



ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND (ADF)
ADF XI REPLENISHMENT MEETING
7–9 March 2012 Manila, Philippines

Review of the Results Framework

Asian Development Bank

February 2012

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	–	Asian Development Bank
ADF	–	Asian Development Fund
DEfR	–	Development Effectiveness Review
PSO	–	private sector operations

NOTE

In this report, "\$" refers to US dollars.

In preparing any country program or strategy, financing any project, or by making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area in this document, the Asian Development Bank does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK	1
III. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW	1
IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES	2
V. PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND DEPUTY CONSULTATIONS	2
VI. CONSULTATION PROCESS	4
APPENDIXES	
1. Asian Development Bank Results Framework	5
2. Summary of Comments from Asian Development Fund Deputies	9

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In January 2012, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) initiated a review of its corporate results framework to strengthen its results management system further. ADB intends to adopt an updated results framework by early 2013. This paper explains (i) the background of the results framework, (ii) the objective and scope of the review, (iii) a number of principles that guide the review process, and (iv) the ongoing and planned consultation process. It also highlights key areas suggested for consideration by Asian Development Fund (ADF) deputies.

II. THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK

2. The corporate results framework is a management tool that allows ADB to monitor and improve its operations, and achieve the long-term strategic focus expressed in Strategy 2020.¹ ADB was the first multilateral development bank to adopt a corporate-wide results framework—the primary tool for mainstreaming managing for development results across its operations. The ADF results framework is a subset of ADB’s corporate results framework, sharing the same set of indicators with ADF-specific baselines and targets. The corporate results framework forms the basis of the annual Development Effectiveness Review (DEfR) report with a scorecard showing where ADB has been successful, challenges remain, and remedial action is required.²

3. The current corporate results framework was approved by the Board of Directors in 2008 and refined in 2011 (Appendix 1). It has four levels with 77 performance indicators and targets:

- (i) Level 1: Asia and Pacific Development Outcomes
- (ii) Level 2: Core Outputs and Outcomes of ADB and ADF operations
- (iii) Level 3: Operational Effectiveness
- (iv) Level 4: Organizational Effectiveness

III. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

4. The results framework has succeeded in generating insights on ADB’s performance and helped Management determine necessary actions. Therefore, the main objective of reviewing the results framework is to ensure its continued relevance and to reinforce it as a performance management tool at the corporate level. The review is also an opportunity to update targets in levels 2–4 that expire in 2012 and to respond to Management’s commitment to review several outstanding issues raised by the Board of Directors and ADF deputies during the 2010 refinement exercise.³

5. The review will examine lessons learned since 2008, emerging good practices, changes in ADB’s operational context, and feedback from stakeholders. This will lead to recommendations for specific improvements to the overall structure and content of ADB’s results framework and the processes surrounding its use.

¹ ADB. 2008. *Strategy 2020: The Long-Term Strategic Framework of the Asian Development Bank, 2008–2020*. Manila.

² The DEfR report has been published four times since 2007. See <http://beta.adb.org/documents/series/development-effectiveness-review>

³ These issues include reviewing or adding performance indicators on (i) finance (level 2), (ii) knowledge management (level 3), (iii) private sector operations in general (level 1–3), (iv) budget adequacy (level 4), and (v) decentralization (level 4).

6. Specific issues likely to be covered include (i) the structure of the results framework, (ii) performance indicators, (iii) targets, (iv) the scorecard methodology, and (v) data collection. The review will also consider ADB's experience in institutionalizing the corporate scorecard as an integral part of its decision-making processes, using the results framework as a communication tool, and cascading the results framework's objectives by linking them to results frameworks at multiple levels within the organization.

IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

7. Results frameworks are powerful agents for organizational change, but selecting appropriate performance indicators can be challenging. International good practices for results management and corporate scorecards point to certain principles that can be applied in evaluating and prioritizing indicators. Other useful principles can be derived from ADB's experience in implementing its results framework since 2008 and guidance from stakeholders, including ADF deputies and the Board of Directors.

8. ADB will apply the following six core guiding principles in recommending improvements to its results framework:

- (i) Ensure alignment with Strategy 2020 and the overall strategic focus of ADF XI.
- (ii) Keep ADF and ADB performance indicators as an integral part of a coherent results framework.
- (iii) Ensure continued value as a practical corporate-level management tool by avoiding undue proliferation of performance indicators.
- (iv) Select performance indicators relevant to corporate-level decision making.
- (v) Retain sufficient data comparability to gauge progress over time.
- (vi) Complement performance indicator reporting with more detailed analysis on disaggregated data and qualitative assessments in the DEFIR.

