



cities²⁰³⁰

D1.2 Project Impact Action Strategy

Chapter n1

**“Project Impact Action Strategy: Basics for
Theoretical Guidelines”**

Chapter n2

**“Project Impact Action Strategy: Recipe and
Action Plan”**



Document information

Key information	Data
Project reference number	101000640
Project acronym	'cities2030'
Project title	'Co-creating resilient and sustainable food systems towards FOOD2030'
Project start date	October 1 st , 2020
Duration	48 months
Project Coordinator	Mr Nicola CAMATTI
Project website	cities2030.eu
Work package (WP)	1
WP leader and key author	P39, RTU - Riga Technical University, Kalnciema iela 6, Riga, Latvia Dr.sc.administr. Iveta Cīrule naturalproducts@inbox.lv PhD. Elīna Miķelsone Elina.mikelsone@rtu.lv Kristīne Šteinerte Kristine.steinerte@rtu.lv
WP co-leader	P25, LLF
Contributors and authors	Executive Committee and Partner responsible for deliverables
Peer reviewers	PMO CITIES 2030 Advisory Board (CIAB)
P.R. approval date/version	25/02/2021 Version Rev 1.1
Document type	R - Report
Document/file name	D1.2._PIAS_final_Febr15_2021
Document title	CITIES2030 PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY
Deliverable number	D1.2
Project delivery date	December 31st, 2020
Submission date	February 25th, 2021
For public dissemination	YES
Document short abstract	<p>Purpose: on the basis of literature review, the project proposal, CORDIS documents and strategical documents generate the project impact action strategy.</p> <p>Approach: the research is based on literature review, project proposal, CORDIS documents and strategical document review. This detailed literature review has considered 130 scientific publications on the effectiveness and impact over the last 47 years, CITIES2030 project proposal, CORDIS documents on the impact measurements till December 2020 and strategical documents related with the project focus.</p> <p>Findings: Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS).</p> <p>Research limitations: literature collection of 7 databases, CITIES 2030 project proposal, CITIES2030 project proposal, CORDIS documents on the impact measurements till December 2020 and strategical documents related with the project focus.</p> <p>Value: Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS).</p> <p>Paper type – literature and document review.</p> <p><i>Keywords - Project impact action strategy, Impact, Strategy, Effectiveness, Literature review</i></p>

Disclaimer

The content of this deliverable does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Responsibility for the information and views expressed herein lies entirely with the author(s). All 'cities2030' consortium members are also committed to publish accurate and up to date information and take the greatest care to do so. However, the 'cities2030' consortium members cannot accept liability for any inaccuracies or omissions, nor do they accept liability for any direct, indirect, special, consequential or other losses or damages of any kind arising out of the use of this information.

Document history

Version	Date	Main changes	Author
Ver 0.0	1/01/2021	Initial Version	P39, RTU
Rev 1.0	15/02/2021	Overall finalization	P39, RTU
Rev 1.1	25/02/2021	Minor editing Chapter 1 & Chapter 2 merged in a single document	P2, EPC

Table of Content

DOCUMENT INFORMATION	1
DISCLAIMER	2
WP1 SCOPE	4
LIST OF DELIVERABLES	4
ABSTRACT	5
CHAPTER 1	6
INTRODUCTION	6
1. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	6
2. RESEARCH RESULTS	7
2.1. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.2. IMPACT FROM PROJECT PROPOSAL	16
2.3. STRATEGY VERIFICATION AND APPLICATION METHODOLOGY	16
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	16
REFERENCES	17
ATTACHMENT 1 - PROJECT IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS	27
CHAPTER 2	34
1. RECIPE OF PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY	34
1.1. SUMMARY OF DELIVERABLE 1.2 PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY (PIAS).....	34
1.2. PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY BASICS FROM PROJECT PROPOSAL.....	36
1.3. CREATION, VERIFICATION AND APPLICATION OF PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY	38
1.4. IMPACT ELEMENTS.....	38
2. ACTION PLAN OF PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY	44
2.1. WHO?	44
2.2. WHEN?.....	44
2.3. HOW?	44

H2020 project CITIES2030 PROJECT IMPACT ACTION STRATEGY (WP1 D.1.2)

WP Leader: P39 RTU

WP Co-Leader: P25 LLF

WP1 scope

WP1 aims at securing the project's effective impact action which is to effectively transform UFSE towards sustainable CRFS which meet the EU-U11NUA. Activities under WP1 deliver the impact action strategy to secure an effective food system transformation, allow to adjust, foster, and improve actions developed under WP2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 via impact monitoring and assessment (IMA) of the aforementioned action's effectiveness to make a change. WP1 secures alignment between operations, methodologies and anticipated results, incorporating a risk and change plans. In addition, WP1 forecasts and characterizes additional outcomes not planned initially and examines their feasibility without additional resources. Likely WP2 to 6, WP1 foster synergies with comparable IMA processes from other sources (e.g. EU-funded projects, etc.). All in all, WP1 secures that all activities effectively meet each of the 7 call's expected impacts (CEI) with a continued, systemic and digital-based impact monitoring and assessment (IMA) process that generates CRFS/FNS indicators and city/region fact-sheet instruments.

List of DELIVERABLES

TITLE	RESP	Contributors
D1.2 Project impact action strategy (PIAS)	P39 RTU	P5 IAAD, P25,LLF P27,AGFT P30, ITC



Abstract

Chapter 1

Purpose: generate the project impact action strategy on the basis of literature review, project proposal, CORDIS documents and strategical documents.

Approach: research is based on literature review, project proposal, CORDIS documents and strategical document review. This detailed literature review has considered 130 scientific publications on the effectiveness and impact over the last 47 years, CITIES2030 project proposal, CORDIS documents on the impact measurements till December 2020 and strategical documents related with project focus.

Findings: Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS).

Research limitations: literature collection of 7 databases, CITIES 2030 project proposal, CITIES2030 project proposal, CORDIS documents about impact measurements till December 2020 and strategical documents related with project focus.

Value: Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS).

Paper type – literature and document review.

Chapter 2

Purpose: on the basis of created theoretical framework in Chapter 1 to generate the project impact action strategy recipe on main approaches and plan how to apply these approaches.

Approach: This detailed literature review has considered 130 scientific publications on effectiveness and impact over the last 47 years, CITIES2030 project proposal, and strategical documents related with project focus.

Findings: Project impact action strategy (PIAS).

Research limitations: literature collection of 7 databases, CITIES 2030 project proposal, CITIES2030 project proposal, CORDIS documents on impact measurements till December 2020 and strategical documents related with project focus.

Value: Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS).

Paper type – literature and document review.

Keywords - Project impact action strategy, Impact, Strategy, Effectiveness, Literature review

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

One of the main topics in management science is effectiveness and impact (Goodman & Saks, 1977; Biswas, 2010) and mainly researches have been conducted to increase it (Noruzi & Rahimi, 2010). Over the recent decades its topicality has grown rapidly based on an increasing scientific and practical interest in this topic (Mausolff & Spence, 2008; Lecy, Scmitz & Swedlund, 2012). Researchers have concluded that impact is multidimensional (Angle & Perry, 1981; Campbell et al., 1974; Dension, 1990; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013) and impact dimensions and influencing factors could vary (Steers, 1977; Stevens, Beyer & Trice, 1978). The authors on the basis of literature review, project proposal, CORDIS documents and strategical documents have generated the project impact action strategy.

Research tasks:

- (1) to manage research in scientific databases to explore literature on impact and effectiveness;
- (2) to gather all information about the impact from project proposal;
- (3) to summarise information about impact strategies from CORDIS system;
- (4) to analyse impact indicators from strategical documents mentioned in the project proposal;
- (5) to create measurement lists and their application;
- (6) to describe strategy verification methodology;
- (7) to create conclusions and suggestions for future researches.

Research method: research is based on theoretical research method.

Research base: literature sources from 7 databases: *Scopus, ScienceDirect, Google Scholar, Sage Journals, Ebsco Academic Search Complete, Emerald, Web Science*. In the research mainly secondary sources (scientific papers, books etc.) are analysed.

1. Research methodology

The research is based on a theoretical research method – literature and document review.

Literature review was divided in 4 research stages: (1) to research 7 scientific databases to explore literature where "impact", "effectiveness" are mentioned; (2) to select literature directly about terms; (3) to exclude duplicates; (4) to analyse selected literature. At the first research stage 1029401 literature sources were found. At the second research stage literature directly about terms was selected and duplicates were excluded. 133 literature sources passed the third stage. Detailed literature source count in different stages is reflected in Table1.

Table 1

Count of the literature sources in stages

	Stage 1- in article title or/and keywords mentioned terms:	Stage 2- directly about (full text available):	Stage 3- unique sources:
Scopus	16592	36	133
ScienceDirect	78381	24	
Google Scholar	23700	15	
Sage Journals	54575	34	
Ebsco	832645	33	
Emerald	23456	25	
Web of Science	52	8	
Sum:	1029401	175	

Selected literature after stage 3 was analysed in systematic review using 3-step approach (Boiral, 2012): the development of a review protocol; 2) data extraction; 3) and information synthesis. Document reviews were conducted with the same approach.

2. Research results

2.1. Literature review

The concepts of effectiveness and impact are encountered repeatedly in the organisational literature, but there is only a rudimentary understanding of what is actually involved in the concept. In fact, although these terms are generally considered a desirable attribute in projects, few serious attempts have been made to explain the construct either theoretically or empirically. So, the objectives of this research are: (1) the analysis of general data in literature; (2) perspective and model analysis; (3) dimension analysis.

2.1.1. General data analysis

The results reflect that terms of impact and effectiveness are in the scope of researchers and mainly researched in the USA (43%), India (10%) and the UK (10%).

The first literature source that mentioned the impact and effectiveness according to this research was published in 1969. From 1969 till 2004 literature was fragmented, but from 2004 there were substantive literature sources about these terms. Research results show that these terms have become especially topical in the last decade, this tendency is consistent with Scopus (2016) data analysis, where wider range of literature sources are included, for example, papers with only accessible abstracts.

Additional data in Scopus (2016) represents that the most cited authors about effectiveness and impact are R. E. Quinn and K. S. Cameron, the research results also show that the most used articles are "Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis" (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983) and "Organizational Life Cycles and Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Evidence" (Quinn & Cameron, 1983). Also Cameron (2010) has marked the leading researchers of - P.R. Lawrence, W. Lorsch, E. Yuchtman, S. E. Seashore, J.L. Price, D. Lawless, R.M. Steers, J.P. Campbell, W.R. Scott, R.E. Quinn, K.S. Cameron, A. Lewin, J.W. Minton, and these authors are often cited in the researched literature as well.

2.1.2. Perspective and content analysis

Although there is evidence on increasing scientific interest about the impact and effectiveness over the last decade, the scientific researches are still characterized by a paucity of empirical studies, because more than half of all researched literature sources are theoretical sources. The authors have analysed literature by several aspects: (1) applied theories and applied or mentioned models; (2) methods and focuses; (3) dimensions.

2.2.2.1. Theories and models

The authors have summed up and sorted literature and theories used in literature to understand basic sources about the terms. The authors have concluded that scientific knowledge is primarily represented in business and management literature (98%), but there are also articles on engineering, medicine, psychology. The most often used theories and approaches in literature are classical theory (for example in Burnes, 1998), social capital theory (for example, Nelson et al., 2007; Pors, 2008), human relations approach, culture-excellence approach, contingency theory (for example in Burnes, 1998), organisational theory (Kataria, Rastogi & Garg, 2013), etc.

