



SOCIAL VALUE ASSURANCE STANDARD

2017

SOCIAL VALUE

INTERNATIONAL

Principle 1: Involve stakeholders

Stakeholders are those people or organisations that experience change as a result of the activity and they will be best placed to describe the change. This Principle means that stakeholders need to be identified and then involved in consultation throughout the analysis.

The important issues are:

- identification of stakeholders and a rationale for those that have been included and excluded from involvement in the process
- evidence of involvement of the included stakeholders in the application of the other Principles.

1.1	Identification of stakeholder groups	Y/N	Comments
1.1.1	Does the report include a range of stakeholder groups (not just intended 'beneficiaries')?		
1.1.2	Does the report identify any subgroups (or potential subgroups) of stakeholders?		
1.1.3	Does the report describe how subgroups have been considered based upon evidence of materially different outcomes?		
1.1.4	Does the report provide a description and analysis of how stakeholders were involved in identifying other stakeholders, addressing the extent to which it provides a fair representation of the whole stakeholder group? Stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process for selecting representative stakeholders; • the method chosen for involving stakeholders (e.g. focus group, semi structured interviews); • the numbers involved 		
1.1.5	Where representatives of a stakeholder group (identified as likely to experience material outcomes) have not been involved in identifying other stakeholder groups, does the report include a rationale to explain why they were not involved and how their perspective is represented in the analysis (if another group has been used as a proxy, an explanation should be provided justifying why they are an appropriate group)?		

1.2	Stakeholders involved in defining outcomes (qualitative phase)	Y/N	Comments
1.2.1	<p>Does the report provide a description and analysis of how stakeholders were involved in defining outcomes (and, where necessary, identifying the relevant outcome within a chain of events) addressing the extent to which it provides a fair representation of the whole stakeholder group?</p> <p>Stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process for selecting representative stakeholders; • the method chosen for involving stakeholders (e.g. focus group, semi structured interviews); • the numbers involved 		
1.2.2	Does the report include a list of the questions presented to stakeholders in the process of identifying outcomes (and, where necessary, identifying the relevant outcome within a chain of events)?		
1.2.3	Do the questions reflect an open approach to identifying outcomes (i.e. including options to identify unintended and negative outcomes)?		
1.2.4	Where representatives of a stakeholder group (identified as likely to experience material outcomes) have not been involved in defining the outcomes, does the report include a rationale to explain why they were not involved and how their perspective is represented in the analysis (if another group has been used as a proxy, an explanation should be provided justifying why they are an appropriate group)?		

1.3	Stakeholder involvement in establishing the levels of attribution, drop off, deadweight and displacement of outcomes	Y/N	Comments
1.3.1	<p>Does the report provide a description and analysis of how stakeholders were involved in establishing the levels of attribution, drop off, deadweight and displacement of outcomes, addressing the extent to which it provides a fair representation of the whole stakeholder group?</p> <p>Stating:</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the process for selecting representative stakeholders; the method chosen for involving stakeholders (e.g. focus group, semi structured interviews); the numbers involved 		
1.3.2	Does the report include the questions that were asked to stakeholders about how they might establish the levels of attribution, drop off, deadweight and displacement of outcomes?		
1.3.3	Where representatives of a stakeholder group <i>have not</i> been involved in establishing the levels of attribution, drop off, deadweight and displacement of outcomes, does the report include a rationale to explain why they were not involved?		

1.4	Future stakeholder involvement	Y/N	Comments
1.4.1	Does the forecast report include recommendations on how stakeholders should continue to be involved in the analysis so that actual information can be compared with the forecast?		
1.5	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle one; 'Involve stakeholders'?		

Principle 2: Understand what changes

The important issues for this Principle are:

- inclusion of a clear explanation of the overall theory of change and chains of events for included stakeholders
- statement of which outcome in each chain of events will be valued and why
- evidence to support causality in the chain of events
- the experience of all stakeholders in stakeholder groups is included

2.1	Scope	Y/N	Comments
2.1.1	Does the report make clear whether the analysis is a forecast or an evaluation?		
2.1.2	Does the report make clear the activities that are being analysed?		
2.1.3	Does the report make clear the period over which the activities occur?		

