

**QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT
GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INVESTMENT LENDING
(NOT INCLUDING ANNEX FOR LEARNING & INNOVATION LOANS – LILs)**

REVISED: 3/06/01

REGION _____ **COUNTRY** _____ **PROJECT TITLE:** _____

Task Team Leader: _____ **Sector Manager:** _____ **Country Director:** _____

Sector: _____ **Project ID:** _____ **Date Approved:** _____

LOAN/CREDIT AMOUNT (\$MIL) _____ **LOAN/CREDIT NUMBER** _____

SIL **LIL** **FIL** **APL** **TAL** **OTHER**

ENVIRONMENT CATEGORY A, B, C OR FI: _____

PERSONS INTERVIEWED: TTL _____ **OTHERS:** _____

FIRST STAGE REVIEW

SECOND STAGE REVIEW

FIRST STAGE REVIEW:

QAG Moderator: _____

PANEL LEADER/MEMBER(S): _____

Specialized Reviewers:

1. **Environment** _____

2. **Social Assessment** _____

3. **Financial Management** _____

4. **Procurement** _____

OVERALL RATING: _____ **Assessment Date:** _____

SECOND STAGE REVIEW (if applicable):

PANEL LEADER: _____

PANEL MEMBERS: _____

DATE: _____ **PANEL RATING:** _____

SIL = Sector Investment Loan; **LIL** = Learning and Innovation Loan; **FIL** = Financial Institution Loan
APL = Adaptable Program Loan; **TAL** = Technical Assistance Loan;

**QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT
GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT SHEET**

COUNTRY AND PROJECT TITLE: _____

Panel's overall assessment

A. Overall judgment:

B. Strong Aspects:

C. Areas Needing Improvements

D. Any Systemic Lessons

In light of this assessment, list two or three factors that will require particular attention during the next 1-2 years to improve the prospects for achieving the project's development objectives and long-term sustainability.

**QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT
GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE
SUMMARY ASSESSMENT SHEET**

Assessment Rating

1 = Highly Satisfactory
2 = Satisfactory
3 = Marginally Satisfactory
4 = Unsatisfactory
NA= Not Applicable

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. | Concept, Objectives and Approach | <input type="text"/> | |
| 2. | Technical, Financial and Economic Aspects | <input type="text"/> | |
| 3. | Poverty and Social Aspects | <input type="text"/> | |
| 4. | Environmental Aspects | <input type="text"/> | |
| 5. | Fiduciary Aspects | <input type="text"/> | |
| 6. | Policy and Institutional Aspects | <input type="text"/> | |
| 7. | Implementation Arrangements | <input type="text"/> | |
| 8. | Risk Assessment and Management | <input type="text"/> | |
| | OVERALL ASSESSMENT | | <input type="text"/> |
| 9. | Bank Inputs and Processes | <input type="text"/> | |

The relative importance of the eight quality dimensions are not of equal weight and thus the overall rating is not a simple average of the individual ratings. The project, sector, and country context influence the relative importance of these dimensions. Hence, the panel should use its knowledge, judgment and professional skills in arriving at weights to determine the overall rating.

Development Objectives

A. Development objectives outlined in the project’s documents
 (Importance of development objectives addressed by the project: **H = High, M = Moderate, L = Low, N/A= Not Applicable**)

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

B. Likelihood of achieving the stated development objectives (Panelists to assess using a scale of: **HL = Highly Likely; L =Likely; U = Unlikely; HU = Highly Unlikely; or N/A Not Applicable**)

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

Comments:

Sustainability
 (Check appropriate Box)

Highly Likely Likely Unlikely Highly Unlikely

(Panel’s judgment of the likelihood that project’s results will be sustainable over its intended useful life)

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

1 = Highly Satisfactory
 2 = Satisfactory
 3 = Marginally Satisfactory
 4 = Unsatisfactory
 NA = Not Applicable

Assessment Rating

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| 1. | CONCEPT, OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 2px solid black;" type="text"/> |
| 1.1 | Quality and coherence of development rationale underpinning the project? (Is it specific and focused on outcomes? Is it sufficiently but not overly ambitious?) | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 1.2 | Consistency of the project's objectives with: | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | a) CAS and the country's key development priorities? | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | b) Bank's Sector Strategy? | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 1.3 | Appropriateness of project approach? (Pilot/experimental vs larger investment? Sector wide coverage Vs. area specific investment? Choice of lending instrument?) | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 1.4 | Extent to which lessons of experience are adequately reflected in project approach? (Country's track record in implementing projects? Similar operations in the country or region? OED findings?) | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 1.5 | Adequacy of country and sector knowledge underpinning the project? (Sector-specific analysis? General public expenditure reviews? Etc.) | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 1.6 | Level of borrower ownership: | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | (a) Degree of borrower participation in project design and implementation? (Including mechanism for providing key inputs to project supervision) | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | (b) Credible evidence of borrower ownership and commitment based on track record and pre-Board action? | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | (c) Presence of strong champions? | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 1.7 | Appropriate partnership arrangements with other donors? (Are the respective key policies, procedures and development objectives consistent? Are arrangements for joint supervision clearly defined?) | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