There are also different aspects viewed in literature connected with impact and effectiveness, for example, creativity (for example in Bratnicka, 2015), job satisfaction (for example in Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Biswas, 2010; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011), employee engagement (for example in Kataria, Rastogi & Garg, 2013a; Rieley, 2014), knowledge management (for example in Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Yang & Wan, 2004), organisational commitment (for example in Angle & Perry, 1981; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011); organisational affective commitment subscale (for example in Ashraf & Khan, 2013); organizational culture (for example in Gregory et al., 2009; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Nazi & Lone, 2008; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011), organizational citizen behaviour (for example in Braun, Ferreira & Sydow, 2013; Walz & Niehoff, 2000), information culture (for example in Choo, 2013), leadership (for example in Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Santra & Giri, 2008), non-profit OE (for example in Herman & Renz, 1999; Eisenger, 2002; Nobbie & Brudney, 2003; Sowa, Selden & Sandfort, 2004; Shilbury & Moore, 2006; Grabowski et al., 2015; Liket & Mass, 2015; Willems, 2015), etc.

Despite the large scientific interest in this topic there is no consensus what impact and effectiveness are and how to measure it properly. So, there are different kinds of models. According to the research the most frequent applied and mentioned models are Goal Attained Model and Competing Values Model, but the most common applied approach is multidimensional approach (for example in Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Lecy et al., 2012; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Ziebicki, 2013; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Boiral, 2012; Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015; Braun, Ferreira & Sydow, 2013; Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015; Jiang & Liub, 2015; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2014; Naor et al., 2014) which reflects the multidimensional concept.

However, there are also different models applied and mentioned in literature, for example, Structural Functional Model which characterises systems ability to forestall threatened aggressions or deleterious consequences from the actions of others (for example in Cunningham, 1976); Organizational Development Model which reveals an organisation's problem solving and renewal capabilities, ability to work as a team and to fit the needs of its members (for example in Cunningham, 1976); Managerial Process Model which explores the ability to perform effectively certain managerial functions (for example in Cunningham, 1976); individual or team effectiveness approach (for example in Machi, 1977; Tuffield, 1975, Smith & Kleine, 1987; Rieley, 2014; Vance & Tesluk, 1999); contingency models (for example in Burrell & Morgan, 1979); population ecology models (for example in Aldrich, 1979), social justice model (for example in Keeley, 1978), an

evolutionary model (for example in Zammuto, 1982), a power model (for example in Hrebiniak, 1978), a political economy model (for example in Nord, 1983).

The authors have gathered some of the commonly used and mentioned models and approaches (see in Table 4).

Table 4

Methods and approaches			
Model	Focus and approaches	Applied or mentioned for example in :	
Multidimensiona/ one dimensional	Goal Attained Model	Evaluation of an ability to achieve goals, for example, Cost-Benefit analysis, MBO, output analysis, goals and means.	Cunningham, 1976; Pors, 2008; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Lecy et al., 2012; Alastair, Coldwell & Callaghan, 2013; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Baugh, 1983; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Biswas, 2010; Nayak & Mishra, 2005
	Functional Model	Social consequences analysis. Need-satisfaction analysis	Cunningham, 1976; Pors, 2008, Lowe & Soo, 1980; Amagoh, 2015
	Competing Values Model	Identification of key variables and determine how variables are related - for particular group different priorities	Quinn & Baugh, 1983; Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Burnes, 1998; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Gregory et al., 2009; Choo, 2013; Shoraj & LLaci, 2015; Chermac, Bodwell & Glick, 2015; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Shilbury & Moore, 2006; Grabowski et al., 2015
	Systems (Resource) Model	Analysis of resource distribution efficiency among various subsystems needs.	Cunningham, 1976; Nelson et al., 2007; Pors, 2008; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Upadhay, Munir & Blount, 2014; Lecy et al., 2012; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013; Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Vance & Tesluk, 1999
Multidimensional	Open Systems Model	Analysis with focus on flexibility and external orientation.	Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Baugh, 1983
	Reputational approach	Analysis of perception of stakeholders	Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Lecy, Scmitz & Swedlund, 2012; Willems, 2015
	Internal Process Model	Analysis of organisational environment	Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013; Steers, 1977a; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Rohraugh, 1983
	HR Model	Analysis with internal focus	Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Baugh, 1983; Pors, 2008

2.2.2.2. Methods and focuses

The authors have also collected the most frequently used research methods in the literature sources. It has been concluded that the most often used data collection method is questionnaire

and of data analytic methods - statistical methods. This classification is adapted from classification developed by Beisell- Durrant (2004). See collected methods, objectives and some researches where they were applied in Table 5.

Table 5

More frequently used methods and focuses in the researched literature

Subcategory	Examples of objectives (main focuses)	Research examples	
Interviews	To study the relations between the organizational effectiveness and the efficiency, commitment etc. To examine the assessment of impact in a specific context.	For example, in Ziebicki, 2013; Cameron, 1978; Angle & Perry, 1981; Yang & Wan, 2004; Rai, Sinha & Singh, 2006; Grabowski et al., 2015	
Focus groups Workshops	To collect impact data. To discuss results of a research.	For example, in Grabowski et al., 2015; Liket & Mass, 2015	
Questionnaire	To examine links between impact and different factors, like communication processes in SMEs, management process, people, social capital, organisational culture, employee motivation, involvement climate, innovation, leadership style, face to face communication, commitment, knowledge management. To discover important impact parts.	For example in Nelson et al., 2007; Jackson, 1998; Pors, 2008; Tuffield, 1975; Upadhyay, Munir & Blount, 2014; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Rieley, 2014; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Cameron, 1978; Riordan, Vandeberg & Richardson, 2005; Angle & Perry, 1981; Santra & Giri, 2008; Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Gregory et al., 2009; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2014; Rahimi & Vahedi, 2011; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Shoraj & LLaci, 2015; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005; Pounder, 1999; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Cameron et al., 2011; Walz & Niehoff, 2000	
Data Collection	Observation	To collect data to evaluate impact.	For example, in Grabowski et al., 2015
	Audit	To analyse impact evaluation experience.	For example, in Zairi, Cooke & Whymark, 1999
	Case studies	To examine influencing factors on the impact.	For example, Hayes & Praksam, 1991
Data Handling	Analysis of documents	To study the relations between the impact and other factors. To measure impact.	For example, in Ziebicki, 2013; Collins-Camargo, Ellet & Lester, 2012; Grabowski et al., 2015



<p>Statistical</p>	<p>Regression analysis - to create a hierarchical model of criteria of impact. To investigate correlates and predictors, mediators of impact.</p> <p>Factor analysis- to create a hierarchical model of a criteria of effectiveness. Examines relationships between impact and dimensions, mediating role. To examine impact measures.</p> <p>Principal component analysis- to examine impact measures, to analyse factors.</p> <p>Correlations-to explore correlations.</p> <p>Structural equation modelling-to examine the relationships between and among variables. To test direct and indirect influence on impact. To examine the anticipated model.</p>	<p>For example: Willems, 2015; Upadhay, Munir & Blount, 2014; Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Riordan, Vandenberg & Richardson, 2005; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Parhizgar & Gilbert, 2004; Walz & Niehoff, 2000; Shilbury & Moore, 2006 Santra & Giri, 2008; Braun, Ferreira & Sydow, 2013 Rahimi & Vahedi, 2011; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Gelade & Gilbert, 2003 Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Kataria, Rastogi & Garg, 2013; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2012; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Biswas, 2010</p>
<p>Benchmarking</p>	<p>To identify how to achieve impact, determine which of the factors actually related to impact.</p>	<p>For example, in Jackson, 1998; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005</p>



Literature reviews	To consolidate the previous literature. To explore theories. To examines impact variables. To explore routes to OE. To examines relation between impact and variables, like, transformative leadership, creativity, information culture. To develop theoretical framework. To create retrospective analysis of impact. To review problems of impact, model review. To clarify the logic of participant interest notions of impact. To create models and how to use them. To create proposals. To evaluate tool which helps leveraging organizations to impact.	For example, in Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Burnes, 1998; Downey-Ennis & Harrington, 2002; LiBrián & Kleiner, 2001; Smith & Kleiner, 1987; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Shepherd, 1989; Pounder, 2001; Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Bratnicka, 2015, Amagoh, 2015; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013; Boiral, 2012; Steers, 1975; Keeley, 1984; Connolly, Conlon & Deutsch, 1980; Cunningham, 1976; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Lewin & Minton, 1986; Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015; Choo, 2013; Jiang & Liub, 2015; Cross, Ernst & Pasmore, 2013; Yukl, 2008; Chermac, Bodwell & Glick, 2015; Vance & Tesluk, 1999; Bharadwaj, 2014; Boisot & McKelvey, 2011; Skrivastavat & Agrawal, 2003; Sowa, Selden & Sandfort, 2004; Liket & Mass, 2015
--------------------	--	--

Basic

The main focuses in researched literature are: (1) theoretical researches on aspects; (2) empirical researches on measurements and predictors.

2.2.2.3. Dimensions

There are many models but there are even more dimensions, which we could use as indicators. Accordingly, research scientists seem to agree that impact is multidimensional (Angle & Perry, 1981; Campbell et al., 1974; Steers, 1977), and the determinants of OE vary (Steers, 1977a; Stevens, Beyer, and Trice, 1978). To sum up, effectiveness and impact are broad concepts encompassing a wide variety of dimensions. And its multidimensionality has made it difficult to gain consensus over its precise measurement. Also, Ziebicki (2013) claimed that impact and effectiveness is mostly presented as multidimensional criteria and it makes possible to identify various types of outputs and indicate reasons for the specific level of performance in the given system. Secondly, effectiveness has no objective reality but is conceptualized on one's point of view.

Previously researchers (Nayak & Mishra, 2005) have counted 30 dimensions in the 1960s and early 1970s studies, but in this research, we have concluded that there are more than 199 dimensions possible. Explored dimensions analysed by several factors- if they are (1) subjective (not directly measurable indicators, like, employee satisfaction, quality of work life, organizational climate etc. (Sharma & Kaur, 2011) /objective (generally contended monetary success indicators (Ashraf & Khan, 2013), these are monetary or numeric measures, for example, profit, production rate etc. (Sharma & Kaur, 2011), (2) internal (an internal, micro emphasis on the functioning and development of the organization's people and their activities (Grabowski et al., 2015)) /external (an external, macro emphasis on the functioning and development of the organization as part of the larger environment

(Grabowski et al., 2015), (3) financial/non-financial, (4) universal. Results reflect that the most common type of dimensions are subjective- internal dimensions and there are more less external dimensions. Evaluating dimensions by criteria – financial or non-financial type of dimension, the authors have concluded that there are mostly non-financial dimensions (74% of all explored dimensions), there are only 36 financial indicators, 21 mixed indicators. 40% of all dimensions are universal, but 58% applied in only some contexts, 4 dimensions universality depend on their applications.

It should be noted that some researchers (for example, Evan, 1976; Scott, 1977; Cameron, 1986, Daft, 1998; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011) do not separate definitions of performance measures and organisational effectiveness and the authors of this paper support this approach.

To sum up, dimensions could be subjective or objective, internal or external, financial or non-financial, universal or non-universal as well mixed types, but the most commonly dimensions are subjective, internal, non-financial and not universal. This situation reflects that impact evaluation is mostly connected with specific contexts of organisations. Based in the research the authors would like to define impact as a multidimensional measurement which could consist from financial /nonfinancial, internal/external, subjective and objective dimensions, which reflect achievements of the organisation, but the dimensions of impact could be different in different contexts.

See 199 dimensions and their apportionments by their type (subjective/objective and external/internal) in Figure 1.

