While many social innovations have been around for decades (e.g., the social security system), others are still in their infancy (e.g., car sharing). In addition, while technological innovation is already a mature concept, the notion of Social Innovation is just gaining momentum. As demonstrated in the previous articles, Social Innovation is a global phenomenon whose traces can be found in every world region. One key question has remained unanswered thus far: What does the future of Social Innovation look like?

The following articles will provide an outlook on the next decade, explore opportunities and constraints to the growth of social innovation initiatives, and evaluate the role social innovation labs will play in this development. They highlight the importance of ecosystems and infrastructures and make a case for a European Agency specialized in Social Innovation.
SOCIAL INNOVATION – THE LAST AND NEXT DECADE

Social innovation has become much more visible over the last few years. But how much has really been achieved? And how will it prosper in a potentially more hostile climate dominated by populist politics and social resentments? This chapter takes stock of what has and hasn’t been achieved over the last decade and sets out a roadmap for the one ahead.

Geoff Mulgan

THE LAST DECADE

In 2006 an event in Beijing led to the creation of SIX, the Social Innovation Exchange. It brought together foundations; innovators; social entrepreneurs; and corporates, along with senior figures from governments. It set out a rough roadmap to making social innovation more mainstream (and led to the report ‘Social Silicon Valleys’ [1]) at a time when many were trying to build on what had been achieved in supporting social entrepreneurship to promote more systematic approaches to social change. Looking back it’s surprising how much of what that report advocated in 2006 has materialised, including new sources of finance, social R&D, opening up public commissioning, incubators and accelerators as well as more extensive, rigorous, imaginative and historically aware research on how social innovation happens and how it can be helped. The implementation of these ideas has often been messy and fragmented. There have been many pioneers and advocates. But the movement has come a long way forward.

National cultures remain very diverse – and what social innovation means in Bangladesh (home of some of the strongest institutions for social innovation like BRAC and Grameen) or Kenya (home of Ushahidi and some of the most dynamic digital innovation) is very different from what it means in a US city, or a European nation. But there are some common patterns.

One is the spread of social innovation centres and labs – physical spaces and organisations aiming to promote social innovation in the round, with prominent examples in places as diverse as Adelaide, Rio, Bihar and the Basque Country and many others. Some are based on foundations (like the Lien Centre in Singapore or Bertha in Cape Town), others on buildings (such as the Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto). Some have found a home in universities (like ESADE in Barcelona) others on the edge of governments. There’s been a big expansion of social investment funds: although only a small minority focus on innovation, these provide a new route to help innovations grow to scale, and of new funding tools that can support social innovation such as crowdfunding platforms. Many governments have created social innovation funds (from Hong Kong and Australia to France and the US) and fairly comprehensive national policy programmes have been introduced in a few countries, from Malaysia to Canada. The European Commission has also incorporated social innovation into many of its programmes including the European Social Fund, and the Horizon 2020 science and research funding. The United Arab Emirates now commit 1% of public spending to public innovation – a rare example of shifting towards more serious allocations.

There are dozens of university research centres (from Dortmund and Waterloo to Barcelona) and courses for undergraduates and mature students.

International NGOs – such as Oxfam, Mercy Corps, and the Red Cross – are taking innovation much more seriously, as a way of responding to new technological opportunities and
challenges, as are many UN agencies, notably UNICEF and UNDP. Many big firms have announced initiatives using the social innovation label, including tech firms like Hitachi and Dell and consultancies like McKinsey and KPMG, though one of the disappointments of the last decade is that most are little more than cosmetic.

Social innovation skills are becoming much more widely accessible – e.g. through the ‘DIY Toolkit’ used by over one million people worldwide, and content provided by organisations like IDEO. Digital social innovation has taken off – around 2000 organisations were recently mapped by DSI Europe, and there are thousands of others around the world sometimes described with the ‘civic tech’ label. There are hundreds of social innovation incubators and accelerators of all kinds, and transnational networks of social incubators such as Impact Hub and SenseCube.

Quite a few mayors are now defined by their commitment to social innovation (such as Won Soon Park in Seoul or Virginio Merola in Bologna). There are social innovation prizes in the US, Europe, China and elsewhere, new tools such as Social Impact bonds (over 80 in the UK, US, Australia); and new legal forms – like Community Interest Companies and B-Corps.

There are new campaigning tools – like Avaaz and Change.org – and new kinds of social movement pioneering social innovation in fields like disability, refugee rights and the environment. There are social innovation media – such as the Stanford Social Innovation Review (which has partly shifted away from focus on US non-profits to a more international and cross-sector perspective), Apolitical or the Good Magazine. And there have been some significant surveys of the global social innovation landscape, including from the Economist Intelligence Unit, and regional surveys in Latin America, East Asia and Europe.

Finally, there has been at least some progress in clarifying boundaries and definitions. It’s better understood that social innovation is not the same as social entrepreneurship, or enterprise, or creativity, or investment, though these all overlap. My own preference for definitions remains the simple one – social innovation refers to innovations that are social in their ends and their means. But there are also plenty of alternatives. The diagram in this article summarises some of what has been achieved.

FALSE STARTS?

Not everything has worked. Obama’s Office for Social Innovation in the White House did a lot of good work but did not survive the change of President. The UK’s Big Society programme likewise didn’t survive a change of political leadership.

There have also been some uneasy transitions. Traditional innovation agencies have adopted some of the language of social innovation but with uneven results (although Sweden’s VINNova, Finland’s SITRA, Canada’s MaRS and Malaysia’s AIM have all done well in complementing technology support with a new focus on social innovation, most have not).

Social innovation is not the same as social entrepreneurship, or enterprise, or creativity, or investment, though these all overlap.
Organisations associated with the earlier wave of programmes devoted to social entrepreneurship have struggled to achieve a better balance between support for individuals and the broader needs of innovation (given that the model of a single individual developing an innovation, a venture and then growing it remains very rare).

The field of social innovation also has shown its share of risks. One is fetishising innovation as an end in itself rather than a means to other ends. For most organisations most of the time innovation may be much less important than effective implementation of existing ideas or adoption of ideas from elsewhere (I used to advocate that governments should spend around 1% on their own innovation, but that the majority of time, money and effort should go into good implementation). Innovation can often seem exciting and sexy while implementation and adoption are dull. But innovation without a wider system for implementation and adoption risks being pointless.

The most important challenge is that the scale of activity is still small relative to the scale of needs. The projects and initiatives listed above are modest and most of the organisations mentioned above are fragile. In some fields (including, at times, impact investment) hype has greatly exceeded reality so far. Meanwhile vastly more innovation funding still goes to the military than to society, and the world’s brainpower is still directed far more to the needs of the wealthy and warfare than it is to social priorities. More worrying is the shift in climate. Relatively centrist, pragmatic governments of both left and right were sympathetic to some of the arguments for social innovation. By contrast authoritarian leaders of the kind who are thriving now tend to be hostile, suspicious of civil society and activism of any kind, and much more favourable to innovation that’s linked either to the military or big business.

So what could be achieved over the next ten years during what may be a less favourable climate? What could organisations with power and influence do to strengthen the most useful forces for change?

The most important challenge is to achieve, and demonstrate, big inroads on the major issues of our times.

10 POSSIBLE PRIORITIES FOR THE NEXT 10 YEARS:

1. **Tackle big challenges and at the right level of granularity:** the most important challenge is to achieve, and demonstrate, big inroads on the major issues of our times such as ageing; unemployment; stagnant democracy or climate change. This will require moving on from the units of analysis and action of the previous era. Much past activity focused on the individual (social entrepreneurs and innovators); the individual venture, or the individual innovation. At the other end of the spectrum have been very macro initiatives that try to change the behaviour of all businesses, or all charities, or a rather abstract discussion of systems change at a global level. Often the most impact will come from tackling issues at a middle level – specific sectors in specific places. For example: how to sharply improve the performance of the housing sector, or childcare, or training in a city or region. Here collaborations between foundations, municipal government and others have the potential to achieve significant and lasting impact.

2. **Grow funding at serious scale** – a significant proportion of R&D spend, both public and private, needs to be directed to innovations that are social in both their ends and their means. Funding needs to grow steadily – to ensure there is capacity to use money well. It also needs to be plural, including: grant funds, investment through loans and equity, convertible funding, matched crowd funding as well as public procurement, outcomes based funding and bonds, as well as participatory budgeting.

3. **Link action to evidence of impact** – every aspect of social innovation needs to be attuned to evidence and a willingness to find out what achieves most impact. This doesn’t mean making a fetish of randomised control trials or costly evaluations. But it does require doing much more to embed analysis into the everyday work of organisations; where possible to test alternative models; adoption of common standards of evidence; and promoting a sophisticated understanding of how to discover what works, where, and when.

4. **Connect into movements, activism and democracy** – social innovation in many countries will need to become more, not less, political, willing to campaign on many fronts. That means going far beyond ‘clicktivism’, including direct action in countries where the political climate is hostile to social and civic action. It means linking individual social innovations to broader programmes for change, while also tapping into the emotions that so often drive social change. Politics, and being active in democracy, is vital for social innovations to thrive.
5. Make the most of digital and shape the next generation Internet – there’s been an extraordinary flowering of digital social innovation and civic tech, particularly around open data, open knowledge, the maker movement and citizen science. But these haven’t yet made strong links to previous generations of civil society organisations and charities, and many have struggled to achieve large scale.

