The Problem

The social sector thrives through innovation and the commitment of nonprofit, foundation and social entrepreneurs who adapt business models to the indigenous options of places where people are in need. 1.8 million tax-exempt organizations generate over $1.25 trillion in revenues, own over $2.5 trillion in assets,[1] employ millions and touch millions of lives internationally. The social sector is growing beyond traditional non-profits, through foundations, venture philanthropy, hybrid profit and other entities.

Today, cities present layered challenges. The social sector has disaggregated urban issues into domain expertise ranging from environmental and energy to public health and economic development. With the experts have come a cacophony of "indicators" proving the severity of problem sets each expert community knows how to solve. Each expert group's "indicators" reflect the ways government regulators and the science and vocabulary of professional knowledge choose in order to benchmark how bad the problem is, in isolation, untethered to regional or national measures and the "indicators" of other expert groups.

Expert groups have evolved highly refined technological barriers to common ground and discussion. They communicate and computerize by storing expert knowledge as studies or reports exchanged through static (Adobe® PDF) Web document formats. The reports are intended as proof enough of need, non-comparable to other experts' proofs of need. In an emergency, like Hurricane Karina's devastation of New Orleans, the cacophony and myopia of expertly sacrosanct networks of knowledge, people and assets, funded to be islands operating in isolation, presented unacceptable public risk and damaged a whole generation of lives and neighborhoods. In the daily routine between emergencies, experts fight out the academic, industry and foundation equivalent of budget wars, outshouting each other's proof of severity, and rallying media headlines and focus around their "indicator" of doom and gloom unless the expertise they control is funded to mitigate and monitor the quantified risk.

Simultaneously

- Foundations expect grantees to quantify their social impacts for the communities they serve to justify further funding,
- Bond rating services, mutual fund managers, fiscal authorities and the media pressure governments to report a consistent performance benchmark for the public services they fund and the infrastructure assets they own and maintain,
- Stock investors and fund managers want more granular corporate social responsibility and governance reports and rating services to gauge industrial impacts on specific environmental assets, communities, social issues and indigenous peoples,
- Numerous corporate governance, environmental carbon footprint, world corruption and other indices of social impacts are becoming more plentiful, and disconnected throughout the Web, vying for supremacy, funding and trusted use, and

Web commerce (mobile and desktop) has the underutilized potential to transparently account for and reward sustainable business practices and performance in its global and regional context. The rhetoric of urban issues cannot be unmasked through "indicators" scaled to quantify a continuing problem outside of its geographic context. The search for *win: win* solutions is blinded by non-comparable statistics of need and despair.

Like others, the social sector needs to evolve a composite way for seeing its programmatic biases, blind spots and options. As in government and industry, the social sector needs a way to communicate its "efficiency and effectiveness" using a common denominator of value. Our current political and media environment demonizes the innovator proposing solutions.

The social sector needs new ways to align and coalesce its effective programs, retire its ineffective ones and to crystallize community human, natural and physical demography so as to see options for change. Above all, in competing for capital with other economic sectors, the social sector needs a bell-weather measure through which funders will have improved faith and trust in the likelihood of social returns and fiscal stewardship. In short, we need sustainable resiliency®.

A Novel Solution: Sustainable Resiliency®

Sustainable resiliency®'s framework would be open so as to register, spatially-correlate and pool (like Wikipedia®) a range of expert data, modeling, analytic and report tools for visualizing the positive impacts of social change in the places where it is happening and can occur. Urban Logic's sustainable resiliency® approach would (i) pull together disparate performance benchmarks about a region (and the "indicator" models that generate such benchmarks), (ii) normalize them to reflect the region's unique geographic and strategic challenges, (iii) reflect the sources of positive social impacts available to maintain the benchmarked level and (iv) calculate a composite index of the region's sustainability and resiliency. Sustainable resiliency® would complement environmental, community and building information modeling and geographic information systems, as in effect a socially impactful modeling (**SIM**) layer.

Contact for further information

Urban Logic seeks strategic partners and funders. For more information, feel free to contact:

Bruce Cahan bcahan@urbanlogic.org
2007 Ashoka Fellow – Social Venture Investing
Stanford Law School Center for Internet & Society – Nonresidential Fellow

[1] Testimony of IRS Commissioner Mark Everson (April 5, 2005), http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-tege/metest040505.pdf.