

**QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT
GUIDANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADJUSTMENT LENDING**

VERSION: 06/19/03

COUNTRY: _____ **OPERATION:** _____

Region: _____ **Task Team Leader:** _____ **Sector Manager:** _____

Country Director: _____

Sector: _____ **Operation ID:** _____ **Date Approved:** _____

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

SAL **SECAL** **OTHER**

PERSONS INTERVIEWED:

FIRST STAGE REVIEW

SECOND STAGE REVIEW

FIRST STAGE REVIEW:

PANEL LEADER/MEMBER(S): _____

Moderator: _____

Specialized Reviewers:

1. **Environment** _____

2. **Social Assessment** _____

3. **Financial Management** _____

4. **Other** _____

OVERALL RATING: _____

ASSESSMENT DATE: _____

SECOND STAGE REVIEW (if applicable):

PANEL LEADER: _____

PANEL MEMBERS : _____

DATE: _____ **PANEL RATING:** _____

SAL = Structural Adjustment Loan

SECAL = Sector Adjustment Loan

**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. | Strategic Relevance and Approach | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. | Structural, Financial and Macroeconomic 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 program, 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 operation's documents

(Importance of development objectives addressed by the operation: **H = High, M = Moderate, L= Low N/A = Not Applicable**)

(1) Development Objectives

- | | | |
|-------|---|--------------------------|
| i. | Poverty Reduction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. | Structural and Sector Policy Reform | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. | Private Sector Development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. | Institutional Development/Capacity Building | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| v. | Human Development ¹ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| vi. | Environmental Sustainability | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| vii. | Infrastructure Development | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| viii. | Other (specify) ² | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ix. | Macroeconomic Management | <input type="checkbox"/> |

(2) Outcomes

For each Development Objective identified above as High, describe the corresponding outcome that will serve as the primary indicator that it has been attained, and an interim benchmark to evaluate progress during implementation.

- i. Poverty Reduction
- Outcome: _____
- Interim Benchmark: _____
- ii. Structural and Sector Policy Reform
- Outcome: _____
- Interim Benchmark: _____
- iii. Private Sector Development
- Outcome: _____

¹ Specify which one of the five following: i) Achieve Universal Primary Education; ii) Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women; iii) Reduce Child Mortality; iv) Improve Maternal Health; v) Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other Diseases

² e.g. Gender Equality and empower women.

Interim Benchmark: _____

iv. Institutional Development/Capacity Building

Outcome: _____

Interim Benchmark: _____

v. Human Development

Outcome: _____

Interim Benchmark: _____

vi. Environmental Sustainability

Outcome: _____

Interim Benchmark: _____

vii. Infrastructure Development

Outcome: _____

Interim Benchmark: _____

viii. Other (specify)

Outcome: _____

Interim Benchmark: _____

ix. Macroeconomic Management

Outcome: _____

Interim Benchmark: _____

Comments:

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

i. Poverty Reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Structural and Sector Policy Reform	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Private Sector Development	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Institutional Development/Capacity Building	<input type="checkbox"/>

- v. Human Development
- vi. Environmental Sustainability
- vii. Infrastructure Development
- viii. Other (specify)
- ix. Macroeconomic Management

C. Sustainability

(Check the Appropriate Box)

(Panel's judgment of the likelihood that the operation's results will be sustainable in the longer- term)

Likely	Unlikely	Uncertain
<input data-bbox="873 730 950 772" type="checkbox"/>	<input data-bbox="1047 730 1123 772" type="checkbox"/>	<input data-bbox="1279 730 1356 772" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

Assessment Rating

1. Strategic Relevance and Approach

1.1 Coherence and consistency of development rationale underpinning the operation?

(a) Results focus of the operation design consistent with the outcomes listed in section A(2) above?

(b) Consistency of the operation's objectives with CAS and the country's key development priorities?

(c) Consistency of the operations objectives with the Bank's sector strategy? (for SECALs)

Comments:

1.2 Clarity and realism of the reform objectives?

(a) Overall quality of the macro economic justifications?

(b) Are the reform objectives specific and focused?

(c) Are the reforms sufficiently but not overly ambitious?

