

Assessing Social Impact in Base of the Pyramid Markets

By Will Swanson

Mentor: Dr. Keith Warner OFM

Reader: Dr. Joseph Schuchter

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract | 3 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Health social enterprises | 7 |
| London's impact assessment framework and the logic model | 8 |
| Social impact assessment case #1 Sankara Eye Foundation | 11 |
| Social impact assessment case #2 Operation ASHA | 13 |
| Results | 14 |
| Discussion | 19 |
| Conclusions | 22 |

Abstract

This research evaluates two different impact assessment tools for social entrepreneurs. The Base of the Pyramid (BoP) Impact Assessment framework, designed by Ted London, and the standard logic model were both designed to help guide the impact evaluation methods of organizations working in developing world markets. In particular, London's framework was designed to help impact enterprises explore a range of potential social impacts within their BoP markets, whereas the logic model is used by the Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship to help social enterprises create impact monitoring and reporting systems. This research uses two social enterprise case studies, Operation ASHA and the Sankara Eye Foundation, to apply both frameworks to determine the strengths and weaknesses of each, and how they can help social enterprises. Based on these case studies, London's framework appears to be a suitable tool for businesses working in the developing world and looking to establish a social mission. However, the logic model better fits the needs of social enterprises like Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA. Both of these enterprises were built around a compelling social mission and that social mission compels each organization to use a more practical tool that translates directly into a monitoring and evaluation system.

Introduction

Monitoring social impact is one of the most important tasks for social enterprises. The distinctiveness of social entrepreneurship rests on the premise that social enterprises create a positive change in the communities in which they operate. When enterprises are unable to describe and explain this impact, they are indistinguishable from commercial businesses and, as such, are unable to garner vital funding from impact investors and grant making organizations. Impact assessment is far from a straightforward calculation, in fact, Jill Kickul and Thomas Lyons describe it as, “one of the most challenging and potentially frustrating aspects of a social entrepreneur’s work”¹. Challenges include: providing the financial and human resources to calculate impact, deciding what type of impacts to track, and monitoring impact in a way that is transparent, reliable, and compelling.

To overcome these challenges, entrepreneurs, researchers, and investors have looked to identify best practices in impact evaluation. The result has been a proliferation of different principles, tips, and frameworks intended to help entrepreneurs assess the impact of their organizations. Entrepreneurs can only benefit from this growing collection of tools if they know which tool is right for their particular organization. This is particularly challenging to figure out in the enterprise-led development sector, where there are many different beliefs of how best to affect change in the developing world. For example, some groups champion social businesses that focus on profitability first and impact second, whereas others believe in impact first enterprises that focus on creating positive change first and business sustainability second. These

¹ Kickul, Jill R., and Thomas S. Lyons. "Measuring Social Impact." *Understanding Social Entrepreneurship: The Relentless Pursuit of Mission in an Ever Changing World*. New York: Routledge, 2012. 178. Print.

differences can have a significant effect on how frameworks are constructed and how useful frameworks are for certain organizations.

| Development approach | Impact Enterprise | Social Enterprise |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Proponents | Ted London | Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship |
| Actor | Entrepreneur launching enterprise in BoP Market | Social change leader using impact first approach |
| Theory of change | Businesses can utilize the untapped purchasing power at the base of the pyramid to create a positive change and a profitable business | Poverty and sustainability issues can be addressed more effectively by using business principles |
| Impact Model Name | Impact Assessment Framework (IAF) | Logic Model |
| Strength of Impact Model | Maps all the different ways and organization can have both positive and negative impacts | Translates effectively into an actual impact monitoring and evaluation system |
| Weakness of Impact Model | Difficult to create an impact monitoring and reporting system based off the framework | Does not guide organizations into thinking about all the different ways they may be impacting beneficiaries |

Table 1. Alternative models of enterprise-led development, and associated impact models

The table above shows how the two types of enterprise-led development differ. The impact enterprise approach reflects a belief in the base of the pyramid (BoP) business management concept. This theory, first outlined by C.K. Prahalad in his book, *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*, is that misconceptions about the base of the pyramid's purchasing power have caused multinational corporations (MNCs) to overlook profitable business opportunities. If MNCs realized the untapped wealth in these areas, they could operate businesses that both

succeeded and alleviated poverty². For Ted London, this BoP idea has evolved past the MNC and into the BoP Impact Enterprise. The BoP Impact Enterprise operates in developing world markets in a financially sustainable and scalable way, along with actively working to produce positive change in the communities they operate in³. To best serve these organizations, London created a novel impact assessment framework, the Base of the Pyramid Impact Assessment Framework (BoP IAF). This framework provides a matrix that identifies the potential actors and beneficiaries associated with an organization, how that organization could impact these actors, and all the different ways these people could be impacted.

