

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

**REVISED: 05/20/03**

**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:** \_\_\_\_\_

**MULTI-SECTOR**  **SINGLE SECTOR**

**PERSONS INTERVIEWED:**

**FIRST STAGE REVIEW**  **SECOND STAGE REVIEW**

**FIRST STAGE REVIEW:**

**QAG MODERATOR:** \_\_\_\_\_ **PANEL LEADER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PANEL MEMBERS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SPECIALIZED REVIEWERS:** 1. **Environment** \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Social Assessment** \_\_\_\_\_

3. **Financial Management** \_\_\_\_\_

4. **Procurement** \_\_\_\_\_

5. **Observer** \_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_ **ASSESSMENT DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECOND STAGE REVIEW (if applicable):**

**QAG MODERATOR:** \_\_\_\_\_ **PANEL LEADER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PANEL MEMBERS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL RATING:** \_\_\_\_\_ **ASSESSMENT DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SIL** = Specific Investment Loan; **LIL** = Learning and Innovation Loan; **FIL** = Financial Intermediary Loan  
**APL** = Adaptable Program Loan; **TAL** = Technical Assistance 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. | <b>Strategic Relevance and Approach</b>          | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. | <b>Technical, Financial and Economic Aspects</b> | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. | <b>Poverty and Social Aspects</b>                | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. | <b>Environmental Aspects</b>                     | <input type="text"/> |
| 5. | <b>Fiduciary Aspects</b>                         | <input type="text"/> |
| 6. | <b>Policy and Institutional Aspects</b>          | <input type="text"/> |
| 7. | <b>Implementation Arrangements</b>               | <input type="text"/> |
| 8. | <b>Risk Assessment</b>                           | <input type="text"/> |

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

- |    |                                  |                      |
|----|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| 9. | <b>Bank Inputs and Processes</b> | <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** )

**(1) Development Objectives**

- i. Poverty Reduction
- ii. Structural and Sector Policy Reform
- iii. Private Sector Development
- iv. Institutional Development/Capacity Building
- v. Human Development<sup>1</sup>

**Comments:**

- vi. Environmental Sustainability
- vii. Infrastructure Development
- viii. Other (specify)<sup>2</sup>
- ix. Macroeconomic Management

**(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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>1</sup> Specify which one of the four following: i) Achieve Universal Primary Education; ii) Reduce Child Mortality; iii) Improve Maternal Health; iv) Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other Diseases

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Gender Equality and Empower women  
*QEA6 Investment*

iii. Private Sector Development

Outcome: \_\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_\_\_

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

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| 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

  
  
  
  


Comments:

Likely	Unlikely	Uncertain
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C. Sustainability**

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

*Comments:*

## QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

### 1. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE AND APPROACH

1.1 Coherence and consistency of development rationale underpinning the project?

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

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

c) Consistency of the project's objectives with the Bank's sector strategy?

**Comments:**

1.2 Clarity and realism of the project's development objectives?

a) Are the DOs adequately focused on outcomes?

b) Are the DOs sufficiently but not overly ambitious?

**Comments:**

1.3 Appropriateness of project approach? (Pilot/experimental vs larger investment? Sector-wide coverage Vs. area specific investment? Single-sector vs. Multi-sector. Choice of lending instrument?)

**Comments:**

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?)

**Comments:**

1.5 Adequacy of country and sector knowledge underpinning the project? (Sector-specific analysis? General public expenditure reviews? Etc.)

**Comments:**

## QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

Assessment Rating

1.6 Level of borrower ownership:

(a) Degree of borrower participation in project design and implementation?  
(Including mechanism for providing key inputs to project supervision)

(b) Credible evidence of borrower ownership and commitment based on track record  
and pre-Board action?

(c) Presence of strong champions?

**Comments:**

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?)

**Comments:**

## 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

2.1 Technical soundness of the project? (Based on well-tested technologies? Appropriate for current country conditions?)

**Comments:**

2.2 Appropriateness of alternative designs considered?

Evidence of risk aversion resulting in sub-optimal design as a result of Bank policies (including environmental and social safeguard policies).

YES  NO  N/A

**Comments:**

2.3 Quality and coherence of economic rationale and analysis underpinning the project?

**Comments:**

2.4 Appropriateness and realism of project conditionality? (Including balance between up-front and subsequent actions?)

**Comments:**

2.5 For revenue-earning projects:

(a) Quality of financial analysis over the useful life of the investment?

(b) Appropriateness of financial covenants and performance indicators?

**Comments:**

2.6 Realism of the project's financing plan? (Including provisions for counterpart funding, cost recovery and recurrent cost funding?)

**Comments:**

## QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

Assessment Rating

### Compliance with Bank's safeguard policies:

2.7 Projects in Disputed Areas (OP 7.60)

Comments:

2.8 Projects on International Waterways (OP 7.50)

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 Project's focus on poverty issues:

(a) Quality and depth of poverty diagnosis?

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

**Comments:**

3.2 Extent to which gender issues were considered during project design?

**Comments:**

3.3 Extent to which relevant social development issues and risks were considered in project 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 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 mechanisms for ongoing participation during implementation by key stakeholders whose involvement is critical to the project's success?)

**Comments:**

## QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

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

3.5 Appropriateness and realism of arrangements to manage and mitigate any adverse social impacts arising out of the project?