1 = Highly Satisfactory
 2 = Satisfactory
 3 = Marginally Satisfactory
 4 = Unsatisfactory
 NA = Not Applicable

Assessment Rating

2. TECHNICAL, FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.1 | Technical soundness of the project? (Based on well-tested technologies? Appropriate for current country conditions?) | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.2 | Appropriateness of alternative designs considered? | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.3 | Quality and coherence of economic rationale and analysis underpinning the project? | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.4 | Appropriateness and realism of project conditionality? (Including balance between up-front and subsequent actions?) | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.5 | For revenue-earning projects: | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | (a) Quality of financial analysis over the useful life of the investment? | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| | (b) Appropriateness of financial covenants and performance indicators? | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.6 | Realism of the project's financing plan? (Including provisions for counterpart funding, cost recovery and recurrent cost funding?) | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |

Compliance with Bank's safeguard policies:

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.7 | Projects in Disputed Areas (OP 7.60) | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
| 2.8 | Projects on International Waterways (OP 7.50) | <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

Assessment Rating

1 = Highly Satisfactory
 2 = Satisfactory
 3 = Marginally Satisfactory
 4 = Unsatisfactory
 NA = Not Applicable

3. POVERTY AND SOCIAL ASPECTS

- 3.1 Project's focus on poverty reduction in the context of the CAS? (Likely impact on the poor and other vulnerable social groups adequately assessed and reflected in project design?)
- 3.2 Extent to which gender issues were considered during project design?
- 3.3 Extent to which relevant social development issues and risks were considered in project design and institutional arrangements?
- 3.4 Quality of stakeholder analysis and consultation:
- (a) Adequacy of stakeholder analysis? (Including identification and assessment of diverse social and organizational groups, stakeholders' interests affected by the program, and/or stakeholders' interests that will affect the project?)
- (b) Degree of beneficiaries and other key stakeholders' participation? (Including an assessment of their attitudes toward the project, attention to issues arising from the consultation/assessment process and mechanism for ongoing participation during implementation by key stakeholders whose involvement is critical to the project's success?)
- 3.5 Appropriateness and realism of arrangements to manage and mitigate any adverse social impacts arising out of the project?

Compliance with Bank's safeguard policies:

- 3.6 Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)
- 3.7 Involuntary Resettlement (OD 4.30)
- 3.8 Cultural Property (OPN 11.03)

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

| |
|--------------------------|
| Assessment Rating |
|--------------------------|

| |
|--|
| <p>1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable</p> |
|--|

4. ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

4.1 Extent to which significant environmental impacts (positive and negative) and risks were identified and assessed? (Were alternatives examined? Consultation with affected groups?)

4.2 Adequacy of arrangements for mitigating and managing any adverse environmental impacts during (and following) project implementation? (If mitigation measures are outside the project, assess the likelihood of their successful implementation)

4.3 Adequacy of assessment of environmental policies and institutional capacity for carrying out the EA and ensuring subsequent compliance?

4.4 Appropriateness and quality of Environmental Assessment:

(a) Appropriateness of the selected environment category ?

(b) Choice of the EA instrument (SEA/REA/EIA)?

(c) Adequacy of public disclosure procedures (BP 17.50)?

Compliance with Bank's safeguard policies:

4.5 Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01)

4.6 Natural Habitats (OP 4.04)

4.7 Forestry (OP 4.36)

4.8 Pest Management (OP 4.09)

4.9 Safety of Dams (OP 4.37)

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

| |
|--|
| <p>1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable</p> |
|--|

| |
|---------------------------------|
| <p>Assessment Rating</p> |
|---------------------------------|

- 5. **FIDUCIARY ASPECTS**
- 5.1 **FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**
 - (a) Adequacy of financial management systems and personnel for project accounting, internal controls, auditing and reporting as described in the Project Implementation Plan?
 - (b) Adequacy of financial management assessment as recorded in the Project Appraisal Document? Were appropriate and time bound measures introduced to correct any shortcomings?
- 5.2 **PROCUREMENT**
 - (a) Adequacy and timeliness of country procurement assessment?
 - (b) Quality and adequacy of arrangements for managing procurement?

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

| |
|--------------------------|
| Assessment Rating |
|--------------------------|

| |
|--|
| <p>1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable</p> |
|--|

6. POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

6.1 Extent to which the prevailing economic policy environment was considered in project design?

6.2 Appropriate identification of agencies and institutions (e.g. government, regulatory, judicial, private sector, NGOs) responsible for project execution and clarity of their respective roles?

