

EIF Phase Two: Quality at Entry of Project

Table 3: PROJECT ASSESSMENT MATRIX (PAM)

(issues to be checked by each reviewer)

<i>The project proposal must score at least 4 to be rated as Good Q@E proposal</i>		Rate (1-5)	Remarks
1	Signing MOU: A cover letter is included which states that a government authority, e.g., EIF Focal Point, is committed to signing the MOU within two (2) months/specified period after acknowledging receipt of the project approval letter.		
2	Bank account: A cover letter/statement is included which states that a bank account is open for project funds or can be opened within two (2) months/ specified period of project approval.		
3	Stakeholder engagement: The proposal includes an analysis and inclusive consultations on the project concept to enable buy-in and support from stakeholders.		
4	Project implementation: The proposal explicitly shows project implementation arrangements (<i>technical, managerial and fiduciary capacity of the MIE</i>), including coordination and reporting.		
5	Logical framework: The project proposal includes a fully fledged logical framework inclusive of the EIF programme-level indicators.		
6	Baseline data: Logframe of project proposal includes baseline data.		
7	Work plan: The proposal provides a work plan with activities neatly linked to the indicators in the logframe.		
8	Budget: Budget line items are based on activities in the work plan.		
9	Disbursement and burn rate: As much as possible, project implementation activities are front-loaded in the early years of the project, beginning in Year 1.		
10	M&E: The M&E mechanism explicitly stated with tasks, responsibilities and timelines linked to the logframe.		
11	Results focus: The project proposal describes how results are to be achieved.		
12	Risk management: The project proposal outlines risks in achieving the project objective and provides actionable risk mitigation measures.		
13	Gender inclusiveness: The proposal is specific on gender and facilitates a gender-disaggregated analysis (for a Tier 2 project).		
14	Job creation: The proposal is explicit on types and the projected number of jobs to be created (particularly for a Tier 2 project).		
15	DTIS Action Matrix (DTIS AM) and donor support: The		

	Tier 2 proposal stems from the DTIS AM priorities and includes EIF Donor Facilitator sign-off.		
16	<p>Value added: For a Tier 1 project, the proposal provides clarity on trade mainstreaming, including sequencing and linkages between the DTIS/DTISU, MTP, NDP/PRSP, trade strategies, etc.</p> <p>For Tier 2 projects, the proposal shows added value through backward and forward linkages to other projects and contributes to the national trade agenda. It shows progress along the value chain through the use of innovation, new/improved technology, new/improved crop variety, etc.</p>		
17	Upscaling/leveraging: The project proposal shows consultations with the government and external development partners, leveraging activities and the prospect for future up-scaling through leveraging additional resources.		
18	Communications: The proposal provides the means of communicating results, project implementation issues, issues on branding (if any) and associated constraints to stakeholders using communications tools (email, website, public media, newsletter, etc.).		
19	<p>Sustainability: The sustainability plan provides actionable milestones, particularly concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing means to promote human capacity development in trade and trade-related sectors; • Financial sustainability of the MIE, including self-financing of intervention; and • Government support financially, structurally, and institutionally. 		
21	Clarity on legal matters: The Tier 2 proposal provides clarity on legal issue, such as land ownership, promulgation of decrees, etc.		
22	Clarity on legal matters: The Tier 2 proposal provides clarity on potential environmental impact (where applicable), including mitigation measures.		
23	Clarity on Poverty: The Tier 2 proposal clearly delineates the potential impact of project on poverty alleviation		
24	Staffing: The proposal includes job descriptions, where hiring of staff is proposed.		
	Proposed Rating = $\Sigma \text{rate} / N = (VfM \geq 4)$		

Table 2: EXPLANATION OF RATING SCALE

(to be used for the overall ranking of the programme/project design)

Q@ET Members should apply their knowledge, judgment and professional skills in rating the issues and assigning an overall score. In the remarks column, comments such as 'not applicable' (n/a) or 'not yet' (n/y) should be used instead of scores. The relative importance of the issues to be scored are of equal weight, and thus the overall ranking is a **simple average of the individual rankings** of each Q@E issue. The project and country context influence the relative importance of these dimensions.

Rating scale	Explanation of scale
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory	Broad pattern of serious deficiencies or unrealism makes the achievement of the stated objectives unlikely or pose serious issues of non-compliance with the EIF principles/strategic plan. The risks far outweigh the potential benefits. Drop the project.
2 = Unsatisfactory	Significant deficiencies in several key areas; the proposal needs corrections, which are likely to be difficult or time-consuming to resolve. Delay further processing until real progress is made (e.g., additional design work in-country). A major re-design is needed if it is to proceed at all. Go back to the drawing board or drop the proposal: Put on a 'reserve list' if justified.
3 = Moderately Satisfactory	Satisfactory in all key areas, but some deficiencies and missed opportunities to respond effectively to the county needs: additional work is needed to increase the prospects of reaching the stated objectives or to comply more fully with the EIF principles/strategic plan and logframe. The risks are by and large commensurate with benefits but may need some review and/or remedial work during follow-up design (start-up facilitation mission), as a prelude to implementation. Guide the MIE and provide milestones for review.
4 = Satisfactory	Satisfactory or better in all key areas – an effective response to the country's needs and is likely to meet the stated objectives. In addition, the operation complies with the EIF principles/strategic plan and logframe, involves risks commensurate with benefits and portrays a high probability to be sustainable. It is unlikely to raise new or unexpected issues during further design or meet serious implementation problems. Engage the MIE immediately.
5 = Highly Satisfactory	An exemplary project design demonstrating good practice in several areas. It is a proposal that responds very well to the country's needs and has a high probability of meeting the stated objectives and sustainability criteria. In addition, the operation complies with the EIF principles/strategic plan and logframe and involves risks commensurate with benefits. It comprehensively clears the way for trouble-free implementation. Endorse and clear the proposal.