9. In the review, ADB also will consider the following:

- (i) Show a logical structure within and between levels.
- (ii) Align level 2 indicators with sector operational plans and include more outcome estimates.
- (iii) Harmonize with other multilateral development banks, where appropriate.⁴
- (iv) Maintain appropriate balance between quantitative, qualitative, leading, and lagging indicators.
- (v) Set ambitious yet attainable targets within a time frame.
- (vi) Verify the availability of a timely (preferably at least annual) and actionable data set of robust quality.
- (vii) Ensure the cost effectiveness of data collection and processing.

V. PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND DEPUTY CONSULTATIONS

10. ADB has started consulting key stakeholders, including ADF deputies and the Board of Directors, to determine the full scope of the revisions to the results framework and to identify key

⁴ The African Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank introduced results frameworks in recent years, drawing inspiration from the ADB results framework. This has resulted in considerable harmonization in the structure, results areas, and indicators. ADB will pursue further harmonization, while recognizing the benefits of innovation and that the results framework is primarily a management tool to manage strategies and challenges that may be specific to each organization.

performance areas needing reinforcement. As part of an initial consultation with ADF deputies, ADB sought comments through an online forum and received useful suggestions for consideration (Appendix 2).⁵

11. ADF deputies have identified the following areas as requiring attention: (i) inclusive growth, (ii) climate change, (iii) private sector development, (iv) gender equity and mainstreaming, (v) governance and transparency, (vi) partnerships and aid effectiveness, (vii) decentralization, (viii) gender balance at ADB, and (ix) budget resources (Table 1). These and other suggestions received from ADF deputies during this and future phases of the review will be examined as part of the broader consultation process.

Table 1: Key Improvement Areas Suggested by Asian Development Fund Deputies

Key areas	Level	Examples
Inclusive growth	1	Include standard measure of inequality
	2	Disaggregate by location or beneficiary group
	3	Assess focus in country partnership strategy
	3	Measure project-level focus
Climate change	1–2	Include mitigation and adaptation
	3	Assess focus in country partnership strategy
	3	Measure project-level focus
Private sector development	1	Assess investment climate
	2	Add or separate outputs or outcomes delivered through PSOs
	3–4	Include PSO performance and business process efficiency
Gender equity and mainstreaming	1	Disaggregate selected indicators by gender
	2	Add specific outputs or outcomes promoting gender equity
	3	Assess focus in country partnership strategy
Governance and transparency	1	Consider other externally available sources
	3	Measure ADB's openness and transparency
Partnerships and aid effectiveness	3	Assess Busan implications
Decentralization	4	Strengthen the overall indicator set
Gender balance at ADB	4	Include indicator for women in managerial positions
Budget resources	4	Add efficiency indicator(s)

ADB = Asian Development Bank, PSO = private sector operation.

Source: Strategy and Policy Department.

⁵ Comments were posted by ADF deputies between December 2011 and January 2012.

VI. CONSULTATION PROCESS

12. ADB plans to complete the review of the results framework by submitting a recommendation paper for Board consideration by December 2012. ADB intends to use the revised results framework to assess its performance—including ADF operations—starting in 2013. ADB will engage stakeholders, including ADF deputies and the Board of Directors, at key stages of the review process. Milestone events and their timeline, including stages of consultations for ADF deputies, are summarized in Table 2.

13. Following initial consultations with ADF deputies (including discussions during the third ADF XI replenishment meeting) and the Board of Directors in January–April 2012, ADB will develop a discussion paper. The paper will analyze ADB’s experience with the results framework, identify areas for improvement, and propose specific changes. ADF deputies will be consulted on the discussion paper in July–August 2012 through the online forum and in bilateral meetings, if desired.

14. ADB plans to hold an informal Board seminar and individual meetings to consult Board members on the discussion paper. ADB will develop a working paper reflecting these consultations that will be circulated to the Board for discussion around October 2012. The working paper will be posted on the ADB website for public consultation. Based on the feedback from all stakeholders, ADB will develop a recommendation paper for circulation to the Board in December 2012.

