



# Benchmarking Good Practice in Social Innovation

*Prepared by Danson Associates & the GCU team*

The project Atlantic Social Lab is co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through the INTERREG Atlantic Area Cooperation Program (EAPA\_246 / 2016).



## TECHNICAL DATA

### *Organisation*

Fiona Henderson & Geoff Whittam

### *Analysis of the data and document drafting*

Iain Campbell, Michael Danson, Fiona  
Henderson, Geoff Whittam

### *Revision*

Geoff Whittam, Fiona Henderson and Project  
Partners

**Disclaimer:** This document reflects only the views of the authors. The Atlantic Area Programme, the European Commission or the project partners are not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

### *How to cite this document:*

Campbell, I., Danson, M., Henderson, F. & Whittam, G. (2020) *Benchmarking Good Practise in Social Innovation*. Atlantic Social Lab and Glasgow Caledonian University.



## INDEX

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Research methods .....	3
3. Territorial results and analysis .....	6
3.1 Benchmarking and impact studies of social enterprises .....	6
3.2 The partner territories' priorities, themes, projects and activities .....	9
Benchmarking best practice in the Atlantic Area .....	17
3.1 Introduction .....	17
3.2 What we mean by Best Practice .....	19
3.3 Atlantic Social Lab: interim assessment of Best Practices case studies.....	21
3.4 Summary of interim assessment of Best Practices case studies.....	36
4. Conclusions and Recommendations .....	39
References .....	41
Appendices.....	42
Appendix 1: Social needs and underlying factors identified by territory focus groups.....	42
Appendix 2: Aggregated social needs information by focus group session .....	46
Appendix 3: Relationship between social needs and strategies.....	49
Appendix 4: Strategies by theme .....	51
Appendix 5: Interregional reports summarised.....	53
Appendix 6: Study visits to projects by partner territory .....	60
Appendix 7: Pilot actions .....	64
Appendix 8: Pilot projects by strategic themes and regional partners .....	76
Appendix 9: Acronyms .....	78



## 1. Introduction

The Atlantic Social Lab (ASL) has commissioned this report to use the conclusions of existing ASL Partners' reports to generate benchmarks of good practice in the Atlantic Area territories (regions of Spain, Portugal, France, Ireland, and the UK). From these materials, sourced from the dedicated ASL database, the objectives are to:

- a) Identify the analysis and prioritizing of social needs by each of the Atlantic Social Lab Partners within their territories as revealed by their own reports;
- b) Highlight communities and facilitators involved in generating socially innovative solutions;
- c) Examine and compile examples of best practice from the Partners' territories;
- d) Develop a composite report based on these existing findings of each ASL partner;
- e) Present individual reports for each of the five country partners;
- f) Create benchmarks from the above analyses for further use after the project ends;
- g) Provide conclusions which give greater insight into the common needs to be addressed.

The Atlantic Social Lab project on social innovation focuses on “the development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations” (Pinto, Sampaio, Carrozza and Nogueira, 2018; EC, 2013). Benchmarking has been defined by the OSIRIS (Open Social Innovation policies driven by co-creative Regional Innovation eco-systems) project as “to improve design, rapid delivery and implementation of open and social innovation policies and action plans through co-creative regional systems for innovation” (OSIRIS, 2017). OSIRIS is a collaboration between partners, where the benchmarking exercise involves “analysing cases from each region, boiling them down to the essentials and sharing the features that may be useful in other settings”.

Benchmarking ASL actions and interventions is therefore paralleling some of the approaches embedded into similar transnational projects and partnerships across Europe for ensuring that good practices are recognised and shared where appropriate, and identifying where national and regional institutions, policy environments and cultures modify their transfer and exchange.

This report is structured as follows. In Section 2, the research methodology applied to benchmarking the good practices of ASL projects is introduced. Section 3 briefly reviews the literature on benchmarking and then explores the macro and meso layers of the economies and societies of each territory as background to the analysis. It draws on research and focus groups conducted in each region to establish the priorities and themes that each has identified for their respective area. This forms the basis for the substantial description and

analysis of the actions, projects and other features of each of the partner territories, considering and reporting on progress to date on recording and implementing activities locally. Section 4 offers the benchmarking outcomes through a comparison of these activities and actions as self-presented by each territory against the preferences and priorities revealed by the focus groups and other instruments discussed in the early parts of Section 3. Section 4 is therefore looking for ‘best’ as in transferable across boundaries and contexts. That is: the aim of this report is to identify ‘benchmarks’ from what is happening in each area, including actions each partner has initiated during the project period, but also any they have identified that have started without them or had been set up with or without them beforehand. The dedicated template developed and introduced in Section 2 guides this benchmarking. Section 5 concludes the report.

## 2. Research methods

This desk top evaluation of the *Benchmarking Good Practice in Social Innovation (Atlantic Social Lab: An Atlantic Area project)* is based on the reports and other output materials from the national Partners.

The literature on benchmarking, impact studies and social enterprises has been reviewed to inform and focus the project methodology on the specifics of *Benchmarking Good Practice in Social Innovation*. The detailed research methodology to be applied to the work was established, developed and agreed and is captured in the template in **Table 1**.

Essentially while there are evolving schemes of identifying ‘best practice’ and ‘benchmarking’, contextualising to recognise the particular systems and characteristics of a sector, population, etc. are essential to analysing the range of interventions being proposed and implemented. For this exercise, this led to the need for a customised template for benchmarking the ASL projects, informed by an understanding of the actions and priorities of each of the partners and the partnership as a whole.

The next steps therefore were to identify, catalogue and collate all of the Partners’ reports and other materials uploaded onto the dedicated websites of the ASL project (<http://atlanticsociallab.eu/>). As anticipated from experience with similar appraisals, there were significant delays, omissions, gaps and other challenges in gathering and verifying all the relevant and appropriate materials. This led to the subsequent stages being necessarily postponed.

A full appraisal of the nature, breadth, limitations, quality and sophistication of the individual country submissions and other information followed in the process of preparing for analysis and reporting. Being familiar with the research materials is a critical phase in any such exercise and allows an initial identification of the issues arising from the reporting of the projects’ delivery on the ground in each context of country, location, social priorities, actors, etc.

The rationale, aims and objectives of the *Benchmarking Good Practice in Social Innovation* project are based on the need to overcome the challenges faced by respective welfare states as social preferences have evolved in recent times and industrial, economic, demographic, and other structural changes have impacted on societies, confirming context is fundamental to benchmarking.

**Table 1: Adapting social impact measures to the requirements of the Atlantic Social Laboratory project objectives and Best Practice criteria**

Social impact measurement*	ASL indicators to assess project performance <sup>#</sup>	Best Practice Assessment Categories <sup>##</sup>
Identify objectives	Evidence of identifiable need for Project	Sustainability and viability over time; Utility and social added value
Identify objectives	Identification of relevant of Project purpose and targets	Sustainability and viability over time; Utility and social added value
Measure, validate and value Report, learn and improve	Evidence of social capital emerging from Project activities	Utility and social added value
Identify objectives Set relevant measurement	Project contribution to localised social enterprise activities	Utility and social added value
Set relevant measurement	Project has enabled socially innovative activities	Utility and social added value
Set relevant measurement	Project has identified barriers to social innovation	Utility and social added value
Measure, validate and value	Project has Strengths by Engagement Category	Sustainability and viability over time
Measure, validate and value	Project has Weaknesses by Engagement Category	Sustainability and viability over time
Measure, validate and value	Project has made effective and efficient use of financial resources	Effectiveness and efficiency
Measure, validate and value	Project has achieved agreed Local Measures of success	Effectiveness and efficiency
Report, learn and improve	Extent of the scale of identifiable Project impacts	Effectiveness and efficiency
Report, learn and improve	Extent of transferability of Project to other jurisdictions	Transferability and further application

Notes: \* From GECES (2014); # Developed by the authors from ASL report: Atlantic Social Innovation Mapping – A Multilevel Perspective. ## Developed by authors – see Section xx for detailed description of best practice categories.



Particular attention has been paid to partners' respective emphases on prioritising social needs locally as revealed in focus groups and interviews (see Appendices 1 and 2), the degree of consistency between these needs and the initiatives taken to determine whether they are fit-for-purpose. **Table 2** shows the four benchmarking categories adopted for this study to assess 'best practices' across the four strategic themes of the ASL project.

As the key groups for support have been identified as the elderly, youth and women especially in the contexts of education, housing and employment, these comprise the set of themes being considered most closely under interventions to address *Social innovation and welfare services* ('Welfare services', Row 1 in Table 2).

Integral to delivering the *Benchmarking Good Practice in Social Innovation* project is the degree of engagement with citizens; therefore, analysis of methods introduced to promote *Social innovation and active public engagement* and respect shown to their opinions and priorities are undertaken (Row 2-Table 2: 'Active public engagement').

Reflecting some of the horizontal themes of the Lisbon Treaty and subsequent actions, how the partners have incorporated both elements of the *Green inclusive economy* (Row 3-Table 2: 'Green inclusive economy') and of links across from the *Social economy and social responsibility in the private sector* (Row 4-Table 2: 'Social responsibility in the Private Sector') are explicitly included in the template.

In each of these four thematic areas, interrogation of the Partners' materials and reports has identified and highlighted the key communities and facilitators revealed in these documents, distinguishing common and contrasting approaches and types of actors. This has allowed benchmarks and best practices to be recognised and characterised with the aim of these being made available for transfer to other environments and times.

**Table 2: Template for Benchmarking ASL projects**

Strategic Themes	Benchmarking Categories			
	Sustainability and viability over time	Transferability and further application	Effectiveness and efficiency	Utility and social value
1.Welfare services				
2.Active public engagement				
3.Green inclusive economy				
4.Social responsibility - Private Sector				

Note: Projects in the respective strategic themes are scored against each of the benchmarking categories where a score of 1 equates to low evidence in the reporting documentation from partners and a score of 5 indicates a high level of evidence.



### 3. Territorial results and analysis

#### 3.1 Benchmarking and impact studies of social enterprises

Benchmarking has been progressively introduced and refined as a means “to promote and embed best practices across projects, learning from some of the most significant projects from recent years and those still ongoing” (Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA), 2019) with the aim of generating “the evidence and analysis needed for government to make important decisions with greater confidence, ensure value for money for taxpayers and avoid excess costs and missed benefits”. More specifically in the case of social interventions and particularly through the social economy and social enterprises, ISEDE-NET (2012), GECES (2014), Rogerson, Green and Rabinowitz (2013), OSIRIS (2017) offer examples of transnational benchmarking exercises of European Union and other funded projects.

In particular, GECES, as the Commission Expert Group on the social business initiative (GECES)/Groupe d'experts de la Commission sur l'entrepreneuriat social (GECES), cautions against benchmarking for social enterprises noting that “Nowhere in the world is there an agreed standard for social impact measurement” (2014, p5) but that this would “encourage a more informed engagement with partners, investors, and public sector funders”. Rather they propose a process involving five stages, which are analogous to the approach adopted for this ASL reporting:

- Identify objectives: of the various parties in seeking measurement and of the service being measured; to be identified from the interviews and focus groups conducted previously with the partners and others to determine the specific priorities for their territories.
- Identify stakeholders: who gains and who gives what and how; embedded into the research proposals being undertaken here.
- Set relevant measurement: the social enterprise will plan its intervention, and how the activity achieves the outcomes and impacts most needed by its beneficiaries and stakeholders. This link from activity to impact is the social enterprise’s theory of change.
- It will decide this, and establish measurement most appropriate to explaining the theory of change and the achieved impacts, and will then agree it with major stakeholders. In the case of the range of ASL projects for each territorial partner, this will require a description of each initiative offered by the partners and analysis of its performance as demonstrated by the outputs and outcomes generated by the project.
- Measure, validate and value: assessing whether the targeted outcomes are actually achieved in practice, whether they are apparent to the stakeholder intended to benefit, and whether they are valuable to that stakeholder. In this benchmarking

exercise, the assessment will, be against the priorities identified by the territory from the focus groups and interviews, how well they fit with these and how they are performing in terms of addressing these as objectives.

- Report, learn and improve: as the services are delivered and the measurements of their effectiveness emerge, so these results are reported regularly and meaningfully to internal and external audiences. This is being interpreted as the essential benchmarking element, and will be undertaken using the results from the template analysis outlined in **Table 2**.

In creating a framework for evaluating social entrepreneurship, and so for the “identification and record of good practices”, ISEDE-NET (2014, p.8) also highlights the need to identify ‘*Viability over time*’, how sustainable the project promises to be especially against the priorities established within the territory; ‘*Transferability and further application*’, determining whether the project can be transferred to other territorial contexts and other social enterprises; ‘*Effectiveness*’, as with GECES, measuring performance in terms of being fit-for-purpose against the locally-determined priorities and objectives of benefitting the target group and impacts; ‘*Utility and social added value*’, similar to this but more widely offering inputs to the benchmarking exercise for further development and transfer.

