



UNIVERSITA' DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA

**DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE ECONOMICHE ED AZIENDALI "M.
FANNO"**

**CORSO DI LAUREA MAGISTRALE IN
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

TESI DI LAUREA

**"MEASURING WHAT MATTERS: HOW VENTURE PHILANTHROPY METRICS CAN
ENHANCE STRATEGIC PHILANTHROPY"**

RELATORE:

CH.MO PROF. BOESSO GIACOMO

LAUREANDO: LOIOTILA CLAUDIO

MATRICOLA N. 2096039

ANNO ACCADEMICO 2024 - 2025

Dichiaro di aver preso visione del “Regolamento antiplagio” approvato dal Consiglio del Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Aziendali e, consapevole delle conseguenze derivanti da dichiarazioni mendaci, dichiaro che il presente lavoro non è già stato sottoposto, in tutto o in parte, per il conseguimento di un titolo accademico in altre Università italiane o straniere. Dichiaro inoltre che tutte le fonti utilizzate per la realizzazione del presente lavoro, inclusi i materiali digitali, sono state correttamente citate nel corpo del testo e nella sezione ‘Riferimenti bibliografici’.

I hereby declare that I have read and understood the “Anti-plagiarism rules and regulations” approved by the Council of the Department of Economics and Management and I am aware of the consequences of making false statements. I declare that this piece of work has not been previously submitted – either fully or partially – for fulfilling the requirements of an academic degree, whether in Italy or abroad. Furthermore, I declare that the references used for this work – including the digital materials – have been appropriately cited and acknowledged in the text and in the section ‘References’.

Firma (signature) ... 

Index

Abstract	4
Chapter 1	5
Theoretical Background	5
Strategic Philanthropy	5
<i>History and evolution</i>	5
<i>Advantages and limitations of strategic philanthropy</i>	8
<i>Applications of strategic philanthropy and social impact</i>	10
Venture Philanthropy	12
<i>History and evolution</i>	12
<i>Key characteristics and applications</i>	13
<i>Criticism about venture philanthropy</i>	14
<i>Social impact of venture philanthropy</i>	16
<i>Similarities and differences between strategic philanthropy and venture philanthropy</i>	17
Chapter 2	20
How foundations measure social impact	20
Assessing social impact in strategic philanthropy	20
<i>Theory of Change</i>	21
<i>Evaluation policies and output-outcome monitoring</i>	21
Assessing social impact in venture philanthropy	23
<i>Social Return on Investment (SROI)</i>	23
<i>Tailored Key Performance Indicators (KPI)</i>	25
<i>Due diligence per Impact Investment</i>	25
Methodology and Analysis	26
Chapter 3	28
Adopting venture philanthropy metrics in strategic philanthropy	28
GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance: a venture philanthropy project	28
<i>Strategic development of GAVI</i>	28
<i>Impact measurement: quantitative and qualitative assessments</i>	29
<i>SROI: a brief calculation</i>	31
100 Resilient Cities: a strategic philanthropy project	33
<i>Strategic development of 100 Resilient Cities</i>	33
<i>Impact measurement: quantitative and qualitative assessments</i>	34
Differences between GAVI and 100 Resilient Cities	37
Integration of venture metrics in a strategic philanthropy project	39

<i>Applications and changes in evaluating social impact</i>	39
<i>Discussion of results: how a strategic project can enhance its measurement system</i>	42
Conclusions	44
Bibliography	45

Abstract

In recent times philanthropy evolved significantly, with strategic philanthropy (SP) and venture philanthropy (VP) emerging as crucial and modern approaches for addressing complex socio-economic challenges. This thesis explores the theoretical foundations of strategic and venture philanthropy, analysing their evolution, impact, and limitations, as well as highlighting exemplary cases, such as the 100 Resilient Cities project by Rockefeller Foundation and the GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance developed by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. While strategic philanthropy is more imprinted to emphasize structured and outcome-oriented interventions, venture philanthropy introduces entrepreneurial methodologies, risk tolerance, and innovative tools to achieve measurable social impact.

The principal objective of the research is to investigate whether the methods, tools, and metrics utilized in venture philanthropy projects can enhance the transparency and effectiveness of social impact measurement within strategic philanthropy. To address this question, the elaborate applies a two-steps approach. First, it examines existing measurement systems by analysing and comparing the metrics used in SP and VP projects. Second, it performs an analysis by applying VP metrics to SP projects. This qualitative analysis assesses whether the integration of VP measurement frameworks improves the accuracy and clarity of impact assessment. This is done through the comparison of GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance and 100 Resilient Cities projects. Specifically, the latter is subjected to a hypothetical application of venture philanthropy metrics and methods of measurement that are applied in the former.

The main objective is to define whether the adoption of VP metrics in 100 Resilient Cities could fill the existing gaps in transparency and efficiency between the two initiatives, providing a more robust and enhanced understanding of social impact in order to propose that an integration of SP and VP measurement systems could lead to more effective resource allocation and greater social value creation.

Chapter 1

Theoretical Background

Strategic Philanthropy

To evaluate how various approaches to philanthropy can generate distinct outcomes in the world, it is essential to first establish a clear understanding of what strategic philanthropy entails. This begins by examining how strategic philanthropy differs fundamentally from traditional philanthropy, particularly in terms of its implementation methods and the resulting effects. A key focus of this analysis lies in assessing these differences through the lens of social impact, highlighting the ways in which strategic philanthropy can achieve more targeted, sustainable, and systemic change compared to traditional philanthropic initiatives. Thus, next paragraphs will be dedicated to analysing the historical literature of strategic philanthropy and its evolution, defining the impact and some applications.

History and evolution

According to scholars (Vveinhardt and Zygmantaiteb, 2015) philanthropy and strategic philanthropy differs on several aspects and these differences are mainly related to the motivation, the approach, and the objectives with which philanthropic activities are carried out and, afterwards, the metrics used in order to monitor performances and social impact. Traditional philanthropy is often seen as a disinterested act of charity (Carroll, 2018). The main objective is social welfare, without a real and direct link to corporate objectives and without a defined and structured planning. On the other hand, strategic philanthropy is defined as an investment that aims to generate value for both society and the company, attempting to align philanthropic activities with the company's mission, goals, and strategy. It is characterized by a more formal and well organised approach with careful evaluation and measurement of both social and corporate impacts. Indeed, philanthropic activities are professionally managed and integrated into corporate strategy and are subjected to a careful analysis to assess areas of intervention, the projected impact, and results. Moreover, measurement, differently from traditional philanthropy, is crucial for assessing the effectiveness of philanthropic activities and for making informed decisions, both on social and business perspectives.

Liket and Maas, (2016) emphasise that strategic philanthropy is more than just a giving strategy and represents a way for companies to integrate themselves into society, to act as

responsible corporate citizens and to create shared value. Strategic philanthropy can be seen as a *happy marriage* between corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance.

Furthermore, Post and Waddock (1995) made a further distinction between *strategic philanthropy* and *philanthropic strategy*. Philanthropic strategy refers to the way a company organises and manages its donations, while strategic philanthropy focuses on the impact of donations on both the company and society. A philanthropic strategy can exist without philanthropy being truly strategic, but strategic philanthropy requires an accurate management strategy.

So, it is possible to state that strategic philanthropy represents an evolution of traditional philanthropy, in which the company seeks to maximise the social and economic value of its charitable activities. Porter and Kramer (1999, p. 125) focused their analysis on non-profit organizations and stated that “Foundations need strategy” as the usual companies. They proposed a new model aiming at the creation of social value because even if philanthropic foundations have significantly increased their assets and donations, they often do not exploit their full potential to generate real and lasting social impact.

Several definitions of strategic philanthropy can be found in literature. One provided by Carroll (2018, p. 2) states that “Strategic philanthropy is an approach by which corporate or business giving and other philanthropic endeavours of a firm are designed in such a way that it best fits with the firm’s overall mission, goals, and values”. One more time, literature underlines that, unlike traditional philanthropy which is driven by altruistic reasons, strategic philanthropy aims to benefit both society and the company itself, creating a dual-purpose framework.

Furthermore Carroll (2018) states that the origins of corporate philanthropy can be traced back to a time when the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) had not emerged yet as a formalized movement. Within the traditional economic model, the market was the sole and dominant influence on corporate behaviour. Companies could produce the right services and products for their customers but were far away from ensuring that business was conducted ethically. The first examples of corporate philanthropy were primarily motivated by ethical considerations. Indeed, companies engaged in charitable activities largely to address community needs, with a focus on altruism and social betterment. This early model of philanthropy was rooted in the belief that businesses had an ethical obligation to contribute to societal welfare, regardless of direct benefits to the company, as a form of responsibility for the main social problems created by an unethical and unfair management towards society.

Over time, increasing competition and rising cost pressures led corporate leaders to reassess the purpose and outcomes of philanthropic efforts. They recognized the potential for philanthropy to serve as both a social good and a strategic tool. In this regard Carroll (2018, p. 4) states “..business can not only help others but help itself at the same time.” This realization marked a transition toward what we now refer to as strategic philanthropy, characterized by a more institutionalized and professionalized approach. Corporate giving began to be viewed as an activity that could deliver specific, measurable benefits to the company, such as enhanced reputation, stronger stakeholder relationships, and long-term value creation.

As reported by Kubíčková (2018), the concept of strategic philanthropy gained significant traction in the 1980s, underpinned by the theory that competing on both price and corporate citizenship is more effective than competing exclusively on price. This idea was formally introduced into business literature in 1982, when Fry, Keim and Meiners (1982) revealed a positive correlation between charitable contributions and the extension of a company’s public network. While this approach offered new possibilities for aligning corporate and societal goals, some scholars criticized it as an oxymoron (Saiia et al., 2003), questioning whether true philanthropy could coexist with business-driven objectives.

Strictly correlated to this paradox there is the concept of cause-related marketing, which is often considered a subset of strategic philanthropy. However, a deeper analysis can surely find how the two concepts substantially differ in significant ways. Indeed, cause-related marketing typically prioritizes public visibility and branding, while strategic philanthropy focuses on creating measurable social impact that aligns with the company’s long-term strategy (Porter and Kramer, 2002). In many situations the term strategic philanthropy is used erroneously to advertise charity activities when it lacks the core of the definition: the strategic approach. For this reason, strategic philanthropy goes beyond marketing campaigns, embedding philanthropy within a company’s core operations and treating it as an investment aimed at delivering returns—whether in societal benefits, corporate advantages, or both—over a defined timeframe.

