

Comparison of Performance between 2012 and 2013

1. The 2013 Development Effectiveness Review (DEfR) is the first corporate performance report using the revised results framework that came into effect in January 2013. This results framework covers 2013–2016, generally uses 2012 or 2010–2012 as the baseline years, and contains annual standards for 2013–2016 or targets for 2016. The previous results framework covered 2008–2012, generally used 2006 or 2004–2006 as the baseline years, and included targets for 2012. Given the different baselines and targets, the scores from these two results frameworks are not directly comparable.

2. With this caveat, this appendix sheds light on the relative performance of the operations supported by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Asian Development Fund (ADF) in 2012 and 2013. While the broad comparison looks at the distribution of *on track* ratings in the 2012 and 2013 DEfRs, the detailed comparison is based on the performance information between 2012 and 2013 which is contained in the 2013 DEfR. The revised results framework uses 2012 or 2010–2012 as the baseline years, enabling the 2013 DEfR to report on the performance of 2012 and the comparison of performance between 2012 and 2013 using information in the same framework—the revised results framework.

A. Major Changes in the Revised Results Framework

3. **Structure.** The revised results framework retains the four-level structure. However, to emphasize the different purposes of level I and levels 2–4, the structure is divided into two sections. Section I, consisting of level I, tracks the state of development in the region. It is not intended to assess ADB's performance. Section II measures ADB's performance in recently completed operations at level 2, ongoing operations at level 3, and organizational management at level 4.

4. **Types of target.** The previous results framework used end-year (2012) targets, while the revised framework uses 2016 as well as annual targets. The 2016 targets are intended to be achieved in or before 2016—the final year of the results framework. Examples of indicators with such targets include completed sovereign operations rated *successful* (level 2), direct value-added cofinancing relative to ADB financing approved (level 3), and processing time for procurement contracts (level 4). Annual targets define minimum and/or maximum thresholds that need to be satisfied every year up to and including 2016. They are also termed performance standards. Examples include results achieved in Strategy 2020 core operational areas (level 2), civil society organization participation in sovereign operations (level 3), and budgeted international and national staff in operations departments (level 4).

5. **New indicators.** A variety of indicators have been added to strengthen the focus on results and alignment with Strategy 2020. These include indicators at

- (i) level 2 on the likely sustainability of outcomes of sovereign operations, success of completed policy-based operations, more core sector outputs and outcomes,¹ regional cooperation and integration, and gender equality results;
- (ii) level 3 on the satisfactory rate of nonsovereign operations at implementation; efficiency in processing procurement contracts; ADB's support for public–private partnerships; and support for Strategy 2020 drivers of change (climate change, governance and/or capacity development, web distribution of knowledge, and Global Partnership commitments);

¹ Nine core area indicators were added, all are measures of outcome or outcome proxies, increasing the total number of indicators from 19 to 23. The previous framework did not have individual outcome indicators. Since outcomes are more difficult to achieve than outputs, these revisions make it harder to achieve a good composite score. A further two indicators were deleted and two were combined into one indicator (expressways and roads).

- (iii) level 4 on budget management, measuring both efficiency and adequacy; and sovereign operations implemented with substantial resident mission involvement; and
- (iv) inclusive growth—a measure of inequality at level 1, and at level 3 the quality at entry of country partnership strategies and individual operations in contributing to the inclusive economic growth agenda.

6. While the revised results framework includes some new indicators, almost 70% of the indicators are common between the two results frameworks. There is thus a high degree of continuity between these results framework. Further, all indicators in the revised results framework have 2012 or 2010-2012 as their baseline years, providing another link to past performance.

7. **Number of indicators.** While the previous results framework contained 77 indicators, the revised framework has 89 indicators (Table 1). The net addition of results indicators is entirely in levels 2–4. At level 1, some new indicators replaced earlier ones, but the total remains unchanged.

