# Humanovability®: A Human-Centered Model for Impact Assessment

**Oscar Di Montigny · Davide Maestri** [1]

Grateful Foundation ETS · Grateful Sphere Benefit Corporation, Italy · oscar.dimontigny@gmail.com

*Abstract ID 2054 · Session 766 — Methods and Approaches to Impact Assessment · IAIA26, Québec City*

**Abstract**

Impact Assessment methodologies have steadily broadened their scope from environmental forecasting to social, health, cultural and strategic dimensions. A structural limitation nonetheless persists: existing frameworks measure the outcomes of decisions rather than the relational quality of the systems that produce them. This paper introduces Humanovability® — a human-centered assessment model grounded in the Relational Theory of Value — as a complementary evolution of Impact Assessment practice. Through a 9P×8D matrix of seventy-two Fundamental Relational Patterns, the model renders relational quality an observable, measurable and governable property of organizations, territories and institutions. The operational architecture is provided by the Impact Platform, promoted by Consorzio SFERA (Federative System for a Regenerative and Spherical Economy), which extends the logic of mitigation and compensation toward regeneration. The paper argues that the fundamental unit of assessment should evolve from the isolated impact indicator to the Fundamental Relational Pattern: the recurring configuration through which a system tends to generate, conserve or deplete value over time.

**Keywords:** *relational theory of value; evolutionary impact assessment; Humanovability®; regenerative governance; human-centered assessment; ESIA.*

## 1. Introduction

Over five decades, Impact Assessment has evolved from a purely environmental instrument into a multidimensional governance mechanism. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Social Impact Assessment (SIA), Health Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and integrated ESG reporting now constitute a sophisticated methodological ecosystem, to whose standardization the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) has substantially contributed.

Yet a structural limitation persists across this ecosystem. Existing frameworks predominantly measure the observable results of decisions — emissions, displacement, land-use change, employment effects — rather than the relational quality of the systems that produced them. Impacts are interrogated as end points, rarely understood as symptoms of deeper systemic configurations. Relational factors — trust, governance quality, organizational culture, territorial identity, inter-institutional cooperation — are treated as background conditions rather than primary objects of analysis. The result is a growing misalignment between the complexity of contemporary systems and the analytical resolution of the tools used to assess them (Morin, 2008).

This paper introduces Humanovability® as a complementary, evolutionary response. It does not argue for replacing existing assessment methodologies. It proposes an additional analytical layer operating prior to impact prediction: the assessment of the relational quality of the system that makes certain impacts probable.

## 2. Theoretical Foundations: The Relational Theory of Value

Every assessment system presupposes, explicitly or implicitly, a theory of value. The history of economic thought can be read as a succession of value theories, each adequate to its historical context: from Smith's labour theory of value to the marginalist focus on subjective utility, and the subsequent extension of the concept to institutional capital (North, 1990), social capital (Putnam, 1993), human capability (Sen, 1999) and natural capital (Costanza et al., 1997). More recently, ecological economics — exemplified by Raworth's (2017) Doughnut Economics — foregrounded planetary boundaries as non-negotiable constraints. The Relational Theory of Value extends this trajectory and the parallel work of circular and regenerative economics, the civil-economy tradition of reciprocity and common good (Bruni & Zamagni, 2007), and the relational, common-home framing of the Economy of

Francesco (Economy of Francesco, 2022): it does not replace these currents but locates their shared insight — that prosperity is relational — at the centre of the theory of value.

Each contribution captures a genuine dimension of value generation. None, however, fully accounts for the relational dimension: the quality of the connections through which different forms of capital interact to generate — or erode — value over time. The Relational Theory of Value addresses this gap through a single founding axiom: value is not a property of objects, but a property of relations. From this axiom follow five operating laws of regenerative value — reciprocity, interdependence, regeneration, dynamic equilibrium and purpose — holding respectively that value grows as the mutual capacity to generate it grows, that no system generates value in isolation, that authentic value increases the conditions of its own reproducibility, that prosperity arises from continuous harmonization rather than from maximizing a single variable, and that value is conserved when oriented by an end beyond immediate results. Their violation predicts deterioration, loss of trust and depletion of relational, human and natural capital (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Meadows, 2008).

