

ANNEX 6. Methodological approach to scoring and ranking.

This section explains the use of a model for measuring the contribution of projects within project sub-activities from a series of elementary indicators. The methodology groups these indicators into a number of factors with an assigned value and, subsequently, aggregates the factors in a synthetic index called the “scoring index”. The dispersion in the distribution of the synthetic indexes constitutes the measure in which the given activity gets closer to the maximum or minimum value (concentration and/or dispersion). In addition, an application of the methodology is provided within a set of project activities measured by its participation in project execution, on the one hand, and on the other hand, on its relevance to the general and specific objectives of the programme.

This method is based upon a subjective (opinion base) measurement approach, which is different from the ones developed with precise data and information, since it uses principal components analysis and interviews (as well as second and third direct interviews) for aggregating the variables and avoids many of the problems and limits shown by the dispersion of existing non-executed activities. The measurement framework presented here reveals the degree of contribution of project activities to end results.

To prepare this ranking the following criteria have been used as “proxies” and indexes to project and program objectives: contribution to employment, to production, productivity, knowledge (transfer and education), institutional strengthening and innovation. These criteria have been assessed in each project and project component. When the value assigned is high or closer to 5, means high rate of contribution. When the value is low means low or not enough strength to make contributions to any or to at least the majority of the criteria. The aggregation of the results divided by the number of valuations provide a reference or scoring measure.

The following table illustrates the application of the methodology:

Project 1: Sub components	Criteria Ranked						
	Employment	Production	Productivity	Knowledge	Institutional Strengthening	Innovation	Scoring
More than 10 000 young people trained in IT. Approximately 45% of the trainees were female. Training took place in various provinces.	2.5	2.5	4	4	4	4	3.5
6000 technicians participated in IT training activities in various provinces.	1.5	1.5	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2
Future scientist program, establishing 10 clubs for 1000 students trained throughout the country in 2013. In 2014 program focused on IT education. Final national level competition event and the Scientific Olympics Ten provincial winner and 34 students took part in the final event at Maluana Science Park.	1.5	2	1.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.0
Innovators Program in 2013 resulted in 10 new inventions. 38 tech trained and 3 inventions chosen for funding.	2	2.5	2.5	2	2	2	1.75
7 Hackathon events organized in 2013-2014. 339 persons trained including 61 women and 66 teams established.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
AppCampus Ambassadors held in Finland. Two trained in the AppCampus concept. A Windows Application Acceleration Campus held in Maputo.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3 new CMCs built equipped and made operational (in Moma, Tsangano and Mecuburi). The CMC in Machava was changed to a telecentro concept. For the CMC in Mogincual STIFIMO financed the rehabilitation of the building (World Bank and project MEGCIP financed the rest.) The CMCs in Lugela and Magoe were rehabilitated and equipped. The activity Development of District Portals resulted a portal being created in Namaacha.	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
STIFIMO covered the salaries of three MoRENET technicians. MoRENET supported activity resulted in the establishment of 3 nodes (Maluana Science Park, Unilurio-Niassa and CITTAU).	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
5 MCT technicians, 80 young people and 60 other government officials trained in Maputo province. The construction of the Manica CPRD started in 2012.	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
							2.4

ⁱ Ranking based on multi criterial analysis. Zoran Babic, Neli Plazibat. London School of Economics Journal. 2012.