Table 2: Milestone Events

Milestone Events	Timeline
1. Review documents; conduct initial consultations (including ADF deputies and Board members); analyze data; identify areas requiring improvement	January–April 2012
2. Draft discussion paper	May–June 2012
3. Consult key stakeholders on discussion paper (including ADF deputies and Board members)	July–August 2012
4. Draft working paper	August–September 2012
5. Circulate working paper to the Board; post on ADB website for public consultation	October 2012
6. Circulate recommendation paper for Board consideration in January 2013	December 2012

ADB = Asian Development Bank, ADF = Asian Development Fund.
Source: Strategy and Policy Department.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Table A1.1: Level 1—Asia and Pacific Development Outcomes

Indicator
Poverty and Human Development
Population living on less than \$1.25 (PPP) per day (%)
Primary education completion rate, both sexes (%)
Ratio of girls to boys in:
Primary education
Secondary education
Tertiary education
Women in nonagricultural wage employment (%)
Under-5 child mortality (per 1,000 live births)
Women (aged 15 and above) living with HIV (number, million)
Population with sustainable access to improved water source (%)
Urban
Rural
Population with sustainable access to improved sanitation (%)
Urban
Rural
Other Development Outcomes
Gross domestic product:
GDP per capita (at constant 2000 prices, \$)
Regional cooperation and integration:
Intraregional trade in total Asia and Pacific trade (%)
Access to basic infrastructure:
Telecommunications: fixed lines and mobile telephone subscribers (per 1,000 people)
Roads: paved roads for every 10,000 people (km)
Electricity: household electrification rate (%)
Finance:
Banking assets to GDP (%)
Governance: ^a
Cost to start business (% of gross national income per capita)
Time to start business (days)
Governance and public sector management assessment from country performance assessments
Environment:
Carbon dioxide emissions (tons per capita) ^b

km = kilometer, PPP = purchasing power parity.

^a The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to governance and transparency at several levels.

^b This indicator will be used for information only, and will be consistent with the purpose of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The review will consider strengthening this indicator.

Sources: Asian Development Bank estimates, International Energy Agency, International Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, United Nations, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, and World Bank.

Table A1.2: Level 2—Core Sector Outputs and Outcomes

Indicator	
Education^a	
Classrooms built or upgraded (number)	
Teachers trained (number)	
Students benefiting from school improvement programs or direct support (number)	
Energy	
Installed energy generation capacity (MW equivalent)	
Transmission lines installed or upgraded (km)	
Distribution lines installed or upgraded (km)	
New households connected to electricity (number)	
Greenhouse gas emission reduction (tCO ₂ -equiv/yr)	
Additional capacity installed using renewable energy (MW) ^b	
Energy saved (GWh-equiv/yr) ^b	
Finance	
Microfinance accounts opened or end borrowers reached (number)	
Small and medium-sized enterprise loan accounts opened or end borrowers reached (number)	
Transport	
Expressways built or upgraded (km)	
National highways, provincial, district, and rural roads built or upgraded (km)	
Railways constructed and/or upgraded (km)	
Beneficiaries from road projects (number)	
Movement of people and goods on roads built or upgraded (daily vehicle-km) ^b	
Movement of people and goods on railways (daily converted ton-km) ^b	
Urban rail and bus based mass transit systems built or upgraded (km) ^b	
Passengers on urban rail and bus based mass transit systems built or upgraded in first full year of operation (average daily) ^b	
Water^c	
Water supply pipes installed or upgraded: length of network (km)	
New households served with water supply (number)	
Wastewater treatment capacity added (m ³ /day)	
New households served with sanitation (number)	
Land improved through irrigation services, drainage, and flood management (hectares)	
GWh-equiv/yr = gigawatt hour equivalent per year, km = kilometer, MW = megawatt, m ³ /day = cubic meter per day, TBD = to be determined, tCO ₂ -equiv/yr = tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year.	
^a ADB is collecting data for a set of new education indicators, including 'educational institutions brought under new/improved quality', and 'students brought under learning standards and learning assessment'.	
^b ADB is collecting data for these new indicators for possible inclusion in the results framework.	
^c ADB is collecting data for new water indicators for possible inclusion in the results framework.	
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.	