Comments:

1.3 Appropriateness of lending instrument (SAL, PSAL, SSAL, SNAL, other) to achieve the stated objectives? (Were alternative instruments considered?)

Comments:

1.4 Extent to which lessons of experience are adequately reflected in the program's approach? (Country's track record in implementing reforms? Similar operations in the country or region? How well were lessons on tranching incorporated? OED findings?)

Comments:

1.5 Adequacy of country (and for SECAL sector) knowledge underpinning the operation? (Sector-specific analysis? General public expenditure reviews, poverty analysis? Etc.)

Comments:

- 1.6 Level of borrower ownership:
- (a) Degree of borrower participation in program design and implementation?
 - (b) Credible evidence of borrower ownership and commitment based on
 - (i) track record; (ii) prior (pre-Board) actions; and/or
 - (iii) wide public dissemination of reform program?
 - (c) Presence of strong champions?

Comments:

- 1.7 Appropriate partnership arrangements with IMF and other donors? (Are Bank, IMF, and donors' views and advice on the key reform measures and objectives consistent? Is the Bank-Fund division of labor appropriate?)

Comments:

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

Assessment Rating

2. STRUCTURAL, FINANCIAL AND MACROECONOMIC ASPECTS

2.1 Adequacy of external financing case for the operation? (Underpinned by an actual or prospective current account or fiscal deficit?)

Comments:

2.2 Adequacy of overall external (Bank, IMF, other donors and creditors) financing arrangements?

(a) Adequacy of total amount of financing relative to projected financing requirements?

(b) Is the Bank's financial contribution consistent with its role of providing medium-term support for structural reform? (Adequacy of financial burden sharing among the various creditors?)

Comments:

2.3 Extent and appropriateness of medium-term framework? (Choice between self-standing one-off operation and programmatic series of operations? Links to medium-term government program of structural and social reform?)

Comments:

2.4 Appropriateness and realism of prior actions and future conditions? (Focus on few big ticket items? Specific up-front actions rather than plans, studies and future commitments?)

Comments:

2.5 Appropriateness of tranching arrangements?

(a) How well does the phasing of disbursements match the financing requirements?

(b) How well does the phasing of reforms match the phasing of disbursements?

Comments:

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 Operation's focus on poverty issues:

(a) Quality and depth of poverty diagnosis?

(b) Appropriateness and comprehensiveness of operation design with respect to poverty issues?

Comments:

3.2 Extent to which gender issues were considered during the operation's design?

Comments:

3.3 Extent to which relevant social development issues and risks were considered in operation's design and institutional arrangements?

Comments:

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 operation)

(b) Degree of beneficiaries and other key stakeholders' participation? (Including an assessment of their attitudes toward the operation, attention to issues arising from the consultation/assessment process, and mechanisms for ongoing participation during implementation by key stakeholders whose involvement is critical to the operation's success)

Comments:

3.5 Appropriateness and realism of arrangements to manage and mitigate any adverse social impacts? (as part of, or outside the scope of the operation)

Comments:

QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

4. ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

4.1 Environmental classification for SECAL operations:

(a) Was an environment classification carried out?

(b) Appropriateness of the selected environmental category?

Comments:

4.2 Environmental Assessment for SECAL operations classified A or B:

(a) Adequacy and quality of EA to assess the potential impacts of planned policy, institutional and regulatory actions under the operation?

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

Comments:

4.3 Extent to which the adjustment operation adheres to environmental Good Practice?

Comments:

Environmental Good Practice for SAL operations (rating guidance):

N/A Project has no impact to environment whatsoever.

(a) Best practice (Highly Satisfactory rating): operation might have environmental impacts, but goes beyond the good practice provisions of OD 8.60.

(b) Good practice (Satisfactory rating): operation might have environmental impacts, but follows good practice provisions of OD 8.60.

(c) Insufficient (Unsatisfactory rating): operation might have negative environmental impacts, and does not follow good practice provisions of OD 8.60.

(d) Bad practice (Highly Unsatisfactory rating): operation is likely to have major negative environmental impacts and does not follow good practice provisions of OD 8.60.

Quality At Entry Assessment: Guidance Questions

Assessment Rating

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

5. FIDUCIARY ASPECTS

5.1 Financial Management

(a) Compliance with disbursement and auditing requirements?