Following the research methodologies proposed by these different organisations suggests that this composite report be derived from the priority social needs identified by each of the Atlantic Social Lab Partner’s territories as revealed in interviews and focus groups, along with highlighting communities and facilitators involved in generating socially innovative solutions.

The extent to which they address these is demonstrated by the activities and support for others’ interventions evident in their respective areas and then demonstrated by these initiatives and their performances in addressing these aims and objectives.

Analysis against the template will allow benchmarks of best practice in the Atlantic Area to be generated, and conclusions and recommendations offered to inform greater understanding of the common needs to be addressed across the Atlantic Area. As complements to the main composite report, individual reports for each territory are also constructed, each describing the key issues, elements and findings for the local partner.

To ensure that the ASL benchmarking exercise being undertaken is consistent with the conclusions and recommended framework of the European Commission Expert Group (GECES), the set of indicators to assess project performance in the relative contexts of each territory’s own priorities

The other social impact measure proposed by GECES is intended to ‘identify stakeholders’ and this is addressed here in terms of the organisations interviewed and the focus groups assembled in each territory, and across those impacted as beneficiary groups as embedded within the individual project objectives.

With the creation of this template, the secondary and primary evidence collected in each partner territory can be applied. This is to establish their specific priorities for their own area, the aims and objectives of their interventions, which of the four main themes (Welfare Services, Active Public Engagement, Green Inclusive Economy and Social Responsibility in the Private Sector) they are addressing. This stage of the process leads onto introducing the projects and pre-start ‘best practices’ to be assessed, ultimately being collated to generate the benchmarking framework. In this research process the three levels of analysis applied in the CES Mapping Report (Pinto, Sampaio, Carrozza and Nogueira, 2018) are adopted as a means to frame and manage the evidence.

As they present: “The ASL analytical model was elaborated based on a systematic review of literature and foresees three levels for analysis including the interrelated macro, meso and micro environments, that work in constant interaction between them” (p9).

In defining the micro level as being about “specific social innovation initiatives that derive from projects and interventions”, this represents the focus of this benchmarking exercise - assessing the performance and fit of these initiatives to deliver a resolution ‘of societal problems with a clear mission’, and whether they offer ‘an ability to be replicated in other contexts and with the potential to produce large scale impact’.

The context and environment within which each project and initiative is undertaken should define the societal problems and opportunities specific to the territory and its institutions. These are the macro-level dimensions providing the key defining frameworks of each territory, determining why socially innovative interventions might be appropriate. The meso-level of analysis is derived from the understanding of these issues, the prioritisation given across the main themes and then the revealed promotion of particular interventions to address these within communities, organisations and other institutions of the territory.

Following the CES model, a brief résumé of the macro-level for each of the partners’ territories is presented to provide the context for considering the subsequent categorisation of their specific needs at the meso-level, as uncovered by interviews and focus groups of government and state agencies. This leads onto the assessment of the projects and initiatives at the micro-level that have been introduced to meet the perceived priorities of the area. The evidence collated and analysed for the CES report are based on data collected from December 2017 – May 2018 and so gives bases for what projects were operational then, this information is supplemented in the micro-level analyses and the benchmarking exercise with further materials available from the ASL project websites.

### 3.2 The partner territories' priorities, themes, projects and activities

While the CES report undertakes a fairly comprehensive review of data and regulatory frameworks at the, mostly, Member State level as representative of the macro-level confronting each territory, this misrepresents and misinterprets regional and national differences within these countries.

For example, definitions, organisations, support and other environmental system-defining characteristics in North West Ireland are different from those pertaining in England so that recording of “United Kingdom” details are irrelevant to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (see CES, chapter 2).

Overall, therefore, consideration of regional level information suggests similar economies and societies across the seven partner areas in terms of demographics, labour markets and in relation to enterprise structures.

Underpinning the approach to resolving *Objective b) Highlight communities and facilitators involved in generating socially innovative solutions*, was confirming the ASL lead partners in each area:

*Avilés Municipality* is the ASL Lead Partner in Avilés, a city in the north of Spain. As a key player, the Welfare Services deliver ‘a comprehensive array of social services to the local community ranging from citizen participation to housing or employment, leading to achieving the social cohesion in the city’.

*Santiago de Compostela Municipality* is the lead partner and the local authority of Santiago de Compostela, the capital of the autonomous community of Galicia, in north-western Spain. The budget and tax office of the council has ‘implemented an innovative approach to participative budgeting to fiscal policy and social redistribution’ (see O’Hagan, Hill-O’Connor, MacRae and Teedon, 2019).

The social enterprise agency, *Enterprise North West*, is the ASL partner covering the region of Derry City and Strabane District Council in the North West of Ireland. This development agency for Northern Ireland (Danson, Helinska-Hughes and Hughes, 2005), arranges support, including feasibility studies, business plans, strategic planning and evaluations for community and voluntary groups, social enterprises and cooperatives across the region.

Bretagne Regional Social Economy Chamber (*Chambre régionale d’économie sociale et solidaire de Bretagne, CRESS Bretagne*) coordinates a regional network of more than 100 organisations (networks, federations or local companies) as social economy stakeholders and is the ASL partner for Bretagne.

The ASL partner in south west Ireland is *Cork City Council*, the local authority. Its responsibilities include the coordination of stakeholders and service delivery,

communications, EU funded project experience, social inclusion projects, social regeneration and social enterprise.

As the capital of the Pyrénées-Atlantiques Département in the region of Nouvelle-Aquitaine, France, the *Agglomeration Community of Pau-Pyrénées* is the ASL partner. This community of 14 municipalities has been delivering a wide range of social economy services and programmes very innovatively, including *The Club d'initiatives solidaires* or the *Fabrique à projets*.

The ASL partner for Ave, a Portuguese NUTS 3 region, is *Ave Intermunicipal Community (CIM Ave)*, an association of municipalities. It was established to promote the management of intermunicipal projects.

To meet *Objective a) Identify the analysis and prioritizing of social needs by each of the Atlantic Social Lab Partners within their territories*, analysis of the social needs and underlying drivers of these problems by each of their focus groups (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2) and cross referencing by social groups (below) generates these summary data:

*Priority groups for attention:*

1. Youngsters and children
2. Elderly people
3. Disabled
4. Unemployed
5. Vulnerable people/risk of social exclusion
6. Others

*'Social Needs' highlighted by focus groups:*

1. Educational and training needs
2. Employment needs
3. Public engagement needs
4. Entrepreneurship, innovation and social economy needs
5. Support and integration needs of vulnerable families and individuals
6. Need for new and improved public policies
7. Environmental concern

In turn, this allows the relationship between social needs and strategies to be demonstrated, overall (Appendix 3) and by region/country (Box 1)

As the original ASL proposal proposed, by conducting intensive transnational cooperation the partners will implement and test small exemplar interventions to assess those that are successful and can be scaled up in the following areas:

- i) Social innovation and welfare services;
- ii) Social innovation and active public engagement;
- iii) Green inclusive economy and;
- iv) Social economy and social responsibility in the private sector.

Most helpful for this benchmarking exercise, the CES analysis created a framework of measures (Appendix 4) by recording any 'identical' and replicable measures mentioned during the focus group sessions. In particular, this assessment assigned suggested measures to the four key themes that could then be transferred to other regions facing similar problems.

For this benchmarking exercise, the basis for addressing *Objective c) Examine and compile examples of best practice from the Partners' territories* is established.

### Box 1: Relationship between social needs and strategies

Spain (Avíles and Santiago de Compostela Region) - social problems related to unemployment and training, as well as lack of active public participation and coordination among various public, institutional and organisational actors. Proposed strategies: improvement of networks, more significant investment in training and development, and greater involvement of government offices.

Ireland (Cork Region) - lack of legislation and public support concerning the social economy sector, more specifically regarding social enterprises. Limited public knowledge and participation on such solutions. Strategies proposed: increased networking and training, and high emphasis on strategies of informing communication, both among individuals and between individuals and local administration and authorities

Northern Ireland (Derry Region) – concerns focused on entrepreneurship and innovation, strong link between these and the environmental and employability problems of the younger population. Strategies required to finance activities, both technological and environmental, subsequently leading to new and improved strategies for entrepreneurship and innovation.

Portugal (Ave Region) – needs around entrepreneurship and innovation, with a strong relationship with the employability of the region. Proposed strategies to support entrepreneurial activities and innovation, as well as financing and training in innovation.

France (Region of Bretagne and Pau) – Bretagne has concerns over environmental policies and employability; region of Pau particularly focussed on concerns of elderly population, especially access to information and care. Both require strategies for innovation and financing; Bretagne also needs strategies for training and development, Pau in networking and integration.

in order to complete the Objectives - *d) Develop a composite report based on these existing findings of each ASL partner, and f) Create benchmarks from the above analyses for further use after the project ends* - identifying examples of best practice from the ASL territories and

then generating benchmarks from these requires the reviewing and assessment of projects and initiatives undertaken and facilitated by the partners.

In Appendices 5 and 6, the evidence available to gauge the respective performances of the test interventions is collated from the website and direct communications from partners. These Appendices record the interregional summary reports (confirming the elements of transnational cooperation: Appendix 5 (as required by the project aims) and the outcomes of study visits to partner territories (demonstrating their initial assessments of success: Appendix 6).

Analysis from the interviews with partners of the scope of each project (Table 3) suggests the shares of each target group seem to prioritise younger people with older populations less favoured while the other sections of the population have intermediary positions. These assessments have a degree of subjectivity given many projects have a range of objectives, coverage and so participants.

**Table 3: Priority groups for attention**

Initial identification by focus groups	Refined after project / official interviews	Scope of initiatives from interviews (per cent in each group)
Youngsters and children	Youngsters and children	27.0
Unemployed	Unemployed	18.9
Disabled	Disabled/learning difficulties	13.5
Other	Public in general	16.2
Vulnerable people/risk of social exclusion	People at risk of social exclusion	16.2
Elderly people	Elderly and retired people	8.1

Of the social needs being addressed by the projects and initiatives according to the partner agencies interviewed, labour supply measures: education, skills and training, and measures to improve social inclusion: addressing social exclusion and for improving access to goods and services for disadvantaged groups were both present in many interviews and considered to be transferable across regional and national boundaries; each of these accounted for 20.4 per cent of all mentions in interviews. Employment needs (18.5 per cent) and addressing the various specific needs of young people: in terms of child care, support, help and their integration (16.7 per cent), were also often identified in the interviews as being the focus of projects.



The other social needs being addressed by initiatives were more varied and included ‘reuse and recycling’ (7.4 per cent), and public engagement, initiatives addressing the needs of the elderly, and innovation and entrepreneurship.

Many of these projects again, as with the target groups, had multiple and overlapping objectives and were targeting several social needs so that there is a degree of subjectivity in how these are assigned to each category (see Table 4).

**Table 4: Social needs being addressed**

Social needs from focus groups	Scope of initiatives from focus groups (per cent addressed on each social need)	Social needs from interviews	Scope of initiatives from interviews (per cent addressed on each social need)
Educational and training needs	13	Education, Skills and Training	20.4
Need for new and improved public policies	9	Need for Social Inclusion and Access to Goods and Services	20.4
Employment needs	18	Employment Needs	18.5
Support and integration needs of vulnerable families and individuals	23*	Child Care, Support, Help and Integration of Young People	16.7
Environmental concerns	9	Reuse and Recycling	7.4
Public engagement needs	14	Participation and Legal Change "Make Policies for the Citizens"	5.6
Support and integration needs of vulnerable families and individuals	23*	Health, Well-being and Eldercare	5.6
Entrepreneurship, innovation and social economy needs	14	Innovation and Entrepreneurship	5.6

NB \* Support and integration needs of vulnerable families and individuals = 23% in total

It should follow that the social needs being addressed through these social innovations map onto the reasons for undertaking these initiatives. The information from the interviews suggests some congruence with Unemployment (20%) and Lack of Help and Support for Young People and Children (20%) offering some support for this rationalisation given the evidence in Table 6 above. Next is Dynamization and Urban Rehabilitation (14.3%), followed by Helping People with Disabilities and Learning Difficulties, Environmental Concern, and Access to Affordable Goods and Services (all at 11.4% each).

The final two sets of reasons for introducing an initiative are Ageing Population and Citizen Participation and Engagement (Community Representation), each being mentioned on 5.7% occasions. Again there are overlaps and multiple objectives being pursued by any particular project with contributions to one or more social needs; therefore, these proportions should be considered regarding their overall inputs to meeting the social needs identified by the community and partner representatives.