Santa Clara University's Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship, and its Global Social Benefit Institute (GSBI), has its own development approach. Over the course of its 13-year history, GSBI has worked with over 500 social enterprises through its stage-specific capacity development programs. Two principles that have shaped this work are advancing the University's Jesuit ideals, and serving the needs of the social entrepreneurs that come through Miller Center programs. The combination of these two overarching goals has led the Miller Center to articulate a commitment to working with "impact first" social enterprises, defined as a social enterprise with a primary focus on creating positive change in the world – consistent with the ethical ideals its parent Jesuit institution. At the same time, the Miller Center heavily invests in the practical success of these organizations by working towards making them scalable and investment ready⁴. This emphasis on investment readiness and scalability shows that the social

² Prahalad, C. K. *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Pub., 2005. Print.

³ London, Ted. *The Base of the Pyramid Promise: Building Businesses with Impact and Scale*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2016. Print.

⁴ Lieberman, Andrew, Pamela Roussos, and Keith Warner. "The GSBI Methodology for Social Entrepreneurship:." (n.d.): n. pag. *The Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship*. Web. 19 May 2016.

enterprise is very similar to London's BoP Impact Enterprise. However, what makes a social enterprise different is that social impact is the first priority and profitability comes second. The Miller Center has used various frameworks of its own to help social entrepreneurs evaluate impact and uses the logic model to help social enterprises design their programs of impact evaluation.

This research seeks to answer the question: what are the critical differences between the logic model and London's framework and what do these differences indicate about how each framework could best serve social entrepreneurs? To answer this question, two social enterprise alumni of Miller Center programs, Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA, will be evaluated using London's framework to learn more about the impact evaluation methods of each enterprise. They will then be evaluated using the logic model, and the results of each evaluation will be compared. This comparison will focus on the potential value of London's framework for Sankara Eye Foundation, Operation ASHA and enterprise-led development. This will thus address the original problem presented in this paper, determining what types of frameworks are relevant to certain types of organizations.

Health Social Enterprises

Before proceeding further it is worth acknowledging that Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA are health service enterprises. These cases were selected because they are highly relevant for informing scaling of social enterprise impact, as envisioned by the Miller Center. Health social enterprises are crucial for scaling public health solutions beyond what local governments can accomplish in the developing world. *Reimagining Global Health*, by Paul Farmer, Arthur Kleinman, and Jim Yong Kim, outlines four principles of global health delivery,

<http://static1.squarespace.com/static/55036eefe4b0fe6c8e833e4a/t/55887e50e4b0617eda6331f1/1435008623541/GSBI+Methodology+for+Social+Entrepreneurship.pdf>.

all of which Sankara Eye and Operation ASHA exhibit. These four principles are that the health delivery approaches be adapted to a local context, construct a care delivery value chain, leverage shared delivery infrastructure, and improve both health delivery and economic development⁵. Since social enterprises, like Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA, excel in these areas, it is worth determining how relevant London's framework is to these types of organizations⁶. Additionally, with 49 Miller Center social enterprise alumni working in healthcare, the cases are a valuable test of how London's framework could fit into Miller Center programs⁷. These cases also present an opportunity to study social enterprises with more data than would normally be available. I worked at Operation ASHA's Cambodia operation as a research fellow in the summer of 2015 and two research fellows from the same program worked at Sankara Eye Foundation. There is thus ample, accurate data to fill out both London's framework and the logic model.

London's Impact Assessment Framework and the Logic Model

To evaluate London's framework, one must first understand what it was intended to do. The framework is designed to capture an organization's impact holistically by breaking down impacts into different categories and beneficiaries into different groups and organizing them into one matrix. This is reflected in its matrix design, shown below, where type of impact is differentiated vertically and type of beneficiary is differentiated horizontally. Impact is differentiated into economic well-being, capability well-being, and relationship well-being. Economic well-being measures an organization's financial impact on beneficiaries,

⁵ Farmer, Paul, Jim Yong Kim, Arthur Kleinman, and Matthew Basilio. *Reimagining Global Health: An Introduction*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.

