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Dear Readers,

As organizations fight for the best talent available in the marketplace, it has become a necessity for them to get the insights they need to hire people with the right skills and backgrounds.

We are very happy that many organizations are utilizing our trends reports to model their background screening programs and establish best practices. Such a proactive approach to background screening is enabling companies to make informed hiring decisions, resulting in improving the quality of hires.

We remain committed towards aligning Indian recruitment and pre-employment screening practices with the best in the world.
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Talent occupies the most important position in any organization no matter what the current economic scenario may be. Irrespective of the continuously changing nature of recruitment process, the need for a good hire is indispensable. There has been a tremendous shift in the mindset of organisations as well as recruiters when it comes to talent today.

As organisations have started to capture talent early on, the overall recruitment process cost is even higher and to be cost-efficient in such cases, knowing a candidate’s background becomes all the more important. It helps mitigate risk and saves the time and money involved in hiring a candidate with a fraudulent background.

In this regard, First Advantage helps you make the right decision by presenting essential facts about the current workplace scenario through this trend report. Here are some of the finding that might prove beneficial in the process of a talent search by any organisation:

- 78% of the Discrepant Cases are males and remaining 22% are females.

- Out of the total occurrences of discrepancies a huge chunk of them have occurred in the Employment Component, followed by Address Component and Education Component.

- City-wise Bengaluru leads in Employment related discrepancies, Hyderabad leads in Address related discrepancies & Mumbai leads in Education related discrepancies.

- Out of every 100 Education Discrepancies identified - 59 are from the Graduate level.

- Case Level Discrepancy across industrial sectors like FMCG, Healthcare & Pharma, BFSI and ITES/BPO has shown a rise in Q3-16 in comparison to Q2-16.

- Discrepancy rates for Employment and Address checks are very high in the Southern zone and Education checks are very high in the Northern zone in India.

- Highest number of discrepancies have been observed in the Associate level employees and in that too - the age bracket >= 22 to 30 years has the biggest chunk of discrepant cases at 46.2%.
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Case(s)
One case indicates one candidate. It is denoted by a case reference number which is unique to that particular candidate.

Component(s)
Screening carried out for various phases of the candidate’s background like Employment, Education, Address, etc. are termed as Components.

Client
The organization which authorizes First Advantage to conduct the verification.

Check(s)
One case can have one or more than one check based on the credentials being verified.

Industry
The industry sector/segment under which the client falls. All abbreviations used are as per Indian standards of industry bifurcation and are easily accessible via the internet.

Employee Category
The designation at which the candidate worked/is working [current employment] in the organization.

Possible Suspect
Any organization or company - whose credentials might not be genuine.

FOR EXAMPLE

First Advantage is conducting a background check for a candidate ABC [Case]

The check is authorized by a client say XYZ Corp. This Client belongs to the BFSI sector [Industry].

As per the client’s mandate, the screening components include latest Education and two previous Employments of the candidate. Here Education and Employment are Components & there are a total of three Checks - one Education [Check] and two Employment [Checks].

Depending on a predefined matrix followed by the client, either as standardized by First Advantage or a client customized matrix - a disconnect identified [Discrepancy] would be categorized as major or minor discrepancy, suspect, possible suspect, etc.
A study of the Case Level Quarterly Discrepancy Analysis for Q3-16 shows that the discrepancy percentage is at 10.6% [which goes to say that out of every 100 candidates who were screened by First Advantage - 11 candidates were found to have discrepancies in one or more than one component].

The discrepancy versus verified percentage for 2011, 2012 and 2013 was at 10 percent. In 2014 it had risen to 10.5 percent. In 2015 it has further risen to 11.6 percent.
Case Level Trend from July to September 2016

1.8. Discrepancy Percentage - By Gender [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

- 74% of the overall cases verified by First Advantage, in the third quarter of 2016 were Males [which means out of every 100 cases verified - 74 were Males] and the remaining 26% were Females.