Internal

Objective

(1)Delivery (on time); (11)business results; (13)cash flow; (14)cash out; (34)employee turnover rate; (61)new product development; (62)operating efficiency ratio;(63)operating expense/employee;(64)operating expense/revenue; (66)product maximization; (68)productivity through people; (71)profit margin; (72)program effectiveness; (91)scrap material per unit; (99)sub-units performance;(105)technical efficiency; (110)turnover, (112)units produced; (114)vehicle hour; (115)viability;(118)absenteeism(122)average assets; (126)compensation; (132)controllable expenses; (134)creating efficient output from limited means available; (140)efficiency; (145)equity; (146)expenses; (148)financial performance;(153)growth; (156)increasing resourcefulness (open system); (157)individual employee performance/ efficiency; (161)innovativeness/ inovation/ innovation capabilities; (163)internal efficiency; (176)optimal use of available resources; (183)overall performance; (185)performance management; (186)personal effectiveness;(189)productivity;(197)achieving goals; (198)stability; (199)survival

(3)Accuracy of customer orders; (4)appropriateness; (5)aspects of identity; (7)beliefs; (8)biased for action;

External

(6)Autonomy;(10)broadening of the market base; (25)cost minimization; (26) cost of capital; (28)cost of raw materials; (31)demand; (52)labor costs; (58)market share; (67)product price leadership (70)profit generated and profitability; (79)repeat business;(83)return of investments; (84)revenues; (86)sales achieved (growth);(87)sales per advertising dollar; (98)stock return; (150)funding; (166)inventory cost; (197)achieving goals

(2)Ability to cope with users and non-users expectations



(9)bringing the planned strategic actions to a good end; (12)leveraging of resorces; (17)close to customers; (18)cohesion; (19)commitment and involvement; (20)commitment towards learning and development; (32)deployment of predefined strategy; (33)determine reward distribution; (35)employees levels of ambiguity regarding customers; (39)equipment supply; (40)evaluate the effects of change; (46)immediate supervison; (47)improving internal processes; (49)independence of board; (53)leadership contingency fit; (54)leadership for quality; (55)leadership management;(56)legitimization; (57)management of scarce resources; (59)need for independence; (65)organizational enviroment fit; (69)productivity through worker satisfaction; (72)program effectiveness; (73)project design, implemention, evaluation; (75)provide information for decision making; (76)quality and its improvements; (78)reliability; (81)responsiveness; (82)retention of employees; (85)right decisions in right times for right reasons, (89)satisfaction through attention to needs, (92)selectivity; (95)staff attitude; (96)staff complaints; (97)stakeholder involvement; (99)sub-units performance (100)supervisor support; (101)supplier wellfare; (103)task orientation; (104)teamwork; (106)technical excellence; (107)timely implementation of change; (108)transformative leadership; (111)turnover rate attraction of talent; (113)unity of comand and direction; (115)viability; (116)ability to accomplish core mission; (117)ability to identify problems or opportunities; (123)clarity; (124)clear authority and discipline; (127)competitive attainment; (128)competency; (129)congruence of internal processes; (130)consensus; (131)control; (133)core functions; (134)creating efficient output from limited means available;(135)culture; (136)decison making;(138)disciplinary actions; (139)discretion; (142)employee self-esteem; (143)employee well being; (144)employee-perceived adaptability; (149)flexibility; (151)governance; (152)grievances; (154)increase of expertise and employee development; (155)increased employee versatility/ flexibility; (156)increasing resourcefulness (open system); (157)individual employee performance/ efficiency; (160)iniciation of ideas and

and needs;
(6)autonomy;(15)citizen orientation; (16)civil participation; (21)community satisfaction with organization; (22)competition; (23)community improvement;; (24)cooperation; (29)customer complaints;(30)customer satisfaction;(36)enforcing changes to our society; (37)enviromental control; (38)environmental impact; (41)external focuss; (42)external reporting purposes; (43)extra role behavior; (50)industrial action; (51)investor atraction; (60)new market development; (77)quality of life; (80)reputation; (88)satisfaction of supplier with organization; (90)satisfying clients; (93)social responsibility; (94)societal transformation; (102)supply; (109)turn away eligible clients; (119)accessibility via various channels; (120)adaptability; (121)advanteges ; (137)differentiation; (158)networks and partnerships; (174)open communication; (175)openess; (193)willingness to recommend;(197)achieving goals



practises; (161)innovativeness/ inovation/ innovation capabilities; (162)integration or its errors; (163)internal efficiency; (164)internal equilibrium; (165)interpersonal relationships; (167)job satisfaction; (168)keeping the vision and mission up to date; (169)leanness; (170)long-term sustainability; (171)management effectiveness; (172)manager-perceived adaptability; (173)motivation; (177)order; (176)optimal use of available resources; (178)organisational commitment; (179)organisational management; (180)organizational attachment; (181)organizational climate; (182)organizational structure and governance; (183)overall performance;(185)performance management; (186)personal effectiveness; (187)physical comfort; (188)planning (also strategic) and goal setting; (190)self-control; (189)productivity; (191)structure/strategy congruence; (192)values; (194)work pressure; (195)workforce morale; (196)working conditions and job demands; (197)achieving goals; (198)stability; (199)survival

Subjective

Figure 1. OE dimensions (their focus- subjective/objective and internal/external)

2.2. Impact from Project Proposal

Document "Recipe and Action"

2.3. Strategy verification and application methodology

Creation, verification and application of the project impact action strategy:

1. P39 conducts literature review and strategical documentation analysis to create research tool (+methodological issue +questions/data set + template for survey report) initiating participatory IMA and preparing the documentation of the entire IMA procedure (KPI, approach, action plan, methodology, Gantt, resources, synergies, etc.).
2. Partners P5 IAAD; P25 LLF; P27 AGFT; P30 ITC are invited to discuss created research methodology. Online group activities between partners and on-site workshops with stakeholders in each partner's participating countries for sound understanding of the project context, its elements and their interrelations, information management.
3. Partners P5 IAAD; P25 LLF; P27 AGFT; P30 ITC use a tool for local research and fill in the survey report, to share the report with the responsible of the deliverable and with the WP leader, encompassing stakeholders, problem and objectives analysis (including analysis of alternatives).
4. WP leader checks and reviews them to analyse data and provide the report, notably the deliverable. Participatory activities include fine tuning impact prediction per anticipated framework (proposal level) incorporating the 7 call's expected impact (CEI), review of problem analysis, formulation of impact hypotheses, validation, selection of impact indicators, incorporation of real-time adjusted indicators per current realities (e.g. "emerging" indicators. Generating KPI. Preparing the updated IMA baseline and assessment with KPI grids and procedures.

Output REPORT "Project impact action strategy"

Conclusions and Future Directions

Project impact action strategy is created based on critical and analytical literature and document analysis. (in progress)

There are selected impact indicators: direct and indirect criteria.

1. All criteria are characterised by 3 classifications:
2. Geographical (individual, organisational, national, EU, Global)
3. Material (material, non-material)
4. Objectivity (objective/subjective measurement)

Impact will be measured and evaluated in system dynamics, analysing the data over the project time period and all impact relations.

Impact will be measured using self-assessment survey, that will be filled out by WP leaders in proposal mentioned terms. All reports will be summarized and analysed by WP1 representatives.

References

1. Aagaard, A. (2012), "Idea Management in support of Pharmaceutical Front End of Innovation", *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, 12(4), 373-386.
2. Aagaard, A. (2013), "A theoretical model of supporting open source front end innovation through idea management", *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 7(4), 446-465.
3. Alastaire, D., Coldwell, L. & Callaghan, W. (2013), "Specific Organizational Citizenship Behaviours and Organizational Effectiveness: The Development of a Conceptual Heuristic Device", *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 44 (3), 347-267.
4. Aldrich, H.E. (1979), *Organizations and Environments*, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5. Amagoh, F. (2015), "Improving the credibility and effectiveness of non-governmental organizations", *Progress in Development Studies*, 15 (3), 221-239.
6. An, J.Y., Yom, Y.H. & Ruggiero, J.S. (2011), "Organizational Culture, Quality of Work Life, and Organizational Effectiveness in Korean University Hospitals", *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 22(1), 22-30.
7. Angle, H & Perry, J.L. (1981), "An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26 (1), 1-14.
8. Applegate, L.M. (1986), "Idea management in organization planning (brainstorming, strategy)", dissertation, University of Arizona, Arizona.
9. Ashraf, F. & Khan, M.A. (2013), "Organizational Innovation and Organizational Effectiveness Among Employees of Cellular Companies", *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28 (1), 1-24.
10. Azrolan, N. & Pavlins M.S. (1998), "Idea management: Restructuring technology-based research to help achieve corporate goals", *Drug News Perspect*, 11(3), 180-184.
11. Baez, M. & Convertino, G. (2012), "Innovation Cockpit: A Dashboard for Facilitators in Idea Management", in *ACM 2012 conference proceedings of the international conference in Seattle, Washington, USA*, NY: ACM, 47-48.
12. Bailey, B.P. & Horvitz, E. (2010), "What's Your Idea? A Case Study of a Grassroots Innovation Pipeline within a Large Software Company", in *CHI2010 proceedings on the 28th annual CHI conference on human factors in computing systems in Atlanta, USA, 2010*, NY: ACM, 2065-2074.
13. Bakker, H., Boersma, K. & Oreel, S. (2006), "Creativity (Ideas) Management in Industrial R&D Organizations: A Crea-Political Process Model and an Empirical Illustration of Corus RD&T", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15 (3), 296- 309.
14. Bansemir, B. & Neyer, A.K. (2009), "From idea management systems to interactive innovation management systems: Designing for interaction and knowledge exchange", *Wirtschaftsinformatik Proceedings*, 1(1), 860-870.
15. Barczak, G., Griffin, A. & Kahn, B.K. (2009), "PERSPECTIVE: Trends and Drivers of Success in NPD Practices: Results of the 2003 PDMA Best Practices Study", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26 (1), 3-23.
16. Bassiti, L. & Ajhoun, R. (2013), "Toward an Innovation Management Framework: A Life-cycle Model with an Idea Management focus", *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 4(6), 551-559.
17. Beissel- Durrant, G. (2004), "A Typology of Research Methods within the Social Sciences", working paper, Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute, University of Southampton, Highfield, November.

18. Bettoni, M., Bernhard, W., Eggs, C. & Schiller, G. (2010), "Idea Management by Role Based Networked Learning", in *11th European conference on knowledge management proceedings of the international conference*, London: Academic Publishing Limited, 107-116.
19. Bharadwaj, A. (2014), "Planning Internal Communication Profile for Organizational Effectiveness", *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review*, 3(2), 183–192.
20. Biswas, S. (2010), "Relationship between psychological climate and turnover intentions and its impact on organisational effectiveness: A study in Indian organisations", *IIMB Management Review*, 22 (1), 102-110.
21. Bjork, J. & Magnusson, M. (2009), "Where Do Good Innovation Ideas Come From? Exploring the Influence of Network Connectivity on Innovation Idea Quality", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26(1), 662-670.
22. Boeddrich, H.J. (2004). "Ideas in the Workplace: A New Approach Towards Organizing the Fuzzy Front End of the Innovation Process", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 13(4), 274-285.
23. Boiral, O. (2012), "ISO 9000 and Organizational Effectiveness: A Systematic Review", *QMJ*, 19 (3), 16-37.
24. Boisot, M. & McKelvey, B. (2011), "Connectivity, Extremes, and Adaptation: A Power-Law Perspective of Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(2), 119–133.
25. Bothos, E., Apostolou, D. & Mentzas, G. (2008), "A Collaborative Information Aggregation System for Idea Management", in *Conference on Internet and Web Applications and Services proceedings of the international conference in Athens*, Athens: IEEE, 289-296.
26. Bothos, E., Apostolou, D. & Mentzas, G. (2012), "Collective intelligence with web-based information aggregation markets: The role of market facilitation in idea management", *Experts Systems with Applications*, 39(1), 1333-1345.
27. Bratnicka, K. (2015), "Creativity and effectiveness in organizations. A new approach to an old question", *Management*, 19 (1), 22-45.
28. Braun, T., Ferreira, A.I. & Sydow, J. (2013), "Citizenship behavior and effectiveness in temporary organizations", *International Journal of Project Management*, 31 (1), 862–876.
29. Brem, A. & Voigt, K.I. (2007), "Innovation management in emerging technology ventures – the concept of an integrated idea management", *Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, 7(3), 304 - 321.
30. Brem, A., & Voigt, K.I. (2009), " Integration of market pull and technology push in the corporate front end and innovation management- Insights from the German software industry", *Technovation*, 29(1), 351-367.
31. Burnes, B. (1998), "Recipes for organisational effectiveness. Mad, bad, or just dangerous to know", *Career Development International*, 3 (3), 100-106.
32. Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979), *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*, London: Heinemann.
33. Cameron, K. (1978), "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23 (1), 604- 632.
34. Cameron, K. S. (2010). *Organizational effectiveness*. US: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
35. Cameron, K., Mora, C., Leutscher, T. & Calarco, M. (2011), "Effects of Positive Practices on Organizational Effectiveness", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(3), 266–308.



