

DEVELOPING AND SUPPORTING SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

IN THE DUBLIN REGION

THE BASIS FOR A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

By John Everett

On behalf of

Dublin Employment Pact and Clann Credo



CONTENTS

Preface	3
Introduction	5
The Social Enterprise Context in Five Metropolitan Areas	7
The Current Context in Dublin	16
The Strategic Components of a Supportive Infrastructure	17
The Proposed Way Forward	20
Appendix A – Abstracts from Relevant Literature	22
Appendix B – Bibliography	62
Appendix C – Web Site Data Base	69
Appendix D – List of Persons Interviewed	77
Appendix E – Social Enterprises Developed in Clondalkin	78

Preface

There is a large sector in Ireland composed of 'social enterprises' though they rarely describe themselves and even more rarely are known as such in the public mind. This sector – employing upwards of 20,000 people – produces a variety of goods and delivers many vital public and community services as well as employment opportunities, mainly in disadvantaged communities.

By 'social enterprise' we mean:

“a financially sustainable organisation in the third sector that creates and/or distributes needed goods and services in order to benefit a stated community of geography or interest, either through the goods and services themselves or through the financial surpluses achieved. They engage in activities of a commercial nature in order to produce social and community gain.”

In a time of economic crisis the social enterprise sector can be ignored or it can be assisted to become a substantial vehicle for securing jobs, building the capital and maintaining the fabric of communities, and acting as a gateway to the labour market for people who might otherwise not get such an opportunity.

Negative connotations popularly associated with the term 'social enterprise' are largely undeserved. These often attribute to social enterprises poor business acumen, a grant-dependence mentality and poor quality work and product. Where there are grounds for such attitudes, then they need to be taken head on and resolved. But in fact most social enterprises are characterised by efficiency and a dogged ability to survive, and indeed enjoy a considerably better ratio of survival and sustainability than private sector small and medium enterprises. Many constraints on the development of social enterprises come from outside factors, such as poor access to public procurement (public service contracts) and restrictions in government programmes arising from fears of the social partners that they represent unfair competition or are a threat to public sector wages and conditions. All such fears need to be confronted honestly and the basis for them removed.

What the sector lacks in Ireland is a coherent sense of itself and its potential. The social enterprise sector in Ireland needs to band together and promote its common interests. Such a development would also lead to greater economies of scale, better harnessing of potential support services, greater access to public contracts and in general to the fulfilment of the growth potential of the sector.

Loan finance for the sector has become more readily available in recent years with the appearance of social investment funds such as Clann Credo and the Social Finance Foundation established by a government initiative in 2006 following a policy initiative led by DEP, Clann Credo and *Pobal*.¹ However, the step to venture and equity capital investment has yet to be made. Similarly, while the contracted delivery of public services of one kind or another is the greatest area of social enterprise activity, the full potential of public procurement has never been realised. This has caused both in the public procurement tendering process itself as well as in the scale at which Irish social enterprises traditionally operate. The untapped potential is enormous in relation to tendering for state services (in areas such as health,

¹ See *In The Common Interest – The Case for Social Finance in Ireland*; Published by Dublin Employment Pact, Westmeath Pact, Clann Credo, ADM Ltd. (2004)

education, childcare, elder care etc.) and especially local authority services (environmental etc.).

For all these reasons, DEP and Clann Credo - both of which have many years experience promoting and assisting social enterprise - commissioned this report into the potential of the sector and the development of an action plan for its realisation.

We see this report as the starting point of a process which will build the coherence of the social enterprise sector in Ireland, establish a support system for it through mobilising the skills, capacities and knowledge already available, and begin to realise its full potential. In this in-depth report, John Everett lays bare the potential of the sector and, taking examples from other cities and countries, sets out the steps which can bring this about.

DEP and Clann Credo are committed to taking this process forward.



Philip O'Connor
Dublin Employment Pact



Paul O'Sullivan
Clann Credo

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades the European Union, several member states and numerous regional and local government authorities have, in conjunction with other institutions, agreed and implemented comprehensive strategies for the development and support of social enterprises*

This growing commitment to encouraging and supporting social enterprises is based on the conclusion that these entities provide a number of benefits, particularly to marginalised communities and their residents, including

- delivery of goods, services and resources that are not adequately provided for by private and public sector entities

- creation of employment, especially for persons who are unable to access mainstream employment opportunities

- leveraging of external finance into these communities

- enhancement of local economic development

- underpinning of progress achieved through regeneration programmes

- creation of additional streams of income to support the achievement of voluntary organisations' missions.

Recognising the potential for achieving these same benefits in the Dublin region Clann Credo and the Dublin Employment Pact commissioned Smith Everett & Associates to identify the critical components of a comprehensive strategy for the development and support of social enterprises in the Dublin area and to outline a process for the adoption and implementation of such a strategy.

As a starting point Smith Everett examined the experience in five metropolitan areas where it was believed that comprehensive strategies have been successfully conceived and implemented – London, Glasgow, Bristol, Belfast and Toronto. The examination was designed to take into account the various public policy contexts in which the strategies were developed – the European Union in the case of the first four areas, the

* The process of agreeing the definition of “social enterprise” has been an arduous one in a number of external contexts and the reality is that the accepted definition differs between the US, the EU and the UK. In this report a “broad church” approach to the definition has been adopted as follows -

- A social enterprise is a financially sustainable organisation in the third sector that creates and or distributes needed goods and services in order to benefit a stated community of geography or interest, either through the goods and services themselves or through the financial surpluses achieved.

This definition is designed to avoid rigorous requirements as to levels of trading income and nature of legal structure that have plagued the discussion about social enterprise and retarded the development of the sector in other jurisdictions. Under the proposed construct organisations as diverse as local community centres, national cultural organisations, large social firms and deliberately established trading entities can all be included in the broad church. This will enable many existing entities to “self select” their inclusion in the sector.

national context in the case of all five areas, the devolved government context in the case of Glasgow and Belfast and the provincial context in the case of Toronto. It was also intended to identify common components in each of the successful strategies.

The examination of the five metropolitan areas began with an extensive review of relevant internet sites and published literature. As a part of this exercise the public policy context for the promotion and support of social enterprises was also examined in a number of other European Union member states in addition to the United Kingdom. In order to assist persons reading this document who may not have an in depth understanding of social enterprises, the benefits they deliver and the support structures required to ensure their development and sustainability, three appendices are included, which enable a further exploration of these topics.

Appendix A is a series of abstracts from the published literature that are included to describe in depth key issues, and important conclusions and recommendations with respect to social enterprise that have informed the suggested strategy set out in this document. After a general section, the appendix is organised on a geographical basis at the first level and then on a chronological level so that a reader can effectively trace the way in which the discussion of a number of topics has evolved over the past decade.

Appendix B is a bibliography of the relevant published literature that was reviewed in this study. Most of these publications are available to download from the internet through a basic query with any search engine. This appendix is also organised on a geographical basis at the first level and then on a chronological level.

Appendix C is a listing of the websites that were visited in the course of the study. By visiting a sampling of these sites, particularly those of individual social enterprises, a reader can obtain numerous concrete examples of the benefits in human, financial and social capital terms that social enterprises generate.

Following the literature review interviews were conducted with a number of government officials and representatives of organisations that were involved in devising and implementing the strategies in the five metropolitan areas to test the findings from the literature against their experiences as participants in the actual process. Simultaneously, a number of persons involved in social enterprises in Ireland were interviewed. (See Appendix D).

The current context in the Dublin area was then examined and considered in light of the information obtained in the examination of the five selected metropolitan areas in order to understand what strategic components need to be put in place here in order to maximise the potential for the support and development of social enterprises. A number of Irish persons were interviewed during this phase of the study (See Appendix D).

THE SOCIAL ENTERPRISE CONTEXT IN FIVE METROPOLITAN AREAS

London

The effort to devise a comprehensive social enterprise support strategy for London occurred in a context in which the UK government had already identified social enterprises as “delivering high quality, lower cost products and services, while at the same time, creating real opportunities for the people working in them and the communities that they serve”.¹ Indeed, the Forward to the 2002 document, *A Social Enterprise Support Strategy for London*, was written by a Junior Minister in the UK Department of Trade and Industry, which had recently published its own national strategy, *Social Enterprise a Strategy for Success*, earlier that year.

A cornerstone of the UK government’s commitment to the support of social enterprises was a belief that they constituted “an integral and dynamic part of the ‘real’ economy”,² rather than a politically correct sideshow. To that end the government directed its own departments, local authorities and existing business support agencies to become familiar with and responsive to the needs of social enterprises. In order to ensure that the strategy was implemented in a co-ordinated fashion it established a Social Enterprise Unit in the Department of Trade and Industry.

Another important element of the UK strategy was the recognition of the value of networks of social enterprises and social entrepreneurs and while the government did not directly create any, it played a proactive role in facilitating the development of infrastructure that supported their establishment and sustainability.

The social enterprise support strategy for London was developed and has been implemented by a broad based Task Force including representatives of Social Enterprise London, the Association of London Government, the Government Office for London, the London Development Agency and a number of community and voluntary sector networks and organisations. The local and national governments’ commitment to the exercise was evidenced by their initial funding of the process leading to the agreement of the strategy and their continuing funding of many of its components.

The overarching aim of the strategy was “to contribute to increasing the number of successful social enterprises in London – both developing new and strengthening existing social enterprises. The success of the strategy will be measured by the development of the sector in London and the resulting social and economic benefits.”³

To achieve the overall aim the strategy set out four objectives –

- to support innovative approaches to social enterprise development
- to develop the social enterprise support network
- to improve the quality of social enterprise business support services
- to improve access to business support services across London

It also included eighteen specific actions under the following four headings – (1) research, (2) mapping and building understanding, (3) delivery of advice and (4) theme projects. In terms of the first heading the Task Force commissioned a study entitled, *Mapping the Social Economy and Social Enterprise in the UK and London*, which provided both an initial understanding of the nature and scope of social enterprises in London and a base line against which to measure the eventual impact of its other actions. One of the findings from the study was that “social enterprises tend to cluster in areas where there is a well-managed agency facilitating network activity. As a result, helping new social enterprises to network with existing successful social enterprises is a potentially important part of the development process.”⁴

In terms of the delivery of advice the strategy provided for a networking approach to the education of existing SME business support agencies on the particular needs and culture of social enterprises rather than the creation of new specialist agencies. It also provided for a communication effort and an element of funding to social enterprises to enable them to effectively access the existing system.

Based on the research underlying the development of the strategy it was clear that the potential for developing successful social enterprises was enhanced in certain contexts or as the document says along certain themes. Therefore the strategy emphasised a number of actions in the context of regeneration programmes, caring services, housing, the transfer of local authority assets and local government procurement needs.

The strategy also recognised the need for increased and more effective financing of social enterprise and provided for greater research, net-working and collaboration among the many different sources of finance to provide sufficient funding to support its development objectives.

The Task Force members listed above play differing roles in the implementation of the strategy.

Social Enterprise London (SEL) works as both the sector network and as a specialist support agency promoting best practice and skills development for the social enterprise sector. As a network it now has 1,000 members. As a specialist support agency it maintains an extensive online social enterprise directory, publishes a regular social enterprise news bulletin, organises frequent networking events, provides technical support to individual social enterprises and manages a sector-wide promotion campaign. It also supports LA Connects, a local authority forum for sharing best practice in procurement of services from social enterprises and developing strategically targeted social enterprise partnerships.

The Association of London Government, which changed its name to London Councils in 2006 is a cross-party organisation funded and run by the thirty-two London boroughs, the City of London, the Metropolitan Police Authority and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority to provide advice, support and training to member organisations and represent them in negotiations with central government, the EU and other parties. Its role in promoting social enterprises includes funding Social Enterprise London and individual social enterprises and acting as a key partner in LA Connects.

The London Development Agency is the regional economic development agency for the capital. It has a number of specialist programmes for social enterprise development, funds several Social Enterprise London initiatives and leverages additional finance from the UK government's Office of the Third Sector for the support and development of social enterprises in London.

The Office of the Third Sector (OTS) has taken over the original role of the Government Office for London. It was created in May 2006 when the Active Communities Directorate in the Home Office and the Social Enterprise Unit in the Department for Trade and Industry (DTI) amalgamated. The decision to place the OTS at the centre of government in the Cabinet Office was taken in recognition of the increasingly important role the third sector plays in both society and the economy in the UK. In London the OTS provides strategic funding to social enterprises through Social Enterprise London.

The interviews with representatives of these organisations confirmed a common belief that the preparation and implementation of an agreed strategy has both increased the number of individual enterprises and created a sustainable infrastructure to support their continuing development. However, the interviews also identified a common opinion that it has taken several years for the combined efforts of the key players to achieve a significant impact in terms of increased numbers and capacity within the sector.

Bristol

The social enterprise support strategy for Bristol, which pre-dated the UK Government's own strategy, has always been driven by the Bristol City Council. In 1999 the Council determined that social enterprises had potential to both promote successful local economic development and deliver valuable services and that they represented alternative ways of generating wealth and providing new routes into employment particularly for people with physical and learning disabilities or from ethnic minority groups.

The Council's starting point for adopting a public policy to support social enterprise was a recognition that a number of communities throughout Bristol had pioneered social economy development, often as a self-help approach to seemingly intractable problems and that the sector had already made a major impact in terms of creating jobs and wealth, promoting sustainable development, contributing towards local empowerment, capacity building, extending democracy, combating poverty and overcoming social exclusion. It also concluded that social enterprises succeeded in dealing with some of the major issues faced by the mainstream economy, such as the competitive delivery of public services and the development of entrepreneurial skills within excluded communities.

In order to build on the existing sector Bristol City Council invested £400,000 in the Social Economy Bristol Development Project. The City convened a Steering Group to oversee the project with representatives of key mainstream and sector development agencies such as the Avon Co-operative Development Agency, Bristol Area Community Enterprise Network - the social enterprise support agency for the Bristol area and RISE - the regional social enterprise support agency for the southwest of England along with a number of local community organisations. The Steering

Group's first initiative was to undertake a comprehensive audit of the social enterprise sector with the co-operation and guidance of the University of the West of England. The audit indicated that the sector was then comprised of more than 1,100 organisations with an annual turnover of approximately £223 million representing 4.3% of local GDP, employing around 9,400 people or 4.6% of the total workforce in the city.

The 1999 audit also found that Social Economy organisations in Bristol had attracted the support of 21,600 volunteers, an impressive 10.6% of the total workforce or 5.4% of the total population in the city. Based on the then average wage for the South West region of £7.50 per hour, the value of volunteering identified in the Bristol audit was estimated to be £67 million, or the equivalent of 1.3% of local GDP.

Finally, the audit found that Bristol's economic growth had been enhanced by the social economy's ability to attract and sustain inward investment – more than 20% of the sector's revenue (£40 million) had come from non Bristol sources. As a consequence one of the next initiatives of the Social Economy Bristol Development Project was to support strategic investment opportunities through European Social Fund and UK Government funding and to develop community and private finance mechanisms to invest directly into sector initiatives. In subsequent years the 'added value' of this approach has been demonstrated by the amount of new enterprise and employment that has been generated.

Following on from the audit, the Project Steering Group agreed four strategic aims for developing and supporting social enterprises:

- to increase employment and business activity in the social economy - improving advice and intelligence services and supporting enterprise development in media, environment, care and social firms

- to increase efficiency and competitiveness of social enterprises through the development of mutual services such as a recruitment and supply agency, an ICT resource, a property and asset management service, a financial services centre for bidding support and higher level planning and an equipment brokerage

- to promote and develop the Sector through a comprehensive marketing plan that included a directory of goods and services, a website, intelligence support, public sector and supply chain initiatives, employment and product development and a champions group for networking across sectors

- to increase access to credit and finance facilities through the enhancement and integration of grants and loans availability and the development of community finance mechanisms.

The implementation of several of these has been documented in a number of reports which can be accessed through the Project's website.

By 2005 the Social Economy Bristol Development Project had evolved into the 3C Partnership and secured joint ESF and Bristol City Council funding of £4 million to continue and expand on the previous six years' work. The key players in the original Steering Group are still actively supporting social enterprises. The City Council itself continues to pioneer a number of innovative local authority supports for the sector and

is internationally recognised for its early engagement in the transfer of assets to community enterprises.

The Avon Co-operative Development Agency remains an independent entity concentrating on supports to co-operatives and receives direct funding from Bristol City Council. However it has integrated into the general economic development agency for Bristol to achieve a greater degree of co-ordination and organisational capacity.

Bristol Area Community Enterprise Network (BACEN), which has re-branded itself as Social Enterprise Works!, operates on the same model as Social Enterprise London. The network has approximately one hundred and fifty members, maintains a Bristol area directory of goods and services and in 2008 provided direct consultancy services to ninety eight enterprises. While it continues to receive government funding, especially from Bristol City Council, it has increased its traded income to 48% of its overall revenue.

RISE continues to provide support to Bristol based social enterprises in the context of its role as the regional social enterprise support agency. In the past few years it has pioneered and expanded the recognition of the Social Enterprise Mark, which over time may have the same impact on social enterprises as the fair trade mark has had on fair trade companies.

The interviews with representatives of Steering Group members elicited a shared sense of accomplishment in terms of the development of the social enterprise sector during the past decade and a conviction that the process of agreeing and implementing a comprehensive strategy was critical in achieving that success.

Glasgow

In Glasgow the comprehensive strategy for developing and supporting social enterprises was agreed by a partnership chaired by the City Council, which included local economic development agencies, the government regeneration agency - Communities Scotland, several third sector networks and two respected and successful social enterprises.

The strategy was developed in a similar context to the one in London, which preceded it by four years, in that it came in the wake of the 2006 publication of the Scottish Executive's strategy for the whole of Scotland, entitled *Better Business – A Strategy and Action Plan for Social Enterprise in Scotland*. The Executive's strategy set out four key objectives –

- to raise the profile and prove the value of social enterprise

- to open up markets to social enterprise

- to increase the range of finance available to develop social enterprise

- to develop the trading capacity of social enterprises by providing better business support

In Scotland the Executive's commitment to social enterprise went one step further than that of the UK government – it provided for the establishment of a social enterprise partnership in all thirty local authorities. The overall goal of these partnerships was to support the growth of the social economy by improving co-ordination, facilitating local networking, strengthening the range of locally available support and unlocking market opportunities for new and existing social enterprises.

The Glasgow Social Economy Partnership reflected the Executive's commitment to supporting social enterprises when it agreed its own seven key objectives, which were separated under the headings of "Policy" and "Sector Development". The Policy objectives were aimed specifically at increasing economic activity in the city's most deprived communities and helping to close the "Opportunity Gap" by:

- increasing the chances of sustained employment for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups;

- improving the confidence and skills of the most disadvantaged children and young people to enhance employability;

- reducing the vulnerability of low income families to financial exclusion and multiple debts;

- increasing the rate of improvement of the health status of people living in the most deprived communities in order to improve their quality of life, including their employability prospects.

The Sector Development objectives were aimed at the financial sustainability of social enterprises by:

- building the capacity of their staff and governing bodies;

- improving their asset base and access to investment and funding;

- opening up access to the bidding process for public sector contracts

Among the representative partners and stakeholders who make up the Partnership are Glasgow City Council, NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde, Scottish Government Third Sector Division, the regional support agency CEiS, the Glasgow Local Regeneration Agency Network and the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce.

The work of the Partnership is supported by a full time Development Manager who is housed by Glasgow City Council. The current annual work programme includes efforts to

- improve support services available to social enterprises through a review of existing services and the provision of web based information

- support and promote the increased delivery of public sector contracts through networking events for procurement specialists and social enterprises

- conduct original research that will build the capacity of social enterprises

deliver training and consultancy services to individual enterprises

link social enterprises into the broader enterprise community and networks

Glasgow City Council provides funding and resources to the Partnership and also works to ensure that its public procurement process enables social enterprises an opportunity to tender for and deliver services. It is currently examining the best way to incorporate a community gain element into the contracts that will be awarded in connection with the upcoming Commonwealth Games to be hosted by the city. For Glasgow City Council the social enterprise sector is an important element of the city's economy and often provides a mechanism through which the city can achieve its objectives in a way that it wouldn't be able to directly.

NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde is a key source of public procurement opportunities in line with the national public policy to utilise social firms to deliver goods and services to the NHS where and when appropriate.

The Scottish Government Third Sector Division manages the implementation of the *Enterprising Third Sector Action Plan 2008-2011* under which it began to allocate £12 million in direct investment in enterprising third sector enterprises with effect from January 1, 2009.

CEiS is the social enterprise agency for Scotland. It provides tailored business support to about eighty individual enterprises annually and operates a subsidiary company that provides business finance to social enterprises.

The Glasgow Regeneration Agency Network is made up of the five regeneration agencies that operate in Glasgow, all of whom have dedicated social enterprise support staff.

The fact that the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce is an active member of the Partnership is a reflection of the central role that social enterprise is expected to play in the economic development of the metropolitan area.

Belfast

There is no strategy for developing and supporting social enterprises for Belfast specifically. Rather, the strategy for Northern Ireland, which was published in 2004 by the Minister for Trade and Industry, is the basis for the development and support of social enterprises in Belfast. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the majority of social enterprises in Northern Ireland are located in the Belfast region. It is also worth noting that the Minister himself chaired the Social Economy Forum in Northern Ireland.