⁶ Farmer, Paul, Jim Yong Kim, Arthur Kleinman, and Matthew Basilio. *Reimagining Global Health: An Introduction*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. Print.

⁷ "Introducing the GSBI Alumni." *The Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship*. N.p., n.d. Web. 02 May 2016. <<https://legacy.scu.edu/socialbenefit/entrepreneurship/gsbi/library.cfm?id=>>.

encompassing metrics such as change in a beneficiary's income, jobs created, and increased access to credit. Capability well-being measures an organization's effect on the abilities of beneficiaries, which can be anything from a change in physical health to a change in intellectual ability. Two examples of metrics used to capture this would be change in beneficiary's free time and change in beneficiary's access to information. Relationship well-being measures how the relationship roles change in families and communities and how the enterprise affects the general constitution of the community in areas like governance and infrastructure. An enterprise's impact on gender equality or on government dependence would be example metrics in this category⁸.

| | Seller (Producers or Distributors) | Buyer (Consumers or Agents) | Community |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Economic Well-Being | +/- Income, income stability +/- Price received +/- Access to credit/ new debt | +/- Product price, availability, choice +/- Investment required, economic productivity | +/- Jobs, economic opportunities +/- Existing businesses, new competition |
| Capability Well-Being | +/- Skills, knowledge +/- Ability to manage uncertainty, risk +/- Contentment, quality of life | +/- Confidence, pride, dignity +/- Health, stress +/- Time available for self, family, leisure | +/- Access to information, infrastructure +/- Aspirations about the future |
| Relationship Well-Being | +/- Reputation, respect, trust +/- Household roles +/- Social status | +/- Dependence +/- Network access +/- Power of intermediaries | +/- Gender, caste, race equity +/- Environment (water, air, land biodiversity) |

Table 2. An overview of London's framework from his book *The Base of the Pyramid Promise*

These three classifications of impact are sorted further by the three categories of beneficiary: sellers, buyers, and community. An enterprise's sellers may be local manufactures

⁸ London, Ted. *The Base of the Pyramid Promise: Building Businesses with Impact and Scale*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2016. Print.

of an organization's goods or a door to door salesman. An enterprises buyer's may be local buyers of goods, intermediary distributors, or recipients who do not pay. Finally, the community category measures the total impact an organization has on a given area with metrics such as jobs created or change in biodiversity.

Altogether, this system of holistic impact classification is intended to give management teams more insight into how their organization can improve in the future. The first step in utilizing London's framework is for organizations to conduct a strategic analysis using this framework⁹. In London's words, a team within an organization would, "rigorously and collaboratively fill in the cells of the framework¹⁰". This entails talking to all stakeholders, including those who may be negatively impacted by the organization's work. There also is an assessment of how likely each impact is to occur with highly likely impacts prioritized over low likelihood impacts. With this complete strategic analysis the next step would be for organizations to do a performance analysis. An organization would identify key impacts and areas to explore from filling out the matrix and then create metrics to track progress in these areas¹¹. Finally, with a strategic analysis and then performance analysis in hand, an organization could comprehensively present its impact and identify areas to improve upon in the future.

The logic model breaks down the steps that lead to impact creation. Its intent is to show how a resource, like impact investment or a grant, can transform into a compelling impact, like a

⁹ London, Ted. "Making Better Investments at the Base of the Pyramid." *Harvard Business Review*. N.p., 01 May 2009. Web. 29 Mar. 2016. <<https://hbr.org/2009/05/making-better-investments-at-the-base-of-the-pyramid/es>>.

¹⁰ London, Ted. "Making Better Investments at the Base of the Pyramid." *Harvard Business Review*. N.p., 01 May 2009. Web. 29 Mar. 2016. <<https://hbr.org/2009/05/making-better-investments-at-the-base-of-the-pyramid/es>>.

