

SI-DRIVE
Social Innovation: Driving Force of Social Change

SOCIAL INNOVATION IN POVERTY REDUCTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

STATE OF THE ART SUMMARY

Status: August 2015

Project acronym	SI-DRIVE
Project title	Social Innovation: Driving Force of Social Change
Grand Agreement number	612870
Coordinator	TUDO – Technische Universität Dortmund
Funding Scheme	Collaborative project; Large scale integration project
Due date of deliverable	03/2015
Actual submission date	03/2015
Start date of the project	January 1st 2014
Project duration	48 months
Work package	10: Poverty reduction and sustainable development
Lead beneficiary for this deliverable	UBRUN
Authors	Jeremy Millard (UBRUN, UK), Ka Lin, Zhejiang (ZUH, China), Nicolás Martín Jiménez (SOMOS MAS, Colombia), Swati Banerjee (TISS, India), Elena Como (LAMA, Italy), Maria Elisa Bernal (ECLAC UN, Chile), Mohamed Wageih (Heliopolis, Egypt), Fuat Erdal ITU, Turkey), Mirna Karzen (SIL, Croatia)
Dissemination level	Internal



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612870.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
1.1 Approaches to poverty reduction and sustainable development	1
1.2 Policy challenges.....	1
1.3 Governance and legal/regulatory framework.....	2
1.4 Actors and their roles	4
1.5 Social innovation practice fields.....	5
1.6 The role of ICT	7
1.7 Summary tables of social needs and practice fields.....	9



SUMMARY

Prepared by Jeremy Millard, Brunel University, United Kingdom

March 2015

As mentioned above, this is an initial report on the first round of mapping which is unlikely to be adequately representative of the true picture of the use of social innovation in tackling poverty and supporting sustainable development in those countries and regions where it was possible to undertake mapping. The report does, however, provide a good initial assessment and can be used to guide future work. The overall conclusions below provide an assessment from each country/region surveyed on the coherence or otherwise of the social innovation practice fields already identified with the policy and other challenges existing.

The main research questions addressed in this report were, first, what kind of social innovation practices can be found in the poverty and sustainable development policy field, and, second, what challenges and social needs are they responding to?

1.1 APPROACHES TO POVERTY REDUCTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The European countries surveyed use the official European Commission relative income definition of poverty as disposable income below 60% of the national median equalised income after social transfers. Some like Denmark do this mainly using accurate and comprehensive income data, whilst other countries also use definitions related to, for example, people at risk of poverty, going without the basic necessities of life, not being able to maintain a minimum life standard, economic unease and various concepts of social exclusion.

In Eastern Asia, China uses the common global standard of absolute income poverty set at the equivalent of \$1 per day for individuals who then receive subsidies, but also designates certain counties as in poverty and provides special assistance on a spatial basis. In contrast, India focuses on a multi-dimensional approach to poverty and social exclusion together defined as “people are living in poverty if their income and resources (material, cultural and social) are so inadequate as to preclude them from having a standard of living which is regarded as acceptable by society generally.” In Latin America and the Caribbean a mix of income and other assessments is used which classifies a person as “poor” when the per capita income of their household is below the “poverty line” (which is less than the UN’s \$1 per day). This is set as the minimum income the members of a household must have in order to meet their basic needs. In the Middle and Near East, both the Arab countries and Turkey use the UN’s absolute yardstick of poverty set at \$1.25 per day. The Arab countries also refer to non-income measures like exhausted economic infrastructures, high levels of system corruption, low technological innovation capacities.

1.2 POLICY CHALLENGES

In Northern Europe, poverty has increased by a factor of between two and three times since the 1980s and especially since the 2007-8 financial crisis. Much of this is due to increasing income inequality, though there are large variations, for example although both Denmark and the UK have seen poverty levels tripling, in the former the percentage of people living in poverty remains at under 5% compared to the latter where this figure rises to almost one third of the population. The groups doing best and which are least likely to be in poverty are pensioners and people with work in middle or high income occupations. Most other groups have become much worse off, for example in both Denmark and the UK those unemployed or on other benefits, whereas in the UK this also extends to those on low incomes so there is a very severe rise in the proportion of the so-called working poor, many of whom are stuck in various forms of precarious work. The UK situation is somewhat similar to some parts of Southern Europe, such as in Italy where there have also been steep rises in income inequality leading to the new poor and shrinking social safety nets. Also in Italy much policy intervention tends to be remedial in nature rather than preventative or empowering. Recent developments have taken a somewhat different course in the Western Balkans with the impact of the 1990s wars still

significant, such that poverty has been steadily declining since. However, a large number of the population remain poor and vulnerable to falling into poverty. Responses have been mostly reactionary, based on "emergency planning" rather than an integrated approach towards regeneration, innovation and sustainable development, and the negative trends have not changed. These include high depopulation rates and unemployment, low levels of investment and economic activity, expensive public services coupled with low quality and narrow access in some areas, all of which continue to exacerbate poverty and social exclusion in the region.