The North's strategy included the establishment of a number of structures through which the Executive sought to achieve integrated support across several departments and develop a partnership with key non-governmental players active in the sector. The strategy involved –

funding the Social Economy Network to facilitate the establishment of an inclusive network to represent the sector

formation of an Inter-Departmental Steering Group (IDSG) to represent the 11 NI Departments and develop greater cross-Departmental co-operation,

creation of the Social Economy Forum where representatives from the Network and officials from IDSG and Government could work together in constructive partnership.

The North's three key strategic objectives were also similar to those of the UK Government and Scottish Executive, i.e. to –

- increase awareness of the sector and establish its value to the local economy

- develop the sector and increase its business strength

- create a supportive and enabling environment

The Social Economy Network is the key institution driving the implementation of the social enterprise strategy in Belfast. Its own aims are consistent with those of the overall strategy for Northern Ireland -

- provide a strong, united and representative voice for the Social Economy Sector of Northern Ireland

- promote the role of the Social Economy Sector and its contribution to socio-economic development

- represent the views of the Sector in engagement with Government and all key stakeholders

- provide a channel for Social Economy Sector input into policy development

- increase the business strength of the Sector and create a supportive and enabling environment for Sector growth

Since its appointment of a Chief Executive in June 2007 and recruitment of a full staff compliment in early 2008, the Network has grown to over one hundred members in Northern Ireland (the majority from the Belfast area where it is based) and has set a target of adding five new members per month. In addition to organising networking events the Network also maintains an online resource for members to increase trading opportunities by promoting their goods and services to the social economy, private and public sectors - in particular the Central Procurement Directorate in Northern Ireland.

In Belfast the Network engages with a number of stakeholders including the Economic Unit of Belfast City Council, the North Belfast Partnership, Ulster University, the Work West Enterprise Agency and a number of successful, mature social enterprises. Belfast City Council's Economic Unit represents the city in the Network and brings funding and procurement opportunities similar to those provided by the local authorities in Bristol, Glasgow and London. The North Belfast Partnership is the regeneration agency for north Belfast and has utilised EU Urban II funding to support a number of social enterprises in that area of the city. The

University of Ulster provides a number of services to social enterprises including networking events, student placements, participation in knowledge transfer partnerships and direct consultancy assignments. Work West is a key support agency for enterprises operating in the social economy in Belfast delivering a range of support programmes to groups and individual social entrepreneurs for the past 20 years.

The experience in Belfast confirms that of Bristol, London and Glasgow in that it takes time, probably five to ten years, for the impact of implementing agreed strategies to be reflected in a robust infrastructure for the support and development of social enterprises. The persons consulted in Belfast all agreed that progress has been made toward establishing that infrastructure, but also expressed the opinion that the Social Economy Agency has only been operational for about eighteen months and will need more time to bring the sector together and engage effectively with local authorities such as Belfast City Council.

Toronto

The context for the development and support of social enterprises in Toronto differs greatly from the contexts in the four previous cities described above. Neither the Canadian Government nor the Province of Ontario has a strategic public policy with respect to social enterprise.

The absence of government policy has meant that an important stimulus to the development of a support infrastructure for social enterprises is lacking in Ontario and Toronto. Nevertheless a number of organisations have come together to attempt to organise the sector, raise awareness and create a focal point for engaging with government. This effort is at a very early stage. In fact the embryonic Social Enterprise Ontario describes itself as “primarily a mailing list to enable practitioners and their supporters to connect and share information... and host occasional meetings to network, share ideas and take action.”

A number of third level institutions in Ontario, including the University of Toronto have programmes that involve research on social enterprise, support to individual enterprises and importantly a comparative study of the social enterprise sectors in Ontario-Toronto and Quebec-Montreal. The latter study, which will be completed in 2009, is anticipated to document the much greater economic impact of social enterprise in the Quebec and Montreal as a consequence of provincial government policy and a cultural acceptance of this form of enterprise.

The persons interviewed about Toronto were quite interested in the outcome of any attempts to develop a comprehensive strategy for the support and development of social enterprises in Dublin and hope to apply any lessons learned to their own community.

THE CURRENT CONTEXT IN DUBLIN

The first thing to note about the Dublin context is that there is an absence of specifically supportive public policies at either the national or regional levels.

The national context is more problematic than the local one in that the government initiated and implemented a Social Economy Programme from 2000 through 2005, which in the opinion of many observers was essentially a labour market intervention programme rather than a social enterprise support programme aimed at achieving the various benefits outlined in the Introduction. The decision to transform it into a Community Services Programme and transfer responsibility for its operation from the Department of Trade and Industry to the Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs is to a certain extent indicative of a lack of serious commitment by the government to the development of the social enterprise sector in Ireland. Although it can also be argued that the decision is evidence of the government's recognition that a labour market intervention programme is not the most effective way to support essential community service projects.

At the regional level, none of the four local authorities provide a policy context or support infrastructure similar to those described above with respect to Bristol, Glasgow or London. Nevertheless, Dublin City Council officials have in at least one instance examined the potential for entering into a partnership to establish a social enterprise and all four authorities provide various supports to local community organisations engaged in social enterprises. Further, South Dublin County officials have recently begun to study the potential of social enterprise in some detail.

Because of limitations to their remits the city and county enterprise boards do not have specialist social enterprise units in the way that most of their counterparts in England, Scotland and Wales do.

The various area based partnerships charged with implementing the Local Development Social Inclusion Plan all provide enterprise support that can and has been utilised by social enterprises and all have been directly involved in the development of social enterprises either on their own or as part of a consortium. Further, three in particular – Clonalkin (now CPLN), Northside and Tallaght (now Dodder Valley) have a strong record of promoting social enterprise. Appendix E describes three social enterprises that the Clondalkin Partnership has played a key role in developing and supporting – a community property company, a recycling enterprise and a training centre.

There are also three local enterprise support organisations, who are themselves social enterprises – BASE in Blanchardstown, Enterprise Action in Clondalkin, and Partas in Tallaght -that each operate in a manner similar to the various sub-regional support agencies described in the preceding section.

Two organisations with a national remit for the promotion and support of social entrepreneurship are also based in Dublin – Ashoka Ireland and Social Entrepreneurs Ireland. Further, all of the third level institutions in Dublin are developing programmes similar to those at universities that have been involved in supporting social enterprises in each of the five metropolitan areas described above.

Finally, there are numerous social enterprises throughout the Dublin region. While many are small community enterprises, some are significant social firms. Rehab, as an example, would rank among the larger social firms internationally operating in more than two hundred locations in Ireland, Netherlands, Poland and the UK.

THE STRATEGIC COMPONENTS OF A SUPPORTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE

Based on the examination of metropolitan areas where successful social enterprise strategies have been (and in the case of Toronto not been) implemented it is clear that a successful strategy involves creating an infrastructure which includes a number of interrelated components.

A Clearly Defined Sector

In order to create an infrastructure to effectively support the development and sustainability of social enterprises it is essential to clearly define the sector. This exercise identifies those financially sustainable organisations in the third sector that create and or distribute needed goods and services in order to benefit a stated community of geography or interest, either through the goods and services themselves or through the financial surpluses achieved that currently operate in the relevant metropolitan region.

A key benefit of the exercise is the creation of a data and information base that not only supports efforts to organise the sector, but also provides critical benchmarks both for determining the current contribution that the sector makes to the region against both financial and social criteria and for measuring the future development of the sector from an agreed starting point.

The mapping exercises reviewed in this study indicate that, while social enterprises develop and deliver a wide range of goods and services, the great majority are active in a number of market sectors. These segments include, but may not be limited to –

- Assembly and Packaging
- Branded Retail
- Care Services
- Catering
- Construction
- Cultural Activities
- Education and Training
- Ethical Products
- Neighbourhood Upkeep
- Property
- Produce Markets
- Recreation
- Recycling and Restoration
- Specialist Tourism and
- Work Integration

The same mapping exercises indicate that individual social enterprises originate in one of seven ways. The starting point for many social enterprises is the vision, commitment and unwavering determination of individuals and groups who are Social

Entrepreneurs. Most of the enterprising characteristics that these persons possess are identical to those exhibited by entrepreneurs in the private sector – business acumen, identification of and responsiveness to market demand, hard work, concentration on quality, etc. Those that differentiate them from their private sector counterparts are in the minority - commitment to the service for its own sake, desire to benefit the community and a vocation to help others.

Existing not-for-profit organisations provide another starting point. Social enterprises arising from this platform have the advantage that certain critical resources that are needed to establish a successful enterprise – organisational and operational experience, existing profile, finance, access to influential decision and policy makers, etc. are often already in place.

Government contracts across Europe have emerged as an important starting point during the past two decades and the information obtained in this study indicates that they will continue to grow as a catalyst for social enterprises.

Urban Regeneration, particularly as it has evolved in the United Kingdom, is another significant starting point for social enterprises. Because of the close partnership involvement of local and sometimes regional and national government in these large scale projects, substantial resources can be included in the social enterprise start-up scenario that do not exist in “green field” circumstances.

Although the replication of existing social enterprises is a relatively limited phenomenon to date, many successful social enterprises have themselves only recently achieved sustainability, so it is reasonable to expect that the number of enterprises created from this starting-point will increase incrementally in the future.

Social Enterprise Franchises are also small in number and recent in development. Further, the experience of successful implementation to date has been mixed. Nevertheless, where potential franchisees already have enterprise capacity in their own right, this mechanism has potential as a viable starting point.

In a few instances existing private sector enterprises have served as the starting point for parallel or subsidiary or supra social enterprises.

An Organised Sector

The evidence elsewhere and the experience in Ireland during the past fifteen years indicate that an essential component in a supportive infrastructure for social enterprise is an organised sector. Until the sector is organised, it lacks the self awareness and confidence, critical mass and common objectives to effectively engage with government, the wider enterprise community and the general public to achieve its potential. This study has also confirmed that sectoral associations, networks and peer groups have been critical in achieving the level of organisation that is required to develop a supportive infrastructure.

Adequate Finance

The research and consultations indicate that the availability of adequate and appropriate finance is an important component of the desired infrastructure. While most of the discussions about finance for social enterprises tend to focus on the supply

side of the equation questions also need to be asked about the demand side of the equation.

The issues with respect to the supply side include the need for capital investments in social enterprises that can play the same role that equity investments play in private sector enterprises, the lack of understanding of social enterprise among mainstream financial institutions, the restrictions that often accompany government and foundation grants and to a lesser extent, the limited amount of dedicated social finance actually available.

On the demand side the issues include the historic exclusive reliance on grant income to provide capital finance, the capacity of social enterprises to assess and structure the appropriate amount and mix of finance required to start and grow the enterprises, and the inherent conflict between the demands of simultaneously achieving social and financial returns that will satisfy socially motivated stakeholders on the one hand and financial investors on the other.

A Positive Policy/Legislative/Regulatory Context

There can be no question that the pre-disposition of the incoming Labour administration in 1997 provided the social enterprise sector with an unprecedented window of opportunity to influence the UK policy context. The positive policies adopted by the Northern Ireland and Scottish governments have also been important to the successful development of social enterprise strategies in Belfast and Glasgow.

At the local authority level the city councils in the four UK metropolitan areas studied were convinced to support social enterprise by the existence of clear, evidenced based arguments which demonstrated the public benefit of their doing so and they have each played an important role in developing the sectors in their jurisdictions. Significantly, in all of these locations elected officials played a key role in securing public servant support.

Effective Government Supports

Government supports of three types constitute another key component in the desired infrastructure. Throughout the literature and in the opinion of every person interviewed, appropriate government grant aid has been identified as an important type of support.

The importance of government procurement policies can be as important as, and in some cases more important than, direct funding through grants. The recent initiatives in the health services in the UK and in most local authorities there offer a clear model for application in Ireland and Dublin.

The third type of government support which has proven beneficial is the delivery of training and expert advice to individual social enterprises and their networks.

Effective Specialist Support Agencies

One of the common barriers identified in each of the strategies studied was a lack of understanding of the particular characteristics and needs of social enterprises among generalist enterprise support agencies. Each strategy included a two pronged approach

to overcome this barrier – training programmes for personnel in existing generalist support agencies and support for and in some cases the creation of specialist social enterprise support agencies.

An Interested Academia

Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship have been growth areas for third level institutions throughout the world. In each of the urban areas studied they have contributed to the development and sustainability of social enterprises in a number of ways.

The most common contribution that third level institutions have made is the provision of students to carry out specific marketing and operational assignments on behalf of specific enterprises. Also as indicated above a number of university departments have carried out mapping exercises in designated geographical areas. Universities are also doing extensive pure research on numerous areas relating to the nature and role of individual social enterprises the social economy as a whole. Finally, many business schools have established departments dedicated to the training of new social entrepreneurs and social enterprise managers.

THE PROPOSED WAY FORWARD

Initial Consultations

The most striking aspect of the interviews conducted in the course of this study was the level of positive interest there is in devising, agreeing and implementing an effective strategy to develop and support social enterprises in the Dublin region. Clann Credo and the Dublin Employment Pact should disseminate this document and engage in a series of consultations with officials in each of the four local authorities and representatives of the organisations described above in order to determine preliminary indications of the potential contributions that each might make to the process.

The initial consultations should be followed by one or more group visits during which a number of interested Dublin based persons can engage in dialogue with local authority representatives and sector activists in Belfast, Bristol, Glasgow and/or London who have been involved in the development of social enterprise strategies in those cities.

Setting Up the Task Force

A definitive commitment should be sought from potential stakeholders in the process of agreeing and implementing a social enterprise strategy for Dublin and a Task Force should be set up. Initially, one of the stakeholder organisations should undertake the Task Force's executive functions.

The Task Force In Operation

The Task Force should engage in a number of actions. **It should manage a mapping exercise similar to those that have been carried out in a number of cities and regions**

in the United Kingdom. The pilot mapping work that has been commissioned by Planet should also help to design the template for this endeavour. The exercise can be used to build sector awareness and promote subsequent intended initiatives as well as to build the data and information base needed to define and organise the sector.

In each of the cities that were studied it was evident that the most important catalyst for developing the social enterprise sector was the establishment of a representative network with at least one full-time member of staff. Hence, the Task Force should prepare a three to five year business plan setting out the mission, aims, and objectives of a Dublin (or if necessary national) network and describing its activities, operations, human and other resources, finance strategy and governance structure

The Network should be launched at a high profile conference that addresses relevant issues in order to increase the sector's internal awareness, promote it to policy and decision makers and the general public and jump start its initial membership campaign.

The Task Force, supported by the Network executive, should also engage elected officials and senior civil servants in Central Government in an ongoing dialogue to educate them about the positive impact that a robust social enterprise sector can have on government's existing economic development and social inclusion policies.

The Task Force's other major activity, again supported by the Network executive, should be to agree, publish and disseminate a formal strategy for developing and supporting social enterprises in Dublin.

APPENDIX A – ABSTRACTS FROM RELEVANT LITERATURE

GENERAL

The basic differences between social enterprises and traditional non-profit organisations are an entrepreneurial starting point and continuing agenda, a greater degree of autonomy from the State and the provision of innovative responses to needs not met by the State and market (Maiello 1997). (**General - Social Enterprise through the Eyes of the Consumer**)

As part of its Targeted Socio-Economic Research (TSER) program, the DG XII of the European Commission has supported the implementation of a thematic network, called EMES (L'urgence des entreprises sociales), on the emergence of social enterprises as an innovative response to social exclusion in Europe. It was agreed that the term social enterprise covered entities with different names in different countries, but with the common features of an entrepreneurial strategy and a social purpose. Indeed, the OECD identifies changes to the welfare state, market failures in certain activities and new incentives for employment and cooperation between economic and social players, as the main reasons for the growth of social enterprises. The common definition most often used by social enterprise organisations themselves, emphasises three common characteristics:

- **Enterprise oriented** – they are directly involved in the production of goods and the provision of services to a market. They seek to be viable trading concerns, making a surplus from trading.
- **Social aims** – they have explicit social aims such as job creation, training and provision of local services. They are accountable to their members and the wider community for their social, environmental and economic impact.
- **Social ownership** – they are autonomous organisations with governance and ownership structures based on participation by stakeholder groups (users or clients, and local community groups etc.) or by trustees. Profits are distributed as profit sharing to stakeholders or used for the benefit of the community. (**General - Social Enterprise through the Eyes of the Consumer**)

There are also a growing number of MBA programmes specialising in social entrepreneurship from which entrepreneurs will emerge that wish to develop socially driven businesses. Filling the gap for equity-like capital is also likely to allow more success stories to emerge which in turn will generate more social enterprises. (**General – Equity like Capital for Social Ventures**)

BCV's conclusion from this research was that new high potential social ventures are likely to emerge in at least three main ways:

1. New entrepreneurs entering the field – experienced entrepreneurs or talented graduate students who have an appetite to set up businesses that have a social purpose as well as financial goals. Life Water Ltd., discussed later in this report, is an example of these.
2. Corporate venturing by proven social enterprise successes – such as the new ventures established by the FRC Group, on the back of its core activity.
3. Entrepreneurial ventures set up by established charities such as Oxfam's Progreso Cafes Ltd. (**General – Equity like Capital for Social Ventures**)

It seems to BCV and is widely accepted in the social enterprise sector that grants alone cannot be enough for this sector to grow and flourish. **(General – Equity like Capital for Social Ventures)**

While patient capital providers may experiment with royalty payments and other features associated in this report with equity-like capital, the core tools used in patient capital are grants and low interest loans. So far patient capital has been provided by organisations with charitable or governmental funding bases like Adventure Capital, Futurebuilders and Venturesome, as well as some foundations. **(General – Equity like Capital for Social Ventures)**

The Community Interest Tax Relief (CITR) could act as a very helpful catalyst in this regard. The CITR is available to investors in financial institutions that back certain social enterprises and socially driven businesses, as well as enterprises located in certain deprived areas of the UK. **(General – Equity like Capital for Social Ventures)**

High on the enterprise culture agenda are community and social enterprises. Social enterprises are heralded as catalysts for revitalising disadvantaged communities through employment and countering welfare dependency throughout the UK (OECD 2003). The government is therefore vigilant of the sector and plays a key role in its development. This has been recognised with the recent drive towards promoting the sector, particularly the emergence of the ‘Community Interest Company’ model in July 2005 and the establishment of the ‘Office of the Third Sector’ (OTS) in May 2006, where the cabinet office is ‘Putting the sector at the heart of government’; *“The Office has been set up to drive forward the Government’s role in supporting a thriving sector, and brings together sector-related work from across government.”* **(General – Unlocking Performance in Social Enterprise)**

The collapse of Aspire shocked the social enterprise movement in the UK, and inflicted a blow to social enterprise’s credibility as a way to address social issues. Our analysis of this case, however, finds that social franchises are not doomed to failure, and that Aspire’s mistakes can be avoided. Aspire’s first error was that it became a franchise too soon. Franchises need a strong brand, a product or service that is competitive in the marketplace, and an open, supportive relationship between the franchisor and its franchisees. **(General – Aspire Case Study)**

Aspire’s second mistake was pairing a weak business model with ambitious social objectives. Staffing the business with homeless people who had little work experience and significant personal problems made it difficult for the organization to provide reliable services, and consequently to turn a profit. Moreover, franchisees did not just want to employ homeless people; they also wanted to rehabilitate them. **(General – Aspire Case Study)**

Aspire franchisees were also disadvantaged by knowing very little about business. Just four of the nine franchise managers had any business experience, and none had worked in the household catalog industry. This made it difficult for franchisees to evaluate Aspire’s business plan prior to entering the franchise agreement, or to compensate for Aspire’s weaknesses as they became apparent. **(General – Aspire Case Study)**

In the United Kingdom, the history of social enterprise extends as far back to Victorian England (Dart, 2004 and Hines, 2005). Indeed the worker cooperative is one of the first examples of a social enterprise. Social enterprises prevail throughout Europe, and are most notable in the form of social cooperatives, particularly in Italy, Spain and increasingly France (Mancino and Thomas, 2005 and Ducci et al., 2002). Front line social enterprises in the UK generate £18 billion in annual turnover and employ 775,000 people (www.dti.gov.uk). In addition, recent research conducted by the Social Enterprise Unit (working under the Department for Trade and Industry) suggests that there may be more than 15,000 social enterprises in the UK, registered as either companies limited by guarantee (88%) or as industrial and provident societies (12%) – three quarters of which are based in the capital alone (Small Business Service, July, 2005). The DTI (2002:7) defines social enterprise as “*a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholder and owners.*” Social enterprises aim to generate sustainable income streams (via selling products and/or services) in order to address social concerns. These concerns may range from training the unemployed, combating homelessness, offering counselling to those facing mental health problems and struggling with substance abuse and addiction. This is indicative of the work undertaken by social enterprises in communities, including hard-to-reach groups. **(General – Capability and Social Enterprise)**

In many respects, the social enterprise revolution has been a great success: It has fostered an emphasis among nonprofits on achieving measurable results for clients; it has encouraged sound financial planning and fiscal responsibility. It has made many organizations more dynamic, more innovative, more efficient, and more effective. Yet in researching this report we found that nonprofits driven to meet a ‘double bottom’ line for customers and clients have far more typically led to frustration and failure, drawing attention and resources away from the organization’s core work—and that even the oft-cited success stories are less cut-and-dried than they appear. **(General – Limits of Social Enterprise)**

One of the most thorough reviews of profitability was conducted by two consultants writing for the Harvard Business Review. They found that in a random sample of social ventures in 2001, 71 percent lost money, 5 percent broke even, and 24 percent turned a profit. But the authors stressed that even those claiming success probably under-counted indirect costs such as managerial time from the host organization or unaccounted subsidies for start-up costs. **(General – Limits of Social Enterprise)**