Strategic philanthropy is linked to the idea of *shared value* developed by Porter and Kramer (2002). According to them, philanthropic initiatives can benefit both business and society, making social and economic objectives not separated but conjoined, creating simultaneously value for both society and the business. In this framework, philanthropic activities are deeply integrated with a company’s mission, objectives, and culture. They are professionally managed, with clear goals and metrics for evaluation. This approach ensures that philanthropy is not treated as an isolated initiative but as a fundamental component of the company’s long-term strategy.

In recent years, strategic philanthropy evolved substantially together with the economic and social changes. For a stronger social impact, numerous non-profit organizations, often connected with known corporates, were founded in order to design, implement and measure strategies in different fields. At the same time more foundations are adopting specific strategic perspective in developing projects with a stronger impact in the long term and with specific measures to monitor performances. However, some researchers (Kania, Kramer and Russell, 2014) recognize that the complexities and unpredictability of social change make extremely difficult for foundations to adopt repeated and linear approaches. Indeed, logic and linear models can mislead foundations to recognize the complexity of the dynamics of social changes. Thus, a different approach is needed, a set of strategies that could define “..the next evolution of strategic philanthropy” (Kania, Kramer and Russell, 2014, p. 29), based on the co-creation and co-evolution of strategic initiatives with multiple organizations. This new tendency was called *emergent strategy*, which presumes a shift from the predictive model usually implemented to an emergent model, which could better fit the social changes and their complexity. Indeed, the term *emergent* refers to the learning curve developed by the organization in implementing the philanthropic activities. The emergent strategy is more prone to flexibility in response to the changing reality, where the initial intentions collide with the effective situation and thus the strategy must accommodate to the changes, *emerging* in its final aspect over time.

Advantages and limitations of strategic philanthropy

Strategic philanthropy, while offering considerable advantages, also has limitations that it is important to consider. The principal advantages are related to the main differences with the traditional form of philanthropic activities. In the first place, strategic philanthropy is structured in order to maximise synergies between social and corporate objectives, creating a *win-win* situation (Liket and Maas, 2011) for both society and company. The resources invested contribute to the common good and also support company’s mission, leading to a better effectiveness and sustainability of the philanthropic initiatives. The alignment between social and corporate objectives leads to a professional management of strategic philanthropy, which is handled as professionally as other corporate activities, through a well-defined planning process, implemented, monitored and evaluated in a systematic way. This approach paves the way to long-term value creation for both companies and society: philanthropic activities are not seen as economic expenses, but as investments in the future of the community in which the company operates (Porter and Kramer, 2002).

Moreover, it is verified that a company involved in philanthropic activities improves its reputation and brand image, leading to a stronger customer loyalty. Often even known foundations are linked to famous companies, brands or celebrities which benefit from the appreciation of the audience for their social commitment, for example the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation or the Rockefeller foundation.

However, the most important advantage of strategic philanthropy and the principal reason for its development is the measurement of impact, both on a social and corporate level. This enables the effectiveness of initiatives to be assessed, improvements to be made and the value of philanthropic activities to be demonstrated. Measuring impact makes it possible to guide future decisions more effectively, minimising the waste of resources and providing greater benefits to the communities (Liket and Maas, 2010).

On the other hand, strategic philanthropy incurs in several limitations making its implementation not always a guarantee for great social impacts. In the first place, there is a risk of instrumentalization of philanthropic activities, which could be perceived as aimed only at corporate profit, rather than a real interest in social good. This situation could undermine the credibility of the company and the effectiveness of the philanthropic initiatives. On this point Saia and Schwarz (2020, p.15) warn about the possibility of strategic philanthropy becoming an “exercise in corporate control” or an attempt to “manipulate public opinion”. In order to avoid an instrumental perception of strategic philanthropy, it is crucial to demonstrate a genuine interest in social good, going beyond simply seeking economic benefits for the company. This can be achieved through active community involvement, transparency in philanthropic activities and clear communication of the company's objectives and values.

Furthermore, Brest (2005) reports that some scholars, such as Collins and Sievers, contest the use of corporate metaphors in philanthropy, arguing that a *hyper-rational* and *managerial* approach is replacing a value-driven and mission-based approach. Brest replies to the critics stating that philanthropy should be driven by passion and values, but that once goals are defined, strategies must be used to achieve them. Brest argues that Collins is confusing ends with means and that is a mistake. Indeed, he affirms that the strategic approach is only a tool to achieve the mission of philanthropy, not an end in itself.

Moreover, in its original definition, strategic philanthropy may not be able to adapt to changing social circumstances, because of its usual implementation in a rigid multi-year plan and the inevitable complexity of societal issues. Indeed, social problems are often difficult to treat and unpredictable, which makes it harder to plan and actuate philanthropic activities with

a guarantee of success (Kania, Kramer and Russell, 2014). The usual linear cause-and-effect model may not be feasible to address complex problems, that instead require a more flexible and adaptable approach (see *emergent strategy* explained earlier), where collaboration and co-creation with communities are the key factors in developing strategies.

Even if methods and instruments to measure the social impact of strategic philanthropy initiatives are extremely important to assess the effectiveness of the activities, not always these measures can offer a clear picture of the real impact of the initiatives. Indeed, the complexity of social problems makes it difficult to isolate the effects of a single philanthropic project and attribute a specific and related result to it. This happens mostly on huge initiatives in which there are several activities carried out and where it is not possible to evaluate exactly the individual performance, quantifying the impact.

Thus, to implement strategic philanthropy is crucial to be aware of the limitations and risks. An ideal approach, in many situations, is an adaptable and flexible strategy based on a deep understanding of social issues and a genuine commitment to the common good.

Applications of strategic philanthropy and social impact

Thanks to its multifaceted approach, strategic philanthropy has been applied in numerous ways and adapted to different contexts and objectives, with the aim of creating a positive impact for both companies and society. The most common use of strategic philanthropy is the related to multinational companies, which finance several philanthropic activities across the world monitoring the results obtained. However, applications of strategic philanthropy approaches are more interesting when they regard non-profit organizations, which are involved in this kind of initiatives as their core business.

There are some examples reported in literature that can depict how the application of a strategic approach really improved the functioning of non-profit organizations. A virtuous example is the Roberts Enterprise Development Fund, which was focused on creating employment for the homeless and indigent. The fund developed 25 criteria that not only measure the success of job-training programs but also help the grantee of the fund to manage the programs more effectively. Indeed, through the application of these measures, they found other related factors affecting the outcomes of the program that otherwise would never be measured (Porter and Kramer, 1999).

Furthermore, Porter and Kramer (1999) report another virtuous example of a strategic approach from foundations: the collaboration between the Charles and Helen Schwab Family Foundation, the Peninsula Community Foundation, and the Sobrato Foundation. The strategic partnership between foundation had the result of strengthening local family service agencies by offering management support, specialist expertise and funding for technology. This strategy has led to increased efficiency, including the merger of some agencies.

Another recent example of strategic philanthropy in foundations initiatives was the collaboration between the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) and FSG, a strategic consulting firm specialized in social impact, to develop and implement an emerging strategy approach to improve health and well-being in the United States, through the adoption of a *culture of health* that takes into account social and emotional determinants. The entire process had as a final result the transitioning of RWJF to an emerging strategy approach through four key areas of work: testing, skills development, coaching, and peer reflection.

Another interesting case was the Raikes Foundation, founded by Jeff Raikes, former CEO of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The real innovation in this approach was the integration of design thinking into strategic planning whereby the foundation could help philanthropists in effectively addressing complex social issues. So, the case study was analysed through the collaboration between the Stanford Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society (Stanford PACS) and the Raikes Foundation, focusing on the integration of human-centred design thinking (HCD) in strategic philanthropy planning. The main objective was to use HCD to develop a strategy that could increase the strategic focus and impact of high-net-worth donors (HNW). The initial hypothesis made by Raikes was related to the fact that many donors do not do in-depth research on non-profit organisations and do not use rigorous methods to address social problems. For this reason, Raikes wanted to explore how to increase strategic behaviour among HNW donors. Through the HCD, the Raikes Foundation conducted an in-depth analysis of the HNW donors, defining their characteristics and the main factors that could influence them in making donations. As a result, donor archetypes were created based on shared characteristics, behaviours, and motivations, defining the most common issues and problems that donors have when deciding to donate. The results obtained were extremely significant in order to draft a coherent strategy that could bring solutions to overcome the issue. Eventually the case showed how the implementation of a strategic approach, with the specific application of HCD, could lead to develop more effective philanthropic strategies by deeply understanding the needs and motivations of donors and experimenting with innovative solutions.

Venture Philanthropy

After having illustrated what strategic philanthropy entails, it is appropriate to complete the literature review by exploring the concept of venture philanthropy. This begins by examining the main concept of venture philanthropy, its evolution overtime, and the main differences with strategic philanthropy, going from the different forms of implementation to the methods used to assess performances. Thus, next paragraphs will be dedicated to analysing the historical literature of venture philanthropy, offering the virtuous example of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

History and evolution

Venture philanthropy is an approach to philanthropy that applies the principles of venture capital to the social sector, with the aim of creating significant and lasting social impact (John, 2006). Given the similarities in the approach, it is often compared to venture capital, but more as an analogy than a model, although many venture philanthropy funds have been set up by professionals of the private equity sector.

As its strategic counterpart, with which it shares several features, this methodology differs from traditional philanthropy in a higher level of involvement, long-term approach and emphasis on performance and outcome measurement. Moreover, venture philanthropy combines the provision of financial resources and non-financial support services, with a deep focus on organisational growth and development.

There is no single definition of *venture philanthropy*, and this term was first coined in 1969 by the American philanthropist John D. Rockefeller III, who used it to define an adventurous approach of financing unpopular social causes (John, 2006). After that, as reported by John (2006), the term re-emerged in 1984 in the annual report of the Peninsula Community Foundation, describing a new generation of young, energetic philanthropists who were more involved in the funding process than previous generations.

In the 1990s, the term exploded, sparking a debate, conducted by several authors, on which new forms of highly committed giving the foundations should develop. An influential paper by Letts et al. (1997) challenged foundations to use *venture capital* instruments to invest in the organisational needs of social purpose organisation, rather than the programmatic ones. Furthermore, Porter and Kramer (1999) challenged foundations to create more value, not simply to be a passive *conduit*, used as transfers from private sources to beneficiaries. On the edge of

this wave, venture philanthropy started developing significantly in the US in the mid-1990s and then it established in the UK from 2002 and expanding afterwards in Continental Europe. Right in Europe, venture philanthropy has faced the challenge of finding its own identity, rather than being seen as an Anglo-Saxon import. Among the several challenges of venture philanthropy, there are the communication and marketing of its own activities, the development of a range of financial instruments and advisory services with the related measurement of financial performance and social impact.