36. Cameron, K.S. (1986), "Effectiveness as paradox: consensus and conflict in conceptions of organizational effectiveness", *Management Science*, 32(5), 539-553.
37. Campbell, J., P., Bownas D., A., Peterson N., G. & Dunnette M., D. (1974), *The Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness: A Review of Relevant Research and Opinion*, NPRDCTR 75-1, San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
38. Chermac, T.J., Bodwell, W. & Glick, M. (2015), "Two Strategies for Leveraging Teams Toward Organizational Effectiveness: Scenario Planning and Organizational Ambidexterity", *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 12(1), 137-156.
39. Chidambaranathan K. & Swarooprani, B.S., (2009) "Knowledge Management as a Predictor of Organizational Effectiveness: The Role of Demographic and Employment Factors", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41 (1), 758-763.
40. Choo, C.W. (2013), "Information culture and organizational effectiveness", *International Journal of Information Management*, 33 (1), 775-779.
41. Collins-Camargoa, C., Ellett, C.D. & Lester, C. (2012), "Measuring organizational effectiveness to develop strategies to promote retention in public child welfare", *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34 (1), 289-295.
42. Connolly, T., Conlon, E.J. & Deutsch, S.J. (1980), "Organizational Effectiveness: A Multiple-Constituency Approach", *Academy of Management Review*, 5 (2), 211-217.
43. Coughlan, T. & Johnson, P. (2008), "Idea Management in Creative Lives", in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems proceedings of the international conference*, NY:ACM, 3081-3086.
44. Cross, R., Ernst, C. & Pasmore, B. (2013), "A bridge too far? How boundary spanning networks drive organizational change and effectiveness", *Organizational Dynamics*, 42 (1), 81-91.
45. Cunningham, J.B. (1977), "Approaches to the Evaluation of Organizational Effectiveness", *Academy of Management Review*, July, 463-474.
46. Daft, R.L. (1998), *Organization Theory and Design*, 6th ed., OH: Southwestern College Publishing.
47. Deichmann, D. (2012), "Idea Management: Perspectives from Leadership, Learning, and Network Theory", dissertation, ERIM, Netherland.
48. Dension, D.R. (1990), *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
49. Dorow, P.F., Davila, G., Varvakis & G., Vallejos, R.V. (2015), "Generation of Ideas, Ideation and Idea Management", *NAVUS-REVISTA DE GESTAO E TECNOLOGIA*, 5(2), 51-59.
50. Downey-Ennis, K. & Harrington, D. (2002), "Organisational effectiveness in Irish health-care organisations", *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 12 (5), 316-322.
51. Eisenger, P. (2002), "Organizational Capacity and Organizational Effectiveness Among Street-Level Food Assistance Programs", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31 (1), 115-130.
52. Enkel, E., Grassmann, O. & Chesbrough, H. (2009), "Open R&D and open innovation: exploring the phenomenon", *R&D Management*, 39(4), 311-316.
53. Evan, W.M. (1976), "Organizational theory and organizational effectiveness: an exploratory analysis", in Spray, S.L. (Ed.), *Organisational Effectiveness: Theory-Research-Utilization*, Kent State University Press, Kent, OH.



54. Fatur, P. & Likar, P. (2009), "The development of a performance measurement methodology for idea management", *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 6(4), 422-437.
55. Flynn, M., Dooley, L., Sullivan, D. & Cormican, K. (2003), "Idea management for organizational innovation", *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(4), 1-26.
56. Fritz, M. (2002), "Idea management enabler", *EContent*, 25(8), 50.
57. Galbraith, J.R. (1982), "Designing the innovating organization", *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(3), 5-25.
58. Gamlin, J.N., Yourd, R. & Patric, V. (2007), "Unlock creativity with "active" idea management", *Research Technology Management*, 50(1), 13-16.
59. Gelade, G. & Gilbert, P. (2003), "Work Climate and Organizational Effectiveness: The Application of Data Envelopment Analysis in Organizational Research", *Organizational Research Methods*, 6 (4), 482-501.
60. Gerschewski, S. & Xiao, S.S. (2015), "Beyond financial indicators: An assessment of the measurement of performance for international new ventures", *International Business Review*, 24 (1), 615-629.
61. Gish, L. (2011), "Experience with idea promoting initiatives: why they don't always work", in *18th Conference on Engineering Design: Impacting Society through Engineering Design proceedings of the international conference*, Copenhagen: Design Society, 83-92.
62. Glassmann, B.S. (2009), "Improving idea generation and idea management in order to better manage the fuzzy front end of innovation", dissertation, Prude University, Lafayette.
63. Goodman, P.S. & Saks, A.M. (1977), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.
64. Goyal, A. & Sampath, K. (2007), "Institutionalizing innovation: look to employees for the next great idea", *Ivey Business Journal*, 71(8), 1-5.
65. Grabowski, L., Neher, C., Crim, T. & Mathiassen, L. (2015), "Competing Values Framework Application to Organizational Effectiveness in Voluntary Organizations: A Case Study", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(5), 908-923.
66. Green, S.G., Bean, S.A. & Snively, B.K. (1983), "Idea management in R&D as a human information processing analogue", *Human Systems Management*, 4(2), 98-112.
67. Gregory, B.T, Harris, S.G., Armenakis, A.A. & Shook, C.L. (2009), "Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes", *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (1), 673-679.
68. Herman, R.D. & Renz, D.O. (1999), "Theses on Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28 (2), 107-126.
69. Hrebiniak, L.G. (1978), *Complex organizations*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company,
70. Iversen, H., Kristensen, K., Liland, C.S., Berman, T., Enger, N. & Losnedahl, T. (2009), "Idea Management: A Life-cycle Perspective on Innovation", available at: http://www.ict-21.ch/com-ict/IMG/pdf/39_IdeaManagement_Kjetil_Kristensen_FINAL.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
71. Jackson, S. (1998), "Organisational effectiveness within National Health Service (NHS) Trusts", *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 11 (7), 216-221.
72. Jiang, J.Y. & Liub C.W. (2015), "High performance work systems and organizational effectiveness: The mediating role of social capital", *Human Resource Management Review*, 25 (1), 126-137.

73. Karanjikar, M.R. (2007), "Funnel-reverse-funnel: the future model of idea management in new product development", *Futures Research Quarterly*, 23 (3), 21-26.
74. Kataria, A., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2013), "Employee Engagement and Organizational Effectiveness: The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *IJBIT*, 6 (1), 102-113.
75. Kataria, A., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2013a), "Psychological Climate and Organizational Effectiveness: Role of Work Engagement", *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12 (3), 33-46.
76. Kataria, A., Rastogi, R. & Garg, P. (2013), "Organizational Effectiveness as a Function of Employee Engagement", *South Asian Journal of Management*, 20 (4), 56-73.
77. Keeley, M. (1978), "A social justice approach to organizational evaluation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22 (1), 272-292.
78. Keeley, M. (1984), "Impartiality and Participant-Interest Theories of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29 (1), 1-25.
79. Kilmann, R.H. & Herden, R.P. (1976), "Towards A Systemic Methodology For Evaluating The Impact Of Interventions On Organizational Effectiveness", *Academy of Management Review*, July, 87-98.
80. Kim, J.H., Kim, C.S. & Kim, J.M. (2011), "Analysis of the effect of leadership and organizational culture on the organizational effectiveness of radiological technologist's working environments", *Radiography*, 17 (1), 201-206.
81. Klein, D. & Lechner, U. (2010), "Ideenmanagement im Rahmen von organisatorischem Wandel", *im MKWI 2010–IKT-gestutzte Unternehmens kommunikation proceedings*, Gottingen: Universitätsverlag Gottingen, 1831-1842.
82. Kwantesa, C.T. & Boglarsky, C.A. (2007), "Perceptions of organizational culture, leadership effectiveness and personal effectiveness across six countries", *Journal of International Management*, 13 (1), 204–230.
83. Lacey, J.D., Scmitz, H.P. & Swedlund, H. (2012), "Non-governmental and not-for-profit organizational effectiveness: a modern synthesis", *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 23 (2), 434-457.
84. Lewin, A.Y. & Minton, J.W. (1986), "Determining organizational effectiveness: another look, and an agenda for research", *Management Science*, 32 (5), 514-538.
85. LiBriani, L & Kleiner, H. (2001), "Expatriate-local relationship and organisational effectiveness: a study of multinational companies in China", *Management Research News*, 24 (3/4), 49-56.
86. Liket, K.C. & Maas, K. (2015), "Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness: Analysis of Best Practices", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(2) , 268–296.
87. Lindross, M. (2006), "Developing Front-End idea management and information processing", working paper [39], Innovation Management Institute, Helsinki University of Technology, 6 March.
88. Lowe, E.A. & Soo, W.F. (1980), "Organisational Effectiveness — A Critique and Proposal", *Managerial Finance*, 6 (1), 63-77.
89. Lowe, M. & Heller, J.E. (2014), "PLM Reference Model for Integrated Idea and Innovation Management", *Product Lifecycle Management for a Global Market, IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, 442(1), 257-266.
90. Lu, I.M. & Mantei, M.M. (1991), "Idea Management In a Shared Drawing Tool", *in the Second European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work proceedings of the international conference*, Rotterdam: Springer Netherlands, 97-112.

91. Machin, J. (1977), "Using the Expectations Approach to Improve Managerial Communication and Organisational Effectiveness", *Management Decision*, 15 (2), 259-277.
92. Mahoney, T.A. & Weitzel, W. (1969), "Managerial Models of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14 (3), 357-365.
93. Mason, C.M., Chang, A.C.F. & Griffin, M.A. (2005), "Strategic Use of Employee Opinion Surveys: Using a Quasi-Linkage Approach to Model the Drivers of Organisational Effectiveness", *Australian Journal of Management*, 30 (1), 127-143.
94. Mausolff, C. & Spence, J. (2008), "Performance measurement and program effectiveness: a structural equation modeling approach", *International Journal of Public Administration*, 31 (6), 595-615.
95. Mikelsons, E., Lielā, E. (2015), "Literature Review of Idea Management: Focuses and Gaps", *Journal of Business Management*, 9(1), 107-122.
96. Mikelsons, E., Lielā, E. (2015a), "Discussion on the Terms of Idea Management and Idea Management Systems", *Journal of Regional Formation and Development Studies*, 3(17), 97-110.
97. Moss, B., Beimborn, D., Wagner, H.T. & Weitzel, T. (2011), "The role of innovation governance and knowledge management for innovation success", in *the 44th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Science proceedings*, Kohla: IEEE, 1-10.
98. Naor, M., Jones, J.S., Bernardes, E.S., Susan Meyer Goldstei, S.M. & Schroeder, R. (2014), "The culture-effectiveness link in a manufacturing context: A resource-based perspective", *Journal of World Business*, 49 (1), 321-331.
99. Naravaez, J.L.M. & Gardoni, M. (2015), "Harnessing idea management in the process of technology transfer at Canadian Space Agency", *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing*, 9(33), 1-11.
100. Nayak, B. & Mishra, B.B. (2005), "Impact of leadership style on organizational effectiveness", *Management & Labour studies*, 30 (1), 90-103.
101. Nazi, N.A. & Lone, M.A. (2008), "Validation of Dension's model of organisational culture and effectiveness in the Indian context", *VISION-The Journal of Business Perspective*, 12 (1), 49-58.
102. Nelson, S., Brunetto, Y., Farr-Wharton, R. & Ramsay, S. (2007), "Organisational effectiveness of Australian fast growing small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)", *Management Decision*, 45 (7), 1143-1162.
103. Nilsson L., Elg, M. & Bergman, B. (2002), "Managing ideas for the development of new products", *International Journal of Technology Management*, 24(5/6), 498-513.
104. Nobbie, P.D. & Brudney, J.L. (2003), "Testing the Implementation, Board Performance, and Organizational Effectiveness of the Policy Governance Model in Nonprofit Boards of Directors", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32 (4), 571-595.
105. Nord, W.R. (1983), A political-economic perspective on Organizational Effectiveness. In K.S. Cameron and D.A. Whetton (Eds.), *Organizational Effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models*, New York: Academic Press.
106. Noruzi, M.R. & Rahimi, G. R. (2010), "Multiple Intelligences: A New Look to Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Management Research*, 2 (2), 1-15.
107. Parhizgar, A.M. & Gilbert, G.R. (2004), "Measures of organizational effectiveness: private and public sector performance", *Omega*, 32 (1), 221-229.