Table A1.3: Level 3—Operational Effectiveness

Indicator^a	
Quality of Completed Operations	
Completed CPSs rated <i>successful</i> (%)	
Completed sovereign operations rated <i>successful</i> (%)	
Completed nonsovereign operations rated <i>successful</i> (%)	
Completed technical assistance projects rated <i>successful</i> (%)	
Positive perceptions of ADB effectiveness in reducing poverty (%)	
Quality at Entry and Portfolio Performance	
Quality at entry of CPSs rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%)	
Quality at entry of sovereign projects rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%)	
Quality at entry of nonsovereign projects rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%)	
Performance of sovereign operations during implementation rated <i>satisfactory</i> (%)	
Average time from approval to first disbursement in sovereign operations (months)	
Finance Transfer and Mobilization	
Disbursement ratio for sovereign operations (%)	
Disbursement ratio for nonsovereign loans and equity (%)	
DVA cofinancing relative to ADB financing approved annually (%)	
Financing for Strategy 2020 Core Operational Areas	
Financing for Strategy 2020 core operational areas (%)	
Projects supporting private sector development (%) ^b	
Projects supporting regional cooperation and integration (%)	
Projects supporting environmental sustainability (%)	
Projects with gender mainstreaming (%) ^c	
Knowledge Management^d	
Annual MAKE survey assessment rating (%)	
ADB perceived externally as excellent source of knowledge on development issues (% strongly agreeing)	
Partnerships^e	
Sovereign operations with CSO participation (%)	
New program-based approaches approved (number)	
CPS and CPR missions conducted jointly with at least one other development partner (% annually)	
ADB = Asian Development Bank, CPR = country portfolio review, CPS = country partnership strategy, CSO = civil society organization, DVA = direct value-added, MAKE = most admired knowledge enterprises.	
^a The review of ADB's results framework will assess whether a year-based or performance-based standard is adopted. Target values/Performance standard will be determined based on past trends and consensus within the organization. 2016 targets or the average of the 2014–2016 period corresponding to baselines which are 3-year averages.	
^b The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to private sector development at several levels.	
^c The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to gender equity and mainstreaming at several levels.	
^d The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to knowledge management.	
^e The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to partnership and aid effectiveness.	
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.	

Table A1.4: Level 4—Organizational Effectiveness

Indicator^a
Human Resources^b
Budgeted international and national staff in operations departments (%)
Budgeted international and national staff in resident missions (%)
Representation of women international staff in total (%)
Staff engagement survey results (index)
Budget Adequacy^c
Internal administrative expenses per \$1 million of project approval (\$'000)
Internal administrative expenses per project approved (\$ million in 2000 constant prices)
Internal administrative expenses per \$1 million disbursement (\$'000)
Internal administrative expenses per project under implementation (\$'000 in 2000 constant prices)
Business Processes and Practices^d
Average sovereign operations processing time (months from fact-finding to effectiveness)
Sovereign operations administered by resident missions (%)
Resident missions leading country programming (%)
Resident missions leading country portfolio review (%)
Resident missions leading country economic work (%)

^a The review of ADB's results framework will assess whether a year-based or performance-based standard is adopted. Target values/Performance standard will be determined based on past trends and consensus within the organization. 2016 targets or the average of the 2014–2016 period corresponding to baselines which are 3-year averages.

^b The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to gender balance at ADB.

^c The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to budget.

^d The review will consider strengthening indicators pertaining to resident mission operations.

Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND DEPUTIES
(as of 1 February 2012)

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
Suggestions on performance areas cutting across levels 1–3			
Inclusive growth	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capture the impact of economic growth on inequality by one of the standard measures (e.g., the Gini Coefficient). 	Australia Finland Netherlands UK
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include indicators focused more on employment or inequality, capturing who is benefiting from expansion of economic opportunities. Focus on the ‘quality and pattern of growth.’ 	Canada
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore possible indicators on the extent to which ADB interventions reach the poorest groups in recipient countries or the extent to which ADB enables recipient governments to become more inclusive in particular sector policies. 	Australia UK
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether indicators concerning inclusive growth, including non-core sectors could be included in the framework structure to strengthen ADB’s accountability on performance in these areas, e.g., with level 2 indicators such as amount of indigenous peoples directly benefiting from ADB operations (infrastructure, education, health, finance, social safety nets); children with disabilities profiting from ADB education investments; people benefiting from ADB supported social safety nets. Use more disaggregated data in particular for level 2 indicators (male versus female and urban versus rural). Each sector included at level 2 should have 1–3 indicators, completed by available disaggregated data. 	Canada Germany Switzerland
	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce indicators that measure if growth is becoming more inclusive and how ADB contributes to this objective. It is important to define appropriate indicators for the levels 1, 2 and 3. 	Austria
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a measure of commitment to inclusive growth and suggest that this is achieved through an assessment of the CPS, either as part of an amendment to the existing indicator or as an additional one. 	Canada Netherlands UK
Environment/ Climate change	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a measure of people’s resilience to the impacts of climate change, in addition to the existing mitigation indicator. 	Sweden UK
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Track better both financial flows and results relating to climate change. Explore indicators that would look at adaptation as well as leveraging (are ADF funds leveraging/catalyzing other climate change spending)? 	Canada
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a “fight against climate change” category to make monitoring of the climate change strategy possible. Then the indicators should reflect each objective of the strategy. For example, create an indicator to follow progress regarding the strategic priority of “promoting climate resilience” such as “number of new built climate change resilient infrastructures” could be an option to work on. 	France

