



**INHERIT**

**WP2: Current Promising Practices and  
Innovation  
Scoring Sheet**

## A. Introduction

INHERIT<sup>1</sup> aims at identifying effective inter-sector policies, interventions and innovations that enable a **‘triple win’**: **reduce environmental impacts, improve health, and generate greater health equity**. INHERIT will seek to identify, investigate, implement and encourage the uptake of good practices which promote environmental sustainability and health while at the same time enabling and inspiring people across the socio-economic spectrum towards more sustainable and healthier lifestyles. Opportunities to act upon for governments, private sector and civil society will be explored.

INHERIT investigates the links between lifestyles, environmental sustainability, health and health equity for three areas:

1. **Living** (green space, housing),
2. **Moving** (active transport)
3. **Consuming** (food)

INHERIT seeks to identify:

1. ***“Interventions, programs, services, or strategies that show potential (or “promise”) for developing into a best practice. Promising practices are often in the earlier stages of implementation, and as such, do not show the high level of impact, adaptability, and quality of evidence as best practices”.***
2. ***Interventions, programs, services, or strategies that have, through multiple implementations, demonstrated:***
  - i. ***High Impact - positive changes related to the desired goal(s).***
  - ii. ***High Adaptability - successful adaptation and transferability to different settings.***
  - iii. ***High Quality of Evidence - excellent quality of research/evaluation methodology, confirming the intervention's high impact and adaptability evidence<sup>2</sup>.***

Identified practices:

- Should be inspiring, real-life examples of successful or potentially successful and innovative actions that address behaviors and involve health and other sectors, like environment, climate, social, sustainable development and business sectors;
- Demonstrate positive (or potentially positive) impact on health and well-being, social equity (social and economically vulnerable persons/groups), and environmental sustainability;
- Address harmful behaviors or aim at changing behaviors in relation to the three INHERIT fields.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Inter-sectoral Health and Environment Research for Innovation.”

<sup>2</sup>Public Health Agency of Canada. Canadian Best Practices Portal . 2017. Best and Promising Practices. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://cbpp-pcpe.phac-aspc.gc.ca/interventions/>. [Accessed 11 January 2017].

<b>INHERIT ASSESSMENT SCORING SHEET</b>		
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Score</b>
<p><b>1. Relevance.</b> Does the practice address <b>one</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Living – Green spaces</li> <li>b) Living – Energy efficient housing</li> <li>c) Moving – Active mobility</li> <li>d) Consuming – food</li> </ul>	<p>Yes =1 No = 0</p>	
<p><b>2. Evidence of effectiveness (Basic)</b> Is there any evidence of effectiveness (any of the following):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No evidence of effectiveness</li> <li>b) Positive effectiveness, although based on non-systematic (subjective) evaluation</li> <li>c) Basic level of effectiveness based on qualitative data</li> <li>d) Good level of effectiveness: numerical figures or results with positive results, but no pre-post or case-control comparisons</li> </ul>	<p>None = 0 Answer b = 1 Answer c = 2 Answer d = 3</p>	
<p><b>3. Evidence of effectiveness (Advanced)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No evidence of effectiveness</li> <li>b) Good indications of effectiveness: positive results based on pre and post or case-control comparisons, quantitative and qualitative methods</li> </ul>	<p>None = 0 Good indications = 2 Strong indications = 4</p>	

<p>c) Strong indications of effectiveness: positive results based on pre and post or case-control comparisons with follow-up quantitative and qualitative methods</p>		
<p><b>4. The practice has fulfilled its objectives and goals?</b></p> <p>a) Not at all b) Slightly c) Moderately d) Very e) Extremely</p>	<p>Not at all = 0 Moderately = 1 Very = 2 Completely = 3</p>	
<p><b>5. The practice has had a positive effect on one or more of the following:</b></p> <p>a) Health/Well-being b) Social and economically vulnerable persons/groups c) Sustainable lifestyles and behaviors</p>	<p>None = 0 One answer = 1 Two answers = 2 Three answers = 3</p>	
<p><b>6. Could the intervention potentially be a “triple win” improving at the same time:</b></p> <p>a) Health and wellbeing b) Environmental sustainability c) Reducing health inequalities</p>	<p>None = 0 One answer = 1 Two answers = 2 All three answers = 3</p>	
<p><b>7. Scientific evidence base underpinning the practice</b> Is the practice guided by any scientific evidence at all, such as: scientific theory, methodology, literature review, meta-analysis, case-control study or randomized trial findings</p>	<p>Yes = 1 No = 0</p>	

<p><b>8. The practice is based on a logic plan. Does it include <u>at least 3</u> of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Analysis of problem tackled</li> <li>b) Needs assessment</li> <li>c) Target groups</li> <li>d) Objectives/outcomes</li> <li>e) Implementation method</li> <li>f) Evaluation plan</li> <li>g) Cost benefit analysis</li> </ul>	<p>Yes = 1 No = 0</p>	
<p><b>9. Feasibility to transfer: does it include <u>at least 3</u> of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Implementation guide exists</li> <li>b) Implementation costs known</li> <li>c) Information about the necessary human resources, skills and expertise available</li> <li>d) Identified barriers with solution recommendations</li> <li>e) Evidence whether and when the associated benefits overcome the costs</li> <li>f) Identification to which population groups and settings its applies</li> </ul>	<p>Yes = 1 No = 0</p>	
<p><b>10. Feasibility to be pilot tested within the INHERIT Project</b></p>	<p>Yes = 1 No = 0</p>	