¹¹ London, Ted. "Making Better Investments at the Base of the Pyramid." *Harvard Business Review*. N.p., 01 May 2009. Web. 29 Mar. 2016. <<https://hbr.org/2009/05/making-better-investments-at-the-base-of-the-pyramid/es>>.

healthier community. This is done through the models left to right sequence where resources become activities, activities become outputs, outputs lead to outcomes, and outcomes lead to

| Resources | Activities | Outputs | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-----------|------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Table 3. An example logic model

impacts. The most often confused part of the logic model is the difference between an output, outcome, and impact. Understanding the differences between the three leads to a better understanding of how to improve performance. An output is the specific activity of a social enterprise, for example selling a cookstove. The outcome is the effect of that output for the beneficiary, for example, money saved due to a more efficient cookstove. Finally, the impact is the aggregation of all the outcomes on beneficiaries and the larger community. This could be anything from a more sustainable town to a healthier village. Taken altogether, the logic model provides an overview of not just what the different impacts are of an organization but how they are created.

Social impact assessment case 1: Sankara Eye Foundation

No country has more people with curable blindness than India. The WHO estimated in 2010 that 63 million people in India have visual impairment, 8-12 million people are blind, and 52% of the blindness is caused by either curable cataracts or uncorrected refractive errors¹². Since its inception, Sankara Eye Care has been at the forefront of eradicating curable blindness through its innovative financing and customer outreach models. The success of Sankara Eye

¹² "Global Data on Visual Impairments 2010." *Who.int*. World Health Organization, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.who.int/blindness/GLOBALDATAFINALforweb.pdf>>.

Foundation is in large part due to its business model for financing free surgeries for low income residents. Sankara uses the revenues from 20% of the customer segment - \ wealthier consumers - to finance free surgeries for their poorer customers, the 80% that makes up the rest of their customer segment¹³. By providing high quality eye care to each patient that walks in the door they are able to draw enough paying customers to operate this model at eight community eye care hospitals throughout India. This also allows Sankara to devote resources to finding and treating marginalized populations in poorer rural and urban areas.

The way Sankara finds these hard-to-reach potential eye care patients is through a dedicated and comprehensive community outreach model. Sankara faces a common issue among health service organizations in the developing world: the populations most in need of health care have the least access to it. Sankara's solution is to conduct community outreach and screening camps that are easy for low-income beneficiaries to attend¹⁴. Potential beneficiaries attend a conveniently located camp and get screened, and Sankara will also arrange free transportation to a hospital for cataract surgery if a patient is found to have curable vision impairment or blindness. This is the final piece in Sankara's comprehensive rural outreach model. Beneficiaries are located and screened at their convenience and then for free transported to a Sankara hospital where they undergo a free surgery, courtesy of the cross-subsidy model¹⁵.

¹³ *1,000,000 Beneficiaries and Counting* (n.d.): n. pag. *Giftofvision.org*. Sankara Eye Foundation. Web. 27 Apr. 2016.

<http://www.giftofvision.org/sites/default/files/tmp/Vision%20Million%202013%20Brochure_1.pdf>.

¹⁴ "FAQs | SANKARA EYE FOUNDATION." *Giftofvision.org*. Sankara Eye Foundation, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.giftofvision.org/faqs>>.

¹⁵ "FAQs | SANKARA EYE FOUNDATION." *Giftofvision.org*. Sankara Eye Foundation, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.giftofvision.org/faqs>>.

Social impact case 2: Operation ASHA

In 2014 there were 1.5 million TB related deaths worldwide¹⁶ despite a treatment regimen existing to cure TB. While this treatment regimen can save lives, many obstacles prevent this from happening in the developing world. At the front lines of overcoming these obstacles is Operation ASHA. Operation ASHA is a non-profit that focuses on tuberculosis (TB) diagnosis and treatment throughout India and Cambodia. This work started in 2006 when Sandeep Ahuja and Dr. Shelly Batra teamed up to develop a delivery system that would provide health services to the most disadvantaged in Indian society¹⁷. The two decided to focus on TB to maximize their impact and began a journey that would see an organization, which started as a dinner conversation, become an international leader in rural healthcare.

Operation ASHA's value proposition is that it provides free TB diagnosis, treatment, and awareness-raising to low-income households for the entire duration that someone in that household is ill from TB. This lowers the risk of patients developing Multi-Drug Resistant TB (MDR-TB) and Extremely Drug Resistant TB (XDR-TB)¹⁸. Continuously monitoring and providing services to beneficiaries throughout the entire treatment regimen is particularly important with a disease like TB because the treatment regimen can take six to nine months¹⁹. Without the monitoring and services, patients often stop / default on treatment once they begin to feel better or no longer have the means to access and afford treatment.

¹⁶ "Tuberculosis." *Who.int*. World Health Organization, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs104/en/>>.