2.2	Defining Outcomes	Y/N	Comments
2.2.1	Are the outcomes disclosed in the report linked to a stakeholder group that have (or will) experienced that outcome?		
2.2.2	Does the report include evidence of how the process of defining outcomes was designed to capture any unintended (and negative) outcomes? This may include reference to similar research.		
2.2.3	Are the outcomes disclosed in the report consistent with the outcomes in the value map?		

2.3	Context of outcomes	Y/N	Comments
2.3.1	Does the report outline how each outcome is linked to inputs and outputs?		
2.3.2	Are all of the outcomes in the report given context with a 'chain of events'? e.g. other outcomes that lead to this outcome.		
2.3.3	Is the last outcome in the chain of events the one that is then valued and tested for materiality?		

2.3.4	Does the report explain how the chain of events was created? (e.g. the causality between outcomes in the chain of events is based upon stakeholder involvement, suitable third party research and the experience of the author)		
-------	---	--	--

2.4	Defining Indicators	Y/N	Comments
2.4.1	Does the report contain indicators that can demonstrate that the outcome has occurred and where the outcome is non-binary, how much change has occurred?		
2.4.2	Where necessary, have a combination of indicators been identified in order to increase the confidence in the amount of change that has occurred?		

2.5	Measuring the amounts (quantities) of change	Y/N	Comments
2.5.1	Does the report state the number of stakeholders that were involved in measuring how much change occurred?		
2.5.2	Does the report include a rationale for the number involved in measuring how much change?		
2.5.3	Is the amount of change based on the difference between a baseline situation for the stakeholder group at the start of the activity and the position at the end of the activity?		
2.5.4	In a forecast report is the quantity of expected change supported by proposals for how actual data should be collected to compare against the forecast?		

2.6	Completeness of the information	Y/N	Comments
2.6.1	Does the report make it clear what happens to all members of a stakeholder group? (e.g. if 80% of a stakeholder group are experiencing an intended outcome, what is happening to the remaining 20%? Maybe nothing changes for them or maybe they experience a different outcome?)		
2.6.2	If the report uses average figures on a scale to establish whether outcomes have been experienced and/or the amount of change experienced, has the risk of significant different experiences within the group been identified and addressed?		

2.7	Forecast quantities	Y/N	Comments
2.7.1	In a forecast report is there evidence that explains the basis for the quantities of change forecasted? (this can include results from previous years, from other similar activities of a similar scale, from market research with people who share characteristics of expected future stakeholders)		
2.8	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle two; ‘Understand what changes’?		

Principle 3: Value the things that matter

The important issue is that the financial proxies should reflect the value of the outcomes to the stakeholder group.

3.1	Valuing the inputs	Y/N	Comments
3.1.1	Does the report include all of the inputs made by each stakeholder group?		
3.1.2	Does the report and value map include valuations of each input?		
3.1.3	Does the report include a rationale for any inputs that have not been valued?		
3.1.4	Does the report accurately calculate the total value of the inputs?		
3.2	Valuing the outcomes	Y/N	Comments
3.2.1	Does the report include a valuation for each outcome?		
3.2.2	Does the report contain valuations (financial proxies) that represent the value of the specific outcome to the specific stakeholder?		
3.2.3	Does the report include a rationale that justifies the choice of valuation technique and explains why the valuations represent the value of each outcome to the stakeholders?		
3.3	Calculating the SROI	Y/N	Comments
3.3.1	Is the calculation of the total value of each outcome accurate (based upon the quantities of the outcome multiplied by the value of the outcome)?		
3.3.2	Is the calculation of the total value of all outcomes calculated correctly?		
3.4	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle three; 'Value the things that matter'?		

Principle 4: Only include what is material

The important issues are:

- is there evidence to support decisions to exclude outcomes identified from stakeholder involvement and other research?
- if the outcomes had been included is there evidence that the stakeholder may have made the same decision?