Table 1: Number of Indicators

| Level | Original Results Framework | Revised Results Framework | +/- |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| 2 | 19 | 30 | +11 |
| 3 | 23 | 28 | +5 |
| 4 | 13 | 9 | -4 |
| Total | 77 | 89 | +12 |

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

B. Overall Performance in 2012 and 2013

8. Tables 2 and 3 present the overall scores in 2012 and 2013. As 2012 was the last year of the previous results framework, there were no *on track but watch* (amber) scores, and all performance below the 2012 targets was treated as *off track* (red). In 2013, 62% of indicators of ADB's performance at levels 2–4 were rated *on track* compared to 64% in 2012. For ADF, 58% of indicators were rated *on track* in 2013 compared to 65% in 2012. ADB and ADF operations both performed strongly against level 2 targets in 2013, but were weaker against targets in levels 3 and 4. In 2013, underpinned by the strong performance of completed operations, ADB operations for the first time exceeded the outcome achievement threshold of 80% (para. 57 in the main text).

9. While this comparison gives some indication of the distribution of *on track* ratings in 2012 and 2013, caution must be exercised in drawing definitive conclusions for three reasons. First, the baselines and targets for the two results frameworks are different, so the same performance in the two years could be scored differently. Second, the composition of the indicators at the different levels of the results framework has changed. For example, indicators on quality of completed operations have been moved from level 3 to level 2, rendering a direct comparison of the level scores incomplete. Third, validations of project completion reports by the Independent Evaluation Department have changed the 2012 data for some indicators, notably the success rates of completed operations. These adjustments have been incorporated into the baselines and scoring of the 2013 Development Effectiveness Review, but were not reflected in the 2012 report as there is a time lag between the circulation and validation of project completion reports.

Table 2: Distribution of Scores in 2012 and 2013 for ADB Performance

| Level | Total | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Green | Amber | Red | Total | Green | Amber | Red |
| Number | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 23 | 3 | 1 |
| Level 3 | 23 | 15 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 8 | 7 | 5 |
| Level 4 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 55 | 35 | 0 | 20 | 55 | 34 | 13 | 8 |
| Share (% of total) | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | 100 | 68 | 0 | 32 | 100 | 85 | 11 | 4 |
| Level 3 | 100 | 65 | 0 | 35 | 100 | 40 | 35 | 25 |
| Level 4 | 100 | 54 | 0 | 46 | 100 | 38 | 38 | 25 |
| Total | 100 | 64 | 0 | 36 | 100 | 62 | 24 | 15 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank.

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

Table 3: Distribution of Scores in 2012 and 2013 for ADF Performance

| Level | Total | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Green | Amber | Red | Total | Green | Amber | Red |
| Number | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 22 | 16 | 4 | 2 |
| Level 3 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 6 |
| Level 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 40 | 26 | 0 | 14 | 38 | 22 | 6 | 10 |
| Share (% of total) | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | 100 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 100 | 73 | 18 | 9 |
| Level 3 | 100 | 76 | 0 | 24 | 100 | 47 | 13 | 40 |
| Level 4 | 100 | 80 | 0 | 20 | 100 | 33 | 0 | 67 |
| Total | 100 | 65 | 0 | 35 | 100 | 58 | 16 | 26 |

ADF = Asian Development Fund.

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

C. Detailed Comparison

10. The detailed comparison between 2012 and 2013 cannot be based on scores in the two results frameworks due to the factors mentioned in para. 9. Thus the comparison is based on the performance between 2012 and 2013 (or between 2010-2012 and 2011-2013) using the information in the revised results frameworks. The revised results framework includes information for both 2012 (as the baseline year) and 2013 (as the performance year), allowing the comparison of the performance between these two years.

11. **Completed operations.** These success rates of completed operations are captured by seven indicators in level 2. Success rates improved for all these indicators in 2011-2013 compared to 2010-2012. Success rates of completed country strategies and assistance programs rose. Likewise, sovereign operations, including sovereign projects, policy-based operations, and sovereign projects rated likely sustainably; all achieved higher success rates in 2011-2013 compared to 2010-2012. Nonsovereign operations and technical assistance projects also completed with higher success rates. A higher percentage of completed sovereign operations also delivered intended gender equality results. An overwhelming majority of output and outcome targets were achieved in 2013. For ADB operations in

Strategy 2020 core areas, the 85% threshold was met or exceeded in 19 of 20 indicators in 2013. For ADF operations, this standard was met or exceeded in 14 of 16 indicators in 2013.²