- In Q3-16, 78% of the Overall discrepancy cases were Males [which means out of every 100 discrepancy cases - 78 were Males] and the remaining 22% were Females.

- In Q3-16, 11% of the Male verified cases were discrepant [which means out of every 100 cases verified of the Male gender - 11 were found to be discrepant]. Likewise, 9% of the Female gender verified cases were discrepant.

- In comparison with Q2-16 – the trend for Q3-16 illustrates that the Male discrepancy cases have decreased by 1% and the Female discrepancy remains constant at 9%.
### Discrepancy Trends

#### Case Level Trend from July to September 2016

1.C. Discrepancy Percentage - By Age [Q3-16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>&lt;= 21 years</th>
<th>&gt;= 22 to 30 years</th>
<th>&gt;= 31 to 40 years</th>
<th>&gt;= 41 to 50 years</th>
<th>&gt;= 51 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERIFIED CASE%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIScrepancy CASE%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy Vs Verified%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: Cases wherein the date of birth is not mentioned have been excluded from the analysis. These cases have a 11.3% discrepancy.

- Highest number of cases have been verified for the >= 22 to 30 years [age bracket] candidates.
- Similarly highest number of discrepancies have been detected in the >= 22 to 30 years [age bracket] candidates.
- The discrepancy versus verified percentage is highest in the >= 51 years [age bracket] candidates at 27%, followed by >= 41 to 50 years [age bracket] candidates at 16.4%.
Today, background screening is not only restricted to the traditional sectors like IT, ITES, BFSI, Manufacturing, FMCG sectors, but has also shown rapid growth in Retail, Petroleum, Hospitality, Healthcare, Travel, Telecom, Education and Entertainment industries.

In fact, this concept of risk mitigation has tempted even sectors like NGO, Research, KPO, etc. [basically non profit earning sectors] amongst others, to join the bandwagon and engage in the best practices of due diligence.

- In Q3-16, the Discrepancy Vs. Verified trend in sectors like Healthcare & Pharma, BFSI, FMCG and ITES/BPO have shown an increase in comparison to the previous quarter.

In Q3-16, total number of cases Verified were highest for the BFSI sector at 35% [i.e. out of every 100 cases Verified – 35 were from the BFSI sector] followed by IT sector at 29%.

Likewise highest number of discrepancy cases are in the BFSI sector at 41% [i.e. out of every 100 discrepancy cases – 41 were from BFSI sector] followed by IT at 25%.

The discrepancy %, that is the number of cases [Discrepancy Vs. Verified] based on industries, has a totally different story to say, with Healthcare & Pharma leading at 19% [i.e. out of every 100 Healthcare & Pharma verified – 19 cases were discrepant], Telecom at 16% is followed by Retail at 15%. A surprise element in Engineering sector shows a high discrepancy percent at 20% but the percentage can be sort of misleading as the number of cases verified for Engineering sector is pretty less in comparison.
The Discrepancy Vs. Verified % by Age and by Industry is another interesting analytics.

The overall discrepancy trend shows that the >= 51 years age bracket is the highest at 27% [which means of every 100 cases verified in this age bracket - 27 cases are discrepant].

All the cases verified in the less than 21 years age bracket in FMCG were discrepant.

Engineering shows a high discrepancy trend in >=22 to 30 years age bracket.

Manufacturing, Retail and Telecom shows a high discrepancy trend in >=31 to 40 years age bracket.

Many industrial sectors like BFSI, Healthcare & Pharma, IT, ITES/BPO and Travel & Hospitality show a high trend in the >= 51 years age bracket.