LESSON: Social ventures are not a good time to venture into uncharted territory. A nonprofit business venture has the best chance of succeeding if it is a relatively simple model, and one that has worked elsewhere. **(General – Limits of Social Enterprise)**

Nonprofits that are looking primarily for an independent income stream should follow leaders like the Salvation Army or the Red Cross by choosing a straightforward business that gives the organization a competitive advantage in the marketplace, rather than attempting to open restaurants run by the homeless or environmentally friendly dry cleaning stores. **(General – Limits of Social Enterprise)**

One way of thinking about social enterprises is as the more business-like part of the third sector, where the third sector is seen as those organizations that are not part of

the public and private sectors, such as voluntary and community organizations, charities and cooperatives or other mutual organizations. As noted above quite how much income has to be raised from trading for an organization to be classified as a social enterprise is open to debate, although a common rule of thumb is 50%. However, this still leaves a very wide range of organizations. One way of distinguishing different types of social enterprise is in terms of their origins and roots. There appear to be four common routes into becoming a social enterprise, those that arise from mutualism, those that come from existing charitable or voluntary organizations, those that arise as spin-offs from the public sector, and those that are created from scratch by social entrepreneurs. **(General – Governance and Social Enterprise)**

EUROPEAN UNION

This strategy must include an integrated action plan, which will support social entrepreneurship. It is, therefore, necessary to have three basis axes in this strategy. The first axis is the creation of a business environment, which will allow social enterprises to be developed as effectively as possible. The simplification of the proceedings regarding the establishment and operation of a social enterprise, in combination with the granting of tax incentives for such schemes, are a catalytic factor for developing social entrepreneurship. Furthermore, a basic choice, in order to support social enterprises, is for the state to make use of the services they have to offer. The second axis of the strategy for the development of social enterprises in the European Union is the improvement of the business elements of such enterprises. The third axis of the EU strategy on social entrepreneurship is the establishment of the concept “social enterprise” and the value of such an activity. **(EU - Social Enterprises in Europe and the Development of a Common Strategy in the European Union)**

To reflect the economic and entrepreneurial dimensions of initiatives, four criteria have been put forward:

a) A continuous activity producing goods and/or selling services. Social enterprises, unlike some traditional non-profit organisations, do not normally have advocacy activities or the redistribution of financial flows (as, for example, grant-giving foundations) as their major activity, but they are directly involved in the production of goods or the provision of services to people on a continuous basis. The productive activity thus represents the reason, or one of the main reasons, for the existence of social enterprises.

b) A high degree of autonomy. Social enterprises are created by a group of people on the basis of an autonomous project and they are governed by these people. They may depend on public subsidies but they are not managed, directly or indirectly, by public authorities or other organisations (federations, private firms, etc.). They have both the right to take up their own position ("voice") as well as to terminate their activity ("exit").

c) A significant level of economic risk. Those who establish a social enterprise assume totally or partly the risk of the initiative. Unlike most public institutions, their financial viability depends on the efforts of their members and workers to secure adequate resources.

d) A minimum amount of paid work. As in the case of most traditional non-profit organisations, social enterprises may also combine monetary and non-monetary resources, voluntary and paid workers. However, the activity carried out in social

enterprises requires a minimum level of paid workers. **(EU – Social Enterprise in an Enlarged Europe)**

To encapsulate the social dimensions of the initiative, five criteria have been proposed:

e) An explicit aim to benefit the community. One of the principal aims of social enterprises is to serve the community or a specific group of people. In the same perspective, a feature of social enterprises is their desire to promote a sense of social responsibility at local level.

f) An initiative launched by a group of citizens. Social enterprises are the result of collective dynamics involving people belonging to a community or to a group that shares a well-defined need or aim; this collective dimension must be maintained over time in one way or another, even though the importance of leadership - often embodied by an individual or a small group of leaders – must not be neglected.

g) A decision-making power not based on capital ownership. This generally means the principle of "one member, one vote" or at least a decision-making process in which voting power is not distributed according to capital shares on the governing body which has the ultimate decision-making rights. Moreover, although the owners of the capital are important, the decision-making rights are generally shared with the other stakeholders.

h) A participatory nature, which involves the various parties affected by the activity. Representation and participation of users or customers, stakeholder influence on decision-making and a participative management are often important characteristics of social enterprises. In many cases, one of the aims of social enterprises is to further democracy at local level through economic activity.

i) A limited profit distribution. Social enterprises not only include organisations that are characterised by a total non-distribution constraint, but also organisations which - like co-operatives in some countries - may distribute profits, but only to a limited extent, thus avoiding a profit-maximising behaviour. **(EU – Social Enterprise in an Enlarged Europe)**

WISEs [Work Integration Social Enterprises] are autonomous economic entities whose main objective is the professional integration – within the WISE itself or in mainstream enterprises – of people experiencing serious difficulties in the labour market. This integration is achieved through productive activity and tailored follow-up, or through training to qualify the workers. WISEs are active in various sectors, but the most common in Europe are: manual labour (building, carpentry etc.), salvaging and recycling waste, maintaining public or green areas, and packaging products. **(EU – New Market Opportunities for Social Enterprises in the EU)**

With some differences, the sectors indicated as “emerging” for social enterprises include activities in sustainable tourism, cultural and recreational areas, the environment, regeneration of sites and agricultural productions linked to the local context. These economic sectors are a promising challenge for the offer of diversified and quality jobs to people who are experiencing conditions of social exclusion or disadvantage in the labour market. Experts foresee sharp growth in activity sectors where social enterprises could develop activities that would extend their fields of intervention beyond the provision of social services in a strict sense of the term. This change implies new forms of relations with other political, economic and social players and it may be a useful strategy to avoid a possible involution of social entrepreneurship in minority and “niche” sectors; this would certainly inhibit the

future development potential of the social economy in European countries. **(EU – New Market Opportunities for Social Enterprises in the EU)**

Thus, social economy organisations and social enterprises have an important function as suppliers especially in those markets, which are not adequately served neither by private nor by public entities as well as in achieving social and public goals. They contribute to the reallocation of resources and to a favourable transformation of the welfare system. Furthermore, social enterprises help combating social exclusion and can foster local development (as they are often locally based organisations and linked with local authorities). Moreover, the sector has also become a major provider of jobs in Europe, where employment in social enterprises is estimated at 3.5 million. Job creation, firstly, results directly from the aim of work-integration many social enterprises pursue and, secondly, from social enterprises providing personal services with a high labour intensity. At the same time, however, because of their different nature as compared to traditional private firms (e.g. no profit-orientation, not aiming at return on investments), social (economy) enterprises operate under different framework conditions and face particular challenges or barriers to survive and being successful, including limited possibilities to design their supply and prices, multiple and perhaps conflicting objectives, availability of finance, recruiting of personnel etc. Finally, also due to their diversity, social economy organisations are still poorly understood and there is a lack of visibility especially in the wider public sphere. **(EU – Study on the Practices and Policies in the Social Enterprise Sector in Europe)**

Obviously, nowadays the UK has the most developed social enterprise sector among the countries investigated in this study. There, the importance of the social enterprise sector to the overall economy of the nation and the sustainable growth of the economy has been gaining acceptance for several years. With a concise definition of the term ‘social enterprise’ by the Government, a national strategy put forward by the government, the establishment of a Social Enterprise Unit within government and a Junior Minister with responsibility for social enterprises, a complete infrastructure has been built. **(EU – Study on the Practices and Policies in the Social Enterprise Sector in Europe)**

Due to the lack of official definitions and due to the fact that, in nearly all of the countries under investigation, social enterprises may operate under various legal forms, statistical data – if available – usually only describes a fraction of the social enterprise sector in the respective country. Only very few countries (e. g. the UK, Lithuania and Finland) have already implemented some register of social enterprises that supplies more complete and reliable data. **(EU – Study on the Practices and Policies in the Social Enterprise Sector in Europe)**

There is a vague or non-existent general knowledge in societies of social enterprises as a form of enterprise, of their goals and of their ways of action. Social enterprises as well as social entrepreneurs face several external and internal barriers. External barriers consist of e.g. legal and taxation issues and political position towards social enterprises impeding their activities. Internal barriers are e.g. the lack of managerial capabilities and financing the business itself. In many countries, decisions about public financial aids are made on a yearly basis, which creates instability and makes the planning of the future more difficult to social enterprises. **(EU – Study on the Practices and Policies in the Social Enterprise Sector in Europe)**

IRELAND

In addition to this WRC concluded that the majority of those enterprises ‘providing social services in disadvantaged areas’ ‘are insecure and unlikely to be viable in the absence of some form of continued support’ (WRC 2003:124). This finding merely reinforces the view that Irish social enterprises are characterised by a strong reliance on public support in the form of active labour market measures. Any change in this type of support has significant implications for the emergence and long-term sustainability of social enterprises. **(IRELAND - A Comparative Analysis of Irish Rural and Urban Social Enterprises)**

When asked to suggest the primary reasons for establishing the social enterprise, an overwhelming 64% of all social enterprises indicated that it was ‘to respond to local needs’. Sixty eight percent (68%) of the 119 urban social enterprises that responded to this question cited this reason compared with 60% of the 128 rural social enterprises. All social enterprises were asked to identify the main actor responsible for establishing the social enterprises. Nearly 68% of all social enterprises indicated a ‘local voluntary organisation’. **(IRELAND - A Comparative Analysis of Irish Rural and Urban Social Enterprises)**

Respondents to the survey were asked to identify the sources of income to the social enterprise in 2002. Statutory grant assistance was a significant source of income for all social enterprises; 82% of all social enterprises suggested that they were in receipt of this statutory assistance. Only 18 or 7% of all social enterprises had an income in 2002 from the sale of goods and services to statutory authorities. Approximately 26% of all social enterprises recorded an income in 2002 from the ‘sale of goods and services to individuals and the community’. **(IRELAND - A Comparative Analysis of Irish Rural and Urban Social Enterprises)**

BELGIUM

In 2001, the Belgian federal authorities estimated a total **employment** in this sector of 42,000 full-time equivalent people. A total of 694 companies were identified, of which 299 in Wallonia, 290 in Flanders, 100 in Brussels and 5 operating at a national level. The estimated yearly turnover of these companies lies at EUR 1 billion. **(BELGIUM – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Belgium)**

The Flemish public authorities are maintaining eleven regional incubation or start centres. The aim of these centres are to support future social entrepreneurs by providing advice, helping shape ideas, opening up possibilities, etc. The centres accompany future social entrepreneurs step by step in the process of setting up a social enterprise. The start centres of the Social Economy are subsidised by Flemish public authorities out of the Employment budget. **(BELGIUM – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Belgium)**

Trividend is a co-operative company with limited liability, a participation fund for Flanders, especially for social economics. Trividend invests in existing or new companies who pay attention to solidarity economics. Trividend provides venture capital and loans to companies and organisations in the social economy, offering two types of risk capital: Trividend buys stocks or provides loans to organisations and

companies of the social economy. Both measures operate according to certain criteria and payment modalities. **(BELGIUM – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Belgium)**

Especially the larger municipalities have a developed vision concerning local employment, care for the elderly and the local service economy. Especially these municipalities realise that vzw ISIS can offer an important social appreciation in their municipality. In the municipalities where vzw ISIS has signed an agreement cooperation goes well. But also in a number of municipalities where there has been no concluded financial agreement, throughout the years a close cooperation has arisen. vzw ISIS is considered as a full partner, is asked in working groups, the municipal services frequently refer to vzw ISIS. It seems that municipalities are more willing to provide financial resources if they can *show off* with the results. **(BELGIUM - A Report of Best Practices of Social Enterprises in Belgium, Greece, Italy and Slovakia)**

Connect is a project of 'Ghent, city at work', co-ordinated by De Punt and supported by a broad development partnership. Connect informs, trains and advises managers and staff members on social economy and sustainable enterprise in the Ghent region. Two websites are fundamental tools in all communication. Firstly, the business-to-business website of Connect gathers all services and products offered by the social economy in the Ghent region. It also allows entrepreneurs to request online bids. The website puts the entrepreneurs in touch with the most suitable (sub)contractors, offering the specialities needed for a single, temporary or ongoing work. (www.depunt.be/connect) Secondly, a portal website and digital knowledge centre for entrepreneurs with an interest in sustainable business. Themes include marketing, coaching, competency management, public contracts, process management, CSR, etc. For each topic the website offers tools, good practices, articles, etc. (www.depunt.be/misec) **(BELGIUM - Capacity Building for the Social Economy in Belgium)**

As a whole, social economy is not yet recognised as a full-grown economic player, in spite of its large employment and turnover figures (*about 25,000 people in the Flemish social economy alone*). It is perhaps even not desirable to characterize social economy as being a separate sector because it comprises a diverse range of organisations and enterprises, operating across a wide range of activity spheres. Still there is an important need to improve the general outside view on the sector (especially when it comes to capacity, diversity and quality) and to make regular economy aware of these potential partners. For commercial reasons it is important to communicate about the quality of products or services and tailor-made solutions for a market price. Social or community value can be an argument for some customers, such as government bodies and consumers. **(BELGIUM - Capacity Building for the Social Economy in Belgium)**

An often stated threat to social economy, more specifically to those focusing on semi-industrial activities) is that labour-intensive work is shifting towards emerging economies along with an increasing technological development and productivity. In providing an answer to those threats, social economy is looking for new markets in both services and production.

· **Construction & renovation:** the building sector has a high labour demand. Social economy initiatives can, as a subcontractor, provide extra workforce for regular building companies. This can be integrated in a total package contract where for

example social economy provides the preparatory works, some of the finishing touches and part of the lower-skilled manual labour. Most of the social economy initiatives already providing these services indicate the demand is higher than what they can offer. Working as a subcontractor can reduce the qualification demands for public works.

- **Green maintenance:** increased demand for green maintenance creates the possibility for social economy to combine its social, economical, environmental and societal goals. Green or environment maintenance for governments is already a good example of a “win win”, in which higher governments give incentives to local governments to contract social economy.

- **Energy/ecological services:** hot issues such as rational energy use, waste reduction, protection of the environment are thought of as “big business” for social economy. Together with different governmental agencies, social economy organisations and enterprises are launching themselves in new services, such as diminishing the energy use in family homes by making small adaptations, and are even leading the market when it comes to well developed services in recycling and reuse.

- **Mobility:** In the same range, more skills – driven activities as bike repair and hire, providing services for bikes at bigger train stations, taxi services, are being implemented in governmental policies and thus can provide a diversified clientele for social economy organisations and enterprises involved (businesses, consumers, direct or indirectly funded by local and regional governments).

- **Social services:** promising markets are child, sick and elderly care. In Belgium, due to a beneficial tax regulation, services to private households are rapidly growing. Examples are cleaning, cooking, shopping and even ‘granny sitting’. **(BELGIUM - Capacity Building for the Social Economy in Belgium)**

In Sheffield a unique partnership has been developed between the City Council and representatives of the social economy. A target has been set of 10% of contracts allocated to social economy. The council wants to stimulate the development of a ‘mixed economy’ in the region. In order to be recognised as a valid partner for public procurement, social enterprises in the UK are starting winning small contracts. After proving their added value in such a “test”, they gain access to larger tenders. The Belgian government is also encouraging local authorities to adopt similar policies of sustainable government purchasing. A lot of social (insertion) economy businesses already provide services for (local, regional or provincial) governmental agencies. **(BELGIUM - Capacity Building for the Social Economy in Belgium)**

The welfare service of the City of Ghent is one of the first to implement a clause directly creating employment for target group employees. They wrote a public tender for a three year contract of cleaning the windows in all the welfare services buildings. In article 23 of their tender a so called ‘employment paragraph’ was integrated, stating that the “selected firm commits to employ at least one low skilled employee full time for minimum the duration of the contract, in consultation with the training- and employment office of the welfare service’. Six companies applied. The selected company employed from day one a trainee, approved by the welfare service, and is providing the young migrant a training and coaching program. This is a quite a special case, since the welfare service can provide a double approach: next to the ‘classical’ welfare service, they have a special, separate unit involved in guidance, training and insertion employment of the welfare service beneficiaries. This unit, called OTC (orientation and training centre), can provide a free service in selecting and coaching a target group employee. **(BELGIUM - Capacity Building for the Social Economy in Belgium)**

CANADA

There is a need for a new social capital market in Canada to help achieve a new scale of social endeavour and to address some fundamental problems in the systems which currently fund the non-profit sector. There are two issues that hobble the non-profit sector: the degree of dependence the sector has on government funding; and the degree of dependence the sector has on one form of funding - grants. **(CANADA - The Future of Canada's Capital Market for Social and Environmental Innovation)**

As the industrial economy evolved, it increasingly moved away from place-based local economies to national and global frameworks of production and consumption. There were many casualties in this shift: jobs and occupations, and for those that do find employment, a transformation in the very nature of work, from meaningful activity reflecting community life and values to maximum production at the lowest cost; other casualties include the public commons such as healthy eco-systems and indigenous cultures. The focus of business narrowed down to only one imperative: maximization of shareholder interests. Industrial strategies and corporate structures were developed to put the commons, including land, resources and social capital, to work to increase shareholder returns with little or no sense of social or environmental responsibility. This has resulted in excluding or marginalizing a significant number of people, communities and groups from active economic life. **(CANADA -The Future of Canada's Capital Market for Social and Environmental Innovation)**

The 'moral' level of legitimacy offers another possible explanation for the emergence and the likely future course of social enterprise. Moral legitimacy refers to the normative sphere of correctness rather than self-interest. It is conferred when undertaken activities are based on broader norms in the socio-political environment. The decline of welfare-state ideology and the emergence of a pervasive trust in market-based approaches are seen in, for example, demands that governments operate more like a business or address social needs through market mechanisms. If business values are now dominant and preferred modes of problem solving and organizational structures, then it follows that social sector organizations can achieve legitimacy by adopting the language, goals, and structures of this ideological form. Social enterprise is morally legitimate because of the agreement between its form and the dominant pro-business ideology in the wider social environment. From this perspective, social enterprise is not simply pragmatically legitimate for its revenue generation and social outcomes, but is deemed morally legitimate as a preferred organizational model. Consequently, social welfare organizations dependent on public funding become less legitimate than those that take up entrepreneurial business models. This may be reflected in discussions that emphasize the difference between organizational 'sustainability' and 'self-sufficiency'. Sustainability strategies include combinations of philanthropic, government subsidy, and earned revenue as well as individual donations and voluntarism. Self-sufficiency is strictly earned income and is seen by some as the ultimate goal of social entrepreneurs; anything less denotes dependency. **(CANADA – Social Enterprise Impact Assessment)**

In the Canadian social capital market, which generates both financial and social returns, the most significant limitation is inconsistent and inadequate financial backing, especially lack of patient capital and government support. Canada also lacks

a national framework of legislation and government programming to encourage community investment. **(CANADA – Social Enterprise Impact Assessment)**

In 2004, the Canadian federal government recognized the potential of this sector and budgeted for \$100 million over 5 years to provide social economy enterprises with access to patient capital. Due to a change in the party governing Canada, the launch of the new Social Economy Financing Program has been delayed. If it is launched, it will mark the first time the Government of Canada will offer both grants and patient capital to social economy organizations and enterprises. **(CANADA – Community Investing in Canada)**

Typically Canadian community investment funds or programs are created by a community that has undertaken a strategic planning process or a needs assessment that has identified a lack of accessible capital as a barrier to development. In Canada, most funds evolved independently in different regions of the country and almost each one has a unique structure and lending methodology. For example, some organizations have been formed independently as non profits or cooperatives. Sometimes organizations funded by the Federal government, called Community Futures Development Corporations, have initiated special financing programs. There are credit unions that partner with community organizations and /or with foundations to provide lending, deposit or granting programs. There are faith based group that operate loan funds. Many Canadian alternative lending programs are community based and work hard to cultivate a sense of community ownership over projects. **(CANADA – Community Investing in Canada)**

Keys to a supportive public policy agenda include –

The political will to initiate supportive policies and practices at all three levels of government;

Collaboration, cooperation and partnerships across existing regional and national organisations and associations;

Private sector engagement through purchasing, mentorship, partnerships and investment; and

Strength in the Social Enterprise Sector to respond to opportunities with social entrepreneurship behaviour. **(CANADA – Supportive Public Policy)**

Indeed the importance of the charitable, the nonprofit and voluntary sectors appears to be Canada's secret, a hidden truth as it were. Yet taken together, as a percentage of the population they are the second largest in the world. They are also a *huge* employer, with more than two million paid workers. That is almost as many Canadians as the *entire* manufacturing sector and two-and-a-half times the number of workers in the construction industry. They contribute almost eight per cent of Canada's GDP — this is more than the retail industry, it is more than mining, oil and gas *together*. **(CANADA – Unleashing the Power of Social Enterprise)**

We can look to the tax incentives that support Canadian business entrepreneurs. For example: labour sponsored funds or the Canadian Film and Video Production Tax Credit Program, which offers federal incentives for Canadian productions. Yet a third example would be flow-through shares that encourage investment in resource-based exploration. The question I would put to you is quite simple – If we in Canada, are prepared to use these kinds of incentives to enable business entrepreneurs to tap capital markets for the betterment of the economy, why would we not provide similar

incentives to social entrepreneurs as they seek to tap capital markets for the betterment of society. **(CANADA – Unleashing the Power of Social Enterprise)**

Social enterprise in North America requires

Public Policy

Government must recognize the social benefits and be prepared to underwrite risk (eg. Loan guarantees)

Government must move from a subsidy to an investment logic

Readily available capital (loan and equity)