Key characteristics and applications

John (2006) shows how there are several features that differences venture philanthropy from other philanthropic methodologies. In the first place, this method is characterised by an elevated level of engagement from the funder of the organisation. For this reason, some venture philanthropic funds prefer describing themselves as *engaged philanthropy* funds.

Secondly, the support provided by the venture philanthropists is carried out for multiple years, providing substantial and sustained financial resources to a limited number of organisations. This form of funding usually lasts at least three-to-five years, with the aim of enabling the organization to achieve financial self-sufficiency by the end of the funding period.

Furthermore, another characteristic is the injection of expertise or services. In fact, in addition to financial support, venture philanthropy is characterised by the provision of value-added services such as strategic planning, marketing and communications, human resource advice and access to other networks and potential funders. Moreover, even the usual injection of financial resources is peculiar. Indeed, funding provided by venture philanthropist is tailored, as in venture capital. A venture philanthropic organisation usually uses an investment approach to determine the most appropriate form and amount of financing for each organisation. Moreover, John (2006) continues stating that “..depending on their own missions and the ventures they choose to support, venture philanthropists can operate across the spectrum of investment returns”. This means that some of them can offer non-repayable grants while others use loans or other financial instruments or quasi-equity finance.

Additionally, venture philanthropy distinguishes itself for the desire to provide an effective organizational capacity-building. Indeed, most of the time, venture philanthropists decide to prioritize the enhancement of the operational capacity and long-term sustainability of the organizations they support, rather than simply financing specific projects or programs. Indeed,

they perfectly understand the significance of covering core operational expenses in order to enable these organizations to maximize their social impact and improve overall efficiency.

The investment in venture philanthropy is performance-based, with an emphasis on good business planning, measurable results, target achievement and important levels of financial accountability and management expertise.

Criticism about venture philanthropy

As already outlined, venture philanthropy offers several advantages but also has some limitations. Some sources express concerns about the uncritical application of venture capital and corporate sector logics and practices to the non-profit sector. Specifically, John (2006) questions whether the emphasis on efficiency, scalability and performance measurement with purely financial metrics can compromise the social mission and values of the non-profit sector. Moreover, he points out that venture philanthropy is based on venture capital principles, such as long-term investment and practical support, and the risk deriving from the application of such principles may lead to a loss of focus on the social mission and values of the non-profit sector. The direct consequence could be an approach more orientated towards the result at the expense of other approaches that favour local needs or democratic participation.

Furthermore, implementation of the methodology requires a prominent level of expertise, commitment and resources from both funders and funded organisations. These needs of high involvement, resources and of measure performance can increase significantly costs and complexity of operations. Additionally, this close relationship between venture philanthropist and social purpose organisation may be characterised by power dynamics that can undermine the legitimacy of the approach. The control practised by the funder and the expectations of results may limit the autonomy of the funded organisation, leading to potential conflicts of interest.

Venture philanthropy may not be suitable for all organisations with a social purpose or for all types of social problems. Indeed, it is often more appropriate for organisations with a significant growth potential and a structured and defined business model, scalable in the future. Indeed, this approach, so strongly similar to venture capital, has been subjected to criticism, particularly in relation to scalability, investor control, performance measurement and exit strategies, which were not seen as an advantage for the funded companies but a potential concern for their on-going activities.

In Brest's article "In defense of strategic philanthropy" (2005), he reports Sievers's critique about venture philanthropy and its approach based on venture capital models such as growth, active engagement in management and exit strategies. Sievers criticises the idea that it is always advantageous to increase the size or scope of an organisation, because, in his opinion, it is not necessary for social purposes. Moreover, he criticises the idea that funders should be involved in the management of the organisations they fund, stating that "...engagement for engagement's sake is not helpful." (Brest, 2005, p. 139), because founders can manage resources alone without a specific help from investors. Additionally, Sievers criticises the 'exit strategy' concept typical of venture capital, where a successful company is expected to go public or be acquired, as this does not fit the reality of non-profit organisations that depend on philanthropic support. Sievers argues that foundations should support organisations over time, rather than seeking a quick exit.

On the other hand, Brest (2005) recognises that the exit strategy concept, typical of venture capital, cannot be applied to non-profit organisations, which depend on philanthropic support. However, the author argues that philanthropists can learn some useful lessons from venture capitalists that are relevant for exit strategies. Indeed, instead of funding individual projects, philanthropists should support the organisation as a whole by funding general operating expenses. This concept is highly valued by non-profit organisations. Another important lesson is about the different evaluation of time horizons. Indeed, venture capitalists decided to believe in a company long enough to see the achievements at a specific stage. Instead, many foundations impose arbitrary and, sometimes, counterproductive time limits on their support, even for high-performing organisations, leading to possible interruptions of the support due "donor fatigue" (Brest, 2005, p. 140), rather than as a bad result of a well-defined strategy. So, Brest does not really defend the direct application of exit strategies to philanthropy, but he wants to emphasise how the principles of venture capital can lead to a greater effectiveness in supporting non-profit organisations.

Despite these challenges, venture philanthropy remains an innovative and promising approach to tackling social issues, fostering a more strategic, results-driven, and impactful form of giving. In Europe, it continues to evolve, adapting to local contexts and cultural nuances. What began as an attempt to apply venture capital principles directly has developed into a more refined model that considers the complexities of the social sector and the diverse needs of organizations. By emphasizing high engagement, long-term support, and measurable outcomes, venture philanthropy aims to maximize social impact through a structured and strategic approach.

Social impact of venture philanthropy

Venture philanthropy has a significant social impact on non-profit organisations, as described by several sources (John, 2006) (Mityushinaa, Hehenbergera, Alemana, 2019). Indeed, it is deeply involved in strengthening the social sector, contributing to build stronger, more sustainable, and effective social purpose organisations, which could be able to tackle social problems in a better way. Also, venture philanthropy promotes innovative solutions that address social problems, experimenting new models and approaches that could lead to better outcomes and an improvement of the quality of the services provided to communities and beneficiaries. Indeed, the positive impact of venture philanthropy is not unknown. Through the investments on different initiatives, the professionalism introduced in the non-profit sector and the continuing monitoring of the performances, by which it is possible to make the social sector more accountable and transparent, venture philanthropists can assess the positive impact on community development, adjust processes whenever is needed and create opportunities for future growth and systemic change.

There are multiple examples of venture philanthropy across the world. For example, an interesting case that really shows how a venture philanthropy approach can be a driver to change a community and have a significant social impact is the case of Tom Cousins and his East Lake Community. The case study, reported by Van Slyke and Newman (2006), focused on the redevelopment of the East Lake Meadows community in Atlanta, thanks to the venture philanthropic investments provided by Cousins and its foundation. In 1991 East Lake Meadows was a neighbourhood characterised by prevalent poverty, crime, and decay, with a poorly managed social housing project. This situation attracted the attention of real estate entrepreneur Tom Cousins, who decided to apply a philanthropic and entrepreneurial approach. Cousins developed a social impact theory based on a complete approach to community regeneration, including quality housing, security, education, social services, and economic development. His vision was not limited to the simple renovation of buildings, but it was aimed to create a sustainable community in the long term. Unlike his previous experiences in philanthropy, Cousins decide to use the principles of venture philanthropy: long term investments, strategic support, involvement of the community, the government, and other foundations with targeted partnerships. So, it was created the East Lake Community Foundation to take care of the redevelopment, separating it from the Cousin family foundation, the CF Foundation (CFF). The ELCF became the vehicle for raising public and private funds, while the CFF was in charge to administrate the ELCF's expenses, in order to be more focused on programmes, rather than numbers.

The strategy implemented had huge results in terms of social impact. First, the redevelopment led to a significant increase in property prices in the surrounding area, going from about \$45,000 in 1994 to \$166,000 in 2001, an increase of almost 270%! Positive consequences did not stop only on property values but were related to socioeconomic improvement and an increased employment in the area. Families saw a significant improvement in their socioeconomic status by 2004, with a significant improve of their quality of life.

The East Lake Meadows case study offers a significant example of how the combination of venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship can be used to tackle complex problems and drive major changes in disadvantaged communities.

In Europe, an interesting case study is the Impetus Trust (John, 2006), a venture philanthropy fund with a classic portfolio approach, which provides funding and support to build the organisational capacity of non-profit organisations. Impetus Trust decided to focus on small and medium-sized charities in the UK that have growth potential and are in transition situation, such as growth, turnaround, or merger, offering a long-term (usually 3 or 5 years) basic financing package combined with practical management support. They behave as a venture capital in selecting the organisations to fund, looking for *best in class* organisations led by competent management teams. Furthermore, Impetus Trust assesses the entity's needs through a capacity assessment tool called McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid, originally developed by McKinsey & Company for Venture Philanthropy Partners in the United States. The main objective of this instrument is to evaluate all the different areas of the organisation, in order to determine which ones need to be strengthened. Impetus Trust ceased to exist as an autonomous entity in 2013, when it merged with the Private Equity Foundation to form Impetus - The Private Equity Foundation.

Similarities and differences between strategic philanthropy and venture philanthropy

Essentially, venture philanthropy can be defined as an evolution of strategic philanthropy, a diversified approach that takes basic concepts of the latter and integrates them with others coming from the venture capital discipline. Indeed, both approaches share similarities and have significant differences on many aspects.

They both focus their work and their efforts on impacting positively the social environment. However, even if the effect can be similar there are differences in how is carried out. Indeed, venture philanthropy is primarily driven by the objective of maximising social impact, while strategic philanthropy applied by companies seeks a balance between social impact and

corporate benefits. Foundations that apply strategic philanthropy are also different from venture philanthropists because their approach is more policy-driven and less entrepreneurial. This is related to the risk tolerance of the two approaches which is significantly different. In fact, venture philanthropists tend to experiment and implement more innovative models in order to generate a disruptive change, while strategic philanthropists are more conservative and focused to define more solid and scalable initiatives. Furthermore, on the approach, even the time horizon could be significantly different. Giving the more innovative and entrepreneurial procedure, venture philanthropy has the main objective of impacting in the medium-term, usually 5-10 years per investment. Instead, strategic philanthropy applies a long-term approach with redevelopment plan of more than 10 years, usually adjusted along time.