6. Broader and deeper social innovation skills – social innovation depends on capabilities: knowledge about how to generate ideas, develop them and scale them. Those skills are scarce and sometimes as much undermined as helped by fashions. We need much more widespread support for practical skills in design, prototyping, pilots, experiments, social investment, evaluation and iteration. These need to include online tools and Massive Online Open Courses, mobilising existing universities and colleges and creating more grassroots academies.

7. Better adoption – it’s often assumed that social innovation is all about radical new ideas, and out of the box thinking. But most innovation in most fields is much more about adoption and incremental adaptation. The first question for any innovator should be – what can I borrow or adapt? And funders should give more weight to smart adoption rather than originality.

8. Mature policy debate – we’re beginning to see serious national policies around social innovation. To help these evolve we’ll need better comparative analysis of multiple national strategies, and ideally competition – as well as reflection on how the goals of innovation policy and social innovation policy might be better aligned, so that policies around funding, new legal forms, tax incentives, procurement and commissioning are better aligned.

9. Continuously reaching out – the risk of any field such as social innovation is that it becomes inward looking or an echo chamber. Many in the field are urban, well-educated and young. But the most useful innovation comes from diversity; encounters of people from different backgrounds.

Too many of the discussions a decade ago around social entrepreneurship and innovation were celebratory and promotional. Not enough were informed by action, and the tough lessons of practice. That led to initiatives like SIX which aimed to be guided by practitioners, and oriented to learning as well as celebration, as well as being more global in spirit, recognising that no part of the world was leading.

Practice continues to lead theory. As we face a potentially more hostile climate there’ll be even more need for alliances between practitioners and interpreters who can help to take the kernels of new ideas and show their broader transformative potential.
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SCALING SOCIAL INNOVATIONS – GAPS & OPPORTUNITIES

Silicon Valley is a hub of technology innovation. But when it comes to social innovation, it is a global phenomenon where solutions emerge from the skills, resources, and perseverance of people across the planet. Three systemic barriers block many social innovations from scale – and finding solutions to these barriers is a call to action.

Kriss Deiglmeier

Record-breaking heat and hurricanes. Refugees with no place to go. Increasing poverty and income inequality within some of the world’s richest countries. At the roots of these tremendous problems are a tangle of causes that demand massive action across a multitude of actors – they demand social innovation at scale.

Aiming to understand patterns that enable social innovations to scale their impact over time, I worked with colleagues at Stanford University’s Center for Social Innovation to examine a breadth of social innovations that have evolved from small, localized experiments to achieve widespread impact [1]. We studied the emergence and scaling of ten social innovations and analyzed the paths traversed to reach new users, beneficiaries, and geographies. Through our research, we identified three recurring barriers to scale and studied the approaches employed to overcome these barriers. These findings can illuminate work to support other social innovations along a trajectory to greater impact, so that proven solutions gain the momentum needed to move the needle on the enormous challenges of our time.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY SCALE?

The definition of scale is not universal. According to Duke University’s Center for Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship, “Social innovations have scaled when their impact grows to match the level of need.” Jeffrey Bradach provides an alternate perspective: “How can we get 100x the impact with only a 2x change in the size of the organization?” [2] By design, we did not set a precise definition of scale, because we wanted to explore the factors that had been important for a broad range of social innovations to achieve widespread impact over the past 30 years, and understood that scaling impact can look different for different innovations.

To analyze a social innovation’s growth, Geoffrey Mulgan identified pathways to scale including advocacy, networks, franchising, and growth of an organization with some direct control.[3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>General Ideas and principles</th>
<th>Spread through advocacy, persuasion and the sense of a movement; e.g. the idea of the consumer cooperative.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>1+design features</td>
<td>Spread through professional and other networks, helped by some evaluation: e.g. the 12 step program of Alcoholics Anonymous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>1+2specified programs</td>
<td>Spread through professional and other networks, sometimes with payment, IP, technical assistance and consultancy. E.g. some methadone treatment programs for heroin addicts would be an example, or the High Scope/Perry model for early years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>1+2+3franchising</td>
<td>Spread by an organization, using quality assurance, common training and other support. E.g. the one third of independent public schools in Sweden that are part of a single network would be an example; or Grameen’s growth in Bangladesh and then worldwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 5</td>
<td>1+2+3+4some direct control</td>
<td>Organic growth of a single organization, sometimes including takeovers, with a common albeit often federated governance structure. E.g. Amnesty International or Greenpeace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our research affirmed that scaling a social innovation often entails an assortment of the strategies listed in the table, employed thoughtfully over a very long time to build momentum, support for, and widespread adoption to achieve deep and sustained impact.

**THE INNOVATION CONTINUUM**

The innovation continuum describes the process through which social innovations evolve to create impact at scale, and helps us to identify the needs, opportunities, and strategies most critical at various points in a social innovation’s trajectory.

An analogous struggle occurs in for-profit entrepreneurship: the “valley of death” refers to the time between a startup company’s first funding and when it begins to generate revenue. In the valley of death, the firm is vulnerable to cash flow requirements and likely to fail before it has reached its full potential. Most companies do not make it across the valley of death. However, as illustrated in the graph on traditional start-up financing, there is a well-developed progression of funding once a new company has crossed the valley of death, with various sources of capital that enable profitable for-profit ventures to scale.

For social innovations, the progression of funding is vastly different. In the stagnation chasm, mezzanine funding and growth capital are scarce even after a program has been proven effective. There are many reasons for this funding gap. First, despite the promising emergence of impact investing, market forces do not push mainstream capital toward social innovations, as the promise of market rate financial returns can rarely compete with traditional industries. Second, social innovation funders are often drawn to the novelty of the idea stage. Funding new ideas and programs provides supporters with the satisfaction of being a part of something novel and catalytic, but social innovations cannot thrive without revenue to support continued growth. Third, scaling social innovations is a

---

**Stages of innovation**

As we applied the innovation continuum to the cases we studied, we identified barriers to scale that often trap social innovations in a “stagnation chasm” before they achieve diffusion and scaling. Many factors contribute to the stagnation chasm, however, three barriers repeatedly block social innovations from reaching their broadest impact: scarce funds for growth, the fragmented nature of the social innovation ecosystem, and deficiencies in leadership. If we are serious about propelling proven social innovations to achieve widespread impact, we must find solutions that overcome these barriers.

**Traditional start-up financing**

For social innovations, the progression of funding is vastly different. In the stagnation chasm, mezzanine funding and growth capital are scarce even after a program has been proven effective. There are many reasons for this funding gap. First, despite the promising emergence of impact investing, market forces do not push mainstream capital toward social innovations, as the promise of market rate financial returns can rarely compete with traditional industries. Second, social innovation funders are often drawn to the novelty of the idea stage. Funding new ideas and programs provides supporters with the satisfaction of being a part of something novel and catalytic, but social innovations cannot thrive without revenue to support continued growth. Third, scaling social innovations is a...
long-term process, and it is rare for funders to make multi-year commitments and stand by leaders through the ups and downs that come with efforts to create long-term change. Many new funders have led careers in the private sector, and bring expectations for market-driven efficiencies that may not be realistic when working in troubled economies, with marginalized people, or on issues where market forces hinder rather than help drive desired behaviors. Moreover, for nonprofit organizations, philanthropic capital is limited and can be very difficult to access, especially for replication or scaling the reach of an innovation. Funding social innovations to reach scale requires an unwavering commitment to the end goal and a great deal of patience and flexibility.

Understanding the barriers to this tier of funding, and learning from social innovations that have successfully mobilized growth capital, will position us to better deploy resources so that proven innovations are able to scale their impact. The scarcity of funding for growth is a primary cause of the stagnation chasm. This systematic problem is further exacerbated by fragmented ecosystems and leadership deficiencies in the sector.

A FRAGMENTED ECOSYSTEM

Engaging various actors from across the private, nonprofit, and public sectors is critical in scaling social innovations. Unfortunately, the importance of cross-sector partnerships can present a major barrier to scale. No matter what the issue – health, environment, or education – once a multi-sector approach is employed, the ecosystem complexity is magnified. Each sector has its own set of resources, incentives, knowledge, and networks. Mutual awareness is low, and meaningful coordination is even more uncommon. Current incentives do not encourage collaboration, and few organizations are positioned to weave together efforts, resources, and activities from all three sectors to drive social innovations on a broad scale.

Case studies – Emissions Trading and Fair Trade

Consider two of the social innovations we studied: emissions trading in the United States to address acid rain pollution; and fair trade globally to ensure that producers receive a fair price for the goods they produce.

Emissions trading in the United States emerged as an approach to address the problem of acid rain from the 1950’s through the 1990’s. The process was slow and riddled with tension between sectors, with deeply fragmented, and often hostile, relations between nonprofit, industry, and government sectors. For years, most manufacturers fought to raise and extend the emissions reductions targets, and environmental nonprofits were unwilling to consider alternative approaches for industry to comply with 1970 Clean Air Act standards. This stand-off eventually shifted, and it was in fact industry that led and supported the first official emissions trading market.
in 1979. It took another decade, at which point leaders from all sectors were willing to collaborate, to finally reach the passage of marketable permits trading. By the end of the 1990s, the Environmental Protection Agency reported one hundred percent compliance with the program, at lower cost than projected; evidence that the approach could now be considered successful.