12. **Ongoing operations.** The overall picture is less clear-cut for ongoing operations. Satisfactory ratings during implementation improved in 2013. However, the disbursement ratio of ADB sovereign operations decreased from 22% in 2012 to 21% in 2013. The disbursement ratio for ADF operations was 23% in 2013, considerably higher than 18% in 2012. The nonsovereign operations disbursement ratio was also much higher in 2013 at 37% compared with 24% in 2012. Direct value-added cofinancing decreased from \$8.1 billion in 2012 to \$6.4 billion in 2013 for ADB as a whole, as the higher official cofinancing was not sufficient to offset the lower commercial cofinancing. Direct value-added cofinancing for ADF operations increased to \$1.1 billion, more than double the 2012 level.³

13. **Strategy 2020 development agendas and core operations.** The 2013 result framework includes four new indicators that monitor operations contributing to inclusive economic growth. Overall, compared with 2010–2012, a larger proportion of ADB operations supported inclusive growth pillars 2 (inclusive access to jobs and opportunities) and 3 (social protection) in 2011–2013, and a larger share of ADF operations supported pillars 1 (growth and creation of jobs and opportunities) and 3.

14. Operations supporting environmental sustainability increased for both ADB and ADF operations in 2011–2013. Finance for Strategy 2020 core areas moderated for both ADB and ADF operations in 2013, partly as a result of financing to public sector management programs in Myanmar and the Philippines. Operations supporting regional cooperation and integration decreased in 2011–2013 from 2010–2012. Operations supporting climate change mitigation and/or adaptation are a new indicator. While the share of operations increased in 2013, there is a large gap between the performance and the target.⁴

15. **Strategy 2020 drivers of change.** The share of operations supporting private sector development and private sector operations remained stable between 2010–2012 and 2011–2013. The share of operations supported governance and/or capacity development declined. Operations supporting gender mainstreaming were strong in 2012, and performance improved further in 2013. There was no perception survey on ADB's performance in promoting knowledge and best practices in 2013. However, a new indicator on web-distributed knowledge shows that downloads for ADB knowledge products increased by 18% between 2012 and 2013. The performance on partnerships was mixed in 2013. Civil society organization participation was strong in 2012 at 98% for both ADB and ADF operations, and this performance moderated in 2013. Of the two new indicators on Global Partnerships on aid effectiveness, ADB and ADF exceeded the target for operational alignment with country results frameworks, but ADB missed the target for use of country public financial management and procurement systems.

16. **Human resources.** ADB allocated more than half of its international and national staff to operations departments in both 2012 and 2013. Women's representation in international staff increased by 1 percentage point from 34% in 2012 to 35% in 2013.⁵

² The 2012 DEFAR reported that 13 of 19 output targets were delivered in or before 2012 in ADB operations, and 8 of 18 output targets delivered in or before 2012 in ADF operations. However, these results cannot be compared with the 2013 DEFAR findings on core operational results as the revised and previous results frameworks use different methodologies.

³ There were no public-private partnership indicators in the 2012 results framework, and quality-at-entry assessment was not carried out in 2013. Thus a comparison cannot be made for these two areas.

⁴ Partly, this was because a high target of 60% was set for 2016 based on the performance of a single base line year (2012). One issue of setting targets using single year information is that the targets may be influenced by year on year fluctuation of the baseline data.

⁵ There was no staff engagement survey in 2013.

17. **Budget resources.** The 2013–2016 results framework shifted attention from budget adequacy to budget efficiency. Budget efficiency decreased in 2013 because of lower disbursement. The share of operational expenses for portfolio management increased in 2013.

18. **Process efficiency and client orientation.** Given that all of the earlier indicators on delegation of project administration to and leadership by resident missions had been achieved, the revised framework introduced a modified indicator on sovereign operations administered with substantial resident mission involvement. The share of resident mission staff involvement in project administration, also a new indicator, improved for ADB operations in 2013, but decreased for ADF operations. Sovereign operation processing time from fact-finding to approval was shortened by about 1 month. A new indicator on nonsovereign operation processing time was added and is performing strongly. The time required to process procurement contracts for sovereign operations—another new indicator—was shortened by 21% in 2013.

19. Tables 4–9 provide performance information for ADB and ADF operations in 2012 and 2013.

D. Summary

20. It is difficult to directly compare 2012 and 2013 scores because they are covered by different results frameworks, baselines, and targets. An indicative assessment suggests that the overall share of on-track scores was similar for ADB operations in 2012 and 2013, but lower for ADF operations.

