

**FAST TRACK INITIATIVE**

**CATALYTIC FUND**

**EXTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW OF**

**GRANT REQUEST SUBMITTED BY [NAME OF COUNTRY]**

**PANEL REPORT**

## **EXTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW (EQR) BACKGROUND & SUMMARY FINDINGS**

**COUNTRY:**

**REGION:**

**PROJECT ID:**

**PROJECT TITLE:**

**PROPOSED GRANT AMT (\$MIL) \$40**

**GRANT PERIOD:**

**GRANT INSTRUMENT:**

**LOCAL DONOR GROUP (Name/Contact):**

**TASK TEAM LEADER:**

**SUPERVISING ENTITY (Name/Contact):**

**DATE of EQR PANEL MEETING:**

**PERSON(s) INTERVIEWED:**

**PANEL MEMBERS:**

**EQR DOCUMENTS REVIEWED:**

**FTI-S COORDINATOR:**

## EXTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW (EQR) QUESTIONNAIRE

COUNTRY:

PROJECT TITLE/#:

### Summary Assessment Sheet

#### A. Panel's Overall Assessment

**Guidance:** This should succinctly (no more than a paragraph) state the Panel's overall assessment of the funding request. Please note that the project/program at hand—and not the sector strategy and supporting documents—is being evaluated. The design adequacy and likelihood of achieving Project Development Objectives (PDOs)/Intermediate Outcome Indicators (IOIs) is critical. *As of November 2009, the FTI Secretariat has been mandated to make a final recommendation to the CF Committee, taking into account all funding requests and the financial situation of the Fund.*

#### **Likelihood--Project Development Objectives (PDO):**

**Guidance:** This should enumerate the PDOs and assess the likelihood of each being achieved. It should take into account whether the activities contemplated are feasible and sufficient to achieve the PDOs.

#### **Rating:**

#### **Development Objectives:**

#### **Likelihood Ratings:**

DO 1:

DO 2:

DO 3:

#### **Comment:**

#### B. Strong Aspects—Good Practice and Strong Aspects

**C. Weak Aspects--Risks and Issues Needing Greater Clarification and/or Improvement**

**D. Suggestions to the Task Team, EFA-FTI, CFC, Other**

## Summary Assessment Sheet

The Panel used the following scale to evaluate those dimensions that the Catalytic Fund Committee asked the panel to assess.

**1 = Highly Satisfactory/Likely:** An exemplary operation, demonstrating good practice in several areas, that responds very well to the client’s needs, has a high probability of meeting the stated Development Objectives, and has risks commensurate with rewards.

**2 = Satisfactory/Likely:** Satisfactory or better on all key areas – an effective response to the client’s needs, likely to meet the stated Development Objectives, and with risks commensurate with rewards.

**3 = Moderately Satisfactory/Likely:** Satisfactory on all key areas, but some deficiencies and missed opportunities.

**4 = Moderately Unsatisfactory/Unlikely:** Significant deficiencies in one or two key areas.

**5 = Unsatisfactory/Unlikely:** Significant deficiencies in several key areas needing correction.

**6 = Highly Unsatisfactory/Unlikely:** A broad pattern of deficiencies.

**NA = Not Applicable**

Criterion	Rating
Overall Assessment	
Likelihood of Achieving Program’s DOs	
1. Internal Consistency	
1.1. Objectives	
1.2. Approach	
1.3. Quality of supporting documents	
2. Making a Case for CF Funding	
3. Quality of Results Framework, M&E	
3.1 Quality of results framework	
3.2 Quality of key performance indicators and arrangements for M&E	
3.3 Third party verification	
4. Assessment Objectivity	
4.1 Technical quality of design	
4.2 Implementation arrangements	
4.3 Risk identification and mitigation	
4.4 Sustainability	
5. Fiduciary Oversight, AC, Safeguards	

## EQR QUESTIONNAIRE

### 1. Quality and Consistency: Objectives, Design, Documents

**Overall Rated:**

*Guidance: Aggregating across 1.1-2-3, are the Grant and CF proposal package internally consistent and of good quality.*

#### 1.1 Objectives

**Rated:**

*Guidance: Are grant objectives clearly specified, appropriate given the education strategy and dimensioned properly given country conditions, capacity (including absorptive), and previous record?*