Even if in both methodologies there is an active engagement with several stakeholders, surely venture philanthropy, as explained, provides and hands-on, active mentorship and advisory also with non-financial services, creating a situation of constant involvement of the supported organisation, as happen in a venture capital context. On the other hand, in strategic philanthropy there is a more indirect involvement of the object of the philanthropy, being less intense and less personal and focusing more on the financial and strategic aspect. The main objective is funding a large systemic change with an engagement of mainly policymakers and governments.

Both methodologies use grants as a funding mechanism, which are non-repayable funds provided to non-profit organisations or to altruistic initiatives. Grants are mostly used when there is not a specific revenue generation from the activity funded. Strategic philanthropy foundations use grants as the preferred tool because allow huge investments to drive social changes. However, they can use the so-called *impact investing*, which is a term referring to investments made by foundations with the intention of generating social or environmental impact alongside the financial return. This method is used more selectively than grants because there have to be a reasonable certainty that the financial return can sustain other future philanthropic efforts. On the other hand, venture philanthropy applies form of funding coming from the venture capital, such as equity investments, loans and, as reported by John (2006), other different funding instruments. Equity funding consists of funding an organisation and receiving an ownership stake in return, as happens in venture capital. This can enable long-term financial sustainability and the provision of mentorship and strategic guidance. Loans, instead, are not the common ones used, but usually are facilitated in the return terms. So, these are usually low-interest loans or recoverable grants, used to help non-profit businesses to access capital without diluting their ownership. John (2006) explains that, especially in Europe, there

are different other methods used to fund organisations, such as through equity-like instruments, surplus sharing mechanisms or strategic alliances with grant making foundations.

Moreover, both forms of philanthropy recognise the importance of measuring results. However, venture philanthropy evaluates performances with a venture capital mindset, focusing on measurable outcomes like financial sustainability and growth and the social impact and medium-term results of the planned activities. Instead, strategic philanthropy evaluates large-scale systemic change overtime, assessing social impact with less financial and developed metrics. This difference could risk on evaluating differently the impact of a strategy on an organisation. (Table 1.1 offers a summary of the main differences).

Feature	Venture philanthropy	Strategic philanthropy
Approach	Entrepreneurial	Policy-driven
Risk Tolerance	High (experimentation of innovative models)	Medium (focused on more solid and scalable initiatives)
Engagement	Financial and non-financial services provided (mentorship, advisory)	More indirect involvement
Time horizon	Medium-term (5-10 years)	Long-term (more than 10 years with adjustments overtime)
Funding mechanisms	Grants, equity, loans, quasi-equity instruments	Mostly grants and selectively impact investing
Impact assessment	Measurable outcomes, both financial and social and a focus on growth of the organisation	Evaluation of a systemic change overtime

Table 1.1

The difference of evaluation of an initiative by venture and strategic philanthropy can lead to make different conclusion on whether a strategy is working. So, the next chapter will be dedicated to discussing the methodologies and metrics used by both approaches to evaluate social and economic impact, trying to understand if their integration could lead to a better transparency and effectiveness of measurement.

Chapter 2

How foundations measure social impact

Assessing social impact in strategic philanthropy

Impact measurement of strategic philanthropy initiatives is fundamental in order to clearly understand if a specific philanthropic project is successful or not overtime and which kind of further actions the nonprofit organisation should put in place to adjust and change the approach. As happens in strategic monitoring for traditional strategies of corporations, it becomes essential to measure performance and social impact of philanthropic activities and monitoring the compliance with the objectives defined (Liket and Maas, 2016).

However, it has been observed that there are not specific and defined rules and metrics universally adopted to measure the social impact. Indeed, Liket and Maas (2010) state that the measurement of philanthropic impact is influenced by a combination of factors internal and external to the organisation, including its size, the resources invested in philanthropy, the sectoral context, and the geographical region in which it operates. According to them, larger companies are more prone to concerns about their legitimacy and consequently are more likely to measure their impact to monitor their reputation and stakeholder satisfaction. For the same reason related to visibility and attention, the more a company spends on philanthropy, the more likely it is to measure its impact. There are differences between sectors in terms of measuring impact, in fact, compared to the financial sector, public service and industrial companies measure their social impact less frequently. Finally, the geographical location of a company has a predictive value for measuring philanthropic impact. This is due to variations in public, regulatory and stakeholder pressures in different regions.

Thus, there is not a specific framework that is valid for all situations and every philanthropic project. Instead, there are different methods that can be used in order to assess and monitor the social impact of a philanthropic initiative. Next paragraphs will be dedicated to explaining some of them and to show that, even if valuable, there is no consistency in their application leading to an inefficient transparency in social impact measurement.

Theory of Change

Brest (2010) defines the concept of Theory of Change regarding the measurement of impact of social initiatives. Theory of Change (ToC) is a methodology that helps to design, implement and evaluate social change interventions. The author argues that both funders and beneficiary organisations should focus on real impact, even if difficult to measure, and consider the theory of change as a predictor of future situations. The article defines the ToC as the most important empirical basis for any form of social intervention. Indeed, the Theory of Change is an organisational process in which stakeholders decide to specify a pathway with the settlement of long-term goals and key assumptions along with the determination of strategic paths to impact. At the heart of ToC is a results pathway, which shows the change process in a step-by-step manner, in which the completion of one step is the prerequisite for moving to the next one, which ultimately lead to desired results and the wanted impact (Brook and Akin, 2019).

Thus, the Theory of Change, although providing interesting concepts about the methodology that should be used to evaluate a strategy, is not a structured and well-defined framework that could be applied to every situation to evaluate carefully if a philanthropic activity is working or not.

Evaluation policies and output-outcome monitoring

The lack of a solid and defined method to monitor the effectiveness of social impact of philanthropic activities led some scholars to define some evaluation policies in that sense. Kinarsky and Christie (2022) tried to fill gaps in existing research and to provide an updated taxonomy to guide the development of effective evaluation policies in the philanthropic sector. They focus their study more on the development of a defined evaluation policy rather than a structured evaluation framework. Consequently, they wanted that the organisations already applying some evaluation policies, to use the revised taxonomy as a benchmark to assess the completeness and comprehensiveness of their current policies.

An interesting approach developed to assess correctly the impact of philanthropic activities is the Logical Framework (LogFrame) created by the USAID (United States Agency for International Development). The Logical Framework (LogFrame) is widely used in the international development community to design projects aimed at achieving measurable results. The LogFrame helps to clearly define the objectives of the philanthropic project, including the Goal, Purpose, Outputs, and Inputs. This ensures that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of what the project aims to achieve. Moreover, it requires the identification of

specific and measurable indicators to monitor progress towards the achievement of objectives. This allows philanthropic projects to assess their impact and make changes as they progress, if necessary. The concept of the LogFrame is based on the output measurement, the necessity to clearly understand and identify which output of the project should be measured to effectively assess the success of the project. Usually, outputs are immediate and quantitative measures, usually focusing on the “products” of an intervention. They are easy to collect, measure and communicate. For example, in a vocational training project, outputs may include the number of participants trained, the number of sessions conducted, or the number of materials distributed.

Along with outputs there is the concept of outcomes which, instead, are referred to the tangible changes that occur in project beneficiaries as a result of the outputs generated. Outcomes are more difficult to measure, as they concern medium- and long-term results. For example, in a project to reduce infant mortality, the Gates Foundation measured not only outputs (number of vaccines distributed), but also outcomes such as reduced infections and increased immunisation rates in the target communities. Output-outcome monitoring is an effective method used by strategic philanthropists in order to clearly assess the impact and effectiveness of the strategies put in place.

Thus, there are no defined methods of measuring a strategic philanthropic initiative. These are different between organisations and between projects of the same organisation as well. However, the main objective of each policy or each monitoring system is to effectively evaluate the systemic change of the initiative overtime.

Assessing social impact in venture philanthropy

Differently from strategic philanthropy, venture philanthropy is more focused on impacting effectively in the medium-term with a more entrepreneurial approach. Consequently, methods and metrics used to measure the social impact of venture philanthropic activities pose their attention to the sustainable growth of the organisation overtime, assessing the financed activities from both social and financial perspective. There are some metrics used by venture philanthropist consistently that can assess better than strategic philanthropists the effectiveness of initiatives. Next paragraphs will be dedicated to describing them.

Social Return on Investment (SROI)

Social Return on Investment (SROI) is a methodology for measuring and quantifying the social value generated by a project, programme, or intervention in relation to the investment made. It is an evolution of the Return on Investment (ROI) concept, integrating social, environmental, and economic aspects. So, it is a framework designed to measure and account for a broader concept of value, which goes beyond the simple financial terms alone. It is developed in order to measure changes in ways that are specifically relevant to the people or the organisations that experience or contribute to it. The main goal of the measure is to reduce inequality and environmental degradation and improve well-being of communities involved in the project.

The guide published by The SROI Network Accounting for Value (Nicholls et al., 2012) describes a six-step process for conducting an SROI analysis:

- 1) Definition of purpose and identification of key stakeholders: Establish the boundaries of the SROI analysis and involve stakeholders in the process.
- 2) Outcome mapping: Develop an impact map showing the relationship between inputs, outputs, and outcomes.
- 3) Evaluation of outcomes and attribution of value: Find data to demonstrate whether outcomes have occurred and evaluate them.
- 4) Defining impact: Eliminating aspects of change that would have occurred anyway or that are the result of other factors.
- 5) Calculation of the SROI: Add up all benefits, subtract any negative aspects and compare the result with the investment. The formula of the SROI is:

$$SROI = \frac{\text{Social value generated (€)}}{\text{Total investment (€)}}$$

6) Reporting, utilisation, and integration: Sharing results with stakeholders, integrating outcome processes and verifying the report.

So, the implementation of the SROI is marked by a defined step-by-step process, that can be applied to any context and any venture philanthropic project, differently from what usually happens in strategic philanthropy. It consists of accurately translate the several outcomes in numbers that can be used to estimate the real effectiveness of the activity.