108. Pee, L.G. & Kankanhalli, A. (2015), "Interactions among factors influencing knowledge management in public-sector organizations: A resource-based view", *Government Information Quarterly*, 33 (1), 188-199.
109. Perez, A., Larrinaga, F. & Curry, E. (2013), "The Role of Linked Data and Semantic-Technologies for Sustainability Idea Management", in Counsell, S. (Ed.), *Software Engineering and Formal Methods*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 306-312.
110. Pors, N.O. (2008), "Trust and organisational effectiveness", *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 9 (1), 59-68.
111. Pounder, J. (1999), "Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education Managerial Implications of a Hong Kong Study", *BEMAS*, 27 (4), 389-400.
112. Pounder, J.S. (2001), "New leadership and university organisational effectiveness: exploring the relationship", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(6), 281 – 290.
113. Poveda, G., Westerski, A. & Iglesias, C. A. (2012), "Application of Semantic Search in Idea Management Systems", in *conference for Internet Technology Secured Transactions proceedings of the international conference in London, UK*, London: IEEE, 230-236.
114. Pundt, A. & Schyns, B. (2005). "Führung im Ideenmanagement - Der Zusammenhang zwischen transformationaler Führung und dem individuellen Engagement im Ideenmanagement", *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie*, 4(2), 55-65.
115. Quinn, F.F. & Thorne, D.M. (2014), "The Influence of organizational effectiveness and other correlates on the job satisfaction of staff employees at four year institutions of higher education", *Business Studies Journal*, 6 (2), 67-84.
116. Quinn, R. E. & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983), "Spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis", *Management Science*, 29 (3), 363-277.
117. Quinn, R.E. & Cameron, C. (1983), " Organizational life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: some preliminary evidence", *Management Science*, 29 (1), 33-51.
118. Rahimi, G. & Vahedi, M. (2011), "A study of the relationship between senior line and staff managers' development in Ministry of Education and organizational effectiveness in the Educational System of Iran", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29 (1), 927-931.
119. Rai, S., Sinha, A.K. & Singh, A.K. (2006), "Value realization and organizational effectiveness: culture related imperatives", *Management & Labour studies*, 31 (1), 32-48.
120. Redshaw, B. (2000), "Evaluating organisational effectiveness", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 32 (7), 245-248.
121. Redshaw, B. (2001), "Evaluating organisational effectiveness", *Measuring Business Excellence*, 5 (1), 16-18.
122. Rieley, J.B. (2014), "Building Alignment to Improve Organizational Effectiveness", *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, July/August, 6-16.
123. Riordan, C.M., Vandenberg, R.J. & Richardson, H.A. (2005), "Employee involvement climate and organizational effectiveness", *Human Resource Management*, 44 (4), 471-488.
124. Rose, A. & Jensen, V. (2012), "A literature review of idea management", the paper presented at the 9th NordDesign conference proceedings DS 71 of NordDesign, Aalborg University, Denmark. 22-24 August, available at: <https://www.designsociety.org/publication/35610/a-literature-review-of-idea-management> (accessed: 10 January 2016).

125. Rowbotham, L. & Bohlin, N. (1996), "Structured Idea Management as a Value-Adding Process", available at: http://www.adlittle.com/uploads/tx_extprism/1996_q2_31-36.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
126. Saatcioglu, A. (2002), "Using grounded inquiry to explore idea management for innovativeness", the paper presented at Academy of Management Proceedings, available at: <http://proceedings.aom.org/content/2002/1/C1.19.abstract> (accessed: 10 January 2016).
127. Sandriev, A.R. & Pratchenko, O.V. (2014), "Idea management in the system of innovative management", *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(12), 155-158.
128. Sandstrom, C. & Bjork, J. (2010), "Idea management systems for a changing innovation landscape", *International Journal of Product Development*, 11 (3/4), 310-324.
129. Santra, T. & Giri, V.N. (2008), "Effect of Organizational Structure on Organizational Effectiveness through Face-to-Face Communication", *The Icfa Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 7 (2), 28-38.
130. Scott, W.R. (1977), "Effectiveness of organizational effectiveness studies", in Goodman, P.S. and Pennings, J.M. and Associates (Eds), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, Jossey-Bass, London.
131. Selart, M. & Johansen, S.T. (2011), "Understanding the Role of Value- Focused Thinking in Idea Management", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 20(3), 196-206.
132. Shani, N. & Divyapriya, P. (2011), "A Role of Innovative Idea Management in HRM", *International Journal of Management*, 2(1), 69-78.
133. Sharma, M. & Kaur, G. (2011), "Workplace empowerment and organizational effectiveness: an empirical investigation of Indian banking sector", *Academy of Banking Studies Journal*, 10 (2), 105-120.
134. Shepherd, R. (1989), "Training for Organisational Effectiveness", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 21(1), 14 -18.
135. Shilbury, D. & Moore, K.A. (2006), "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness for National Olympic Sporting Organizations", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35 (1), 5-38.
136. Shoraj, D. & Llaci, S. (2015), "Motivation and Its Impact on Organizational Effectiveness in Albanian Businesses", *SAGE Open*, April-June, 1-8.
137. Skrivastavat, S.K. & Agrawal, S. (2003), "The role of power, politics and management in organisational effectiveness", *Management & Labour studies*, 28 (2), 153-157.
138. Smith, G.R. & Kleine, B.H. (1987), "Differences in Corporate Cultures and their Relationship to Organisational Effectiveness", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 8 (5), 10 - 12.
139. Sowa, J.E., Selden, S.C. & Sandfort, J.R. (2004), "No Longer Unmeasurable? A Multidimensional Integrated Model of Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33 (4), 711-728.
140. Steers, R., M. (1977), "Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22 (1), 46 - 56.
141. Steers, R., M. (1977a), *Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral View*, Santa Monica: Goodyear.

142. Steers, R.M. (1975), "Problems in the Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20 (1), 546-558.
143. Stevens, J., M., Beyer, J., B., & Trice, H.M. (1978), "Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment", *Academy of Management Journal*, 21 (1), 380 - 396.
144. Summa, A. (2004), "Software tools to support innovation process- focus on idea management", working paper [29], Innovation Management Institute, Helsinki University of Technology, 15 June.
145. Tuffield, D. (1975), "Organisation behaviour", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 7 (4), 164 - 166.
146. Tung, W.F., Yuan, S.T. & Tsai, J.R. (2009), "A custom collaboration service system for idea management of mobile phone design", *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, 19(5), 494-509.
147. Ullah, I. & Yasmin, R. (2013), "The Influence of Human Resource Practices on Internal Customer Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 18 (2), 1-28.
148. Upadhyay, B., Munir, R. & Blount, Y. (2014), "Association between performance measurement systems and organisational effectiveness", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 34 (7), 853 - 875.
149. Vagn, A.R., Clause, C. & Gish, L. (2013), "Towards a new perspective of managing ideas in front-end innovation as actor networks", the paper presented at the 63. International Conference on Engineering design, 19-22 August, Seoul, Korea, available at: http://orbit.dtu.dk/ws/files/58958235/ICED_13.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
150. Van Dijk, C. & Van Den Ende, J. (2002), "Suggestion systems: transferring employee creativity into practicable ideas", *R&D Management*, 32(5), 387-395.
151. Vance, R.J. & Tesluk, P.E. (1999), "A systems perspective on employee involvement and organizational effectiveness", *Group & Organization Management*, 24 (3), 269-270.
152. Vandenbosch, B., Saatcioglu, A. & Fay, S. (2006), "Idea management: A systematic view", *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(2), 259-288.
153. Voigt, K.I. & Brem, A. (2006), "Integrated Idea Management in Emerging Technology Ventures", in *IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology proceedings of the international conference in Singapore, China*, Singapore: IEEE, 211-215.
154. Wadongo, B. & Abel-Kader, M. (2014), "Contingency theory, performance management and organisational effectiveness in the third sector", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63 (6), 680 – 703.
155. Walz, S.M. & Niehoff, B.P. (2000), "Organizational citizenship behaviours: their relationship to organizational effectiveness", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 24 (3), 301-319.
156. Westerski, A. & Iglesias, A. (2012), "Mining sentiments in idea management systems as a tool for rating ideas", the paper presented at the International Conference on the Design of Cooperative Systems (COOP2012) of the Large-Scale Idea Management and Deliberation workshop, 30 May – 1 June, Marseille, France, available at: http://www.gi2mo.org/files/papers/coop2012/opinions_coop2012_paper.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).

157. Westerski, A. (2013a), "Semantic Technologies in Idea Management Systems: A Model for Interoperability, Linking and Filtering", dissertation, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid.
158. Westerski, A., Dalamagas, T. & Iglesias, C.A. (2013), "Classifying and comparing community innovation in Idea Management Systems", *Decision Support Systems*, 54(1), 1316-1326.
159. Westerski, A., Iglesias, C.A. & Nagle, T. (2011), "The road from community ideas to organisational innovation: a life cycle survey of idea management systems", *International Journal of Web Bases Communities*, 7(4), 493-506.
160. Willems, J. (2015), "Building Shared Mental Models of Organizational Effectiveness in Leadership Teams Through Team Member Exchange Quality", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Published online before print, 1–25.
161. Wood, A. (2003), "Managing Employees' Ideas From Where do Ideas Come?", *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 26(2), 22-26.
162. Yang, J. T. & Wan, C.S. (2004), "Advancing organizational effectiveness and knowledge management implementation", *Tourism Management*, 25 (1), 593–601.
163. Yilmaz, C. & Ergun, E. (2008), "Organizational culture and firm effectiveness: An examination of relative effects of culture traits and the balanced culture hypothesis in an emerging economy", *Journal of World Business*, 43 (1), 290–306.
164. Yu, F.Z., Chen, J. & Shen, H.H. (2006), "Idea Management Model for NPD Fuzzy Front End: Empirical Analysis Based on All-key-elements Innovation in TIM", *Chinese Journal of Management*, 3(5), 573-579.
165. Zairi, M. Cooke, M. & Whymark, J. (1999), "Best practice organisational effectiveness in NHS Trusts", *Journal of Management in Medicine*, 13 (6), 436-449.
166. Zammuto, R.F. (1982), *Assessing Organizational Effectiveness*, Albany: NY State University of New York Press.
167. Zejnilovic, L., Oliveira, P. & Veloso, F. (2012), "Employees as User Innovators: An Empirical Investigation of an Idea Management System", *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1(1), 1-38.
168. Zheng, W., Yang, B. & McLean, G.N. (2010), "Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management", *Journal of Business Research*, 63 (1), 763–771.
169. Ziebicki, B. (2013), "Relations between organizational effectiveness and efficiency in public sector units", *Problems of Management in 21st century*, 8 (1), 102-110.
170. Zooga, D.B., Peng, M.W. & Woldu, H. (2015), "Institutions, resources, and organizational effectiveness in Africa", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29 (1), 7-31.