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include the indicator “household traditional fuels cook stoves rate (% of total population)” (UN indicator: share of population depending on traditional fuels and cook stoves). 	Netherlands
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On “Environment/Carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per capita)”, capture contribution of renewable energy (RE) to low carbon development in the context of mainstreaming RE-components in non-energy loans (in agricultural and water sectors) Fixed rate indicating the mainstreaming of RE-components with loans in the agricultural and water sector to create synergy between RE, food security and availability of water supply. 	Netherlands
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction target covering all ADF interventions which have a significant impact on GHG <u>not just energy</u>. There may also be a case for the extent of private sector finance leveraged for tackling climate change and the number of people supported to cope with the impacts of climate change. 	UK
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider including indicators such as the number of countries supported to develop or improve national climate change adaptation frameworks or disaster risk reduction strategies. 	Austria
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on climate-specific measures, such as “the total number of people provided with improved climate resilience from ADB activities”; and “total CO₂ emissions reduced or avoided through the provision of clean energy.” 	Australia
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider measuring the proportion of CPSs that are sufficiently informed by climate change issues. 	UK
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an indicator capturing the share of projects that have been climate-proofed. 	Finland
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put in place the carbon footprint methodology for mitigation projects which has already put in place by the IFC, IADB and the EBRD. 	France
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add “Proportion of projects supporting climate change adaptation”, “Proportion of projects supporting climate change mitigation.” 	France
Regional cooperation and integration	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore an additional indicator such as cross-border electricity integration. Trade integration is probably the best general indicator. 	UK
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly communicate the economic growth and poverty reduction outcomes associated with this important work. Examples: trade and capital flows, cross-border electricity integration, and decreased travel or transit time as a result of streamlined border procedures. 	Australia

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding “Proportion of projects where two countries or more are involved”. 	France
Private sector development	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use some useful suggestions from the Development Effectiveness Review on Private Sector Operations. A measure of internet access may be useful and could reflect inclusiveness. 	Finland UK
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure results of private sector operations, e.g., increases in income and jobs. 	Germany
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore methodologies from development partners such as the IFC regarding measuring and reporting on private sector initiatives. 	Australia
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an indicator on the percentage of private sector operation projects carried out in ADF-countries. 	Austria
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include more indicators on non-sovereign operations, (e.g., quality at entry and portfolio performance also a “performance of nonsovereign operations during implementation rated satisfactory” indicator, as well as one on “average time from approval to first disbursement”). 	Switzerland
Gender equity in operations	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review whether “Other Development Outcomes should have gender disaggregated indicators as there are already a significant number of gender disaggregated Millennium Development Goal (MDG) indicators. 	UK
	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregate all indicators that are on target groups/population level. 	Norway
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce an indicator on women’s empowerment (e.g., decision making, influence), not just participation in projects. 	Austria Canada
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include indicators such as % of women participating in the labor force or women participating in democratic institutions. 	Finland Norway
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include gender disaggregated indicators for the most relevant sectors—including education (e.g., number of girls benefiting) and microfinance (e.g., number of women entrepreneurs reached). Consider possible gender disaggregated indicators for water, sanitation, energy and transport beneficiaries. 	Austria Canada Netherlands Spain UK
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce an indicator measuring the amount of women and girls benefitting from social protection programs. 	Finland
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the extent to which the current requirements to obtain an assessment of gender mainstreaming are sufficiently robust and not open to the possibility of token additional activities being mistaken for genuine mainstreaming. Also consider the case for a separate measure of the proportion of CSPs that are sufficiently gender informed. 	Netherlands Spain UK

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For gender mainstreaming, indicate percentage of projects that are targeted gender projects, aside from percentage of projects that are classified as mainstreaming. 	Canada
Governance and capacity development	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore better indicators measuring the level of governance in a particular country, e.g., indicators referring to the existence and power of institutions exercising control and/or improvements in public financial management systems. 	Austria
	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include under level 1 the governance indicators used by the World Bank (state institutions with adequately established and differentiated power structure; effective and accountable government; public access to information). Include under level 2 governance indicators like: % of ADB programs above US\$10 million presented to and discussed by national parliaments; % of ADB operations included in medium term financing plans of governments; % of procurement processes with ADB involvement with publicly available procurement report; % of ADB programs affected by corruption. 	Switzerland
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List the two level 1 indicators currently listed under Governance (Cost to start business and Time to start business) under Financial (/Private) Sector Development. 	Switzerland
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the World Bank’s and UN’s indicators on good governance/transparency and corruption that could be useful here. 	Finland Germany
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider indicators on other major ADF sectors, including public sector management. 	UK
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an indicator measuring ADB’s activities/results in developing recipient countries’ governance and capacities. 	Finland
	2–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better capture results achieved through policy-based loans and technical assistance. 	Canada
	Level-specific suggestions (level 1–4)		
Education	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an indicator on secondary education, e.g., the proportion of children completing secondary education. 	Netherlands UK
Energy	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include additional indicator “Additional capacity installed using renewable energy (MW)” to capture clean energy, and align with international standards. The UK is exploring a similar indicator which covers all forms of clean energy and all scales i.e., micro-generation as well as large scale power projects. New households connected to electricity (number)—Clarify on how this indicator is assessed—does new mean just additional? How would the counterfactual for this be calculated (i.e., how many “new” households fail to be connected; what about the growth in the number of households)? 	Canada UK