However, the SROI is not a measure that provides exclusively advantages. Indeed, Cooney and Lynch-Cerullo (2014) provide a detailed overview of Social Return on Investment (SROI), describing as a tool to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of non-profit organisations' programmes, but also with some potential drawbacks. They highlight a number of methodological dilemmas that remain in the implementation of SROI. First, identifying stakeholders, so who will have the benefits evaluated, is not easy. The organisation should carefully consider who will benefit from the action and measure exclusively the impact on those stakeholders. Second, the evaluation needs to be carefully designed and executed, specifically regarding the monetising of the outcomes, so how outcomes can generate a monetary reward in exchange of the investment provided. This includes including data collection, counterfactual calculation, development of proxy measures, attribution, and drop-off. Third, it should be defined a clear time horizon in which benefits are measured, or more time horizons to compare overtime to assess if the project is developing overtime. Finally, the selection of the appropriate discount rates for future value. Indeed, differently from strategic philanthropic projects, in venture philanthropy the effectiveness of a social initiative is also evaluated by discounting the future social value of the investment. However, there is a lack of standards in the application of these discounting principles in the nonprofit contexts, so it is another area of possible falter of the SROI methodology. Thus, despite the methodological challenges, Cooney and Lynch-Cerullo (2014) conclude that the SROI can be a useful tool for communicating an organisation's impact and attracting funding. However, it is important to interpret SROI as an approximation of impact, rather than a precise measure, even if it offers more certainty than the traditional methods of social assessment.

Tailored Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

The need in venture philanthropy of monitoring continuously the evolution of the philanthropic project led to the development and application of some evaluation performances indicators that are specialised for the project put in place. These are the so-called Tailored KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) that each nonprofit organisation uses at its own discretion based on the kind of activities performed. Tailored KPIs are customised following the project's mission, objectives and vision and focus on indicators relevant to the organisation and its stakeholders. The main concern regarding the use of tailored KPIs is related to define what to measure. Indeed, firm can make mistakes deciding to measure some aspects and ignore others that instead could have been significant in the correct evaluation of the project. An example regarding the use of tailored KPIs is The Nature Conservancy, a U.S. nonprofit organisation that customises its indicators in order to measure the effectiveness of environmental protection. It uses KPIs such as the number of hectares of land protected, but also indicators of ecological quality and biodiversity, which are specifically designed for each conservation project.

The rationale behind the application of Tailored KPIs is the same of traditional strategies of companies in the market: monitoring the progress of the strategy and adjust the activities when needed according to changes in the environment or potential problems rising. Differently from strategic philanthropy, which evaluates the success of a project in the long-term for a systematic change in society, venture philanthropy focuses on the continuous improvement of the strategic actions and KPIs are extremely important in that sense.

Due diligence per Impact Investment

A useful method used by nonprofit organisations is evaluating the social impact of a project by setting an efficient due diligence process in order to be sure that every step conducted leads to an effective and meaningful result. Thus, due diligence per impact investment is a crucial process that aims to assess the feasibility, risks, and potential social and economic impact of an investment that seeks to generate a social return as well as a financial return. This type of due diligence is essential for investors who want to ensure that their investments are not only profitable but also contribute positively to society and the environment. As reported by the guide drafted by the Pacific Community Ventures (2019), investors should seek to systematically assess the expected impact of their investments and they can do that thanks to a well-defined process divided into different phases, that go from the financial assessment of the operation, so regarding the potential financial return of the investment, to the social assessment,

so how much the initiative will contribute to solve social problems related to the investment. Due diligence, moreover, focuses specifically on understanding the scalability of the philanthropic activity and the impact generated overtime. This includes market analysis, the company's ability to attract additional capital and the replicability of the business model.

There are many significant examples of due diligence per impact investing in venture philanthropy. For instance, BlueOrchard an investment fund, applies a due diligence process that assesses the social and economic effectiveness of the projects it decided to support. An example is its investment in the Microfinance and Education Fund project, which provides microloans to small businesses and finances educational programmes in emerging countries. The due diligence analysis included assessment of the social benefits (education and economic opportunities) and financial sustainability of the fund. As reported in its Disclosure Statement (2023), BlueOrchard uses its own tool called SPIRIT (Social Performance Impact Reporting & Intelligence Tool) to assess Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) and impact factors of potential investments. This is one of the many examples of how due diligence can lead to a more efficient and effective monitoring of philanthropic investments.

Methodology and Analysis

Afterwards having addressed what strategic philanthropy and venture philanthropy are and how there are different methodologies used to evaluate the social impact of each approach, it is appropriate to carefully set the analysis of this thesis and how it will be conducted. The next chapter will be dedicated to analysing a strategic philanthropy project: “For 100 Resilient Cities” developed by the Rockefeller Foundation; and a venture philanthropy project: GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance developed by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. After having defined if all the characteristics of the two projects can be trace back to the strategic and venture philanthropy’s ones, the analysis will continue by attempting to apply venture philanthropy methods of social assessment of the GAVI project at the 100 Resilient Cities project in order to evaluate if a different procedure of social evaluation can lead to a better transparency in showing the impact of the initiative compared to the actual forms of social evaluation.

In order to assess if a project contains characteristics defined in the literature review, it could be appropriate to develop a checklist with all the theoretical aspects, assigning a value of 1, if the aspect is present in the project, or a value of 0, if the aspect is absent.

Table 2.1 below summarizes the several aspects the analysis will look for in both projects.

Aspect	Brief Definition	Assessment Criterion
Entrepreneurial approach	Presence of an approach that tends to create innovation in addition to the philanthropic impact	1 if the approach is entrepreneurial. 0 if the approach is more traditional
Type of funding mechanism	The use of funding mechanisms that are commonly illustrated in literature.	1 if the funding mechanism used is through multi-year grant commitments. 0 if funding is done through other mechanism
Time horizon	Measurement of systematic change in the long-term period	1 if the planned change is focused in the long term. 0 if the planned change is more focused in the medium term
Scalability and replicability	Evaluation of the attitude of the project to be scaled up or replicated in other contexts	1 if there are strategies for scalability. 0 if not
Type of engagement	Provision of non-financial services in addition to the investments	1 if the organisation provides non-financial services. 0 if not
Theory of Change	Logical map linking input, output, outcome, and final impact to explain the expected change.	1 if ToC is applied. 0 if not
SROI	Ratio between the social value generated and the total investment made.	1 if the organisation uses the SROI. 0 if not
Tailored KPIs	Project-specific performance indicators, both quantitative and qualitative.	1 if the organisation has developed customised KPIs for the project. 0 if not
Output-outcome monitoring	Continuous, monitoring of immediate results (output) and medium- to long-term changes (outcome) to assess effectiveness and overall impact.	1 if there are structured monitoring systems and reporting. 0 if these are absent
Due diligence per impact investment	Evaluation process integrating financial return and social impact, using scorecards and structured analysis.	1 if there is a structured and well-defined process. 0 if not

Table 2.1

Chapter 3

Adopting venture philanthropy metrics in strategic philanthropy

GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance: a venture philanthropy project

Strategic development of GAVI

GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance is a global public–private partnership which was founded in 2000. The organisation has the mission to improve access to immunization in low-income countries bringing together the governments, several international organizations, the private sector, and philanthropic organizations in order to accelerate vaccine introduction and to strengthen health systems in the world. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is one of the most important and largest donors of GAVI. Indeed, the foundation’s involvement has been significant in shaping the strategy of GAVI and the further scaling of its operations.

GAVI, since its foundation, has helped immunized more than 800 million of children, reducing the incidence of vaccine-preventable diseases, through a collaborative approach that leverages resources, expertise, and innovation from multiple stakeholders. The entrepreneurial approach adopted by the foundation led to the provision of both financial and non-financial support through different mechanisms, specifically related to strategy development, technology employment and innovation research to enhance vaccine delivery and to strengthen the health system. From a financial perspective, the Gates Foundation helped GAVI through a combination of financial mechanisms. For instance, the foundation provided to GAVI substantial direct grant funding, typically structured as multi-year commitments. This long-term funding approach allowed GAVI to plan and to implement several large-scale immunization programs with a better certainty and stability. Moreover, by committing significant funds, the foundation encouraged other donors (governments, international organizations, or private sector partners) to contribute, creating a multiplier effect that scaled up initiatives. This is called catalytic funding. Consequently, the co-investment made alongside other organisations and governments results in sharing both the risk and the rewards of the project, helping to mitigate financial risks associated with global health initiatives and to foster collaborative efforts across multiple sectors with a substantial differentiation of funding resources. In addition, an innovative funding instrument was developed for GAVI: the Advanced Market Commitment

(AMC). Basically, it is a form of guarantee by donors to purchase a certain number of vaccines at pre-set price, providing market certainty for a scale production through the reduction of vaccine prices.

Alongside with financial support, the Gates Foundation helped GAVI to develop long-term strategic planning in order to establish a shared long-term vision between philanthropic organisation, governments, and private sector, which could align global immunization goals with the strengthening of health systems and the scaling up of vaccination programs. Strategic advisory provided to GAVI helped to identify several scenarios and assess risks for each of them to prevent emerging health threats through pre-emptive strategies. Furthermore, strategic advisory helped the organisation in deciding how to allocate the resources in a more effective and efficient way, focusing on scalability by ensuring that successful vaccination projects could be expanded to broader regions. These planning sessions usually employed a Theory of Change framework in order to map out all the causal connections from inputs to long-term impact, ensuring that all actions were aligned with measurable outcomes. Moreover, strategic planning was complemented with investments in technology and innovative solutions to support day-to-day operations of the organisation. Indeed, these investments focused on improving data collection, real-time monitoring, and logistical efficiency.

Impact measurement: quantitative and qualitative assessments

Gates Foundation helped GAVI to develop a solid and efficient impact measurement system that could really track both the direct outcomes of the program and the broader social and economic impacts, ensuring a high degree of transparency. The framework consisted of a comprehensive approach that tried to leverage both quantitative metrics and qualitative assessments through the employment of advanced digital monitoring tools, such as integrated data analytics and real-time dashboards.

First of all, GAVI use the vaccine coverage rates as a core metric to assess the percentage of target populations (typically children) who received vaccines. The main objective is to obtain high coverage rates, above 90%, to consider the program successful. Data is collected through national immunization surveys, routine health information systems and third-party evaluations. Afterwards, these numbers are cross-referenced with demographic data to ensure that analysis was accurate. The purpose of this measure resides on the fact that having a high vaccination coverage can reduce the incidence of vaccine-preventable diseases and consequently lead to a decrease in mortality (especially child mortality). According to the World Health Organisation

(WHO), GAVI contributed substantially to achieve a 90% vaccine coverage rates for key vaccines in several countries. Alongside this measure, the Gates Goalkeepers Report stated that GAVI and the Gates Foundation estimated the number of lives that were saved as a result of the immunization programs. This study was conducted through the application of statistic models which incorporated the data of baseline mortality and the projected mortality reductions based on vaccine coverage improvements. The final purpose was to compare pre-intervention and post-intervention mortality rates in order to assess if there were some changes thanks to the implementation of programs. It can be affirmed that this metrics are tailored for this project (KPIs) and are also related to the concept of output-outcome monitoring.