**Regenerative Capacity** is defined here as the capacity of a human system to generate economic, social, environmental and cultural value while preserving and strengthening, over time, the conditions that make such generation possible. It is this capacity — rather than the isolated impact — that the model seeks to render observable.

**Relational Capital** is proposed as the theoretical category missing from existing multi-capital frameworks: the systemic quality of connections that enables an organization, community or territory to generate trust, reciprocity and cooperation, creating the conditions for all other forms of capital to regenerate over time. Financial capital deployed in a high-trust context produces outcomes profoundly different from the same capital in a low-trust environment. The difference is relational.

## 3. The 9P×8D Matrix and Its Architecture

Relational quality is rendered observable through a matrix combining nine Domains of Value (9P) with eight Qualities of Regeneration (8D). The nine P-domains are perspectives through which any human system can be observed simultaneously: P1 Outer Person, P2 People, P3 Partnership, P4 Profit, P5 Prosperity, P6 Planet, P7 Peace, P8 Inner Person and P9 Purpose. These domains are interdependent — no sustainable Profit (P4) without People (P2); no planetary health (P6) without Partnership (P3); no durable Prosperity (P5) without Peace (P7).

The eight D-dimensions indicate not what to observe but how deeply each domain is assessed, expressing qualities of regeneration: Territory and Context, Redistribution, Trust, Transparency, Evolutionary Innovation, Systemic Sustainability, Person-Centeredness and Transformative Potential.

Their intersection yields seventy-two Fundamental Relational Patterns (FRP). An FRP is not an indicator measured against a threshold; it is a recurring configuration — the tendency of a system to behave in a given way along a specific relational dimension. The cell P4×D3 (Profit × Trust), for instance, does not ask 'what is the profit margin?' but 'how does the organization's economic activity express, reinforce or erode the trust relations that make it possible?'.

*Figure 1. The 9P×8D Humanovability® matrix (illustrative; cells P4×D3 and P5×D1 worked as examples).*

| | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 | D6 | D7 | D8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **P1 Outer Person** | | | | | | | | |
| **P2 People** | | | | | | | | |
| **P3 Partnership** | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **P4 Profit** | | | ◆ | | | | | |
| **P5 Prosperity** | ◆ | | | | | | | |
| **P6 Planet** | | | | | | | | |
| **P7 Peace** | | | | | | | | |
| **P8 Inner Person** | | | | | | | | |
| **P9 Purpose** | | | | | | | | |

The FRP framework constitutes an architecture of Reflexive Assessment — a process through which a system becomes progressively aware of the relational quality that determines its capacity to generate value over time. It produces not a ranking but an evolutionary map. The Grateful Balance Assessment® is the methodological instrument that implements this architecture in organizational and territorial practice.

## 4. From Assessment to Infrastructure: the Impact Platform

Humanovability® is operationalized through the Impact Platform, an integrated infrastructure for the measurement, mitigation, compensation and regeneration of impacts, promoted by Consorzio SFERA (Federative System for a Regenerative and Spherical Economy). It performs three interdependent functions: extraction of structured operational data from participating organizations; scoring of those data through the validated seventy-two-pattern matrix, yielding a multidimensional profile rather than a single composite score; and integration with existing permitting and compliance workflows at regional administrative scale. The data-extraction layer is developed in technology partnership with Fyberloom (Santo Sabato, 2026; Fyberloom, 2025), whose Intelligent Knowledge Mapping architecture supports context-aware extraction across heterogeneous sources; the tokenization layer is built on Hypercube's regenerative-tokenization infrastructure (Hypercube, 2025) and the Materiality and Public Relations with Region in Italy via Algebra AI (Algebra AI, 2025)..

The operational endpoint of the assessment process is the generation of a Spheric Materiality Credit (SMC): a discrete, verifiable and redistributable unit of measured impact. The applied example presented at IAIA26 is the Water Token, where one token corresponds to one cubic metre of measured and traceable water impact, recorded on a public, immutable ledger (Hypercube, 2025). Here tokenization denotes not speculative crypto-finance but the operational endpoint of assessment: through a four-stage pipeline (Extract, Score, Certify, Tokenize), measured impact becomes distributed infrastructure that financially recognizes the territory generating it, with value redistributed across the chain without concentration in any single node.