21. Among the indicators, in 2011-2013 success rates were higher for completed operations than 2010-2012. Most results targets have been achieved for both ADB and ADF operations. Overall satisfactory rates for ongoing operations improved in 2013, and time from approval to first contract was shortened. However, disbursement ratios of sovereign operations and overall direct value-added cofinancing were lower. In the alignment with Strategy 2020 priorities, support was stronger for environmental sustainability, gender mainstreaming, and web-distributed knowledge products; but weaker for regional cooperation and integration, governance and/or capacity development, and civil society organization participation. In organizational management, there was a significant reduction in operations processing time and procurement contract processing time in 2013, but budget efficiency deteriorated.

Table 4: Performance of ADB Operations in 2012 and 2013: Level 2

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|--|-----------|----------------------------------|-------------|---|-----------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Quality of Completed Operations | | | | | | | | |
| Completed country strategies and assistance programs rated <i>successful</i> (%) | 2009 | 50 | 70 |  | 2010–2012 | 65 | 80 |  |
| Completed sovereign operations rated <i>successful</i> (%) | 2004–2006 | 68 | 80 |  | | 77 | | |
| Projects | | 72 | | | 2010–2012 | 77 | 80 |  |
| Policy-based operations | | 62 | | | 2010–2012 | 74 | 80 |  |
| Rated likely sustainable | | 60 | | | 2010–2012 | 67 | 80 |  |
| Effectiveness in achievement of core sector outcomes | | 72 | 80 |  | | 82 ^a | | |
| Completed nonsovereign operations rated <i>successful</i> (%) ^a | 2008–2010 | 68 | 80 |  | 2010–2012 | 67 | 80 |  |
| Completed technical assistance projects rated <i>successful</i> (%) | 2004–2006 | 83 | 80 |  | 2010–2012 | 86 | 80 |  |
| Completed sovereign operations delivering intended gender equality results (%) | | 52 | | | 2010–2012 | 62 | 70 |  |
| Core Area Results Number of indicator above 85% target achievement | | 14 of 20 met or exceeded targets | | | | 19 of 20 met or exceeded targets | |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank.

^a The 2012 baseline was recalculated to 53% after Independent Evaluation Department validations of extended annual review reports.

^b Annual effectiveness rate refers to core and other sector outcomes.

Note: Shading in cells indicates the column heading does not apply.

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

Table 5: Performance of ADF Operations in 2012 and 2013: Level 2

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|--|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------|---|-----------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Completed country strategies and assistance programs rated <i>successful</i> (%) | 2009 | 50 | 70 |  | 2010–2012 | 67 | 80 |  |
| Completed sovereign operations rated <i>successful</i> (%) | 2004–2006 | 65 | 80 |  | | 74 | | |
| Projects | | 68 | | | 2010–2012 | 74 | 80 |  |
| Policy-based operations | | 62 | | | 2010–2012 | 71 | 80 |  |
| Rated likely sustainable | | 55 | | | 2010–2012 | 62 | |  |
| Effectiveness in achievement of core sector outcomes | | 74 | 80 |  | | 80 ^a | | |
| Completed technical assistance projects rated <i>successful</i> (%) | 2004–2006 | 82 | 80 |  | 2010–2012 | 86 | 80 |  |
| Completed sovereign operations delivering intended gender equality results (%) | | 53 | | | 2010–2012 | 63 | 70 |  |
| Core Area Results Number of indicator above 85% target achievement | | 9 of 14 met or exceeded targets | | | | 14 of 16 met or exceeded targets | |  |

ADF = Asian Development Fund.

^a Annual effectiveness rate refers to core and other sector outcomes.

Note: Shading in cells indicates the column heading does not apply.