Legal and tax framework

Customized measurement, evaluation, social accounting tools

Communications strategy: information, image

Networking and knowledge sharing

Training environments; university curricula and programs

Development of comprehensive data

International comparisons (best practices, public policy)

(CANADA – A North American Perspective on Social Enterprise)

FRANCE

This invention was re-discovered in 1985 by researchers and field-workers and it was at the origins of these work-integration social enterprises, deeply embedded in the neighbourhoods and aiming at the democratic management of urban services by the inhabitants, social housing owner companies and municipalities. The aim was to reinvent social enterprises combining work-integration, the management of neighbourhood services and the commitment of the inhabitants. The first initiatives were located in Marseille and in Meaux (suburb of Paris), and were soon followed by other initiatives, in Besançon and Avignon, in the years 1985-1986. The *Régies de quartier*, with the support of researchers, gave themselves an autonomous basis to avoid the risk of becoming tools of public policies. In October 1988, the 6 existing *Régies de quartier* created a National liaison committee (*Comité National de Liaison des Régies de Quartier*, or CNLRQ). The main priorities of this network are the reinforcement of existing experiences and the quantitative and qualitative development of this kind of initiatives, and the qualification of "actors". In 2000 there were more than 130 *Régies de quartier*. **(FRANCE - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – France)**

The type of jobs that *Régies de quartier* were initially supposed to give to the people in difficulty were temporary ones: this is due to the fact that "*Régies de quartier* are not employment places, but constitute a transition toward employment, a place providing temporary salaried work" (Béhar, Estèbe, 1990, p.48). But the different activity sectors covered by *Régies de quartier* as well as the diversity of the inhabitants concerned by the integration process have led to modify this approach. The activities developed can be grouped in three main sectors: cleaning and maintenance (cleaning of halls, staircases etc.); maintenance of open and public areas (parks, street furniture, water and sanitation), gardening and roadmending activities and induced activities such as woodwork, painting, masonry, locksmithing etc; technical intervention and maintenance. The heterogeneity of these sectors in terms of qualifications and skills required and in terms of jobs, on the one hand, and the needs of job-seekers (long term unemployed and women with no qualifications), on the other hand, have led decision-makers to propose two types of jobs: fixed term

contracts - often part-time - for women and old workers, and temporary employment, for young job-seekers. **(FRANCE - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – France)**

The annual budget of *Régies de quartier* amounts on average to about 400,000 euros. Their main resources come from the services they provide to social housing companies (cleaning, maintenance, housework, painting, small works...), to the municipality (works in public areas) as well as to the inhabitants (punctual mendings, small works...). For their traditional services, 80% of their income comes from the services provided, and 20% from public support, mainly for their integration and training activities. For the services provided, *Régies de quartier* try to develop contractual relations for the sale of their services to the local authorities and to the social housing companies, rather than being submitted to a system of answers to public call for tenders. The municipalities have different points of view concerning those claims, but generally, even in case of public calls for tenders, they set up dispositions (social clauses) which make it possible for *Régies de quartier* to keep these markets. They recognise the capacity of these organisations to provide a service of a quality level that neither the private sector nor the public sector would be able to reach because they do not benefit from the same "local embeddedness" as *Régies de quartier*. Public resources come from subventions and exemptions that *Régies de quartier* are entitled to when employing people within the framework of training or integration contracts. *Régies de quartier* are recognised by the state as "integration enterprises" for part of their integration activities for young people. **(FRANCE - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – France)**

The title of this paper has echoes of a 1988 article by Sian Reynolds entitled "Whatever happened to the French ministry of women's rights?"¹ Although they raise questions about completely separate incidents and policy sectors in French politics, it appears to me that Sian Reynolds' article and my paper here relate to a broader tendency in French domestic politics since 1981: the "plural" left around the socialist party has brought in and institutionalised new policy areas, only for the right to dismantle or fundamentally alter them later: *Taltemance a la francaise*". Even where the same broad functions continue, left and right tend to give their ministries different labels, particularly in the social policy sector. Two broad questions then arise: (a) whether policy innovation did take place, and if so how to explain it, and (b) whether the genie was let out of the bottle, that is, whether the institutionalisation of a new policy area left lasting results either in terms of policy outputs or in terms of methods of implementation and relations with new policy actors in a context of a shift towards urban governance. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

The developments discussed here also have broader relevance outside France because they raise questions about the relationship between social economy actors and the state, particularly the legal and fiscal framework in which they operate. It will be argued here that, at the very least, the institutionalisation of policy on the social economy created a space — an opportunity structure — for social economy actors to formulate and express views on an optimum architecture of governance from their point of view. Of course, it also responded to the growth in importance of the sector, from government's point of view as service deliverers, and as an increasingly organised lobby. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

The third sector does not merely provide goods or services, it creates community, or social capital in the Putnam sense because of the integrative effect on its participants and because of the way in which they operate within the wider community. The rise of the social economy constitutes a response to market failure and above all to state failure: either the retreat of the state or the tendency of public welfare services to fall into institutional isomorphism, creating inefficiencies and increasing inequality. It is seen as having something new and distinctive to offer, principally by virtue of its proximity to communities or individuals in need. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

According to a leading expert on the social economy in France, the creation of the sub-ministry represented a significant step towards building a stable environment for social enterprise (Laville, 2001). **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

To a large extent, social enterprise has developed from the bottom up, and therefore public policy's response to it has depended on its response to decentralisation and its willingness to trust bottom-up initiatives. Nevertheless, it will also be argued in this paper, the bottom-up nature of the social economy means that it is likely to have a lasting impact regardless of policy output at national level. This chimes with Defourny et al's arguments that the rise of the social economy in Europe represents a convergent trend, notwithstanding national specificities reflecting the "historical" composition of the social economy (Defourny and Monzon Campos, 1992; EMES Network, 1999). **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

The promotion of the social economy at European level was identified by French government as a priority when the sub-department was set up in 2000, coinciding with the French presidency of the EU Council of Ministers. Demands for a European statute or charter of social enterprise emerged strongly in a parliamentary workshop on the social economy held in November 2000. At the same time as the French set up their ministerial sub-department, however, the EU was axing its own unit (DG XXIII). On the other hand, the EU has continued to support social enterprise in individual member states through the structural funds (see e.g. O'Hara, 2001, on the Irish case; Cabinet Office, 2006, on the British case). It has also funded influential research projects, notably the EMES project (EMES Network, 1999; Defourny, 2001). The European Commission also funded the Digestus project, begun in 1998, that sought actively to promote the Italian model of social cooperatives, and it supported the French initiative on SCIC as part of this project (Lindsay and Hems, 2004). **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

At January 2007, 93 SCIC were registered as active, in two main areas: in personal health and social services (*services de proximité*), and in environmental services (data from SIC network). After a fairly slow start, the number of SCIV has increased substantially in the last year or so, demonstrating the importance of recent developments aimed at encouraging contractual relationships between local authorities and social enterprises in the area of local services. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

At the same time, the 2006 decree established a High Council on the Social Economy, in order to promote social dialogue on policy initiatives relating to the sector. The impetus for these initiatives was widely seen as the government's "turn to

social questions" following its disastrous showing in the 2004 regional elections. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

Finally, it is at regional level that a framework for social economy is being constructed through projects and contracts. Each region has a chamber of the social economy, mirroring regional chambers of commerce. The chambers are funded by the central state and by the region. Some regional chambers have established observatories of the social economy, placing France alongside the Netherlands at the vanguard of social enterprise monitoring in Europe. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

In 2001, Borzaga and Defourny argued that social enterprise was being under-utilised in Europe, having become narrowly associated with work integration and personal social service provision. Recent developments in France have tended to consolidate this narrow specialisation. Borzaga and Defourny also called for local authorities to provide demand for the goods and services of social enterprises by limiting procurement in certain areas to social enterprises. Such a radical proposal seems to swim against the tide and Lipietz's recommendation in this respect was more restrained. Although various recent legal decisions have freed the way for regions and local authorities to award more contracts to social enterprises, particularly in the field of personal social services, considerable uncertainty remains. **(FRANCE – Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for Social Economy)**

GERMANY

Between the mid-1970s and the mid-1990s, the "second labour market" of quasi-jobs, financed by the unemployment insurance and by social assistance based programmes, was generally accepted in Germany as an instrument to cope with unemployment. Labour market policy was thus not confined to paying allowances but was also oriented towards activities of re-skilling and of improving the overall employability of the jobless. A major tool of this approach became the so-called "*Arbeitsbeschaffungsmaßnahme*" (ABM; public employment scheme). This instrument, financed through the unemployment insurance, allowed for publicly subsidizing regular jobs, thus offering income and occupational experience to the unemployed for a certain period. In the seventies and eighties, numerous job facilities of this kind were set up by agreements between the Federal Labour Office and organizations willing to employ people on this basis. The measures were to permit people to get a combination of work and income, and sometimes they also aimed at creating innovative services in fields where market did not provide needed products and services. It was through this channel that early forms of social enterprises came into being. However, these enterprises soon faced the problem of offering such occupations without competing with local business. In addition to this, they had to come to terms with an increasingly dense public regulation that pushed them to target people with numerous lacks and disadvantages by organising fixed-term occupational activities; obviously with such a clientele prevailing it became nearly impossible to become as well a promoter of new services and subsequent jobs to be stabilised over time. **(GERMANY - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – Germany)**

On average, only 30% of the participants in the employment measures are integrated into the first labour market after the end of the project. However, effects other than placement have to be taken into account as well, when it comes to an evaluation of

activities of second labour market organisations. Giving temporary work to people in programmes of urban renewal or in services that cover social needs may reduce the overall risk of social exclusion in a given community. Furthermore, the success of placement strategies proved to be limited in regions with low growth and employment rates. **(GERMANY - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – Germany)**

Within the given regulatory framework, WISEs are prone to increasingly concentrate on those groups of unemployed that can easily be placed ("cream-skimming"). Conversely, if they adhere to the objective of supporting foremost the very disadvantaged groups, they risk to be threatened in their mere existence. So far, WISEs have had difficulties in using the employment potential in the field of household-related services. The Federal Labour Office in general sets limits to the scope of activities in which WISEs engage. A general rule, already mentioned in the beginning, requires that programmes for time limited work should only produce goods and services that are not already made available by the business sector or the public sector. This is meant to avoid substitution effects and/or unfair competition by publicly subsidised work. Additionally, by focusing on the aspect of placement, the Federal Labour Offices do not support WISEs in developing own service fields that might constitute more than "playgrounds" for those who have to train there in order to get a better employability. **(GERMANY - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – Germany)**

Summing up, one can say that while the interest in the not-for-profit sector has been growing for a couple of years, the label "social enterprise" is quite unknown in Germany. The idea of social enterprises and more specifically of WISEs exists, but merely in the minds of some actors of labour market policy and of social research. As far as the management and the clientele of WISEs are concerned, these organisations, engaged in tasks of labour market integration have not yet developed an identity of their own. **(GERMANY - National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – Germany)**

NETHERLANDS

From the perspective of the providers of care for example, it is important to break with the history of government control, and to claim the freedom to attract private finance and to add more commercial services to the range of their activities. The other perspective is that entrepreneurship is key and should be cherished. This view is very popular in Dutch social housing associations' circles, where people talk of "entrepreneurs who fulfil a social function but are not government or quasi-government, yet are neither commercially driven organisations." (ten Cate 2000). As will be demonstrated below, entrepreneurship is such an important issue to housing because their financial ties with government have been cut in the mid-nineties. **(NETHERLANDS - Social Enterprise in the Dutch Property Market)**

In part, these have a political slant: the social enterprise concept appears to fit comfortably into Dutch Christian Democrat thinking and policy formulation – for example by de Hoop Scheffer (1999) and Balkenende (2000) who have outlined a general framework within which social enterprises could operate. Building on this, yet another Christian-Democratic study has suggested a special legal status for social enterprises, which should regulate several aspects of their governance and

accountability. (CDA 2005). Left-of-centre, the Third Way certainly ties in with the idea, although there is obviously more concern here about the government's ability to ensure that social enterprises actually fulfil their social obligations (van der Meer 2001). And in liberal thought too a benevolent attitude towards social enterprise can be observed. This seems to be fuelled by the promise of greater consumer choice and the potentially higher efficiency in provision of services, as well as by the prospect of the transfer of financial burden from the public to private budgets. On the other hand, liberals are very critical of the effect that special conditions for social enterprises may have on competition with commercial providers of goods and services. **(NETHERLANDS - Social Enterprise in the Dutch Property Market)**

Building new houses to provide cheap rental accommodation requires an investment in excess of the present value of the future rental income generated from them. This is a direct consequence of social housing associations' letting and rent-setting policies, which they adopt in order to realise their social purpose. The 'gap' – i.e. the capitalised difference between cost covering rent and actual rent – has since 1995 not been compensated by government subsidies, and is a direct charge against social housing association capital. One way in which the housing association attempts to limit this charge is by making profits elsewhere in the project, building properties for sale on the market. This is one of the characteristic examples of the functioning of housing associations as social enterprises, using private funds for social tasks. **(NETHERLANDS - Social Enterprise in the Dutch Property Market)**

SPAIN

The Spanish government has regarded social economy as a tool to fight against unemployment, poverty and social exclusion. The Secretariat-General for Employment has a specific division, the Directorate-General for the Promotion of the Social Economy and the European Social Fund, which is responsible for co-ordinating the government departments that promote social economy; formalizing accords and agreements on social economy with the 17 Autonomous Regions of Spain and national public institutions, such as the National Public Employment Service; and facilitating the funding of enterprises and associations in the social economy sector. In Spain, the unemployment rate rose from around 2% in the early 1970s to more than 10% in the late 1970s, and reached the peak of 24.2% in 1994. The unemployment rate then gradually dropped from 18.8% in 1998 to 8.5% in 2006. According to the government, a major reason for the drop was the growth of social economy. Statistics from the Directorate-General for the Promotion of the Social Economy and the European Social Fund reveal that, from 1996 to 2005, the social economy sector created a total of 420 000 jobs, representing a 67% increase, which was higher than the corresponding 41% growth in the overall labour market. **(SPAIN – Social Enterprise Policies in the UK, Spain and Hong Kong)**

According to the government, social economy enterprises have a higher survival rate than other SMEs, with over 51% of them remaining active and generating jobs five years after their establishment. In 2006, Spain had more than 51,500 social economy enterprises. These enterprises employed more than 2.4 million people, accounting for some 25% of Spain's total working population. In 2004, social economy enterprises generated a yearly turnover of more than €87 billion, accounting for more than 7% of Spain's GDP. About 96% of the social economy enterprises are micro (with less than 10 employees) and small (with 11 to 49 employees) enterprises. In the fourth quarter

of 2006, the proportion of production and trading activities of social economy enterprises in the service, industrial, construction and agricultural sectors were 53.6%, 22.6%, 13.5% and 10.3% respectively **(SPAIN – Social Enterprise Policies in the UK, Spain and Hong Kong)**

In Spain, about 51,000 social economy enterprises are represented by a business confederation called the Confederation of Spanish Social Economy Businesses (CEPES), which was established in 1992. Comprising 24 member organizations, CEPES has provided a platform for dialogue between social economy enterprises and the public authorities. It has been contributing actively to the formulation of government policies and initiatives at the local, regional and national levels on employment, social inclusion, empowerment and development of SMEs, corporate social responsibility (CSR) and development of de-industrialized areas. It has also been working with the National Public Employment Service on the design and execution of employment and vocational training plans. In addition, CEPES represents the Spanish social economy enterprises in European forums, and coordinates the "Mediterranean Euro Network of the Social Economy", which covers Spain, Greece, Italy, France and Portugal. **(SPAIN – Social Enterprise Policies in the UK, Spain and Hong Kong)**

According to the government and the academia, the growth of social economy has been hindered by the following major problems: (a) legal and administrative barriers; (b) lack of a specific regulatory framework for social insertion companies; (c) financing difficulties; (d) insufficient business support; and (e) inadequate public understanding of social economy. **(SPAIN – Social Enterprise Policies in the UK, Spain and Hong Kong)**

The government has schemes to subsidize activities relating to social economy. In particular, any activities, such as media campaigns, training programmes, workshops, conferences and research, that promote social economy, self-employment and CSR, are eligible for a government subsidy of up to €60,000. In addition, the government has subsidized the operational costs of co-operative associations, workers' societies and entities representing social economy at the national level. For instance, a national association of co-operatives or labour societies may apply for a government subsidy of up to €160,000 every year to fund its operation, including travel expenses, rents, maintenance, insurance premiums, advertising and public relations, stationery and membership fees of national and international associations. **(SPAIN – Social Enterprise Policies in the UK, Spain and Hong Kong)**

According to some organizations relating to social economy in Spain, the operation of social economy enterprises has been on a level playing field with other business enterprises in the market. In spite of this, the Spanish government has included a social clause in its tender documents, requiring the contracts to employ a specified percentage of workers who are unemployed or have a disadvantaged background. This arrangement has increased not only the chance of social economy enterprises in bidding government contracts but also the employment opportunities of the unemployed and disadvantaged. **(SPAIN – Social Enterprise Policies in the UK, Spain and Hong Kong)**

Additionally, it notes that, although Spain is one of the countries which has witnessed the greatest development of the social economy, the WISEs which have appeared in this period have still not received official recognition from those responsible for the

Spanish government's employment policies. As a consequence of this, WISEs have no Spain wide legislative framework and these enterprises have been developed outside the programmes implemented by those responsible for employment policies, to provide an answer to a problem which has proved hard to resolve by either passive or by the scarcely-developed active employment policies. **(SPAIN – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Spain)**

The great success of co-operatives and worker-owned companies which appeared as a result of the industrial crises that began at the end of the seventies (and lasted until the middle of the eighties) provided a chastising lesson for those in charge of employment policy, who were forced to accept that small enterprises, and especially companies incorporated by workers made redundant or at risk of being made so, created more jobs that better resisted the vagaries of economic cycles than large concerns, public or private. **(SPAIN – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Spain)**

Sales to the public sector represent 38% of WISEs' income from sales. Within the public sector, the main customers are local authorities: municipal councils and agencies with responsibilities over the provision of municipal services account for 25.2% of WISEs' income from sales. Second come regional authorities (12.5%) which, in the case of Spain, are the various Autonomous Communities. The latter have their own powers and a great deal of autonomy from the central government, which explains why none of the WISEs in our sample have the Spanish state as a customer. Third come public or quasi-public enterprises, which contribute 0.9%. Public sector customers tend to be important to WISEs. Some of the managers interviewed mentioned that winning a public tender or contract had been a decisive factor in their success. This type of contract gives WISEs security and stability, but many (especially among the youngest and smallest enterprises) complained of the difficulty in accessing them. One of the main demands of the Spanish WISEs is the inclusion of and compulsory compliance with social clauses in public contracts. **(SPAIN – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Spain)**

Regarding relationships between WISE and buyer, in general, there is no uniform type of relationship with private business customers. Some enterprises have won customers due to the fact that they are WISEs. Others are treated like any other company in their business relationships. In some cases, depending on the customer, they do not reveal that they are WISEs, because it may be prejudicial to them, whilst in other cases they do so because it is a further point in their favour. Everything depends in fact upon to whom they are talking. Private enterprises' interest in the social role of WISEs is still slight. Commercial relationships are rarely established simply because of the nature of the WISE. Nonetheless, there have been some experiences of employers' associations supporting WISEs. In the case of the sale of second-hand clothing and objects to individuals, there does appear to be a social motivation among customers. **(SPAIN – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Spain)**

Direct subsidies provide 19% of WISE monetary income. They come mainly from the relevant Autonomous Communities which provide 78.1% thereof, followed by central or national government (8.2%), municipal authorities (7.9%) and the European Union (5.9%). As regards the purpose of the financing, in 85.2% of cases the subsidy was awarded for matters related to the social employment integration of participants. More specifically, 46.6% subsidised temporary jobs. **(SPAIN – Work Integration Social Enterprises in Spain)**

UNITED KINGDOM

Successful social enterprises can play an important role in helping deliver on many of the Government's key policy objectives by:

- helping to drive up productivity and competitiveness;
- contributing to socially inclusive wealth creation;
- enabling individuals and communities to work towards regenerating their local neighbourhoods;
- showing new ways to deliver and reform public services; and
- helping to develop an inclusive society and active citizenship.

(UK – Social Enterprise – A Strategy for Success)

The Social Enterprise Unit was set up in Autumn 2001, within the Department of Trade and Industry, to provide a focal point for strategic decision making across Government. Eight Working Groups, involving key stakeholders from the social enterprise community, were established by the Unit, and they have identified the major barriers to growth of the social enterprise sector:

- poor understanding of the particular abilities and value of social enterprise;
- little hard evidence to demonstrate the impact and added value of social enterprise;
- fragmented availability of accessible, appropriate advice and support;
- difficulty accessing and making use of what is perceived to be limited appropriate finance and funding available;
- limited account taken of the particular characteristics and needs of social enterprise within an enabling environment; and
- complexity and lack of coherence within the sector, combined with widely varying skills and knowledge bases.

These barriers will be tackled to achieve three key outcomes:

- create an enabling environment;
- make social enterprises better businesses; and
- establish the value of social enterprise.