As confirmed in page number 7, cases wherein the date of birth is not mentioned have been excluded from the analysis. The same is applicable to all the above mentioned sectors as well.
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2.C. Discrepancy Percentage - By Top 10 Industry By Component [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

- BFSI
  - Employment: 10.5%
  - Address: 4.5%
  - Education: 1.6%

- Engineering
  - Employment: 10.6%
  - Address: 5.5%
  - Education: 1.2%

- FMCG
  - Employment: 8.5%
  - Address: 2.3%
  - Education: 0.9%

- Healthcare and Pharmaceuticals
  - Employment: 15.9%
  - Address: 4.3%
  - Education: 0.4%

- IT
  - Employment: 6.7%
  - Address: 2.1%
  - Education: 0.6%

- ITES / BPO
  - Employment: 6.4%
  - Address: 3.9%
  - Education: 0.6%

Based on Discrepancy Vs. Verified Checks
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2.C. Discrepancy Percentage - By Top 10 Industry By Component [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

Manufacturing
- Employment: 8.7% (Q2-16), 11.5% (Q3-16)
- Address: 1.4% (Q2-16), 0.5% (Q3-16)
- Education: 0.8% (Q2-16), 0.2% (Q3-16)

Retail
- Employment: 21.3% (Q2-16), 15.2% (Q3-16)
- Address: 19.5% (Q2-16), 18.4% (Q3-16)
- Education: 2.2% (Q2-16), 2.2% (Q3-16)

Telecommunication
- Employment: 7.7% (Q2-16), 6.7% (Q3-16)
- Address: 10.3% (Q2-16), 7.7% (Q3-16)
- Education: 1.5% (Q2-16), 1.5% (Q3-16)

Travel and Hospitality
- Employment: 24.2% (Q2-16), 16.0% (Q3-16)
- Address: 2.6% (Q2-16), 1.0% (Q3-16)
- Education: 3.0% (Q2-16), 2.8% (Q3-16)

☑ Based on Discrepancy Vs. Verified Checks

- In Q3-16, Employment discrepancies vs. verifications have recorded an increase in most of the above mentioned sectors in comparison to Q2-16. The maximum increase was recorded in the FMCG sector [from 8.5% in Q2-16 to 15.9% in Q3-16] followed by ITES/BPO sector [from 11.4% in Q2-16 to 14.4% in Q3-16]. It has shown a fall in Engineering sector [from 22.9% in Q2-16 to 14.5% in Q3-16].

- While the maximum increase in Address discrepancies vs. verifications was recorded in the FMCG sector [from 2.3% in Q2-16 to 4.3% in Q3-16], the highest drop was observed in the Telecommunication sector [from 10.3% in Q2-16 to 7.7% in Q3-16].
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3.A. Discrepancy Percentage - By Component [Q4-15 to Q3-16]

Employment component has always had the highest number of discrepancies in comparison to other components. 63.5% discrepancies are formed by it in this quarter [which means out of every 100 discrepancies identified – 64 are of the Employment Component].

Note:
- At times, discrepancies tagged by First Advantage are used as highlighters, which may serve as triggers for further investigation and might not necessarily signify a fraud or discrepancy in the literal sense.
- These tags/requirements are purely based on client criteria.

- In Q3-16 - discrepancies related to Employment, Address and Education components were at 63.5%, 12.4% and 4.9% respectively
- The remaining discrepancies of 19.2%, were related to Criminal, Document Investigation, Database, Reference, etc. [clubbed under Others] checks.
- The Employment related discrepancies have increased from 61.5% in Q2-16 to 63.5% in Q3-16.
- The Address related discrepancies have increased from 10.3% in Q2-16 to 12.4% in Q3-16.
- The Education related discrepancies have decreased from 5.4% in Q2-16 to 4.9% in Q3-16.
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3.B. Discrepancy Percentage - By Component By Gender [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

- **Q3-16 Trends:** In the Employment discrepancy checks - Males form the biggest chunk at 80% [which means out of every 100 Employment discrepancy checks - 80 are Males and 20 are Females]
- In Address discrepancy checks, Males are at 70% and Females are at 30%
- In the Education discrepancy checks - Males form 86% and the remaining 14% are Females.
- In the Criminal discrepancy checks - Males form 88% and the remaining 12% are Females.
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4. Discrepancies - By Component Across Zones in India and Abroad [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

The discrepancy trend across zones in India and abroad has displayed an interesting spectrum and has remained constant except for a couple of surprises:

- Discrepancy trend is consistent in both Employment and Education component across zones in the second and third quarter of 2016.

