



Deliverable D3.4:
Social Innovation Assessment
Template

Work Package No.3



Document Identification

Project Acronym	SMARTCHAIN
Project Full Title	Towards Innovation - driven and smart solutions in short food supply chains
Project ID	773785
Starting Date	01.09.2018
Duration	36 months
H2020 Call ID & Topic	SFS-34-2017 - Innovative agri-food chains: unlocking the potential for competitiveness and sustainability
Project Website	http://www.smartchain-h2020.eu/
Project Coordinator	University of Hohenheim (UHOH)
Work Package No. & Title	WP3 Social Innovation
Work Package Leader	UOC
Deliverable No. & Title	D3.4 Social Innovation Assessment Template
Responsible Partner	CIHEAM Bari
Author (s)	Annarita Antonelli, Damiano Petruzzela (IAMB)
Editing & review	Eugenia Petropoulou (UOC) & Francisco Javier Casado Hebrard (UHOH)
Type	Report
Dissemination Level	Public
Date	26.02.2020
Version	V.1
Status	Final

Executive Summary

The main objective in Deliverable D3.4 is to set up a tool useful to measure the level of social “innovativeness” of each of the 18 case studies of Smartchain project.

The Social Innovation Assessment Template (SIAT) will include a self-assessment template, through which local actors in short food supply chains can improve their understanding of the local landscape and uncover their potential for social innovation (openness to new ideas, availability of resources, barriers to change and more).

The SIAT will also include a set of indicators for measuring the level of “social innovativeness” within each specific case.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
2. SIAT as a tool for measuring social innovation.....	5
2.1 Methodological framework and objectives.....	5
2.1.1 Evaluability step.....	6
2.1.2 Assessment step.....	7
2.2 SIAT tailoring: the final version.....	10
References.....	12

1. Introduction

According to the results highlighted by the literature review process carried out in WP3.1, the definition of social innovation (SI) in short food chains is quite challenging. Indeed, it was pointed out the lack of an explicit definition for SI in SFSCs and the misunderstanding of SI as a linear process. After the literature review process, it has been decided to adopt the following definition for the project:

Social Innovations (SI) are processes that change short food supply chain systems by altering the collective perspective of the actors involved and their corresponding action mode, thus leading to the achievement of, primarily, social goals that benefit all short food supply chain participants in sustainable ways.

This definition highlights the social goals pursued by the groups co-creating SIs and, at the same time, it maintains the need for these innovations to generate benefits in sustainable ways.

The terms collective perspective and action mode are the ones characterizing the perspective of the definition that looks at the collective awareness of SFSC participants.

The aim of task T3.2 of WP3 is to deliver a **Social Innovation Assessment Template (SIAT)**, an autonomous and self-consistent tool, that enables the self-assessment in SFSCs in order to measure the level of '**social innovativeness**' within each case study of SFSCs. To approach this task, a literature review process on SFSC assessment studies has been conducted and, at the same time, it has been questioned how to measure the social innovativeness. To establish the second aspect, it has been decided to focus on the last part of the SI definition to find the key: "Social Innovations (SI) are processes leading to the achievement of, primarily, **social goals** that benefit all short food supply chain participants in sustainable ways." The Social Innovation process within SFSCs should enable the achievement of social goals and therefore sustainable/blended value creation, that imply (positive) social and economic performances. This aspect has become the centre for the creation of the SIAT.

How to assess the achievement of social goals opens up the stream of studies related to Social Impact Assessment (SIA). SIA is a challenging topic as it combines social research, public involvement, planning, and management of social change (Bakar, Osman, Bachok, Zen 2014) and is at the center of social innovation debate. The main challenge of SIA lies in the conversion of qualitative data regarding a social mission's achievements into quantitative metrics (Grieco et al. 2015). Arvidson and Lyon (2014) state that social impact can be perceived as a social construction. The complexity of SIA lies in this: there is no clear definition of what is meant by 'social', so discretion must be involved when assessing social impact (Barman 2007; Lyon & Sepulveda 2009; Hall 2012). This opens social impact to interpretations of the concept as measured through its evaluation (Arvidson and Lyon 2014). Around the world, 76 models for SIA have been mapped (Grieco et al. 2015) of which 5 or 6 are actually used (Corvo et al. 2020). Theory of Change (ToC) and the Impact value chain (Clark et al. 2004) logic are usually behind the most used SIA models.