U.S. emissions trading as a social innovation faced two predominant barriers to scale: a fragmented ecosystem and a leadership deficit. Over time, both of those barriers were overcome as leaders from all sectors shifted from a defensive to a solutions-oriented approach. Civil society actors first protested the problem, then galvanized forces to implement legislation through key nonprofit organizations, and over time shifted from attacking innovative implementation solutions to a willingness to collaborate. Government agencies emerged to align stakeholders and enforce standards, and industry representatives evolved to proactively shape regulation rather than reject it. Within each sector, leaders had to consider differing viewpoints to reach a solution that could bridge a fragmented ecosystem.

Now consider the example of fair trade, a social innovation that has achieved impact at scale, despite economic disincentives, scarcity of growth capital, and a fragmented ecosystem. Fair trade started after World War II with a handful of experiments by well-intentioned groups of people. Among them, the Church of Brethren imported cuckoo clocks from Germany and the nonprofit Ten Thousand Villages bought needlework from Puerto Rico. Fair Trade remained a nascent idea for decades until the establishment of intermediaries. Many intermediaries such as the Fair Trade Organization helped it to scale by setting standards and verifying adherence, in effect synchronizing the diverse grassroots efforts that had emerged across the United States and Europe. Southern fair trade organizations emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, aiming to support producers in Africa and Latin America. New alliances helped to bridge the fragmented ecosystem and connect supply and demand around the shared goal of greater equity in international trade. When fair trade expanded into the coffee industry, major nonprofits and corporate buyers entered the demand side of the market. Ultimately, scale was fueled when large global retail outlets such as Walmart and Starbucks became sellers of fair trade products, in addition to traditional outlets.

When fair trade emerged as an idea, market solutions to social problems were rare, and the small shops and nonprofits leading the movement struggled to attract growth funding. As fair trade built momentum, leadership from the nonprofit and private sectors employed higher-level skills to reach a broader market, institutional funding became a viable option, and intermediaries and certifying organizations helped to unite the fragmented ecosystem.

THE FRONTIER FOR SCALING SOCIAL INNOVATIONS

Given the complexities of social and environmental problems, it is clear that traditional disciplinary approaches are not up to the task. In order to strengthen a social innovation ecosystem that will support impact at scale, we need to:

- Research more deeply the barriers of the stagnation chasm to better define viable solutions
- Challenge for-profit and nonprofit funders to address the dearth of growth capital to scale proven innovations
- Educate, support and expand people who can effectively bridge the fragmented ecosystem
- Invest in leaders, teams and entire organizations that are able to persist and overcome the stagnation chasm

The opportunity for impact mirrors the immensity of the need. This can be done. We have learned that for-profit innovation grows in countries with strong “innovation systems,” which include the financial, managerial, technical, and other support for entrepreneurs and ideas. To create vibrant “social innovation systems,” it is upon us to nurture a global ecosystem that can support the social innovation process from ideation all the way through scaling, so that the promise of proven solutions can reach the people and places most in need.
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At the Centre for Social Innovation (CSI), our goal is to build social innovation ecosystems. We know that social innovation is unpredictable. There are too many complex variables at play, and as those variables dance together they create an emergent process whose consequences confound quantitative analysis and detailed prescription. That’s why we avoid attempts to engineer specific outcomes, and focus instead on using experience and theory to craft the conditions for success. We create social innovation ecosystems by providing a coworking space, community and launchpad for people who want to change the world. Our theory of change is most succinctly communicated through the corresponding graphic.

Let’s talk about each level of the pyramid, starting with the foundation: space.

CSI is a global pioneer in coworking. Today, coworking has been mainstreamed into a multi-billion-dollar business. Back in 2004, CSI created a coworking space that may have been the first of its kind in the world. When we started our goal was to address two issues at once. First, we wanted to address the fact that so many social mission organizations lacked good, affordable space. Second, we wanted to seize the opportunity of sharing space provided for promoting collaboration between organizations across sectors.

Coworking meets crucial organizational needs. By sharing the cost across many organizations, we could all enjoy the amenities that are possible for a certain scale of enterprise, like a full-size kitchen, advanced printers and meeting rooms. The coworking model also provides organizations with the flexibility to scale their physical space up or down to match their needs during different phases of their life cycle.

We knew that we needed to go beyond conventional office design. While many office spaces are austere and artificial, we designed our space to be warm and nourishing. We wanted the kind of people who choose to work on some of the hardest social and environmental challenges to feel comforted by their environment. More than that, we knew that with the right design we could help them feel great. When people feel great they are going to be helped in doing their best work, and they will be encouraged to look up from their desks and seek out connections with their peers.

The idea caught on and we were soon looking for more capital to expand and welcome more organizations. Our response: a new idea for a community bond that allows an organization to leverage financial contributions from its supporter base by providing a reasonable return, with...
We have since organized two more community bond campaigns to raise millions of dollars from hundreds of individuals and organizations to buy two buildings in Toronto. These buildings are islands of security for our community, now surrounded by a sea of sharply-rising property prices. The community bond has since been replicated and scaled up around the world, creating a lasting social innovation.

Since starting its first location in Toronto, CSI has grown to include 162,000 sq. ft. under management spread across five locations in Toronto and New York City. We are also testing out a new program to partner with the new generation of coworking spaces that have developed since we opened our doors a decade ago, with our first affiliate site in London, Canada.

CULTURE AND COMMUNITY

While coworking meets a fundamental need for space, it is community animation that builds a community that can foster a social innovation ecosystem that collaborates, innovates and succeeds in unpredictable ways.

Community animation is the glue that holds a shared workspace together and the air that breathes vitality into the lives of everyone who moves through it. From social networking events to issue-based summits, and from a weekly “salad club” lunch potluck to our intranet platform, we bring our members together for work and pleasure.

Social innovation occurs best in environments that are diverse. Innovation rarely occurs within uniform or static structures. It happens at the edges, where differing approaches bump up against each other and stimulate new ways of thinking.

Social innovation occurs best in environments that are diverse. Innovation rarely occurs within uniform or static structures. It happens at the edges, where differing approaches bump up against each other and stimulate new ways of thinking. The diversity of our ecosystem leads to new opportunities and robust and flexible responses to common challenges. For us, this means doing away with the silos that keep sectors and structures apart. We often refer to the ‘social mission sector’ – an umbrella term that includes all the individuals and organizations whose primary mission is to produce some benefit for people or planet.

We don’t create change by doing the same things we’ve always done. By introducing diversity, we provoke discovery.

The CSI community reflects this diversity, and we are always striving to be more inclusive. Our social mission members include nonprofits, charities, for-profits, entrepreneurs and activists working in areas from health and education to arts and environment. We don’t create change by doing the same things we’ve always done. By introducing diversity, we provoke discovery.

If the community is the body of CSI’s innovation ecosystem, then our culture is the DNA. Over the years, we’ve developed an intentional culture with nine values that bring us together and inspire our success. The culture mixes high-performance with fun, and celebrates our authentic individuality while emphasizing that our greatest success will come through our collaboration.

The secret to our culture is our commitment to acting on our values. CSI supports social innovation by others, and practices social innovation itself. We are a lab and we embrace this role wholeheartedly. For one example, while it’s possible that we could have found other ways to raise the money we needed to buy buildings for our coworking space, the community bond was a way to live our purpose. It is collaborative, entrepreneurial, and system changing, and the more we act on our values the greater our ability to attract and animate our community.

In this way, our culture brings our vision into reality: a world where people and the planet come first. Where our systems – economy, government, culture and communities – serve to create a healthy, just, resilient and sustainable society full of meaning, equity and happiness. Where everyone can take meaningful action to be co-creators of their world.

Our unique culture and the quality of our community can be hard to quantify, but our members routinely describe it as being an essential part of their experience at CSI, and something that differentiates us from other coworking spaces.

LAUNCHPAD FOR SOCIAL INNOVATIONS

Potential social innovations emerge as our community connects in our spaces, and we provide a launchpad for their success. We act as an incubator and accelerator for social enterprises and other social mission organizations, both member and non-members. Our space and community
create rich soil for new projects to grow. Over the years we have supported and nurtured projects that have failed, and others that succeeded and gone on to spin off their own organizations.

Interventions and learning opportunities that help make connections and stimulate new thoughts and ways of doing. We are a platform that brings innovators together with capacity-building workshops, informal social mixers, our Intranet network, and more. We foster individual and collective growth and create an environment that produces original action. Historically, we have adopted a light touch. We do not program with an expectation of uniform engagement. We offer opportunities for individuals to 'find their own level'; to dip in and dip out of the community in a way they find comfortable and natural. And when a new idea begins to surface, that same gentle touch helps it to grow.

Today, we are increasingly focused on acceleration programs and online platforms. Our acceleration programs bring together a cohort of social entrepreneurs working in a defined area, such as climate change and community health, and provide them with training and mentors to help them succeed. Our online platforms will create new connections between members outside of our home cities of Toronto and New York, and make it easier for social entrepreneurs to find the resources and knowledge they need to succeed.

As the community has grown and developed, so too has the breadth of the community’s reach and the depth of its social and economic impact. The ultimate goal is social impact, that can be difficult to measure, and even harder to aggregate across so many different areas of focus. For that reason, we offer the chart as a snapshot of the community’s economic impact and the growth in staff, volunteers and revenue that participants in our premier acceleration program enjoyed while working with us.

