

ANNEXES

APRIL 1, 2003

ANNEX 1

MAIN CONTRIBUTORS

STAFF DIRECTORS: Praveen Kumar Kadir Yurukoglu

MODERATORS: Robert Drysdale John Sinclair

LIST OF PANELISTS

Alexander Fleming	Fritz Fischer	Maria Emilia Freire
Allen Schick	Gerard Byam	Maria-Luisa Escobar
Amar Bhattacharya	Gershon Feder	Marilou Uy
Amitabha Mukherjee	Giovanna Prennushi	Marlaine Lockheed
Ana-Maria Arriagada	Giuseppe Zampaglione	Maureen Lewis
Anis Dani	Graham Donaldson	Mauricio Carrizosa
Anita Schwarz	Guy Pfefferman	Miguel Schloss
Anthony Churchill	Hans-Martin Boehmer	Mike Stevens
Anthony Kupcis	Helen Sutch	Miria Pigato
Anthony Measham	Helga Muller	Mohsin Alikhan
Arvil Van Adams	Homi Kharas	N. Roberto Zaghera
Arvind Panagariya	Howard Peter Williams	Parvez Hasan
Asad Alam	Ian Hume	Paul Delay
Barbara Kafka	Inder Sud	Peter Bottelier
Basil Kavalsky	Indermit Gill	Peter Miovic
Bension Varon	Ira Lieberman	Ram Chopra
Bernard Hoekman	Jaime Quizon	Richard Ericson
Bryan Falconer	James Douglas	Robert Beschel
Cecilia Valdivieso	James Harrison	Robert Buckley
Cesar Bouillon	James Keith Hinchliffe	Saeed Rana
Christine Allison	Jayant Kalotra	Salvatore Schiavo-Campo
Christine Wallich	Jean-Louis Ginnsz	Samuel Otoo
Daniela Gressani	Jeni Klugman	Santhadevi Meenakshy
David Dollar	Joaquin Gutierrez	Shawki Barghouti
David Rosenblatt	John Holsen	Sri-Ram Aiyer
David Sewell	Jonathan Brown	Steve O'Brien
David Shand	Jose Janeiro	Sue Berryman
David Steeds	Jose L. Guasch	Sue Graves
Donald Winkler	Judith McGuire	Susan Stout
Edgardo Favaro	Kadir Yurukoglu	Tawhid Nawaz
Edward Elmendorf	Kalinidhi Subbarao	Timothy Irwin
Elizabeth King	Kathy Lindert	Uri Dadush
Emmanuel Jimenez	Kin Bing Wu	Valerie Kozel
Eugene McCarthy	Laszlo Lovei	Vinay Bhargava
Eugene Stakhiv	Laura Tuck	Vinaya Swaroop
Florent Agueh	Letitia Obeng	Vincent Galbis
Francis Steier	Lynn Sherburne-Benz	Yaw Ansu
Francis Tuan	Maninder Gill	Zafiri Tzannatos

ANNEX 2

LIST OF SAMPLED ESW TASKS

<u>AFRICA (AFR)</u>		<u>LATIN AMERICA & THE CARRIBBEAN (LCR)</u>	
AFR	Skills Development	Argentina	SME Finances
AFR	Measurement of Trade Reform	Argentina	CFAA
Eritrea	Health Sector Review	Brazil	Ceara Human Dev. And Poverty Reduc.
Eritrea	CEM	Brazil	Bahia Health Decentralization
Ethiopia	Public Expenditure Review	Brazil	CFAA-National Level
Guinea	CPAR	Brazil	Maranhao State Economic Memorandum
Senegal	Country Framework Report	Caribbean	Youth Development
South Africa	Sources of Growth-Phase 2	Caribbean	Education Achievements
Zambia	Public Expenditure Review	Colombia	Social Sector Review
<u>EAST ASIA & PACIFIC (EAP)</u>		Colombia	Poverty Selected Topics
China	Struct of China Agr. Research	Guatemala	Poverty Study
China	BFR-Bank Supervision	Latin America	Regional HIV/AIDS Sector Work
China	Regional Development	Mexico	Technology, Wages And Employment
East Timor	CEM	Mexico	Sugar
Indonesia	Urban Sector Strategy	Paraguay	Poverty Assessment
Lao PDR	PER-CFAA	Peru	Public Expenditure Review
Mongolia	Mongolia PER	<u>MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA (MNA)</u>	
Philippines	Development Policy Review 2002	MNA	Social Protection Sector Strategy
Philippines	HD Sector Study	Egypt	Poverty Assessment
Vietnam	Vietnam Dev Report/PIP	Egypt	Early Childhood Development
<u>EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA (ECA)</u>		Jordan	Development Policy Review
Albania	Rural Strategy	MNA	MNA Regional AIDS Strategy Paper
Armenia	Water Resources Plan	Morocco	Public Expenditure Review
Azerbaijan	CPAR	Tunisia	IT Strategy Note
Belarus	Chernobyl Impact Study	Yemen	CEM
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Pub Exp & Inst Rev	<u>SOUTH ASIA (SAR)</u>	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Local Level Institutional Study	Afghanistan	Country Strategy Brief
ECA	Praque Umbrella	Bangladesh	Poverty Assessment
ECA	Regional Trade Study on SE Europe	India	Local Institutions
ECA	Pov. Reduc Growth & Debt Sustainability	India	Power Reform Strategy Review
Kazakhstan	Gov & Service Delivery Diag	India	Governance Policy Notes
Kazakhstan	CFAA	India	Improving Investment Climate
Kosovo	Poverty in Kosovo	India	Maharashtra Study
Macedonia	Education Sector	Maldives	Public Expenditure Review
Macedonia	Aq. Sector Update	Neopal	CFAA
Moldova	Pub Econ Mat Review	Pakistan	Poverty Assessment
Romania	PER		
Russian Fed	Education Policy Note		
Russian Fed	Children Initiatives		
Russian Fed	Labor Market Review		
Slovak Rep	Social Sector Exp Rev (PER)		
Turkey	Corporate Sector Impact Assessment		
Turkey	Poverty & Crises		