Moreover, GAVI annual reports show several cost-effectiveness metrics used to quantify the economic efficiency of the investment, such as the cost per vaccine dose delivered, the cost per life saved, or the cost per disability-adjusted life year (DALY) averted. These costs are tracked down along the supply chain of the organisation (procurement, distribution, administration, etc.) and then it is divided by the health outcomes that have been achieved. For instance, research suggest that the cost per vaccinated child can range between \$1.5 and \$2. This kind of metrics are not plainly important to assess the effectiveness and the success of the program, but also to understand if there is necessity to make some adjustments in resource allocation decisions.

From a qualitative perspective, GAVI used different methods to evaluate the effectiveness of its immunization programs, providing significant insights into areas that are difficult to capture using purely numerical indicators. For instance, GAVI used qualitative tools, such as ethnographic studies or structured interviews, to assess what was public trust for vaccines in order to identify which factors could influence the acceptance of vaccines and hesitancy from people. Furthermore, GAVI's impact was also measured through policy-level assessments that examined whether national governments were integrating the GAVI's initiatives into long-term health policies for countries. The use of qualitative assessments is essential to complement numerical data and to provide better insights of community behaviours, governance, and health system situation, thus ensuring that vaccination programs can be effective, efficient, and sustainable overtime. Additionally, there was the implementation of a well-defined multi-layer due diligence system conducted by monitoring outcomes, ensuring transparency, and applying real-time adjustments. This is done through several tools including tailored KPIs, third party evaluations (WHO and UNICEF) and especially the SROI.

SROI: a brief calculation

SROI metric an instrument used by venture philanthropic organisation to show the economic and social impact of the activities funded. Regarding GAVI, some research suggests that there in several countries the SROI reached by the program is about 5:1, meaning that for \$1 invested, the social value generated was worth \$5. However, there are no substantial evidence of the total Social Return on Investment generated by GAVI that can really show the impact of the Gates Foundation investments over the years. For this reason, a brief calculation of the SROI is necessary using several sources for data needed and some assumptions. As previously stated, the formula of the SROI is:

$$SROI = \frac{\text{Social value generated (€)}}{\text{Total investment (€)}}$$

Consequently, it necessary to understand these values to compute the social return. According to the Gates Foundation grant database, the total investment provided to GAVI is about \$4 billion committed since 2000. Instead, in order to determine the social value generated by the investment, it is necessarily following the guidelines provided by The SROI Network Accounting for Value already described, which take qualitative assumptions and data in order to obtain related quantitative information. Moreover it is possible to deduct from the framework for the computation of the SROI, developed by the UK Institute of Social Value, that the social value generated is obtained considering two main elements: the economic effect of the lives saved through the program and the additional benefits from the implementation of the program different from lifesavings. The economic value used to show lifesavings is called Value of a Statistical Life (VSL) and it is a widely used to observe the economic effect of reduced mortality. The World Health Organization (WHO), other global health organizations and some scholars (Viscusi and Aldy, 2003) usually apply lower VSL estimates for low- and middle-income countries, with figures that can vary from \$100.000 to £300.000. Thus, considering that GAVI's programs funded by the Gates foundation have prevented about 15 million deaths since 2000 and assuming a VSL of \$200.000, consistent with the countries helped by the organisation, the total value from lives saved can be computed as:

$$\text{Value from Lives Saved} = 15.000.000 \times \$200.000 = \$3 \text{ billion}$$

The second element that contributes to the generation of social value is the amount of all the additional benefits that are indirectly produced by the implementation of the program. For GAVI, the main effects are related to the reduction of healthcare costs. Indeed, vaccination treatment have proven to reduce consistently the related treatments for the diseases. Thus,

considering that vaccination reduces healthcare costs, with some assumptions it is possible to obtain an estimation of these savings. GAVI's annual reports states that the organisation prevented about 600 million diseases thanks to immunization, while the WHO reports that for low-income countries, the average cost of treating diseases that could be prevented by vaccines is around \$50 per case. Consequently:

$$\textit{Estimated healthcare savings} = 600.000.000 \times \$50 = \$30 \textit{ billion}$$

Adding this estimation to the total value from lives saved, it is possible to obtain a social value generated by GAVI equal to \$33 billion. Recall that this value is obtained through a simplified estimation that does not consider several side factors, and it is based on simple numbers deductible from sources available. Eventually, given all computations, the SROI of GAVI can be derived:

$$SROI = \frac{\$33 \textit{ billion}}{\$4 \textit{ billion}} = 8 : 1$$

So, this means that every \$1 invested in GAVI immunization programs generates \$8 of social and economic benefits. The impact of the entire investment provided by the Gates Foundation is extremely positive from both social and economic perspectives and it is the minimum result considering that there are many other factors that could affect the result in a better way.

100 Resilient Cities: a strategic philanthropy project

Strategic development of 100 Resilient Cities

Resilient Cities is a strategic philanthropic project, developed by the Rockefeller Foundation from 2013, that aims to help cities around the world in building the capacity to face physical, social, and economic challenges. Specifically, this initiative was born to support urban resilience when facing climate changes, natural disasters, and rapid urbanization. The approach in developing the project is more holistic and more focused in the long-term period than GAVI, emphasizing systemic change rather than immediate financial and social returns. In 2013, the program had initially selected 100 cities from around the globe, which had various income levels and were located in different geographical regions. The main objective was to provide cities a tailored support to develop resilience strategies. This could happen with a dedicated resilience team, called “Resilience Director”, along with technical assistance, strategic planning workshops and the access to a global network of experts. The project was built in order to create resilient infrastructures that could make cities ready to face both acute shocks, like natural disasters, and/or event of chronic stress, such as climate change or economic instability. The Rockefeller foundation drives the project through a financial and strategic support, ensuring that all selected cities could have the necessary resources to conduct resilience assessments and to implement strategic plans. Differently from GAVI, which is an independent organisation founded by a foundation, 100 Resilient Cities is a project embedded in the Rockefeller Foundation, and it is financially supported through a long-term funding. Indeed, the foundation allocated funds from its endowment, guided by strategic priorities identified in its annual and impact reports. Grantees are subjected to a rigorous selection process in which proposals are evaluated in order to be effectively alignment with the mission of the foundation and, mostly, with potential for a significant and sustainable impact. As happened for GAVI, the investment made by the Rockefeller Foundation had a catalytic effect because it had the result to attract additional funding from other entities, like governments and private donors. The collective investment generated a risk-sharing situation that helped to mitigate financial uncertainties, enhancing collaborative problem-solving between partners involved in the project.

From a strategic perspective, the Rockefeller Foundation offered strategic guidance to the process, providing direction and expertise by setting long-term goals, setting milestones to achieve them with the related roadmap, all in accordance with the priorities identified. In the 100 Resilient Cities initiative, the foundation developed exhaustive resilience frameworks that could be guidelines for cities in assessing potential risks, facing potential emergencies and, especially, implementing long-term strategies. These frameworks helped these cities in

identifying their vulnerabilities and in developing action plans in response to their needs. The foundation decided to exploit its global network of expert, going from urban planners and engineers to policy makers and researchers, in order to provide the needed technical support and advice to the project, offering not only specialised knowledge but also facilitating learning among cities through a peer-to-peer system. In addition, strategic workshops and conferences were organized to spread new insights and to discuss emerging challenges. Differently from venture philanthropy, there is not an effective involvement of the foundation in the creation of a structured and well-defined strategy with the provision of non-financial services, but there is more an indirect way of offering support in the development of the initiative. However, this form of strategic guidance could ensure that the initiative was embedded within a broader and sustainable vision, becoming also scalable overtime, not much from an economic and entrepreneurial point of view, as from an example of successful model that can be replicated in other contexts. Even if not explicitly labelled, the 100 Resilient Cities applied the Theory of Change, from its inputs (financial resources, technical assistance) to its application (strategic planning and implementation), leading to create some significant outputs (resilience frameworks and partnerships networks) that paved the way for important outcomes, such as an enhanced urban resilience, that must be monitored overtime, an improved governance and coordination between institutions and privates, and an increased community engagement, implying a broader participation of residents in planning and decision-making processes. Every process is designed to obtain a long-term impact that translates into a sustainable and inclusive urban development, leading to better quality of life, with the chance to integrate this politics with national policy frameworks.

Impact measurement: quantitative and qualitative assessments

The Rockefeller foundation decided to employ a multi-dimensional measurement system for the 100 Resilient Cities project. It was the result of a balanced combination between both quantitative and qualitative approaches in order to evaluate the actual impact of the resilience interventions. The system was designed to assess not only the direct economic benefits, like the reduced losses for avoided disasters or the improvements in the infrastructure system, but also the effect from a social perspective, such as a potential enhanced governance, a community empowerment with a consequent transformation and improvements of policies.

The 100 Resilient Cities initiative used a range of quantitative metrics in order to correctly assess the effectiveness of the programs in enhancing urban resilience. These metrics were

designed following an output-outcome approach in order to evaluate tangible improvements especially in infrastructure, economic stability, and risk reduction. Indeed, metrics are built from a combination of local government data, surveys and assessments that were conducted by technical partners of the project. There is not presence of defined tailored KPIs that show an ongoing performance of the initiative, but rather the creation of certain indexes that capture an overall and overall performance of the project. One of these indexes is the resilience index that is created with the objective to quantify the capacity that a city must have to absorb, recover from, and then adapt to potential shocks and stresses of various nature. This index is typically built from several sub-indicators that reflect various dimensions of the wanted resilience, such as quality and durability of important facilities, efficiency of emergency planning designed by the local government, the ability to absorb economic shocks of the local community and the potential strength of recovery. It is constructed with a collection of data coming from municipal records, specific resilience surveys and third-party assessments, with the aim to obtain a final resilience score, usually on a 0–100 scale, for each city. Some of them have reported an improvement of 10-15 points in their resilience following the targeted interventions. Alongside this measure, there are more economic metrics used to observe the impact of the initiative, such as the reduction in disaster losses and the increased economic productivity, expressed in percentage in comparison to the previous situation (for example 10% reduction in losses from disasters after the treatment). However, these metrics are not built to effectively monitor progresses of an investment overtime, but these are more a general assessment of the overall improvement of the initiative overtime with no significant specific and specialised indicators as it happens in venture philanthropy.