**CONCLUSION**

Social innovation refers to the whole cycle of creating, applying, spreading and evaluating new and renewed ideas to put people and planet first. At CSI our motto is that “It’s up to us!” because we are focused on the power of citizens to take initiative to create social innovations, and understand that this work must be supported with an ecosystem approach. For that reason, our work is biased toward local, emerging, citizen-led initiatives. We offer people a chance to share space and collaborate with other people who want to be part of the solution, and we support them by living our values and building a platform for their success. We’ve found this to be a reliable way of improving the chances for social innovation in an unpredictable world.

**BUILDING THE NEW ECONOMY**

CSI members are turning social, environmental, economic and cultural challenges into opportunities to create jobs and make the world a better place.

**MEMBER STUDY**

**PAID STAFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

214% increase in paid staff

**VOLUNTEERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48% increase in volunteers

**REVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$160000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160000</td>
<td>$320000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$320000</td>
<td>$480000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$480000</td>
<td>$640000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$640000</td>
<td>$800000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

461% increase in revenue

**JOB & IMPACT**

**TOTAL JOBS**

2,176

Number of jobs CSI supports

**NEW JOBS**

270

The top 20% of CSI members each create 1.7 new jobs per year

**ECONOMIC IMPACT**

$250M

Annual revenue generated by CSI members

**TOP FOCUS AREAS**

1. Education
2. Community Development
3. Health and Well-Being
4. Environment
5. Children & Youth
6. Arts & Culture
7. Equality & Human Rights
8. Social Justice

Snapshot of the community’s economic impact and the growth in staff, volunteers and revenue

**FUTURE CHALLENGES AND INFRASTRUCTURES**
THE FUTURE IS SOCIAL – OR THERE IS NONE!

Our society is facing many social challenges while everything that we need to solve these challenges has already been invented. What we need are people who want to find new solutions and proactively create change in this world. The non-profit Social Impact supports those who develop new approaches to make the world to a better place by scaling social innovations.

Norbert Kunz

INTRODUCTION

By the end of the Cold War at the latest, neoliberalism prevailed in Western and Central Europe as a dominant paradigm. In principle, the advocates of this school of thought assume that the market should regulate and shape all sectors of society. The consequences of this approach become apparent in the conditions of our world order. The gap between rich and poor, developed and developing countries is growing, resulting in wars, distress, escape. Natural resources are heavily exploited and the dangers of ecological disasters remain ignored. There are currently no major national or global strategies to stop this trend. However, there are more and more civil society organizations and dedicated individuals who are looking for an alternative to a growth-oriented economy.

It is about the survival of civilization. No more and no less!

This economy kills – the pope came to this conclusion three years ago in the Evangelii Gaudium [1]. This statement broadly remained unnoticed since, after all, the pope is not an economic expert. Recently, the Research Institute of the WEF in its Global Risk Report 2017 [2] has also come to the conclusion that social and economic inequality, social polarization and exclusion as well as the consequences of climate change will have an essential impact on the global development. It is furthermore noted that technological progress is steadily withdrawing from social control, resulting in major and unpredictable risks to mankind. Additionally, the world’s powerful people are asked to take measures to reduce poverty and instability.

It appears to be contradictory: Those who benefit the most from the capitalist market economy are the ones asking for its reform.

However, this understanding and realization is necessary: it is about the survival of civilization. No more and no less!

IMPACT ON GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

We need to rethink the economy! The thesis that the individual utility maximization can nurture the social wealth has proven itself wrong.

The fetish of profit and growth will lead us to a disaster. We do not need more consumption, more technological innovations, or more business innovations. What we need is a new attitude, a new understanding of the essence and character of business. What we need are better and smarter products and production processes that account for our limited resources. We need work relationships that allow fair pay for the labour. We need trade relations which allow a fair exchange between producers and consumers. What we need is the understanding that the most favourable form of social problem solving is to not let the problems arise at all.

INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS

The solution of social problems should be the starting and final point of all thoughts on innovation and must include all social spheres. The traditional way of dividing responsibility between politics, business and civil society is obsolete.

With regard to these aspects, no new technological innovations are needed. Everything that we need to solve these social challenges has already been invented. However, it is necessary to have the willingness, the joy and the desire to change – to develop and spread social innovations.
SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

Equal to the private sector, entrepreneurs are also often the drivers of social innovation. The difference of these entrepreneurs to the traditional ones is, that they see their goal in solving a social problem. They strive primarily for social value and recognition, and not for private profit. Just a few years ago, it seemed naive to believe that the scene of these “do-gooders” had any influence on business and society. But now these exotics are getting more and more attention. The European Union launched the Social Business Initiative, and the current coalition agreement and the German engagement strategy state the support of social entrepreneurs. More and more companies and welfare organizations are looking to engage in cooperation with social entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, there is still no coherent public strategy to promote social innovation and social entrepreneurs.

SPECIAL NEEDS OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

In December 2015, the study “Challenges of the founding and scaling of social enterprises”, commissioned by the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Energy (BMWi), has been published. Although the study only takes commercial-based social enterprises into account, it clearly indicated that social enterprises need different framework conditions and a different funding infrastructure than traditional founders. Thus, the authors of the study conclude: “Consulting services are of particular importance to social enterprises (e.g. on legal issues, financing options, concretization and implementation of the business idea and scaling of the company). There is a corresponding need for high-quality support structures. This need cannot currently be covered by the classic central places (e.g. chambers, institutions for economic development) or the consultants, which are more oriented towards general founding support.” [3] Despite this finding, nothing has happened since.

STARTUP SUPPORT SYSTEMS

As a result, the non-profit Social Impact gGmbH – which is mostly funded by foundations and donations – is the only reliable, high-quality support programme for social start-ups and social entrepreneurs in Germany that includes all different phases of the founding process. Social Impact has established Social Impact Labs to support the creation of social enterprises and to scale social innovations. The Social Impact Labs are a platform for social entrepreneurs and social startups as well as for all organizations and companies that want to promote social innovations. The Social Impact Labs offer space for work and co-creation, networking, shared services and exchange for everyone interested. Social Impact Labs provide social startups with a special support programme that is adapted to their specific needs. They receive a free-of-charge co-working spot for a period of 8 months and can benefit from a comprehensive qualification, coaching and mentoring programme.

THE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMME

The graph shows the development phases of the Social Impact incubation programme. Only those participants are accepted into the programme that present a socially innovative idea and that can show that a significant social added value will be created with the development of the product or service. The projects are evaluated by internal and external experts. Only 10 - 15 % of the applicants are accepted into the programme. Based on this intensive preselection process, a special development and qualification plan is created for each Social Startup Team.
In the first two months, the focus is on the “Theory of Change”. The key question is whether the intended target can actually be achieved. Only after a successful completion of this phase, the social business model is thoroughly examined. After about 5 months, the social startups have to present their business model to an independent jury, which decides whether further support should be given. In the subsequent phases, the Social Startups receive intensive support in preparing the founding and financing of their projects. The model shows that the participants have to qualify from phase to phase in order to be able to benefit from the versatile and differentiated support offers tailored towards the individual needs of social startups.

Throughout the process, the teams are not only supported by the Social Impact experts but also by many mentors from the business sector (SAP, HANIEL, Deutsche Bank, etc.) and by welfare organizations (PARITÄT).

The success of the programme is impressive:

• more than 2,000 Social Startup teams have applied for a place in one of the Social Impact Labs throughout Germany,
• 430 teams were accepted into the programme,
• 70 teams are currently working in the labs,
• more than 200 teams have already founded a business;
• more than 1,000 jobs were created,
• the crowdfunding offer of Social Impact generated nearly €1.6 million for the teams (until May 2017).
• in addition, in 2016 Social Impact has set up six labs in Germany (Berlin, Hamburg, Leipzig, Frankfurt, Duisburg and Stuttgart) and established the largest social entrepreneurship incubation programme in Europe, both in Germany and Eastern Europe.

However, the success of the Social Impact Programme is also an indicator for how much potential for addressing societal challenges is not untapped because of the lack of public support for social innovations.

The success stories of our alumni showed how important a startup support system is for their development. The programme “Dialog macht Schule” supports students from non-educational families with an immigration biography from the seventh grade in developing an awareness for democracy and social participation. At selected schools dialogue groups take place regularly over a period of 2-3 years. Starting out with topics that are important for the students in their personal learning and living environment, they then develop insights into the current political, cultural and social life to expand their views and perspectives and to develop a differentiated approach towards questions of identity, religion and society. Another good example is the startup “Original Unverpackt”, the first supermarket in Germany which avoids disposable packaging. Instead of the usual product packaging and plastic bags, the customer can bring their own storage containers or take reusable containers in the store and fill them with products from the wide range of goods. The background of the idea is that valuable resources such as water and oil are exploited for the production of packaging.

These examples show that entrepreneurship and social commitment are not contradictory. They are role models for others and contribute to the development of the social entrepreneurship scene – not only in Berlin but all over Germany where a growing number of people want to launch a social enterprise and find solutions to the problems and deficits in this world.
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Social innovation ecosystems enable or inhibit the development of social innovations. They consist of actors from different societal sectors and their environments with legal and cultural norms, supportive infrastructures and many other elements.

