** *While each task is expected to reach carefully analyzed findings or conclusions, the nature and extent of recommendations will vary with the task, its objectives and the state of the dialogue with the country. For example, fiduciary products are expected to have clear conclusions as to risk assessment. Good recommendations should be realistic/appropriately specific as against bland and general; they should be operational/actionable, with clear follow-up actions for Bank/Clients. In the event that the Bank chooses not to include recommendations in the body of the report, as a didactic style or for reasons of country sensitivities, did the Bank consider alternatives such as posing and weighing options and alternative? Likewise, when recommendations are not included in the report, on the basis of other documents or panel discussions with the team or managers, can the panel discern a Bank view on the issues being addressed?*

**Comments:**

### 3. DIALOGUE AND DISSEMINATION

**Guidance:** This set of questions seeks to inquire how and to what degree the country clients, and other stakeholders such as donors, were active participants in the performance of the task under review. Effective participation and the opportunities for dialogue associated with it are recognized as hallmarks of ownership, and an important indicator of the prospects for the achievement of task objectives. Not all questions in this section may be equally relevant to any single task. Accordingly, in cases where, because of the purpose and nature of the task, selected questions are not applicable, score NA.

3.1 Attention devoted to engaging the client and key stakeholders

(a) well-thought-out strategy for engagement

(b) relevant and effective counterparts

(c) efforts at building coalitions and increasing awareness on the part of key stakeholders

**Comments:**

3.2 Effectiveness of client participation in:

(a) defining the scope of the work

(b) carrying out the analysis

(c) formulating the conclusions and recommendations

**Comments:**

3.3 Quality of Bank contribution/support for client-led tasks:

(a) defining the scope of work

(b) organizing the task, putting the team together, selecting the consultant

(c) knowledge sharing, providing cross-country experience

(d) reviewing work in draft stages

**Guidance:** This question seeks to assess the quality of Bank support to the Client in preparing those components of the task for which the Client has had the lead or a major, substantive role. Score NA if the task is essentially Bank-led.

**Comments:**

3.4 Quality of capacity-building efforts during the task implementation

**Comments:**

3.5 Appropriate consultation with other key stakeholders in the country (e.g. legislators, local government officials, civil society groups, local academics, private sector, etc.)

**Comments:**

3.6 Quality of partnership arrangements with other donors

**Comments:**

3.7 Appropriateness of the actual/planned arrangements for dissemination

**Comments:** .

3.8 Quality of presentation of the Bank's written products

**Comments:**

#### 4. LIKELY IMPACT

**Guidance:** Based on the information available, including interviews with country counterparts, as appropriate, panels are asked to make **judgments** about **expected** impact of the task in relation to the development objectives of the task. The panel is not assessing actual future impact, but rather the probability of positive outcomes. Likely Impact is expected to depend on how relevant/timely the task is, how well it has been done and how receptive is the client. Panelists should seek a sense of the value-added of the task (e.g. What if the task had not been done?). The ratings should factor out substantial and specific changes in the country situation beyond the team's control. The panelists should score N/A against those issues that are not related to explicit objectives of the task. They should also be sensitive to the size and scope of the task as planned in the Concept Paper.

4.1 Efforts made towards maximizing impact

**Guidance:** Does the concept paper identify clearly what are the measures of impact or results for the intended audiences?

- (a) clearly defined indicators of success.
- (b) a clear and well-structured strategy for achieving impact
- (c) timeliness of output(s) in terms of the client's own cycle of policy and program review and planning

**Comments:**

4.2 Likely Impact on the Client

- (a) helping to create ownership of change proposals among key decision-makers
- (b) enhancements in the area of capacity building, knowledge transfer, or institutional change
- (c) promoting meaningful change in government policy, strategy, expenditures, investment programs, project design

**Guidance:** The purpose of question 4.2 is to seek panel judgment on whether the criteria and indicators for success, as initially identified by management and the task team, likely to be satisfied? Panels are asked to gather responses to these questions both from the Bank team and from country clients and other stakeholders, as appropriate. The questions probe indicators of a model of change: from growing awareness, through commitment and advocacy, to institutional capacity and instruments for change. Since change is unlikely to occur within a vacuum, has the team exploited appropriately opportunities to build support and capacity as may be required? This question therefore asks panelists to reach judgment on whether the intermediating linkages for change are being forged and on whether the causal sequence of enabling conditions is moving into alignment. (Note that for some Network ESW the client may be the donor community.)

