

1. Overview

ILO-Score India Phase II	2014-2017	
Audit visit dates	1-2 April 2015	
Overall final ratings ¹	MUST	391/450 = 87%
	RECOMMENDED	0/50 = 0 %
Coverage	Full Audit for India	
	All control points checked	
DCED Standard	Version VI, January 2013	

Signed:



ILO-Score Michael Elkin

20 April 2015, Geneva



Auditors Pithcha Wanitphon

15 April 2015, Thailand

Table of Contents

1. Overview	1
2. Key Audit Findings.....	2
3. Brief Review of the Programme and Measurement System	5
4. Summary of the audit process	6
5. Detailed scoring of the Control Points.....	7
6. Summary of key areas with potential for improvement.....	11
Annexes.....	11

¹ An overall rating of 100% implies that the project meets the compliance criteria and has a strong measurement system of acceptable quality within the boundaries of what the programme has set itself to measure, not that it has a perfect measurement system.

2. Key Audit Findings

Articulating the Results Chain	
A results chain has been developed for each intervention. The logic of the results chains is supported by academic research as well as clusters and partners assessments. Significant assumptions are documented. The sustainability strategy and business model are documented in the project document. Staff can describe the results chains covering their work. The key partner can describe the logic of intervention. The results chains are reviewed at least annually.	There are discrepancies in logical order and descriptions of the results chain boxes. The research and analysis underlying the results chain do not take into account the risk of displacement.
Defining Indicators of Change	
There are quantitative and/or qualitative indicators for each change in the results chains. The indicators are mostly relevant to the changes in the results chains. The proxy indicators used are validated by academic paper. The enterprise results chain includes universal impact indicators (scale and income). The justification for not including job creation is provided. There are appropriate indicators to assess the sustainability of results. Staff can describe indicators and have used them to inform implementation.	Some indicators are not relevant to the changes in the results chains. The anticipated impacts are not projected.
Measuring Changes in indicators	
Baseline information on key indicators is collected. There is a documented plan to collect information for each indicator at appropriate time. The plans are mostly appropriate. Information collected by consultants and self-reported by SMEs is validated by the programme. Qualitative information gathering mainly focuses on how changes are taking place and the sustainability of changes.	Some indicators are not included in the measure plans. There are minor discrepancies in the documented tools in the measurement plan. For enterprise results chains, changes reported in the self-reported enterprise indicator card (EIC) may not be fully attributable to the intervention. There is no explicit plan for assessing attributable impacts at the enterprise level. The qualitative information gathering sometimes does not include information on why (or why not) changes are taking place.
Estimating Attributable Changes	
There is a methodology to assess the causal links along the results chains.	For the institutional results chain, the plan only includes before and after measurement, and does not include a formal mechanism to validate the causal links e.g. using respondent opinion. However, the causal links are relatively straightforward. For the enterprise results chain, there is no explicit plan to deal with the counterfactual and assess the attributable impacts on operating performance and costs saving.
Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market	
Not Applicable	

Tracking Programme Costs	
All costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	
Reporting Results	
The programme produced annual progress report which reported numbers of SMEs that financially benefited. However, the cost saving has not been assessed and reported yet. Contributions of private sector actors are acknowledged. The reported changes are disaggregated by gender where applicable.	The reported numbers of staff trained in enterprises are not corrected for overlapping. Results are not published.
Managing the System for Results Measurement	
The programme has a formal system for results measurement through which findings are used in programme management and decision-making. Staff have access to a written MRM guideline. Staff are able to explain how they use the results of the MRM system to inform management decision-making. Human and financial resources are sufficient. Tasks and responsibilities in results measurement are documented in job descriptions, MRM Guideline and measurement plans. The system is mostly institutionalised.	For the Bi-Annual review, the programme should also review the results chains, indicators and measurement plan and adjust them if required.

Final ratings

“Must” control points:

Percentage	Description	Programme Rating
91-100	Strong results measurement system	
81-90	Reasonable results measurement system	√
71-80	Moderate results measurement system	
61-70	Moderate results measurement system	
51-60	with notable weaknesses	
41-50		
31-40		
21-30	Weak results measurement system	
11-20		
0-10		

“Recommended” control points:

Percentage	Description	Programme Rating
81-100	Results measurement system with strong additional features	
61-80	Results measurement system	
41-60	with some additional features	
21-40	Results measurement system	
0-20	with few additional features	√

3. Brief Review of the Programme and Measurement System

Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises (SCORE) is a practical training and in-factory consulting programme that improves productivity and working conditions in small and medium enterprises (SMEs). SCORE Training focuses on developing cooperative working relations, resulting in shared benefits. The five SCORE Training modules cover Workplace Cooperation, Quality Management, Clean Production, Human Resource Management, and Occupational Safety and Health. Each module includes a two-day classroom training for managers and workers, followed by on-site consultations with industry experts that help to put the training into action in the workplace.