As for the definition of social innovation, even for the impact assessment of a SFSCs, in literature a specific model has not been developed yet.

2. SIAT as a tool for measuring social innovation

2.1. Methodological framework and objectives

The **Social Innovation Assessment Template (SIAT)** proposed is based on the development of an impact value chain for Smart Food Supply Chains (SFSC) that implies the investigation of five dimensions related to **impact hypothesis**.

The 5 key dimensions of analysis were identified on the basis of a literature review of the existing SFC assessment models and included in the reference framework (WP 3.1) for defining social innovation. Therefore, this framework blend SIA approach, SFSC assessment literature and social innovation perspective.

The analysis dimensions are:

- **Economic Dimension**
- **Environmental dimension**
- **Socio-cultural dimension**
- **Governance dimension**
- **Fertilization dimension**

Each dimension is composed of one or more sub-dimensions, its impact hypothesis and analysis units. In most cases the analysis unit is the SFC. When this is not possible, the analysis unit is the responding manufacturer or its main products. The goal is to understand whether being part of an SFSC determines the characteristics or practices of social innovation within the individual organization.

In particular, the latest 3 dimensions are the ones that investigate the collaborative perspective of the SFSC and the stakeholder behaviour in changing existing processes, organising activities with a collective approach and in being able to influence the surrounding environment. In particular, the Fertilization dimension is the one related to the creation of networks and the effects on external stakeholders.

In addition, SIAT has the objective, where possible, of being a counterfactual assessment between the SFSC and the long chain (LFSC). The organizations operating in both chains will respond to questions in a comparative way and data analysis is requested with respect to both. On the other hand, a slightly different survey that does not include the comparative element will be submitted to companies that operate only in SFSC.

The SIAT is therefore a self-assessment tool and it is composed of two steps:

- 1) Evaluability
- 2) Assessment

2.1.1 Evaluability step

According to the main adopted definition, evaluability assessments help determine “the extent to which an activity or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion” (OECD-DAC, 2010). In doing so, they inform stakeholders about the potential feasibility, scope, approach, and value for money of an evaluation. An evaluability survey examines the extent to which a research activity can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. The evaluability step calls for the early review of the research in order to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable.

The **Evaluability** is composed by different sections:

- Pondering dimensions and sub-dimensions (relative connection between them). The purpose of this section is to directly involve the respondent's perspective so that subsequent tool metrics are weighted consistently with it.
- Profile of the characteristics of the respondent organization and the related SFC. The purpose of this section is to profile the organization corresponding to its sizing (turnover, employees, etc.), strategic orientations (e.g., types of investments) and the characteristics of the reference SFSC (sizing and actors involved). Moreover, it investigates if the organization operates both in SFSC and in Long Food Chain (LFC) or not.
- Evaluability - this session has the purpose of assessing the data availability concerning the products and the possible span and depth of the counterfactual analysis for those cases who operate both in SFC and LFC.

The evaluability consists in a survey of 24 questions and the expected compilation time is 14 minutes.

The following table shows the structure of the investigation and the relevant information to be gathered.