**Comments:**

4.3 Likely Impact on the Bank

- (a) its strategic approach to the country
- (b) design/implementation of operational products
- (c) the knowledge-base of the Bank

**Comments:**

4.4 Likely Impact on the wider development community

- (a) other donors (including NGOs) and aid coordination
- (b) development thinkers

**Guidance:** This is not a 'necessary' requirement of high impact. Score NA where objectives of the task did not anticipate spin-offs to the wider development community.

**Comments:**

## 5. BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES

### Inputs

1.1 Elapsed time (Months)

Activity initiation - Discussion Draft  
Discussion Draft - Client Delivery

1.2 Preparation/Processing Cost

(\$000)

Regular Budget (BB)  
Trust Funds  
Other Donors [to be filled in by the panelists based on discussion with TT]  
Total Funding

### Managerial Attention

1.3 How reasonable was the time taken to complete the task?

#### Comments:

1.4 How adequate was the total funding in view of the objectives and scope of the task? Funding for dissemination & follow-up?

**Guidance:** Bear in mind the complexity, country context, and previous work available. Do not overlook TF or other donor resources. Was dissemination sufficiently funded?

#### Comments:

1.5 Skill-mix of the task team? How comprehensive? Cross-sectoral skills?

**Guidance:** Did the managers select the right leadership? Did the manager or TTL assemble the right team in terms of country knowledge, experience, skills?

#### Comments:

1.6 Overall efficiency of resource use (both Bank budget and Trust Funds, where used)

- (a) Overall
- (b) Trust funds component only

#### Comments:

1.7 Attention to Quality at Entry

- (a) by Sector Management
- (b) by Country Management

**Guidance:** Extent of shared understanding between managers and the team on the objectives, methodology, key milestones for progress and indicators of success, etc; an appropriate understanding on roles of core participants at the time of launching the task - through a Concept Paper or otherwise. Sector management here means the individual with a direct supervisory/advisory relationship with TTL in the performance of the task

#### Comments:

1.8 Attention to implementation/dissemination of the task.

- (a) by Sector Management
- (b) by Country Management

3

**Guidance:** *Monitoring of quality/milestones, promotion of cross-fertilization, best practices, etc. Did the management provide appropriate guidance and mentoring? Were adjustments made and mid-course corrections taken in a timely manner? Were comments on drafts appropriately considered? Did management support and/or participate in the dissemination and dialogue? Typically such attention is at key points rather than continuous and is provided in relation to the size, complexity of the task and the experience, skill mix of the task team*

**Comments:**

**Other Processes**

1.9 Quality enhancement contributions of the Network/Sector anchor(s)

- (a) Quality of inputs
- (b) Impact on the final output

**Guidance:** *Score NA if the team did not seek any support from the anchor(s). Use of available supply of knowledge produced by the anchors is covered in question 2.4.*

**Comments:**

1.10 Quality enhancement contributions of the peer review process.

- (a) Quality of inputs
- (b) Impact on the final output

**Comments:**

1.11 Quality enhancement contributions of a QER or equivalent

- (a) Quality of inputs
- (b) Impact on the final output

**Comments:**

1.12 Quality of the Activity Completion Summary?

**Guidance:** *Score 3 or 4 if ACS has not been completed in time as per guidelines*

**Comments:**

1.13 Quality of information on the task in SAP

**Guidance:** *Completeness/accuracy of budget information, task description, task objectives, milestones, etc.*

**Comments:**

1.14 Indicate any factors that had especially positive influence on quality