The ILO assists government agencies, training providers, industry associations and trade unions in emerging economies in Africa, Asia and Latin America to offer SCORE Training to enterprises. The project is managed by a global team based in ILO Country Offices and Headquarters in Geneva. SCORE is financed by the Governments of Switzerland and Norway.

The SCORE project (Phase I) started in India in 2011. During phase I, the project introduced the enterprise training programme to different partners and built technical expertise among service providers to offer the services to SMEs. SCORE Phase II started in 2014 and continues the work of phase I with a stronger focus on institutional sustainability. The programme continues to work with technical service providers and business membership organizations to make SCORE Training services available to SME. The programme targets SME factories in the light-manufacturing sectors currently in Ahmednagar and Chennai.

The project results measurement system was developed during SCORE Phase I. Its objective was to:

- Monitor project output and impact across eight country components
- Report project results to donors and ILO constituents
- Provide data to make informed decisions on project strategies

During SCORE phase I, the programme underwent a preview-audit of its results measurement system. However, it was only with the start of SCORE phase II that the project is implementing the standard more thoroughly, starting in one pilot country. From the eight country components, India was selected as the pilot country as it had the most advanced monitoring and results measurement (MRM) system and operates in English. However, the system mainly focuses on “Must” control points and compliance criteria.

4. Summary of the audit process

This audit was a full audit for India. It covered only the SCORE project in India and the overall programme's results measurement system. For both audited interventions, the audit reviewed the results chain, measurement plan, attribution strategy, project documents, supporting research and analysis, results chain review log, relevant reports and the M&E database. For SCORE as a programme, the audit reviewed the MRM guideline, progress reports, costing system as well as other project documents. A full list of the documents reviewed is included as Annex 3.

For SCORE as a programme, interviews were held with Chief Technical Advisor and Training, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. For SCORE India, interviews were held with the National Project Manager and a Partner (Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry). The list of interviews conducted is included in Annex 4.

5. Detailed scoring of the Control Points

The program scored 391 out of 450 points for the MUST control points and scores 0 out of 50 points for the RECOMMENDED control points. The maximum scores have been adjusted to exclude the “Not Applicable” compliance criteria. All compliance criteria were verified.

Control Point	M/R	Max. Score	Rating	Justification
Section 1: Articulating the Results Chain				
1.1 An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each of the interventions.	M	30	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A results chain has been developed for each intervention. There are discrepancies in logical orders and descriptions of some of the results chain boxes.
1.2 Each results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis.	M	30	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The logic of the results chains is supported by academic research as well as clusters and partners assessments. Significant assumptions are documented. For the enterprise result chain, the missing key assumption is, in order to progress to other modules, the module contents have to be matched with SMEs' needs. The sustainability strategy and business model are documented in the project document.
1.3 Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities; key partners can explain the logic of interventions.	M	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff can describe the results chains covering their work. Staff can give example of how they use the results chains. The key partner can describe the logic of intervention.
1.4 The results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players and the programme circumstances.	M	20	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results chains are reviewed at least annually. The reasons for changes or lack of changes are not documented.
1.5 The results chain(s) include the results of broader systemic change at key levels.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programme does not aim to stimulate systemic change.
1.6 The research and analysis underlying the results chain(s) take into account the risk of displacement.	REC	10	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research and analysis underlying the results chain do not take into account the risk of displacement.

Section 2: Defining Indicators of Change				
2.1 There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each key change described in the results chain(s).	M	30	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are quantitative and/or qualitative indicators for each change in the results chains. • The indicators are mostly relevant to the changes in the results chains. • Some indicators are not relevant to the changes in the results chains. • The proxy indicators used are validated by academic research.
2.2 The universal impact indicators are included in the relevant results chain(s).	M	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The enterprise results chain includes universal impact indicators (scale and income). The justification for not including job creation is provided.
2.3 There are specific Indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are appropriate indicators to assess the sustainability of results.
2.4 Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff can describe indicators and have used them to inform implementation.
2.5 Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators to appropriate dates.	REC	30	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anticipated impacts are not realistically projected.
Section 3: Measuring Changes in Indicators				
3.1 Baseline information on key indicators is collected.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline information on key indicators is collected.
3.2 Information for each indicator is collected using methods that conform to good research practices.	M	40	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a documented plan to collect information for each indicator at appropriate time. • The plans are mostly appropriate. Information collected by consultants and self-reported by SMEs is validated by the programme. • Some indicators are not included in the measurement plans. There are minor discrepancies in the documented tools in the measurement plan. • For enterprise results chains, changes reported in self-reported enterprise indicator card (EIC) may not be fully attributed to the intervention. And, there is no explicit plan for assessing attributable impacts at the enterprise level.
3.3 Qualitative information on changes at various levels	M	20	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative information gathering mainly focuses on how changes are