¹⁷ "History." *Opasha.org*. Operation ASHA, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.opasha.org/about/history/>>.

¹⁸ "Quick Facts." *Opasha.org*. Operation ASHA, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.opasha.org/our-work/quick-facts/>>.

¹⁹ "TB | Treatment." *Cdc.gov*. Center for Disease Control, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.cdc.gov/tb/topic/treatment/>>.

What makes Operation ASHA capable of maintaining this continuous relationship is its community outreach model. In India this involves recruiting a respected member of a community to be a Community Dots Provider (CDPs). The business this person owns will then have space set aside devoted to TB treatment, giving patients a convenient location to receive treatment. This CDP is aided by two Community Counselors, often young locals, who go out in the community and begin both raising awareness and looking for the signs and symptoms of TB²⁰. Counselors also monitor patients to make sure they complete the drug regimen. In Cambodia this model is altered to accommodate a much more rural environment. Operation ASHA instead uses field supervisors who ride motorcycles out into rural villages and begin building relationships with government-employed Village Health Support Group members (VHSGs) and the community at large²¹. This raises TB awareness and works towards detecting cases. Like community counselors, once cases are detected field supervisors monitor patient treatment making sure each patient completes the entire regimen. Both Operation Asha models make treatment free and easy and defaulting from treatment difficult.

Results

Operations ASHA - London's Framework and Logic Model

London's framework shows that Operation ASHA's most significant impacts are on the buyer and the community. The buyers are TB patients who have their economic well-being, capability well-being, and relationship well-being affected by receiving Operation ASHA treatment. The low-income (80%) buyers do not actually purchase anything from Operation ASHA but rather are the primary beneficiaries. The most significant impact is seen in the

²⁰ "Quick Facts." *Opasha.org*. Operation ASHA, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.opasha.org/our-work/quick-facts/>>.

²¹ "Quick Facts." *Opasha.org*. Operation ASHA, n.d. Web. 27 Apr. 2016. <<http://www.opasha.org/our-work/quick-facts/>>.

capability well-being of the buyer: their health is dramatically improved by being cured of a deadly disease. This contributes to the increase in economic well-being. Once healthy, buyers can return to work, which increases household income. There is also a less tangible but equally important impact on relationship well-being. Operation ASHA helps remove the stigma against TB, which helps the buyer's relationship with friends and family.

| Operation ASHA | Sellers | Buyers | Community |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Economic Well-Being | + Jobs Created | + Vocational training for female TB patients + Patients able to return to work + Income | + Money saved due to TB treatment |
| Capability Well-Being | Data not collected | + Patients cured of Tuberculosis - Treatment Default Rate + Knowledge about healthcare + Access to other health services such as contraceptives | + Awareness raised in community about TB - MDR and XDR TB rates |
| Relationship Well-Being | Data not collected | + Standing in community when a patient can return to work | - stigma towards TB |

Table 4. London's framework for Case #1, Operation ASHA

All of the impacts on the buyer are reflected in a larger scale in the impact on the community. Community capability well-being is improved when individuals no longer transmit and are cured of TB, and also when patients, households, and other community members are provided contraceptives or rehydration tablets. Additionally, Operation ASHA's program greatly reduces the risk of MDR-TB developing in a community. Economically, the TB treatment program saves the community money by reducing the amount of sick people who cannot work and need financial assistance to meet basic needs. Relationship well-being is improved in the

community through increased TB awareness. As community members become more informed about how TB is transmitted, those with TB are no longer ostracized.

The section of London's framework with the least available information is the seller component. When applying London's framework to Operation ASHA, "sellers" are employees, staff members that travel to the field and interact with patients. The only section with a relevant tracked impact is the economic well-being of sellers. Sellers often are formally disadvantaged community members who now have a dignified reliable job. There are no tracked changes to capability well-being and relationship well-being. This does not mean that field workers do not benefit in capability and relationship well-being from being a part of the Operation ASHA team. In fact, it is fair to assume that having a steady job creates a positive impact in both of those areas. However, with such little information available, more research would need to be done to fill out that portion of London's framework.

| Resources | Activities | Outputs | Outcomes | Impacts |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Grants and Donations | Raising TB awareness and finding potential TB patients | TB Patients treated | Patients are restored to full health | Healthier communities |
| | Delivering TB drugs and monitoring patients | | Patients can return to work | Poverty alleviation |