The transferability and synergies offered by many projects is suggested by the goals and objectives claimed for each project and catalogued in terms of key terms. The social needs leading these are Promoting Employment (18.5%) followed by Promoting Training and Education to the Population (16.7%); these are roughly of the order suggested by the focus groups and interviews according to Table 6. Promoting Socio and Economic Development and Access to Goods and Services (16.7%), Entrepreneurship and Innovation (11.1%), Reintegration and Help to Young People (9.3%), public policy changes (9.3%), Adequate Responses to the Aging Problem (7.4%), Green and Circular Economy (7.4%), and Participation in Decision Making (Direct Participation) (3.7%) are the remaining goals in order of stated importance as analysed by CES (Pinto, Sampaio, Carrozza and Nogueira, 2018).

Testing the comparisons of the priorities revealed across Table 6 for focus groups and interviewees with the proclaimed goals and objectives recorded in the CES report discloses that there is a correlation between the partners' preferences and initiative rationales (about 0.7). However, the relation is much weaker (0.4) between the priorities suggested by focus groups and these rationales. Why the revealed preferences from the partners' interviews and then the aims of the projects their organisations are funding show little correspondence to an extent can be explained by the descriptions used to capture the different 'needs' and priorities. These are respectively expressed in the collection of the primary research evidence where factors were self-defined without a pre-determined set of terms offered *a priori*.

Generally, some key needs and priorities are consistently understood across focus groups, interviews, reasons for pursuing social innovations and goals and objectives: where these are addressing education and training needs, (un)employment, entrepreneurship and innovation, green and circular economy objectives. These are not always present in projects to the relative strength expected by the preferences expressed in interviews, there are more initiatives focused on entrepreneurship for instance.

The definitions and descriptions of the remaining social needs, rationales and objectives are not so easily reconciled so that any simple mapping of needs onto themes and then projects and interventions is problematic. These issues subsequently make the identification of good

or best practice and then benchmarking challenging as the contradictory and ill-defined terms, rationales and objectives make transparent connections difficult to discern.

## Benchmarking best practice in the Atlantic Area

### 3.1 Introduction

Benchmarking set within the context of appropriate metrics is recognised as one of the most productive evaluation tools utilised for performance improvement within organisations by creating a culture of continuous improvement from learning best management practices. Benchmarking is the search of best practices that will lead to superior performance in some development and/or business activity. It involves a process of identifying superior performance or practices from other organisations or projects and to internalise such knowledge for project management improvements or in a business context for competitive advantages (Ramabadron, Dean and Evans, 1997). In general terms benchmarking is a learning process to find better ways of doing things. If undertaken in a systematic and consistent way, it is a management process that requires constant updating whereby performance is regularly compared against relevant benchmarks in relation to partners managing similar social enterprise activities and/or community and economic development projects. A key component of benchmarking is the ability to recognise weaknesses and acknowledge that similar projects could be achieving increased levels of impact and more sustainable outcomes, learn how this is happening and be willing to implement new best practices in your own socioeconomic and community context. Benchmarking in essence is about adapting lessons learnt from the best for the development of an improved organisational or project performance (Barber, 2004).

The definition of benchmarking reveals that benchmarking is not only a measurement process that results in comparative performance measure, it also describes how exceptional performance is attained. The exceptional performance is identified by measures of performance indicators, which are called benchmarks and those key activities that facilitate the achievement of exceptional project and/or developmental performance. Those key activities and/or processes should be capable of describing the pivotal causes which are the explanatory factors underpinning such superior performance.

Benchmarking is about comparing processes, practices or procedures. Processes may be compared within an organisation against internal operation or with partners outside the organisation. There are several ways to classify types of benchmarking, depending on the focus of the benchmarking process. The types of benchmarking reflect “what is compared” and “what the comparison is being made against”. The former involves comparisons of performance, process and strategic benchmarking; while the latter involves internal, competitive, functional and generic comparisons.

Table 5 shows approaches generally adopted for benchmarking exercises (Barber, 2004).

**Table 5: Approaches adopted for benchmarking**

Type	Definition
Performance Benchmarking	It is the comparison of performance measures for the purpose of determining how good an organisation is in comparison to others
Process Benchmarking	It is the comparison of methods and processes in an effort to improve processes in an organisation
Strategic Benchmarking	It is the comparison of an organisation’s strategy with successful strategies from other organisations to help improve capability to deal with a changing external environment.
Internal Benchmarking	It is the comparisons of performance made between department/divisions of the same organisation solely to find and apply best practice information.
Competitive Benchmarking	This is the comparison made against the “best” competition in the same market to compare performance and results.
Functional Benchmarking	It is comparisons of a particular function in an industry. The purpose of this type of benchmarking is to become the best in the function.
Generic Benchmarking	It is the comparison of processes against best process operator regardless of industry.

The process of benchmarking entails the use of historical information in order to identify standards and best practice. In the context of the delivery of project and the project management of discrete projects, such as those pilot actions within the ASL projects’ framework, the process involves comparing projected, or actual, project performance information against similar information from past projects with the aim of improving assurance and delivery. In the case of ASL, this can be a challenge for socio-community, social innovation, and social entrepreneurship focused endeavours through the difficulties inherent in establishing commonality across baseline data, information and processes.

The benchmarking process aims to analyse data and information from past projects and programmes to create a point of reference to compare observed or predicted details of a particular project.

Given no two projects or community situations are the same, project managers and subject matter experts should be involved to help explain any differences, especially when the number of comparable projects is low, and in the ASL context, where the social/community

milieu within which social innovation takes place is not readily comparable in terms of socioeconomic and other community and environmental factors and dynamics.

### *3.2 What we mean by Best Practice*

There are various definitions as to the meaning of “Best Practice”, but in general terms it is recognised as a “practice” that has been proven to work well and produce good results, and is therefore recommended as a model capable of being transferred to other similarly situated contexts. It can be described as a successful experience, which has been tested and validated, in the general sense, which has been repeated and deserves to be shared so that a greater number of people and communities can adopt the process/practice of project management and delivery. In short, “best practices” help to define “how” to best implement a specific policy or project within relatively comparable socioeconomic situations.

In addition, it should be noted that the social economy sector (including factors underpinning social innovation dynamics) is very heterogeneous and generally comprises: a great plurality of actors; different local socioeconomic and community circumstances; diverse national developmental priorities and support mechanisms; and different political ideologies. As a result it is challenging to establish a commonality of factors which are equally applicable across regional boundaries and this fundamental actuality also holds for assessing benchmarks and best practice in the context of the Atlantic Social Lab Initiative.

Recognising the challenges inherent in benchmarking best practices across socially innovative projects and processes we have developed a number of criteria to provide an interim evaluative overview of the current state of play for projects that have been presented by the ASL partnership as examples of “best practice”. It should also be noted that this report is (a) an interim assessment of “best practice” factors based on the best practice case studies identified by the ASL partnership and (b) the proposal to the Commission stated that benchmarking of Good Practices will be identified from the pilot actions (ASL, 2017, Section 4.7.1). We would expect that the final report on benchmarking best practices would assess the ASL pilot projects, summarised at Appendix 8, in the context of the criteria set out below<sup>1</sup>.

The criteria adopted for this interim assessment report comprises the following elements:

**Sustainability and viability over time:** the project/ best practice is still in implementation. This criteria assesses the ability of the “best practice” to be maintained in the long-term with the available resources, adapting to social, economic and environmental requirements

---

<sup>1</sup> During the finalisation of this report we received an interim report from the CES Team (2019). This proposes a methodology for recording results from case studies through completion of a questionnaire by partners and projects (see CES Team, 2019, p78). The initial other elements of this approach are captured here in Appendix 7.

of the context in which it is developed. The “best practice” requires to identify and document the elements that need to be put into place for the “practice” to be institutionally, socially, economically and environmentally sustainable.

**Transferability and further application:** main characteristics (elements) of the project concept can be transferred to other territorial context and other social enterprises, the project can also be reproduced in similar circumstances responding to similar problems. A “best practice” should have the potential for replication and transferability and should therefore be adaptable to similar objectives in other ASL regional locales. Assessment requires to address the extent to which “best practice” processes and actions can be systematised and documented, making it possible to transfer them to other target populations and/or a geographic contexts.

**Effectiveness and efficiency:** the project has positive (quantitative and qualitative) results/benefits for the target group and impacts, comparing with its main aim and objectives. It measures the extent to which the objectives, both quantitative and qualitative have been achieved under project implementation conditions.

**Utility and social added value:** the project addresses the needs of the target population; the project brings (or has the potential to bring) changes/ impacts on economy and society, influencing specific socio-economic problems. Utility and added value might regard: local/regional and/or national economy, social enterprises, social economy sector, different vulnerable population groups, work integration purposes, labour market policies, etc.

The next section of the report applies the identified criteria in the assessment of the “Best Practice” Case Studies reported by the regional partners of the Atlantic Social Lab.

**It is important to note that for this interim evaluation of the ASL pilot projects that the scoring applied to each of the projects against the respective benchmarking categories is based on the reporting documentation produced by the regional partners. It is likely that when more detailed reporting of outputs and outcomes are documented by the partners that the levels of scoring could change across projects and benchmarking categories.**

### 3.3 *Atlantic Social Lab: interim assessment of Best Practices case studies*

This section provides an assessment against the selected best practice criteria adopted by the consultants for each of the “best practice” case studies identified by the ASL partnership. The assessment is based on a summary of each of the reported case studies from each of the ASL project partners. The consultants have endeavoured to provide a fair and balanced account in relation to the scoring matrices based on the available documentation evidence produced by the ASL regional partners.

The assessment takes account of a number of discrete “best practice” elements:

- Regional area and ASL partner
- Strategic themes addressed by case study
- Brief description of the case study aims and objectives
- Results reported by the ASL partner
- Transferability potential reported by the ASL partner
- Best Practice Assessment by consultants

#### 1. *Municipality of Avilés*

**Strategic theme(s): Social innovation and welfare services**

##### Case Study: “ACT” (Acting for Dependent people)

The Project “ACT” (Acting for Dependent people) aims to respond to one of the great challenges confronting European Nations and their welfare systems in the near future: the growing need for care and assistance by an ever-increasing ageing population.

The objective is to facilitate the permanence of dependent people in their house through the training and support to their family care-givers and involving professionals of social services, health system and volunteers. The main objective is support family members who informally care for dependents, to improve their training, implement actions to recognize their work and promote the creation in the territory of support networks formed by all agents involved in the care of dependent persons (professionals, family caregivers, neighbours and volunteers).

##### Reported Results

More than 100 family care-givers; 48 professionals; and 12 citizen associations have participated since the project started in 2014. Additionally, the project promotes two factors that are the most valued by caregivers and professionals, (1) empowerment that takes place in the personal lives of the carers, within their respective families and as a group, and



(2) the level of social support they are building in their environment, with the members of their own group and with other social networks in their neighbourhood.

### Transferability Potential

Two social innovations are reported for this case study:

1. The design and development of a specific dynamic to establish a network between health professionals and social services with family and volunteer caregivers.
2. The design and development of tools and dynamics for the creation and strengthening of social networks to support the main caregiver and support networks for the dependent person.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	2
Transferability and further application	2
Effectiveness and efficiency	3
Utility and social added value	4

### 2. *Municipality of Avilés.*

#### **Strategic theme(s): Social innovation and welfare services**

#### Case study: Local Group on Immigration

GLIA (Avilés Local Group on Immigration) is a permanent local network responsible for the coordination of actions developed in the area regarding immigrants. It pays special attention to details and elements that make them more vulnerable (difficulties entering the labour market; access to housing and health-care system; recognition of studies and qualifications; language barriers; lack of support network; administrative situation; discriminatory practices; ...).

The main objectives of this project were to:

Ensure social rights and resources; foster their participation in civil, social, economic and political life; improve the processes of reception, care and community intervention; and adapt and coordinate the actions of the different agents

#### Reported Results

The project has reported a number of outputs which can be summarised as:

- Four studies during 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2016 have been undertaken in relation to immigration to Avilés.

- Guides on rights and resources available in the city for in-migrants, which includes a compendium of fact sheets on local groups involved in immigration issues and are available in 3 languages: Spanish, English and French
- A guide 'Recursos para la Ciudadanía Avilés te acoge' (2009), includes information on available resources and services in Avilés. It comprises four documents and is available in seven languages, Spanish, French, English, Arab, Romanian, Chinese and Portuguese.
- Awareness raising audio-visual materials which illustrate how an immigrant can access different resources available in the city.