In contrast to much of Europe, poverty has been decreasing significantly in Eastern and Southern Asia, although with strong economic growth income inequality continues to be high and has been increasing so that, despite this success, there remain huge challenges. In both China and India, migrant workers from rural to urban areas are at high risk of falling into poverty, and in India particularly poverty is seen as closely connected to illiteracy, malnutrition, mortality, morbidity, poor access to water and sanitation, and vulnerability to economic shocks. The education challenge is especially important in India, as are gender inequalities. In both countries, tackling poverty is an intrinsic part of general development programmes related to the need to provide jobs as well as to improve infrastructures, social services and governance.

Also in contrast to much of Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean has recently seen important progress in poverty alleviation, although many households remain in a condition of great vulnerability and often extreme poverty. Moreover, Latin America remains the most unequal region in the world in terms of income distribution and assets such as land, capital, health, education and technology. Furthermore, labour informality remains high in most countries, leaving unprotected a large number of people excluded from social protection systems. More so than in many other emerging economies, there are significant challenges related to income inequalities, a high level of informal economy, lack of education and skills, land concentration and, in some countries like Colombia the vestiges of an internal conflict with illegal armed groups. This country like others is attempting to reduce violence, increase respect for human rights as well as move towards a more inclusive economy where vulnerable people can have access to health services, and rural areas could be developed by tackling the land problem, for example by working collaboratively with the private sector.

The near and Middle East, again in contrast to much of Europe, has seen significant decreases in poverty levels in the recent past, although acute challenges remain. In the Arab countries, the Arab Spring of 2011 and its aftermath has seen these challenges become more acute, such as the absence of peace and security, high levels of unemployment, illiteracy and hunger; remaining high poverty in some countries like Yemen and North Sudan; high population growth rates; drastic climate changes, pollution, drought, desertification and the over consumption of natural resources, water and lands. Furthermore, over the last four years, political and social instability in the region resulted in a financial crisis in a number of Arab States. In Turkey, poverty has also significantly declined, although poverty and income distribution are still worse than the European and many of the OECD countries. Although economic growth and development have been impressive, the poor have not benefited significantly. Another challenge is that poverty rates are remarkably varied across the country, as well as between rural and urban areas. Migration towards the big cities often increases urban poverty, and another recent challenge in terms of both poverty and social exclusion is the increasing number of Syrian immigrants (more than 1.5 million).

1.3 GOVERNANCE AND LEGAL/REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Governance responses in Northern Europe to the policy challenges outlined above concerning poverty and social exclusion are quite mixed. Denmark places strong emphasis on tackling their root causes as opposed to stigmatizing poor people as only lazy or irresponsible and only trying to address the symptoms, and the continuing strong welfare state provides one of the best social safety nets anywhere in the world. This is likely to be one of the reasons why poverty and social exclusion are still at relatively low levels compared to most other developed countries. However, there is some reluctance on the part of the public sector (policy makers, employers and civil servants) to recognise the value of new ways of meeting social needs, especially through using volunteers, both because of genuine skepticism concerning their role (for example, skills and accountability) as well as some fear that civil servant jobs will be lost at an even higher rate than is anyway happening because of budget cuts. On the other hand, there is today increasing awareness that even the relatively strong welfare state cannot solve all social problems for disadvantaged groups and those in poverty.

The UK governance response has, in many respects, taken a more aggressive path, for example by rhetoric backed by much of the media that depicts many poor people as lazy and irresponsible, although both countries deploy a number of instruments and initiatives, such as 'welfare-to-work' measures and a variety of benefits systems. In the UK however there is greater emphasis on tackling specific problems like the need for winter fuels and warm housing, etc.; tax and working tax credits; the national minimum wage; as well as family and children's policies more generally including social welfare. The UK also has a major focus on the so-called 'Big Society' initiative to support grassroots and other forms of social innovation, although most commentators reflect that this has not had much impact to date.