4.1	Inclusion or exclusion of stakeholder groups	Y/N	Comments
4.1.1	Does the report provide a rationale exploring the materiality of outcomes for each stakeholder group?		
4.1.2	Is the decision to exclude stakeholder groups without involving them based upon evidence from third party research (consistent with these criteria) that there are no likely material outcomes?		
4.2	Materiality of outcomes	Y/N	Comments
4.2.1	Is the rationale and ultimate decision to include or exclude outcomes based upon any of the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevance of outcomes (emerging from the qualitative stage of stakeholder) • The significance of outcomes (emerging from the quantitative stage) based upon the <i>quantity, duration, value and causality</i>. 		
4.3	Sector specific or 'relevant' outcomes	Y/N	Comments
4.3.1	Is there any reason, in the experience of the assessor, that the activity would have other material outcomes that have not been included in the report?		
4.4	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle four; 'Only include what is material'?		

Principle 5: Do not over claim

The important issue is that the analysis does not overstate the value caused by the activity;

5.1	Counterfactual (Deadweight)	Y/N	Comments
5.1.1	Does the report describe the approach used to assess the level of deadweight for each outcome?		
5.1.2	Does the report contain evidence to support the level of deadweight for each outcome?		
5.2	Attribution	Y/N	Comments
5.2.1	Does the report describe the approach used to assess the level of attribution for each outcome?		
5.2.2	Does the report contain evidence to support the level of attribution for each outcome?		
5.3	Displacement	Y/N	Comments
5.3.1	Does the report describe the approach used to assess the level of displacement for each outcome?		
5.3.2	Does the report contain evidence to support the level of attribution for each outcome?		
5.4	Drop off	Y/N	Comments
5.4.1	Does the report describe the approach used to assess the level of drop off for each outcome?		
5.4.2	Does the report contain evidence to support the level of drop off for each outcome?		
5.5	Risk factors	Y/N	Comments

5.5.1	Does the report consider the risks of over claiming in all of the above approaches?		
5.6	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle five; ‘Do not over claim’?		

Principle 6: Be transparent

The important issue is that all decisions relating to stakeholders, outcomes, indicators, values, and counterfactual; the sources and methods of information collection; the difference scenarios considered and the involvement and communication of the results to stakeholders should be explained and documented.

6.1	Consistency of Information	Y/N	Comments
6.1.1	Does the report and any appendices or attachments (e.g. Value Map) contain consistent information?		
6.2	Sensitivity Analysis	Y/N	Comments
6.2.1	6.2.1 Does the report contain a sensitivity analysis that tests for sensitivities around the following aspects of each outcome; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • values, • levels of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deadweight (counterfactual) - attribution, - displacement - drop off 		
6.3	Referencing	Y/N	Comments
6.3.1	Does the report contain accurate references?		
6.4	Replicability	Y/N	Comments
6.4.1	Is the Value Map presented in a way that makes it possible for the analysis to be replicated?		
6.5	Transparency	Y/N	Comments
6.5.1	Does the report discuss the potential risk of errors in any of the data or findings?		

6.5.2	Does the report explain the professional judgements that support the report's findings and conclusions?		
6.6	Forecast recommendations	Y/N	Comments
6.6.1	For a forecast report are there recommendations included for the assessment of actual results against the forecast?		
6.7	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle six; 'Be transparent'?		

Principle 7: Verify the result

The important issue is that stakeholders have had an opportunity to review the information in the report

7.1	Stakeholder involvement in reviewing and verifying the result	Y/N	Comments
7.1.1	Does the report describe how stakeholders have been involved in reviewing and verifying: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the theory of change • the range of outcomes • the relative value of outcomes 		
7.1.2	Does the report describe how stakeholders have been, or will be, involved in reviewing and verifying the final analysis?		
7.2	Overall, in the opinion of the assessor, does the report contain professional judgements that demonstrate a good understanding of Principle seven; ‘Verify the result’?		