### Transferability Potential

The immigration phenomenon is posing several challenges for European Member States. Promoting their social inclusion at a local level is a must. For this purpose, collaboration among different local agents is necessary. The project partner contends that one of the key strengths of this particular project is that as a local network initiative it should be possible to replicate and transfer to other territorial contexts.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	2
Transferability and further application	2
Effectiveness and efficiency	3
Utility and social added value	3

### 3. *Cress Bretagne*

**Strategic theme(s): Social innovation and welfare services; Green inclusive economy**

Case study: Solidarity Gleaning (Glanage solidaire)

The project involves the coordination of volunteers who are collecting vegetables that are left behind by producers in their fields. These vegetables are then prepared and assessed for consumption and thereafter distributed to food aid organisations. The main objectives of this project are to:

- Reduce food waste
- Promote social integration through engagement of socially isolated volunteers
- Diversify the food supply available for distribution by aid organisations
- Inform and educate people about food waste across the supply chain.

#### Reported Results

- 10 tonnes of fruits and vegetables harvested and distributed to food aid organizations
- 35 actions of gleaning/collection of food for re-distribution, 223 volunteers involved in the project over the period 2015 to 2017
- Evidence has been recorded in respect of the satisfaction of people and organisations who got involved in the implementation and delivery of the project
- Project has had several requests for transfer of the approach to other territories.

#### Transferability Potential

As a result of the project Horizons Solidaires has produced a guide for the implementation of solidarity gleaning. Additionally, the project ethos and methodology has been transferred to Rennes area and Morlaix area of Bretagne, France.

#### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	3
Transferability and further application	3
Effectiveness and efficiency	3
Utility and social added value	3

### 4. *Cress Bretagne*

**Strategic theme(s): Green inclusive economy; Social economy and social responsibility**

Case study: Cellaouate, filière locale, solidaire et écologique de ouate de cellulose

Cellaouate is a factory which produces cellulose wadding, a thermal and sound insulation, made from 90% of recycled newspapers. The factory is supplied by community organisations and ESAT (companies which employ disabled people). The ESAT network of companies also manages the sorting of the recycled newspaper before distribution to ‘Cellaouate’ for final production to meet the demands of the market. A variety of associations (schools, sports, arts, humanitarian...) collect paper to fund their own projects. Les Genêts d’Or, the SSE which employs disabled people, also collects, and manages the sorting of unsold newspapers. The raw material is controlled, weighted and transformed with the final product subject to quality control processes before distribution to the marketplace for sale.

### Reported Results

Project management reports that the project activity is ongoing with production processes and outputs in development.

The production company managing ‘Cellaouate’ has had the same social model since its creation in 2010.

### Transferability Potential

The project and associated methodology and production processes have not been transferred as yet, but project management is of the opinion that potential exists for transferability because of the increasing demand for ecological insulation of the type produced by ‘Cellaouate’.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	2
Transferability and further application	1
Effectiveness and efficiency	2
Utility and social added value	3

## 5. *Enterprise North West*

### **Strategic theme(s): The NOW Group**

#### Case study: Social innovation and active public engagement

The NOW group is a limited company with charitable status which has been operating in North and West Belfast since 2001. NOW Group is a social enterprise that supports people with learning difficulties and autism into jobs with a future. The primary aim of the NOW group is to enable local people with learning difficulties to get the job they want and keep it.

Over the years they have developed a range of innovative, person-centred services which help participants realise their full potential. NOW group provides a range of services including a dedicated training and employment team, a transition service for young people moving on from education, a volunteering programme and social forums. We also provide a Family Service which offers support to new and expectant parents.

### Reported Results

On an annual basis the NOW group undertakes a Social Return on Investment evaluation. The latest evaluation reports that the Group has had a considerable positive impact on society. The work of the NOW group challenges perceptions around the capabilities of people with learning difficulties by engaging with employers, and through raising awareness of the benefits of using social enterprises through Loaf Catering and Cafes and in improving the customer service of JAM Card holders. Latest reported outputs include:

- A 43% increase in the number of people gaining paid employment
- 370 people supported
- 206 qualifications achieved
- £181k earned in wages by our participants
- 22 participants supported by our Family Service
- 7700 JAM Card and app users
- 40% increase in Loaf Catering income

### Transferability Potential

At present, the NOW Group only operate within Northern Ireland, but the ability and potential exist to transfer this model and approach across other regions and countries. The NOW group have been able to inform and guide national government on their policies and this has supported the long-term development and projects outcomes that the organisation is capable of delivering into the community. The social enterprises owned by the NOW group are also transferable to any region. The Loaf Catering Company is managed by experienced catering staff who operate this on a business model but who provide ‘meaningful’ employment and volunteering opportunities for people with a disability. Although a specialist service, Gauge NI could also be transferred to another region as the basic model of social impact measurement can be used across a wide sector of public, private and third sector organisations and services.

### Initial Assessment

<b>Best Practice Assessment Category</b>	<b>Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)</b>
Sustainability and viability over time	<b>5</b>
Transferability and further application	<b>4</b>
Effectiveness and efficiency	<b>5</b>

Utility and social added value	5
--------------------------------	---

## 6. Enterprise North West

### Strategic theme(s): The 4Rs Project

#### Case study: Green inclusive economy

The 4Rs Resuse Workshop which opened in April 2013, is run by the Resource Centre, Derry, in conjunction with Derry City Council. Located near the amenities site at Pennyburn Industrial Estate, Derry, their mission is to reuse unwanted furniture and electrical goods and to upcycle these goods for retail resale. In doing this, they provide the opportunity to develop skills among local people.

#### Reported Results

Since 2013 the 4Rs Resuse Workshop has trained over 200 young people in a range of woodwork and electrical skills and the majority of these participants have gained an accredited qualification. They have also provided all of these young people with life skills training (covering topics such as drug and alcohol abuse, sexual health, cookery skills and mental health resilience). The Reuse Centre has also been able to regenerate its own income so that it is not totally dependent on government funding.

The Council has also benefited from the reduction of costs of landfill which since 2013 has averaged £50k per annum. This saves the ratepayer monies, but it also assists the council in achieving their environmental targets.

#### Transferability Potential

The Reuse Centre is a very simple model and for the approach to be transferable to other jurisdictions, an organisation would require suitable fitted premises as this is one of the main USPs of the 4Rs Reuse centre. The availability of such premises would allow the organisation to recycle/ upcycle the volume of waste products in order to make the venture sustainable over time.

In addition, an ongoing agreement / contract with the local authority/ council would also be paramount to ensure adequate volumes of waste and community support for the project versus other smaller projects.

#### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	4
Transferability and further application	4

Effectiveness and efficiency	4
Utility and social added value	5

## 7. *Cork City Council*

### **Strategic theme(s): STEAM Education Ltd**

#### Case study: Social economy and social responsibility

This initiative is made up of a group of individuals interested in promoting STEAM subjects, namely Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and the Arts. They come from a variety of backgrounds in industry, academia and youth education to address the serious gaps which exist in these areas of the education system. Education in these subjects is under-funded and under-resourced worldwide in terms of specialist skills, appropriate curricula, tools and equipment and the continuity of education and engagement. STEAM Education aims to inspire children to love STEAM subjects and to become the future generation of Scientists, Technologists, Engineers, Artists and Mathematicians. They also aim to provide a framework for industry to sponsor their local schools to avail of these programmes. Companies can provide their experts to deliver the programmes in the classroom with the primary teacher.

STEAM Education provides innovative, fun, hands-on educational programmes in these subject areas, which are delivered in primary schools using a co-teaching model. The co-teaching model means real life STEAM experts from industry and academia work with the primary school teacher, and with specially designed tools & content to deliver the programme and inspire children. In short, STEAM Education provides courses that address and enhance the school curricula, delivered by experts in each of the STEAM fields, throughout the primary teaching year.

#### Reported Results

The STEAM Education ethos and programmes are an example of good practice. They are not only filling a need in society for better education in the STEM and Art subjects but they are also creating strong links between private business and educators and providing businesses with a practical method of delivering on their Corporate Social Responsibility. They are now 50% self-financing, have delivered their programmes to over 30 schools across Ireland and demand for their programmes is steadily rising.

#### Transferability Potential

There is a potential for shared learning of this social innovation and for transferability to other regions. The gap in education in STEM and Arts subjects is global and this model of linking with private business could be replicated worldwide.

This approach, where programmes are co-developed with STEM and Art experts and co-delivered with industry in primary schools is a key element of this innovation.

Through the Atlantic Social Lab project there will be the possibility of Study visits which will have the potential to facilitate knowledge transfer to other partner regions.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	4
Transferability and further application	4
Effectiveness and efficiency	4
Utility and social added value	5

### 8. *Cork City Council*

#### **Strategic theme(s): Public Participation Network (PPN)**

#### Case study: Social innovation and active public engagement

Public Participation Networks (PPNs) were introduced following the enactment of the Local Government Act 2014. Since then they have been established in each county / city through collaboration between Local Authorities (LAs) and community & voluntary, social inclusion and environmental organisations in that area. Both LA staff and member organisations in each county / city have put huge effort into developing the new structure over the past two years.

The Cork City PPN was established in 2015 and has around 130 member organisations. It is an information and knowledge-sharing network with measures in place to ensure that member organisations and their representatives can interact with the policy-making committees of Cork City Council and have their voice heard. Local authorities are required to engage with the PPN to include representatives of the community sector on policy and strategy committees in City Hall, including Strategic Policy Committees, Policing Committees and Local Community Development Committees.

Membership of the PPN also ensures third sector organisations are kept informed of funding opportunities, local, regional and national consultations, plan-making and policy development.

#### Reported Results

At present Cork City PPN has a total of 130 members with 5 voluntary representatives in the secretariat. Although only in the early stages of its development it is proving very successful at creating a bridge with local government.



In the past year, attendance at network events and meetings and engagement with the network coordinator and representatives has increased significantly and this growth has been sustained. Furthermore, awareness of the PPN among stakeholders such as the Health Services Executive, social inclusion funding providers and government departments has seen considerable development.

### Transferability Potential

PPNs are a relatively new concept in Ireland but have significant potential to link community and voluntary groups with local government. There is an opportunity for other regions to adopt this concept and create PPNs in their territories.

Through the Atlantic Social Lab project there will be the possibility of Study visits which will have the potential to facilitate knowledge transfer to other partner regions.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	3
Transferability and further application	4
Effectiveness and efficiency	4
Utility and social added value	3

## 9. *Cork City Council*

### **Strategic theme(s): Churchfield Community Trust**

#### Case study: Social economy and social responsibility

This initiative aims to develop community support programmes for young people in the Churchfield and surrounding areas of Cork City. Integral to the Initiative is ensuring that Personal Development is a key component of the programmes as many of the participants need to make life-changes in respect of attitudes, beliefs and their own respective behaviours. The focus is person-centred and individual programmes are put in place in agreement with each participant according to their needs. The initiative aims to make respectful interventions, to foster responsibility and model open and honest communication at all times.

### Reported Results

The Initiative is person-centred and individual programmes are put in place in agreement with each participant according to their needs. Programmes which have been developed to meet participants needs include a Literacy Support Programme, a Crafts Initiative, a Food Supply Service, a Women’s Group Progression for Change initiative and a Garden Café. Churchfield also works closely with other initiatives (e.g. Sailing into Wellness) to benefit its participants.

Examples of measures of success from their 2016 annual report include:

- 103 beneficiaries passing through their addition counsellors;
- 80 beneficiaries through their outreach programme; and
- 42 through their substance misuse programme.

In terms of qualitative measures, feedback from participants in their Sailing into Wellness programme (introducing participants to the benefits of sailing for mental health and wellbeing). Included benefits such as ‘Good for Self-esteem’ and a ‘Confidence Booster’.

Feedback from participants of the Women’s Group Progression for Change included ‘Happy with the education aspect’, ‘Learned new information regarding anxiety / sensations / thoughts and emotions’ and ‘Liked the diagrams that described feelings and behaviours’.

Separately a review was conducted with Cork University Hospital (CUH) with vegetables and herbs, concluded that the project had potential to grow and provide new opportunities for Churchfield to work closely with the Health Service Executive (HSE) Community Work department, other HSE partners and CUH. The review also noted that the project had provided a range of new skills to Churchfield beneficiaries and there were opportunities to set up other similar projects supplying other hospitals and other suitable outlets with produce.