6.3 Extent to which the implementing agencies have:

(a) Capacity to implement the project (i.e. do they have the required institutional culture, leadership, vision, strategy, systems, and funding?)

(b) Commitment to vigorously implement the project and promote the stated objectives?

(c) Political economy clout to carry out reforms and institutional changes included in the project?

6.4 Where the institutional capacity is deficient, appropriateness and realism of the capacity building measures:

(a) Institutional capacity assessment?

(b) Technical assistance arrangements?

(c) Staff and management training?

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

| |
|--|
| Assessment Rating |
| 1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory |

- 7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**
- 7.1 Prospects for completing the project within the prescribed time-frame? (Realism and quality of Project Implementation Plan?)
- 7.2 Readiness of the first year’s program for implementation? (Procurement, disbursements, on-lending, counterpart funding, TA, staffing and management arrangements in place?)
- 7.3 Appropriateness of arrangements to monitor implementation and to review progress with the borrower? Specificity of indicators and benchmarks? Clear assignments of monitoring responsibilities to implementing agencies?:
- (a) Tracking of implementation progress?
- (b) Poverty and social aspects?
- (c) Adverse environmental impacts?
- (d) Procurement monitoring?
- 7.4 Appropriateness of arrangements (e.g. baseline survey, outcome indicators) for evaluating impact and measuring outcomes of:
- (a) Institutional and policy reform aspects?
- (b) Project’s development objectives?
- (c) Poverty and social aspects?
- (d) Adverse environmental impacts?

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

| |
|--|
| Assessment Rating |
| 1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable |

8. RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT

8.1 Quality of risk assessment (with particular reference to candor, rigor, comprehensiveness and realism)

- (a) Technical soundness
- (b) Borrower commitment (including policy environment)
- (c) Social risks (including socio-political support)
- (d) Economic viability
- (e) Financial viability
- (f) Institutional effectiveness (to implement the project)
- (g) Environmental impact
- (h) Resilience to exogenous factors

8.2 Appropriateness of strategies for dealing with risk during project implementation?

- (a) Technical soundness
- (b) Borrower commitment (including policy environment)
- (c) Social risks (including socio-political support)
- (d) Economic viability
- (e) Financial viability
- (f) Institutional effectiveness (to implement the project)
- (g) Environmental impact
- (h) Resilience to exogenous factors

8.3 Clarity and candor in recognizing residual risks (i.e. risks not amenable to mitigation), and assessing them in relation to overall risks and rewards?

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

Assessment Rating

1 = Highly Satisfactory
 2 = Satisfactory
 3 = Marginally Satisfactory
 4 = Unsatisfactory
 NA = Not Applicable

9. BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES

9.1 Elapsed time (months)
 Concept-Appraisal _____
 Appraisal-Board _____ (Was the service standard of 5 months met? Yes/No)
 Board-Effectiveness _____ (Was the service standard of 4 months met? Yes/No)

9.2 Preparation/Processing Expenditures (\$000)
 BB _____
 PPF _____
 PHRD _____
 Other _____
 Total _____

9.3 **Task Team's Assessment:** (Check the appropriate box)

Too Too About
 Little Much Right

A. Project Preparation

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) | Funds | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Processing Time (weeks) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Amount spent on safeguard/fiduciary aspects (\$) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

B. Contributions to project preparation

High Medium Low

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (d) | Borrower | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | Other donors | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | Other Bank funded activities (ESW, IDF, Dropped projects, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Quality at Entry Assessment: Guidance Questions

| |
|--------------------------|
| Assessment Rating |
|--------------------------|

| |
|--|
| 1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable |
|--|

9.4 Task team’s composition in relation to operation’s complexity? (Skill-mix, continuity, experience, staff/consultants mix?)

9.5 Appropriateness of processing time considering operation’s complexity and urgency?

9.6 Overall efficiency of resources used? (In relation to operation’s complexity)

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROJECT QUALITY

9.7 Value Added from management

(a) Country Management

(b) Sector Management

(c) Regional Quality Assurance Team (Procurement, ENV, Social, Other)

9.8 Quality Enhancement

A. Peer Reviewers

(a) Appropriateness of reviewers’ selection?

(b) Quality of guidance given?

(c) Appropriate use of advice provided?

B. QER

(a) Appropriateness of reviewers’ selection?

(b) Quality of guidance given?

(c) Appropriate use of advice provided?

Quality at Entry Assessment: Guidance Questions

| |
|--------------------------|
| Assessment Rating |
|--------------------------|

| |
|--|
| 1 = Highly Satisfactory 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Marginally Satisfactory 4 = Unsatisfactory NA = Not Applicable |
|--|

- 9.9 Quality of support provided by
- (a) Sector Board and Anchor
- (b) Legal
- (c) Disbursement
- 9.10 Quality of the Bank's documents (PAD, legal documents)?