

Comparison with Existing Impact Frameworks

Comparison with Existing Impact Frameworks

The SUI framework does not replace existing impact measurement standards — it operationalises them at the per-application unit level. Understanding how SUI relates to the major frameworks helps practitioners choose which standards to cite in their SUI definition and which verification protocols are compatible.

The Landscape of Impact Standards

Standard	Owner	Primary Use	Granularity	Verification Requirement
IRIS+ 5.3b	GIIN	Impact indicator selection	Portfolio/fund	None mandated
IMP Five Dimensions	Impact Frontiers	Impact conceptualisation	Programme	None mandated
IFVI / Capitals Coalition	IFVI	Impact-weighted accounts	Enterprise	Recommended
IFC AIMM	IFC	MDB investment scoring	Project	IFC internal
EU Taxonomy	European Commission	Regulatory do-no-harm	Activity	Mandatory (DNSH)
TNFD	TNFD Secretariat	Nature-related disclosure	Enterprise/site	Recommended
60 Decibels	60dB	Beneficiary perception	Beneficiary	Independent (60dB team)
GRI Standards	GRI	Sustainability reporting	Enterprise	Recommended
SUI (CTH Framework)	CleantechHUB	Per-application unit definition and verification	Application	Mandatory (SSOT-backed)

SUI vs. IRIS+ (GIIN)

IRIS+ is the most widely used impact measurement framework globally, with over 10,000 indicators organised into sector-specific metric sets. IRIS+ tells you *what to measure*; SUI tells you *how to verify it at the unit level*.

Complementarity: Every SUI should reference an IRIS+ indicator (or TNFD/GRI equivalent) in its Specificity criterion. IRIS+ provides the taxonomy; SUI provides the per-application protocol.

Key gap SUI fills: IRIS+ 5.3b includes sector metric bundles (agriculture, energy, housing) but has no concept of a "per-application standard." A company using IRIS+ PI5765 (GHG emissions avoided) can report any number of tonnes avoided with no protocol for verifying the per-dose or per-hectare calculation. SUI closes this gap.

SUI vs. IMP Five Dimensions (Impact Frontiers)

The Impact Management Project's Five Dimensions — What, Who, How Much, Contribution, Risk — are the closest conceptual antecedent to the SUI criteria. The SUI framework directly adapts them:

IMP Dimension	SUI Criterion	SUI Addition
What	Specificity	Requires taxonomy link at application level
Who	(Embedded in Specificity)	SUI focuses on environmental outcomes; social "who" is contextual
How Much	Quantifiability	Requires per-application unit, not programme total
Contribution	Attribution	Requires documented counterfactual, not just claim
Risk	(Embedded in Verifiability)	SSOT system reduces impact risk by making claims auditable

IMP operates at the programme or portfolio level; SUI operates at the product application level. SUI is, in a sense, IMP operationalised for startup product teams.

SUI vs. IFC AIMM

The IFC's Anticipated Impact Measurement and Monitoring (AIMM) system scores investments on a 100-point scale across 29 sectors. It is the standard used by IFC and increasingly by other MDBs for investment decision-making.

Why SUI alignment with AIMM matters: A startup seeking IFC co-investment or IFC-backed blended finance must score above threshold on AIMM. AIMM's "Market Creation" and "Effects on People and Planet" components reward verifiable, sector-aligned impact measurement. A startup with a well-defined SUI can self-score on AIMM with significantly higher confidence — and can present the SSOT evidence trail to IFC reviewers.

SUI vs. EU Taxonomy

The EU Taxonomy Regulation defines environmentally sustainable economic activities and requires companies to demonstrate "substantial contribution" to one of six environmental objectives while meeting "Do No Significant Harm" (DNSH) criteria. Taxonomy alignment is increasingly a condition for accessing EU green finance

instruments.

SUI as EU Taxonomy enabler: The EU Taxonomy requires quantitative, measurable environmental contributions — precisely what the SUI provides. A SUI aligned to EU Taxonomy criteria (e.g., climate change mitigation, circular economy) gives a startup a credible claim to Taxonomy-aligned revenue, unlocking access to EU Green Bond instruments and SFDR Article 9 fund investment.

SUI vs. TNFD

The Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) had 733+ adopters representing \$22T AUM as of 2025. TNFD focuses on nature-related risks and dependencies, not just climate. The SUI framework is extensible to biodiversity and water outcomes using TNFD metrics (e.g., habitat restored per application, water quality index per treatment).

Where SUI Is Genuinely Novel

No existing framework combines all four of these properties simultaneously:

1. **Per-application granularity** (not programme or portfolio level)
2. **Mandatory independent verification** against a defined SSOT
3. **Explicit financial instrument design interface** (SUI as trigger metric)
4. **Startup-native operationalisation** (designed for companies with limited measurement infrastructure)

IRIS+ covers #1 in principle but not #2, #3, or #4. The EU Taxonomy covers #2 and #3 but operates at the activity level, not the product application level. SUI fills the gap between these frameworks and the financial instruments that want to use their outputs.

Next: [The Parameterized SUI Protocol](#) — how to formally specify and document a SUI.

Revisión #1

Creado 2026-06-08 20:35:02 UTC por Angelica Diaz

Actualizado 2026-06-08 20:35:02 UTC por Angelica Diaz