### Transferability Potential

There is a potential for shared learning and for transferability to other regions. Communities with high rates of substance misuse, youth unemployment or youths with offending behaviour would benefit from the person-centred approach of Churchfield Community Trust.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	4
Transferability and further application	4
Effectiveness and efficiency	4
Utility and social added value	4



10. *University of Pau and the Pays de l'Adour*

**Strategic theme(s): Senior White Paper**

Case study: Social innovation and welfare services

In the form of a “white paper for seniors “, this original, innovative project relies on several coordinated dimensions to respond to population ageing issues, which include: the offer of services focused on healthy and active-ageing and the prevention of loss of autonomy; habitat-adapted answers; and integration of new technologies. Individual projects developed to address these issues aim to build, with the involved parties within the regional area, innovation for health, autonomy and well-being via three distinct responses: (1) the experimentation of the urban renewal of the Saragosse district; (2) the diversification of the activities of the Pau’s institution hosting dependant elderly individuals; and (3) the home for seniors and caregivers.

Reported Results

Project management report that the Social Cohesion Direction believes that the solutions developed and implemented by this Initiative represent best practices in the sense that they respond to clearly identified social needs. These needs were assessed by a multidimensional approach assessing priorities based on the perceptions of professionals and users and on the basis of a socio-demographic diagnosis (highlighting demographic, sociological and urban factors).

Transferability Potential

Project management considers in the context of ‘transferability potential’ that at National and European level, capitalization presentations will be organized with the national bodies of the Social Cohesion Direction (professional network of local social action structures and action executives) and the European political authorities (Parliament, Committees of Regions...) in partnership with the office of the Region of New Aquitaine in Brussels.

At local level, most information is shared between the Social Cohesion Direction and the regional management teams within Pau's regional area. It is considered that since the information and the practice is mutually beneficial this will facilitate the transfer of knowledge and action sharing with other towns across the regional area.

Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	3
Transferability and further application	3
Effectiveness and efficiency	3
Utility and social added value	4

11. *University of Pau and the Pays de l'Adour*

**Strategic theme(s): Social innovation and welfare services**

Case study: "Silver & Co" - Saragosse area

"Silver & Co" is a policy initiative that aims to deploy a chain of coordinated housing / service responses that promote the prevention of loss of independence. The initial goal of the initiative is to carry out an experimental and innovative project in Pau's Saragosse area, by a project extending the Urban Renewal Programme (in charge of the renovation of 1,400/2,700 accommodation spaces existing in this area). The final goal is to extend the most successful initiatives to the whole town of Pau.

The overall aim is to develop an offer that helps the 'seniors to age better' in their living environment by:

- Creating 140 fully equipped lodgings to complement the 1,400 renovated ones in the targeted zone;
- Improving the layout of common areas/ spaces close to the entrance of the public housing;
- A proposal to adapt the layout of public spaces;
- Creation of a supply of services via a social and joint intergenerational concierge; and
- Over the medium term, consideration given to establishing a health and an entrepreneurial hub in central district.

Reported Results

Through dis-aggregating the range of needs and skills available/required during the implementation phase it is possible to explain why the solutions adopted are considered as "best practices". At the outset, through engagement with participants and by taking part in the consultation process to identify their respective social needs, this has been reported as supporting and/or classifying social innovation. Additionally, through utilising the technical skills from other management sources, it is possible to identify clear and transparent communication as a key factor in driving the success of local social innovation.

Transferability Potential

Project management has reported that at the local level, the defined sharing and transversal functioning between Pau town and agglomeration Directions, including collaboration in terms of information and competency sharing, is essential to project success. (The transferability potential of this project has not been clarified).

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	3
Transferability and further application	2
Effectiveness and efficiency	3
Utility and social added value	3

#### 12. *City Council of Santiago de Compostela*

**Strategic theme(s): Social innovation and active public engagement; Social economy and social responsibility**

#### Case study: Equal Compostela Social

This initiative is being reported as having established new methodologies at the Councils within the borough (and other participating entities) on the handling of self-employment procedures and social economy.

Employment search procedures were treated in an integrative manner. Such an approach allowed Councils, when the financial crisis came about, to have in place mechanisms oriented to supporting the social economy in order to provide a response to self-employment requirements, both from the groups in permanent risk of social exclusion and to individuals who found themselves in a unstable social situation as a result of the wider impact of the financial crisis.

#### Reported Results

The number of participants supported by this Initiative was 213. The project is no longer active.

#### Transferability Potential

The transferability potential of this project has not been clarified.

### Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	1
Transferability and further application	1
Effectiveness and efficiency	2
Utility and social added value	3

13. *City Council of Santiago de Compostela*

**Strategic theme(s): Social innovation and welfare services; Social innovation and active public engagement; Social economy and social responsibility**

Case study: Decide Madrid

In order to develop tools for the participation of the citizens, the City Council created a technological platform focused on encouraging the participation of Madrid residents in the management of city issues: the platform was/is the open-government website 'Decide Madrid'.

This platform hosts the participation tools which, from a bi-directional perspective, allow the residents to state their social needs and proposals, and suggest/enquire of the administration about decisions of particular importance for the city. The platform 'Decide Madrid' has been developed with free software, which allows it to be shared with other entities that might request the source code in order to implement themselves the platform.

Reported Results

No identifiable results reported

Transferability Potential

The transferability potential of this project has not been fully clarified. However, project management report that over 30 local and regional entities in Spain and Latin America have already presented a protocol by which they will use the digital platform for citizen participation.

Initial Assessment

Best Practice Assessment Category	Score: (1 = low evidence; 5 = high evidence)
Sustainability and viability over time	2
Transferability and further application	1
Effectiveness and efficiency	3
Utility and social added value	4

*3.4 Summary of interim assessment of Best Practices case studies*

Collating the above sets of assessments is captured in the table below. This reveals a substantial range of best practice scores: from 7 and 8 up to 19 (out of a maximum possible 20), with averages (out of 5) from 2 to 4.75. This suggests that some projects and initiatives are offering features of best practice, four recording assessment scores of 16 or above, averaging 4 or over and none of these had any element below 4, while others clearly are

either still in the process of development and learning or have been discontinued for performances that do not promise to improve or fail to show good practice.

There are variations across the four categories also with all projects tending to do well in delivering 'Utility and social added value' (averaging 3.77 out of 5) followed by 'Effectiveness and efficiency' (average of 3.31, although two cases were rated at 2); there was greater diversity in the 'Sustainability and viability over time' of projects (average 2.92, with scores between 1 and 5) and in 'Transferability and further application', a key objective of this ASL collaboration which presently is scoring on average 2.69 with five cases at 1 or 2 out of 5.



**Table 6: Summary results of best practice assessment by project/best practice case study**

<b>Best Practice Assessment Category</b>	<b>P1</b>	<b>P2</b>	<b>P3</b>	<b>P4</b>	<b>P5</b>	<b>P6</b>	<b>P7</b>	<b>P8</b>	<b>P9</b>	<b>P10</b>	<b>P11</b>	<b>P12</b>	<b>P13</b>
Sustainability and viability over time	2	2	3	2	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	1	2
Transferability and further application	2	2	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	1	1
Effectiveness and efficiency	3	3	3	2	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3
Utility and social added value	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	4	4	3	3	4
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Average</b>	2.75	2.5	3	2	4.75	4.25	4.25	3.5	4	3.25	2.75	1.75	2.5

## 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The objectives of this benchmarking exercise have been to:

- a) Identify the analysis and prioritizing of social needs by each of the Atlantic Social Lab Partners within their territories as revealed by their own reports;
- b) Highlight communities and facilitators involved in generating socially innovative solutions;
- c) Examine and compile examples of best practice from the Partners' territories;
- d) Develop a composite report based on these existing findings of each ASL partner;
- e) Present individual reports for each of the five country partners;
- f) Create benchmarks from the above analyses for further use after the project ends;
- g) Provide conclusions which give greater insight into the common needs to be addressed.

After establishing the meanings and approaches to benchmarking and impact analysis of social innovations through social enterprises (Sections 2 and 3.1), these objectives have been tackled through a recording of how the partners of each territory have analysed their socio-economic challenges and the priorities to be addressed (Objective a) - Section 3.2); this has incorporated revealing the key players (Objective b) - Section 3.2).

Template analysis based on Tables 1 and 2 has been applied to identify examples of best practice (Objective C – Section 3.3), which allowed an attempt at benchmarking what works and a process for considering the development and maturing of existing and forthcoming initiatives and innovative interventions in the partners' territories (Objective f – Section 4).

This report (Objective d) – Section 5) pulls the analyses together and present the findings and is now being used to generate the individual partner reports for each country (objective e). The conclusions to this benchmarking exercise (Objective g), including recommendations, now follow.

This report has offered an interim assessment of the reported Best Practices Case Studies and, with limited information and intelligence available on the results of projects, Section 4.4 has presented the outcome of the assessment exercise undertaken here.

As the ASL partners do not appear to have agreed and applied a consistent set of their own measures of performance and success to indicate 'best practice', an essential stage in benchmarking – recording 'best practices', has not as yet been addressed.

**That confirms that it is premature to conclude which projects and practices are 'best' or 'benchmarks' and this should follow over the next year as the ASL partners and collaboration adopt a consistent means to measure and then identify best practices across**

**the dimensions of ‘Sustainability and viability over time’, ‘Transferability and further application’, ‘Effectiveness and efficiency’, and ‘Utility and social added value’.**

It follows from this recommended approach that the data on these dimensions of performance and process need to be available for the identification of best practice and then benchmarking to be undertaken. This requires the ASL partners to agree and implement a strategy for collecting and submitting data on projects and case studies as soon as possible. The approach and appendix in CES Team (2019) seem to offer a sensible means to achieve this objective. Making sure that reporting of this information and data is adequate is an essential stage in the benchmarking exercise, therefore, and follows from the need for agreement on data collection.

The social innovation benchmarks to be tested should also be identified and agreed and particular forms have been suggested in this report as being sensible and appropriate for the ASL collaboration. Complementing this, partners need to agree on a set of consistent performance measures across similar strategic themes. It is essential to ensure that the narrative and underlying links between: social needs - strategies - themes – projects – objectives – expected results – performance indicators – reported results are understood, clear to all involved and applied. This then requires the need for all to adhere to reporting templates and timetables.

As with any exercise in monitoring and evaluation, the stated objective of the ASL partnership to identify best practice and generate benchmarks for others from these essentially requires testing finalised results against original objectives, and so the latter must be explicit and the performance indicators agreed and adopted. It then necessitates an evaluation that objectively “evaluates” performance and outputs/outcomes rather than a mechanistic description of activities and indicators.

There is a particular need for the partners to consider the community engagement processes and elements of “best practice” as presently these are not fully documented in the reporting procedures to fully capture aspects of social innovation.

Overall, the benchmarking exercise must have completed projects before assessment is undertaken on the achievement of objectives in order to have a consistent foundational baseline for “best practice” assessment.

## References

- ASL (2017) Project Approved Form, EAPA\_246/2016, *Contratualisation Final from EAPA\_246\_2016 - Atlantic-Social-Lab\_Definitive.pdf*, ASL.
- Barber E. (2004) 'Benchmarking the management of projects: a review of current thinking', *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(4), 301-307.
- CES Team (2019) 'Social innovation pilot actions in the Atlantic Area. A proposal for monitoring impacts', Atlantic Social Lab and Centro de Estudos Sociais: Coimbra.
- EC (European Commission) (2013) *Guide to Social Innovation*, [http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/20182/84453/Guide\\_to\\_Social\\_Innovation.pdf](http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/20182/84453/Guide_to_Social_Innovation.pdf).
- GECES (2014) *Proposed Approaches to Social Impact Measurement in European Commission legislation and in practice relating to EuSEFs and the EaSI*, GECES Sub-group on Impact, <http://ec.europa.eu/social/publications>.
- Danson, M., Helinska-Hughes, E. and Hughes, M. (2005) RDAs and benchmarking: learning from good practice when the model has broken, *Public Policy and Administration*, 20(3), 4–22.
- Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA) (2019) *Best Practice in Benchmarking*, [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/783525/6.5341\\_IPA\\_Benchmarking\\_doc\\_FINAL\\_Web\\_050319.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/783525/6.5341_IPA_Benchmarking_doc_FINAL_Web_050319.pdf)
- Innovative Social Enterprise Development Network (ISEDE-NET) (2012) *Benchmarking Study on Social Entrepreneurship*, [http://www.southeast-europe.net/en/projects/approved\\_projects/?id=93](http://www.southeast-europe.net/en/projects/approved_projects/?id=93).
- O'Hagan, A., Hill-O'Connor, C, MacRae, C. and Teedon, P. (2019) Evaluation of participatory budgeting activity in Scotland 2016-2018, *Research Findings No. 14/2019*, Social Research, Scottish Government.
- OSIRIS (2017) *Benchmarking Good Practices*, <https://www.interregeurope.eu/osiris/news/news-article/750/benchmarking-good-practices/>
- Pinto, H., Sampaio, F., Carrozza, C. and Nogueira, C. (eds.) (2018) 'Atlantic social innovation mapping: a multilevel perspective', Atlantic Social Lab and Centro de Estudos Sociais: Coimbra.
- Ramabadron R., Dean Jr., J., and Evans, J. (1997) 'Benchmarking and project management: a review and organizational model', *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 4(1), 47-58.
- Rogerson, A., Green, M. and Rabinowitz, G. (2013) 'Mixing business and social. What is a social enterprise and how can we recognise one?', ODI Working Paper, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8755.pdf>.
- Ryan, J. (2016) 'Criteria to select best practices - a proposal from the Commission', [https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/major\\_chronic\\_diseases/docs/ev\\_20161130\\_co01\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/major_chronic_diseases/docs/ev_20161130_co01_en.pdf).