From a qualitative perspective, the Rockefeller Foundation needed to monitor the 100 Resilient Cities initiative to capture improvements in several areas, like governance, policy transformation and community engagement, aspect that are not easy to quantify but are essential to observe the broader and mostly intangible impacts of these initiatives. The 100 Resilient Cities had a strong impact in terms of changes in the governance and policy enhancements. Indeed, there have been conducted qualitative assessments focusing on how resilience initiatives could change local governance and the consequent policy formulation of strategies for cities' improvements. This process included the integration of the concept of resilience into long-term strategic plans and the strengthening of public sector accountability. The Rockefeller foundation offers several case studies and evaluation reports that show significant improvements in governance, coordination, and emergency management of the treated cities. Furthermore, differently from GAVI and the Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation

does not conduct a well- defined and data-driven due diligence approach for 100 Resilient Cities. Instead, the due diligence is more focused on an accurate strategic selection and qualitative assessments, incorporating a systematic evaluation of potential urban partners. Indeed, cities are selected considering several criteria like urban vulnerability, strength of the governance structures and the strategic alignment of the city with the initiative.

Regarding the most famous metric to assess the social and economic impact of a philanthropic initiative, the SROI, there is not a widely recognized SROI analysis that has been published for the 100 Resilient Cities initiative. Indeed, as seen, the Rockefeller Foundation has conducted numerous evaluations of urban resilience investments, but most of the assessment are specifically focused on a combination of qualitative and quantitative indicators, not so specific and detailed, rather than a SROI ratio that can show with one measure the effective impact of the project. Some independent research (Ritchie et al., 2019) (Kousky et al., 2019) conducted studies on urban resilience and cost-effectiveness in similar contexts, however these analyses were not specifically focused on the 100 Resilient Cities as a whole, rather they focused their attention on few subsets of interventions and investments in various urban situations.

Differences between GAVI and 100 Resilient Cities

The two projects developed by the Gates foundation and the Rockefeller foundation show strong differences in the initial premises, in the implementation of the initiatives and in the related measurement systems adopted. However, there are some contact points in which the projects are similar, indeed both are conducted with a philanthropic purpose supported by a strategic vision to help communities and create a significant impact socially and economically. The difference, instead, reside more on the willingness of obtaining direct and relatively immediate results in GAVI, compared to a more systemic and indirect approach of 100 Resilient Cities. Not to be forgotten the strong differences in terms of creation of the initiatives: GAVI is an organisation funded by the Gates Foundation, while the 100 Resilient Cities project is embedded in and monitored by the Rockefeller Foundation itself.

The principal aspects to consider in evaluating the compatibility of the projects with the theoretical considerations made in early chapters can be summarized into Table 3.1, that functions as a checklist offering a general view of the two projects and their relevant aspects.

Aspect	GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance	100 Resilient Cities
Entrepreneurial approach	Value: 1 The approach can be considered entrepreneurial due to the strategic and technological innovations introduced to enhance vaccine delivery and improve the health systems.	Value: 1 The approach can be considered entrepreneurial due to the innovations introduced to improve the urban resilience of several cities in order to face climate changes challenges.
Type of funding mechanism	Value: 1 The project is funded through investments made in multiple years by the foundation through common grants .	Value: 1 The project is funded through investments made in multiple years by the foundation through common grants .
Time horizon	Value: 0 Even if introduced in 2000, the aim of the project was to obtain results in the medium term in order to contribute to save as many lives as possible.	Value: 1 The principal objective was to create resilient and sustainable cities overtime , not necessary in the short or medium period.
Scalability and replicability	Value: 1 All strategies and implementation were designed and monitored especially in order to be scaled up in other contexts.	Value: 1 The implementation of a strategy in one city can offer important insights to replicate the strategy in other cities as well.

Type of engagement	Value: 1 The foundation provided strategic advisory for each step of the program alongside financial support.	Value: 0 Even if the program had a strategic support, it was limited to a strategic support in the development of the program, not a continuous relationship overtime along with financial support.
Theory of Change	Value: 1 The Theory of Change was applied.	Value: 1 The Theory of Change was applied.
SROI	Value: 1 The organisation uses the SROI as a form of evaluation of social and economic impact.	Value: 0 The organisation does not the SROI .
Tailored KPIs	Value: 1 The organisation developed customised KPIs to assess the impact of the project overtime.	Value: 0 The organisation did not develop structured KPIs but relied in more absolutistic form of measurement that show the impact as a systemic change.
Output-outcome monitoring	Value: 1 There are structured monitoring systems and reporting.	Value: 1 There are structured monitoring systems and reporting.
Due diligence per impact investment	Value: 1 There is a structured process of evaluation that integrates financial return and social impact , using scorecards and structured analysis.	Value: 0 Due diligence is not data-driven and relies more on qualitative assessments conducted before the execution of the process.

Table 3.1

It can be observed that the main differences rely on the methodologies and the metrics used to assess the social and economic performances of the two projects and consequently the type of approach in determining the effectiveness of the impact in the communities involved.

Integration of venture metrics in a strategic philanthropy project

As observed, the methods of measurement and the metrics used in GAVI are slightly different from the ones used in evaluating the social impact of 100 Resilient Cities. The main purpose of the next paragraphs will be to define a hypothetical scenario in which the project of the Rockefeller Foundation can incorporate the metrics used by GAVI in order to observe a significant improvement in transparency and effectiveness of the communication of the social impact. This analysis will be structured in 3 levels: introduction of tailored KPIs, SROI analysis and the implementation of a due diligence process.

Applications and changes in evaluating social impact

First of all, 100 Resilient Cities does not offer a comprehensive and structured system of monitoring through defined KPIs that can track down the effectiveness of the initiative. Instead, it uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative assessments that can be subjected to biases and errors in the collection, being extremely dependent on surveys, government communications and interviews. Relying only on these kinds of assessments, and on few absolute values that can be observed after many years of the beginning of the program, is not an effective way to show if the initiative is having the social impact declared. For this reason, it is necessary to take inspiration from the GAVI development of KPIs in order to define what are the most important areas of the project that should be monitored in order to show if the initiative is working and what type of adjustments to make. In this view, the resilience index is the metric closer to a KPI developed in the 100 Resilient Cities project and its efficiency and effectiveness can be enhanced by adding to the usual data other statistical models that can track the effective improvement of all elements involved in the measurement (quality and durability of important facilities, efficiency of emergency planning, the ability to absorb economic shocks, potential strength of recovery). In addition, a constant monitoring of the elements of the resilience score should be structured in order to offer a clear and continuous view of the situation on a quarterly basis. The rationale is to decompose the resilience index into more single metrics for its elements that can be more reliable overtime, offering an enhanced view of the effective improvement of the urban environment. In this way, the measurement becomes more tied to quantitative and objective assessments than qualitative interviews and reports.

Along with this metric, it is important to structure other indicators tailored to the project. The reduction of economic losses is another general metric used to observe changes in cities comparing pre and post intervention data. However, this is a general metric used specifically to

compare the losses after disasters, so it is too general, and it does not consider specific situations. More tailored and day-to-day metrics can be a better overview, such as the infrastructure downtime reduction index that measures the decrease in the time during which a city's critical infrastructure is not operational after a crisis event. This KPI can help to assess the potential effectiveness of resilience interventions, showing if the measures taken are accelerating the recovery of critical services or not. This index can be constructed using objective data, collecting the average downtime of critical infrastructures before implementing resilience interventions and comparing it with the average one after the treatment. In this way, it is possible to measure the effectiveness of the intervention overtime but also to assess if the results are consistent with the benchmarks published by the World Bank or UN-Habitat, that usually provide interesting insights on these topics. Another possible metric can be the reduction in insurance claims/recovery costs, which measures the decrease in the number and the total cost of insurance claims that are made after a disaster, considering that fewer or less expensive claims are an indication that the investments in urban resilience are effectively mitigating the damages. So, the development of specific KPIs can help to assess the success of the project better than general quantitative measures and random qualitative assessments.

The SROI analysis is a key element of every venture philanthropy project and computing also for 100 Resilient Cities can give a significant insight of the social and economic impact of the project. Of course, the computation is simplified and considers available data disclosure by the Rockefeller Foundation as assumptions of the outcomes of the project. To begin with, the foundation states to have invested an overall amount of about \$164 million since 2013 in the urban resilience project. As already mentioned previously, the social value generated is obtained considering the economic effect of the lives saved and the additional benefits from the implementation of the program different from lifesavings. In order to obtain the value from lives saved, it necessary to understand how many deaths the application of 100 resilient cities could prevent. However, the exact number of lives that could be saved thanks to the initiative is not available in the same way it is calculated for programs like GAVI. Indeed, the project does not track saved lives, but it is more focused on long-term resilience rather than immediate life-saving measures and consequently quantifying the exact number of lives saved is difficult. The problem, thus, is embedded in the monitoring systems applied that do not consider effectively the real impact that urban resilience can have in terms of lifesavings and decrease in mortality. In order to go on, it is appropriate to make some assumptions about the issue.

Considering that the total investment for 100 cities made by the foundation was \$164 million, it is fair to say that about \$1.5 million was invested in each city. In 2011, the city of Christchurch

in New Zealand, has been struck by an earthquake of magnitude 6.3 that caused the death of 185 people and a strong damage to the city's infrastructure. After that, in 2013, Christchurch was selected as one of the first 33 cities to be part of the 100 Resilient Cities program through which it developed strategies to improve its urban resilience, focusing on the post-earthquake reconstruction. Now, considering that, on average, treatments of urban resilience can reduce mortality by a percentage between 10% and 30%, a possible reduction of mortality in Christchurch for similar further events can be 20%. This means that, in case of future possible disasters, the potential number of lives saved is 37 (185 x 20%). According to some research the Value of a Statistical Life (VSL) for the New Zealand is \$8 million per life. This means that:

$$\textit{Value from Lives Saved} = 37 \times \$8 \textit{ million} = \$296 \textit{ million}$$

So, a potential additional economic benefit that is an indirect effect of the program is the increase on values of properties in New Zealand thanks to the application of the initiative. However, giving the fact that the foundation did not focus its attention on deriving direct indicators to assess the effectiveness of the activity, but it preferred to focus on the systemic changes brought, there are not specific studies and reports that estimate the effective increase in value of the properties, even if it makes perfect sense to state that there is a positive correlation between the urban resilience program and the consequent increase in property values. For this reason, it is feasible, for the purposes of the analysis, to not consider the additional economic benefits because not quantifiable. So, considering only the value from lives saved as the only component of the social value generated, the SROI will be:

$$\textit{SROI} = \frac{\$296 \textit{ million}}{\$1,5 \textit{ million}} = 197 : 1$$

This means that every \$1 invested by the program in Christchurch generates \$197 of social and economic benefits. However as observed, the SROI computation was based on several hypotheses and not to real data, because of the lack of implementation of measurement systems that could really offer significant insights on the effectiveness of program. This means that not only strategic philanthropy metrics do not fulfil their purpose of offering a transparent view of the effects, but also the entire monitoring system should be reprogrammed as well.

Lastly, the 100 Resilient Cities program does not offer a due diligence process that can really monitor all activities put in place. In this case, the creation of such process can bring some positive outcomes as happens in GAVI and other venture philanthropy projects and it is strictly related to the development of structured and tailored metrics (KPIs and SROI above all). Adopting the VP way of doing due diligence can help cities in establishing more clear baselines,

more defined measurable objectives, and a systemised tracking process. Moreover, due diligence can give useful insights on the ongoing situation in cities, making them aware of potential issues in order to quickly adjust their resilience strategies in response. Finally, a regular and standardised tracking process could enhance the accountability of the program contributing to improve the transparency of the insights provided.

Generally, the discussion provided reasonable argumentations in support of the theory that venture philanthropy metrics and measurement methodologies provide a better transparency and a clearer picture of the initiatives put in place than the ones used traditionally by strategic philanthropists.

Discussion of results: how a strategic project can enhance its measurement system

To sum up, the introduction of venture philanthropic metrics can effectively enhance the measurement system of a strategic philanthropy project. The comparison between the two systems evidenced strong lacks the 100 Resilient Cities in monitoring the effective implementation of the initiative with significant outcomes that can give useful insights in describing the social and economic impact. Moreover, the analysis showed that an actual application of VP metrics is not possible without a restructuring of the strategic and monitoring system of the project funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. Indeed, in order while it is possible to tailor and maintain some KPIs, that can give deeper knowledge of the performance of activities, it is basically impossible to construct a SROI analysis without a revised system for data collection and consequently the creation of a due diligence process of the ongoing performances that is basically inexistent but just applied in the selection process of cities.

Table 3.2 illustrates the principal changes that, theoretically, could lead the 100 resilient cities project, and others of the same type, to a substantial improvement in the transparency of showed information and a better understanding of the real effects of the initiative, giving more elements to understand if the philanthropic strategy is currently working or not.

Situation before integration of VP metrics	Changes introduced	Situation after integration of VP metrics
Quantitative metrics that describe general outcomes of the initiative measured to observe a systemic change in the long term	Tailored KPIs to monitor consistently specific aspect of the project	Specific metrics that are able to describe the ongoing performance of the initiative, tracking the results overtime and offering chances to adjust strategies.
No presence of SROI analysis, presentation of social and economic impact only through not frequent qualitative assessments	SROI analysis	SROI gives, even in hypothetical contexts, a useful insight of the investment made and its return in terms of social impact. The effective implementation needs a more accurate documentation process.
Presence of a due diligence process only in early stages of the project dedicated only to selection of candidates and strategic alignment. It is not built to monitor consistently the project overtime.	Due diligence process to monitor performances	Creation of a well-defined process able to keep track of all current situations from a qualitative point of view supported by quantitative measures.

Table 3.2

Conclusions

To conclude, the analysis carried out in this thesis has shown that strategic philanthropy and venture philanthropy are two evolved approaches compared to traditional philanthropy, each one characterized by its own methodological specificities and its distinct ways of measuring social impact. On one hand, strategic philanthropy is defined by the attempt to merge social objectives with corporate goals through planned and measurable interventions, which, although effective in promoting a long-term vision, can risk instrumentalization and methodological rigidity. On the other hand, venture philanthropy, inspired by venture capital principles, adopts an entrepreneurial and dynamic approach that emphasizes a high degree of involvement, the provision of non-financial support, and the use of performance metrics, such as SROI and tailored KPIs to quantitatively express the social value generated.

The comparative analysis of the two case studies, the GAVI project, supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the 100 Resilient Cities initiative of the Rockefeller Foundation, has highlighted how the adoption of tools and methodologies typical of venture philanthropy can help to fill gaps in transparency and effectiveness in impact measurement of strategic philanthropy projects. Specifically, the application of quantitative metrics (Tailored KPIs and SROI above all), integrated with qualitative assessments and continuous monitoring tools (due diligence), provides a more comprehensive and dynamic view of the achieved results, consequently facilitating more informed management and a better allocation of resources.

Finally, the research undertaken has underscored the importance of a synergistic approach that integrates the distinctive elements of both models to inspire an overall improvement in the evaluation of philanthropic interventions. This integration not only addresses the need to account for actual social impact but also contributes to define new perspectives on accountability and sustainability within the sector. While recognizing the inherent limitations of each model, this study predicts that a methodological integration can represent a promising direction for the future evolution of philanthropic practices.

Bibliography

- Anita, L. (2021). Venture Philanthropy Investments. *Economy and Finance*, 336-350.
- Brest, P. (2005). In Defense of Strategic Philanthropy. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 149, 132-140.
- Brest, P. (2010). The Power of Theories of Change. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 47-51.
- Brook, J., & Akin, B. (2019). Using theory of change as a framework for examining community context and philanthropic impact. *Evaluation and Program Planning*.
- Campbell, D., & Slack, R. (2008). Corporate "Philanthropy Strategy" and "Strategic Philanthropy" Some insights from voluntary disclosures in annual reports. In D. Campbell, & R. Slack, *Business Society* (pp. 187-212). Sage Publications.
- Carroll, A. (2018). Strategic Philanthropy. In A. Carroll, *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Business Ethics and Society* (pp. 3276-3279). Thousand Oaks,: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cooney, K., & Lynch-Cerullo, K. (2014). Measuring the Social Returns of Nonprofits and Social Enterprises: The Promise and Perils of the SROI. *Nonprofit Policy Forum*, 5(2): 367-393.
- Gates Foundation. (Available at <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/goalkeepers/report/2024-report> [Access in 15/02/2025]). *Gates Foundation Goalkeepers Report 2024*.
- Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance . (Available at <https://www.gavi.org/our-alliance/operating-model> [Access in 15/02/2025]). *Gavi's Operations Model*.
- GAVI, The VAccine Alliance. (2024). *GAVI's Strategy*. Available at <https://www.gavi.org/our-alliance/strategy> [Access in 14/02/2025].
- GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance. (Available at <https://www.gavi.org/> [Access at 15/02/2025]). *GAVI Official website*.
- GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance. (June 2024). *Programme Funding Guidelines*. Available at <https://www.gavi.org/our-support/guidelines> [Access in 16/02/2025]: GAVI, The Vaccine Alliance.
- Hochstädter, A. K. (2017). Impact measurement in venture philanthropy organizations: A single case study. *WiSo-HH Working Paper Series, No. 42, Universität Hamburg*.

Institute for Social Value. (n.d.). SROI Value Map. Available at <https://socialvalueuk.org/resources/sroi-value-map/> [Access at 02/02/2025].

John, R. (2006). *Venture Philanthropy: The Evolution of High Engagement Philanthropy in Europe*. Oxford Said Business School.

JohnW. (18 May 2023). New Zealanders (statistically) value a life at \$12.5M (NZD). *Effective Altruism Forum*, Available at <https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/4eXJ2rEi5AGgDjRr3/new-zealanders-statistically-value-a-life-at-usd12-5m-nzd?> [Access in 22/02/2025].

Kania, J., Kramer, M., & Russell, P. (2014). *Strategic Philanthropy for a Complex World*. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

Kinarsky, A., & Christie, C. (2022). Analysis of Evaluation Policies in the Philanthropic Sector. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 175-192.

Kramer, M., & Phillips, S. (2024). Where Strategic Philanthropy Went Wrong. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

Kubíčková, K. (2018). STRATEGIC PHILANTHROPY: LITERATURE REVIEW. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia*, 70-89 .

Letts, C., Ryan, W., & Grossman, A. (1997). Virtuos Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists. *Harvard Business Review*, Available at <https://hbr.org/1997/03/virtuous-capital-what-foundations-can-learn-from-venture-capitalists> [Access in 27/01/2025].

Liket, K., & Maas, K. (2016). Strategic Philanthropy: Corporate Measurement of Philanthropic Impacts as a Requirement for a “Happy Marriage” of Business and Society. *Business & Society*, 889-921.

Maas, K., & Liket, K. (2011). Talk the Walk: Measuring the Impact of Strategic Philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 445–464.

Mityushina, N., Hehenberger, L., & Alemany, L. (2019). Value-Added in Non-Financial Support: How Evaluations of Venture Philanthropy Practice of Impact Measurement Affect Its Diffusion. *European Research Network on Philanthropy 9th International Conference, University of Basel*. Basel.

Nelson, J., & Twersky, F. (2024, July 11). In Defense of Strategic Philanthropy, a Response to Mark Kramer and Steve Philips. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

- Nicholls, J., Lawlor, E., Eva, N., & Goodspeed, T. (2012). *A guide to Social Return in Investment*. The SROI Network Accounting for Value.
- Paul, B. (2010). The Power of Theories of Change. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 47-51.
- Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (1999). Philanthropy's New Agenda: Creating Value. *Harvard Business Review*, 121-130.
- Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (2002). The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Rockefeller Foundation. (2020). *100 Resilient Cities* . Available at <https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/100-resilient-cities/> [Access in 17/02/2025].
- Rockefeller Foundation. (Available at <https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/governance-reports/> [Access in 18/02/2025]). *Financial Statements and Governance Reports*.
- Saia, D., & Schwartz, M. (2022). The continuum of strategic philanthropy: Rationalizing the context for philanthropy in business and society. *Business and Society Review*, 3-22.
- Sopact. (n.d.). Venture philanthropy: Pioneering impact investments. . [online] *Disponibile su:* <https://www.sopact.com/guides/venture-philanthropy> [Access 23/01/2025].
- Viscusi, K., & Aldy, J. (2003). The Value of a Statistical Life: A Critical Review of Market Estimates Throughout the World. *The Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 27:1; 5–76.
- Vveinhardt, J., & Zygmantaite, R. (2015). Impact of Social Context on Strategic Philanthropy: Theoretical Insights. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1165 - 1173.
- World Health Organisation (WHO). (Available at <https://www.who.int/teams/immunization-vaccines-and-biologicals/immunization-analysis-and-insights/global-monitoring/immunization-coverage> [Access in 20/02/2025]). *Immunization Coverage: Analysis and Insights* .