LIST OF NON-SAMPLED ESW TASKS

<u>OTHER ESW TASKS</u>		<u>EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA (ECA)</u>	
<u>AFRICA (AFR)</u>		ECA	Small Initiatives
AFR	NEPAD	Kyrgyz	Pensions & Soc Safety Note Update
<u>EAST ASIA & PACIFIC (EAP)</u>		Romania	Econ Transition Consul/Conference
Indonesia	Forest PolicyDev & Soc Outreach	Russia Fed	Anti-Corruption Dialogue
Mongolia	Energy Strategy	<u>MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA (MNA)</u>	
Papua New Guinea	Rural Dev Strategy II	MNA	Public Health Agenda
Thailand	CDP-Governance	<u>SOUTH ASIA (SAR)</u>	
<u>FSAPs</u>		India	Joint GOI/WB Poverty Workshop
Bulgaria, Mexico, Senegal, Tunisia			

ANNEX 3

**ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF FY02 ESW
APPROACH PAPER**

1. While building on experience in assessing ESW accumulated over the past four years, the proposed FY02 Assessment also seeks to implement the recommendations of the recently completed ESW assessment advisory panel (the de Ferranti report).¹ It also incorporates new guidance from OPCS on the definition of ESW and the corresponding coverage of QAG assessments of ESW².

2. The de Ferranti report outlined a phased transition in ESW assessments. As recommended in the report, QAG will implement one further full round of evaluation with a unit of assessment of individual ESW tasks randomly selected (ESW02). In addition, QAG will deepen a pilot program of Country AAA assessments (three were conducted in FY02), and develop and test an assessment approach for sectoral/thematic products. QAG will also develop an approach to assessing “process-intensive” tasks, for example, non-lending TA and PRSP support. Beyond FY03, and subject to lessons emerging from ESW02 and the pilots, the de Ferranti report proposes a transition in future years to a new core unit of account of a Country AAA program in its CAS/PRSP context. This present approach paper covers only one part of this larger agenda for FY03, namely the program of assessment of individual ESW tasks completed in FY02 (ESW02). That program will be implemented over the period mid-June to late-November 2002.

3. Although, as noted, ESW02, will continue with a unit of assessment of individual ESW tasks randomly selected, a number of significant changes are being introduced in accordance with the de Ferranti report. The main changes in coverage and approach are as follows³:

- All tasks under the updated ESW definition will be eligible for inclusion in the ESW02 sample. This would include, therefore, jointly conducted products (such as FSAP), Bank-managed tasks implemented with trust fund financing (such as PPIAF, ESMAP) and Network ESW, all of which were not uniformly included before.
- CFAAs and CPARs completed in FY02, will be integrated into the regular ESW02 universe, as compared to a separate pilot assessment in FY01.
- ESW02 will sample only tasks costing in excess of \$50,000 total cost. The assessment exercise will be conducted no sooner than four months after task delivery to client.

¹ See *Report Of The Advisory Panel On Assessing Economic and Sector Work*, dated May 7th, 2002.

² ESW is now clearly defined as an activity that involves analytic effort, is undertaken with the purpose of influencing an external client's policies, and is owned by a Bank unit. Under this definition, ESW covers five classes of output: country diagnostic reports; country advisory reports; regional reports; other products (policy notes, conferences and other events); and process tasks (country analytical work that does not generate separate products).

³ Other, more minor, modifications are being incorporated into the survey instrument and into the assessment process based on feedback from TTLs and managers.

- Whenever feasible, the assessment process will include direct client input as part of the assessment process in order to strengthen, in particular, the basis for panel assessment of *Likely Impact*.
- Panels will be provided more explicit contextual information on country circumstances, broader country programmatic aspects, or other considerations, which, in the view of the task team, have a special bearing on the delivery and quality of the task under review.
- Panels will include more external members (e.g. other donors, NGOs) in order to bring a stronger partner/stakeholder perspective into the assessment process.
- TTLs will be asked to explicitly define their key objectives of the task, with a focus on impact(s) sought and leading 'success' indicators identified
- In the interest of objective and robust assessment ratings, panels will be encouraged to use the ratings scale in strict accord with the definition of each rating category.
- Finally, QAG will reinforce and expand its activities to promote learning and sharing of findings with staff and intermediate management.

WHY QUALITY ASSESSMENTS OF ESW?

4. ESW is coming to play an increasingly critical role in the Bank's tool-kit. Bank commitment to the MDGs, the on-going PRSP/CDF process, the emergence of the Knowledge Bank, and growing sensitivity to ownership and participation, all point to the critical role of good policy based on sound analysis. ESW provides the foundation for the Bank's policy dialogue with clients, the development of country strategies, and the formulation and implementation of effective lending programs. ESW is also a key instrument for building institutional capacity, especially when it is undertaken with local partners. For all of these reasons, the quality of ESW is important to the Bank, to its clients and to the wider donor community. Recognizing the resources involved, Bank management views assessment of ESW quality as a core responsibility in the interest of accountability and learning. (The Bank is expected to spend \$72m on ESW in FY02, compared to \$106m for lending and \$137m on supervision.)

5. The ESW02 Program of Quality Assessments is designed to:

- *Promote accountability* by providing management and staff with robust quality indicators based on credible, independent assessments.
- *Identify systemic strengths and weaknesses* in ESW and promote appropriate changes in policies and procedures relating to ESW, including its management and review; and
- *Learn from experience* by disseminating findings and conclusions, including examples of best practice.

The broad results and recommendations of ESW assessments are reviewed with Management and CODE via a Synthesis Report. (The last report covering FY01 was issued in March 2002 and is available on the QAG website.)

HOW WILL THE ASSESSMENTS BE DONE?

6. **Coverage:** The QAG Assessment is based on ESW as it is recorded under SAP. Given the new OPCS guidelines and in line with the recommendations of the de Ferranti report, this assessment will reflect a number of adjustments: it will exclude tasks under \$50,000 in total cost but now include Fiduciary ESW, Network ESW, Joint Products and most trust-fund financed ESW.