Attachment 1 - Project Impact and Effectiveness

Dimension	Authors applied/ mentioned
(1) Delivery (on time)	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Naor et al., 2014
(2) Ability to cope with users and non-users expectations and needs	Pors, 2008
(3) Accuracy of customer orders	Redshaw, 2000, 2001
(4) Appropriateness	Zairi et al., 1991
(5) Aspects of identity	Ashraf & Khan, 2013
(6) Autonomy	Burnes, 1998; Turnipsee, 1988
(7) Beliefs	LiBrián & Kleiner, 2001, Dension, 1990
(8) Biased for action	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(9) Bringing the planned strategic actions to a good end	Willems, 2015
(10) Broadening of the market base	Redshaw, 2000, 2001
(11) Business results	Downey-Ennis & Harrington, 2002
(12) Leveraging of resources	Eisinger, 2002; Steers, 1975; Nobbie & Brudney, 2003
(13) Cash flow	Cameron et al., 2011
(14) Cash out	Cameron et al., 2011
(15) Citizen orientation	Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015
(16) Civil participation	Ziebicki, 2013
(17) Close to costumers	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(18) Cohesion	Turnipsee, 1988; Pounder, 2001; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Pounder, 1999; Ashraf & Khan, 2013
(19) Commitment and involvement	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Nelson et al., 2007; Turnipsee, 1988; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Ashraf & Khan, 2013
(20) Commitment towards learning and development	Jackson, 1998; Zooga et al., 2015
(21) Community satisfaction with organization	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(22) Competition	Choo, 2013
(23) Community improvement	Zooga, et al., 2015
(24) Cooperation	Liket & Mass, 2015; Ziebicki, 2013; Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969
(25) Cost minimization	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(26) Cost of capital	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(27) Cost of goods sold	Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Naor et al., 2014
(28) Cost of raw materials	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(29) Customer complains	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Hayes & Praksam, 1991; Walz & Niehoff, 2000
(30) Customer satisfaction	Downey-Ennis & Harrington, 2002; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Gregory et al., 2009; An, et al., 2011; Cameron et al., 2011; Walz & Niehoff, 2000

(31) Demand	Eisinger, 2002
(32) Deployment of predefined strategy	Willems, 2015
(33) Determine reward distribution	Upadhay, et al., 2014
(34) Employee turnover rate	Riordan, et al., 2005; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Yang & Wan, 2004; Mason, et al., 2005
(35) Employees levels of ambiguity regarding customers	Nelson et al., 2007
(36) Enforcing changes to our society	Willems, 2015
(37) Environmental control	Lewin & Milton
(38) Environmental impact	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(39) Equipment supply	Hayes & Praksam, 1991
(40) Evaluate the effects of change	Upadhay et al., 2014
(41) External focus	Choo, 2013
(42) External reporting purposes	Upadhay, et al., 2014
(43) Extra role behavior	Rai et al., 2006
(44) Food and labor cost percentages	Walz & Niehoff, 2000
(45) Image building	Amagoh, 2015
(46) Immediate superior	Priyadarshini, 2005
(47) Improving internal processes	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Choo, 2013; Nobbie & Brudney, 2003; Shilbury & Moore, 2006
(48) Increased ability to respond to change/ pressure / environment	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Banner, 1987; Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Kataria et al., 2013; Kataria et al., 2012; Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969; Steers, 1975; Lewin & Milton, 1986
(49) Independence of board	Liket & Mass, 2015
(50) Industrial action	Redshaw, 2000, 2001
(51) Investor attraction	Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015
(52) Labor cost	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(53) Leadership contingency fit	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(54) Leadership for quality	Boiral, 2012
(55) Leadership management	Jackson, 1998; Burnes, 1998; Priyadarshini, 2005
(56) Legitimization	Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015; Nayak & Mishra, 2005
(57) Management of scarce resources	Grabowski et al., 2015
(58) Market share	Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Zheng et al., 2010
(59) Need for independence	Nayak & Mishra, 2005
(60) New market development	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(61) New product development	Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Nazi & Lone, 2008
(62) Operating efficiency ratio	Walz & Niehoff, 2000
(63) Operating expense/employee	Angle & Perry, 1981
(64) Operating expense/revenue	Angle & Perry, 1981
(65) Organizational environment fit	Lewin & Milton, 1986

(66) Product maximization	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(67) Product price leadership	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(68) Productivity through people	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(69) Productivity through worker satisfaction	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(70) Profit generated and profitability (growth)	Redshaw, 2000; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Steers, 1975; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Zooga et al., 2015; Yukl, 2008; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Zheng et al., 2010
(71) Profit margin	Walz & Niehoff, 2000
(72) Program effectiveness (capacity and outcomes)	Sowa, Selden & Sandfort, 2004
(73) Project design, implementation, evaluation	Upadhy et al., 2014; Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014)
(74) Prosecution	Redshaw, 2000, 2001
(75) Provide information for decision making	Upadhy et al., 2014
(76) Quality and it's improvements	Redshaw, 2000; Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Naor et al., 2014; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Pounder, 1999; Cameron et al., 2011; Walz & Niehoff, 2000
(77) Quality of life	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(78) Reliability	Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969
(79) Repeat business / loyalty	Redshaw, 2000, 2001
(80) Reputation	Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015
(81) Responsiveness	Zairi, Whymark & Cooke, 1991
(82) Retention employee	Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Yukl, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Lewin & Milton, 1986
(83) Return of investments	Yukl, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Lewin & Milton, 1986
(84) Revenues	Cameron et al., 2011; Walz & Niehoff, 2000
(85) Right decisions in right times for right reasons	Rieley, 2014
(86) Sales Achieved (growth)	Redshaw, 2000; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Zooga et al., 2015; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011
(87) Sales per advertising dollar	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(88) Satisfaction of supplier with organization	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(89) Satisfaction through attention to needs	Lewin & Milton, 1986; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005
(90) Satisfying clients (human relations)	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Zooga et al., 2015; Shilbury & Moore, 2006
(91) Scrap material per unit	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(92) Selectivity	Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969
(93) Social responsibility	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(94) Socialite transformation	Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015

(95) Staff attitude	Hayes & Praksam, 1991; Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(96) Staff complains	Hayes & Praksam, 1991
(97) Stakeholder involvement	Jackson, 1998;
(98) Stock return	Yukl, 2008
(99) Sub-units performance	Upadhay et al., 2014; Vance & Tesluk, 1999
(100) Supervisor support	Turnipsee, 1988
(101) Supplier welfare	Zooga et al., 2015
(102) Supply	Eisinger, 2002
(103) Task orientation	Turnipsee, 1988
(104) Teamwork	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Jackson, 1998; Burnes, 1998
(105) Technical efficiency	Gelade & Gilbert, 2003
(106) Technical excellence	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(107) Timely implementation of change	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(108) Transformative leadership	Ashraf & Khan, 2013
(109) Turn away eligible clients	Eisinger, 2002
(110) Turnover	Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969; Cameron et al., 2011
(111) Turnover rate attraction of talent	Ullah & Yasmin, 2013
(112) Units produced	Redshaw, 2000; Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(113) Unity of command and direction	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(114) Vehicle hour	Angle & Perry, 1981
(115) Viability	Zooga et al., 2015; Nobbie & Brudney, 2003
(116) Ability to accomplish core mission	Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015
(117) Ability to identify problems or opportunities	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(118) Absenteeism	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Angle & Perry, 1981
(119) Accessibility via various channels	Liket & Mass, 2015
(120) Adaptability	Kataria et a;, 2013; Kataria et al., 2012; Santra & Giri, 2008; Pounder, 1999; Giri & Santra, 2008
(121) Advantages	Zooga et al., 2015
(122) Average assets	Cameron et al., 2011
(123) Clarity	Turnipsee, 1988
(124) Clear authority and discipline	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(125) Communication	Lewin & Milton, 1986; Bharadwaj, 2014
(126) Compensation	Shoraj & LLaci, 2015; Priyadarshini, 2005
(127) Competitive attainment	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(128) Competency	Ziebicki, 2013
(129) Congruence of internal processes	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(130) Consensus	Nayak & Mishra, 2005

(131) Control	Turnipsee, 1988; Upadhy et al., 2014; Ziebicki, 2013; Boiral, 2012; Steers, 1975; Choo, 2013; Pounder, 1999
(132) Controllable expenses	Gregory et al., 2009; An et al., 2011
(133) Core functions	Amagoh, 2015
(134) Creating efficient output from limited means available	Willems, 2015
(135) Culture	Burnes, 1998
(136) Decision making	Priyadarshini, 2005
(137) Differentiation	Choo, 2013
(138) Disciplinary actions	Redshaw, 2000, 2001
(139) Discretion	Choo, 2013
(140) Efficiency	Zairi et al., 1991; Kataria et al., 2012; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Steers, 1975; Santra & Giri, 2008; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Cross et al., 2013; Pounder, 1999; Giri & Santra, 2008
(141) Efficient information processing	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(142) Employee self-esteem	Ullah & Yasmin, 2013
(143) Employee well being	Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015
(144) Employee-perceived adaptability	Angle & Perry, 1981
(145) Equity	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(146) Expenses	Cameron et al., 2011
(147) Feedback	Priyadarshini, 2005
(148) Financial performance	Riordan et al., 2005; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Walz & Niehoff, 2000; Boiral, 2012; Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015
(149) Flexibility	Burnes, 1998; Santra & Giri, 2008; Choo, 2013; Naor et al., 2014; Giri & Santra, 2008
(150) Funding	Amagoh, 2015
(151) Governance	Amagoh, 2015
(152) Grievances	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(153) Growth	Steers, 1975; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Zooga et al., 2015; Pounder, 1999; Priyadarshini, 2005; Zheng et al., 2010
(154) Increase of expertise and employee development	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Burnes, 1998; Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969; Pounder, 1999
(155) Increased employee versatility/flexibility	Redshaw, 2000,2001
(156) Increasing resourcefulness (open system)	Redshaw, 2000; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Shilbury & Moore, 2006
(157) Individual employee performance/ efficiency	Upadhy et al., 2014; Gelade & Gilbert, 2003
(158) Networks and partnerships	Zooga et al., 2015; Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Amagoh, 2015
(159) Information management – communication	Pounder, 2001; Upadhy et al., 2014; Shoraj & Llaci, 2015; Pounder, 1999; Priyadarshini, 2005
(160) Initiation of ideas and practices	Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969