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenhouse gas emission reduction (tCO₂-equiv/yr) –This should assess the net change in emissions from an intervention, rather than just reductions i.e., to capture any rebound effects and any perverse effects that might increase emissions. (Surprised to see that a single proxy emission factor is suggested as emissions intensity varies by energy and region. Concern that the estimated savings from the proxy factor suggested will not be very accurate. For instance, rates vary by a factor of five depending on the types of savings by displacing coal, gas or oil. Clarify if ADB has a methodology to address this. More specific emission factors are available if the fuel, combustion type and region can be identified). • Energy saved (GWh-equiv/yr)—This should capture the net effect of an intervention i.e., not just the savings but any potential increases in consumption from a rebound effect (this might be intended to be included but helpful to clarify). Would energy savings be measured at end use level or supply level and so factor in savings from avoided transmission and distribution losses also? (Helpful to get clarity on this if the data is then used to calculate emissions saved, as would need to know the appropriate emission factor to use). • Disaggregate energy indicators into renewable and non-renewable for installed energy generation capacity. Also the caption of “energy efficiency” should be considered. • Consider including two sub-indicators for “new households connected to electricity (number): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – New households connected to off-grid electricity (number) – New households connected to non-traditional fuels and improved/clean cook stoves (number) 	<p>Switzerland</p> <p>Netherlands</p>
Water	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rename the heading ‘water’ into water and sanitation’ and divide this in the categories urban and rural: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Water supply pipes installed or upgraded: length of network (km) – Number of public taps installed – Number of household connections installed – Wastewater treatment capacity added (m³/day) – Number of households provided with (access to) sanitary facilities – Sewage pipes installed or upgraded: length of network (km) Rural: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Number of new households provided with access to safe sources of drinking water previously unserved (MDG7 contribution) – Number of new households provided with access to improved sanitary facilities (MDG7 contribution) 	Netherlands

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
Food security	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include indicators on agriculture and food security. 	Germany UK
Quality of completed operations	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the indicator, “Proportion of projects that are rated as highly effective 5 years after completion (%)”. The data could be collected through a policy of having resident missions visit projects 5 years after completion and rate them according to a set of criteria for effectiveness. To keep the operational burden of implementing this indicator manageable, a sampling technique could be used with the proportion applying to the share of sampled projects that were rated as highly effective. • Discuss areas that have been identified as weak at the recent ADF Independent Evaluation Study, such as sustainability of projects, project effectiveness or the achievement of development results. 	US Austria Canada Norway
Quality at entry and portfolio performance	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify how the proposed targets have been set and the extent to which they are both stretching and appropriate. Re-circulate the criteria used in the qualitative indicators (e.g., the rating of CSPs and quality at entry indicators) and consider whether any of these need to be amended in the light of the priorities agreed for ADF XI. Discuss the case for modifying the requirements for CPSs given that the baseline is already 100%. • Under “performance at implementation rated satisfactory (%)”, consider adding “average percentage of the rate of cooperation between donors with similar projects in renewable energy sector with regard to harmonization and alignment.” • Include an indicator on the success of remedial action. Where a project is assessed as “unsatisfactory” during implementation, the Bank takes remedial action, as has happened recently with the Pakistan portfolio. 	UK Netherlands Australia UK
Financing for Strategy 2020 core operational areas	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding the following indicators: “Proportion of projects supporting infrastructure development”, “Proportion of projects supporting climate change adaptation”, “Proportion of projects supporting climate change mitigation”, “Proportion of projects supporting inequalities reduction” and “Proportion of projects where two countries or more are involved” (to measure regional cooperation). • Consider the indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – “increasing share of RE in total energy portfolio (separate targets on RE and non-RE in order to illustrate better the progress towards a low carbon society: 50% share of RE in 2015 and 70% in 2020 in total energy portfolio.) – “mainstreaming RE components with non-energy loans, in agricultural and water sectors, to create synergy between RE, food security and availability of water supply (25% increase in 2015 with regard to 2012 and 25% increase in 2020 with regard to 2015). 	France Netherlands