#### 1.2 Program Design

**Rated:**

*Guidance: Is the grant design realistic given the country's past track record and capacity? Are priorities and resource allocation logical given the education strategy, feasible and sequenced appropriately? Is anything important missing from the Program Documentation and not explained elsewhere? Note that it is the grant that is being evaluated. Technical concerns are to be detailed in Section 4.2.*

#### 1.3. Quality of the documents submitted to the CFC

**Rated :**

*Guidance: To be given less weight than items 1.1 and 1.2 in determining the overall score. The Program Documentation is the key document.*

*Comments:*

### 2. Making the Case for CF Funding

**Rated:**

*Guidance: Is the case for CF financial support clear? Is the financing gap credible? Does IMF have a view? Is the gap due to recession or market conditions or to poor tax effort? Is education spending a reasonable percentage of GDP and budget? Are major inefficiencies and inequities in the sector that might contribute to the gap being addressed? Is the country spending on non-priority activities in education and elsewhere? Have IFIs stepped in with sector or budget support? Note that there is a prima facie case for poor countries having gaps but this alone is insufficient.*

### 3. Quality of Results and Monitoring & Evaluation

**Overall Rating:**

*Guidance: This is a composite of the quality of the results framework, of M&E arrangements and third party verification ratings*

#### 3.1. Quality of the results framework

**Rated:**

**Guidance:** *This is very important hence framework criteria are broken out and rated to derive an aggregate rating.*

a) **Comprehensiveness.** *Are project objectives addressed adequately by component activities and do they reflect important education priorities? Are Components that will generate important outputs/outcomes covered adequately by results framework indicators?*

**Rating:**

b) **Technical Quality of Indicators.** *Are KPIs and IOIs well specified: unambiguous, measureable, with baselines and feasible targets given loans, grants, and other funding, country conditions, past record and data availability and timeliness. Are/should previous indicators be continued?*

**Rating:**

c) **Causal Links.** *Are the causal chains linking KPI ,IOIs, & sector strategy complete, plausible and in accordance with international experience? If plausibility activities not funded by the project, are these covered elsewhere?*

**Rating:**

### **3.2. Quality of arrangements for M&E**

**Rated:**

**Guidance:** *Will M&E arrangements provide missing baselines, timely tracking, evaluation and reporting findings for subsequent action? Are systems/ procedures/resources/staffing adequate? Will M&E identify and remedy problems? What does past history tell us?*

### **3.3. Independent third party verification**

**Rated:**

**Guidance:** *Do M&E arrangements include means of obtaining feedback from beneficiaries/stakeholders on access, quality of works, goods, and services? Are there complaint or appeal mechanisms? Third party verification of activities and outcomes?*

## **4. Assessment Objectivity and Comprehensiveness**

**Overall Rating:**

### **4.1. Technical quality of design**

**Rated:**

**Guidance:** *Are grant activities technically well designed? All important technical issues bearing upon meeting grant objectives should be enumerated here even if there is some repetition.*

#### **4.2 Implementation arrangements**

**Rated:**

*Guidance: Are arrangements satisfactory based upon (i) agencies' capacity, previous experience, record and (ii) grant size and complexity? Are decentralization arrangements adequate? Procurement, financial management and supervision?*

#### **4.3. Risk identification and mitigation**

**Rated:**

*Guidance: Are external and political economy risks including corruption identified and addressed adequately? Are capacity risks addressed including supervision, procurement, and financial management?*

*Comments:*

#### **4.4 Sustainability**

**Rated:**

*Guidance: What is required to sustain the progress made during the CF period, and have these requirements been met? This should consider each of the links in causal chains ending in grant objectives and their impact upon sustainability.*

#### **F. Fiduciary Oversight, Anti-Corruption, Safeguards:**

**Rated:**

*Guidance: If serious fiduciary oversight (financial management, procurement) corruption, or safeguard problems have been identified, are they being adequately addressed in the grant or in other ways? What do previous grants tell us?*

# Annex 1: Documents Reviewed and Interviews Conducted

**EQR DOCUMENTS REVIEWED (Name/Date/Description if needed):**

<i>Documents in EFA-FTI Package</i>	<i>Quality</i>	<i>Usefulness</i>

<i>Other Documents Reviewed</i>	<i>Quality</i>	<i>Usefulness</i>

**INTERVIEWS:** [ Not mandatory]