(b) Extent to which the fiduciary concerns regarding the overall use of borrower resources were addressed?

Comments:

5.2 Procurement

(a) Were the strengths and weaknesses identified in the CPAR and/or other relevant analysis appropriately reflected in the design and documentation of the operation (e.g. through specific conditionality and/or parallel capacity building/technical assistance)?

Comments:

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 Appropriateness of prevailing economic (especially macroeconomic) policy environment for achieving the operation’s objectives? (Country’s macroeconomic management satisfactory? Is the IMF program on track or have staff ascertained that the IMF has no major outstanding concerns?)

Comments:

6.2 Consistency of the policy and institutional reform actions supported by the operation with the stated reform/development objectives?

Comments:

6.3 Appropriate identification of agencies and institutions (e.g. government, regulatory, judicial, private sector, NGOs) responsible for program execution? Respective roles clearly defined?

Comments

6.4 Extent to which the implementing agencies have (or where they are lacking capacity, adequacy of institution building measures under other Bank or donor funded operations):

(a) Capacity to implement the operation (staff and organization structure)?

(b) Commitment to implement the program?

(c) Political capacity to carry out the reforms?

Comments:

**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 operation within the prescribed time-frame

(a) Realism of time allotted for completing reforms supported by future tranches, relative to their ambitiousness and institutional capacity?

(b) Extent to which experience from similar operations in the country/region are reflected in the implementation plane?

Comments:

7.2 Extent to which the operation was ready to proceed at the time of Board approval

(a) Unless specifically justified by special circumstances, absence of effectiveness conditions or substantive reform actions?

(b) Arrangements for disbursements in place?

Comments:

7.3 Appropriateness of arrangements to monitor implementation and to review progress with the borrower? Specificity of indicators and benchmarks? Clear assignment of monitoring responsibilities to implementing agencies for:

(a) Tracking progress of reform programs initiated under the operation?

(b) Poverty and social aspects?

(c) For SECALS, any adverse environmental impacts?

Comments:

7.4 Appropriateness of arrangements (e.g. baseline surveys, outcome indicators) for evaluating impact and measuring outcomes of:

(a) Reform programs initiated under the operation?

(b) Poverty and social aspects?

(c) or SECALS, any adverse environmental impacts?

Comments:

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) | <input type="text"/> |
| | a) Country capacity (Non supportive macroeconomic and political environment, governance problems and borrower commitment) | <input type="text"/> |
| | b) Institutional effectiveness to implement the project | <input type="text"/> |
| | c) Social risks (Risk of adverse social impact like exclusion of key groups, socio-political support) | <input type="text"/> |
| | d) Environmental risks (including natural resource management and indigenous peoples or resettlement issues) | <input type="text"/> |
| | e) Financial Management capacity (Financial Management risks in the country that may impact the project.) | <input type="text"/> |
| | f) Resilience to exogenous factors (Reaction of local and external civil society advocates, support from relevant stakeholders). | <input type="text"/> |
| | <i>Comments:</i> | |
| 8.2 | Realism of the operation's overall risk rating and its relation to rewards | <input type="text"/> |
| | a) Clarity and candor in recognizing residual risks (i.e. risks not amenable to mitigation) as indicated by the overall risk rating for the project | |
| | b) Appropriate balancing of project risks with potential rewards | <input type="text"/> |
| | <i>Comments:</i> | |

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 _____

Board Effectiveness _____

(Was the service standard of 5 months met? (Yes/No)

(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 Little Too Much About 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 safeguards/fiduciary aspects (\$) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

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, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

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?)

Comments:

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

Comments:

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

Comments:

9.7 Value Added from management

(a) Country Management

(b) Sector Management

(c) Regional Management

Comments:

9.8 Quality Enhancement

(a) Peer Reviews

(i) Appropriateness of reviewers' selection?

(ii) Quality of guidance given?

(iii) Appropriate use of advice provided?

Comments:

(b) QER

(i) Appropriateness of reviewers' selection?

(ii) Quality of guidance given?

(iii) Appropriate use of advice provided?

Comments:

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) LOA (Disbursement)

Comments:

9.10 Quality of the Bank's documents (PAD, legal document

Comments: