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Section 1: Ops Academy - Components of the Operations Academy
Section 1: diverse set of Gateway e-courses
Section 1: Impact of Gateway

98% of Graduates consider the Gateway as excellent or good

- Excellent: 61%
- Good: 37%
- Fair: 2%
- Very Poor: 25%

46% of Graduates are less than three years in their current position

- Less than 3 years: 46%
- Between 3 and 5 years: 37%
- Between 5 and 7 years: 10%
- More than 7 years: 7%
Section 2: Enhanced RR is based on key drivers of project performance

**Project Readiness Review**

**DIMENSIONS**

1. **Strategic readiness**
   - 1.1. Strategic alignment
   - 1.2. Policy compliance
   - 1.3. E&S safeguards

2. **Results readiness**
   - 2.1. Rational and lessons
   - 2.2. Results framework
   - 2.3. Eco/fin analysis
   - 2.4. Positive effects

3. **Implementation readiness**
   - 3.1. Institutional capacity
   - 3.2. Financial Management
   - 3.3. Procurement

4. **Cross-cutting priorities**
   - 4.1. Fragility lens
   - 4.2. Climate change
   - 4.3. Gender

**CRITERIA**

1. **CPO/CE**
2. **SNFC**
3. **SNOQ.2**
4. **CPO/CE**
5. **SNFI**
6. **RDTS**
7. **AHGC**
8. **PECG**

Readiness review eco-system per dimension
Section 2: What are we doing differently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination conducted by CPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No verification mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ratings that hide weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness Review not fill-out &amp; timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same CPOs are doing the Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhanced RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination done by a central unit (impartiality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification with first &amp; second round review at PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregated rating per criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring of criteria as drivers of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E for region &amp; both CPO &amp; CE can do the reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex: Example of RR

**READINESS REVIEW**
Project Appraisal Report

**A PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. PROJECT NAME (AP CODE): Agricultural markets, value addition and trade development project (AMVAT)
2. COUNTRY: South Sudan
3. DEPARTMENT: AGRIPRODEZ
4. AMOUNT: 10.37 US million
5. GENDER MARKER CATEGORY: II
6. CLIMATE SAFEGUARDS CATEGORY: II
7. E & S CATEGORY: II
8. TASK MANAGER: Edison MPYISI
9. TASK TEAM: John Bosco KUEMEYA; Anieah Rutabuka MUJA; Mukaman BOULUEGED; Chantal UMBUSHIRE; Mulaku TADESE; Scay WOLDETENSA;
10. Eritrea: DAVA; Robert DOCHIERING; Olakand SABU; Akcento DOSSOU

**B PROJECT READINESS**

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

1. Strategic Readiness
   - 1.1. Strategic alignment
   - 1.2. Policy compliance
   - 1.3. E&S safeguards

2. Results Readiness
   - 2.1. Development rationale
   - 2.2. Results framework
   - 2.3. Eco./Fin. Analysis
   - 2.4. Additional positive effects

3. Implementation Readiness
   - 3.1. Implementation capacity
   - 3.2. Financial management
   - 3.3. Procurement

4. Cross-cutting Themes
   - 4.1. Application of fragility lens

**RED FLAGS**

Some selected indicators have no baselines nor targets.

**RED FLAGS**

It is noted that FAO, as a third party, will handle project execution, including procurement. However, the FAO has not elaborated the mechanisms to be put in place to ensure timely start-up of project activities.

The Fragility and Resilience section fails to describe how the project addresses the sectoral drivers identified.
Section 3: Bank’s approach for better results

- **Theory of Change**
  - What we want to achieve
  - How we will achieve it
  - What are our assumptions

- **Results framework**
  - How will we know the project is successful
  - (e.g. SMART performance indicators, established baselines and targets)

- **Monitoring plan**
  - What are the arrangements for monitoring achievement of results

- **Risk analysis matrix**
  - How do we handle risks to development results

- **Results planning and monitoring tools**
  - How do we handle risks to development results
## RESULTS FRAMEWORK

### A. PROJECT INFORMATION
- **Project Name and SAP Code:**
- **Country/Region:**
- **Project Development Objective:**
- **Alignment Indicator(s):**

### B. RESULTS MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS CHAIN AND INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RMF/ADOA INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNIT OF MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>TARGET AT COMPLETION</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACTIVITIES

### INPUTS
Thank you.
## Monitoring and Evaluation plan

### A. Alignment indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Definition/ description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Baseline and targets (where possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline (date): Target (date):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Outcome and output indicators (performance indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Definition/ description</th>
<th>Methodology for collection</th>
<th>Responsibility for collection</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
<th>Results planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DATE 1 DATE 2 DATE X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High** | - The risk is almost certain to occur during the life of the project, and if it occurs it could have a very severe adverse impact on the achievement of the project’s development objective  
- (Additional considerations: If the risk occurs it could have significant reputational impact; the Bank or the client may have limited ability to manage the risk, i.e. to reduce likelihood or impact) |
| **Substantial** | - The risk is likely to occur during the life of the project, and if it occurs it could have a severe adverse impact on the achievement of the project’s development objective.  
- (Additional considerations: If the risk occurs it could have some negative reputational impact; the Bank or the client have some influence in managing the risk but cannot control it completely) |
| **Moderate** | - The risk may possibly occur during the life of the project, and if it occurs it could moderately impact the achievement of the project’s development objective.  
- (Additional considerations: The Bank or the client can manage the risk to an adequate degree) |
| **Low** | - Irrespective of the likelihood of occurrence, if the risk occurs it is expected to have relatively minor adverse impact on the achievement of the project’s development objective. |