## Appendices

### *Appendix 1: Social needs and underlying factors identified by territory focus groups*

#### *Avilés Municipality*

##### Hierarchy of social needs

- 1) Problems related to Training and Employment;
- 2) Problems related to Formal Education;
- 3) Problems related to Primary and Secondary Social Support Networks;
- 4) Problems related to Active Participation of Vulnerable People;
- 5) Problems related to Recreational and Leisure Programs

##### Factors underlying needs:

- 1) access and use of public resources for people at risk of exclusion
- 2) unemployment.

#### *Santiago de Compostela City Council*

##### Hierarchy of social needs

- 1) Social and community assessment of the municipality, which must be oriented to real necessities and be unified, even if it is carried out by parishes and neighbourhoods;
- 2) Encouragement, through education, to participate;
- 3) Higher focus on the people;
- 4) Unifying approach;
- 5) The problems regarding the weakness of civic participation. Necessary but very hard to define rights and responsibilities in participation

##### Factors underlying needs:

- 1) Poor civic participation and engagement

#### *Enterprise North West*

##### Hierarchy of social needs

- 2) More opportunities/ jobs for young people;
- 3) More locally based jobs for people from disadvantaged communities;
- 4) Increased levels of entrepreneurship and innovation;
- 5) More locally based jobs based in the community;
- 6) Further support for mental health;
- 7) Further support for families (early intervention).

Factors underlying needs:

- 1) Labour market information and intelligence
- 2) Incomplete local and circular economy
- 3) Poor local enterprise and economic eco-system
- 4) Mental and other health problems
- 5) Need for support within the family

*Cork City Council*

**Focus Group 1 - Social Economy/Social Enterprises**

Hierarchy of social needs

- 1) The rigidity of public and governmental policies concerning social enterprises;
- 2) Employment in social enterprises is precarious and complicated. They need more support so that people can work in these organisations at full time;
- 3) Lack of expertise in social enterprises which needs to be filled;
- 4) Need for more research and analysis into the costs and benefits of social enterprise employment;
- 5) Need to identify and value currencies other than money when measuring the costs and benefits of social enterprises;
- 6) The gap in the governance capacity of boards of social enterprises which needs to be addressed.

Factors underlying needs:

- 1) lack of legislation and clear definition concerning the social enterprises
- 2) lack of institutional and governmental support to the social enterprises
- 3) lack of clear understanding and analysis of the social benefits that social enterprises can bring to society

**Focus Group 2 – Public Engagement**

Hierarchy of social needs

- 1) Related to public engagement:
- 2) lack of knowledge of the structures available to engage with.;
- 3) There is a need for new groups and communities to be stimulated to engage. These new communities or groups need not be geographical;
- 4) specific gap in relation to the more disadvantaged communities in the city and their voice at a city-level.

Factors underlying needs:

- 1) People are unclear as to where they should go to engage with government on different issues
- 2) narrow range of elite people and groups who participate and engage all the time.
- 3) Some structures which had previously been very strong in the city have been weakened in recent years

*Regional Chamber of Social and Solidarity Economy of Bretagne*

Hierarchy of social needs

- 1) Coping with dwindling natural resources
- 2) Necessities regarding social ties
- 3) Work-related needs

Factors underlying needs:

- 1) significant concern with the reduction of the intensive use of natural resources
- 2) wide range of social problems is due to environmental issues

*Agglomeration Community of Pau-Pyrénées*

**Focus on seniors:**

Hierarchy of social needs

1. Isolation problems and integration needs
2. Problems with the access to rights and helping seniors to exploit them

Factors underlying needs

The Struggle Against Isolation and Accessibility to Rights due to:

1. concentration of the elderly
2. French decentralisation laws make the organisation of the sanitary-social and medical actions more complex
3. obsolete housing estates, the renovation of shared properties and their common areas.

*CIM do Ave*

Hierarchy of social needs

1. Mental health;
2. Disabilities;
3. Care dependency in old age;
4. Poverty and social exclusion;
5. Domestic violence and children and young people at risk;
6. Social economy, social innovation and social entrepreneurship;

7. Accessibility;
8. Institutional coordination, articulation and capacity building.

Factors underlying needs

1. Need for public entities to have more active and dynamic participation in social economy, social innovation and social entrepreneurship.
2. Need for promotion and involvement of several stakeholders to find possible solutions.



*Appendix 2: Aggregated social needs information by focus group session*

ASL Partner / Social Needs	Educational and Training Needs	Employment Needs	Public Engagement Needs	Entrepreneurs hip, Innovation and Social Economy Needs	Support and Integration Needs of Vulnerable Families and Individuals	Need for New and Improved Public Policies	Environmenta l Concern	Most Voted Social Need	Focus Group Discussion Topic
Aviles Municipality	☆	☆	☆		☆			Problems related to Training and Employment	The Welfare Service
Santiago de Compostela City Council	☆		☆			☆		Social and community assessment of the municipality	The Public Participation and Engagement
Enterprise NW		☆		☆	☆		☆	Jobs for young people	The Welfare Services and

									Social Economy
Cork City Council		☆	☆	☆		☆		Focus Group 1: The rigidity of public concerning social enterprises Focus Group 2: Lack of knowledge amongst the public as to where they should go to participate	Focus Group 1: Social Economy Focus Group 2: The Public Participation and Engagement
CRESS	☆	☆			☆		☆	NA	The Green Inclusive Economy

Agglomeration Community of Pau- Pyrénées					☆			NA	The Welfare Services
CIM do Ave			☆	☆	☆			Social needs related to the social economy, social innovation and social entrepreneurship	The Welfare and Social Economy

☆ Not raised by focus group as a social need

*Appendix 3: Relationship between social needs and strategies*

Social Needs/Strategies	Educational & Training Needs	Employment Needs	Public Engagement Needs	Entrepreneurship, Innovation & Social Economy Needs	Support & Integration Needs of Vulnerable Families & Individuals	Need for New & Improved Public Policies	Environmental Concern
Technological	☆	☆			☆		☆
Funding	☆	☆		☆	☆		☆
Awareness, Visibility & Communication		☆	☆			☆	☆
Interaction & Involvement of Governmental Structures & Legislative Changes		☆	☆			☆	☆

<b>Networking &amp; Integration</b>	☆		☆	☆	☆	☆	
<b>Training &amp; Development</b>	☆	☆	☆	☆			☆
<b>Entrepreneurship &amp; Innovation</b>				☆	☆		☆

☆ strategies related to social needs

*Appendix 4: Strategies by theme*

Themes	Measures
<b>The Welfare Services</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Creation of insertion companies and introducing social clauses in public procurement procedures as a tool to achieve the integration of disadvantaged people into the labour market</li> <li>2) More use of digital innovation to engage with young people and help them within the school environment and outside</li> <li>3) Creation of social networks that allow the identification, accompaniment and help of the most isolated and vulnerable people (neighbourhood-oriented resources, activities and social interaction programs, among others)</li> <li>4) Social Cafes / Repair Cafes with the support of local cafe owners and multinationals that had cafes or social spaces that could be easily accessed</li> <li>5) Anti-Solitude Plans, centred on the individual, analysed in consideration of social isolation, proposing a series of solutions, answering related needs. For example, amongst the solutions considered, one action, foresees the construction of an offer of services dedicated to senior citizens, to re-enforce the existing services (home support, operations and operating plans, among others)</li> </ol>
<b>The Social Economy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Creation of an incubator for social projects, for example, to support the preparation of applications for funds</li> <li>2) Provide Social Enterprises with Toolkits across a variety of areas such as data protection, employee support and others (mentoring and training);</li> <li>3) Define, Connect and Map Social Enterprises and Social Enterprise Support Services in the City</li> <li>4) Training 'capsules' and incubators to respond to a broad range of entrepreneurial needs. At each stage of the development of their business, entrepreneurs will require technical or moral support</li> </ol>
<b>The Public Participation and Engagement</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Identification of the social problems of the territory with the local partners and promote the public participation, therefore, it can be identified people that has ideas/projects aimed at solving these identified societal problems</li> <li>2) Develop a plan to simplify and improve the public engagement process. Key to this is ensuring that the technical language used in</li> </ol>

	<p>government documents is simplified for the layperson</p> <p>3) Representatives of each social group (rather than territorial) must always be present</p> <p>4) Sociocultural centres should not be only for leisure activities, but also to address the problems of the residents</p> <p>5) The participation activities need to be structured by age and educational level groups and have to be linked to the knowledge of new technologies</p>
<p><b>The Green Inclusive Economy</b></p>	<p>1) Reducing food waste, for example, recovering unsold food from supermarkets and 'anti-waste' canteens</p> <p>2) The local authority in charge of training should, therefore, finance training for the employees of Green Organisations</p> <p>3) Encouraging the use of bio-sourced materials, for example, adjusting taxation so that the use of bio-sourced materials is more advantageous than the use of new and/or non-renewable materials</p> <p>4) Support businesses in preparation for re-use and recycling</p> <p>5) Pay as You Throw (PAYT) schemes</p> <p>6) Embed Zero Waste Circular Economy principals into economic development plans and business funding</p> <p>7) Develop a local market for second-hand material</p>

Appendix 5: Interregional reports summarised

Participants	Theme	Projects Discussed at Meeting			
		Project1	Project2	Project3	Project4
Aviles/Pau	Welfare Services	Pau-Pilot 1- ANISEN(Seniors)	Pau-Pilot 2-Ensembl		
Cork/Aviles/ENW	Social Economy	Aviles-progress made on implementation of social clauses into the contract of local councils	Cork pilot actions progressing. Awareness events completed. Mapping of needs of social enterprises.	Cork-implementation of scheme to encourage private sector to engage with the social enterprise sector	ENW-designing pilot actions around developing and encouraging more young social entrepreneurs alongside FE College
unknown	unknown	Cork-Public Participation in Planning Process	Santiago - Participatory Budgeting	Cim do Ave_Collaboration on Education Initiatives	
ENW/CRESS Bretagne	Green Economy	CRESS B-4 meetings between Reuse Centres and local authorities - 2 successful, 2 less success	ENW-seminars with schools ongoing, working with Zero Waste NW. Schools interested but engagement with young people not always easy.		
unknown	unknown	Cim do Ave-Ave Social Angels. Initiative for Social Entrepreneurship to combat youth employment. Self reported as an example of good practice			



Santiago/Cork/Cim do Ave	Public Engagement	Cork: Cork intends to take a strategic view to improve the involvement of the local community in Participatory Budgeting.	Santiago: Santiago de Compostela continues to promote participatory budgeting, considering that although there are still some constraints, the implementation of the Participatory Budget in Santiago de Compostela is very positive and it is intended to continue in the future.	Cim do Ave: The Ave CIM pilot actions focused on motivating and sensitizing politicians to the theme of Social Innovation. - Discussion Sessions were organized with local stakeholders on the strategies to be adopted to promote Social Innovation in the Territory of CIM Ave (14/09/2018); - Meeting on 13 December with IRIS - Regional Incubator of Social Innovation in order to collaborate	
Aviles/Pau	Welfare Services	Pau: timetable for Pilot Action - "ANISEN": July 2018: validation by the mayor of Pau as an action of the "anti-solitude plan" November 2018 to February 2019: launch of an experimentation with ten collective sessions on Pau February 2019: deployment of the	Pau: timetable for Pilot Action "ENSEMBL": July 2018: validation by the mayor of Pau as an action of the "anti-solitude plan" November 2018 to December 2018: study of the conditions of deployment of the solution with the company February 2019:	Aviles: timetable for Pilot Action Communication Plan of social issues: 2018: Over 80's door to door contact under Social Services programme January 2019: Contracting of an external assistance to help with Practice development	

		initiative to other cities in the territory	deployment in experimental neighbourhoods of Pau		
Santiago/ENW/Cim do Ave	Public Engagement	Cim do Ave -no project	Santiago-no project	ENW-no project	
ENW/CRESS Bretagne	Green Economy	ENW-Derry area and recycling. 4Rs Reuse Centre and engagement of young people with project. 4Rs important example of recycling on the area.	CRESS- report on reuse centres. 3 meeting with local authorities. Success depends on voluntary effort with is independent of CRESS.		
Cork/Aviles/ENW	Social Economy	Cork-reported on development of a social enterprise stakeholder group. Reported on Pilot Actions: 1. Governance training workshops. 2. Development of an employers cluster. 3. Networking and conference events.	Aviles-reported on Pilot Actions developed to address local inequalities and low levels of social enterprise.	ENW-through mapping exercise have developed Pilot Actions that target the social enterprise and green economy sector.	