of the results chain is gathered.				<p>taking place and the sustainability of the changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The qualitative information gathering sometimes does not include the information on why (or why not) changes are taking place.
3.4 Reported changes in indicators that are extrapolated from pilot figure are regularly verified.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable.
Section 4: Estimating Attributable Changes				
4.1 Attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains are estimated using methods that conform to established good practice.	M	20	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There plans to assess the causal links along the results chains. For the institutional results chain, the plan only includes before and after measurement, and does not include the formal mechanism to validate the causal links e.g. using respondent opinion. However, the causal links are relatively straightforward. For the enterprise results chain, there is no explicit plan to deal with the counterfactual and assess the attributable impacts on operating performance and costs saving.
Section 5: Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market				
5.1 The results of systemic change at key levels in the results chain(s) are assessed.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programme does not aim to stimulate systemic change.
Section 6: Tracking Programme Costs				
6.1 Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	M	20	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.
6.2 Costs are allocated by major component of the programme.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Applicable.
Section 7: Reporting Results				
7.1 The programme produces a report at least annually, which clearly and thoroughly describes results to date.	M	30	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programme produced an annual progress report which reported numbers of SMEs that financially benefited. Cost savings have not been assessed and reported yet. There is no concrete plan to assess the attributable impacts yet. The numbers of staff trained are not corrected for overlapping.
7.2 Contributions of other publicly funded programmes and private contributions are acknowledged.	M	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contribution of private sector is acknowledged. Beneficiaries do not enrol on the government programme.

7.3 Reported changes in key indicators are disaggregated by gender.	M	10	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reported changes are disaggregated by gender where applicable.
7.4 Results of systemic change and/or other indirect effects are reported.	REC	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. The programme does not aim to stimulate the systemic changes.
7.5 Results are published.	REC	10	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results are not publicly published.
Section 8: Managing the System for Results Measurement				
8.1 The programme has a clear system for results measurement through which findings are used in programme management and decision-making.	M	40	34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programme has a formal system for results measurement through which findings are used in programme management and decision-making. For the Bi-Annual review, the programme should also review the results chains, indicators and measurement plan and adjust them if required. Staff have access to a written MRM guideline. The MRM guideline does not contain step by step guidelines on how to implement all elements of result measurement system. Staff are able to explain how they use the results of the MRM system to inform management decision-making.
8.2 The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.	M	30	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human and financial resources are sufficient. Tasks and responsibilities in results measurement are documented in job descriptions, MRM Guideline and measurement plans. Staff can describe their tasks and responsibility in results measurement.
8.3 The system is integrated with the management of the programme.	M	20	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The system is mostly institutionalised. The system has just been fully introduced at the beginning of 2015. It will need more time to be fully institutionalised. Staff can provide examples of results measurement activities they have recently undertaken.

6. Summary of key areas with potential for improvement

The following notes key areas with potential for improvement.

Articulating the Results Chain

Ensure that the results chains are fully logical, and statements of changes in the results chain boxes are clearly described.

When reviewing the results chains, document the reasons for changes or lack of changes.

Defining Indicators of Changes

There should be a clear connection between the results chain boxes and the indicators in the measurement plan. Ensure that all indicators relate to the changes in the results chain boxes.

Measuring Changes in Indicators

Develop an explicit plan to assess attributable impacts on operating performance and costs savings.

Ensure that all relevant indicators are included in the measurement plan.

Ensure that qualitative information gathering includes information on why (or why not) changes are taking place.

Estimating Attributable Changes

As discussed above, develop an explicit plan to assess attributable impacts on operating performance and costs savings.

For the Institution results chain, also use respondent opinion to validate the causal links along the results chain.

Managing the System for Results Measurement

For the bi-annual review, ensure that results chains, indicators and measurement plans are adjusted if required.

Annexes

1. Overall and market specific ratings
2. Sector specific findings
3. List of documents reviewed
4. List of interviewed individuals