Dmitri Domanski / Christoph Kaletka

1. WHY SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEMS? A MULTI-SECTORAL PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIAL INNOVATION

Social innovation research does not originate from a systemic concept of innovation (which became dominant in the Innovation Studies during the 1980s), but mainly from quite isolated, often uni-sectoral perspectives or actor-centred approaches. For decades, scientific work in the field of social innovation predominantly focused on social economy and on social entrepreneurship as the main topics. This almost exclusive view fails to recognise other key aspects of a comprehensive concept of social innovation, among them, social innovations in the public sector and the role of business economy as well as of academia. At the same time, contributions regarding such question as "how institutional and social networks and interactions between levels of governance can work to enable or constrain local innovation" [1] have been important for the development of the research field of social innovation.

The need for better understanding the complexity and systemic character of social innovation can also be stressed by taking a closer look at the field of Innovation Studies. While social innovation research has been strongly characterised by focusing on the third sector as the main societal sector and driver of social innovation, or on the social entrepreneur as its protagonist in order to explain how social innovations emerge in societies, concepts such as innovation systems or the triple helix are based upon different components, among them almost always a conceptual operationalisation of drivers, barriers and governance (even if these might be labelled in different terms). The concepts both recognise appropriate constellations of key actors (i.e. in particular universities, industry and government) and complex interactions among them as being important for development of technological innovations. An important question is to what extent such concept as (national and regional) innovation systems can be useful in order to further develop the concept of social innovation ecosystems.

Empirical results of the SI-DRIVE project show that multiple types of partners are involved in social innovation initiatives. Findings from the project’s global mapping of social innovations confirm that the public and the private sector as well as civil society are relevant for social innovations on a more or less equal footing, with science and research only taking a minor role in social innovation initiatives. Hence, in spite of increasing activities by academia that can be detected in areas such as university social responsibility, social innovation is still far from having a balanced quadruple helix. The potential of science and research remains largely untapped – a strong contrast to the essential role they play in classical innovation processes.
2. SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEMS: IN SEARCH OF A CONCEPT

A systemic approach to social innovation focuses on the interfaces of the so far differentiated and largely separate self-referential societal sectors of state, business, civil society and academia, of their corresponding rationalities of action and regulation mechanisms, and at the associated problems and problem-solving capacities.

Such collaborations are picked up by at least two different heuristic models, the quadruple helix on the one hand, where government, industry, academia and civil society work together to co-create the future and drive specific structural changes, and the social innovation ecosystem on the other hand, which also asks for interactions between the helix actors, adds the notion of systemic complexity and looks at both, the serendipity and absorptive capacity of a system as a whole. Academic knowledge on social innovation ecosystems is very scarce and the concept is still fuzzy.

The development of a scientific concept of social innovation ecosystems is much more demanding than just trying to adapt concepts such as innovation systems or triple helix to the area of social innovation. This task implies a much better understanding of what social innovation ecosystems are about. One precondition for fulfilling this task has to do with understanding social innovation from a multi-sectoral perspective. In this regard social innovation research could learn indeed from the area of Innovation Studies. Another precondition is to comprehend such ecosystems as environments in which social innovations emerge: these innovations are different from technological innovations, which take centre stage in the established concepts mentioned above. Furthermore, the ecosystem perspective goes beyond actor-centred concepts and has to include governance models, potentially supportive infrastructures, and even legal and cultural norms which take effect in a specific ecosystem and which make a difference.

The ecosystem perspective goes beyond actor-centred concepts and has to include governance models, potentially supportive infrastructures, and even legal and cultural norms which take effect in a specific ecosystem and which make a difference.

new ways of developing and diffusing social innovations are necessary (e.g. design thinking, innovation labs etc.) as well as the necessity of a new role of public policy and government for creating suitable framework and support structures, the integration of resources of the economy and civil society as well as supporting measures by science and research.

3. CHALLENGES FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The five key dimensions of social innovation, a methodology used in the SI-DRIVE project, help to better differentiate internal and environmental factors initiatives are facing.

3.1 Concepts and understanding of social innovation

The global mapping of SI-DRIVE uncovers countless approaches and initiatives that illustrate the strengths and potentials of social innovations in different parts of the world, with their different economic, cultural, religious and historic backgrounds. Overall, social innovations are gaining in importance, not only in relation to social integration and equal opportunities, but also in respect to the innovative ability and future sustainability of society as a whole. At the same time, the understanding of social innovation varies a lot from actor to actor and also from ecosystem to ecosystem. For example, while in some ecosystems, the understanding of social innovation is mainly influenced by a strong involvement of cooperatives and a dominant role of the social economy, in other ecosystems the issue of social inclusion through technological innovations shapes the concept. Also common is the lack of a clear understanding of social innovation through those who are part of the ecosystem. Better understanding social innovation, including its relationship to technological innovation and innovations which seek for economic rather than social value creation, would help the actors within the ecosystems to work in a more targeted way.

3.2 Objectives and social demands, societal challenges and systemic changes that are addressed

This research dimension focuses on the desired output and motivation of social innovation and its initiatives. With regard to the different levels on which output is generated, BEPA suggests that “the output dimension refers to the kind of value or output that social innovation is expected to deliver: a value that is less concerned with mere profit, and including multiple dimensions of output measurement” [2]. In this understanding, social innovations:

• respond to social demands that are traditionally not addressed by the market or existing institutions and are directed towards vulnerable groups in society […]
• tackle ‘societal challenges’ through new forms of relations between social actors, […] respond to those societal
challenges in which the boundary between social and economic blurs, and are directed towards society as a whole [...], or contribute to the reform of society in the direction of a more participative arena where empowerment and learning are both sources and outcomes of well-being” [2].

Results of SI-DRIVE’s global mapping reveal that actors of innovative projects and initiatives increasingly try to address social needs and societal challenges instead of focusing primarily on economic success and profit. The need to respond to a specific societal challenge or a local social demand are by far the main motivation and trigger for initiating and running a social innovation. More than 60% of the initiatives have started from this perspective.

As the mapping reveals, there is an abundance of approaches and initiatives exploiting the strengths and the potential of social innovation in order to support societal integration through education and poverty reduction, to implement sustainable consumption patterns or to manage demographic change. However, social innovations do not only become increasingly important for ensuring social cohesion and equal opportunities, but also for the innovative capacity and resilience of companies and society as a whole.

Moreover, a true challenge for both research and practice has to do with the development of new governance models for social innovation ecosystems. Regarding the importance of empowerment, co-creation and citizen involvement for social innovation, traditional patterns and mechanism seem obsolete. Against this background, Sgaragli’s approach to social innovation ecosystems in terms of “a paradigm shift where grass-root, bottom-up, spontaneous movements and communities of change are shaping new ecosystems” as well as regarding the “replacement of existing governance models with ones that are more open, inclusive and participatory” [3], opens up a different perspective that needs to be explored through empirical studies.

### 3.4 Process dynamics

Questions about transferability and scalability within a given or to another ecosystem dominate social innovation discourses. Scaling in terms of different modes of organisational growth is a typical way. While scaling is a more prominent strategy within a given ecosystem, transfer and adaptive replication more often takes place in a different setting, which helps to reach completely new target groups. The initiating actors – social entrepreneurs, project managers,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>‘Scaling out’</td>
<td>Organisation attempt to replicate their social innovation in other geographical areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Scaling up’</td>
<td>Organisations attempt to affect a wider system change by tackling the institutional causes of a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>A social entrepreneur rids of traditional aspects of organisational control (brand, intellectual property, etc.) to influence and create other ‘change makers’ within the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-replication</td>
<td>Open Source</td>
<td>The core intellectual property of the innovation or organisation is turned into an open source tool for others to take up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (less explored potential strategies)</td>
<td>Including:</td>
<td>• Affiliation with new partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct/indirect dissemination of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Working to change policy environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social movement building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of main scaling strategies [4]
activists, groups, networks and so on – have a motivation, an intention or a strategy to disseminate their solution for a social problem. There are even further activities an actor can initiate in order to overcome the limits of organisational growth. The summarising table shows the different modes of scaling or dissemination strategies that had been discussed in the Critical Literature Review of SI-DRIVE.

Social innovation ecosystems can only develop their full potential if there are people who have the necessary skills to work in this area.

3.5 Resources, capabilities and constraints
Social innovation initiatives are enabled or inhibited through different types of resources, capabilities and constraints, depending on the co-operation of actors, (supporting) networks, cross-sector triple and quadruple helix collaboration, combinations of knowledge backgrounds, user involvement, and institutional conditions. They are closely related to the social innovation ecosystem and infrastructure for social innovations. Resources (financial or other) for social innovation ecosystems are definitely not a big issue on most of policy-makers’ agendas. Many ecosystems are poor in terms of resources available for social innovations: funds are scarce, experts are seldom and knowledge is missing.

SI-DRIVE’s global mapping shows that lack of funding is the biggest barrier for social innovators and that own resources represent their main financial source. However, it is much more than just money. Social innovation ecosystems can only develop their full potential if there are people who have the necessary skills to work in this area. Here, universities could play an important role. At the same time, developing capabilities for social innovation ecosystems is a key task for actors from all societal sectors.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK
The ecosystems of social innovation are in different stages of development across Europe and beyond. In all countries “there are a number of important factors enabling the development of social innovation, including important support and impetus from the EU”[5]. The status of the social innovation activities differs in the different world regions, in regard to the existence of a (shared) understanding of social innovation, the dissemination of the initiatives, the societal challenges addressed, the actors involved, and more. The societal and governance systems, in which the social innovations are embedded, are complex and the problems addressed are deeply rooted in multifaceted societal and structural issues. At the same time, many initiatives are small in scale: Only a minority of social innovations are leaving the narrow context of the initiative and the local or regional level, and if so, mainly scale within the own initiative. Therefore, an important task for future research is not only to better understand social innovation ecosystems themselves (e.g. along the different dimensions presented above), but also to explore connections between ecosystems which would facilitate diffusion of social innovations.