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
Knowledge management	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider an indicator on the proportion of projects that have satisfactory results measures to enable effective monitoring and evaluation—IDA and IADB provide examples. 	UK
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include the indicator “Proportion of projects undergoing impact evaluations or post-implementation assessments (%)”. To make this indicator tractable, it would have to be defined over a rolling time period, say those projects completed in the 3 years prior to the publication of the results framework. 	US
Partnerships (and aid effectiveness)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reassess the appropriateness of the three existing indicators in the light of Busan. The use of country systems, aid predictability and development resources recorded on budget, for example, may be useful measure than for example the number of program-based approaches or joint missions. 	UK
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore indicators on ADB’s use of country systems, e.g., for procurement, public financial management, monitoring and evaluation. 	Canada Finland Switzerland
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include indicators on aid effectiveness. 	Germany
Decentralization	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include specific targets/benchmarks for the assignment of additional staff to missions or the delegation of greater authority to country directors and senior in-country staff. 	Australia Canada Sweden
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider an indicator relating to the delegation of task management to resident missions and other possible measures of the degree to which resident missions interact directly with recipient governments on e.g., policies, analysis and statistical work. Existing indicators are not anymore relevant. 	Finland Norway UK
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen the aspect of decentralization. Consider to replace the four current indicators related to field offices with the one indicator adopted by the World Bank, which should also allow a benchmarking: Decentralization—Services for clients managed by staff based in client countries. 	Switzerland
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include indicators on share of women in international staff and managerial staff positions. 	Austria Finland Netherlands UK
Budget adequacy	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate indicator on efficiency— efficiency in budget spending is as important as quality, especially taking into account the extraordinary circumstances donors are experiencing. 	Austria Canada Spain Switzerland
Other suggested areas/indicators			
Communication and transparency	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include an indicator on ADB’s performance in public communications, e.g., stakeholder’s satisfaction with ADB’s public communication internationally and in the DMCS/ ADF countries. 	Switzerland

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
General comments	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="537 226 1317 285">• Develop an indicator that would reflect ADB’s openness and transparency <li data-bbox="537 348 1317 617">• Avoid undue proliferation of indicators. Modestly increase the number of ADF indicators, to accommodate the need for better gender disaggregated data. <li data-bbox="537 474 1317 617">• Harmonize and align indicators, wherever possible, with ADF recipients and other MDBs. It could therefore be useful to offer a longer menu of options for review drawn from the indicators used by other multilaterals to help identify those which are most relevant to ADF. <li data-bbox="537 684 1317 861">• Ensure that indicators can be disaggregated and that this data be available to donors—disaggregated gender, disability and other socio-economic inclusiveness data would be very useful; disaggregation by Category (ADF, Blend and OCR) is also desirable especially to show results from donor investments in ADF. <li data-bbox="537 898 1317 1104">• Focus strongly on how further progress can be made to deepen the emerging results culture. Without this, the value of the results framework will be limited to planning and monitoring the delivery of outputs and internal organizational issues rather than help drive through an improvement in the impact of ADB in raising sustainable growth and reducing poverty. <li data-bbox="537 1142 1317 1348">• Consider innovative approaches to more clearly incorporate measurement and results reporting of ADB pro-poor initiatives in its broader results reporting. (For example, the World Bank’s “Mapping for Results” platform allows the user to view the location of World Bank projects, creating transparency about whether projects are located in poor areas.) <li data-bbox="537 1386 1317 1507">• Continue the MDG indicators, although attribution to the ADF will always remain limited. The “Other Outcome Indicators” at level 1 are also broadly appropriate, particularly where they provide comparability with other MDBs and aid agencies. <li data-bbox="537 1545 1317 1633">• Strengthen its development effectiveness briefs (and global synthesis of briefs) which are supposed to address ADB’s contribution to level 1 at a country level. <li data-bbox="537 1671 1317 1755">• Improve the linkages between 1 (development progress) and 2 (program outputs) indicators. Better articulate the linkages and provide more context. 	<p data-bbox="1341 226 1484 285">Finland, Netherlands</p> <p data-bbox="1341 348 1484 646">Australia Austria Canada Finland France Germany Netherlands Spain Switzerland UK</p> <p data-bbox="1341 684 1445 709">Australia</p> <p data-bbox="1341 898 1380 924">UK</p> <p data-bbox="1341 1142 1445 1201">Australia Sweden</p> <p data-bbox="1341 1386 1380 1411">UK</p> <p data-bbox="1341 1545 1445 1570">Australia</p>
	1–2		