**Comments:**

### **Compliance with Bank's safeguard policies:**

3.6 Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)

**Comments:**

3.7 Involuntary Resettlement (OD 4.30)

**Comments:**

3.8 Cultural Property (OPN 11.03)

**Comments:**

# QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

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

## 4. ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

- 4.1 Assessment of environmental impacts and risks:
- (a) Extent to which significant environmental impacts (positive and negative) and risks were identified and assessed?
  - (b) Were alternatives examined and compared?
  - (c) Extent to which consultation with affected groups conducted in a satisfactory manner?

**Comments:**

- 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)

**Comments:**

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

**Comments:**

- 4.4 Appropriateness and quality of Environmental Assessment:
- (a) Appropriateness of the selected environment category ?
  - (b) Choice of the EA instrument (SEA/REA/EIA/EMP/Audit)?
  - (c) Adequacy of public disclosure procedures (BP 17.50)?
  - (d) Quality of EA report?
  - (e) EA results properly reflected in project documentation (e.g., Log Frame)?
  - (f) EA results properly reflected in project's legal documents?

**Comments:**

**Compliance with Bank's Safeguard Policies:**

4.5 Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01)

**Comments:**

4.6 Natural Habitats (OP 4.04)

**Comments:**

4.7 Forestry (OP 4.36)

**Comments:**

4.8 Pest Management (OP 4.09)

**Comments:**

4.9 Safety of Dams (OP 4.37)

**Comments:**

# QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

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

Assessment Rating

## 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?

Comments:

### 5.2 PROCUREMENT

- (a) Quality and adequacy of capacity assessment of the implementing agency(ies)?
- (b) Quality and adequacy of arrangements for managing procurement?

Comments:

# QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

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

**6. POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS**

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

**Comments:**

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?

**Comments:**

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 capacity to carry out reforms and institutional changes included in the project?

**Comments:**

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?

**Comments:**

## QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
<b>1 = Highly Satisfactory</b> <b>2 = Satisfactory</b> <b>3 = Marginally Satisfactory</b> <b>4 = Unsatisfactory</b>

### 7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

7.1 Prospects for completing the project within the prescribed time-frame? (taking into account the realism of the project implementation schedule, and the extent to which experience from similar projects in the country/region were considered?)

**Comments:**

7.2 Readiness of the first year's program for implementation?

(a) Adequacy and timeliness of counterpart funding?

(b) Quality and status of the procurement plan for the first year?

(c) Arrangements for disbursements in place?

(d) On-lending arrangements in place?

(e) Project manager appointed prior to Board approval?

(f) TA, staffing and management arrangements agreed and in place?

**Comments:**

7.3 Quality of Project Implementation Plan?

**Comments:**

7.4 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?

# QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

<b>1 = Highly Satisfactory</b> <b>2 = Satisfactory</b> <b>3 = Marginally Satisfactory</b> <b>4 = Unsatisfactory</b>
--

(d) Procurement monitoring?

**Comments:**

7.5 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 and mitigating strategies (with particular reference to candor, rigor, comprehensiveness and realism)  | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | a) Country capacity (Non supportive macroeconomic and political environment, governance problems and borrower commitment)   | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | b) Institutional effectiveness to implement the project   | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | c) Technical soundness (Design complexity (multiple or untested components), first time operation in the country/sector)  | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | d) Economic viability (Economic soundness based on cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis)   | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | e) Financial viability (For revenue-earning projects, financial soundness based on financial rate of return or NPV, appropriateness of tariffs in relation to marginal cost and O&M cost; reliability of financial reporting; for all other projects, fiscal sustainability upon project completion). | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | f) Social risks (Risk of adverse social impact like exclusion of key groups, socio-political support)   | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | g) Environmental risks (including natural resource management and indigenous peoples or resettlement issues)  | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | h) Financial Management capacity (Financial Management risks in the country that may impact the project.)   | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | i) Procurement capacity ( <i>Assessment of procurement risks that may impact the project</i> ) and measures taken by the implementing agency to mitigate them   | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |
|     | j) Resilience to exogenous factors (Reaction of local and external civil society advocates, support from relevant stakeholders).  | <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> |

**Comments:**

8.2 Clarity and candor in recognizing overall project risks (including residual risks not amenable to mitigation), and assessing them in relation to overall risks and rewards?



**Comments:**

## QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

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

### 9. BANK INPUTS AND PROCESSES

9.1 Elapsed time (months)

- a) Appraisal-Board \_\_\_\_\_ (Was the service standard of 5 months met? Yes/No)
- b) 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:**

**A. Project Preparation:**

- |   | Too Little               | Too Much                 | About Right              |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (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"/> |

**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

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

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:**

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROJECT QUALITY

9.7 Value Added from management

(a) Country Management

(b) Sector Management (for all of the sectors for a multi-sector operation)

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

**Comments:**

*Note: (How and why was the value added high or low?)*

9.8 Quality Enhancement

(a) Peer Reviewers

i) Appropriateness of reviewers' selection?

ii) Quality of guidance given?

iii) Appropriate use of advice provided?

# QUALITY AT ENTRY ASSESSMENT: GUIDANCE QUESTIONS

<b>Assessment Rating</b>
--------------------------

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

(b) QER

i) Appropriateness of reviewers' selection?

ii) Quality of guidance given?

iii) Appropriate use of advice provided?

**Comments:**

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 documents)?

**Comments:**