7. **Quality Dimensions :** Assessments focus on whether we are doing the right ESW, doing it the right way, as well as using the ESW products and processes to achieve optimal impact. They are structured along the following four dimensions:

- *Scope and Strategic Relevance:* Taking into consideration the country context and CAS objectives, this section asks if it was the right ESW to do. Are relationships with MDGs suitably developed? Are the objectives, including the audience, well-defined? Are the expected outcomes and measurable indicators of success identified? Are issues addressed by the task appropriate in view of the objectives? Is the task relevant to the country circumstances and priorities? Is it timely, in terms of country circumstances, receptivity or other key externalities?
- *Internal Quality:* This section looks at the workmanship quality of the task. Are the issues being addressed clearly specified? How good is the analysis and the supporting empirical evidence, both quantitative and qualitative? Does the analysis lead to substantive conclusions? Does it adequately explore the causal chain to results? Are the recommendations operational and consistent with the conclusions? Are they realistic in the light of social, political and administrative constraints?
- *Dialogue and Dissemination.* This section responds to the desire to assess the quality of engagement of the client and other key stakeholders. It explores how effectively they were involved in defining the issues, developing the analysis and managing the dissemination. How effective was the Bank in building ownership with its country-partner? And in capacity-building? This section also assesses the role of other partners, notably donors. It also examines the quality of presentation, in terms of clarity of arguments, adequacy of the summary, transparency/readability for the intended audience.
- *Likely Impact:* This section makes anticipatory judgements about potential impact, in relation to the purpose/objectives and audiences specified by Bank management and the task team at the outset in the concept paper or equivalent. In order to assess *Likely Impact*, the panel uses a variety of qualitative methods that focus upon leading indicators of eventual outcomes, including any self-assessment in the ACS system. Factors for consideration by the panel include: the presence of a sound strategy to achieve impact, engagement of the right target audiences, and appropriate consideration of linkages to policy dialogue and programming. Three possible audiences are considered by the panel, with the balance of priority among them guided by the task team's purpose as stated in the initial task concept paper or equivalent. First, in most cases, the core audience is the country client and target groups within the country; for regional studies, the client may be several countries or regional bodies. Second, the Bank itself (notably its CAS or other key strategic statements) may be a beneficiary. Third, the broader development community may

be a client, or at least an indirect beneficiary⁴. In reaching an assessment for this dimension across these audiences, panelists obtain direct feedback from client representatives and other stakeholders, as appropriate.

8. The assessment also makes a separate set of judgements on *Bank Processes*, seeking to understand the quality of the Bank's own managerial contribution as the ESW was carried out. This component assesses areas such as resource availability (\$, people), cost-effectiveness, the contribution in terms of ideas/guidance from key elements of Bank management (regions, networks, peers, etc). It reviews this contribution at key stages in the task cycle.

9. **Ratings:** The relevance and relative importance of the above dimensions varies with the type of ESW analyzed and the country context. Based on their understanding of the country context and the task-specific goals, panelists exercise judgment in deciding on the relative weights to be given, first to the individual sub-ratings, then among the four assessment dimensions. Such a balanced set of judgments is a central responsibility of panelists.

10. Quality is rated on a four-point scale. Panelists are instructed to use 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 piece of ESW and no major deficiencies
<i>Marginal (3)</i>	Major deficiencies in some important areas
<i>Unsatisfactory (4)</i>	A broad pattern of deficiencies

11. For ESW02, the unit of assessment remains the ESW task with its own SAP ID. But the assessment is being conducted in the light of broader programmatic and country considerations. Individual ESW tasks may not be stand-alone pieces; they may be sub-tasks in support of a larger exercise such as a PRSP or else one of a series of small tasks delivered over a period of time. Also, the approach to and depth of analysis may reasonably be expected to differ with country context/circumstances, across different types (sectors, themes) of ESW, and with different task budgets. For these reasons, it is important that panelists, from CAS/PRSP or other sources, understand the larger Bank programming framework and relevant country context. As part of preparation for the assessment process, QAG is asking task teams to respond to a short list of questions on the key objectives of the task, the broader programmatic context, including related Bank activities/reports, i.e. previous ESW, as well as special country circumstances and conditions that may have a significant bearing on the quality and management of the task. Task teams are also being asked to help characterize the nature of client participation in the task. For their part, panelists are requested to summarize their views of the likelihood of achieving task objectives as well as comment on salient country contextual and programmatic factors in the introductory section of the questionnaire. The importance and influence of these aspects in

⁴ This may be especially true for some Network ESW.

relation to ESW quality are also issues that the panel probes with country correspondents. Finally, notwithstanding the effort to conduct a thoroughly technical and professional review, it is important to recognize that the methodology is not designed to provide a definitive judgment on any individual task. For that reason, QAG only reports in the final synthesis broad aggregates and trends, not specific details of individual task shortcomings.

12. **Sample:** The assessment will be based on a stratified random sample of ESW tasks "completed" in FY02. The formal trigger for entry into the sample is the standard SAP milestone, *delivered to the client*. QAG will share the sampling universe with all the Regions and Sector Boards prior to drawing the sample and also the actual sample as soon as it is drawn. Sampling is expected to be in two batches, one in late-May, based on tasks already delivered at least four months earlier, and the second around Labor Day covering the balance of delivery in the fiscal year⁵. Tasks managed by Task Team Leaders (TTL) who have been subject to a QAG evaluation in the previous 12 months will be replaced by other randomly selected tasks.

13. The sample will be stratified by cost and Region. The sampling percentages by cost strata will be, (i) >\$500,000: 100% (ii) \$250–500,000: 50% (iii) \$50-250,000: 25%.⁶ The minimum sample size is being increased to ten tasks from each Region. Based on SAP/BW and CRM data, Regions are promising to deliver about 350-400 ESW tasks during FY02. It is estimated that, after allowing for slippage and ineligible tasks, the QAG sample may include about 80-90 tasks. This is expected to represent about 35-40% of the universe by cost. This sample size should permit a robust assessment of how well ESW dollars are being spent Bank-wide (with less than 5% sampling margin of error at 95% confidence level). (It also permits estimation of ESW performance Bank-wide in terms of number of tasks with a sampling margin of error around 5% at 90% confidence level.) At the level of the larger Regions and Networks, the sampling margin of error should be approximately 10% at the 90% confidence level.

14. **Timing:** The timing of the assessments, usually within 4-8 months after completion of an ESW task, means that in almost all cases it is not possible to judge actual impact. Panels are making an anticipatory judgment based on the workmanship of the report, level and quality of client participation and dissemination, plus direct feedback from client and other stakeholders. A more thorough longer-term assessment of impact would clearly depend upon effective self-evaluations by the Regions/Networks (through ACSs or otherwise) and via OED's Country Assistance Reviews and Sector Impact Evaluations.

15. **Rapid Assessment:** ESW01 involves a two-stage process. In the first 'Rapid Assessment' stage, a panel of typically two members⁷ reviews each sampled task, using the guidance questionnaire as the framework. Their work starts with a review of the task file, a set of background documents assembled by QAG and the TTL. The task documentation

⁵ The commitment to ensure an interval of four months between task completion and task assessment is one of the recommendations of the de Ferranti report. The purpose is to allow greater time for the client to react to the ESW product once "delivered".

⁶ The cost data include funding from all sources recorded in the SAP--Bank budget as well as trust fund and other sources of financing.

⁷ The panel may be strengthened by adding more panelists if the nature of the task demands it (for example cross-sectoral tasks).

covers from concept through to final report, dissemination activities and follow up, including comments by peer reviewers, minutes of decision/review meetings and summaries of discussions with the client. The task team is also requested to provide a short contextual note. Based upon this background material review, the panel prepares a list of issues for discussion during a meeting with the Task Team. Managers may participate in this discussion if they so desire. The panelists also contact appropriate counterparts in the client countries in order to strengthen the panel's judgment on dialogue aspects and *Likely Impact*. (All panel contacts with clients would be arranged in close consultation with the responsible task team and country director/country team.) Following the interview and related discussions, the panelists prepare consensus ratings and a narrative statement. This, and the full questionnaire is shared in draft with the TTL. Where panelists intend to give an overall *Satisfactory* rating to the task but a lower rating to managerial performance, they also consult the managers concerned. The TTL is given five days to comment. The panel is also available to discuss this draft report with the TTL. After the panel finalizes its report, if the final rating is *Satisfactory or better* overall, it is transmitted to the TTL and the line managers by QAG.

16. If the initial overall rating is *less than Satisfactory* (3 or 4), the task normally goes to an In-depth assessment conducted by a more customized panel, unless QAG and the Region concur that a more intensive review would not add value. In addition, the panelists for the rapid assessment may recommend to QAG to convene a panel for an ESW task with special potential for more learning. This approach ensures that no task rating of *less than Satisfactory* is given without adequate consultation with the staff and managers directly responsible, or further panel review.

17. For particularly large, complex or innovative tasks, QAG may opt to go directly to an "Enhanced" mode⁸, with a larger panel and added discussions with Country Director, Sector Manager, etc.

18. **In-depth Assessments:** As with Rapid assessments, the In-depth panel reviews the quality dimensions and Bank processes, but with broader and more intensive approach, notably by adding structured consultations with sector/country directors and peer/QER reviewers. For this stage, panels also obtain wider feedback from clients and other stakeholders within the country to assess their ownership, participation and gauge more completely their views on the *Likely Impact* of the task. The draft report of the panel is discussed with regional staff before being finalized. In addition, the Region (typically via the Chief Economist) is given the opportunity to attach a one-page rejoinder to the final assessment report, focusing on areas of divergent views (and reasons why) as well as on any proposed follow-up.

19. With a view to support staff development and disseminate QAG methodology in the Regions and Networks, they may propose an *observer* (a relatively less experienced staff member) to attend a panel session.

20. **Panel Composition:** The panel, and its members, lie at the heart of the QAG assessment approach. Assessments are carried out by experienced, credible, senior professionals, with relevant technical and/or geographic expertise. Panelists would normally

⁸ For these there would be no second stage review. They would be de facto 'In-depth'.

be active Bank staff level GH or above, retired Bank staff or consultants of comparable experience. To promote diversity in the panels, QAG will this year seek wherever possible to engage a third external panelist from academic or research institutes, from other donors, NGOs, etc., as may be appropriate. QAG also seeks the active support of the Network and Regions in identifying and selecting panelists. To avoid any potential conflict of interest, an individual who has been involved in a particular ESW task, as peer reviewer, manager, or otherwise, or who is currently a staff member of the same Region, may not be selected to serve as a panelist on that task. Panelists are provided guidance and orientation as part of the start-up process prior to panel duty. Equally, QAG provides a **moderator** for each assessment to ensure consistency of approach, including firmness of ratings, among panels, across sectors and Regions.

21. For a *Rapid* assessment, the panel normally consists of three persons composed of a generalist, preferably with knowledge of the country/sector/topic, and two sector/topic specialists as may be required. For *In-depth* panels there are normally three or more members: a country specialist, one of more sector/topic specialists, and a generalist.

WHAT WILL QAG DO WITH THE FINDINGS?

22. **Reports:** QAG issues two types of reports: full assessments, including a narrative section and the full questionnaire for all tasks assessed; and an annual Synthesis Report. Reports for tasks with an overall *Satisfactory* rating are distributed to the TTL, plus the relevant Country Director and Sector Manager. Reports of In-depth assessments are, in addition, sent to the Chief Economist, Regional VP office and the relevant Sector Board Heads.

23. The Synthesis Report provides an overview/analysis of assessment findings, examines systemic issues, highlight patterns of strengths and weaknesses of ESW, and make recommendations for further improvements in quality. The Synthesis may also report the findings and conclusions from any special systemic studies carried out with the benefit of the survey data. The report in draft form is reviewed with participants and other interested observers of the QAG process, then with senior Regional/Network staff involved with quality issues. It is sent to Managing Directors, Regional VPs, Network VPs for review. A final version is discussed with CODE.

24. **Dissemination Channels and Learning:** For the purpose of promoting staff learning through sharing of findings, including best practices, QAG plans to increase activities devoted to dissemination and learning through a variety of channels, including:

- publishing best practice examples on the QAG website.
- providing summaries of lessons and conclusions on the QAG website.
- publicizing best practice examples through interaction with Regions and Networks and Sector Boards.
- working in partnership with WBI and Regions/Networks, participating in targeted staff training workshops, drawing on findings accumulated over the several years of ESW assessments.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

25. Panels for each Rapid assessment of an ESW task are estimated to require an average of 6 staff-days. For In-depth assessments, the requirement will normally be 10 staff-days. Based on a program of some 80 Rapid assessments and 10 In-depth assessments, the total direct assessment time, including moderators, would amount to about 700 staff-days. Additional costs are represented by QAG overhead in management and logistics. The Synthesis document, with its supporting analytical work, is the other core cost center involving senior QAG staff and specialist support. Altogether, the total estimated direct cost for the FY02 ESW program as outlined in this document is roughly \$650,000 (this represents about 0.9% of the ESW budget). As in previous years, QAG will cover the above direct costs of the assessments. Under the new Bank guidelines for cross-support, QAG would reimburse staff for time billed when they work as panelists or on special tasks.

26. These costs do not include the time spent by Regional staff in preparing for and interacting with assessment panels. At an estimated 3 staff-days for each Rapid assessment and 3 incremental staff-days for each In-depth, the direct cost should be around \$250,000. The budget guidelines make explicit provision for these costs in Regional budgets.

27. **WHAT WILL BE THE SCHEDULE OF KEY ACTIVITIES ?**

Issue Approach Paper in final	end-May
Notify Regions/Networks of ESW02 universe	mid-May
Agree with Regions/Networks on ESW02 universe	late-May
Sample 1st batch of tasks, completed by end-February	end-May
First Rapid panels meet	late-June
Sample balance of FY02 tasks*	early-Sept
Panel meetings end	late-Nov
Synthesis report, completed by	end-Dec

* QAG may sample tasks in three batches depending on rate of flow and timing of task completions

ANNEX 4

Table 1: RESULTS BY REGION

(A) BY DOLLAR COST*. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Region	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue**			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
AFR	9	11	9	94	90	93	49	70	87	100	100	93	79	80	93	75	92	100	100	64	84
EAP	12	12	10	95	83	93	60	50	57	95	100	100	95	73	71	72	100	93	86	83	93
ECA	16	16	22	90	100	100	84	80	97	90	100	100	90	94	96	65	100	87	100	86	95
LCR	12	11	16	81	87	84	76	77	77	94	100	94	81	87	84	88	87	77	90	82	77
MNA	6	8	8	100	85	100	100	59	80	100	85	100	100	68	100	90	55	100	100	40	100
SAR	10	12	10	62	94	100	39	79	90	72	87	100	89	94	100	74	75	92	54	75	100
Bank	65	70	75	86	91	94	66	70	82	91	97	98	88	85	90	75	90	89	88	76	90

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Region	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue**			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
AFR	9	11	9	85	85	94	53	67	79	100	100	94	68	70	94	68	95	100	100	66	88
EAP	12	12	10	91	96	88	61	61	62	91	100	100	91	91	69	86	100	88	91	96	88
ECA	16	16	22	90	100	100	83	68	93	90	100	100	90	94	94	66	100	85	100	73	88
LCR	12	11	16	82	81	77	64	68	74	91	100	85	82	81	77	91	81	81	82	82	70
MNA	6	8	8	100	89	100	100	44	93	100	89	100	100	56	100	79	67	100	100	56	100
SAR	10	12	10	78	83	100	65	75	87	87	79	100	91	91	100	81	66	87	69	66	100
Bank	65	70	75	86	90	92	69	66	83	92	95	96	87	84	88	78	87	88	89	74	86

* Total costs including both Bank regular budget and TF money were used for calculating the cost-weighted results, which are cited in the main report.

The number-weighted or results by number are just for comparison with the cost-weighted results.

** The rating for the dimension Dialogue has a discontinuity. In FY01 a reformatted dimension was created, with a broader set of sub-questions rated.

This footnote applies to all tables in this Annex.

ANNEX 4

Table 2: RESULTS BY NETWORK

(A) BY DOLLAR COST. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

NETWORK	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
ESSD	13	17	7	65	93	100	61	47	84	78	95	100	76	73	100	60	97	70	89	81	89
FSE	3	6	1	100	100	100	100	91	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	77	100	100	68	100
HDN	8	8	17	86	100	100	64	84	97	100	100	100	86	94	93	74	100	100	86	75	94
OPCS	0	0	5	-	-	82	-	-	82	-	-	82	-	-	82	-	-	84	-	-	66
PREM	33	32	38	91	93	90	59	79	72	91	98	97	91	89	86	73	88	90	86	82	88
PSI	8	7	7	88	57	100	86	45	90	95	91	100	88	66	100	88	79	74	91	45	100
Bank	65	70	75	86	91	94	66	70	82	91	97	98	88	85	90	75	90	89	88	76	90

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

NETWORK	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
ESSD	13	17	7	82	89	100	66	53	84	89	97	100	89	68	100	80	96	65	92	77	82
FSE	3	6	1	100	100	100	100	74	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	74	100	100	48	100
HDN	8	8	17	82	100	100	75	78	93	100	100	100	82	88	86	65	100	100	82	80	93
OPCS	0	0	5	-	-	80	-	-	80	-	-	80	-	-	80	-	-	80	-	-	59
PREM	33	32	38	91	92	86	64	70	77	91	98	94	88	85	84	80	88	90	88	79	85
PSI	8	7	7	72	63	100	72	56	79	86	69	100	72	94	100	72	62	73	86	56	100
Bank	65	70	75	86	90	92	69	66	83	92	95	96	87	84	88	78	87	88	89	74	86

ANNEX 4

Table 3: RESULTS BY PRODUCT TYPE

(A) BY DOLLAR COST. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

PRODUCT	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
Core Diagnostic	14	17	30	89	96	91	49	87	72	89	100	96	83	100	85	66	82	88	81	79	89
CEM/SSR/DPR	4	6	7	100	86	64	65	71	64	100	100	88	100	100	64	16	59	76	100	59	64
CFA/CPA	0	0	6	-	-	85	-	-	85	-	-	85	-	-	85	-	-	86	-	-	71
PA	5	4	8	86	100	100	64	85	89	86	100	100	86	100	100	77	100	100	100	85	100
PER	5	7	9	85	100	100	27	100	61	85	100	100	71	100	85	86	89	87	55	89	100
Other ESW	51	53	45	85	89	97	71	64	89	91	94	99	89	80	94	77	88	90	90	76	91
Policy Notes	5	8	17	100	86	100	81	74	80	100	86	100	100	87	91	68	86	91	81	86	96
Bank	65	70	75	86	91	94	66	70	82	91	97	98	88	85	90	75	90	89	88	76	90

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

PRODUCT	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
Core Diagnostic	14	17	30	81	96	88	42	74	79	81	100	93	72	100	83	71	83	88	81	65	84
CEM/SSR/DPR	4	6	7	100	81	74	94	63	74	100	100	92	100	100	74	65	42	82	100	42	74
CFA/CPA	0	0	6	-	-	83	-	-	83	-	-	83	-	-	83	-	-	83	-	-	67
PA	5	4	8	69	100	100	38	48	88	69	100	100	69	100	100	69	100	100	100	48	100
PER	5	7	9	77	100	100	9	100	74	77	100	100	55	100	90	77	90	91	55	90	100
Other ESW	51	53	45	87	89	94	75	63	85	94	96	97	90	78	89	80	93	88	90	75	88
Policy Notes	5	8	17	100	80	100	80	67	82	100	80	100	100	90	86	75	80	86	80	80	93
Bank	65	70	75	86	90	92	69	66	83	92	95	96	87	84	88	78	87	88	89	74	86

ANNEX 4

Table 4: RESULTS BY COST* RANGE

BY NUMBER. WEIGHTED % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Cost* Range	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
20-50	7	4	0	100	74	-	69	44	-	100	74	-	100	100	-	100	63	-	100	44	-
50-250	36	39	46	80	92	91	68	68	83	88	99	95	80	81	86	69	89	86	83	75	83
250-500	13	19	23	93	95	96	75	81	79	93	96	96	93	90	92	85	86	92	100	86	93
>500	9	8	6	89	86	100	61	47	86	89	100	100	94	72	100	81	100	100	89	86	100
Bank	65	70	75	86	90	92	69	66	83	92	95	96	87	84	88	78	87	88	89	74	86

* Include costs from both regular Bank budget (BB) and Trust Fund, retrofitted to historic series.

Table 5: RESULTS BY HQ/FIELD MANAGED

(A) BY DOLLAR COST. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
Field	17	13	10	84	100	95	56	81	63	92	95	95	93	89	90	63	95	100	76	95	95
HQ	48	57	65	86	89	94	69	68	85	90	98	98	87	84	90	79	89	88	92	72	89
Bank	65	70	75	86	91	94	66	70	82	91	97	98	88	85	90	75	90	89	88	76	90

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
Field	17	13	10	88	100	88	72	80	63	94	94	88	94	87	76	78	93	100	76	93	88
HQ	48	57	65	86	88	93	67	64	86	91	95	97	84	83	90	79	85	86	94	70	86
Bank	65	70	75	86	90	92	69	66	83	92	95	96	87	84	88	78	87	88	89	74	86

ANNEX 4

Table 6: RESULTS BY IDA STATUS

(A) BY DOLLAR COST. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Funding Source	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
IBRD	32	25	39	88	91	93	76	77	85	94	97	97	86	93	92	80	92	89	92	85	89
IDA	30	41	31	83	95	98	56	75	82	88	97	98	89	86	89	71	88	91	84	75	93
Bank	62	66	70	85	94	95	66	76	84	90	97	97	87	89	91	75	90	90	88	79	91

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Funding Source	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
IBRD	32	25	39	91	89	90	77	65	84	95	97	94	91	86	87	86	89	89	93	79	84
IDA	30	41	31	80	91	98	58	68	84	88	94	98	82	84	91	73	87	89	84	72	92
Bank	62	66	70	86	90	94	67	67	84	91	95	95	86	84	89	80	87	89	88	74	87

Note: IDA includes blend countries. Regional studies in AFR were treated as IDA; In ECA, regional studies on Eastern Europe treated as IBRD, and on Central Asia were treated as IDA. All tasks in China and Egypt are excluded, since these major countries shifted from IDA to IBRD during the period FY98-01. The series including them, is however, broadly similar.

ANNEX 4

TABLE 7: RESULTS BY CPIA* CATEGORY

(A) DOLLAR COST. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

CPIA Category	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
Low Performing	16	26	20	74	96	94	70	79	86	79	100	94	68	86	86	66	94	96	94	74	94
Other	49	44	55	88	88	95	66	64	80	93	95	99	93	83	92	77	87	87	87	77	88
Bank	65	70	75	86	91	94	66	70	82	91	97	98	88	85	90	75	90	89	88	76	90

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

CPIA Category	No. of Tasks			Overall Quality			Bank Processes			Relevance			Internal Quality			Dialogue*			Likely Impact		
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY00	FY01	FY02
Low Performing	16	26	20	77	94	89	63	69	85	84	100	89	70	82	85	71	95	96	93	69	89
Other	49	44	55	90	88	93	70	65	82	94	92	98	92	86	89	81	81	85	87	76	85
Bank	65	70	75	86	90	92	69	66	83	92	95	96	87	84	88	78	87	88	89	74	86

* CPIA categories were based on the overall scores of CPIA. Countries whose overall CPIA scores rated less than 3.5 were coded as Low Performing countries.

ANNEX 4

TABLE 8: FY01-02 RESULTS BY PARTICIPATION LEVEL

(A) DOLLAR COST. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Participation Level	No. of Tasks		Overall Quality		Bank Processes		Relevance		Internal Quality		Dialogue*		Likely Impact	
	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02
Strongly Participatory*	27	33	100	100	89	92	100	100	86	95	100	97	100	97
Other	43	42	85	88	57	71	95	95	83	85	83	81	60	83
Bank	70	75	91	94	70	82	97	98	85	90	90	89	76	90

(B) BY NUMBER. % TASKS RATING AS SATISFACTORY OR BETTER

Participation Level	No. of Tasks		Overall Quality		Bank Processes		Relevance		Internal Quality		Dialogue*		Likely Impact	
	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02
Strongly Participatory*	27	33	100	100	88	96	100	100	86	98	100	96	100	96
Other	43	42	84	87	53	74	92	93	83	81	78	83	57	80
Bank	70	75	90	92	66	83	95	96	84	88	87	88	74	86

* The criteria for strongly participatory ESW tasks are client-driven, iterative process, use of local institutions, and emphasis on dialogue.

ANNEX 4

TABLE 9: AVERAGE ELAPSED TIME AND COSTS BY GROUP

	No. of Tasks		Elapsed Time (month) ^{a/}		Process Costs (\$'000) ^{b/}	
	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02
ESW Universe ^{c/}						
Region						
AFR	30	29	15.6	15.8	178	159
EAP	35	33	12.2	15.3	283	202
ECA	62	65	14.3	16.4	166	202
LCR	32	53	17.4	14.2	206	181
MNA	20	20	10.1	14.2	129	234
SAR	40	29	15.6	15.7	150	186
Network						
ESSD	42	25	16.3	16.0	257	152
FSE	14	6	17.0	6.3	125	200
HDN	33	37	17.1	15.9	168	191
ISN	0	1	-	15.4	-	320
OPCS	6	26	12.1	12.3	176	91
PREM	87	102	12.7	15.8	191	226
PSI	37	32	13.6	16.9	130	194
BANK	219	229	14.5	15.4	186	192
ESW Sample			Weighted Average			
Total Sample	70	75	15.1	15.0	181	191
Product Type						
Core Diagnostic	17	30	13.4	14.6	244	216
Other ESW	53	45	15.6	15.2	164	176
Source of Fund ^{d/}						
IDA	41	31	14.0	15.1	157	213
IBRD	25	39	17.3	15.1	192	173
CPIA						
Low performing	26	20	13.8	15.5	181	247
High performing	44	55	16.0	14.8	181	174
Participation level						
Strongly participatory	27	33	15.0	14.9	186	249
Other	43	42	15.2	15.0	177	153
Location of Task						
Field	13	10	18.2	12.3	232	171
HQ	57	65	14.6	15.4	172	195

^{a/} Average elapsed time in months between AIS signoff date and delivery to client date.

^{b/} Average costs include both BB and Trust Fund from task initiation to delivery.

^{c/} ESW universe is defined as tasks eligible for FY01 and FY02 ESW assessments .

^{d/} China and Egypt were excluded.

ANNEX 5

QUALITY OF ECONOMIC AND SECTOR WORK
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT RESULTS *

	FY00	FY01	FY02
A. OVERALL QUALITY	86	90	92
1. Scope & Strategic Relevance	92	95	96
2. Internal Quality	87	84	88
3. Dialogue and Dissemination	78	87	88
4. Likely Impact	89	73	86
B. BANK PROCESSES	69	66	83

* All data in this table is number-weighted.

The overall assessment of the quality of ESW is not meant to be a simple average of the assessment for the four aspects of quality listed (which, in turn, are not simple averages of respective underlying factors). The panel should use its judgment in weighing the relative importance of each component and factor in any particular case.

QAG ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Assessment Rating
 1= Highly satisfactory
 2= Satisfactory
 3= Marginal
 4= Unsatisfactory
 NA= Not applicable

A. OVERALL QUALITY

FY00	FY01	FY02
------	------	------

1. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE AND TIMELINESS

92	95	96
----	----	----

General 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

NA	NA	92
----	----	----

a) Clarity of Task Objectives

83	84	92
----	----	----

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

NA	NA	75
----	----	----

Comments:

1.2 Timeliness of the task in terms of

92	93	98
----	----	----

a) Client receptivity

NA	NA	96
----	----	----

b) Bank's programming agenda

NA	NA	98
----	----	----

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.

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

98	99	96
----	----	----

(a) towards initiating/moving the policy dialogue forward

NA	96	97
----	----	----

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

70	90	94
----	----	----

(c) as an underpinning to lending operations

NA	91	96
----	----	----

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

NA	96	92
----	----	----

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..

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

100	100	99
-----	-----	----

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?

QAG ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Assessment Rating

1= Highly satisfactory
 2= Satisfactory
 3= Marginal
 4= Unsatisfactory
 NA= Not applicable

	FY00	FY01	FY02
2. INTERNAL QUALITY	86	84	88
<i>General Guidance: While this section flows most "naturally" towards assessment of written products, the spirit behind the questions should also be applied to the internal quality and analytical content within dialogue/processes.</i>			
2.1 Appropriateness of coverage/scope of the task, in view of the objectives (focus, range of issues addressed, areas covered)	NA	NA	87
<i>Comments:</i>			
2.2 Clear identification of critical issues	75	91	85
<i>Comments:</i>			
2.3 Quality of the analysis	79	73	94
<i>Comments:</i>			
<i>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.</i>			
2.4 Quality of the empirical evidence	83	86	97
(a) quantitative and qualitative accumulated under the task per se	83	86	96
(b) use of knowledge available inside the Bank - from Network, e.g. anchor thematic groups, DEC, from other Regions, etc.	NA	NA	89
(c) use of knowledge from outside the Bank, notably within the country, (e.g., think-tanks, universities, NGOs, donors)	89	100	93
<i>Comments:</i>			
<i>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.</i>			
2.5 Appropriate consideration of/sensitivity to the poverty 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?	60	83	77
<i>Comments:</i>			
2.6 Appropriate consideration of/sensitivity to the gender dimension	NA	77	68
<i>Comments:</i>			
<i>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</i>			
2.7 Quality of conclusions and recommendations	NA	71	74
(a) conclusions and recommendations appropriately specific and consistent with the analysis?	NA	NA	76
(b) recommendations adequately selective/prioritized?	48	55	56
(c) appropriateness of the recommendations, particularly in the light of social, political and administrative realities?	71	78	80

QAG ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Assessment Rating
 1= Highly satisfactory
 2= Satisfactory
 3= Marginal
 4= Unsatisfactory
 NA= Not applicable

3 DIALOGUE AND DISSEMINATION

FY00	FY01	FY02
NA	87	88

General 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

Comments:

a) Well-thought-out strategy for engagement

NA	NA	85
----	----	----

b) Relevant and effective counterparts

NA	68	85
----	----	----

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

NA	80	90
----	----	----

NA	NA	80
----	----	----

3.2 Effectiveness of Client participation in:

Comments:

a) defining the scope of the work

80	84	78
----	----	----

b) carrying out the analysis

NA	83	78
----	----	----

c) formulating the conclusions and recommendations

NA	75	76
----	----	----

NA	67	75
----	----	----

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

Comments:

a) defining the scope of work

NA	100	100
----	-----	-----

b) organizing the task, putting the team together, selecting the consultants,

NA	82	54
----	----	----

c) knowledge sharing, providing cross-country experience

NA	100	54
----	-----	----

NA	69	100
----	----	-----

d) reviewing work in draft stages

NA	98	100
----	----	-----

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.

3.4 Quality of capacity-building efforts during task implementation

Comments:

NA	82	89
----	----	----

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. groups, local academics, private sector, etc.)?