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------|---|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|---|
| growth and creation of jobs and opportunities (%) | | 49 | | | 2010–2012 | 49 | | |
| inclusive access to jobs and opportunities (%) | | 45 | | | 2010–2012 | 47 | | |
| social protection (%) | | 5 | | | 2010–2012 | 7 | | |
| Operations supporting environmental sustainability (%) | 2004–2006 | 44 | 25 |  | 2010–2012 | 46 | 50 |  |
| Operations supporting climate change mitigation and/or adaptation (%) | | 39 | | | 2011–2012 | 41 | 60 |  |
| Operations supporting regional cooperation and integration (%) | 2004–2006 | 20 | 15 |  | 2010–2012 | 19 | 25 |  |
| Financing for Strategy 2020 core operational areas (%) | 2008 | 85 | 80 |  | 2010–2012 | 87 | 80 (A) |  |
| Strategy 2020 Drivers of Change | | | | | | | | |
| Operations supporting private sector development and private sector operations (%) | 2004–2006 | 37 | 30 |  | 2010–2012 | 38 | 40 |  |
| Operations supporting governance and/or capacity development (%) | 2010–2012 | | | | 2010–2012 | 54 | Above baseline (A) |  |
| Operations supporting gender mainstreaming (%) | 2004–2006 | 49 | 40 |  | 2010–2012 | 53 | 45 |  |
| Web-distributed knowledge solutions (number of downloads) | 2010–2012 | | 2010–2012 | 2010–2012 | 2012 | 360,000 | Increase |  |
| Civil society organization participation in sovereign operations (% of approved operations) | 2006 | 98 | 80 |  | 2012 | 92 | 90 (A) |  |
| Operations using country results frameworks (%) | | 94 | | | 2012 | 96 | 90 (A) |  |
| Operations using country systems (%) | | 59 | | | 2012 | 50 | Above baseline (A) |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank.

Note: Shading in cells indicates the column heading does not apply.

^a This indicator uses the clarified definition of cofinancing adopted in 2012. Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

Table 7: Performance of ADF Operations in 2012 and 2013: Level 3

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------|---|
| Implementation Quality | | | | | | | | |
| Performance of sovereign operations at implementation rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%) | 2010 | 89 | 80 |  | 2012 | 94 | 85 (A) |  |
| Performance of nonsovereign operations at implementation, credit rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%) | | | | | | | | |
| Time from approval to first contract in sovereign projects (months) | | 13.7 | | | 2012 | 11.5 | 9 |  |
| Quality at Entry | | | | | | | | |
| Project design and monitoring frameworks rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%) | | 81 | | | 2012 | 83 | 90 |  |
| Development Finance | | | | | | | | |
| Disbursement ratio for sovereign projects (age standardized, %) | | 16.3 | | | 2012 | 17.0 | 20 |  |
| Disbursement ratio for sovereign projects (%) | 2006 | 18 | 20 |  | | | | |
| Disbursement ratio for nonsovereign project finance loans (age standardized, %) | | 26.9 | | | | | | |
| Direct value-added cofinancing (% of ADB financing approved) | 2004–2006 | 30 | 20 |  | 2010–2012 | 32 ^a | 50 |  |
| Project development transactions for public–private partnerships (total number from 2013) | | | | | | | | |
| Cumulative public–private partnership leveraging achieved using ADB financing (ratio of leveraging amount to ADB financing approved) | | | | | | | | |
| Strategy 2020 Development Agendas and Core Operations | | | | | | | | |
| Operations contributing to inclusive economic growth focusing on growth and creation of jobs | | 39 | | | 2010– | 44 | | |

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|-------|
| and opportunities (%) | | | | | 2012 | | | |
| inclusive access to jobs and opportunities (%) | | 60 | | | 2010–2012 | 54 | | |
| social protection (%) | | 9 | | | 2010–2012 | 11 | | |
| Operations supporting environmental sustainability (%) | 2004–2006 | 36 | 25 | | 2010–2012 | 40 | 40 | |
| Operations supporting climate change mitigation and/or adaptation (%) | | 27 | | | 2011–2012 | 32 | 60 | |
| Operations supporting regional cooperation and integration (%) | 2004–2006 | 27 | 15 | | 2010–2012 | 25 | 25 | |
| Financing for Strategy 2020 core operational areas (%) | 2008 | 92 | 80 | | 2010–2012 | 70 | 80 (A) | |
| Strategy 2020 Drivers of Change | | | | | | | | |
| Operations supporting private sector development and private sector operations (%) | 2004–2006 | 31 | 30 | | 2010–2012 | 29 | 40 | Red |
| Operations supporting governance and/or capacity development (%) | 2010–2012 | 68 | | | 2010–2012 | 66 | Above baseline (A) | |
| Operations supporting gender mainstreaming (%) | 2004–2006 | 59 | 50 | | 2010–2012 | 60 | 55 | |
| Web-distributed knowledge solutions (number of downloads) | | | | | | | | |
| Civil society organization participation in sovereign operations (% of approved operations) | 2006 | 98 | 80 | | 2012 | 89 | 90 (A) | |
| Operations using country results frameworks (%) | | 100 | | | 2012 | 100 | 90 (A) | |
| Operations using country systems (%) | | 47 | | | 2012 | 48 | Above baseline (A) | |