	Ziebicki, 2013; Santra & Giri, 2008; Zooga et al., 2015; Jackson, 1998; Turnipsee, 1988; Mason et al., 2005; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Giri & Santra, 2008; Grabowski et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2010
(161) Innovativeness/ innovation/ innovation capabilities	
(162) Integration or it's errors	Steers, 1975; Choo, 2013; Lewin & Milton, 1986
(163) Internal efficiency	Boiral, 2012
(164) Internal equilibrium	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(165) Interpersonal relationships	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
(166) Inventory cost	Kilmann & Herden, 1976
	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Nelson et al., 2007; Downey-Ennis & Harrington, 2002; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Kim et al., 2011; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Shoraj & Llaci, 2015; An et al., 2011; Nayak & Mishra, 2005
(167) Job satisfaction	
(168) Keeping the vision and mission up to date	Willems, 2015
(169) Leanness	Burnes, 1998
(170) Long-term sustainability	Amagoh, 2015
(171) Management effectiveness (capacity and outcomes)	Sowa et al., 2004
(172) Manager-perceived adaptability	Angle & Perry, 1981
	Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Upadhay et al., 2014; Ziebicki, 2013; Priyadarshini, 2005
(173) Motivation	
(174) Open communication	Steers, 1975
(175) Openness	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(176) Optimal use of available resources	Willems, 2015; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Ziebicki, 2013; Upadhay et al., 2014
(177) Order	Lewin & Milton, 1986; Choo, 2013
(178) Organisational commitment	Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Nayak & Mishra, 2005
(179) Organisational management	Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014)
(180) Organizational attachment	Nayak & Mishra, 2005
(181) Organizational climate	Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Cameron et al., 2011
(182) Organizational structure and governance	Grabowski et al., 2015
	Ziebicki, 2013; Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Collins-Camargo et al., 2012; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Srivastavat & Agrawal, 2003; Zheng et al., 2010
(183) Overall performance	
(184) Overall satisfaction	Steers, 1975; Cameron et al., 2011
(185) Performance management	Amagoh, 2015
(186) Personal effectiveness	Rai, Sinha & Singh, 2006
(187) Physical comfort	Turnipsee, 1988
(188) Planning (also strategic) and goal setting	Pounder, 2001; Upadhay et al., 2014; Pounder, 1999



	Pounder, 2001; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Kataria et al., 2013; Kataria et al., 2012; Steers, 1975; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Zooga et al., 2015; Priyadarshini, 2005
(189) Productivity	
(190) Self-control	Nayak & Mishra, 2005
(191) Structure/strategy congruence	Lewin & Milton, 1986
(192) Values	LiBrián & Kleiner, 2001, Dension, 1990; Priyadarshini, 2005
(193) Willingness to recommend	Cameron et al., 2011
(194) Work pressure	Turnipsee, 1988
(195) Workforce morale	Riordan et al., 2005; Mason et al., 2005; Priyadarshini, 2005
(196) Working conditions and job demands	Priyadarshini, 2005
	Redshaw, 2000; Zairi et al., 1991; Upadhyay et al., 2014; Alastair et al., 2013; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Biswas, 2010; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Eisinger, 2002; Nobbie & Brudney, 2003; Shilbury & Moore, 2006; Lewin & Milton, 1986
(197) Achieving goals	
(198) Stability	Ziebicki, 2013; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Choo, 2013; Pounder, 1999
(199) Survival	Steers, 1975; Lewin & Milton, 1986; Zooga et al., 2015; Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015

CHAPTER 2

1. Recipe of Project Impact Action Strategy

1.1. Summary of Deliverable 1.2 Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS)

DELIVERABLE	D 1.2 Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS)	Dates of issuing: M4 February 15. 2021
Responsible	P39 RTU	
Contributors	P5 IAAD P25 LLF P27 AGFT P30 ITC	
Type		For public dissemination YES
Short Description	A comprehensive blueprint with actionable and deployable information encompassing details on pathways for synergies and leverage/uptake.	
Methodology and process	<p>See Task 1.2. generate the project impact action strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P39 conducts literature review and strategical documentation analysis to create research tool for case studies (+methodological issue +questions/data set+template for survey report) Initiating participatory IMA and preparing the documentation of the entire IMA procedure (KPI, approach, action plan, methodology, Gantt, resources, synergies, etc.). 2. Partners P5 IAAD; P25 LLF; P27 AGFT; P30 ITC are invited to discuss created research methodology. Online group activities between partners and on site workshops with stakeholders in each partner's participating countries for sound understanding of the project context, its elements and their interrelations, information management. 3. Partners P5 IAAD; P25 LLF; P27 AGFT; P30 ITC use a tool for local research and fill in the survey report, to share the report with the responsible of the deliverable and with the WP leader encompassing stakeholders, problem and objectives analysis (including analysis of alternatives). 	

	<p>4. WP leader checks and reviews them to analyse data, provides the report, notably the deliverable. Participatory activities include fine tuning impact prediction per anticipated framework (proposal level) incorporating the 7 call's expected impact (CEI), review of problem analysis, formulation of impact hypotheses, validation, selection of impact indicators, incorporation of real-time adjusted indicators per current realities (e.g. "emerging" indicators. Generating KPI and preparing the updated IMA baseline and assessment with KPI grids and proceduresa are required.</p> <p>Output REPORT "Project impact action strategy"</p>	
Indicators	Report - "Project impact action strategy" Reports of "Project impact of WP"	
Who	Does What (tasks)	Evidences (PIAS / KPIs survey)
P-1 UNIVE	Check and review documentation	
P2 - EPC	NA validate criteria and <u>identify new impact dimensions (?)</u>	
P3 - BRUG +P3a +p3b	NA	
P4 - VIVES	NA	
P5 - IAAD	NA	
P6 - INAG	NA	
P7 - UNRF	NA	
P8 - VEGO	NA	
P9 - INVE	NA	
P10 – VEJLE	NA	
P11 - QUA	NA	
P12 - INTO	NA	
P13 - AGRIA	NA	
P14 - SLEAN	NA	
P15 - BRH	NA	
P16 - TTZ	NA	
P17 - BIOZ	NA	
P18 - QUAR	NA	
P19 - SINNO	NA	
P20 - UPM	NA	
P21 - WIT	NA	
P22 - MATIS	NA	
P23 - FFI	NA	
P24 - VPR	NA	
P25 - LLF	Edit, check and review document drafts	
P26 - GGP	NA	
P27 - AGFT	Edit, check and review document drafts	
P28 - IASI	NA	

P29 - ARFI	NA	
P30 - ITC	NA	
P31 - CORR	NA	
P32 - VIZ +P32a	NA	
P33 - IVM	NA	
P34 - MOMS	NA	
P35 - UNI.Lu	NA	
P36 - UCC	NA	
P37 - PRIM	NA	
P38 - IUAV	NA	
P39 - RTU	Creates and moderates PIAS	
P40 - CITAG	NA	
P41 - HARL	NA	

1.2. Project Impact Action Strategy Basics from Project Proposal

Impact

"Work package 1 (WP1) drives the project's implementation via monitoring and assessing the activities/tasks that enable agile teams and partners to reach their goals of monthly and iterative value delivery, aligning all activities with targeted impact KPI.

CITIES2030 aims at activating and structuring food system transformation towards EU-UN11NUA in the food system arena, incorporating all actors of the food value chain, through the completion and operation of policy and innovation labs and a blockchain-based data-driven CRFS management system. Mapping vulnerabilities and obstacles to sustainable CRFS and generating a structured and actionable URFS knowledge basis in the food system transformation portfolio in the framework of food supply chain and security and data rich requirements CITIES2030 contributes to the alignment of supply chain innovation strategy (Cities2030, 2020).

Beyond Expected Impacts

Increasing cities and regions cooperation efficiency with indicators. WP1 secures alignment between operations, methodologies and anticipated results, incorporating a risk and change plans, yet it is not indeed the core objective. WP1 forecast and characterise additional outcomes not planned initially and examine their feasibility without additional resources. Likely WP2 to 6, WP1 foster synergies with comparable impact monitoring and assessment (IMA) processes from other sources (e.g. EU-funded projects, etc.). All in all, WP1 secures all activities effectively meet each of the 7 call's expected impact (CEI) with a continued, systemic and digital-based IMA approach that generates CRFS/UFSE indicators and city/region fact-sheet instruments.

Deliverable D1.2_WP1



CITIES2030 develops beyond the 6 categories of indicators identified by the MUFFP, enhancing the

framework (outcomes, impact, indicators, recommendations, etc.) with two key pathways: nature based solutions (NBS) and urbanisation as such. Still CITIES2030 plans to keep the same number and nature of categories, only further fine-tune indicators and relates with novel outcomes, impact and recommendations.

The role of cities in future-proofing the food systems is unanimously acknowledged and encouraged, this puts importance and urgency to cities taking on an agency for food system transformation and actively seizing the opportunity for strengthening urban resilience. Or, to use a catchphrase - turning big societal challenges into opportunities for development, using one problem to fix several others. Behind the catch phrase, there are several barriers for cities to embark on food system transformation, as it is a massive complex to address, let alone putting into an orchestrated, forward action. The macro-narrative of food system transformation must be actionable and the systemic change an accumulated effect of deeply contextualized actions. CITIES2030 enable key mechanisms and structure actionable resources to assist cities tackle the following challenges.

CITIES2030 continuously promotes participation in the Food Systems Dialogues (FSD), a UN-based global series of facilitated round-table conversations and consultations, that encourage joint action for transforming food systems, to address a series of challenges listed further, with the incorporation of a comprehensive set of key learnings and evidence-based practices, that are facilitated by the FSD. Since their launch in June 2018, 23 FSDs events have taken place across Europe and the world, and CITIES2030 will create conditions to increase this number by 50 by 16.10.2024.

Lack of food system insight. The transparency of the food production system and its value chain dependencies is oftentimes lacking. Who are the stakeholders and how do they connect?

Lack of connected policies. There are also missing links between policies for food production (often times within business and economic) and affected areas like health and social policy. Or policy links to city based services that could extend and circularize food production value chain, i.e. valorization from 'gut to field' in waste management and utility services.

No plug-and-play. Cities and their food system relations are unique, so every case is highly grounded; no city has the same roadmap. Existing infrastructure, particular strengths or weaknesses, prevalence of specific challenges etc. Making it impossible to merely replicate what has been done elsewhere. It is a process that needs to be carried out locally. While indicators for resilient food systems exist (i.e. MUFFP) they must be carefully calibrated and curated to become actionable locally.

Dynamic roadmap. Cities don't have a clear business case to strategize and implement from. The roadmap is dynamically generated taking direction from policy (vision/ goals) and bottom-up input from experimental and multistakeholder interaction and joint action (solution/ results). This dialectic is key to the resilience roadmap. It's too complex



to draw out a strategy for simple implementation; the opportunities are rather exposed with the multiple perspectives and since prototyped and tested for viability and desirability. There is a lack of city-region food innovation means. For many cities this is blue ocean; divided focus on either industrialized food value chain innovation or socio-economic urban innovation. An innovation bridge is missed. That crosses sector, stakeholders and exposes and explores a new field of innovation. And means to create the needed dynamic are also missed.

CITIES2030 develops and pilot an ambitious approach that addresses the barriers of cities to take on agency for food system transformation. CITIES 2030 applies a systemic perspective, providing complex intelligence (policy lab), and creating a grounded forum for bottom-up knowledge and experimental action (living lab) facilitating new tangible viable solutions (10 innovations) and facilitated uptake by others (city-to-region) in order to foster evidence based 'systemic business case' at city level and tools to make city region food systems a vehicle for broader urban resilience (climate, social, economic) (Cities2030, 2020).

1.3. Creation, Verification and Application of Project Impact Action Strategy

Creation, verification and application of the project impact action strategy:

1. P39 conducts literature review and strategical documentation analysis to create research tool (+methodological issue +questions/data set + template for survey report) Initiating participatory IMA and preparing the documentation of the entire IMA procedure (KPI, approach, action plan, methodology, Gantt, resources, synergies, etc.).
2. Partners P5 IAAD; P25 LLF; P27 AGFT; P30 ITC are invited to discuss created research methodology. Online group activities between partners and on site workshops with stakeholders in each partner's participating countries for sound understanding of the project context, its elements and their interrelations, information management.
3. Partners P5 IAAD; P25 LLF; P27 AGFT; P30 ITC use a tool for local research and fill the survey report, to share the report with the responsible of the deliverable and with the WP leader. It encompasses stakeholders, problem and objectives analysis (including analysis of alternatives).
4. WP leader checks and reviews them to analyse data, provides the report, notably the deliverable. Participatory activities include: fine tuning impact prediction per anticipated framework (proposal level) incorporating the 7 call's expected impact (CEI), review of problem analysis, formulation of impact hypotheses, validation, selection of impact indicators, incorporation of real-time adjusted indicators per current realities (e.g. "emerging" indicators. Generating KPI. Preparing the updated IMA baseline and assessment with KPI grids and procedures.

