



Template of a...

# **NGO Benchmarking**

## **Consolidated Report**

# Client and Scope (Excel spreadsheet with crossings)

## Consolidated

## # of Zero & One

	Dimensions of Best Practices	Contributors' Expectations	Mngt. Component	Continuous Improvement Steps
ICNPO Code	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Other Classification	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
Operational Style	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>
Operational Status	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>
Number of years of field experience	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>
Auditor	<u>21</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>24</u>

Copyright © 2005 SGS Société Générale de Surveillance S.A. All rights reserved.  
This spreadsheet has been designed by SGS Aid Monitoring Services,



## Distribution of audited NGOs (N=11) by Key Perspectives of the NGO Benchmarking Standard

Consolidated Results	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Average	STD
Cells highlighted in orange are those below the 70% threshold													
<b>1. Score by Dimension of Good Practices</b>													
1 Board of Trustees:	88.9%	75.0%	83.3%	66.7%	72.7%	75.8%	72.2%	58.3%	55.6%	57.6%	54.5%	69.1%	11.6%
2 Strategic Framework:	83.3%	91.7%	95.8%	83.3%	85.7%	90.5%	83.3%	62.5%	66.7%	66.7%	57.1%	78.8%	13.2%
3 Integrity Management	66.7%	78.4%	76.5%	62.7%	58.3%	22.9%	58.8%	33.3%	51.0%	20.8%	29.2%	50.8%	20.9%
4 Communication, Advocacy and Public Image:	86.7%	86.7%	86.7%	40.0%	73.3%	80.0%	93.3%	66.7%	73.3%	46.7%	33.3%	69.7%	20.7%
5 Human Resources:	83.3%	80.6%	75.0%	80.6%	83.3%	86.1%	66.7%	77.8%	38.9%	61.1%	19.4%	68.4%	21.2%
6 Fundraising, Resources Allocation and Financial Controls:	92.1%	75.8%	71.2%	86.4%	69.7%	73.0%	54.5%	48.5%	54.5%	33.3%	48.5%	64.3%	17.9%
7 Operations:	88.2%	90.2%	90.2%	86.3%	92.9%	95.2%	72.5%	84.3%	88.2%	66.7%	45.2%	81.8%	14.8%
8 Outcomes:	71.4%	85.7%	81.0%	81.0%	85.7%	95.2%	42.9%	76.2%	57.1%	47.6%	57.1%	68.0%	22.1%
9 Continuous Improvement:	95.8%	87.5%	79.2%	87.5%	75.0%	66.7%	75.0%	70.8%	20.8%	12.5%	16.7%	62.5%	30.6%
<b>Overall:</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>75.8%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>56.5%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	<b>67.2%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>
<b>2. Score by Contributors' Expectations</b>													
Transparency	82.7%	82.4%	81.8%	79.9%	77.3%	74.0%	67.3%	58.5%	56.6%	46.7%	46.7%	68.5%	14.2%
Efficiency	88.9%	81.5%	75.9%	83.3%	66.7%	71.1%	57.4%	53.7%	63.0%	39.2%	20.8%	63.8%	20.3%
Effectiveness	83.8%	82.0%	81.1%	70.3%	77.8%	71.3%	68.5%	69.4%	53.2%	46.8%	33.3%	67.0%	16.1%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>75.8%</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>56.5%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	<b>67.2%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>
<b>3.1 By Management Component</b>													
System	85.1%	84.4%	84.4%	77.8%	77.1%	68.8%	80.7%	68.2%	66.8%	48.8%	37.4%	70.9%	15.5%
Program/Project	80.7%	92.2%	91.9%	79.7%	84.7%	93.7%	64.9%	76.3%	72.0%	68.7%	45.6%	77.3%	14.3%
Human Resources	80.0%	82.5%	83.8%	85.2%	78.7%	63.0%	47.7%	46.4%	27.5%	36.4%	16.7%	58.9%	25.1%
Finance	89.5%	76.8%	69.4%	80.2%	67.9%	72.1%	57.3%	50.8%	58.1%	32.2%	48.4%	63.9%	16.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>82.7%</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>81.2%</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>59.8%</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>55.3%</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>68.5%</b>	<b>16.6%</b>
<b>3.2 By Continuous Improvement Steps</b>													
Plan	87.8%	79.4%	80.4%	79.7%	83.9%	81.8%	60.9%	79.9%	59.5%	58.4%	31.3%	71.2%	16.9%
Do	81.6%	94.8%	94.3%	87.0%	74.1%	69.6%	60.5%	53.5%	63.2%	51.1%	48.3%	70.7%	17.0%
Check	79.6%	76.7%	74.2%	70.4%	80.0%	80.9%	55.6%	50.0%	46.0%	45.1%	28.2%	62.4%	18.1%
Act	78.1%	83.9%	75.6%	84.4%	79.4%	91.4%	62.2%	60.6%	30.3%	27.2%	23.1%	63.3%	25.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>82.7%</b>	<b>85.4%</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>81.2%</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>59.8%</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>55.3%</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>16.6%</b>
<small>Note: Totals for 3.1 and 3.2 may differ from those under 1 and 2 because of the introduction of the weighting system</small>													
Score for 3.1 / 3.2 compared to score for 1 / 2:	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	=	-	+	-	+	