EVALUABILITY

Section	Title	Information
Section I	Pondering	Dimensions
		Sub-dimensions
		Linkage sub-dimensions with dimensions
Section II	Profile	Name
		Age
		Location
		Intervention field
		Economics
		Labour composition

Section III	Evaluability	Shareholders	
		Legal form	
		Specific agrofood sector	
		Production typology (SFC-LFC)	
		3 main products	Revenues
			Production typology (SFC-LFC)
			Production costs (SFC-LFC)
			Selling price (SFC-LFC)
			Supply costs (SFC-LFC)
			Distribution costs (SFC-LFC)
km/kg production (SFC-LFC)			
km/kg distribution (SFC-LFC)			
% BIO (SFC-LFC)			

Hereafter the link to the survey of the first SIAT step:

Evaluability: https://it.surveymonkey.com/r/Eval_SIAT_step1

2.1.2 Assessment step

The second step after the evaluability is the Assessment itself. The purpose of the assessment is to investigate each impact hypothesis through both qualitative-perceptual and quantitative questions. The metrics will be weighted according to the indication of the section “ponderation” of the evaluability. This choice is in line with the nature of being a self-assessment tool, therefore the metrics has to adapt to the sensitivity of the respondents.

The measurement of each impact hypothesis is related to the data availability of the first step. The SIAT model is designed to be an adaptable and adjustable tool depending on the availability of data and the type of change being analysed. For example, if from step one it turns out that all the organizations in the sample operate only in SFSC, the counterfactual questions with respect to LFSC will not be kept in step two (assessment).

The full assessment consists of 59 questions and the expected compilation time is 22 minutes.

The following table shows the structure of the investigation and the impact hypothesis.

SIAT Model and Impact hypothesis

Dimension	Sub-dimension	Impact hypothesis
Profile	Name	
	Age	
	Location	

	Intervention field	
	Economics	
	Revenues composition	
	Main products	
	SFC production (%)	
	SFC dimension	
	Investments: typology & priority	
	Labor composition	
	Shareholders	
	Legal form	
	Specific agrifood sector	
Economic	Bargaining power	More influence on decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - relationship with customers - relationship with suppliers - pricing - production cycle - quantity of product sold
	Value chain and local producers sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generated value is more equally distributed - Production costs are lower (%) - Supply costs are lower (%) - Distribution costs are lower (%)
	Pricing	Selling price is cheaper (%)
	Access to ICT	More access to ICT (collectively too)
	Access to finance	Better access to finance (collectively too)
Environmental	Food miles	Reduced food miles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - km/kg production - km/kg distribution
	Carbon footprint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CO2 emissions are lower - Suppliers are selected by socio-environmental criteria
	Energy consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher % of clean energy from renewable sources (%) - Reduced energy consumption (%) - More energy efficiency measures (collectively too)
	Food loss and waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced food loss & waste (kg) - More circular economy initiatives
	Packaging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less packaging is used - More eco-friendly packaging used
	Production & transformation process	Higher % of BIO products (%)
	Product typology	Higher % of local/traditional products (%)

Socio-cultural	Labour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater inclusion of disadvantaged people (%) - Reduced wage difference (%) - Higher resilience of employment - Longer-term contracts (supply & demand side)
	Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No unequal treatment for same roles - Less gender gap (%)
	Customers' trust and awareness (knowledge and awareness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased customers trust - Increased customers awareness
	Co-production e new relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customers & producers participate in the production & distribution process - Stakeholders are better involved (higher quality relations) - New services collectively provided - Services & spaces shared
	Food accessibility	Increased access to food (matching local consumers with local food)
	Corporate welfare & community welfare (chain)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of corporate welfare - Presence of community welfare services to address the social needs of the community - Spaces regenerated
Governance	Inclusiveness	- SFC actors are involved in decision-making processes
	Collaborative governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Typology of governance is more informal - Customers are involved in strategic decisions
	Cooperative investments	Collectively investments are made
Fertilization	Influence on public policies	Public policies in agrofood sector at local/regional level are influenced by SFC
	Influence on local actors' decisions	Local actors' way of operating is positively influenced by SFC
	Creation of local networks	New local networks (formal or informal) born
	Effects on related sectors	Other productive sectors are influenced by SFC

Hereafter the link to the survey of the second SIAT steps:

Assessment https://it.surveymonkey.com/r/SIAT_step2

The complete **SIAT framework** is presented in an excel file (excel summary) that can be seen at the following link:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1V_HzSnkIYCbd2-ZFQzG00s-m4qelA3dIVfYUNCeHL-w/edit#gid=471745030

2.2. SIAT tailoring: the final version

The aim of this session is to describe the final version of the SIAT tool and the process that led to it. The 18 Smartchain Case Studies have been asked to participate in the SIAT evaluability step 1 during the month of MAY 2020. As described in section 2.1.1 the purpose of the Evaluability step was to explore the data availability of the case studies to set the Assessment (step 2).