Aviles/Pau	Welfare Services	Aviles-Pilot Action: Information, access and citizen participation in the public services of welfare and social entities. Key actions required listed.	Pau-Pilot Action: Ensemble. Timetable of actions and costs.		
Aviles/Pau	Welfare Services	Pau-Pilot Action report: at mid-term October 2019 a presentation of the pilot action and first results of deployment will be carried out.....it's too early to make an evaluation of ENSEMBL....	Aviles- subcontracted external assistance with design of communications strategy. Progress: too early to make an evaluation, even intermediate results.....without assistance it is difficult to clarify a realistic timetable to the development of the action.....		
ENW/CRESS Bretagne	Green Economy	CRESS B-Training of local authority employees; regional meeting of all reuse centre in Bretagne with common projects identified; meeting on reuse of materials with interactions between reuse centres and interior designers identified....	ENW- Special launch to showcase Green Inclusive & Circular Economy Technology Project - a student-led programme. Feedback and evaluation of the programme now being completed.....to be measured against the baseline and indicators set down at start of the		

			project.		
Cork/Aviles/ENW	Social Economy	Aviles: proposal developed to seek external expertise to support/advise on the implementation of the social clauses throughout municipality. Progress slow.	Cork: Pilot Actions progressing with delivery of number of social enterprise events and a schedule to deliver an event each month to mid-2019.	ENW: Completed Innovation Lab Pilot Action with North West Regional College.	
ENW/CRESS Bretagne	Green Economy	ENW: Special launch event in Feb 2019 to showcase the Green Inclusive & Circular Economy Project. Reporting indicates a successful project engagement with a range of Partners including schools. Feedback and evaluation of programme now being completed. Possible scope for further	CRESS: Seminar organised for 5 March 2019 on circular and social economy with participation of 140 people across Bretagne region. Issue with size of region/number of organisations involved and with turnover of senior managers with these organisations resulting in significant		

		Pilot Actions based on feedback and evaluation results. Positive results reported from engagement with schools and students.	time dedicated to creating new relationships between Project and respective organisational management.		
Santiago/Cork/Cim do Ave	Public Engagement	Cork: Shape your City Initiative. Local Council wishes to engage more migrants in the local democracy process.	Cork: Participatory Grant Making. City Council and City Public Participation Network have been motivated by ASL Partners (Santiago, Cim do Ave, Scottish Partners) which has led to Cork partners running two pilot Participatory Grant-making workshops.	Cim do Ave: IRIS project. Capacity building between April and Sept 2019 - objective to increase open-mindedness about Social Innovation. At end of process each municipality with develop and implement its own Social Innovation Plan.	Santiago: Participatory Budgeting. Slow progress with Initiative. Tender seeking Trainers for older people did not return any successful candidates. New tender being issued to run platform.
Santiago/Cork/ENW	Social Economy	Aviles: proposal developed to seek external expertise to support/advise on the implementation of the social clauses throughout municipality. Progress slow. (same report as previous meeting)	Cork: similar report to 15/2/19 meeting. Reported progress being made.	ENW: Completed Innovation Lab Pilot Action with North West Regional College THAT BEGAN IN Oct 2018 (same as previous report). Social Enterprise day delivered in conjunction with local council in March 2019.	



*Appendix 6: Study visits to projects by partner territory*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Legal Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Vila Nova de Famalicão	Famalicão Municipality – Vision 2025	Local Government/Public Organisation	The main objective of the project observed in the Municipality of Vila Nova de Famalicão is the integration and participation of its citizens in the strategic planning of the future vision for the city - Vision 2025.
Vila Nova de Famalicão	The Social and Cultural Centre of S. Pedro do Bairro – Pedagogical Farm	Non Profit Public Utility	The Social and Cultural Centre of S. Pedro do Bairro, has a mission of meeting the needs and expectations of the local and municipal community through excellence in the provision of education, training and rehabilitation services, contributing to the improvement of the quality of life of the population and to a more open and inclusive society.
Derry	Kippie	Social Enterprise	Kippie, has a mission of meeting the needs and expectations of the local community through the provision of education and training, contributing to the improvement of the quality of life of the population, more specifically, they work with the young population with or without learning difficulties.
Derry	Reuse Centre	Social Enterprise	The Reuse Centre is a social economy project in partnership with Derry City, the Departments of the Environment and Social Development and the Strabane District Council.
Derry	Nerve Centre	Social Enterprise	The Nerve Centre is Northern Ireland’s leading creative media arts centre and it is a successful social economy enterprise that employs more than 40 staff in Derry and Belfast.

Derry	The Playtrail	Social Enterprise	The Playtrail aims to provide an inclusive approach to play and provide increased training and employment opportunities for young adults with learning disabilities.
Rennes	Ressources T	Social Enterprise	Ressources T has two essential objectives at its core. Firstly, it is an enterprise specialised in the reuse of goods. Second, it intends to support its employees in the process of integration in the labour market through the renovation, restoration and sale of goods (mostly household appliances).
Rennes	TAg BZH and La Grenouille à Grande Bouche	Associations	TAg BZH1 is a social incubator, its main objective is to support the creation of local, collective and innovative companies that meet the social needs of the four great regions of the Bretagne. The economic activity in question is a social restaurant - La Grenouille à Grande Bouche.
Rennes	TEZEA	Social Enterprise	TEZEA is located in Pipriac and Saint-Ganton in Ille-et-Vilaine (Rennes Region). It is a job-oriented enterprise (Back-to-work Enterprise) created under the project "Territories zero long-term unemployed". The main objective it is to redirect public budgets from the costs of deprivation of employment to finance the missing jobs by ensuring good working conditions.
Santiago	Participatory Budgeting	Local Authority	Municipality identified a deficit of involvement and civic participation in their region because the mechanisms of participation are unknown and few divulged.
Santiago	ASPAS Association	Non Profit Association	ASPAS is an association of families concerned with the improvement of the lives of people with intellectual disabilities and their families.
Santiago	COREGAL	Private Company	COREGAL is a private company dedicated to the management of the environment.



Vila Nova de Famalicão	Famalicão Municipality – “Famalicão Made IN”	Local Government/Public Organisation	The main objective of the project is the economic promotion and development of the Municipality. It intends to mobilize and boost the territory entrepreneurial characteristics.
Cork City	Sailing into Wellness	Social Enterprise	Sailing into Wellness is a not for profit social enterprise that aims to utilize the unique setting of the sea to help the local communities. The vision of this social innovation initiative is for Sailing into Wellness to be a healthy natural solution for the local communities to look after their physical and mental well-being.
Cork City	Cork Foyer	FoyerFederation-Non Profit Organisation	The Cork Foyer is a not-for-profit organisation that helps to transform the circumstances of young people who have faced barriers in their lives. Cork Foyer works directly with young people to create new approaches developing the skills and resources they need to thrive in society and in the labour market. The overall aim of Cork Foyer will be to provide a process of transitional support and holistic development to the young people.
Cork City	STEAM Education Limited	Company for Profit	The main objective of the company is to inspire kids to "love" the STEAM subjects – Science, Technology, Engineering, Maths and Art. Secondly. According to the members of the STEAM Education, there is a shortage of highly qualified graduates in the STEAM fields, so their logic is to create an interest in these subjects.
Cork City	Churchfield Community Trust	Company Limited by Guarantee	The Churchfield Community Trust is a Company Limited by Guarantee that was initially created because there was a need within the local area for an initiative to engage with young people. Nowadays its target audience is wider, namely individuals at the local level who are unemployed, people with alcohol and drug problems, offending behaviour, people with mental and physical problems among others.



Appendix 7: Pilot actions

**Avilés Municipality**

**WELFARE SERVICES**

***Pilot Action 1: Information, Access and Citizen Participation in the Public Services of Welfare and Social Entities***

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Outputs</u>
Communication plan to promote the existent welfare services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal services;</li> <li>• Regional health and education system;</li> <li>• Regional counselling of social services;</li> <li>• Social entities;</li> <li>• Citizens' associations;</li> <li>• Users of public services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Diagnostic report of departure instruction in Avilés.</li> <li>➤ Creation Municipal work Commission (number of people and departments involved)</li> <li>➤ Protocol for the application of social and environmental clauses</li> <li>➤ New final document available – Instruction, Yes/No</li> <li>➤ Table of evaluation indicators and monitoring of clauses</li> <li>➤ Training-practical workshops. (Number of training actions/number of participants).</li> </ul>	
Digital map of community resources			
Sectorial catalogues of services and benefits			
Systematic procedures for the participation of users in the planning, evaluation and adaptation of services received			

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

***Pilot Action 2: Social Clauses in Public Procurement to Help Disadvantaged People Enter the Labour Market, Improve Labour Conditions of Workers and Promote Social Economy Entities***

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Outputs</u>
Establish annually percentage of market reserve for the vulnerable people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generate work opportunities for the most vulnerable groups;</li> <li>• Improve the labour conditions of workers; promote the equality for people with disabilities and women within the companies which contract with Avilés City Council;</li> <li>• Continue improving the responsible management of public financial resources;</li> <li>• Promoting a new business culture by encouraging and supporting the social responsibility of companies, social economy companies and the local net of SMEs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Mapping of social community resources of the territory (number of services/participating entities)</li> <li>➤ Number of descriptive sheets prepared</li> <li>➤ Number of catalogues/repertoires/service directories prepared or edited</li> <li>➤ IT training workshops (Number of workshops; number of hours of training; Number of entities/participants; Number of new partners)</li> <li>➤ Protocols for evaluation of municipal services and benefits in Social Welfare (Number and typology; Number of people who evaluate)</li> <li>➤ Digital map implementation in local website (Number of registered resources; Number of map visualisations)</li> <li>➤ Impact of the communications strategy – users (Number of people/families benefiting from municipal resources; Number of people attending the 1<sup>st</sup> municipal services – Welfare Area; Number of new registrations in municipal resources – Welfare Area).</li> </ul>	
Extension of the instruction scope (social clauses)			
Promotion of social economy			
Support for the local economy and Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)			
Ethical and sustainable purchasing criteria;			
Improvement of the planning and monitoring system			

**CRESS Bretagne**

***Green Inclusive Economy***

***Pilot Action 1: Supporting Single Stream Reuse Centres***

<b><u>Objectives</u></b>	<b><u>Expected Results</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Indicators</u></b>	<b><u>Reported Results</u></b>
Clarify the economic models and business plans of the reuse centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement of processes and management of the reuse and recycling centres;</li> <li>• Reuse centres have a new and more balanced economic model;</li> <li>• Increase the networking of the centres (companies, local authorities, SSE);</li> <li>• Promoting a green and inclusive economy; increased rates of reuse and recycling in the Bretagne region.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of SSE's and Local Authorities involved</li> <li>➤ Number of meetings and workshops</li> <li>➤ Existence of a shared vision of what should be the economic model of reuse SSE's</li> <li>➤ Number of people who consults the Map</li> <li>➤ Existence of a Regulation solution approved by SSE's</li> <li>➤ Number of new Reuse Centres</li> <li>➤ Percentage of Reuse Centres that maintained/stopped their activity.</li> </ul>	
Involve local authorities more closely with the reuse centres			
Help reuse centres to develop new activities (collecting, selling or upcycling other goods and materials)			
Help the know-how of this type of centres by promoting updating and understanding of management, legal aspects, potential for upcycling and improvement of the methods (training and formation)			
Sharing a view of the economic model and the perspectives of evolution of reuse centres with local authorities, SSE, companies and other stakeholders			

Create a territorial coverage map with reuse solutions available for everyone			
---	--	--	--

**Green Inclusive Economy**

***Pilot Action 2: Developing New Industries (SSE recycling industry)[AS A FOLLOW-ON FROM PILOT ACTION 1]***

<b><u>Objectives</u></b>	<b><u>Expected Results</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Indicators</u></b>	<b><u>Reported Results</u></b>
Employ people with employment needs in the region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of a new consolidated and modernized recycling industry based on green and inclusive economy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of participants in the clothes working group</li> <li>➤ Number of participants to the training for public entities</li> <li>➤ Number of public entities interacting/asking for information and intervention</li> <li>➤ Number of participants involved in material reuse initiatives meetings</li> <li>➤ Number of clothes sorted in unit</li> <li>➤ Number of new businesses.</li> </ul>	
Improve recycling and reuse processes, promoting a green and inclusive economy			