In Southern Europe, governance approaches to tackling poverty and social exclusion have traditionally been quite weak. In Italy, public spending in this area has declined, although there remain forms of income support to help the poor in the purchase of basic goods. However, due to the limited resources and complex eligibility structure, these measures have led to inequalities in terms of geographic coverage as well as the types of marginalised groups actually benefiting. Italy also relies on its regions and municipalities to provide appropriate services, and to some extent on EU-funded food aid programmes, delivered in partnership with third sector and Catholic networks. The emphasis is a little different in the Western Balkans where there have been a number of government strategies that explicitly mention and/or define social innovation either in the context of research and innovation activities or in support of social entrepreneurship. Similarly to Italy, however, there is some reliance on support from European funds, even though most countries are aspiring rather than actual EU Member States, and many of these funds specifically include social innovation as part of their policy approach.

In contrast to many of the governance approaches taken in Europe, Southern and Eastern Asia is seeing falling poverty, although still with huge contrasts and challenges. China has a very comprehensive approach based on financial transfers to assist both poor regions to develop local economies in the key areas like education, health care, information services as well as transportation and water supply, etc., as well as strengthening social security programmes to support individuals, such as the minimum income household guarantee. There are also efforts to formulate a unified approach across programmes, combining spatial and individual initiatives, and various non-governmental agents are also active, such as local community organisations and various associations (of women, youth, trade unions, etc.), in providing relief for the poor through the collective actions of welfare and caring. India has also seen important poverty reductions and improvements in areas like GDP growth, literacy rates, life expectancy and school enrolments, as well as decreasing infant mortality and a lowering of the gender gap. Like China, India has also undertaken reforms that open-up the economy, and liberalize the financial sector, although it remains some years behind China in this regard. However, unlike China, India is making efforts to reduce the role of the public sector. Both countries recognise the need to address environmental pollution and threats like drought, deforestation and soil erosion. India seems to lay greater stress on an empowerment approach, looking at building social and political capital through self-help groups which start with the poorest and most vulnerable, and in terms of asset transfers, including land reforms, designed to assist the chronically poor.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, the core of the social assistance and other programmes designed to fight poverty is the safety nets approach as a mechanism for cross-programme coordination and implementation, for example coordination between traditional social security, the provision of social services, and the supply of assistance programmes. In many countries a number of social ministries and secretariats have been created to put this approach into effect by coordinating a number of public benefits provided by different ministries, such as by housing, education and health. The picture remains quite mixed, however, with social responsibility policies in some countries remaining in autonomous institutions. In the Colombian case, the Constitutional Court is the main governmental institution for safeguarding fundamental rights, including access to health services and the right to be employed, through an integrated Social Security System. This brings together and coordinates the creation of institutions, norms and procedures across the pension, health and labour systems as well as with special welfare services, which guarantees citizens a certain level of life quality in accordance with human dignity principles. To better target poverty and social exclusion, the government identifies and registers designated families so they can receive access to social services and enjoy special cost conditions, including in basic health care. Current and ongoing national plans increasingly incorporate a strong role for social innovation to strengthen and scale public policy and the role of the market.

In the Middle and Near East, pan national bodies like the League of Arab States (LAS), the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA), and the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSA), are the chief governance structures designed to help achieve the MDGs. The LAS has different Specialized Councils and Sectors to design and manage the regional Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction framework in all Arab States. Agenda 21 is the Arab countries master plan for sustainable development and fighting poverty. At the national level, central governments and different ministries are the main, and in some countries the single, governance structures for social innovation practices. In Turkey, the government implements various instruments and initiatives, such as exemption from corporation tax when businesses are first established; exemption from social security payments when such businesses employ people in the relatively underdeveloped east and southeast regions; additional exemptions from social security payments when employing women and the disabled; various benefits systems (unemployment, child, housing, disability, job-seekers, pensions, free prescriptions, green card, winter fuels, etc.); the minimum wage law and so on. There is strong focus on these poorer regions and special encouragement and support is given to local civil society organisations and social enterprises to help address poverty, income re-distribution and social exclusion.