During this phase the feedbacks from other project partners have been collected and taken into consideration. In particular those regarding the coherence of the tool with the definition of social innovation provided in the previous WP.

The case studies findings of the evaluability assessment have determined various changing in the SIAT final version, hereafter a brief list of the main ones:

- it has emerged that the quantitative information about the three main products are not available for the majority of the case studies, therefore the related questions have been eliminated
- quantitative data are rarely available therefore many questions have been changed into scale of perception (1-5) and the quantitative information has become optional and not compulsory
- a mismatch between dimensions and sub-dimensions has been found, therefore it has been decided to adapt the new framework that is composed by dimensions and impact hypothesis (the subdimensions have been eliminated).
- it was detected when concepts and questions were not clear and explanations have been provided and questions have been modified
- the questions related social innovation have been enlarged (more aspects of community life, relations that characterized the chain have been added in all dimensions)

It has been elaborated a new version of the SIAT tool that takes into consideration the findings emerged. The new SIAT tool does not have two steps anymore but it is a comprehensive survey composed by:

- profile section
- pondering of the dimensions
- economic dimension
- environmental dimension
- socio-cultural dimension
- governance dimension
- fertilization dimension

The data collected through answers are divided into few categories:

- number
- text
- %
- scale (1-5)
- binary data (1;5)

Here the link to the excel file with the new framework:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bJaZFAWNx676ECqvCHsuGRf81A9bJ31u/view?usp=sharing>

Here the link to the pdf version of the new survey:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eMFHc5EO1qIGfIly2eHX4G83M_7bdoOo/view?usp=sharing

Here the link to the new SIAT: <https://it.surveymonkey.com/r/FINALSIAT>

References

- Arvidson, M. and Lyon, F. (2014). Social Impact Measurement and Non-profit Organisations. Compliance, Resistance, and Promotion. *Voluntas* 25, 869. Available at: www.doi.org/10.1007/s11266-013-9373-6 [Accessed 23 Jun. 2019].
- Bakar A., Osman M., Bachok S., and Zen I. (2014). Social Impact Assessment: How do the public help and why do they matter? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 170, 70-77.
- Barman, E. (2007). What is the Bottom Line for Nonprofit Organizations? A History of Measurement in the British Voluntary Sector. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 18(2), 101-115.
- Clark, C., Rosenzweig, W., Long, D., and Olsen, S. (2004). Double bottom line project report: Assessing social impact in double bottom line ventures. Available at: http://www.riseproject.org/DBL_Methods_Catalog.pdf [Accessed 23 Jun. 2019].
- Corvo L, Pastore L, Grieco C., Manti M. (in press 2020), "From theory to action: A comprehensive review on social impact assessment practice", 2020.
- Grieco C., Michelini L. And Iasevoli G. (2015). Measuring Value Creation in Social Enterprises: A Cluster Analysis of Social Impact Assessment Models. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* Volume, 44(6), 1173-1193. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764014555986> [Accessed 23 Jun. 2019].
- Hall, M (2012) Evaluation logics in the Third Sector, *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23(4)
- Lyon, F., and Sepulveda, L. (2009). Mapping social enterprises: Past approaches, challenges and future directions. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 5(1), 83–94.
- Nicholls, A., & Cho, A. H. (2008). Social entrepreneurship: The structuration of a field. In *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change* (pp. 99–118). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- OECD-DAC (2010). Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management. Paris: OECD-DAC.