Output REPORT "Project impact action strategy"

1.4. Impact Elements

Call's expected impact (CEI)	W P	Deliverable No	Deliverable title / KPI	Month	
CEI - 1 > Creation of new and sound evidence for policy makers in relation to urban food systems in support of policy development	2	D.2.2	White paper on ethical CRFS	M28	
	2	D.2.3	White paper on gender-based CRFS	M29	
	2	D.2.4	White paper on RRI-oriented CRFS	M30	
	3	D.3.2	White paper on sustainable CRFS	M13	
	3	D.3.4	Observatory on sustainable urban food policies and practices	M13	
	3	D.3.5	4 Policy briefs	M14, 24, 36, 48	
	3	D.3.6	CRFS taxonomy compendium	M24, M36, M48	
	3	D.3.7	"100 innovation frameworks for CRFS"	M13, M25, M37, M47	
	CEI - 2 > Building up of political commitment and capacity for multi-objective coordinated strategies, roadmaps and actions between different government departments, jurisdictions and stakeholders that aim at delivering co-benefits relevant to FOOD 2030 priorities	4	D.4.1	Policy co-creation capacity building programme	M8
		4	D.4.2	Facilitators and guidelines for policies and pilots developments	M11

CEI - 3 > Creation of a wide network of pilot European cities developing and implementing food system policies and actions including living labs, demonstrators of good practice, ambassadors for the transferability of the food system model all over Europe and beyond	4	D.4.3	Pilot cities policy action plans	M12
	4	D.4.4	Blueprint for policies to generate sustainable CRFS	M26, M37
	4	D.4.5	Pilot cities deployment programme and action plan	M25
	3	D.3.1	"CRFS Alliance" community of practice with 10 cities and 2 in 2020 developing toward 50 by 16.10.2024 with a solid and sustainable synergy action plan	M12
CEI - 4 > Reconnection of citizens with food fostering behavioural change towards healthy sustainable diets and nutrition, responsible production and consumption	3	D.3.1	"CRFS Alliance" community of practice assemble 100 agents of the UFSE in 2020 by M12 and develops towards 500 in total by 16.10.2024	M12
CEI - 5 > Increased food and nutrition security for urban and rural dwellers	4	D.4.1	Policy co-creation capacity building programme	M8
	4	D.4.2	Facilitators and guidelines for policies and pilots developments	M11
	4	D.4.3	Pilot cities policy action plans	M12
	4	D.4.4	Blueprint for policies to generate sustainable CRFS	M26, M37

CEI - 6 > Improved social inclusion and equity of all actors of the food systems	4	D.4.5	Pilot cities deployment programme and action plan	M25	
	2	D.2.2	White paper on ethical CRFS	M28	
	2	D.2.3	White paper on gender-based CRFS	M29	
	2	D.2.4	White paper on RRI-oriented CRFS	M30	
	CEI - 7 > Creation of innovation opportunities, jobs and growth relevant to city region livelihoods and economic development for all actors of the food systems	5	D.5.1	Innovation action capacity building programme	M8
		5	D.5.2	Facilitators and guidelines for innovation and pilots developments	M11
		5	D.5.3	Pilot cities innovation action plans	M12
		5	D.5.4	Blueprint for business models to generate sustainable CRFS	M26, M38
5		D.5.5	Innovation action deployment programme and action plan incorporating the "CRFS SeedInvest" investment action programme	M25	
<i>Beyond expected impacts mentioned in proposal</i>					
<i>New actors of the investment capital arena (Foundation)</i>	All	All	Foundation established	All	
			Number of project partners engaged		
			Finance fund-raised		
			Number of new initiatives started		

Increasing cities and regions cooperation efficiency with indicators	All	All	No of participants enaged outside Cities 2030	All
			No of networks developed	
			No of other activities Foundation engaged	
Additional outcomes not mentioned directly as CEI or KPI				
Delivery (on time)				
SOCIAL impact scale:				
Ability to cope with users and non-users expectations and needs (to what extent the needs and requirements of end users are met, and how CITIES2030 can meet their expectations)				
Bringing the planned strategic actions to a good end (to what extent project activities implemented serve the society needs)				
Civil participation (Number of other community members involved in the project city/region activities, Number of youngster involved in the project activities)				
Cohesion (project coherence with other policies e.g. green deal, CAP,...)				
Commitment and involvement (Number of engaged local/regional/national multi-stakeholders)				
Commitment towards learning and development (involved participants have adequate knowledge, skills and tools to achieve their full potential to support the development of SFSC, and ensure a sustainable growth of urban life quality)				
Community satisfaction with project results				
Community improvement (level of positive social impact on local, natinoal, regional, EU level)				
Cooperation (Number of cross border cooperation)				
Enforcing changes to our society (number of engaged cities and regions)				
Legitimization (number of governance, number of policy makers)				
Reputation (incresead visibility and recognition of CRFS by number of stakeholders engaged)				
Social responsibility (number of organizations having impact of CRFS)				
Networks (number and name of newly created networks, reached out and engaged during project)				

Partnerships (number and name of newly created partnerships, reached out and engaged during project)
Information management – communication (number of stakeholders reached out, WP 7 outcome)
Initiation of ideas and practices (number and names)
Organisational commitment (the readiness level for cooperation and co-creation of all stakeholders)
ENVIRONMENTAL impact scale:
Environmental impact (e.g., reduction of CO2 emission, food optimised delivery chains, etc.)
External focus (Number of structured investment capital plans; Number of Memorandum of Understanding signed)
Urban/rural food consumers' perception on SFSC (number of new consumers engaged in SFSC)
Leanness (level of stakeholders' ability to adapt lean principles in CRFS)
ECONOMICAL impact scale:
Business results (number of innovations, companies engaged, companies consulted, companies informed)
Leveraging of resources (number of financial resources saved, attracted; amount of investment, etc.)
Industrial action (number of food producers engaged in SFSC)
New technologies (number of new technologies developed)
Urban/rural food consumers' perception on SFSC (number of new consumers engaged in SFSC)
Cost minimization (number of saved financial resources due to CRFS)
Investor attraction (number of investment actions, structured investment capital plans; Investment capital, additional - number of investors contacted, number of meetings with investors, number of investors Memorandum of Understanding signed)
Legitimization (number of governance, number of policy makers)
New market development (number of places/spaces created/developed within support of the project activities; Number of consumers involved; Number of traders involved)
New product development (number of new products developed/created within support of the project activities)
Stakeholder involvement (number of engaged stakeholders)
Ability to identify problems or opportunities (number of innovative solutions developed)
Accessibility via various channels (number of developed solutions for SFCS)
Employee well-being (the increase of salaries, competences of employees at CRFS due to project activities)
Funding (number of funding attracted to CRFS)
Increase of expertise (the level of CRFS expertise)
Innovativeness/ innovation/ innovation capabilities (number and description of new solutions created by project activities)



2. Action Plan of Project Impact Action Strategy

2.1. Who?

P39 and WP1 members have created Project Impact Action Strategy (PIAS) and the self-filled survey that should be filled by the other WP leaders and co-leaders for several time periods.

2.2. When?

Every 6 month according to Project proposal. The initial PIAS exercise will be conducted in M6 to configure the starting value of all impacts to be created during the project life-span. This initial value will serve as benchmark indicator for next PIAS activities conducted every six months, thus, revealing the progress over 48 months.

2.3. How?

Team members should fill the self-filled survey, discussing it in the WP meeting and sending the final version to WP1 members 2 weeks before end month of each reporting.
Survey below.

Call's expected impact (CEI)	WP	Deliverable No	Deliverable title / KPI	Month	Progress	Progress level	Main impact level	Main measurement	Value	Description of situation in period	Link to support info
CEI – 1 > Creation of new and sound evidence for policy makers in relation to urban food systems in support of policy development	2	D.2.2	White paper on ethical CRFS	M28	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Self-assessment			
	2	D.2.3	White paper on gender-based CRFS	M29	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	2	D.2.4	White paper on RRI-oriented CRFS	M30	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	3	D.3.2	White paper on sustainable CRFS	M13	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	3	D.3.4	Observatory on sustainable urban food policies and practices	M13	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	3	D.3.5	4 Policy briefs	M14, 24, 36, 48	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	3	D.3.6	CRFS taxonomy compendium	M24, M36, M48	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	3	D.3.7	"100 innovation frameworks for CRFS"	M13, M25, M37, M47	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
CEI – 2 > Building up of political commitment and capacity for multi-objective coordinated strategies, roadmaps and actions between different government departments, jurisdictions and stakeholders that impact delivering co-benefits relevant to FOOD 2030 priorities	4	D.4.1	Policy co-creation capacity building programme	M8	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.2	Facilitators and guidelines for policies and pilots developments	M11	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.3	Pilot cities policy action plans	M12	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.4	Blueprint for policies to generate sustainable CRFS	M26, M37	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.5	Pilot cities deployment programme and action plan	M25	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
CEI – 3 > Creation of a wide network of pilot European cities developing and implementing food system policies and actions including living labs, demonstrators of good practice, ambassadors for the transferability of the food system model all over Europe and beyond	3	D.3.1	"CRFS Alliance" community of practice with 10 cities and 2 in 2020 developing towards 50 by 16.10.2024 with a solid and sustainable synergy action plan	M12	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
CEI – 4 > Reconnection of citizens with food fostering behavioural change towards healthy sustainable diets and nutrition, responsible production and consumption	3	D.3.1	"CRFS Alliance" community of practice assemble 100 agents of the UFSE in 2020 by M12 and develops towards 500 in total by 16.10.2024	M12	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
CEI – 5 > Increased food and nutrition security for urban and rural dwellers	4	D.4.1	Policy co-creation capacity building programme	M8	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.2	Facilitators and guidelines for policies and pilots developments	M11	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.3	Pilot cities policy action plans	M12	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			

	4	D.4.4	Blueprint for policies to generate sustainable CRFS	M26, M37	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	4	D.4.5	Pilot cities deployment programme and action plan	M25	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
CEI – 6 > Improved social inclusion and equity of all actors of the food systems	2	D.2.2	White paper on ethical CRFS	M28	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	2	D.2.3	White paper on gender-based CRFS	M29	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	2	D.2.4	White paper on RRI-oriented CRFS	M30	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
CEI – 7 > Creation of innovation opportunities, jobs and growth relevant to city region livelihoods and economic development for all actors of the food systems	5	D.5.1	Innovation action capacity building programme	M8	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	5	D.5.2	Facilitators and guidelines for innovation and pilots developments	M11	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	5	D.5.3	Pilot cities innovation action plans	M12	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	5	D.5.4	Blueprint for business models to generate sustainable CRFS	M26, M38	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
	5	D.5.5	Innovation action deployment programme and action plan incorporating the “CRFS SeedInvest” investment action programme	M25	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
Beyond expected impacts mentioned in proposal											
New actors of the investment capital arena (Foundation)	All	All	Foundation established	All	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
			Number of project partners engaged		Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
			Finance fund-raised		Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
			Number of new initiatives started		Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
			No of participants engaged outside Cities 2030		Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
			No of networks developed		Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
			No of other activities Foundation engaged		Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
Increasing cities and regions cooperation efficiency with indicators	All	All		All	Progress level for the period	Level of the progress	Impact level	Measurement method			
Additional outcomes not mentioned directly as CEI or KPI											
		All criteria from page 42,43 above will be measured by the level of progress as seen below 0 – not related with WP to 5 - progress									
		Example: Ability to cope with users and non-users expectations and needs			Level of the progress						