## 5. Implications for Impact Assessment

Humanovability® situates its contribution within a typology of four assessment levels: Compliance Assessment (are we following the rules?), Performance Assessment (are we meeting targets?), Impact Assessment (what effects are we generating?) and Evolutionary Assessment (what kind of system are we becoming?). The fourth level does not supersede the first three; it builds on them. Its distinctive contribution is the shift of the fundamental unit of analysis from the impact event to the Fundamental Relational Pattern that made it probable. A system characterized by high trust, strong territorial embedding, transparent redistribution and purpose-oriented governance tends to generate qualitatively different impacts from a structurally identical system with low relational capital, even when both meet the same regulatory standards.

*Figure 4. The generative chain: impacts as the observable manifestation of deeper relational configurations.*

| RELATIONS | DECISIONS | SYSTEMS | IMPACTS | VALUE |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust · culture · meaning | choices | structures | outcomes | generated / eroded |

For practitioners, the framework suggests a complementary scoping phase in which the proponent's relational profile is assessed prior to impact prediction — adding structural context that makes the prediction of residual and cumulative impacts more analytically grounded, without adding procedural complexity. The FRP profile generates questions absent from standard screening: does the proponent demonstrate trust-based stakeholder engagement (P2×D3)? Is the project's redistribution aligned with territorial dynamics (P5×D1)? Is governance capable of evolutionary learning in response to monitoring (P9×D5)?

## 6. Discussion and Research Agenda

The framework offers a coherent relational ontology, grounded in complexity science and capable of dialogue with existing multi-capital frameworks, deployed at operational rather than purely conceptual scale. Limitations must be acknowledged: operationalizing the seventy-two FRPs requires contextual calibration, indicator design for each cell remains an ongoing programme, the tokenization architecture is at pilot stage and requires regulatory harmonization across jurisdictions, and the concept of Evolutionary Capacity requires longitudinal validation.

The following research priorities are proposed to the Impact Assessment community: comparative studies of FRP profiles and subsequent impact outcomes on matched organizational pairs, to validate the predictive capacity of relational assessment; integration protocols for Humanovability® as a pre-EIA or pre-SIA scoping instrument; and longitudinal analysis of territorial FRP profiles and value-chain distribution effects on community resilience and ecological regeneration.

## 7. Conclusion

This paper has introduced Humanovability® as a theoretically grounded and operationally deployed contribution to the evolution of Impact Assessment methodology. Its central argument is epistemological: the fundamental unit of assessment should evolve from the isolated impact indicator to the Fundamental Relational Pattern — the recurring configuration through which a system tends to generate, distribute or erode value. The 9P×8D matrix renders relational quality observable and governable; the Grateful Balance Assessment® implements that observation; and the Impact Platform, through Consorzio SFERA, translates assessment output into distributed regenerative infrastructure. The paper does not argue for replacing established methodologies — EIA, SIA and SEA remain indispensable — but offers an anterior analytical layer and a posterior infrastructural one. Between them lies its contribution: that impact assessment in the twenty-first century must be not only predictive and mitigative, but genuinely evolutionary.

**Declaration of interest**

Humanovability®, Grateful Balance Assessment®, Spheric Materiality Credit and Spherical Economy® are registered trademarks of Grateful Sphere Benefit Corporation and Grateful Foundation ETS. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

**References**

Bruni, L. & Zamagni, S. (2007). Civil Economy: Efficiency, Equity, Public Happiness. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Capra, F. & Luisi, P.L. (2014). The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., et al. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. Nature, 387, 253–260.

Economy of Francesco (2022). The Pact / A Covenant for a Regenerated Economy. Assisi: The Economy of Francesco. https://francescoeconomy.org

Fyberloom (2025). Intelligent Knowledge Mapping: an enterprise memory layer for organizational knowledge. San Francisco: Fyberloom Inc. https://www.fyberloom.ai

Hypercube (2025). Regenerative tokenization and water credits: platform documentation. Hypercube. https://www.hypercube.eco

Meadows, D.H. (2008). Thinking in Systems: A Primer. White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Morin, E. (2008). On Complexity. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

North, D.C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, R.D. (1993). Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Raworth, K. (2017). Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist. White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Santo Sabato, S. (2026). Why AI needs the humanities more than ever: human agency in the age of intelligent systems. Seminar, Stanford Center for Spatial and Textual Analysis (CESTA), Stanford University.

Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.