REFERENCES
The world we live in is more connected than ever, and networks are very much in vogue. Networks are no longer just for socialites; they are a powerful tool for creating societal impact. So why has this phenomenon occurred, and what does it mean for organisations of the future?

Louise Pulford

Networks are very much in vogue, and rightly so. The world we live in is more connected than ever, and networks are directly linked to productivity and capacity building. The practice of investing in relationship and building social capital is no longer seen as the territory of senior executives and socialites. The number of organisations who are building networks, or who are taking a network approach to how they work, is on the rise.

We see more foundations drawing on their alumni networks, universities aligning their approaches, and traditional NGOs working collaboratively to improve access to resources. They are all seeking approaches that are more collaborative, creative and continuous, thus increasing the sustainability of their collective impact.

There are several reasons why this network phenomenon has occurred. Especially three reasons are particularly important for those who work in Social Innovation. First of all, the impact potential of individual social change organisations frequently depends on the robustness of the enabling ecosystem that they are operating in. Secondly, networks can practically speed up the process of learning. Since innovations often happen simultaneously in different places, networks can help innovators become visible outside of their own silos in order to connect and learn from each other more readily. Finally, networks also build capacity more quickly. Given the fact that Social Innovation is a relatively new and expanding field, supporting shared learning is a valuable way of accelerating how frequently deployable insights are developed, scaled and, finally, spread.

However, building and facilitating an effective network is not easy. The Social Innovation Exchange (SIX) has been building and nurturing a global cross-sector network of Social Innovation organisations and individuals over the past nine years. With 16000 members (individuals and organisations), SIX helps to build the necessary relationships, capital and knowledge to increase social impact. At SIX, we have been analysing what we mean when we talk about using a network approach.

The way networks work is just as important as what networks do. Below, seven principles and key features on which the SIX network approach is based are summarised.

1. People focussed – We strengthen our partners by believing in them, motivating them and legitimizing what they do.
2. Trust building – We build trust and enable our partners to engage honestly.
3. Anchor and reframe – We bring together different people and groups aligning them through learning and a shared vision and holding their interactions.
4. Productive disruption – We support people to take risk and ask difficult questions making them comfortable with uncertainty and change.
5. Practice action – We value social impact rather than ideas, taking people through practical processes to seek knowledge and solutions.
6. Connect as peers – We connect people based on interest area not on job title.
7. Empower – We build on assets and stimulate self discovery and democratize innovation.
However, the role of the network is much deeper than simply connecting. In the following, five roles are described that networks should play in order to be most effective.

**We are…**

- **Storytellers & Translators**: We connect as peers.
- **Enablers**: We create spaces for reflection.
- **Designers**: We encourage people to be curious and open.
- **Facilitators**: We welcome unexpected relationships.
- **Extractors**: We inspire ambition.

**We create environments which are…**

- **Safe & Honest**: We motivate our partners by believing in them and legitimising what they do.
- **Radical**: We create spaces for reflection.
- **Egalitarian**: We encourage people to be curious and open.
- **Exploratory**: We welcome unexpected relationships.
- **Diverse**: We inspire ambition.

*The approach of Social Innovation Exchange (SIX)*

Providing a strategic foresight – Networks must remain relevant and current, providing strategic foresight. This means we believe that networks have a responsibility to continuously seek out and leverage strategic opportunities and connections. Their role should be in both thinking and doing, and they should connect to policy, power and practice simultaneously. There is a global breadth of knowledge that can support practitioners to leapfrog ahead by borrowing great proven ideas and adapting them to local circumstances. To stay relevant, network secretariats must keep the horizon scanning functionality, always on the lookout for new people and projects – the value is more than the sum of its parts. A network approach means an ability to seek and identify topics and themes that bring value to the community in the present and for future challenges.

**Strategic curation** – This means taking advantage of the evolving strategic foresight that network facilitators gain from their members. If the curation approach and strategy is shaped carefully, its direction, sequence of activities and focal points will combine to expand the field’s shared knowledge and impact.

This approach will be supported by strong secretariats. There are several ways to structure a network and the advantage of a strong secretariat is that we can support core functions such as information sharing, networking, building strong peer relationships, knowledge-building, strengthening the distributed capability of the network to have agency. Strong secretariats can also develop and deploy specific strategies built around goals such as capacity building, policy engagement and field building. Growing slowly, organically helps build a strong foundation – this means inviting people to be a part of it, and encouraging distributed leadership across the breadth of networks and organisations served.

**Trust building** – Carefully building trusting and trusted relationships is central to a network’s effectiveness. Trust can be built by action as well as attitude.

Whether a network has a formal membership or not, effective networks rely on the power of “pull” in order to keep
people and institutions connected into and active in support of network activities. This also implies working in partnership with organisations in the network. The more activities, whether these are events, research papers, or trainings, are conducted in partnership, the more trust is built and the more effective the work will be. Networks never act alone.

A cocktail for reciprocity – Power dynamics are always at play in any network that includes diverse groups of people. As conveners, it is crucial to never forget where the initial connections come from. Relationships are always reciprocal and layered. This is how networks develop and grow broad-based partners and collaborators across sectors and diverse regions.

Building a narrative and brand – A challenge for networks in this field is developing a powerful and viral narrative, making it much simpler to explain to people in the mainstream what exactly “Social Innovation” is and why it is so important. The narrative helps to build brands, which in turn attract people to become a part of the network, which, in turn, increases the impact.

However, taking this approach is not easy, and there are several challenges that Social Innovation network organisations face.

1. Operating at the periphery of mainstream innovation system – How do we get ‘social’ into the water supply?

The dominant global thinking and organisation of innovation policy and innovation ecosystems is still centred on STEM innovation (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and business model innovation. As a result, Social Innovation is often invisible to the main innovation system, and therefore continues to operate in its own silo. Challenging this dominant innovation narrative remains a daunting, but indispensable task if Social Innovation is to have the impact it seeks and networks play a key role in this mainstreaming strategy.

2. The power of weak ties – How should we manage the tension of depth vs. breadth?

Network theory highlights the power of weak ties versus strong ties. Focussing on weak ties enables people and organisations to reach a large number of diverse and relevant contacts for knowledge or action. There is always a trade-off between size and depth; openness and building a core of like-minded people. This needs to be a conscious choice. The language of Social Innovation is challenging for some organisations and sectors, therefore being aware and sensitive of this will effect how networks are built and how open you choose to be.

3. Ensuring network sustainability – What is the right business model for a network?

Finding the right business model to support the core functions of networks requires an innovation all of its own. Membership fees are just one way to fund a network, and may not be appropriate depending on the choice of breadth vs. depth. In recent years, several networks have been established as part of European Commission funded projects, and there is now money available to support the core function of a secretariat which works across several countries. This is quite unusual compared to other parts of the world where several Social Innovation networks struggle to secure such core support and are forced into more diverse business models, seeking funding from events, training, research work and consultancy, rather than just core network building functions.

BUILDING NETWORKS OF THE FUTURE

Networks of the future need to be more digitally robust, providing a space for online connection and interaction. Whilst face to face interaction is crucial for building relationships, we can not ignore the role and potential of technology to be able to support peer-to-peer connections and collaborative value creation. Much more robust platform development provides an opportunity for the growth of Social Innovation networks by enabling them to harness the distributed knowledge of peers around the world in more effective and ongoing ways.

As Margaret Wheatley and Deborah Frieze describe in “Using Emergence to take Social Innovations to Scale” [1]: “In spite of current ads and slogans, the world doesn’t change one person at a time. It changes as networks of relationships form among people who discover they share a common cause and vision of what’s possible.”

If we want to enable more organisations to leverage knowledge and resources more effectively, and build capabilities through networks, we must ensure networks are carefully managed.
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THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL INNOVATION IN THE EU
THE CASE FOR A EUROPEAN INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION

The European Union (EU) has provided an essential leverage capacity for the emergence of Social Innovation. Drawing from the experience of the last decade on Social Innovation in EU policy making and from the institutional support given to innovative policy issues in other sectors, this article makes the case for the creation of a dedicated European institute for Social Innovation.

Agnès Hubert

SOCIAL INNOVATION IS A EUROPEAN ISSUE

The revival of attention for Social Innovation at EU level is attached to the urge to respond to the social damages of the 2008 crisis, when public budget deficits and pressing social needs acted as accelerators for the development of initiatives to prevent social exclusion and maintain the provision of services. But Social Innovation is not as simple an idea as replacing public spending by the voluntary work of charities or business dynamism. A decade of experimentation and research has brought evidence that Social Innovation can be a transformative process towards a new paradigm of growth. It has the potential to provide answers to address social and ecological challenges as well as political disenchantment and lack of trust.

But while we see plenty of small successful initiatives to address urgent social demands directed towards vulnerable groups in society, the more systemic approach “to transform society in the direction of a more participative arena where empowerment and learning are sources and outcomes of well-being” [2] are slow to start and in need of continuous institutional support upheld by a political vision.