- Address discrepancy trend has increased significantly from 15% in Q2-16 to 20% in Q3-16 in the West Zone. It has shown a slight increase in East India as well. There is a significant fall in the North Zone from 28% in Q2-16 to 22% in Q3-16.

The highlighting factors:

- Discrepancy rates for Employment and Address checks are very high in the Southern zone
- Discrepancy rates for Education checks are very high in the Northern zone
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5. Discrepancies - By Top 6 States [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Q3-16</th>
<th>Q2-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAMIL NADU</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARNATAKA</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDHRA PRADESH</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMIL NADU</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW DELHI</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHARASHTRA</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Q3-16, State-wise discrepancies, Maharashtra state leads at 21% [which means out of every 100 discrepant checks, 21 were from Maharashtra State]

- Karnataka closely follows at 20% and Andhra Pradesh is at 13%.
6.A. Employment Discrepancies - By Top 10 Cities [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

Bengaluru, Mumbai and Hyderabad are the metro cities which have topped in Employment related discrepancies in Q3-16.

6.B. Education Discrepancies - By Top 10 Cities [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

Mumbai, New Delhi and Namchi are the cities topping the Education related discrepancies in Q3-16.
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6.C. Address Discrepancies - By Top 10 Cities [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Q2-16</th>
<th>Q3-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengaluru</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pune</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishakhapatnam</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thane</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghaziabad</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Discrepancy checks only.

- Hyderabad, New Delhi and Bengaluru are the metro cities which have topped in Address related discrepancies in Q3-16.
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7.A. Categorization of Discrepancies - By Component Employment [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

- **Incorrect Tenure**
  - Q3-16: 29%
  - Q2-16: 28%

- **Exit Formalities Not Completed/Absconding**
  - Q3-16: 19%
  - Q2-16: 19%

- **Other False Employment**
  - Q3-16: 16%
  - Q2-16: 17%

- **Fake Document/Not an Employee**
  - Q3-16: 6%
  - Q2-16: 7%

- **Negative HR/Supervisor Feedback**
  - Q3-16: 6%
  - Q2-16: 6%

- **Possible Suspect Company**
  - Q3-16: 4%
  - Q2-16: 5%

- **Inflated Designation**
  - Q3-16: 13%
  - Q2-16: 13%

- **Negative HR/Supervisor Feedback**
  - Q3-16: 6%
  - Q2-16: 6%

**Employment screening** involves confirming the accuracy of the candidate’s claims about his/her previous employment records, with the HR and/or Supervisor [preferably the last Reporting Manager] of the previous employer/s. The verifications are conducted based on the documentary proofs (i.e. copy of salary slip, relieving letter, experience letter, etc.) submitted by the candidate.

**The HR verification** would ideally include questions about the tenure, designation, salary, reason for leaving, exit formalities, etc.

**The Supervisor verification** is more focused on the skills, performance, strengths, weaknesses and areas of improvement, etc. of the candidate.

In addition to the above, it also involves an intensive research on the net, and/or physical verifications conducted to ascertain the existence of the company.

- In Q3-16, as usual, ‘Incorrect Tenure’ has topped the graph at 28%. It is followed by ‘Exit Formalities Not Completed/Absconding’ at 19% & ‘Other False Employment’ at 17%.

* Based on Discrepancy checks only
* Other False Employment includes Active Employee, Not a Direct Employee, Inflated Compensation, Not eligible for rehire, etc.
Check Level Trend from July to September 2016

7.8.1. Categorization of Discrepancies - By Component Education [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

A study of Education discrepancies shows a very interesting spectrum in the Q2-16 vs. Q3-16 trends.