**Enterprise North West (ENW)**

**Green Inclusive Economy**

***Pilot Action 1: Green Inclusive & Circular Economy Technology Project***

<b><u>Objectives</u></b>	<b><u>Expected Results</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Indicators</u></b>	<b><u>Reported Results</u></b>
Collaborative workshops provided to young people from local schools to address local green economy issues through a technology solution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results documented in the form of case studies;</li> <li>• Recycling programme with materials and resources (Online Tool Kit);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Young people from different backgrounds have increased awareness/knowledge of waste</li> <li>➤ High level of awareness of consequences of unsustainable behaviours</li> <li>➤ Increase awareness/knowledge of personal actions</li> <li>➤ Provide a new IT solution to inform and enable local people/schools to recycle more</li> <li>➤ Empathy built around green economy and importance of recycling</li> <li>➤ Facilitate a self-learning process.</li> </ul>	
Creation and development of a mobile application with the help and critical thinking of young people around the issue of the green economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational recycling Apps;</li> <li>• Increasing competences of young people in relation to IT and their social responsibility in relation to the environment;</li> </ul>		
Young people develop meaningful solutions to deliver upon the Derry Region circular economy strategy between different schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools observe benefit of project-based learning approach and increase emphasis on learning through critical analysis and problem solving;</li> <li>• Promoting a green and inclusive economy;</li> <li>• Increased rates of reuse and recycling in Derry region.</li> </ul>		

**Social Economy**

**Pilot Action 2: Design Thinking - Innovation Lab Project**

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Results</u>
<p>Elaboration of DT Workshops provided to young people from local schools to address local social issues/challenges and increase levels of leadership and critical analysis within young people</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of young people critical thinking and their involvement in the social problems of the Derry region;</li> <li>• Solving some social problems in the Derry region; Increase in entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship in the region;</li> <li>• Increased emphasis by schools on creative learning;</li> <li>• Combating unemployment in the Derry region; Development of confidence, leadership and knowledge of young people;</li> <li>• Increasing young people awareness of their community and society.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Young people from different background learn DT methodologies</li> <li>➤ High level of interest in the ability to tackle relatable and local social issues</li> <li>➤ College embrace new learning techniques and highlight the delivery of project across campus.</li> </ul>	
<p>Development of young people civic engagement as they contribute to solving social problems (time and commitment to deliver real social change)</p>			
<p>Fighting the “out of date” educational institutional policy, by implementing critical thinking techniques and innovative designing</p>			



**Agglomeration Community of Pau-Pyrénées**

**Welfare Services**

**Pilot Action 1: ANISEN - Animation seniors**

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Results</u>
An innovative programme of therapeutic activities on digital tablets, it aims to detect the signs of fragility of seniors to maintain their autonomy at home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building of a social offer to the elderly, improving the existing services and creating new ones based on a digital tool shared between users, professionals and family;</li> <li>• Provide seniors with more autonomy at home from a digital application;</li> <li>• Create and maintain social ties and links to avoid isolation;</li> <li>• Provide active aging of the population;</li> <li>• Know the real needs of the elderly in the region.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of organised collective sessions</li> <li>➤ Existence of training and support for social agents</li> <li>➤ Implementation of accompanied transport measures for users.</li> <li>➤ Mid-term study of seniors' perceptions</li> <li>➤ Mid-term evaluation of individual situations using the digital tracking tool.</li> </ul>	
Collective actions to prevent the loss of autonomy of isolated seniors living at home, animated by a team of social careers on digital tablets			
Mapping the elderly and their social needs			
From knowledge of the needs and the digital tool is also provided greater mobility and socialization for the elderly			

**Welfare Services**

**Pilot Action 2: ENSEMBLE**

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Results</u>
Volunteer management: the creation of a base of voluntary neighbours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen the social link by allowing meetings, exchanges and mutual aid;</li> <li>• Promote access to local information for vulnerable or isolated people;</li> <li>• Facilitate the coordination of local actors of solidarity;</li> <li>• Analyse the social needs of the territory in terms of “seniors” policy;</li> <li>• Promote active ageing of the population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Creation of the volunteer neighbours base</li> <li>➤ Rate of inhabitants per district registered on the base</li> <li>➤ No. of actions recorded on the platform</li> <li>➤ Existence of training and support of the group of neighbours</li> <li>➤ Existence of a communications campaign citizens/operators of the territory</li> <li>➤ Response rate to the questions asked on the platform</li> <li>➤ Evaluation of the satisfaction of a sample of users.</li> </ul>	
Communication: information of inhabitants on actions developed for the elderly			
Expression of needs: asks on the network to find an answer to a need expressed by a senior or a caregiver			
Survey: citizen consultation for detailed knowledge of the needs of the territory			
Coordination: networking actors through a digital community			

**Cork City Council**

**Public Engagement**

***Pilot Action 1: Enhancing Public Engagement in Cork***

<b><u>Objectives</u></b>	<b><u>Expected Results</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Indicators</u></b>	<b><u>Reported Results</u></b>
Presentation of the planning process (consultation model) in an accessible manner using an audio-visual animated format to support improved understanding and civic engagement;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer of knowledge to community group; Stronger civic engagement amongst the public and community groups in Cork City;</li> <li>• Educate the population for the different methods of public engagements;</li> <li>• Identification of new and more innovative methods to promote public engagement;</li> <li>• Know the real needs of the population of Cork City.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of hits on websites and social media views</li> <li>➤ Number of events participated</li> <li>➤ Number of voter forms distributed and completed</li> <li>➤ Number and length of mentoring sessions</li> <li>➤ Subjects covered</li> <li>➤ Interview community group to assess knowledge transfer.</li> </ul>	
“Planning for Real” - based on a 3D model of a local area, involving community events, prioritization workshops and action planning sessions with the residents			
Provide mentoring to the community groups to enhance expertise in engaging with government agencies			

**Social Economy**

**Pilot Action 2: Strengthening Social Enterprises in Cork**

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Results</u>
<p>Map the social enterprises of the cities, thus creating a link between them and other organizations that can support them</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased expertise in social enterprises in the Cork region;</li> <li>• Social enterprises engage with private enterprise and local government through joint events;</li> <li>• Stronger social enterprises with greater capacity and stronger links to the private sector and local government;</li> <li>• Knowledge transfer to and between social enterprises;</li> <li>• Procurement of services from social enterprise and employment by private enterprise of people who have come through social enterprises on work programmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of training events and experience of experts</li> <li>➤ Number of events organised</li> <li>➤ Subject matters covered</li> <li>➤ Number of social enterprises attending</li> <li>➤ Number of private sector companies and local Government representatives attending.</li> </ul>	
<p>Work directly with the private sector and public sector to raise awareness of the benefits of employing social enterprise workers</p>			
<p>Organize training and networking for social enterprises</p>			
<p>Networking and conference events focusing on social enterprise and social finance that will involve a range of local and national stakeholders</p>			

**Santiago de Compostela Municipality**

**Public Engagement**

**Pilot Action 1: Public Engagement and Participatory Budgeting**

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Expected Results</u>	<u>Primary Indicators</u>	<u>Reported Results</u>
Reach all the population groups, especially the disadvantaged groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the real needs of the population;</li> <li>• Participation of Santiago de Compostela residents in the management of city;</li> <li>• Residents' education on how and where to participate in the public management of the county;</li> <li>• Modulation of certain decisions by not just taking into account the number of people who demand them but also considering other factors like social improvement, attention to vulnerable groups, or territorial balances;</li> <li>• Democratization of participation and consequent increase in public engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of participants aged 65 or over</li> <li>➤ Number of ballot boxes per parish</li> <li>➤ Number of new participants in each edition</li> <li>➤ Budget for advertising</li> <li>➤ Percentage of participants via telematics</li> <li>➤ Number of proposals</li> <li>➤ Number of votes</li> <li>➤ Absolute and relative costs of advertising and disclosure</li> <li>➤ Number of proposals submitted by the Associations</li> <li>➤ Number of participants per neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	
Allows the citizens to voice their needs and proposals			
Improve the response to the needs of public works and services not expressed, not detected or not conveniently conducted to be met by the municipal offer			
Increase the percentage of the budget of the participatory budget			

**The Intermunicipal Community of Ave (CIM do Ave)**

**Public Engagement and Social Economy**

***Pilot Action 1: Ave Community of Social Innovation***

<b><u>Objectives</u></b>	<b><u>Expected Results</u></b>	<b><u>Primary Indicators</u></b>	<b><u>Reported Results</u></b>
Promotion of social innovation at the territorial level, reflecting and discussing the issue with local strategic partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information and awareness of the population, the strategic partners and the third sector on social innovation (organization of one workshop by municipality of Ave region);</li> <li>• Document with the mapping of the initiatives of social innovation and evaluation of the knowledge of the concept of social innovation in Ave;</li> <li>• Training of policymakers and ambassadors of social innovation on social innovation and social issues in the region (from training events, visits and workshops).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of meetings with strategic partners</li> <li>➤ Number of questionnaires with social innovation partners</li> <li>➤ Intensive training programme for ambassadors of social innovation</li> <li>➤ Number of meetings with ambassadors</li> <li>➤ Number of workshops “Social Innovation Day”</li> <li>➤ Number of inter-municipal seminars on social innovation</li> <li>➤ Implementation of the social innovation ecosystem strategic document</li> <li>➤ Implementation of the intense training programme for social innovation ambassadors</li> <li>➤ Number of actions of practical work sessions developed at CIM do Ave</li> <li>➤ Number of workshops “Days of Social Innovation” energised on NUT III.</li> </ul>	
Identification of existing social innovation initiatives in the municipalities of NUTS III (Ave region)			
Evaluation of the knowledge of the concept of “Social Innovation” among the different partners of NUTS III (Ave region)			
Development of social innovation training actions for the key actors in the territory			
Promotion of the exchange of good national and international practices of reference projects of social innovation			

*Appendix 8: Pilot projects by strategic themes and regional partners*

**Welfare Services**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Partner</u>	<u>Pilot Project</u>
1.	Avilés Municipality	Information, Access and Citizen Participation in the Public Services of Welfare and Social Entities
2.	Agglomeration Community of Pau-Pyrénées	ANISEN - Animation seniors
3.	Agglomeration Community of Pau-Pyrénées	ENSEMBLE

**Public Engagement**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Partner</u>	<u>Pilot Project</u>
4.	Avilés Municipality	Social Clauses in Public Procurement to Help Disadvantaged People Enter the Labour Market, Improve Labour Conditions of Workers and Promote Social Economy Entities
5.	Cork City Council	Enhancing Public Engagement in Cork
6.	Santiago de Compostela Municipality	Public Engagement and Participatory Budgeting
7.	The Intermunicipal Community of Ave	Ave Community of Social Innovation

**Green Inclusive Economy**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Partner</u>	<u>Pilot Project</u>
8.	CRESS Bretagne	Supporting Single Stream Reuse Centres
9.	CRESS Bretagne	Developing New Industries (SSE recycling industry)
10.	Enterprise North West (ENW)	Green Inclusive & Circular Economy Technology Project

**Social Economy**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Partner</u>	<u>Pilot Project</u>
11.	Enterprise North West (ENW)	Design Thinking - Innovation Lab Project
12.	Cork City Council	Strengthening Social Enterprises in Cork
13.	The Intermunicipal Community of Ave	Ave Community of Social Innovation



*Appendix 9: Acronyms*

ASL	Atlantic Social Lab
EC	European Commission
OSIRIS	Open Social Innovation Policies Driven by Co-Creation Regional Systems of Innovation
GECEs	Groupe d'experts de la Commission sur l'entrepreneuriat social
IPA	Infrastructure and Projects Authority
ISDE-NET	Innovative Social Enterprise Development Network
CES	Centro de k Coimbra
CIM Ave	Ave Intermunicipal Community
ACT	Acting for Dependent People
GLIA	Aviles Local Group on Immigration
ESAT	Community Organisations in Bretagne employing people with disabilities
SSE	Company in Bretagne employing disabled people
NOW Group	Company limited by Guarantee with Charitable status based in North and West Belfast working with people with Learning Difficulties
JAM	Just a Minute, card and app for people with disabilities operated by NOW
4Rs Project	A resource Workshop based in Derry
USP	Unique selling Point
STEAM	Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and the Arts
PPN	Public Participation Network
LAs	Local Authorities