THE SLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A SOCIAL INNOVATION POLICY

A stakeholder workshop with the President of the European Commission in 2009 was a starting point for the development of a wave of Social Innovation in European policies. Political attention was brought to the vitality of the sector, the problems encountered and to the transformative potential of Social Innovations. After this workshop, Social Innovation spread in all the relevant EU policies, responding to the...
call of civil society for more EU action in this field: creative initiatives were burgeoning, out of a tradition of social economy organisations. They were looking for recognition, exchanges and new rules and resources to be deployed at European level.

The institutional mobilisation in the European Commission crystallised in 2010 around the new ten years growth strategy: “Europe 2020 for a smart, green and inclusive Europe”, with targets to be reached by 2020 for employment, research, energy and climate change, education, poverty reduction and social inclusion. Social Innovation found a fertile ground in this policy exercise and commitments to grant it programs and resources flourished.

Around 2010, ideas, interests and institutions opportunistically came together to push EU policies to integrate Social Innovation as a significant component. The work of a specific group in the services of the Commission helped to insert Social Innovation in the key initiatives and brought legitimacy and resources to actors inside and outside institutions.

In this period, the European Union deployed its resources in many fields, including in structural initiatives like the “partnership on active and healthy ageing”, to add two healthy and active years to the lives of people. Also in 2011, the social business initiative (SBI), strongly backed by three commissioners, took up the challenge of strengthening the social economy by taking action to improve the recognition of social enterprises, simplify the regulatory environment and the access to funding. It culminated in a large meeting of stakeholders who signed the Strasbourg declaration in January 2014.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Addressing social demands by the contribution of dynamic and imaginative charities and social entrepreneurs, with the occasional contributions of generous donors, is not a sustainable way to address the societal challenges of our time. The commitments to Social Innovation made by the Commission as part of Europe 2020 and later its social investment strategy provided many of the elements of an agenda for change, ranging from supporting networking and funding for grass root Social Innovations and social entrepreneurs to experiments of social policy instruments, research in methodologies and changes in governance modes in order to recognise social policies as an investment in the future. These commitments were embedded in policy documents and their contribution to the reform of social policies and to behavioural and systemic changes were promising, going as far a revival of the debate on indicators of growth “beyond GDP” initiated by the Commission in 2007.

Unfortunately, by 2015, the failure to reach the mid-term targets set for the Europe 2020 strategy, justified strategic changes and President Juncker, who took office in 2015, decided on different policy priorities. While it can be argued that the two defining documents of the recent period, the Commission’s “White paper on the future of Europe” and the “European pillar of Social Rights”, stress the social nature of the challenges facing the European Union, the institutional construction and political attention which boosted developments on Social Innovation vanished.

THE CASE FOR A SOCIAL INNOVATION INSTITUTE

The institutional construction for Social Innovation entailed governance instruments (a permanent inter service group, policy guidance by a group of commissioners, initiatives to power public sector innovations, European innovation partnerships, reform of public procurement), financing capacities and facilities (a specific programme, access to venture capital, a regulatory framework for social investment funds, Microfinance and crowdfunding, an impact investing scheme), capacity building instruments (prizes, mapping of social enterprises, a data base of labels and certifications, incubators and networks, a collective awareness platform initiative, digital innovation platforms, multi stakeholder platform for corporate social responsibility, skills development and exchange) and research (financing of research and pilot projects) [3]. Some were embedded to stay and others were left to vanish.

The need for a stable structure to pursue a “transformative agenda” was mentioned in the Strasbourg declaration. Also, drawing on lessons from the experience of other transformative policy objectives (e.g. gender equality) and given the political nature of internal instruments (group of
commissioners, inter service groups), the option for a sustainable European effort to develop Social Innovation, is the creation of an independent institution in the shape of a European Institute (or agency). This would have to be confirmed by a feasibility study [4], however given the political and administrative investments done so far and the reaffirmed need to find innovative solutions to the challenges faced by European economies and societies, an institute would be the natural place to develop new modes of governance, to ensure appropriate financing is available, to engage with stakeholders and policy makers for capacity building, and to be a resource centre for data and research.

**WHAT IS A EUROPEAN INSTITUTE (OR AGENCY)?**

There are now over 40 EU agencies that are distinct from EU institutions, and have been set up to accomplish specific tasks, such as promoting environmental protection, transport safety, multilingualism or gender equality. They span over Europe and are providing services, information and know-how to the general public. Each agency has its own legal personality. Some answer the need to develop scientific or technical know-how in certain areas; others bring together different interest groups to facilitate dialogue at European and international level.

The largest wave of European agencies came at the turn of the century. The literature on European integration and governance highlights three types of reasons behind the creation of EU agencies in the early 2000: (1) to improve the legitimacy of decisions, (2) to ensure the continuity of policies against the changing preferences of successive political majorities and (3) to cope with the increased size of the EU which ends the time of consensual decision making process used so far.

In a functional perspective, the literature on the role of epistemic communities on policymaking and expertise in the European Union [5] raise three principles for policy making which confirm the appropriateness of an agency for a European Social Innovation policy:

- a policy development must be based on verifiable and reliable data, and grounded in **expertise**
- a policy must be able to garner support even beyond its immediate constituency: **participation and legitimacy**
- a policy needs to remain clearly circumscribed and identifiable: **specificity**.

**EXPERTISE**

The development of EU wide knowledge on Social Innovation has so far been developed mainly by academics and practitioners within large and small research projects and occasional policy experiments within the boundary of administrative regulations. Evidence and theoretical insights produced have shed light on the need to monitor fast moving policy developments in their diversity, to empower networks to explore areas beyond the boundaries of traditional policy making and avail resources to experiment. No doubt that a small and reactive body as an institute would be fitter to fill in these tasks and act as a resource centre for data and knowledge than many different silos in administrations.

**POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND LEGITIMACY**

As EU policy-making has become more complex, due to the diverse situations amongst and within its member states, citizens are at an increasing loss and legitimacy is sinking, fuelling a need for change and to empower citizens. Social Innovation is both a space to “make people gain the feeling that they can influence their surrounding and the direction of events” (TRANSIT) and a way to produce legitimacy through its social aims.

**SPECIFICITY**

In the early stage, the need to recognise Social Innovation with a single definition seemed a condition for its success but almost a decade later, research and practice have produced a complex picture of different types of Social Innovations, from the practical answer to a punctual issue (e.g. the creation of a social enterprise to serve the needs of a community) to culturally disruptive and transformative initiatives on a large scale (e.g. the circular economy). Battles of definitions will continue to surround Social Innovation, a “quasi concept” according to Jane Jenson [6], where being polysemous is a strength.

**HOW TO PROCEED?**

Agencies are mostly funded by EU budget, and the ordinary legislative procedure applies to their establishment. Decentralised agencies were set up to respond to emerging individual policy needs. They are heterogeneous in nature,
size and goals, which, despite efforts to harmonise their regulations, do not comply with "one size fit all" rules. Their only bible is a "non-binding common approach to EU agencies" agreed on in 2012, after a long institutional controversy, leaving a decent amount of flexibility to fix ad hoc objectives, size, structure and scope for a European Social Innovation Institute.

CONCLUSION

There has been steady progress in building up institutional support for Social Innovation in the last decade at European level. The EU has been able to act as a catalyst in developing initiatives, instruments, projects and research to support new ways to address societal challenges. Initially, Social Innovations where seen as participative instruments to respond to new needs which were not addressed by the state or the market. However, it has grown into a promise to "empower people and drive change".

Digital developments are not the least reason to continue exploring the potential of Social Innovation as a transformative process. Inequalities, changes in family structures and the labour market, the mitigation of climate change and populist attacks on democracy are interlinked challenges which are weakly addressed by traditional policy making and where Social Innovation works at its best.

Drawing from the experience of other transversal policy fields (gender equality), the creation of an autonomous institution in the form of a Social Innovation institute, is necessary for the continuity of the policy but also to preserve its specificity, mobilise its epistemic communities and assert its legitimacy. The idea is not to discharge institutions of their responsibility to develop innovative policies but on the contrary to support and advise them in their tasks by experimenting on policies co-designed with an active citizenry.
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EMPOWERMENT, CO-CREATION AND SOCIAL INNOVATION ECOSYSTEMS

While co-creation and empowerment are generic features of social innovation, initiatives are embedded in an environment which can sometimes be supportive or even hostile. Research in SI-DRIVE provides examples for a variety of manifestations, leading to a typology of six models.

Josef Hochgener

EMPOWERMENT

Empowerment is one of the most specific features of social innovation processes on the one hand, and of outcomes (potential impact) on the other hand. This was emphatically highlighted by the European Commission in an early key document on social innovation: “The process of social interactions between individuals undertaken to reach certain outcomes is participative, involves a number of actors and stakeholders who have a vested interest in solving a social problem, and empowers the beneficiaries. It is in itself an outcome as it produces social capital.” [1]

Co-creation and empowerment can be determined as generic features of all sorts of social innovation. Over and above these characteristic properties any social innovation is embedded in an eco-system.