The discrepancy trend for:

- Fake Document, by far, forms the biggest chunk at 40% in Q3-16 followed by Suspect Institution at 32%
- Fake Institution related discrepancies have remained consistent at 6%.
- Discrepancies like ‘Did not officially complete the course’ have also remained consistent.
Discrepancy by Education level of the candidate is another talking point of the Education verifications conducted by First Advantage.

- In Q3-16, the discrepancy percentage in the Graduate level has decreased from 67% in Q2-16 to 59% in Q3-16 [which means out of every 100 Education discrepancies identified – 59 are for the Graduate level].
- The discrepancy trend for Post Graduate level has increased significantly from 27% in Q2-16 to 30% in Q3-16.
- The discrepancy trend for Under Graduate level has increased by 4%.

Education discrepancies at the Graduate level have always been trending on a very high percentage, quarter on quarter, as compared to the Post Graduate and Under Graduate levels.
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7.C. Categorization of Discrepancies - By Component Address [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

Address checks are conducted based on the supporting documents and addresses shared by the candidate in his/her background verification form. The checks focus on basically two things - one is the period of stay at the given address and second whether he/she is actually a resident of the given address or not.

Most of these verifications are physical verifications - conducted by FADV field associates paying a visit to the given address - which makes the verification all the more concrete and precise.

- Address discrepancies have shown a consistent trend.
- ‘Period of Stay’ forms the biggest chunk of discrepancies at 99% [which means out of every 100 Address discrepancy checks - 99 are for ‘Period of Stay’].
- 1% of the Address discrepancies are for ‘Not residing at Address’ [which goes to say that out of every 100 Address discrepancies – 1 is for ‘Not residing at Address’].
Discrepancy Trends
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8.A. Discrepancies - By Employee Category [Q4-15 to Q3-16]

- In Q3-16 - Associate level discrepancy continues to top the graph at 66% [which means out of every 100 discrepancy cases - 66 are from the Associate level].
- It is followed by Middle Management at 16% and First Level Supervisor at 12%. The graph depicts the Senior Management level discrepancies at 2%.
Discrepancy Trends
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8.8. Discrepancies - By Employee Category By Age [Q3-16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE WISE BY EMPLOYEE CATEGORY</th>
<th>APPRENTICE/TRAINEE/INTERN</th>
<th>ASSOCIATE</th>
<th>FIRST LEVEL SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>MIDDLE MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>SENIOR MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 21 years</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 22 to 30 years</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 31 to 40 years</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 41 to 50 years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 51 years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Discrepancy cases only.

- The discrepancy – by Employee Category by Age Level analysis depicts interesting details which basically links both the candidate’s age and designation.
- Maximum discrepancies have been observed at the Associate level at 46.2% [which means out of every 100 discrepant cases - 46 are from the Associate level in the >= 22 to 30 years age bracket]. Similarly the First Level Supervisors has the highest number of discrepancies in the >=22 to 30 years age bracket.
- Another very interesting permutation and combination of Employee Category and age bracket comes to light in the Senior and Middle Management level and age comparison - the discrepancies are highest in the age >=31 to 40 years age bracket. An obvious reason for this of course could be - the average time span an employee would take to reach the higher rungs of the ladder [levels] in an organization.

8.C. Discrepancies - By Employee Category By Industry [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>Apprentice/Trainee/Intern</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>First-level Supervisor</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th>Senior Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2-16</td>
<td>Q3-16</td>
<td>Q2-16</td>
<td>Q3-16</td>
<td>Q2-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFSI</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>56.06%</td>
<td>57.96%</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMCG</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>45.24%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare and Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>58.76%</td>
<td>55.51%</td>
<td>17.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>80.15%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>8.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITES/BPO</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>78.55%</td>
<td>80.74%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>57.38%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>18.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>76.31%</td>
<td>69.78%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Hospitality</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
<td>73.68%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Discrepancy cases only.
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9. Verification Success % Vs. Unable to Verify % [Q2-16 Vs. Q3-16]

- This success percentage includes 1% of checks which are tagged as Cannot be Verified, Inaccessible for Verification, Information to proceed not received from Client, Stop Check, Verification not Required, Inactive, etc.

