

Ensure an objective analysis and avoid over-estimating scores

For an objective analysis, the importance of justifications

- It is important to lead an objective analysis, and to give scores which are accompanied by clear, concrete and informed justifications (reference to interviews, chapters of document, SIG data, etc.) in the "comments" column.

For a useful analysis, the identification of improvement tracks

- An objective work allows the identification of improvement tracks and the definition of action plans linked to technical resources. This identification is useful to strengthen the practices in social performance management.
- The SPI4 can be an « entry point » to discuss technical support projects with technical and/or financial partners.

For a fair analysis, the importance of benchmarks

- The scores can be lower for younger, small organizations which have not formalized their procedures yet. They can then compare their scores to their peers with SPI4 benchmarks (but they should not inflate artificially the results to « encourage », « not penalize informal procedures » etc.).
- A global SPI4 score of 50-60 is in the average of the SPI4 database.
- A global SPI4 score of 80-90 is a very high notation and translates excellent practices.

For a reliable analysis, the identification of "gaps"

- If the SPI4 result is overestimated, it may be misleading for the organization which could go on and engage a Smart certification, a social rating, or apply for a funding with an investor. There is therefore a risk that these results will be lower than expected, which will then penalise the organization. It is clearly better to identify "gaps", to work on upstream of a rating / certification, or to share with full transparency with an investor who could then support a targeted improvement.

For a credible analysis, results without bias

- Overestimated results can challenge the credibility of the auditor, with both the organization and the initiatives working on Universal Standards (Smart Campaign, SPTF, rating agencies, investors, regulators, etc.). This can lead to a conflict of interest, while the objective is at first to support the organization in the appropriation of these standards.

For a responsible analysis, an extensive knowledge of the approaches

- The SPI4 tool leans on international initiatives and a solid network of practitioners, who shared their approaches and their tools to collaborate, speak the same language, and give the same priority to customers. It implies a strong responsibility in the professional use of these tools, stemming from these exchanges and joint works for more than 15 years now.

For an independent analysis, an in-depth work with every partner

- An auditor who would over-estimate SPI4 assessments would be experiencing a vicious circle where each organization would be expecting a higher score comparing itself to other conducted audits.
- For a professional analysis, a process of qualification exists to master the SPI4 tool. SPI4 audits are preferably led by « qualified auditors », who have followed a process of theoretical and practical training, accompanied by CERISE, on the contents, features, and SPI4 results. This process enables auditors to master the tool and the process of audit effectively.