CO-CREATION

According to an understanding of social innovation as a new figuration of practices, i.e. how to act when individuals, groups or organisations intend to solve social issues, some form of collaboration is always essential and indispensable. The fundamental concept of social action explicitly connects the intention of an actor with another person or group. Thus, an interactive relationship between social entities comes into being, that is crucial for the generation of social innovation and its outcomes: a rather loosely form of relation is to accept the action of someone else – yet the more mutual and trusted a relationship becomes, the better the impact. This is why SI-DRIVE emphasises “co-creation” and participation next to “empowerment”, as verified by the results of the research [2].

ECO-SYSTEM

Research proved that social innovation still appears to be a fragile as well as blurry term, if compared to the common understanding of innovation and Research, Technology Development and Innovation (RTDI) -policies in the framework of measures to enhance technological progress and economic growth. It is therefore highly relevant to also look at what determines the conditions for success or failure of social innovation initiatives, the so-called “social innovation eco-system”. The comprehension of social innovation eco-systems includes, first of all, patterns of the pre-conditions to instigate and implement social innovations. Such patterns are formed by potential causes (in the sense of issues, needs, challenges and desires) as well as by facilitating instruments (knowledge, competencies, funding, drivers and varieties of actors which may be individuals, organisations and institutions in all societal sectors), and obstructive factors and impediments, too. Moreover, an eco-system might bear the potential to ensure the sustainability of results and impact. An effective social innovation eco-system usually is required to hedge lasting impact of social innovations.

LEARNINGS FROM SI-DRIVE CASES

Concluding from the mapping and in-depth case studies selected from a total of 1005 examples, observations confirm that some form of co-creation plays a role in all social innovations; additionally one of the effects – impact – of social innovations is empowerment. Therefore co-creation and empowerment can be determined as generic features of
all sorts of social innovation. Over and above these characteristic properties any social innovation is *embedded in an eco-system*, in fact ranging from conducive to hostile socio-economic or cultural environments, just think of the struggle of women in Saudi Arabia for car-driving permit.

So, empowerment, co-creation and eco-systems make a difference beyond peculiarities in relation to the five key dimensions of social innovation, i.e. concepts, societal needs, resources, process dynamics, and governance [3, p. 5]: There are various forms of co-creation, different directions and efficacy of empowerment, and modifications by a spectrum of respective eco-systems. A focus on the ways of collaboration in social innovation processes, and on impact by empowerment under conditions of respective eco-systems enables to determine characteristic modes or typical varieties of social innovation. The specifics and differences of certain modes of social innovation are best explained by key features of concrete social innovations, as identified and thoroughly analysed in the SI-DRIVE case studies. Hence, a sample of case study extracts illustrates the following generic typology.

**SIX MODELS OF SOCIAL INNOVATION**

(1) Social innovation as new or improved service
In this case innovators identify needs and provide solutions for a target group with particular demands. Yet even in this case social innovation may not be seen as something ready-made to be bought and consumed off the shelf, because acceptance and adoption of the new practice(s) require adaptation or imitation as a minimum of joint activity. Such types of social innovation are most likely in policy areas like health, care, raising children, education, poverty, where beneficiaries come into play in the stage of implementation. Yet of course, there are such cases of providing social innovation for somebody in need in all policy fields surveyed.

**Example "MomConnect"**
*Policy Field: Health and Social Care | Region/Country: South Africa (Republic of South Africa, RSA)*

MomConnect is a free mobile service for pregnant women and new mothers. It might be termed a “Public Start-up”, carried out and made possible by private companies, foundations and others in a consortium of more than 20 partners. The main driver and initiator was the National Department of Health; so it is a case of government buy-in social innovation (like many other e/m health care examples). Launched 2014, the mobile phone based service connects more than one million women to vital services of 95% of all health clinics across RSA. The service is not one-directional, as it enables critical feedback and thus stimulates also innovation in the clinics and other service providers, e.g. of education and training.

(2) The DIY-model: Social innovation as self-help
In the case of “Do-It-Yourself” (DIY) the social innovation typically is initiated and carried out by a certain group of people or an organisation to benefit their own good and value. The initial *raison d’être* is to create the possibility of working toward fulfilling a specific demand of members. Because of the perceived lack of other opportunities they develop new forms of collaborating and organising processes. If successful, such initiatives want to expand and tend to change the prior social demand perspective to a societal challenge perspective, hoping the own model may become adopted and replicated on larger scale.

**Example "Nova Iskra"**
*Policy Field: Employment | Region/Country: Europe (Serbia)*

Nova Iskra is a network of designers and creative consultants, aiming at an alternative model of business organisation, following innovative principles such as diversity management in the way of co-working and new forms of governance. The workplace innovation affects management, relationships with users and other stakeholders, and the work environment itself. Success explicitly is perceived by the number of people empowered, namely some 9,000 beneficiaries by 2016.

(3) Social innovation emerging from co-creation
This is the case of a direct start-up aiming at social innovation and to achieve objectives of public interest. “Start-up” does not necessarily mean to become a company – be it for-profit or non-profit. It may remain, at least for some time, an “initiative” of individuals collaborating without a formal structure. Yet as it grows through attraction of new members, occasionally involving companies and other organisations, an appropriate formal structure will be required to enable a reasonable extension to *co-working* following the stage(s) of *co-creation*.

**Example “Qvinnovindar”**
*Policy Field: Energy Supply | Region/Country: Europe (Sweden)*

A women only initiative in the field of wind energy production emerged since 2007 because of the fact that a group of ten women found it impossible to participate by investment in existing wind power projects. As they could not afford the minimum investment required, the prime idea was to enable women with economic potentials lower than usual investors to also produce wind energy – and encourage (empower) them to better take part in ecological and economic affairs by bundling their individual resources.
Social innovation as cooperative
Social innovation as a cooperative places participation of like-minded players in the foreground. However, the significant feature of such cases is that cooperatives want to transcend solely own concerns. An initiative of this kind may be the result of only one person as prime creator, yet it can be as kicked-off as well by a group of people, a civil society organisation, a scientific or research institute, a private company or a government department. In its core, however, the project to launch and implement a social innovation typically is carried out by close participative cooperation in what usually is considered a civil society cooperative. Nevertheless, after implementation and either in the course of its development or in case of replication the organisational framework may become varied or more diverse because of novel processes of participation and cooperation.

Example “Dignity and Designs”
Policy Field: Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development | Region/Country: Asia (India)

Dignity and Designs (D&D) is a craft and marketing social enterprise committed to social and economic empowerment of women, free from practices of bondage and sexual violence in labour dedicated to the lowest cast (Dalit). Starting from concepts of rehabilitation, on to providing new skills (e.g. apparel making) D&D shows elements of becoming a mass movement – slowly mainstreaming the concern of inclusion, capacity building and livelihood promotion of poor and marginalised communities, particularly women.

(5) Social innovation initiated to drive social change
Examples of this kind combine from the beginning explicitly the objective to deal with issues of a specific target group in society with the further perspective to influence social change on a broader scale (⇒ societal challenge perspective). Such initiatives first look at often age-long lasting problems of insecurity or inequity, and from there develop an innovative concept to intervene and improve quality of life and/or working conditions of the particularly affected target group. When implemented, success may pop up sometimes quickly for a small part of the target group, yet in the long run it may gradually change the social issue to the better.

Example “dynaklim”
Policy Field: Environment and Climate Change | Region/Country: Europe (Germany)

dynaklim aimed to develop a climate change strategy for the region (mainly North-Rhine Westphalia) and increasing Germany’s adaptive capacity by anchoring an awareness of the necessity of adaptation within society. The initiative was started by a science lead consortium, having had worked together previously and had generated a high degree of trust and collaborative experience. Because of the size of the societal challenge addressed, the cooperative efforts reached out to public, private and civil society groups and organisations, based on scientific research and evaluation. Funding was received from the Federal Government for a period of five years, ending in 2014. The downside of the experience was an important learning: after finalisation of the project many participating municipalities returned to their administrative routines, although these had been found inadequate to solve the problem at the beginning. This clearly illustrates that the process of social change requires process methodologies in order to secure permanent impact of social innovations. Piecemeal public investment in – maybe even consecutive – projects does not suffice.

(6) Support measures improving the social innovation eco-system
Accelerated since about ten years, an increasing number of organisations aim to support the creation and advancement of social innovation – some in general, some in a particular mode or sector. Such centres, labs, or hubs (to name the most frequently used notions) may be seen as an emerging infrastructure for social innovation. Their evolvement proceeds along the lines of what was implemented many decades ago by policies to boost technology development and, ultimately, economic growth: Technology Centres or Technology Parks, Business Incubation Centres, various funding programmes for RTDI and favouring start-ups. There is, world-wide, a delay in setting up similar research and social development centres which should facilitate social change and societal evolvement (social and cultural evolution) besides economic growth. Existing organisations of this kind are usually civil society organisations (NGO’s,

Example “Social Impact Hub”
Policy Field: Employment | Region/Country: Global (Australia)

Two organisations with the same objective, created in Germany on the one hand (focusing on developments in Germany), and in Australia (expanding as a global network of hubs) on the other hand, are specialised on start-up assistance for social enterprises and advancement of particular target groups. Empowerment and co-creation are cornerstones of their work, enabling individual self-confidence as well as creating work organisations that display novel properties of quality, inclusion, fairness and other human values not sacrificed on behalf of business profit and economic growth.consecutive – projects does not suffice.
partly co-financed by private foundations and other donors). Other sources of facilitation are knowledge production by science and research organisations, and promotion and encouragement of social innovators by awards, festivals and publications in various media.