- Reasons are varied like Company/University ceased to exist, Company not maintaining ex-employee records, Company shifted years before, Client would not like to continue with the candidate’s verification for reasons best known to them, etc.

- These tagging are based on the simple logic that if First Advantage cannot verify them then no other Background Screening company will be able to procure the verification given the same scenario.

- The Q3-16 success percentage is trending as usual – only 1% of the checks have been tagged as Unable to Verify [UTV]. Certain organizations/verifying authorities do not provide verifications [as in their own verbatim] - it is not one of their priorities, what a candidate does after he/she leaves their organization is least of their concerns. Other major reasons for not being able to procure verifications could be time constraints and lack of awareness of due diligence of the verifier, etc.

- Also there are certain clients who would rather have checks closed as ‘Unable to Verify’ post the requisite number of attempts as they are in a rush to onboard the candidates.

- First Advantage’s Verifications success percentage is as high as 99% approximately [98.73% in Q2-16 vs. 98.81% in Q3-16].

- Only a miniscule 1% of the checks are tagged as Unable To Verify wherein the Verifying authorities refuse to provide verifications in spite of several requests.
CONCLUSION
Highlights Discrepancy Analysis [Q3-16]

✓ Although background screening in India is not a mandate like in the US and other developed countries – the awareness and importance of screening backgrounds is growing at a very fast pace. It is being basically seen as risk mitigating tool which forearms employers and helps weeding out negative resources.

✓ The inflow of cases – particularly in traditional sectors like BFSI, Healthcare & Pharma, Manufacturing and also in newer sectors like Real Estate and Recruitment services, according to a QoQ study that is the third quarter of 2016 as compared to 2015 shows an increase.

✓ A quarter on quarter [QoQ] study [Q2-16 vs. Q3-16] has shown a slight decrease in discrepancy vs. verified percentage from 11.0% in Q2-16 to 10.6% in Q3-16.

Only 1% of the checks worked upon by First Advantage have ended up as ‘Unable to Verify’. This gives us more reason to cheer as Verifying Authorities across locations are now more willing to support the concept of background screening by providing verifications.

✓ As the awareness is growing it is also serving as a deterrent for a candidate to fake information and at the same time is encouraging them to be more open with sharing information irrespective of the information being negative or positive.

Employers are feeling a lot more confident – since they are equipped with more inside information of the candidate whom they are planning to take on board and are also happy to have the option of making choices and deciding who would be more apt for their organization.

ETHICAL VERIFICATIONS & VALUES

Credentials of candidates are not just screened, care is also taken to acquire verification only from authorized personnel of the HR departments or officially designated email ids of companies. Rest you can add as it is. Call recordings in the verification process is a routine practice to maintain and ensure our quality. Vendor credentials are scrutinized and cross verified before engaging in a partnership. First Advantage is in compliance with FCPA and FCRA regulations. First Advantage also ensures screening of its employees in compliance with the British Standard 7858 guidelines.

NO BLOATING NUMBERS

The First Advantage Trends Report and its study is purely based on discrepancies as per the Client and First Advantage defined criteria. The data percentages do not include checks which Cannot Be Verified or are Inaccessible For Verification due to genuine reasons, where a company does not hold ex-employee records/Organization /Institute has ceased its operation so records are not available for verification.
About First Advantage

First Advantage provides comprehensive screening solutions including employee screening, vendor screening, consumer screening and ‘know your customer’ offering. First Advantage supports thousands of clients globally, including hundreds of Fortune 1000 companies, by providing integrated, single-source solutions that feature quality products and business practices, configurable technology, helpful compliance and managed services, and highly responsive client support.

First Advantage, a talent acquisition solutions provider, offers companies around the globe solutions to improve their decision making and process for talent acquisition across the employment continuum. Custom tailored for each client, the solutions address recruiting, screening and assessment, on-boarding, and re-screening. As employers tackle the challenges of recruitment and talent management, they turn to First Advantage for integrated solutions.