(UK – Social Enterprise – A Strategy for Success)

The Government is determined that the regulatory, tax and administrative framework should not hinder the development and growth of social enterprise. The Government believes there is significant potential for more public services to be delivered by social enterprises, and that local authorities in particular have an important role in opening up procurement processes. **(UK – Social Enterprise – A Strategy for Success)**

At present, many social enterprises are undercapitalised and struggle to access external finance, particularly when starting up, growing or moving away from grant dependency. Ensuring appropriate finance and funding is available to social enterprise is key to enabling the sector to develop and grow. It is central to our strategy to encourage social enterprises to move away from grant dependency and towards greater self-financing. **(UK – Social Enterprise – A Strategy for Success)**

Social enterprises are increasingly becoming a part of our mainstream business culture. At Marks & Spencer, we have built relationships with a number of these 'community entrepreneurs' and have seen at first hand what social goals combined

with robust business performance can deliver.” Luc Vandeveld, Chairman, Marks & Spencer. . **(UK – There’s More to Enterprise Than You Think)**

What becomes clear from the research available is that:

Social enterprises have needs distinct from those of other enterprises

The needs of social enterprises can only be met by agencies with a specific remit to address those specialised needs

Support needs to be integrated with local community organisations and

Public awareness of the social enterprise sector needs to be increased

(UK – Social Enterprise Support for the Wider West of England)

The West Midlands Social Economy Partnership (WMSEP) is managing a £6.8m social enterprise action research scheme and has commissioned a wide range of action research projects to inform the development of the social economy in the West Midlands. The Scheme is inextricably linked to, and integrates the priorities of, the Enterprise in Communities Working Group of Advantage West Midlands, who are charged with developing the Regenerating Communities pillar of the regional economic strategy. The purpose of the Scheme is to:

put in place a regional support framework to support the development of social enterprises

identify and develop models of good practice, which are agreed and supported by partners across the region

The strategic objectives of the Scheme are to:

create a shared knowledge base and regional learning network on social enterprise

enhance the regional support system for social enterprise

create new models of sustainable and independent social enterprises in the region

increase the participation of specific social groups in social enterprise

expand the contribution of mainstream programmes, funding agencies and other relevant organisations to social enterprise development **(UK – Unlocking Social Enterprise: Infrastructure support for Social Enterprise in Herefordshire & Worcestershire)**

Key findings are:

The main area of activity is in health and social care, food and catering, environment and recycling and creative industries.

Social enterprises do not self-identify as such. They regard themselves as primarily voluntary organisations and not for profit organisations.

Legal forms are primarily companies limited by guarantee and registered charities.

There are relatively few established social enterprises. Most organisations have only been trading (earning income) for less than four years.

The majority of organisations derive less than 50% of their income from trading activity. They remain dependent on charitable or local authority grant funding and other forms of fund raising.

Although some are large and sophisticated, the majority of organisations are small, or micro sized, and rely heavily on volunteers.

Because social enterprises emerge in response to a social need, the potential for social enterprise development can be found predominantly within the voluntary and community sector rather than the business sector

The culture and language of social enterprises is significantly different to that of purely commercial organisations.

Social enterprises are driven primarily by their social purpose rather than by profit motives. **(UK – Unlocking Social Enterprise: Infrastructure support for Social Enterprise in Herefordshire & Worcestershire)**

The most common way in which social enterprises registered as CLG and IPS derive their trading income is classified as “Health & Social Care” (33%) – mostly day care, childcare, welfare / guidance but also accommodation services. Social enterprises also commonly derive their main income from “community or social services” (21%) and “real estate / renting” activities (20%). Smaller proportions of social enterprises trade in the educational sphere (15%) and in wholesale / retail (3%). Social enterprises trading in the “health and social services” field and in “education” were most likely to offer their services free to at least some of their “customers”, and were also most likely to receive payment from third parties. **(UK - A Survey of Social Enterprises Across the UK)**

The key groups of people whom social enterprises registered as CLG or IPS exist to help are people with disabilities (19% of all social enterprises which help people), children or young people (17%), the elderly (15%) and people on low incomes (12%). A range of other groups benefit from social enterprises, although most social enterprises focus on a single core audience. A quarter (24%) of social enterprises exist to help the community within which they are located. **(UK - A Survey of Social Enterprises Across the UK)**

The largest number of social enterprises registered as CLG or IPS is found in London – which accounts for almost a fifth of the total (22%), more than its share of all UK businesses (14%). Social enterprises are also over-represented in the South West (12% compared with 9% of all UK businesses). **(UK - A Survey of Social Enterprises Across the UK)**

Social enterprises are likely to be situated in areas of high multiple deprivation; 29 per cent are located in the 20 per cent most deprived wards and a further 20 per cent in the 20 to 40 per cent most deprived wards. However, social enterprise activity is not restricted to areas of deprivation and half of those (49%) identified operate in areas that would not be considered deprived. In aggregate, social enterprises in deprived areas tend to receive a larger proportion of their income from “grants and donations”, although they are not necessarily more likely to benefit from this type of funding. They are less likely to have any volunteers on their staff, and volunteers form a lower proportion of the total workforce (30% in 20% most deprived wards vs. 43% outside these wards), but those volunteers that work within social enterprises in deprived areas tend to contribute more hours per week (4 vs. 2). **(UK - A Survey of Social Enterprises Across the UK)**

This document outlines a framework for supporting and mainstreaming the social enterprise business model throughout the South East region. The Framework has been prepared by a steering group of 15 partner organisations. However, it is intended as a framework that can be embraced by the whole region. From one perspective, Social Enterprise can be seen as a way of integrating social and environmental sustainability into the fabric of business operation, so ensuring that improved productivity and competitiveness is accompanied by social and environmental benefits. Alternatively it can be seen as a model designed to achieve social or environmental goals in ways

which mean that providers are less dependent on public grant or charitable donations. From either perspective, the unique feature of social enterprises is their ability to link economic empowerment, social equity and environmental enhancement, so contributing to the sustainable economic development of the region. The aim of this Framework is to set out the requirements necessary to take social enterprise from the margins of the economy into the mainstream, scaling up the activities of existing companies and creating new ones, providing a sustainable underpinning to the delivery of public good throughout the region. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

If we are to encourage and promote social enterprise in the South East, we need to build momentum in the understanding of its potential, encourage more start-ups from a diverse range of sectors and enable existing organisations to grow. It sounds simple, but the number of social enterprises currently trading throughout the region is a testament to the barriers to using the model in the current climate. These barriers come in many forms. Some are the same as those affecting any other business including access to business support and finance, a lack of affordable premises and finding skilled staff. However, social enterprises also face one huge barrier that seriously affects their ability to assume a position within the market. That barrier is a lack of understanding of how social enterprises work and of their potential. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

This Framework proposes a long-term vision for social enterprise in the South East:

"To create a region where social enterprise can grow and thrive and play its full part in contributing to the sustainable development of the South East."

Achieving this vision will mean stimulating the growth, market share and visibility of social enterprises operating in all sectors of the economy. We have identified three key objectives that will help deliver this vision;

1. Greater understanding of the role and value of social enterprise, so stimulating the market for their products and services.
2. Develop an integrated, easily accessible, business support infrastructure to encourage the creation and sustainability of new enterprises, from a diverse range of sources, and to support the development and growth of existing enterprises.
3. Enable social enterprises to work together more effectively, opening up new markets through collaboration and innovation. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

Throughout our research it was evident that lack of understanding of the role and value of social enterprise was a major barrier to the acceleration of the use of the business model. All too often, social enterprise is promoted primarily as a solution to the modernising public services agenda or for tackling the problems of disadvantaged communities. There is no doubt that social enterprise has potential to work effectively in both these areas but the model is not a panacea for solving the funding crisis in either the voluntary and community or the public sectors. We have found that this emphasis has led to the active disengagement of many practitioners in the voluntary, community and public sectors, as they sense a groundswell from policy pushing them towards social enterprise as a cost cutting measure, rather than as a proactive choice that is in the interest of the beneficiaries they serve. The emphasis on social inclusion and service delivery has also acted as a distraction from the model's wider potential to play a part in regional economic development through securing local markets. This distraction means that the use of social enterprise as a succession strategy for

mainstream business is extremely under developed. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

With all these issues in mind we have identified a number of key priorities for action to enable greater understanding of the value offered through social enterprise solutions. These priorities are;

1. Training and education of the realistic potential of social enterprise to the public, private and voluntary and community sectors, including specific training for those responsible for procurement.

2. Developing networks for promoting local information and understanding, working through county social enterprise partnerships.

3. Developing a regional approach to the delivery of advice and support to public sector agencies considering service transfer or development through social enterprise models, and to voluntary organisations considering social enterprises a potential succession strategy.

4. Providing training for individual social enterprises on how to build an evidence base of their wider individual impact, and how to market their unique selling points.

5. Securing and publishing reliable, regularly updated information into the nature and scope of the activities undertaken by social enterprises regionally, building on the national mapping project. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

At the regional level we will continue to evolve the role of the regional steering group to direct and develop regional strategy and draw in resources that cannot be accessed by local partners. The partnership will be called Cultural Shift South East and will exist to deliver the following objectives:

1. Managing regional resources and investment programmes being delivered across the South East.

2. Brokering new opportunities to expand social enterprise markets.

3. Influencing regional, national and local policy.

4. Providing focus and regional leadership for Social Enterprise within the region.

5. Capacity building a wide range of stakeholders to participate in the social enterprise agenda.

6. Evaluating and continuing to develop an effective regional framework to support social enterprise.

7. Managing a central information and communication resource.

The existing Social Enterprise Steering Group will become the embryo of the Board of the new partnership. We will be looking to build the diversity of the Boards' membership encouraging social enterprises themselves to find a representative voice. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

Therefore, in order to measure our progress effectively our action plan will provide a baseline of quantitative indicators as outlined below and a target intervention rate of 10% improvement in the following indicators over the three-year period.

1. Number of jobs created in social enterprise

2. Number of new social enterprises operating for 12 months or more

3. Number of businesses created by advice from voluntary organisations

4. Number of social enterprises helped into a business network

5. Number of businesses assisted into new supply chains

6. Value of new public and private sector investment in social enterprise support
7. Number of Social Enterprises receiving specialist advice
8. GVA contribution from social enterprise to the regional economy
9. Number of new sector groups assessing the role and value of social enterprise as a delivery mechanism
10. Number of individuals and organisations with improved understanding of the principles and role of social enterprise.
11. Integration of social enterprise considerations into local and regional policy
- 12 Improved public awareness of social enterprise branded products and services
13. Customer satisfaction of business advice, service quality and ease of access. **(UK - South East England Social Enterprise Strategy)**

The scale of the contribution social enterprises make to the economy has also now been acknowledged. Recent research commissioned by the Department of Trade and Industry for England and Wales suggested that social enterprises now account for £18bn in the economy – three times the contribution of agriculture! In Scotland a few years ago Highland Council officials estimated social enterprise to be as important to the Scottish economy as tourism **(UK – The Future of UK Social Enterprise)**

But now we see a social economy sector emerging which was once just the third sector, and it is a significant part of the economy. It ranges from – at one end of a long continuum – small, local initiatives such as village halls, local markets, pre-school playgroups run by volunteers but often with some part-time paid work – playing a definite role in local economies, to – at the other end - substantial, highly commercial, competitive and successful businesses such as Govan Workspace in Glasgow, Coin Street Community Builders with its Oxo Tower on London's south bank, Greenwich Leisure (£50m turnover, 50 leisure centres in London, 3500 employees), Ealing Community Transport, the Big Issue and even the Eden Project in my native Cornwall. And in between are a vast range of enterprises and organisations – community co-ops (from which West of Ireland experience in the 1970s led to the innovative scheme in the Scottish Highlands and Islands in 1976 and later to the community business movement in central Scotland), social firms creating supported employment, credit unions, fair trade companies, development trusts, community businesses; as well as voluntary and community organisations and charities which increasingly earn much of their income from business and fulfil contracts from the public sector. **(UK – The Future of UK Social Enterprise)**

The Investment Plan makes a case for sustained investment in the sector and calls for action in several key areas in order for social enterprise to become a ‘real asset’ to the regional economy in ten years time. The proposed actions include:

- Access to appropriate sources of finance, including patient loans;
- Generation of revenue through effective marketing of goods and finance;
- Utilisation of asset transfer as a means of ensuring sustainability;
- Development of the skills and knowledge base of the sector;
- Further enabling of the procurement of public services; and
- Exploration of new market opportunities that could be pursued in an enabling business climate. **(UK – Social Enterprise Strategy for West Yorkshire)**

However, some research evidence is available in relation to the provision of residential and day care for the elderly by ‘third sector’ providers (although it is not known whether or not the providers studied had adopted a mutual form) (Kendall and Knapp 2000b). This suggests that these providers are superior to for-profit private or public sector providers in terms of efficiency and economy in some fields of care. Some of this advantage is attributed to the third sector’s ability to call upon a supply of volunteers and its better access to investments, endowments and reserves with which to subsidise fees. The research also finds that the third sector was better than the for-profit sector at engaging residents in leisure and recreational pursuits. However, few other differences were identified (Kendall 2003). Internationally there is more evidence of differences between the for-profit and not-for profit sectors in health services (the term ‘not-for-profit’ broadly relates to that of social enterprise in this country). This evidence supports the notion that a not-for-profit structure may offer a tangible advantage in the provision of health care. A review of research evidence, mostly from the United States, suggests that the not-for-profit sector generally provides services at lower cost, and with greater efficiency, than the for-profit sector (Duckett 2001, Devereaux *et al* 2004). The existing research evidence also tends to support the notion that not-for-profit providers offer higher quality care than the for-profit sector, with better survival rates, and better performance against quality measures (Devereaux *et al* 2002, Rosenau and Linder 2003). **(UK – Social Enterprise and Community Based Care)**

The consultation demonstrated that community owned or managed assets can be critical to the success of community organisations serving local needs, enabling communities to generate wealth, deliver services and strengthen community engagement. A key component of community capacity building is the development of assets and Local Authorities have a critical role to play in using the powers available to them in transferring ownership and management of assets for the benefit of the community. **(UK – The Role of the Third Sector in Social and Economic Regeneration)**

More is known about social enterprise than ever before. The most recent data from the Annual Small Business Survey, suggests that there are 55,000 social enterprises representing around 5 per cent of all businesses with employees. The combined turnover of these social enterprises is £27 billion with a contribution to GDP estimated to be around £8.4 billion. **(UK – The Role of the Third Sector in Social and Economic Regeneration)**

The Olympic Board is committed to ensuring that a diverse range of partners, including social enterprises, contribute to the delivery of the London 2012 Olympic Games, for example by a procurement policy which will seek to ensure open competition for contracts. The Office of the Third Sector has commissioned research to understand opportunities for social enterprise in the Olympics and the London Development Agency (LDA) is supporting a start-up programme, including social enterprise, to engage the workless in employment through enterprise. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) will work with the Office of the Third Sector, Defra and the DTI to promote ways in which mainstream regeneration funding can be used to develop sustainable social enterprise solutions, using case studies of successful practice. The Department for Communities and Local Government will publicise and promote ‘clawback’ guidance to local authorities,

detailing the extent to which a funding body should retain an interest in a transferred asset. From April 2007, the Office of the Third Sector will extend its strategic partners programme to provide £0.8 million a year for three years to support organisations representing social enterprises at a national level, to enable the sector to raise its own profile and influence public policy. **(UK - Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights)**

This plan is the next chapter in the Government's continuing support for social enterprises. Since the publication of its strategy in 2002, the Government has created a new legal form, the community interest company; improved business support and advice and the availability of finance; and supported the establishment of the Social Enterprise Coalition to provide a unified voice for the sector to work with government in raising the profile of social enterprise. The plan sets out the role of government in supporting social enterprises, and outlines actions that the Government will take in the next phase of its support. The actions in this document are not the end of the process. As we learn more about social enterprise, some actions may need to be added, others modified. **(UK - Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights)**

Findings from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor highlighted that women and certain ethnic minority groups were more likely to choose to be social entrepreneurs than conventional entrepreneurs (case study 6). In some regions, women are more likely than men to start up and run a social enterprise, in contrast to being less than half as likely to start up and run a conventional business. **(UK - Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights)**

There are four areas where the role of government is most important, and which are the focus of this document:

- Government can foster a culture where there is full information about the potential of social enterprise

- Government can ensure that the right information and advice are available to those running social enterprises.

- Government can enable social enterprises to access appropriate finance.

- Government can ensure that social enterprises are able to do business with the public sector and to work with government to achieve shared objectives. **(UK - Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights)**

Most social enterprises are one-off, stand-alone businesses, created to address a particular, and often local, need or issue. However, some business models and methodologies developed in one sector or geographic area may be able to be transferred and applied elsewhere. The Community Action Network, Social Firms UK, the North East Social Enterprise Partnership and partners, supported by the Phoenix Development Fund and the EU Equal programme, have investigated replication, using various approaches, ranging from franchising and licensing to less formal sharing of experience. There is scope for the learning from these projects to be disseminated more widely. **(UK - Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights)**

In order to help viable businesses that lack security to access loan finance, the Government offers a guarantee to lenders to take the place of the security provided by the business itself. Participating lenders can make use of the Small Firms Loan Guarantee partially to underwrite lending to social enterprises, providing the conditions of the scheme are met. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Office of the Third Sector have been leading work to

consider ways in which to facilitate an increase in community management and ownership of assets. The development of an asset base can help an organisation earn income and secure future borrowing. This issue is covered in more depth later in this plan. While the supply of debt finance, particularly secured debt finance, appears to be increasing, social enterprises still report difficulties in accessing more high-risk investment. This lack of equity is often perceived to be a barrier to high-growth social enterprises, and the Bank of England report identified a need for some form of ‘patient’ capital. In order to increase private investment, and to raise awareness of the possibilities among new investors, the Office of the Third Sector is supporting a research project by the Saïd Business School in Oxford into the feasibility of a ‘social’ capital market, in which investors interested in a blended social and financial return might be able to make and trade investments. **(UK - Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights)**

There has been a remarkable growth of interest in social enterprise over the last decade. We now have a raft of government policies to support social enterprise, the opposition parties are contesting the ground and there is almost daily coverage in the national media. And this is why: forward-thinking policy makers now recognise the potential of social enterprise to deliver on many of their goals – from better public services and urban regeneration to employment, social inclusion and the even the renewal of civil society. But the extent to which policy makers can help unleash the power of social enterprise remains to be seen. **(Jonathan Bland in UK – Social Enterprise Futures)**

Perhaps the most important action that government can take is to ensure the widespread promotion of social enterprise. Increasing understanding of what social enterprise is capable of is critical in local government and for all those involved in serving the public interest. Consumers and investors also need to increase their understanding of the benefits of social enterprise so that they can make better decisions about the way they spend and invest their money. It is also hugely important to promote social enterprise to entrepreneurs of all ages and all backgrounds. It is time to put forward social enterprise as, in Chancellor Gordon Brown’s words, “the new British business success story, forging a new frontier of enterprise”. **(Jonathan Bland in UK – Social Enterprise Futures)**

A number of key issues are drastically reducing the potential of the sector. For example, not all politicians are convinced of or even understand the extra value that social enterprises can bring. Sometimes this is just ignorance. Even worse, some have come up against poor social enterprise providers or providers who pretend to be social enterprises but are as staid and stolid as the organisations they hope to replace. For every traditionally minded public-sector official, there are two who seek to stop the growth of social enterprises because they challenge the concept that services are provided by either the public or private sector. The sterility of the debate on procurement is amazing. I find it hard to judge whether this is because of inertia or a reluctance to think through new options. **(UK – Social Enterprise Futures)**

“Well-being” is rising up the political agenda and perhaps the way forward is already clear. Social enterprises that are democratic, inclusive and community-led do not just provide jobs and create wealth, but they also use their business model to solve many issues that face communities. Whether it is managing our environment or finding a role for those excluded from society, social enterprises add value to mainstream

business. A community right to buy assets is already in place in Scotland. What a wonderful opportunity for England to follow. **(UK – Social Enterprise Futures)**

One of social enterprises' greatest problems is the perception that we attract preferential treatment, particularly from public policy. Far from providing an unfair advantage, this support is still actually insufficient to compensate for mainstream incentives and financial breaks that are unavailable to social enterprises. For example, tax breaks such as the enterprise investment scheme, venture capital trusts or even the use of offshore tax havens are often inappropriate for social enterprises. We also need to challenge misconceptions within the sector itself. We have a tendency to berate ourselves for receiving grants, and to worry about the particular percentages of different types of finance that we receive or create. Quite simply, it does not matter. The more important issue is whether your social enterprise is sustainable. In fact, it might be better to think about finance and funding in different ways. For example, I don't like "not for-profit" as a term, since you have to create profit to survive. And you could see grants as investments, and then you are not creating dependency. You could also treat grants just like contracts. **(Nigel Kershaw in UK – Social Enterprise Futures)**

There remains, at times, an uncritical espousal of the idea that social enterprises may offer a triple benefit of financial sustainability, integration of disadvantaged people and a social or environmental benefit. Such a message holds out a pledge that there will be little or no drawing on the public purse. In practice this is seldom the case where highly disadvantaged workers are concerned. The key factor here is that usually a disadvantaged workforce cannot work to the same productive level as a non-disadvantaged (especially because of lower skills or physical impairment) in a competitive private market. **(UK – Social Enterprise – Employment for Disadvantaged Groups)**

At a lower level of disadvantage or in areas where special conditions exist there is the prospect of some sustainability without any form of government support. Such special conditions may be where:

there is a niche market (for example, customers paying slightly more for a specialist soap produced by a Social Firm employing disadvantaged people)

market competition is weaker (for example where social enterprises entered a field initially unattractive or not noticed by commercial organisations – such as furniture or clothes collection and distribution to families in social need)

small numbers of disadvantaged people can be absorbed in a larger prosperous organisation (such as a highly profitable commercial company)

an organisation cross-subsidises or takes low wages (for example some co-operatives have taken this path as part of a social commitment). **(UK – Social Enterprise – Employment for Disadvantaged Groups)**

Part of the challenge in transforming the delivery of services, is that government and public bodies are by their nature very risk adverse. If the government is committed to commissioning innovative and better value public services they need develop a more proportional attitude to risk. Currently it is perceived that public services are insulated from failure, however this is not necessarily the case as this may just mean underperformance over a sustained period of time. The aversion to risk also prevents the commissioning of innovative services. A more proportional attitude would enable more social enterprises to win a greater number of contracts. **(UK – Social Enterprise Coalition Response to the Transformational Government Dialogue)**

We have examined the nature of the current barriers to the transfer of ownership and management of public assets to community groups and we have identified a number of issues that need to be addressed for this approach to become more widespread. In so doing, we recognise the following ten foundational factors:

- community groups and social enterprises are amazingly heterogeneous in scope, scale and capabilities and pursue a bewildering array of purposes and missions

- generally, community groups and social enterprises are seriously under-capitalised and therefore are constrained in their ability to realise their ambitions to heighten community and social benefit

- from a community perspective, the term “public assets” includes all public assets in a locality. Many of these are in the ownership of local authorities but a good deal are in the ownership of other public institutions (such as police authorities, fire authorities, health trusts, central government departments and so on)

- over the past twenty years, local authorities have been required to produce various plans and strategies to demonstrate their effective and efficient use of public resources – but community empowerment and asset management plans have not been at the forefront of these requirements.