Table 5. Logic model filled out for Case #1, Operation ASHA

An alternative impact evaluation model to London's framework is the logic model. The logic model for Operation ASHA shows how the resources and activities of Operation ASHA result in measurable impacts. At the front end of the logic model, the grants and donations Operation ASHA receives fund TB awareness and treatment campaigns. These activities create the output of TB patients treated, this translates into the outcome of patients restored to full

health, which creates the impact of having healthier communities. The logic model also shows how treating TB patients can help alleviate poverty in a community, as patients are able to return to work. Overall, this method of impact evaluation demonstrates to both Operation ASHA leadership and potential funders how resources, like a grant, can result in a hard to measure impact, like a healthier community. It is very beneficial for Operation ASHA to be able to articulate this causal chain of events because the enterprise is solely funded by grants and donations. This means that Operation ASHA financially lives and dies on its ability to convince people that their support will make a positive impact in India and Cambodia. The logic model filled out in Table 5 is a basic example, but the Operation ASHA team could create a far more complex one that showed the exact relationship between dollars donated and patients treated for Tuberculosis.

Sankara Eye Foundation - London's Framework and Logic Model

London's framework shows that Sankara Eye Foundation's primary impact is on the buyers, who in this case are recipients of free cataract surgery. Similar to Operation ASHA, capability well-being is where the greatest impact on the buyer occurs as patients have their blindness or partial blindness cured. As a result, patients become capable of doing countless tasks that they otherwise could not do. This then translates into a change in economic well-being as patients can return to work. Patients also see an improvement in relationship well-being through the mitigation of the negative social stigma towards curable blindness by Sankara's community outreach camps.

| Sankara Eye Foundation | Sellers | Buyers | Community |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Economic Well-Being | + Jobs created | + Money saved on transportation and healthcare costs + Patients able to return to work + Income | No Relevant Changes |
| Capability Well-Being | + Vocational training for nurses | + Cataract surgeries performed + Patients able to return to normal life | + Health at schools as a result of screenings |
| Relationship Well-Being | Data not collected | + Empowerment of marginalized groups that would normally not be screened by health organizations | - Stigma towards blind |

Table 6. London's Framework for Case #2, Sankara Eye Foundation

This impact on the community is most evident in capability well-being. The overall health of the community improves through the volume of cataract surgeries Sankara performs. Sankara screens schools, conducts outreach camps, and raises awareness about curable blindness, all of which increase health knowledge within the community. There is also a change in relationship well-being through Sankara's targeting of marginalized groups for eye surgeries. Screening and treating women are priorities and Sankara also tracks the number of transgender patients screened. The cataract surgery does not directly address problems these groups face but it does empower disenfranchised members to rejoin the workforce and be self-sufficient, which improves social standing.

Sankara Eye does create a change in economic well-being for its sellers/ employees, many of whom come from disadvantaged communities. Additionally, there is a measureable change in relationship well-being, since Sankara tracks and highlights the number of women it employs. This is empowering for women who would otherwise be discouraged from working. A positive change in capability well-being is seen in the increased educational opportunities

available to Sankara's Vision Care Technicians. Vision Care technicians are young women recruited from rural villages who are trained to be nurses²².

| Resources | Activities | Outputs | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Revenue | Operating Hospitals | Cataract surgeries performed | Vision impairment and blindness is corrected | Healthier community |
| Grants/Investment | Conducting Community Outreach | | Beneficiaries can return to work | Poverty alleviation |

Table 7. Logic model filled out for case #2, Sankara Eye Foundation

In comparison, the logic model for Sankara Eye Foundation shows how revenue and grant money translates into healthier communities and helps alleviate poverty. The primary activities Sankara Eye Foundation performs are conducting outreach screenings and operating its vision restoration hospitals. The output of these activities, cataract surgeries, leads to the outcomes of restored vision to beneficiaries impaired and beneficiaries able to return to work. This leads to impact on the community in the areas of poverty alleviation and general health. Demonstrating these impacts is critical for Sankara because they, like Operation ASHA, need grants and donations. While there is a revenue component to Sankara's operation, grants and donations help fund the outreach camps and services that make reaching hard to reach beneficiaries possible. The causal chain in the logic model articulates the value of those services and shows what impact metrics Sankara would need to track to prove that value.

Discussion

The results of evaluating each social impact assessment case with the London framework and logic model demonstrate that each could be a very valuable tool in certain circumstances.