First Advantage provides a comprehensive suite of global talent acquisition solutions designed to reduce time, cost and risk associated with candidate recruiting, applicant tracking, screening, assessments and ongoing retention processes. In India, First Advantage offers Background Screening Services and Assessments.

First Advantage combines industry expertise with information to create products and services that organizations worldwide use to make smarter business decisions. First Advantage is a leading provider of talent acquisition solutions including employment background screening, occupational health check-up services, applicant tracking systems, recruiting solutions, behavioral and skills assessments, and business tax consulting services. More information about First Advantage can be found at www.FADV.com.

Verifications Offered:
- Assessments
- Education
- Employment
- Criminal
- Address
- Identity
- Database
- Health
- Financial Credibility
- CV Validation
- Global Checks
- Social Media Checks
- Owner / Proprietor
As part of our growing offering of solutions for the employment continuum in Asia-Pacific, First Advantage has launched a complete suite of talent acquisition solutions including Behavioral and Skill Assessments, Applicant Tracking System, Candidate Relationship Management, and on-boarding solutions.

Verify Direct launched in 2009 is the first-ever Asia-Pacific-wide contributory database driven online background screening service. It covers all industries and provides instant verifications through secured online transactions 24/7. This online service facilitates faster verification of facts submitted by candidates seeking employment, loans or for any other legitimate business purpose, with relatively less documentation compared to the current, more conventional methods of verifying such facts.
MISSION

- We will transform our clients, process of determining trustworthiness for employment, residential, social and vendor decisions
- We will achieve this by creating innovative, customer centric solutions and a simple, positive applicant experience
- Our solutions will be delivered globally, with excellence and high integrity, by engaged, collaborative and empowered professionals.

OUR CULTURE AND BEHAVIOR
VerifyDirect™ is a leading platform offering a full spectrum of premium quality online background screening and risk mitigation solutions to businesses as well as individuals. A global market leader servicing customers across 150 countries worldwide, First Advantage provides over 54 million checks verifications annually.

Safe, secure, easy to use, quick and affordable, VerifyDirect™ is a simplified portal delivering the same value and robust services to small and mid-sized businesses (SMBs) and consumers. In India, First Advantage & VerifyDirect operate out of state-of-the-art offices in Mumbai, Bangalore, Delhi & Chennai with about 4500+ employees.

Background screening includes checks on employment, education, criminal history & address amongst others which can be ordered online via value deal packages or a la carte.

**VDI SERVICES FOR BUSINESS:**
**BETTER HIRES / BETTER BUSINESS**

**Companies:**
Make smart hiring decisions by verifying credentials of candidates and employees. Your workplace gets safer, more productive and you save on replacement cost.

**Database:**
Reduce time and costs associated with candidate verification. Our database gives you quick search access to employment details of thousands of ex-employees from several multinational firms.

**VDI SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS:**
**KNOW MORE / RISK LESS**

**Pre-Matrimonial Screening:**
Ascertain important information about your future partner. Say no to fake identities. Say no to being duped in marriage.

**Resume Verification:**
Get an edge over other job-seekers. Get hired faster. Verify your resume and get First Advantage certified.

**Driver/ Maid/Guard Verification:**
Protect your family and your belongings. Verify the identity and address of the people that have access to your house and life.

**Tenant Verification:**
Determine the identity of the person who lives in your house. An essential service for property owners, hostels and real estate agents.

For more information contact us at:
1800.103.5563
VerifyDirect@fadv.com
www.verifydirectintl.com
Executive Advantage™
Leadership Screening Solutions

The Power Of A Few Can Influence The Behaviour Of Many!

The Companies Act 2013 issued by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs lays onus on the Directors of the Board of a Company to ensure that Independent Directors & Key Managerial Personnel appointed are persons of integrity and possess relevant expertise and experience.