- a considerable number of local authorities have used public asset transfer or asset management by communities as a policy instrument for empowering communities. However, too often approaches to asset transfer have been locally responsive and tactical and insufficiently located in a strategic plan for community empowerment and public asset management

- at the same time, while we have concluded that there are no substantive impediments to asset transfer to community groups, there is nevertheless considerable variation in the extent to which local authorities actively consider options for greater community ownership and management of public assets when they are setting their asset management plans

- relationships between councils and their local community and voluntary sectors are subject to considerable change and renewal. While there is some evidence of robust multi-year compacts between statutory and voluntary agencies at the local level, in too many instances the old orthodoxy of grant giving and rent subsidies has simply given way to a pseudo-contractual relationship based on annual service contracting. Too often this has produced unhealthy short-term horizons for councils and community groups alike

- local authorities are beginning to adopt a “stewardship” or convening role in respect of other public services in their localities. This development has been stimulated by local public service agreements and, more recently, by the government’s promotion of Local Area Agreements (LAAs), and the proposed duty on Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) partners to co-operate in the development and implementation of the LAA

- the asset base of the public sector (including local authorities) is currently subject to considerable investment, rationalisation and re-configuration, presenting both problems and opportunities to the development of this policy area. Councils need to sell a good deal of their asset base to finance investment in their retained assets. This review is concerned with the transfer of ownership and management of assets and not liabilities

- it is not sensible to attempt to “engineer” changes in policies for communities and councils as diverse as are found in Cornwall, Camden, Coventry and Carlisle. Engineering is achieved by “blueprints” – rules and practices that need to be followed precisely to structure the intended outcome. Communities and their councils cannot be engineered through blueprints. Instead they need “recipes” with ingredients

and guidelines that they can follow themselves and which will enable them to discover which particular mix makes most sense in their unique circumstances. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

Our approach is based on the simple idea that councils need to be encouraged to build their capacity in this area through smarter asset management planning and more active community engagement strategies; and at the same time community groups (and the third sector generally) need to be encouraged to develop their capabilities through the adoption of smarter social investment strategies. Put simply, we need to stimulate a renewal of both civic and community enterprise. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

We were driven to three firm conclusions:

- _ assets are used in service of an array of social, community and public purposes. Any sale or transfer of public assets to community ownership and management needs to realise social or community benefits without risking wider public interest concerns and without community purposes becoming overly burdened with asset management

- _ the benefits of community management and ownership of public assets can outweigh the risks and often the opportunity costs in appropriate circumstances. And if there is a rational and thorough consideration of these risks and opportunity costs, there are no substantive impediments to the transfer of public assets to communities. It can be done, indeed it has been done legitimately and successfully in very many places

- _ there are risks but they can be minimised and managed – there is plenty of experience to draw on. The secret is all parties working together. This needs political will, managerial imagination and a more business focused approach from the public and community sectors. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

As a result, we concluded that five key actions could make a decisive difference:

- _ the publication of comprehensive, up-to-date and authoritative guidance on all aspects of local authority asset management, including within it detailed and explicit guidance on the transfer of assets to community management and ownership

- _ the publication of a toolkit for local authorities and other public bodies on risk assessment and risk management in asset transfer to communities

- _ much greater access for local authorities and community organisations to expert advice and organisational development support relating particularly to the transfer and management by communities of land and buildings

- _ the smarter investment of public funds designated for community-led asset-based developments, where permissible, through the involvement of specialist financial intermediaries with expertise in the field and the ability to achieve high leverage ratios

- _ a major campaign to spread the word, through seminars, roadshows, training, use of the media, online and published information, and the dissemination of good practice, as well as promotion of “bottom up mechanisms” such as the proposed Community Call for Action and the Public Request to Order Disposal (PROD) scheme. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

There can be significant direct and indirect benefits for the community in which an asset is situated:

- _ users of assets that are in the control of the community, whether individuals or groups, are better able to plan for the future

_ wealth creation activities, often deliberately aimed to create jobs for local people, will directly bring increased income and improved health within the local community

_ wealth creation and the revaluing through new use of an existing facility, be it a centre, a shop, a housing estate, or a school, can have a powerful multiplier effect. It can restore confidence in that place, it can restore the viability of local businesses, it can help to reverse the exodus of residents and businesses, it can help to restore land values and attract new investment

_ asset-based, community anchor organisations with a broad community remit and a multipurpose function can play a powerful role in promoting community cohesion by bridging the ethnic, faith and other divisions that may be present in communities, and promoting mutual understanding and harmony. Asset ownership can have a major effect in building community confidence and a sense of worth

_ the surpluses generated by the community organisation remain in the community and can support innovative projects through small grants and the availability of community facilities and development support

_ the buildings that are taken over by communities will sometimes occupy iconic status in that community – perhaps a miners’ welfare centre, a disused town hall, or a redundant church. Restoring them to productive use, that directly addresses current local needs, can give a significant psychological boost to local communities giving them a new hope in their future. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

Local service-providers can also benefit both directly and indirectly from community ownership and management of assets in a number of ways:

_ local service providers may find themselves with a local partner which can tap resources they cannot, complement the services they provide, and act as a channel for user and community feedback in response to service provision

_ asset-based organisations can often offer a base for neighbourhood-based service provision, making it more accessible to local people. This is particularly important in rural areas, where services are being lost

_ asset transfer can enable community organisations to support a public body in delivering its objectives in a ways that are more community-responsive and more closely related to local needs

_ the impact of the community benefits described above will have a direct and positive effect on the pressures experienced by local services, such as the National Health Service, welfare support, education and the Criminal Justice System, enabling them to focus their resources on the highest priority needs. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

We were asked to consider whether local authorities and other public bodies have sufficient powers to take the initiative to transfer assets to community management and ownership on preferential terms, where they feel there is a justifiable case. Our conclusion was that local authorities (and other statutory bodies covered by the same legislation) do have the powers they need. The barriers are the widespread lack of awareness of those powers and how they could be used and, in some cases, an unwillingness to make use of them. **(UK – Making Assets Work: The Quirk Review)**

The transfer of land and property to community organisations in order to help them become sustainable in the long term is a stated aim of government policy. The government has accepted in full the recommendations of the review into the subject

led by Barry Quirk, chief executive of the London Borough of Lewisham. The Local Government White Paper promotes asset transfer as a key part of local authorities' 'place-shaping' role, as does the Government's Third Sector Strategy. A £30 million fund to finance refurbishment costs of transferred buildings to be administered by the Big Lottery is currently being delivered. **UK – Advancing Asset Transfer–Implementing the Quirk Review)**

A YouGov poll commissioned by the Social Enterprise Coalition (SEC) in 2007 suggested that over 60 percent of the British public would choose businesses which reinvest their profits in local communities to run local services such as healthcare, rubbish collection and transport, adding weight to the government's drive to expand social enterprise participation in public service delivery. **(UK – Social Enterprise and Business Creation)**

NORHTERN IRELAND

Praxis is a company limited by guarantee without share capital. It is a registered charity, managed by a volunteer board of directors. The organisation has evolved from a small grant dependent voluntary organisation, providing a befriending service to people with mental ill health into a complex and commercially viable social enterprise providing a wide range of support services and accommodation for adults and children with learning disabilities, acquired brain injury or mental health problems and for elderly people in need of support. Its current organisational form was established by the merger in 2002 of 4 distinct organisations that had evolved over time as a strategy to address the issues they faced and to provide services for an expanding range of client groups. **(Northern Ireland – Social Enterprise in Health and Social Care Sector)**

The sector is an integral part of the NI economy and a number of Government Departments/Agencies already work with social economy enterprises. However, it is widely recognised both within and outside central Government, that a more integrated approach to the sector's development is needed to promote increased awareness of its value and particular significance to the Northern Ireland economy and its potential for development and further growth. **(Northern Ireland – Developing a Successful Social Economy)**

DETI has already put in place a number of key structures to develop this process of integration and partnership with the sector, for example:

- the funding of the Social Economy Agency (jointly with the Department for Social Development and the EU Programme for Building Sustainable Prosperity) to facilitate the establishment of an inclusive Social Economy Network to represent the sector;

- the formation of an Inter-Departmental Steering Group (IDSG) to represent the 11 NI Departments and develop greater cross-Departmental co-operation, including preparation of this Three - Year Strategic Plan and first year Action Plan; and

- the creation of the Social Economy Forum where representatives from the Network and officials from IDSG and Government can work together in constructive partnership. **(Northern Ireland – Developing a Successful Social Economy)**

Three key strategic objectives will facilitate Government's action to develop the social economy. They are to increase awareness of the sector and establish its value to the local economy; develop the sector and increase its business strength; and create a supportive and enabling environment. **(Northern Ireland – Developing a Successful Social Economy)**

Successful implementation of this Strategic Plan should result in a more sustainable and diverse social economy, the establishment of more social economy enterprises in some social economy sectors and the development and growth of established social economy enterprises that are already trading and making a distinct and valued contribution to social and economic development in Northern Ireland. DETI will take forward this work and is developing a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and will report progress on the implementation of this Strategic Plan through meetings of the Social Economy Network Steering Group, which meets quarterly and at the Social Economy Forum, which meets twice yearly. An annual progress report will also be published. Towards the end of the three-year period, overall progress will be reviewed in an external evaluation process, in consultation with the sector, to determine the way forward. **(Northern Ireland – Developing a Successful Social Economy)**

SCOTLAND

Recent years have seen an increasing involvement in public service delivery of social economy organisations which combine a business-like approach to delivering services with one or more explicit social objectives. Organisations such as the Richmond Fellowship, the Wise Group, One Plus and the Glasgow Simon Community, and many others, have demonstrated a capacity to grow their organisations by finding and developing market opportunities and by acting in entrepreneurial and innovative ways, working with those responsible for commissioning public services to deliver new, effective and customer-orientated public services. And now, increasing numbers of voluntary sector bodies are playing an effective part in delivering on key Executive agendas in terms of service delivery and in contributing to the regeneration of disadvantaged communities. **(SCOTLAND – A Review of the Scottish Executive's Policies to Promote the Social Economy)**

In particular, we believe that: there is scope for the social economy to increase its contribution to the social and economic well-being of Scotland; social economy organisations are particularly effective in working with excluded and disadvantaged people and the social economy should be encouraged to help tackle poverty and deprivation wherever it exists. **(SCOTLAND - Future Builders Scotland – Investing in the Social Economy)**

Futurebuilders Scotland is an £18 million investment in the social economy to run over the financial years 2004-05 and 2005-06. Its purpose is to extend and strengthen the role of the social economy sector in delivering better public services. It consists of a £16 million Direct Investment Fund, which is underpinned by £1 million training fund and a £1 million support programme. The Direct Investment Fund will invest £16 million directly in social economy organisations delivering services to the public. It will be split into two sections:

a £12 million Investment Fund which will award grants to medium to large sized social economy organisations that have established a reputation as service providers. This is designed to encourage capital investment and to encourage them to

operate in a more business-like fashion, helping them to develop their financial sustainability; and

a £4 million Seedcorn Fund which will award grants to emerging organisations to develop new ideas and enlarge existing schemes that will contribute to their growth and sustainability. It will include a programme of small grants which will encourage new social entrepreneurs to turn local ideas into live projects. **(SCOTLAND - Future Builders Scotland – Investing in the Social Economy)**

Social economy organisations have clearly identified requirements to develop their asset base to both increase their stability and to give access to new forms of funding. We therefore intend that at least 70% of this fund should be devoted to capital investment projects. The development of an asset base will not only help organisations to gain access to alternative sources of funding in the future; it will also be key in enabling organisations develop sustainable services. **(SCOTLAND - Future Builders Scotland – Investing in the Social Economy)**

Our key objective is that over the period of implementation, 500 social economy organisations will develop their service delivery activities **in areas of direct relevance to the delivery of Executive priorities**. That is our key objective, but we will in addition track the following: increase in number of tenders for public service delivery. Increase in number of organisations taking on a specific public service delivery contracts for the first time; the creation of new employment or development opportunities (particularly for young people and individuals furthest from employment within the sector); the uptake of training opportunities; increase in accredited qualifications; and number and value of community assets. **(SCOTLAND - Future Builders Scotland – Investing in the Social Economy)**

Public spending can be a powerful tool. A visionary approach to using the power of public spending could radically transform the long-standing problems facing Scotland's communities. The government should show leadership in ensuring that public spending for community benefit becomes a key creative strategy for achieving multiple objectives across economic and social policy. **(SCOTLAND - Response to Scottish Labour Party 'Growing Scotland's Economy' Consultation)**

The strategy refers to the contribution that social enterprise can make to the regeneration of our most deprived communities. However in this context the strategy seems to imply that the key contribution is restricted to improving the employability of those most disadvantaged in the labour market. While this is undoubtedly one of the benefits, community owned social enterprise can have a much more profound impact at a local level. Community owned social enterprise can be the driver of very significant regeneration, transforming local quality of life and reversing economic, social and environmental decline. In particular successful community owned business enable 'community anchor' organisations such as development trusts to grow and develop their own local plans and meet local priorities from within their own resources. The presence of effective community anchor organisations is widely recognised as being a prerequisite of successful sustainable community renewal. **(SCOTLAND - Social Enterprise Strategy for Scotland: A Response from the Development Trusts Association)**

Social enterprise has a vital role to play in helping us meet some of our main commitments for Scotland – growing the economy; delivering excellent public services; supporting stronger communities; closing the opportunity gap – together

with developing a vibrant third sector. Our vision is of social enterprise as a dynamic, sustainable and credible way of doing business, delivering services and actively improving our communities. We want to develop social enterprise as a realistic and attractive option for those who want to use their talents, energy and creativity to change communities for the better. **(SCOTLAND – Better Business: A Strategy for Social Enterprise in Scotland)**

This strategy highlights the important contribution social enterprise can make to life in Scotland. This includes contributing to economic growth and business development; delivering services focused on the needs of people; regenerating and empowering people in our most deprived communities and playing a major role in supported employment. Many social enterprises operating in Scotland are directly involved with delivery of aspects of Scotland's sustainable development strategy, *Choosing our Future*, for example through waste recycling. **(SCOTLAND – Better Business: A Strategy for Social Enterprise in Scotland)**

In putting our vision into practice we have set out four strategic aims in the strategy -

Aim 1 Raising the profile and proving the value of social enterprise

Aim 2 Opening up markets to social enterprise

Aim 3 Increasing the range of finance available to develop social enterprise

Aim 4 Developing the trading capacity of social enterprises by providing better business support

These initial actions will take place between April 2007 and March 2008. We will then publish an update to this strategy in light of decisions taken during the Strategic Spending Review 2007, which will set Scottish Executive budgets from 2008 to 2011. The second phase will be informed by our monitoring of the impact of this first phase of support for social enterprise. **(SCOTLAND – Better Business: A Strategy for Social Enterprise in Scotland)**

Futurebuilders Scotland – Investing in the Social Economy (2004) sets out that there should be local social economy partnerships (LSEPs) to cover all local authority areas in Scotland. The 30 LSEPs which have been set up to date cover almost all local authority areas. Each LSEP includes Communities Scotland, Scottish Enterprise or Highlands and Islands Enterprise, the local authority and the local council for voluntary services as the central partners. The overall goal of these partnerships is to support the growth of the social economy by improving co-ordination; facilitating local networking; strengthening the range of locally available support; and unlocking market opportunities for new and existing social economy organisations. Many local partnerships have made good progress. However, there have been a range of challenges for LSEPs. We believe LSEPs have a significant local role in delivering this strategy but realise that there is a need to clarify the role of partnerships and consider resource requirements to allow partnerships to make the fullest contribution possible. **(SCOTLAND – Better Business: A Strategy for Social Enterprise in Scotland)**

Public Social Partnership (PSP) is a new approach to public service delivery. The most successful examples of PSP are founded upon a co-planning approach, whereby partners from the public sector and the social economy sector share responsibility for service design, in order to optimise outcomes for service users. The Scottish Government has emphasised that, for the public sector, the social economy sector's proven ability to innovate and experience in working with particular client groups can

provide the opportunity for wider social benefit when the two work together to deliver public services. These wider social benefits represent social added value for the public sector, and have the potential to contribute to the attainment of Best Value. **(SCOTLAND – Public Social Partnership in Scotland: Lessons Learned)**

The overarching message to emerge from this evaluation is that participants of PSP within both sectors must buy in to a shared problem definition and solution. **(SCOTLAND – Public Social Partnership in Scotland: Lessons Learned)**

From the pilots, it appears that as an innovative and therefore somewhat riskier approach to public service delivery, PSP needs to have high level public sector support. Ideally this should exist in the form of champions, namely civil servants and senior officers, elected members and representatives. It is essential that these individuals are embedded in the relevant public sector agency, that they buy into the concept of PSP and that they have the capacity to draw upon a broad base of support within their own organisation. **(SCOTLAND – Public Social Partnership in Scotland: Lessons Learned)**

Whilst the public and social economy sectors appear to take a favourable view of the concept of PSP, in a practice, it is apparent that there is a need for culture change within both sectors. The co-planning approach, the method recommended by this evaluation, requires participants in both sectors to enter into partnership as equals. There have been times, within all three pilots, where the importance of this, and the time it takes to make this happen, has been underestimated. **(SCOTLAND – Public Social Partnership in Scotland: Lessons Learned)**

The inclusion of social requirements within tenders and contracts provides the opportunity to take into account social and environmental matters within contracts to supply goods, services or works where these requirements would perhaps not conventionally have been included as measured outcomes. By virtue of the new EU Services Directive, there are two tools available to achieve this, namely reserved contracts and social clauses. Reserved Contracts provide that Member States may reserve the right to participate in public contract award procedures to sheltered workshops or provide for such contracts to be performed in the context of sheltered employment programmes where most of the employees concerned are handicapped persons who, by reason of the nature or the seriousness of their disabilities, cannot carry on occupations under normal conditions. Social and Environmental Clauses provide that contracting authorities may lay down special conditions relating to the performance of a contract, provided that these are compatible with Community law and are indicated in the contract notice or in the specifications. The conditions governing the performance of a contract may, in particular, concern social and environmental considerations. **(SCOTLAND – Public Social Partnership in Scotland: Lessons Learned)**

For some organisations and groups the advice needs to be to concentrate on how to deliver core services and not be distracted by the business models, funding streams and business support on offer to social enterprises. While resources are quite rightly being allocated to develop and support social enterprises with a view to creating a dynamic and sustainable sector in Scotland, The Scottish Government in particular needs to ensure that there are appropriate measures in place to support the whole of the social economy, not just the subsector that is suited to developing its trading capacity. **(SCOTLAND – CEiS: Developing and Inclusive Economy)**

Scotland is of a scale that lends itself particularly well to organisations working together and delegates from other countries are struck by the closeness of those in and supporting our social enterprise sector. This makes it feasible to introduce initiatives, disseminate new policies and promote good practice to people from all over the country quickly and more effectively than elsewhere. We can use this to our advantage as the social enterprise sector develops and matures, engaging with different business models, addressing leadership and governance issues and influencing economic and social policy throughout the country. **(SCOTLAND – CEiS: Developing and Inclusive Economy)**

GLASGOW

Our principle objective is to promote sustainable development of this important sector in the city's economy. It will be the job of the Partnership to better co-ordinate the actions of partners aimed at supporting and growing the social economy. Following the consultation period on this draft, we will develop an action plan for 2006-08. **(GLASGOW – Glasgow Social Economy Partnership Strategy Statement)**

The Glasgow Social Economy Partnership was formalised in 2004 after publication of the Scottish Executive document 'Futurebuilders Scotland: Investing in the Social Economy'. Current partners are:

- Glasgow City Council (Chair)
- Scottish Enterprise Glasgow
- Greater Glasgow Health Board
- Communities Scotland
- Community Enterprise in Strathclyde
- Glasgow Local Development Company Network
- Glasgow Alliance
- Glasgow Council for Voluntary Service
- Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations
- Glasgow Economic Forum
- WISE Group Ltd
- One Plus Ltd

Membership will be reviewed regularly to ensure that all interests are represented. We have attempted to create a balanced inaugural partnership, featuring as it does broad representation from the public and voluntary sectors. In addition, WISE Group and One Plus participate as representatives of the social economy sector. **(GLASGOW – Glasgow Social Economy Partnership Strategy Statement)**

Organisations represented on the GSEP all have individual strategies which in some way reflect the aim of assisting development of the social economy in Glasgow. Motivations and starting point will vary. For this reason, the compilation of a 'Position Statement' on what each partner's priorities are will be a key early task for the Partnership. This in turn will lead to production of a 'Matrix of Support' for the sector in the city. Identification of gaps from this piece of work will be pivotal in identifying priority actions to move our joint agenda forward. **(GLASGOW – Glasgow Social Economy Partnership Strategy Statement)**

The Glasgow Social Economy Partnership has seven key objectives, separated into 'Policy' objectives and 'Sector Development' objectives:

Policy Objectives

Assisting the social economy to contribute to reducing economic inactivity in the city's most deprived communities and helping to 'Close the Opportunity Gap' by:

Increasing the chances of sustained employment for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups;

Improving the confidence and skills of the most disadvantaged children and young people to enhance employability;

Reducing the vulnerability of low income families to financial exclusion and multiple debts;

Increasing the rate of improvement of the health status of people living in the most deprived communities in order to improve their quality of life, including their employability prospects.