Comments:

NA	81	82
----	----	----

3.6 Quality of partnership arrangements with other donors

Comments:

NA	78	90
----	----	----

3.7 Appropriateness of the actual/planned arrangements for dissemination

Comments:

87	87	85
----	----	----

3.8 Quality of presentation of the Bank's written products

79	88	87
----	----	----

QAG ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Assessment Rating
 1= Highly satisfactory
 2= Satisfactory
 3= Marginal
 4= Unsatisfactory
 NA= Not applicable

FY00	FY01	FY02
88	74	86

4 LIKELY IMPACT

General 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

Comments:

a) clearly defined indicators of success.

NA	71	83
----	----	----

b) a clear and well-structured strategy for achieving impact

NA	NA	75
----	----	----

(c) timeliness of output(s) in terms of the client's own cycle of policy and program review and planning

NA	62	79
----	----	----

NA	92	89
----	----	----

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

4.2 Likely Impact on the Client

Comments:

a) helping to create ownership of change proposals among key decision-makers

NA	71	83
----	----	----

NA	69	82
----	----	----

b) enhancements in the area of capacity building, knowledge transfer, or institutional change

NA	74	81
----	----	----

c) promoting meaningful change in government policy, strategy, expenditures, investment, programs, project design

72	68	80
----	----	----

4.3 Likely impact on the Bank

Comments:

a) its strategic approach to the country

NA	88	89
----	----	----

87	82	88
----	----	----

b) design/implementation of operational products

70	89	87
----	----	----

c) the knowledge-base of the Bank

86	83	95
----	----	----

4.4 Likely impact on the wider development community:

Comments:

a) other donors (including NGOs) and aid coordination

80	78	97
----	----	----

NA	80	94
----	----	----

b) development thinkers

NA	63	95
----	----	----

Comments:

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.

QAG ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Assessment Rating
 1= Highly satisfactory
 2= Satisfactory
 3= Marginal
 4= Unsatisfactory
 NA= Not applicable

	FY00	FY01	FY02
5 BANK PROCESSES	68	66	83
INPUTS			
5.1 Elapsed time (months)			
Activity initiation – Discussion Draft	9	11	13
Discussion Draft - Client Delivery.....	4	5	3
5.2 Preparation/Processing Cost (\$000)			
Regular Budget (BB).....	206	185	205
Trust Funds.....	45	70	30
Total Funding	251	255	235
MANAGERIAL ATTENTION			
5.3 How reasonable was the time taken to complete the task?	82	78	95
5.4 How adequate was the total funding in view of the objectives and scope of the task? Funding for dissemination & follow-up?	65	67	85
<i>Guidance: Bear in mind the complexity, country context, previous work available. Do not overlook TF or other donor resources. Was dissemination sufficiently funded?</i>			
Check if:			
5.5 Skill-mix of the task team? How comprehensive? Cross-sectoral skills?	82	82	88
<i>Guidance: Did the managers select the right leadership? Did the manager or TTL assemble the right team in terms of country knowledge, experience, skills?</i>			
5.6 Overall efficiency of resource use (both Bank budget and Trust Funds, where used)	84	88	91
<i>Comments:</i>			
a) Bank Budget	NA	NA	91
b) trust funds component only	NA	NA	93
5.7 Attention to Quality at Entry	69	64	85
<i>Comments:</i>			
a) by Sector Management	67	73	83
b) by Country Management	81	65	88
<i>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.</i>			
5.8 Attention to implementation/dissemination of the task.	60	76	83
<i>Comments:</i>			
a) by Sector Management	69	80	82
b) by Country Management	77	76	83
<i>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.</i>			

OTHER

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

Comments:

a) Quality of inputs

b) Impact on 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.

5.10 Quality enhancement contributions of the peer review process

Comments

a) Quality of inputs

b) Impact on final output

5.11 Quality enhancement contributions of a QER or equivalent

Comments:

a) Quality of inputs

b) Impact on final output

5.12 Quality of the Activity Completion Summary?

Comments:

5.13 Quality of information on the task in SAP

Comments:

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

FY00	FY01	FY02
------	------	------

NA	87	96
----	----	----

69	89	96
----	----	----

58	85	82
----	----	----

NA	63	76
----	----	----

95	86	83
----	----	----

71	62	70
----	----	----

NA	100	100
----	-----	-----

NA	100	100
----	-----	-----

NA	100	100
----	-----	-----

67	44	52
----	----	----

NA	67	70
----	----	----

ANNEX 6

TABLE 1. TTL SURVEY

	<u>Satisfactory (%)</u>	
	FY02 (n=40)	FY01 (n=22)
Performance of the QAG panel		
a) Panel's skills mix in relation to the task's subject and coverage	83	81
b) Panel's familiarity with country specific issues	65	n/a
c) Panel's preparation for the interview	88	81
d) Extent to which the panel focused on the relevant issues	83	67
e) Panel's listening to the task team's point of view	80	n/a
f) Appropriateness of the tone and atmosphere during interview	98	n/a
ESW5 Process		
a) Transparency of the process	85	n/a
b) Role of the moderator	92	n/a
c) Logistics of the process	88	n/a
d) Time taken to share the draft assessment with the team	85	n/a
While QAG review is essentially an accountability exercise, how Would you rate it as a learning experience?	65	72
Overall QAG review process	74	71
Average time (in hrs) taken for:		
Document preparation	16	18
Panel interview	4	4

ANNEX 6

TABLE 2. PANELIST SURVEY

	<u>Satisfactory (%)</u> (n=83)
Assessment Panel	
a) Panel's skills-mix in relation to the task's type and complexity	97
b) Panel's familiarity with country specific issues	84
Assessment Approach	
a) Usefulness of the TTL inputs on 'context' (Part A of the questionnaire) towards assessment	92
b) Appropriateness of the Guidance Questionnaire to the assessment	97
c) Usefulness of the client feedback to the assessment	64
d) The other panelist were well prepared for the assessment	96
e) My views were taken into account when rating the task	97
Role of Moderator	
a) Role in setting the ground rules and the tone of the discussion	97
b) Guidance provided in interpreting the questionnaire	97
c) Guidance provided towards benchmarking the ratings vis-à-vis similar tasks	92
Logistics	
a) Task background documentation - timely and appropriate?	92
b) Quality of QAG Administrative Support	97
c) Adequacy of the time provided to conduct the assessments	92
Overall Performance	
Usefulness of the ESW5 process overall for enhancing accountability in the Bank?	92
Usefulness of the ESW5 process to identify systemic issues	92
Cost effectiveness of the ESW5 process.	98
Average panelist time per assessment	20.7 hrs