²² Lee, Jana. "Empowering Women: The Social Impact of Vision Care Technician Training." *Global Social Benefit Fellowship*. N.p., n.d. Web.

Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA exemplify the Miller Center definition of a social enterprise in that they are mission-driven. Both organizations were founded by people who saw a pressing social need and looked to build a sustainable and efficient delivery system to address that social need. For this reason, each organization already has a compelling impact narrative built into the business model and value proposition. This makes some of the exploratory work, that London's framework is intended to guide, unnecessary. For example, London's framework reveals that for both organizations the impact on employees is not explored beyond the obvious jobs created metric. This does present a potential new domain of social impact assessment that both organizations could explore and document. However, it is also likely this is not an oversight by either organization, but rather an acknowledgement that with limited resources the most important metrics to track are those that concern the well-being of patients.

In contrast, the logic model helps organizations like Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA take their compelling impact narrative and translate it into a monitoring and evaluation framework. This is because the logic model distinguishes operations, outputs, outcomes, and impacts and reveals the causal relationships between them. An output, like a patient screened for TB, is distinctly different from an impact, like improved livelihoods for TB patients. Differentiating these from each other is important because it gives an organization a clear picture of how its operations can relate to impact. Organizations can see this direct relationship between operations and creating an impact because the columns in the logic model are linked, whereas in London's framework there is no relationship between the separate cells. This is why logic models would likely be more beneficial than London's framework for Operation ASHA and Sankara Eye. Each organization already has an in-depth understanding of the social problem they are addressing by going through a process similar to London's

framework, but they still need to create an impact monitoring system that showcases their impact to outsiders, who are less familiar with the social problems they are addressing. The logic model lends itself more efficiently and effectively to that task by outlining not just what the organization's impacts are, but also how they are created, which is appropriate for the stage in the enterprises lifecycle that each case is at. It shows how a potential grant for Operation ASHA could translate into a patient with TB treated, which could translate into a healthier and more prosperous community. The example logic models provided for each organization were only a basic overview, but the most in-depth logic models can even show the outputs, outcomes, and impact each dollar creates. This picture provided by the logic model gives guidance towards constructing an actual monitoring and evaluation system. Organizations that see how their outputs become outcomes and outcomes become impacts can create relevant metrics for each step.

While London's framework would not be the best tool for evaluating the impact methodology of organizations at the lifecycle stage of Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA, it could be a valuable tool for organizations that take a different approach to reaching base of the pyramid markets, or those that are about to enter these markets. London's "BoP impact enterprise" would likely find his framework valuable. These enterprises create a profitable business first, and then want to explore what impact they are having on the community they operate in, would benefit from the comprehensiveness and rigor that it provides. London's framework provides a landscape of all the different ways a constituent could be affected by an enterprise not just in a positive way but also in a negative way. Exploring the potential harmful outputs created by an organization is uncommon, so having this in London's framework is a testament to how comprehensive it really is. This landscape can be used to determine the social

mission of a business. In this regard, London's framework would serve as the first step for creation of a logic model, and it would also be a crucial first step towards an organization creating an actual monitoring and evaluation system. Additionally, while the logic model is likely more valuable for addressing the current impact evaluation needs of Sankara Eye and Operation ASHA, no organization is exempt from reevaluating their impact system from time to time. London's framework would be a valuable tool to use for these reflections for all the reasons listed above.

Conclusion

Overall, London's framework and the logic model contribute greatly to the ongoing discussion about best practices in impact evaluation. Of these two approaches to evaluating impact, the logic model is likely the best tool for organizations further along in the social enterprise lifecycle, such as Sankara Eye Foundation and Operation ASHA. These social enterprises were founded in response to a compelling social issue, and have thoroughly explored the impact of their intervention on that issue. This makes exploratory work using London's framework less valuable. That is why these enterprises would benefit more from the more advanced logic model, which translates more clearly into a monitoring and evaluation system. However, London's framework would be a valuable tool for impact enterprises and other types of social enterprises to use. Many of these organizations working in base of the pyramid markets start first as a profitable business idea, and then turn to exploring social impact. London's framework is a comprehensive tool to explore social impact and shows not just how organizations positively affect the communities they operate in but also any potential negative impacts. This creates a comprehensive picture of an organizations impact and would be a

valuable first step in establishing a social mission and creating a social impact monitoring system.