Sector Development Priorities

Promoting growth and improving the financial sustainability of social economy organisations by:

Building the capacity of their staff and governing bodies;

Improving their asset base and access to investment and funding;

Opening up access to the bidding process for public sector contracts in the context of Best Value. **(GLASGOW – Glasgow Social Economy Partnership Strategy Statement)**

LONDON

The Taskforce operates as a forum where key London players can come together to address barriers facing social enterprises in the Capital and create solutions to these barriers. It also seeks to ensure that the sector receives the right support and assistance in order to develop, thus enabling social enterprises to deliver solutions to key economic and social issues affecting London. The Taskforce includes governance bodies such as the Association of London Government, the London Development Agency, Government Office for London, and the Greater London Authority as well as strategic agencies such as Social Enterprise London, Business Link for London and London Voluntary Services Council. The Taskforce also includes interested networks and other bodies such as the Community Action Network, Development Trusts Association, Social Firms South East, London Rebuilding Society, ABCUL, the Cross River Partnership, Greater London Enterprise, as well as funding bodies such as the Bridge House Estates Trust. The Taskforce is chaired and serviced by Social Enterprise London. **(LONDON – A Social Enterprise Business Support Strategy for London)**

The production of the strategy has been jointly funded by: Business Link for London, The Association of London Government, The London Development Agency and the Government Office for London. **(LONDON – A Social Enterprise Business Support Strategy for London)**

Local authorities have several roles to play in supporting the social enterprise sector – as funders of social enterprises and social enterprise support services, as deliverers of support services to social enterprises directly and as the key strategic agency developing Community Strategies and Local Neighbourhood Renewal Strategies through Local Strategic Partnerships (i.e. with other partners). This is in addition to local authorities as purchasers of public services, if they decide to contract them out. Local Authorities are becoming increasingly aware that in some areas social

enterprise and the social economy can be effective and cost-efficient delivery agents. **(LONDON – A Social Enterprise Business Support Strategy for London)**

Better support for the sector will come when government (at all levels), the financial community and business advisors understand its nature and needs better, are convinced of its value, and alter their practices to incorporate the social enterprise model. To achieve these results, we need to be able to demonstrate the current and potential contribution of the sector to the UK economy and to the delivery of social objectives. We need to engage in active promotion, to give a higher profile to the sector and help spread understanding. Raising awareness and celebrating success and entrepreneurial achievement is important. The sector also needs to come together to make social enterprise stronger and more visible. **(LONDON – A Social Enterprise Business Support Strategy for London)**

The main features of a Social Enterprise Zone were described as:

- A focus on harnessing all areas of government in the attempt to solve deprivation.

- Licence from central government to change rules and regulations that frustrate regeneration.

- Partnership across public sector agencies and with the private sector and community organisations.

 - Involvement of both users and staff of public agencies.

 - Freedom and willingness to innovate.

- Creation of a positive, forward-looking cooperative culture rather than the sometimes negative, depressed, defensive, cynical culture that currently exists.

- Reinvestment in the SEZ of savings gained by operating more efficient public services.

 - A long-term project 20 years in the completing.

(LONDON – Enduring Change: The Experience of Community Links Social Enterprise Zone)

APPENDIX B – BIBLIOGRAPHY

General

Simons R (2000): *Social Enterprise – An Opportunity to Harness Capacities*. The Smith Family.

Allen B (2004): *Social Enterprise through the Eyes of the Consumer*. National Consumer Council.

Howard L (2004): *Equity Like Capital for Social Ventures*. Bridges Community Ventures.

Boswell J, Campbell C (2006): *Social Enterprise and Health Improvement*. Senscot Network.

Bull M (2006): *Balance – Unlocking Performance in Social Enterprise*. Centre for Enterprise, Manchester Metropolitan University.

Co-operatives UK (2006): *Social Enterprises with a wider Market Focus*. Department of Education and Skills.

Tracey P, Jarvis O (2006): *An Enterprising Failure – Why a Promising Social Enterprise Collapsed*. In: Stanford Social Innovation Review.

Cornelius, N, Todres, M, Janjuha-Jivraj, S, Woods, A and Wallace, J. (2007): *Capabilities and the Social Enterprise*. In: Journal of Business Ethics.

Kleiman N, Rosenbaum N (2007): *The Limits of Social Enterprise*. Seedco Policy Center.

Seanor P, Bull M, Ridley-Duff R (2007): *Mapping Social Enterprise – Do Social Enterprise Actors Draw Straight Lines or Circles*. 4th Annual Social Enterprise Research Conference. Huddersfield University Business School.

Spear R, Cornforth C, Aiken M (2007): *Governance and Social Enterprise*. 1st International CIRIEC Research Conference on the Social Economy.

Institute for Social Entrepreneurs (2008): *Evolution of the Social Enterprise Industry*. Institute for Social Entrepreneurs

Virtue Ventures (2008): *Social Enterprise and Poverty Alleviation-Boundary Conditions and Guiding Principles*. The SEEP Network.

European Union

Evans M (2001): *Social Capital and Social Economy in Europe*. CONSCISE Project
Giannakou M (2003): *Social Enterprises in Europe and the Development of a Common Strategy in the European Union*. Government of Greece.

Defourny J (2005): *Social Enterprise in an Enlarged Europe*. EMES Network.

Austrian Institute for SME Research (2007): *Study on Practices and Policies in the Social Enterprise Sector in Europe*. European Union.

Buscaglia F, Marina M, Tarantola G (2007): *New Market Opportunities for Social Enterprises in the European Union*. Associazione Lavoro e Integrazione.

Ireland

O'Shaughnessy M (2005): *Work Integration Social Enterprises in Ireland*. EMES Network.

O'Shaughnessy M, Fenton M, O'Hara P (2005): *Exploring the Differences – A Comparative Analysis of Irish Rural and Urban Social Enterprises* (Draft). Centre for Co-operative Studies, NUI, Cork.

Donoghue F, Prizeman G, O'Regan A, Noel V (2006): *The Hidden Landscape – First Forays into Mapping Non Profit Organisations in Ireland*. Centre for Non Profit Management, Trinity College Dublin.

Belgium

Cell Social Economy (2005): *Work Integration Social Enterprises in Belgium*. EMES Network.

Development Centre of Oinousses, Agean (2007): *A Report of Best Practices of Social Enterprises in Belgium, Greece, Italy and Slovakia*. DP Telemachus.

Hendrickx P, De Leeuw E, Baeyens B (2008): *Capacity Building for the Social Economy in Belgium*. CONNECT.

Canada

Strandberg, C (2004): *Over the Horizon – The Future of Canada's Capital Market for Social and Environmental Innovation. Social Capital Roundtable*, Vancouver, Canada.

Armstrong K, (2006): *Social Enterprise Impact Assessment Project – A Literature Review*. Canadian National Social Impact Assessment Steering Committee.

Cameron S (2006): *Community Investing in Canada*. Canadian Community Investment Network Co-operative Canada.

Gould S (2006): *Social Enterprise and Business Structures in Canada*. Fraser Valley Centre for Social Enterprise, Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada.

Gyarmati D, de Raff S, Nicholson C, Palameta B, Shek-Wai Hui T, MacInnis M (2007): *Improving Skills, Networks and Livelihoods through Community Based Work*. Social Research and Demonstration Corporation.

LePage D (2007): *A Supportive Environment – Public Policy*. Canadian Summit on Social Entrepreneurship.

Martin P (2007): *Unleashing the Power of Social Enterprise*. Munk Centre, Toronto, Canada.

Mendell M (2007): *Social Enterprise – A North American Perspective*. Social Enterprise Conference, Bucharest, Romania.

Strandberg C (2007): *Report on Canada's First National Social Finance Forum*. Toronto 2007 Social Finance Forum.

France

Acevo (2006): *Towards a New “Entente Cordiale” – Exploring Common Values, Goals and Language*. Acevo

Eme B, Gardin L (2006): *National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – France*. EMES Network.

Milner, S (2007): *Whatever Happened to the French Ministry for the Social Economy? 57th Annual PSA Conference*.

Klapper R, Lauriol J (2008): *The Economic versus the Social Entrepreneur – Towards a “Hybridisation” – Examples from the French Context*. Groupe ESC Rouen

Germany

Bode I, Evers A, Schulz A (2006): *Work Integration Social Enterprises in Germany*. EMES Network.

Netherlands

de Kam G (2005): *Social Enterprise in the Dutch Property Market*. University of Nijmegen.

Spain

Martinez V, Jubany C (2006): *National Profiles of Work Integration Social Enterprises – Spain*. EMES Network.

Vidal I, Claver N (2006): *The Socio-Economic Performance of Spanish Social Enterprises in the Field of Integration of Work*. Centro de Investigación de Economía y Sociedad (CIES).

United Kingdom

Department of Trade and Industry, UK Government (2002): *Social Enterprise – A Strategy for Success*. Department of Trade and Industry, UK Government.

- Social Enterprise Coalition (2003): *There's More to Enterprise than You Think – A Guide to Social Enterprise*. Social Enterprise Coalition.
- Co-operative Assistance Network (2004): *A Delivery Plan for Social Enterprise Support in the Wider West of England*. Avon Co-operative Development Agency.
- Co-operative Assistance Network Ltd, Upstart Services Ltd (2004): *Report into the Feasibility of developing a Social Enterprise Incubator Unit for the West Howe area of Bournemouth*. Dorset Co-operative Development Agency.
- Watkins-Young L, Jackson-Read C, Neil A (2004): *Unlocking Social Enterprise – Infrastructure Support for Social Enterprise in Herefordshire and Worcestershire*. Herefordshire and Worcestershire County Councils.
- Herefordshire and Worcestershire Partnerships (2005): *The Social Enterprise Strategy for Herefordshire and Worcestershire*. Herefordshire and Worcestershire Partnerships.
- IFF Research (2005): *A Survey of Social Enterprises Across the UK*. UK Department of Trade and Industry.
- Pearce J (2005): *The Future of Social Enterprise in the UK*. Wales-Ireland Social Economy Link (WISElink), Dublin, December 2005.
- Reed H, Stanley K (2005): *Social Enterprise and its Potential in Public Service Delivery*. Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Social Enterprise Link (2005): *The Social Enterprise Strategy for West Yorkshire*. West Yorkshire Enterprise Partnership.
- South East England Development Agency (2005): *South East England Social Enterprise Strategy*. South East England Development Agency
- Williams V (2005): *Social Enterprise for Community Food Projects – A Solution to the Funding Conundrum or Just another 'Magic Bullet'?* SUSTAIN – The Alliance for Better Food and Farming.
- Brooks B (2006): *Report on Social Enterprise Option for the Delivery and Social Care Services in the Local Area for Stroud District Council*. The King's Fund.
- HMS Treasury (2006): *The Role of the Third Sector in Social and Economic Regeneration – Interim Report*. HMS Treasury.
- Lewis R, Hunt P, Carson D (2006): *Social Enterprise and Community-Based Care*. The King's Fund.
- Office of the Third Sector (2006): *Social Enterprise Action Plan – Scaling New Heights*. Office of the Third Sector, UK Cabinet Office.
- Somers A (2006): *Exploring the Role of English Local Government in Social Enterprise Development*. London South Bank University.

Aiken M (2007): *What is the Role of Social Enterprise in Finding, Creating and Maintaining Employment for Disadvantaged Groups?* Office of the Third Sector, UK Cabinet Office.

Hart T, Haughton G (2007) *Assessing the Economic and Social Impacts of Social Enterprise – Feasibility Report*. Centre for City and Regional Studies, Department of Geography, University of Hull.

Leadbetter C (2007): *Social Enterprise and Social Innovation – Strategies for the Next Ten Years*. Office of the Third Sector, UK Cabinet Office.

Millington B (2007): *Haringey Social Enterprise Strategy 2007-2012 (Consultation Draft)*. Haringey Council Regeneration Team.

Nicholls J (2007): *Why Measuring and Communicating Social Value Can Help Social Enterprise Become More Competitive*. Office of the Third Sector, UK Cabinet Office.

Office of the Third Sector (2007): *Social Enterprise Action Plan – One Year On..* Office of the Third Sector, UK Cabinet Office.

Russell R, Scott D (2007): *Social Enterprise in Practice*. Charities Aid Foundation.

Walstall A, Chalkley D (2007): *Social Enterprise Futures*. The Smith Institute

Westall A (2007): *How Can Innovation in Social Enterprise be Understood, Encouraged and Enabled?* Office of the Third Sector, UK Cabinet Office.

ECOTEC (2008): *Social Enterprise and Business Creation*. ECOTEC

France E S (2008): *Social Enterprise and Children's Services*. VCS Engage.

Harding D, Harding R (2008): *Social Entrepreneurship in the UK*. Delta Economics.

Peattie K, Morley A (2008) *Social Enterprises – Diversity and Dynamics, Contexts and Contributions*. Social Enterprise Coalition.

Public Administration Select Committee (2008): *Public Services and the Third Sector – Rhetoric and Reality*. Public Administration Select Committee, House of Commons, United Kingdom.

South East England Development Agency (2008): *Social Enterprise – Scaling New Heights. National Social Enterprise Action Plan. One Year On – Progress Report for the English Regional Development Agencies*. South East England Development Agency

Walker D (2008): *Misplaced Faith in Social Enterprise*. The Guardian, 16.07.2008.

Northern Ireland

Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment, Northern Ireland (2004): *Developing a Successful Social Economy – NI Government's Three-Year Strategic*

Plan 2004-07, Including Action Plan for 2004-05. Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment, Northern Ireland

Social Economy Agency (2006): *Social Enterprise in the Health and Social Care Sector.* Social Economy Network.

Ontario

Merrifield S, (2006): *Supporting the Social Economy in Ontario – FedNor’s Strategy.* Communities Under Pressure Conference.

Scotland

Scottish Executive (2003): *A Review of the Scottish Executive’s Policies to Promote the Social Economy.* Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2004): *Future Builders Scotland – Investing in the Social Economy.* Scottish Executive.

Scottish Social Enterprise Coalition (2005): *Response to Scottish Labour Party ‘Growing Scotland’s Economy’ Consultation.* Scottish Social Enterprise Coalition

Birch K, Whittam G (2006): *The Role of the Social Economy, Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Sustainable Regional Development.* Centre for Public Policy for Regions.

Hardie A (2006): *A Social Enterprise Strategy for Scotland – Response from Development Trusts Association Scotland.* DTAS.

ODS Consulting (2006): *Perceptions of the Social Economy.* Communities Scotland.

McDonald K, Wilson L, Jack A (2007): *Public Social Partnership in Scotland – Lessons Learned.* Forth Sector.

Scottish Executive (2007): *Better Business – A Strategy and Action Plan for Social Enterprise in Scotland.* Communities Scotland.

Social Enterprise Institute, Harriot Watt University (2007): *Developing the Social Economy – Critical Review of Literature.* Communities Scotland.

EKOS, Ltd (2008): *Scoping Study – Support for Social Enterprise Start-ups in Scotland.* Scottish Government Social Research

Bristol

Fowler T, (2005): *Report on Asset Transfers.* Bristol City Council.

Fowler T, (2005): *Social Economy Bristol Development Programme – Information Brief.* Bristol City Council.

Glasgow

Glasgow Social Economy Partnership (2005): *Glasgow Social Economy Partnership Strategy Statement (Consultation Draft)*. Glasgow Social Economy Partnership

CEiS (2007): *Social Enterprise Business Models – Conference Report*. CEiS Conference, Glasgow, 2007.

London

London Social Economy Taskforce (2002): *A Social Enterprise Business Strategy for London – Time to Deliver*. Social Enterprise London.

Economic and Social Development Committee, Greater London Authority (2004): *Social Enterprises in London*. Greater London Authority.

Smerdon M, Robinson D (2004): *Enduring Change – The Experience of the Community Links Enterprise Zone*. Policy Press for the Joseph Roundtree Foundation.

Social Enterprise London (2006): *Access to Enterprise – Using Social Enterprise to Tackle Homelessness*. Social Enterprise London.

Greater London Authority (2007): *Social Enterprises in London – A Review of London Annual Business Survey (LABS) Evidence*. Greater London Authority.

London Development Agency (2007): *LDA Social Enterprise Business Support Proposal to the Office of the Third Sector*. London Development Agency

Macalister T (2008): *Going to Waste*. The Guardian 16.07.2008

Warrell H, (2008): *Social Enterprises Win London 2012 Transport Contract*. Third Sector on Line 10.04.2008.

APPENDIX C - WEB SITE DATA BASE

IRELAND

Alliances, Networks, etc.

The Rural Initiative for Social Economy www.rise.ie

Support Agencies

Cavan Monaghan Rural Development www.cmr.d.ie

Ashoka www.ashoka.ie

Social Economy Bridging Programme www.sebp.org.uk

Social Entrepreneurs Ireland www.socialentrepreneursireland.ie

School for Social Entrepreneurs in Ireland www.sse.org.uk

Networks: Cross Border Community Enterprise Programme www.crossbordnetworks.com

Open4Social Enterprise: Cork City www.open4socialenterprise.ie

Social Enterprises

ALISON: The Free Global Learning Experience www.alison.com

CANADA

Alliances, Networks, etc.

Canadian Social Entrepreneurs Network www.csen.ca

Canadian Worker Co-op Federation www.canadianworker.coop

Data Bases

Enterprising Non Profits Marketplace www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca

Social Enterprise Data Base Associates www.dtes.ca

Social Purchasing Portal Canada www.sppcanada.org

BC Social Economy Roundtable www.ucscoop.com

Finance Organisations

Alterna www.alterna.ca

Canadian Alternative Investment Cooperative www.caic.ca

Social Capital Partners Canada www.socialcapitalpartners.ca

Vartana www.vartana.com

Support Agencies

Centre for Community Enterprise www.cedworks.com

Centre for Social Enterprise www.centreforsocialenterprise.com

Social and Enterprise Innovations www.sedi.org

Universities

Canadian Centre for Social Entrepreneurship www.business.ualberta.ca

NETHERLANDS

Social Enterprises

iNSnet Foundation www.insnet.org

Multatuli www.multatuli.nl

SCOTLAND

Alliances, Networks, etc.

Senscot	www.senscot.net
Social Firms Scotland	www.socialfirms.org.uk
Scottish Social Enterprise Coalition	www.ssec.org.uk

Data Bases

Social Economy and Enterprise Data Base Scotland	www.scvo.org.uk
--	--

Finance Organisations

DSL Business Finance	www.dsl-businessfinance.co.uk
Social Investment Scotland	www.socialinvestmentscotland.com

Government Agencies

Social Economy Unit	www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk
---------------------	--

Periodicals & Portals

Good Company – The Magazine for Socially Enterprising People	www.good-company.info
--	--

Support Agencies

CEiS	www.ceis.org.uk
First Port Doing Good Business	www.firstport.org.uk
Social Economy Scotland	www.socialeconomyscotland.info

Universities

Heriot-Watt University Social Enterprise Institute	www.sml.hw.ac.uk
--	--

Social Enterprises

Kibble Education and Care Centre	www.kibble.org
----------------------------------	--

SPAIN

Alliances, Networks, etc.

New Social Enterprise in Europe	www.newsocialenterprise.eu
---------------------------------	--

UNITED KINGDOM

Alliances, Networks, etc.