The Risks We Help You Mitigate

- Risk brand integrity & goodwill
- Financial risk
- Regulatory compliance issues
- Data / IP Theft
- Assault / Harassment damages
- Negative media
- Loss of customers & business
- Poor organizational climate

Get The Executive Advantage!
Choose The Leaders Your Organization Deserves. Choose The Best!

Here Is Our Offering

- A far-reaching background check
- Led by senior personnel
- Via expert research methodologies
- In a fully compliant manner, abiding by existing laws
- Presented in a comprehensive Dossier Report

First Advantage
A Symphony Technology Group Company
Provides quality and in-depth information that can solidly corroborate a candidate’s professional credentials and background and also helps reveal a wealth of additional information in terms of strengths & weaknesses, attributes demonstrated, behavior, social life and overall personality of a candidate.

Executive Screening Packages

Comprehensive background screening with a 360 degree perspective on the executive hire is critical for you to make an informed decision.

Package for India includes the following checks:

- **Education Check**: Verify education, training or other certification claims made by a candidate
- **Employment Check**: Verify candidate’s past work history
- **Directorship Check**: Checks if candidate holds any directorship position which has not been declared and poses a conflict of interest to the hiring company
- **Social Media Check**: Can be done for India and for Indian citizens only. Checks candidate’s presence on social media, network strength, social reach, online buzz and tone of updates where available
- **Shadow referencing**: Understand candidate’s background, interaction, feedback, mentionable incidents, people issues, harassment issues, general views, management style, philanthropy, integrity, etc.
- **360 Degree Check**: Understanding candidate’s professional competencies, roles, responsibilities, etc. from co workers
- **Database Check (Global and India)**: Provides information on any negative, criminal or fraudulent activity reported in the media anywhere in the world
- **CIBIL**: Analysis of credit score

*As needed you may opt to include address, passport, PAN card or criminal court checks at an additional cost

Incidents Of Executive Level Fraud That Impacted The Brand

- **Yahoo, CEO** Scott Thompson lied about his computer Science degree which not only affected his hiring but also the official regulatory filings for the company
- **Mylan, CEO** Heather Bresch claimed an e-MBA though she did not complete the course
- **RadioShack, CEO** David Edmondson had lied about very serious records from his past, including his academic record and three DWI charges
- **MIT, Dean Admissions** Made up degrees from Union College and Albany Medical College. She also claimed a degree from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, which she attended as a “part-time, non-matriculating student,” and she never earned a degree.

First Advantage provides comprehensive background screening solutions that give employers and property managers’ access to actionable information allowing for faster decisions with dramatically better insights. With an advanced global technology platform, superior customer service and compliance expertise delivered by experts who understand local markets, First Advantage helps customers around the world build fully scalable, configurable screening programs that meet their unique needs. Headquartered in Atlanta, Ga., First Advantage supports over 45,000 clients worldwide with offices throughout North America, Europe and Asia. More information about First Advantage can be accessed at www.fadv.com

For further details on Executive Screening, email us at executive.advantage@fadv.com or call us on +91 7710022111
Call +91 80 4252 9400  
email info-india@fadv.com  
visit fadv.com/apac

First Advantage - India  
Interface 7, 1st Floor  
Link Road, Malad (West)  
Mumbai 400 064  
+91 22 4069 7000

First Advantage Pvt. Ltd.  
Inventor Bldg, Ground Floor  
International Tech Park Ltd (ITPL)  
Whitefield Road, Bangalore - 560066  
+91 80 4252 9400
As the trusted partner of over 45,000 organizations worldwide, we at First Advantage provide easy-to-understand background screening results so you can confidently make decisions about prospective employees, vendors and renters. Not only does this safeguard your brand, but you also arrive at dramatically better background insights—insights you can rely on.

It’s time to partner with First Advantage. Now in 27 locations, 13 countries and conducting over 54 million international background screens on 16.8 million applicants annually.

Trusted Knowledge. Exceptional People.