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Use a proxy indicator for measuring whether its programs are contributing to development outcomes—the percentage of programs (grouped by theme or sector) rated as effective in delivering their targeted sector outcomes – Assess whether a program has been effective at achieving its objective (as a proxy for measuring development outcomes), which avoids the problem of making a difficult judgment about how much of a particular development outcome is attributable to ADB funding – Improve its narrative regarding it attributing to development outcomes from its programs. 	Australia Canada UK
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rethink the indicators at levels 1 and 2 to link the results framework closer to the overall goals of inclusive economic and sustainable growth and regional integration in ADB’s strategic agenda (Strategy 2020). 	Norway
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capture outcomes better, e.g., other than having the “students benefiting” it would be useful to record the number of students completing primary education in ADF projects. The output indicators have been helpful and should stay. They are good measures of what ADF has done, are comparable with other MDBs and comparable over time. • Include extra output indicators in level 2 outputs, which assess the impact such as by lowest income quintile (for example, beneficiaries from road projects could be disaggregated to show the percentage of poor beneficiaries). • Strive for indicators that measure better the quality (outcomes/impacts) rather than just the quantity (outputs) of activities to get a better picture of how especially the poorest people benefit from the projects. • Set realistic and stretching targets for outcomes given some of the results achieved already (e.g., set realistic and stretching gender targets, not just of the number of projects with different levels of gender integration, but also of the kinds of gender-related outcomes that will be achieved). • Make results framework data openly available by showing the breakdown of the figures to countries (and potentially projects). This would be of use for all donors to show specific data for composite indicators. For example, one of the ADB level 2 indicators combines “students benefitting from school improvement programs (e.g., civil works) and those benefitting from “direct support” (i.e., stipends, feeding programs). • Introduce a two-layer design at level 2 to be able to monitor contributions to changes at the country level: (a) output indicators that are directly linked to ADB intervention, and (b) outcome indicators that reflect changes that are considered relevant to the ADB strategic development agenda. This is necessary to support ADB in its increased focus on country planning and emphasis on sector portfolio planning. 	Canada UK Australia Finland Australia Canada Australia Norway

Areas	Levels	Key Suggestions	Source
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify better the timelines (i.e., results framework mixes periods; some current, while others based on 6-year lag). While this approach is likely unavoidable, the challenge is explaining why draft programmed outputs (2013–2016) are lower than delivery outputs (2009–2012), especially in areas where ADB is planning to increase efforts (e.g., for water all programmed outputs are lower). ADB needs to better explain these discrepancies (the footnote is not sufficient). 	Canada
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At level 3, the indicators that are set up to monitor how much of ADB support that is invested in core operational areas (relevance to private sector development, regional integration, environmental sustainability) and projects that are gender mainstreamed generate useful information on cross-cutting issues. These input indicators become redundant if they are substituted by indicators at level 2. 	Norway
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonize indicators with other MDBs; look at the similar measures in other MDB results frameworks and attempts where possible to use common measures. Can ADF build on COMPAS to agree standard measures—for example of project processing times? However, do not limit indicators to those which are standardized—the current list is fairly limited and may be improved. 	UK
Other Comments			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide some indicative targets for the outputs and outcomes generated from ADF XI resources, as well as those achieved during the ADF XI period from the resources of previous replenishments. 	Australia UK
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better link the annual DEfR with the DEfR for PSOs. While different indicators for PSO are useful, ADB needs to better think through the links between public/private sector operations and how they collectively contribute to overall ADB performance. Ideally, these reports will be integrated (not necessarily all in one report, but timelines would be the same and linkages would be made). 	Canada

ADB = Asian Development Bank, ADF = Asian Development Fund, CO₂=carbon dioxide, COMPAS = Common Performance Assessment System, CPS = country partnership strategy, CSP = country strategy and program, DEfR = Development Effectiveness Review, DMC = developing member country, EBRD = European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, GHG = greenhouse gas, GWh-equiv/yr = gigawatt hour equivalent per year, IADB = Inter-American Development Bank, IDA = International Development Association, IFC = International Finance Corporation, km = kilometer, m³/day = cubic meter per day, MDB = multilateral development bank, MDG = millennium development goal, MW = megawatt, OCR = ordinary capital resources, PSO = private sector operations, RE = renewable energy, tCO₂-equiv/yr = tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year, UK = United Kingdom, UN = United Nations, US = United States.