ADF = Asian Development Fund.

^a This indicator uses the clarified definition of cofinancing adopted in 2012

Note: Shading in cells indicates the column heading does not apply

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

Table 8: Performance of ADB Operations in 2012 and 2013: Level 4

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|---|-----------|-----------------|--------------------------|---|
| Human Resources | | | | | | | | |
| Budgeted international and national staff in operations departments (%) | 2004–2006 | 56 ^a | 56 ^a |  | 2010–2012 | 56 ^a | 55 (A) |  |
| Representation of women in the international staff category (%) | 2007 | 34 | 35 |  | 2012 | 35 | 37 |  |
| Budget Resources | | | | | | | | |
| Internal administrative expenses per \$1 million disbursement (\$'000) | 2004–2006 | 60 | Maintain |  | 2010–2012 | 63.1 | 56.1–57.2 |  |
| Share of operational expenses for portfolio management (% of expenses attributable to portfolio management and processing of operations) | | 59.8 | | | 2012 | 61.5 | 62–64 |  |
| Process Efficiency and Client Orientation | | | | | | | | |
| Sovereign operations administered with substantial RM involvement (%) | | 62 | | | 2012 | 70 | 80 |  |
| Sovereign operations administered by resident missions (%) | 2006 | 44 | 43 |  | | 47 | | |
| Sovereign operations processing time (from start of fact-finding to Board approval, months) | | 8.0 | | | 2012 | 7.0 | 6.0 (A) |  |
| Sovereign operations processing time (from Board approval to effectiveness, months) | | 3 | | | | 3 | | |
| Average sovereign operations processing time (months from fact-finding to effectiveness) | 2006 | 21 | 16 |  | | | | |
| Nonsovereign operations processing time (from start of due diligence to Board approval, months) | | 8.0 | | | 2012 | 6.2 | Maintain |  |
| Processing time for procurement contracts for sovereign operations (more than \$10 million, days) | | 72 | | | 2012 | 57 | 40 |  |

ADB = Asian Development Bank, RM = resident mission.

^a These figures represent annual percentages, rather than the 3-year rolling average.

Note: Shading in cells indicates the column heading does not apply.

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.

Table 9: Performance of ADF Operations in 2012 and 2013: Level 4

| Indicators | Baseline | 2012 Data | 2012 Target | 2012 Score | Baseline | 2013 Data | Target 2016 / Annual (A) | Score |
|---|----------|-----------|-------------|---|----------|-----------|--------------------------|---|
| Level 4 | | | | | | | | |
| Process Efficiency and Client Orientation | | | | | | | | |
| Sovereign operations administered with substantial resident mission involvement (%) | | 72 | | | 2012 | 69 | 80 |  |
| Sovereign operations administered by resident missions (%) | 2006 | 43 | 43 |  | | 43 | | |
| Sovereign operations processing time (from start of loan fact-finding to Board approval, months) | | 6.8 | | | 2012 | 5.8 | 6.0 (A) |  |
| Sovereign operations processing time (from Board approval to effectiveness, months) | | 3 | | | | 3 | | |
| Average sovereign operations processing time (months from fact-finding to effectiveness) | 2006 | 20 | 16 |  | | | | |
| Nonsovereign operations processing time (from start of due diligence to Board approval, months) | | | | | | | | |
| Processing time for procurement contracts for sovereign operations (more than \$10 million, days) | | 64 | | | 2012 | 62 | 40 |  |

ADF = Asian Development Fund.

^a These figures represent annual percentages, rather than the 3-year rolling average.

Note: Shading in cells indicates the column heading does not apply.

Source: ADB Strategy and Policy Department.