Social Enterprise Coalition	www.socialenterprise.org.uk
Social Enterprise Network	www.networks.nhs.uk
Social Enterprise West Midlands	www.wmro.org

Data Bases

Ethical Junction	www.ethical-junction.org
Social Enterprise Training & Support	www.setas.co.uk
Southeast Cultural Observatory	www.seco.org.uk
The Social Enterprise Mark	www.socialenterprisemark.co.uk
Near By You – The National Social Enterprise Trading Network	www.nearbyyou.co.uk

Finance Organisations

Bridges Ventures	www.bridgesventures.com
Futurebuilders England	www.futurebuilders-england.org.uk
Social Enterprise Support Fund	www.news.jgp.co.uk

Social Enterprise Fund	www.dh.gov.uk
UK Social Investment Forum	www.uksif.org
Government Agencies	
Welsh Assembly Business Advice for Social Enterprises in South Wales	www.new.wales.gov.uk
Government Policy	
Office of the Third Sector	www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/third_sector
Periodicals and Portals	
Charity Times	www.charitytimes.com
New Sector	www.newsector.co.uk
Social Enterprise Magazine	www.socialenterprisemag.co.uk
Social Enterprise News	www.socialenterpriseneeds.co.uk
Social Entrepreneur Business and Enterprise Community	www.i-genius.org
Social Investments Portal	www.socialinvestments.com
Support Agencies	
CAN	www.can-online.org.uk
Innovation Exchange	www.innovatgionexchange.org
Social Enterprise Foundation	www.socialenterprisefoundation.org
Social Firms UK	www.socialfirms.co.uk
UnLtd	www.unltd.org.uk
Social Enterprise Partnership GB Ltd.	www.sepgb.co.uk
Edge Upstarts	www.edgeupstarts.org
Social Enterprise Ambassadors	www.socialenterpriseambassadors.org
SEEM Structure	www.seem.uk.net
Social Enterprise Outcomes	www.socialenterpriseoutcomes.co.uk
Social Enterprise Support Centre	www.sesc/info
Social Enterprise West Midlands	www.socialenterprisewm.org.uk
CaSE-da	www.case-da.co.uk
Social Enterprise & Co-operative Development Ltd.	www.secod.org.uk
Think Tanks	
Centre for Local Economic Strategies	www.cles.org.uk
Universities	
Cardiff University, Centre for Business Relationships	www.brass.cf.ac.uk
Liverpool John Moores University	www.ljmu.ac.uk
Middlesex University	www.mdx.ac.uk
Skoll Centre for Social Entrepreneurship	www.sbs.ox.ac.uk
School for Social Entrepreneurs	www.sse.org.uk
University of Birmingham	www.cpsp.bham.ac.uk
Huddlesfield University	www.hud.ac.uk
Nottingham University	www.nottingham.ac.uk
University of Teeside	www.tees.ac.uk
Manchester Metropolitan University	www.mmucofe.co.uk

NORTHERN IRELAND

Alliances, Networks, etc.	
Social Economy Network	www.socialeconomynetwork.org

Data Bases

Big Black Book
Business for Good

www.bigblackbook.org
www.businessforgood.org

Support Agencies

School for Social Entrepreneurs Ireland
Advance Ards

www.sse.org.uk
www.advanceards.com

Social Enterprises

Praxis Care Group

www.praxiscaregroup.org.uk

ONTARIO

Alliances, Networks, etc.

Social Economy Roundtable of Ontario

www.ontariononprofitnetwork.ca

Finance Organisations

The Ontario Trillium Fund

www.trilliumfund.org

Support Agencies

MaRS Discovery District

www.marsdd.com

Social Enterprises

Foundation for Building Sustainable Communities www.fbsc.org

London Training Centre www.londontraining.on.ca

BELFAST

Alliances, Networks, etc.

North Belfast Partnership

www.thelearninginitiative.com

Support Agencies

Social Entrepreneurs
Social Economy Belfast

www.investni.com
www.socialeconomybelfast.org

Social Enterprises

Now Project
Ashton Centre
Avec Solutions
Belfast Safaris
Bryson Charitable Group
Childcare Vouchers
Colin Glen Trust
Cresco Trust
East Belfast Mission
Loaf Catering Company
Media Ireland
Mediation Northern Ireland
Motion2Music
Oh Yeah Music Centre
The John Hewitt Bar
TREE-ni.org Timber Recycling
Work West

www.nowproject.co.uk
www.ashtoncentre.com
www.avec-solutions.com
www.belfastsafaris.com
www.brysongroup.org
www.employersforchildcare.org
www.colinglen-trust.org
www.crescotrust.com
www.ebm.org.uk
www.loafcatering.com
www.mediaireland.co.uk
www.mediationnorthernireland.org
www.beyondskin.net
www.ohyeahbelfast.com
www.thejohnhewitt.com
www.tree-ni.org
www.workwest.co.uk

BRISTOL

Alliances, Networks, etc.	
RISE: South West Social Enterprise	www.rise-sw.co.uk
Finance Organisations	
Bristol Enterprise Investment Fund	www.bedf.co.uk
Support Agencies	
Community Enterprise Unit	www.ceultd.co.uk
Eastside Consulting	www.eastsideconsulting.co.uk
Edge Upstarts	www.edgeupstarts.org
Baker Brown Associates	www.bakerbrown.co.uk
Social Economy Bristol	www.socialeconomybristol.org.uk
Social Enterprise Works	www.socialenterpriseworks.org
Universities	
Bristol University	www.bristol.ac.uk
Social Enterprises	
The Sofa Project	www.sofaproject.org.uk
Aspire Bristol	www.endhomelessness.org.uk
Bristol East Side Traders	www.bristoleastside traders.co.uk
Bristol Wireless	www.bristolwireless.net
Bristol Wood Recycling Project	www.bwrp.org.uk
Brogdale Farm	www.brogdalecollections.co.uk
Co-opportunity	www.coopportunity.org.uk
Community at Heart	www.ndcbristol.co.uk
Emmaus Bristol	www.emmaus.org.uk
Equal Sign	www.equalsign.co.uk
FRANK Water	www.frankwater.com
Bristol Indy Media	www.bristol.indymedia.org
Real Ideas Organisation	www.realideas.org

DUBLIN

Social Enterprises	
Base Enterprise Centre	www.base-centre.com
Blastbeat	www.blastbeat.org
Carmichael Centre for Voluntary Groups	www.carmichaelcentre.ie
Partas	www.partas.ie
Rehab Group	www.rehab.ie
Release Speech Therapy	www.release.ie
SWITCH IT Training & PC Repair	www.uswitch.ie
Sunflower Recycling	www.sunflowerrecycling.ie

GLASGOW

Support Agencies	
Glasgow Social Economy Partnership	www.gsep.org.uk
International Network of Street Papers	www.street-papers.org

Source Social Research Company	www.sourcesocialresearch.org
Social Enterprises	
Community Can Cycle	www.communitycancycle.org.uk
Emmaus Glasgow	www.emmausglasgow.org.uk
Forth Sector	www.forthsector.org.uk
Galgael	www.galgael.org
The Wise Group	www.thewisegroup.co.uk
Rainbow Turtle	www.rainbowturtle.org.uk
Lamhill Stables	www.lamhillstables.co.uk
Red Button Design	www.thisisredbutton.co.uk
The Skinny	www.theskinny.co.uk
Social Enterprise & Training UK	www.setuk.org.uk
Spruce Carpets Glasgow	www.sprucecarpets.org.uk
The Coach House Trust	www.thecht.co.uk
Glasgow Wood Recycling Project	www.glasgowwoodrecycling.blog.com
Travel Options	www.travel-options-uk.co.uk
Unity Enterprise	www.unity-enterprise.com
Universal Comedy	www.universalcomedy.co.uk
Upkeep Glasgow	www.upkeepglasgow.org.uk
Wasps Artists Studios	www.artistsstudios.org.uk
Southside Media	www.southsidemedia.org

LONDON

Alliances, Networks, etc.

Social Enterprise London	www.sel.org
Network 2012	www.network2012.ne
Network of Entrepreneurial Talent	www.networkforentrepreneurialtalent.com
East London Social Entrepreneurs Group	www.sealliance.meetup.com

Data Bases

Shop Social Enterprise	www.shopsocialenterprise.com
------------------------	--

Finance Organisations

London Rebuilding Society	www.londonrebuilding.com
---------------------------	--

Support Agencies

EQUAL The Social Enterprise Partnership	www.equal-works.com
---	--

Social Enterprises

Coin Street Community Builders	www.coinstreet.org
Acorn House Restaurant	www.acornhouserestaurant.com
Belu Water	www.belu.org
Beyond Boyle	www.beyhondobyle.com
Borough Market	www.boroughmarket.org.uk
C22 Magazine	www.catch22mag.com
Calverts	www.calverts.coop
Community Campus	www.communitycampus87.co.uk
Community Views	www.communityviews.org
Connection Crew	www.connectioncrew.org.uk
Core Design London	www.coredesignlondon.co.uk
Divine Chocolate	www.divinechocolate.com
ECT Group	www.ectgroup.co.uk

Fifteen	www.fifteen.net
GLL	www.gll.org
Green Rocket Group	www.greenrocketgroup.com
Green-Works	www.green-works.co.uk
Hatti Trading Ltd.	www.hattitrading.co.uk
HCT Group	www.hctgroup.org
Fruit First Warehouse	www.ffw.eclipse.co.uk
Cafedirect	www.cafedirect.co.uk
John Lewis Partnership	www.johnlewispartnershp.co.uk
Make Believe Arts	www.makebelievearts.co.uk
Market Porter Pub	www.pubs.com
Novas Scarman Group	www.novasscarman.org
Pecan	www.pecan.org.uk
StreetShine	www.streetshine.com
The Bromley by Bow Centre	www.bbc.org.uk
Waterhouse Restaurant	www.waterhouserestaurant.co.uk
Newham Social Enterprise	www.newhamsocialenterprise.org.uk
Women Like Us	www.womenlikeus.org.uk

TORONTO

Alliances, Networks, etc.	
Enterprising Non Profits	www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca
Finance Organisations	
SVP Toronto	www.svptoronto.org
Social Capital Partners	www.socialcapitalpartners.ca
Toronto Enterprise Fund	www.torontoenterprisefund.ca
Periodicals & Portals	
Social Entrepreneurship @ Work	www.socialenterprisework.blogspot.com
Support Agencies	
MaRS Discovery District	www.marsdd.com
Social Economy Centre Blog	www.socialeconomycentreblogger.blogspot.com
Universities	
Rotman School, University of Toronto	www.rotmanutoronto.ca
Social Enterprises	
Contemporary Textile Studio Co-op	www.textilestudio.ca
Alternative Grounds	www.alternativegrounds.com
African Village	www.africanvillage.com
Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood Centre	www.dpnc.ca
Engineers Without Borders	www.ewb.ca
Eva's Initiatives	www.evasinitiatives.com
Evergreen Brick Works	www.evergreen.ca
Food Share	www.foodshare.net
Furniture Bank	www.furniturebank.org
Ganesh	www.ganesh.coop
Heliotrope	www.heliotrope.ca
Centre for Social Innovation	www.socialinnovation.ca
World Inspirations	www.torontolanguageschool.ca
Na-Me-Res	www.nameres.org
iRecycle	www.irecyclecomputers.info

Me to We	www.metowe.org
Haween Enterprises Inc.	www.haween.com
River Restaurant	www.river413.ca
St. John's Bakery	www.stjohnsbakery.com
Sustainable Enterprise Resource Centre	www.sustainabilityincubator.com
The Big Carrot	www.thebigcarrot.ca
thriftopia.com	www.thriftopia.com
Tropicana	www.tropicanacommunity.org
TurnAround Couriers	www.tournaroundcouriers.com
Vert Catering	www.vertcatering.com
Goodwill	www.goodwill.on.ca
The Mill Centre	www.themillcentre.com

APPENDIX D - LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Bull, Mike - Centre for Enterprise, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK
Byrne Liz - Enterprise Action, Clondalkin
Coughlan Sean - Social Entrepreneurs Ireland
Cunningham, Jim - Glasgow City Council, Scotland
Davidson, Allen – Glasgow City Council, Scotland

Doherty, Margaret – London Development Agency, UK
Elsen, Peter - Mount Royal College, Calgary, Canada
Flannery Paddy - Moyross Enterprise, Limerick
Flint, Elaine – Social Enterprise Works, Bristol, UK
Fowler, Ted – Bristol City Council, UK

Germaine Ken – BASE, Blanchardstown
Graham, Anne – Social Economy Network, Northern Ireland
Higgins, Gerry – CEiS, Glasgow, Scotland
Khan, Sabina – Social Enterprise London, UK
Kinhead, Maurice - Avec Solutions, Belfast

Logan, David - Glasgow Social Enterprise Partnership, Scotland
Lyon, Fergus - Middlesex University, UK
Marshall, Rachel – Work West, Belfast
Martin, Lisa – Belfast City Council
Mook, Laurie – University of Toronto, Canada

Neamtan, Nancy - *Chantier de l'économie sociale*, Montreal, Canada
O'Hara Paul - Ashoka Ireland
O'Neill, Larry - CPLN Partnership, Clondalkin
Pope, Geoff – Scottish Executive, Scotland
Price, Martin – Martin Price Associates, Cardiff, Wales

Quinn, Alice – North City Business Centre, Belfast
Rafferty, Lisa – London Councils
Richmond, Diane – Partas, Tallaght
Sinclair, Mary – Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector
Surman, Tonya – Center for Social Innovation, Toronto, Canada

Thompson, Kerry – University of Ulster
Walsh, Bernie – Sunflower Recycling, Dublin
Whyte, John – Fatima Regeneration Board
Wilson, Alison – Orchardville Society, Belfast

APPENDIX E

SOCIAL ENTERPRISES DEVELOPED IN CLONDALKIN

Clondalkin Community Property Company

The Clondalkin Community Property Company was formed by the Partnership in 1995 with the aims of:-

- Providing office, training and development space for organisations delivering community services.
- Providing a range of support services relating to property for organisations delivering community services
- Working to improve local infrastructure and services
- Addressing the provision of housing
- Facilitating the development of community-owned business initiatives and
- Building an asset base for the community

It is constituted as a Company Limited by Guarantee and registered as a Charity with the Revenue Commissioners. Its eight Directors are drawn from a range of differing backgrounds, each of whom bring specific knowledge and expertise to their role.

At the time of the formation of the Partnership the lack of office, training and meeting space in the Clondalkin area was identified as a priority issue. Increasingly high rents during the Celtic Tiger boom were being demanded by property developers and owners, often for premises in poor condition, located on unsuitable sites. The Partnership was also concerned that investing wisely in property could bring greater benefits in the longer term to the community, as an asset base could have the potential to return funds to the community.

Over the past thirteen years the Property Company has developed into a substantial social enterprise with assets in excess of €2,000,000 and an annual operating surplus of approximately €45,000. It currently owns/leases eight premises which provide space for the following organisations -

Citizen Information Centre
Community Health Initiative
Community Recycling Initiative
Drugs Task Force
Intercultural Centre
Jobs Initiative Scheme
Local Employment Service
National Council for the Blind
Youth Support and Training Unit

It also provides its own office space and the Partnership's office space.

The Property Company provides space at approx 30% below the market price, and also provides supports to organisations in the area looking for premises for whom it may not be able to provide suitable accommodation. It will continue to source premises, to meet the growing demands of local organisations, such as arts and

cultural facilities, supported enterprise space, training space and hostels. Given the extension of the Partnership's geographical remit, the board has decided that the next property to be acquired should be mixed use combining supported enterprise space, offices and training space and be located in Lucan, where there is currently a dearth of such facilities.

Clondalkin Community Training Centre

Due to the lack of training space and training facilities in the local Clondalkin area and surrounds, the Community Property Company decided in 2007 to lease Unit 2A, Nangor Road Business Park, Clondalkin, Dublin 22, the lower floor building directly across from Clondalkin Partnership's current premises. The owner of the property approached the Company with a view to leasing the premises on a short-term lease and assisted in their renovation and refurbishment to accommodate an IT Room, a Meeting Room and an Open Seminar Room. They also donated the furniture in the "break-out" area, computer desks and the chairs for the Seminar Room. The Partnership's Enterprise & Employment Working Group contributed €18,000 to the facility and Wyeth donated twenty reconditioned computers. The Property Company itself invested €10,000 towards the start-up costs and renovations.

Further modifications have recently taken place and the Training Centre now accommodates three individual private rooms:-

Seminar Room – Caters for approximately thirty to forty persons seated comfortably. There is a speaker podium available with full integrated wireless broadband on a high-tech 40" flat-screen monitor for presentations.

Meeting Room - Caters for up to twenty persons in a Board-Room Setting. It has a white board and flip charts for more intimate meetings. This room is also used for English speaking classes and on occasions food presentations.

IT Computer Room - The computer room caters for up to twenty individual computer stations with Microsoft Office Suite 2003. It has full integrated broad-band and internet access. A projector is also available if required.

Break-out Area – This area has three round tables and chairs to accommodate approximately twelve to sixteen persons. Facilities include burco, fridge and a Tipperary water station. Toilets and a small kitchen area are located off the break-out area.

Currently there are a number of regular rentals of the facility. A Local Training Initiative providing participants with a series of courses on information technology, communications, literacy and work practices utilises the Centre five days a week. A number of courses are offered on a part time weekend basis by Active Health Foundation including Chinese Medical Acupressure, Facial Rejuvenation and Cosmetic Acupuncture. The IT room is hired out on Tuesday afternoons for a Touch-type Read and Spell programme, which aims to develop the literacy skills of those with reading, writing and spelling difficulties and increase their level of confidence, self-esteem and motivation.

The Clondalkin Employment Initiative has used the facility to deliver a number of courses for their employees over the past twelve months, including Occupational First Aid, Health & Safety, Manual Handling, Fire Training and Basic Food Hygiene

Extern Ireland, which works directly with children, adults and communities affected by social exclusion throughout Ireland, has rented the IT Room to deliver in-house IT training to its staff.

Clondalkin Community Recycling Initiative

Clondalkin Community Recycling Initiative (CCRI) is a community enterprise, established in 2002, which provides an electrical waste recycling service to both retailers and householders with the following objectives:

- Combat the illegal dumping of waste in Clondalkin
- Recycling of white goods as defined in the E.U. WEEE directive
- Employment and social inclusion of long-term unemployed people
- Creation of a sustainable social economy recycling enterprise and
- Distribution of trading surpluses in support of other recycling/environmental projects in the Clondalkin area

The primary activity of CCRI is the kerbside collection and re-processing of waste electrical and electronic materials, primarily from white goods such as washing machines, dishwashers, ovens etc. to ensure that all waste electrical material is disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner in compliance with the E.U. WEEE directive. The CCRI service removes any pollutants and then dismantles these goods into their separate component parts in preparation for recycling

CCRI is based in a 6300 square foot facility at Crag Terrace in Clondalkin. This facility is fully equipped to handle waste with storage bins, a crusher, workbenches and a forklift. The facility can process between 500 to 700 units per week and provides a drop off point for all white goods. CCRI also offers a collection service for households and commercial enterprises.

The WEEE Kerbside Collection service covers the South Dublin County area from Rathfarnham in the east to Rathcoole in the west and also includes an estate of 330 houses in Ballinteer (Dun Laoighre Rathdown). In the six months from November 2007 through April 2008 CCRI offered the Kerbside Collection to 27,825 households. Of those offered the service, 6,516 (23.4%) households participated and of these 181 were assisted in removing their WEEE to the kerbside. This cohort of participants is possibly the most significant as it is made up of the incapacitated and/or infirm who would not be in a position to participate in other take-back or drop-off schemes. Significantly, they are also the most vocally appreciative of the service at the doorstep, through phone calls and personal thank you cards.

The WEEE Kerbside service has three distinct operational stages. CCRI informs the households due for a free collection by way of leafleting on the week prior to the collection date. In the second stage CCRI's 16-foot curtain-sider truck with tail-lift, purchased specifically, for the door-to-door collections then makes up to three collection runs per day. In the third stage all collected items are recorded, weighed and documented and then either made ready for transport on for further treatment or

in the case of large household appliances (bar fridges) are retained for dismantling or in the case of items that appear on visual inspection to be in sound order retained for further investigation regarding reuse.

This kerbside collection service has proven to be very worthwhile in terms of establishing that there are significant quantities of historic WEEE which have not been recycled and that there is a willingness by the public to respond to a kerbside collection that is 'genuine' - particularly those persons who need assistance in removing WEEE from the household and those persons without their own means of transport.

Another aspect of CCRI's service is that the majority of items that can be reused go to benefit community groups and charities as well as its neighbours in the industrial estate in which it is located, e.g. Roadstone's security hut is supplied with radios and portable TVs as often as needed. The list of beneficiaries is extensive demonstrates a demand for good quality second-hand equipment especially within cash-starved community and educational organisations. One of the most significant reuse schemes CCRI has engaged with in conjunction with WEEE Ireland has been one run by the Belfast charity 'Tools for Solidarity'. In one six month period CCRI collected fifty-two sewing machines in the door-to-door collection and which were then sent to the Mwanza Sewing Machine and Training Centre in Tanzania. Other beneficiaries have included the Intercultural Centre in Clondalkin which was supplied with table lamps and a stereo and a national school in Kilkenny which was supplied with a computer, a musical keyboard and two portable radiators.

CCRI currently employs a fulltime manager, a full time administrator and nine operatives. The operatives conduct the kerbside collection, dismantle and separate the product into its constituent parts and sort the parts into various categories for recycling. The operatives were all long-term unemployed persons who through their work in CCRI have been able to overcome the social exclusion which they were experiencing because of their previous economic status. Governance of the enterprise is exercised through the board, who meet monthly to review, monitor and agree all significant operational and financial activities and decisions. CCRI has received support from the Department of the Environment, WEEE Ireland and South Dublin County Council.

CCRI is currently exploring the potential for becoming involved in "repurposing", which involves potential for applications that are both high-tech (mobile phones repurposed as alarms and baby monitors) and low-tech (tumble drier drums used as garden planters). In terms of product development CCRI has developed five complete products and has three more at concept stage. At a recent National Greener Ireland Exposition where CCRI had a stand there was great interest in all the products especially from members of Tidy Towns Committees and school teachers looking for new ideas for gardening with students - especially in schools with little or no green areas.