1.4 ACTORS AND THEIR ROLES

In Northern Europe, as with governance systems, the types of actors and their roles is quite mixed. In Denmark on the government side, relevant ministries exercise national responsibility alongside a number of agencies with specialised functions. These focus for example on the socially marginalized including marginalized Greenlanders, people with mental illness and marginalized youth, whilst the Agency for Social Affairs works to ensure that social initiatives are based on evidence about what works and what does not. At the local level, the municipalities are responsible for delivering all services related to tackling poverty, social exclusion and marginalization. The UK tends to be more centralized in fewer ministries and agencies, prominent among which is the Department for Work and Pensions and the Treasury and Inland Revenue. Both Denmark and the UK, however, have many important non-governmental actors including private actors, companies, non-profits and social entrepreneurs, under contract to the municipality or in collaboration with them, that provide many of the services. Social entrepreneurs and social innovators are particularly important, often supported by public and private funding and foundations, as well as an increasing number of both formal and informal volunteers. Given the weakness of government provision when compared to Denmark, non-state actors in the UK also include lobby, interest and action groups like the Child Poverty Action Group, the End Child Poverty Coalition, Age Concern, the Oxfam UK Poverty Programme, and the Living Wage Foundation. There are also numerous thinktanks and research institutes with a special focus on poverty, in particular the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Poverty and Social Exclusion Project at Bristol University and the Equality Trust. The Trades Union movement in the UK is also very concerned with poverty and related issues especially with those aspects related to employment, wages and working conditions, including contracts and safe working environments. Other non-state actors include funding agencies like Funding Central for charities and NGOs, the Big Society Capital for tackling social initiatives, and Social Enterprise UK as the national umbrella body for social enterprise.

In Southern Europe, Italy is similar to the UK in having one main Ministry (of Labour and Social Policies) responsible for national policies concerning poverty. But, more like Denmark, it has greater focus on sub-national entities, in this case both regions and municipalities. Also more similar to the UK, non-profit actors play a major role including foundations, social cooperatives, and associations. These deliver most services and interventions, using public resources as well as privately raised resources and community resources, needed to fill the gaps left by weak state intervention. Also like the UK, there are important lobby and action groups in Italy, especially the Alliance against Poverty, and, at local level, alliances are emerging between the municipalities and the third sector (especially the foundations), with the aim of joining forces to innovate strategies to combat poverty. In contrast, in the Western Balkans, the situation is somewhat different with both policy and action on poverty reduction and sustainable development being primarily the responsibility of national governments, with less involvement of other actors (although this varies depending on the country and the level of public discussions), including the private sector, civil society organizations, universities and institutes. As in other European countries, however, civil society is active in looking for innovative approaches to service delivery and to cooperate with other sectors, including the growing sector of social entrepreneurs, social cooperatives, and start-ups.

In Southern and Eastern Asia, and in line with their governance systems, the types of actors and their roles stand in some contrast with each other. In China, the main actors are the major state agencies with responsibility for anti-poverty issues, first and foremost the State Council Leading Group Office of Poverty Alleviation and Development. This office, together with several other major state agents and their local departments, prepares social plans for combating poverty and coordinating different governmental ministries and other state actors on anti-poverty actions. In India by comparison, poverty alleviation has been one of the guiding principles across many parts of government and in the planning process, including public sector driven industrialization, a strong focus on employment and human resources, positive institutional reform measures, the decentralization of services, improving urban governance, and a special programme for vulnerable groups. In the non-government sector, there are however many similarities between the two countries. In China, some foundations play a very important role in poverty reduction, including the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation and the China Association of Poverty Alleviation and Development, both of which organize poor relief action and charitable activities and develop channels between entrepreneurs and the groups in need. Similarly in India, civil-society participation is strong. With community based organizations, like cooperatives, special companies, societies, trusts and self help groups, are ideal instruments in such a strategy. On the other hand, social movements have centred around gender and minority rights issues, ecological conservation, caste and ethnicity, nation-building and democracy, as well as pro-poor growth. In contrast to China, however, there is in India a more overt focus amongst non-government actors to contribute to the creation of more pluralistic and democratic political systems. Also important in India, is intersecting the path of female empowerment and bargaining power with income level and financial literacy, as well as with poverty alleviation through building commercially sustainable enterprises and job creation.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, the coordinating social ministries described above are typically responsible for social policies, but their powers and resources vary considerably across countries, and can be reduced by more powerful entities such as the finance ministries. On the other hand, the role of non-governmental organizations is important, especially for addressing specific local challenges, for community participation and to mobilize support and allies at different levels, typically through small scale initiatives, although their impacts are often intermittent because of lack of stable funding. The private sector also plays a role through Corporate Social Responsibility issues which has recently generated significant benefits in the community. The comparative advantage of this sector compared to the others is the availability of financial and human resources to carry out new social initiatives. A good example in Colombia is the important role played by private investment, international cooperation with overseas aid agencies which fund and provide technical assistance to development projects, and with the Interamerican Development Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNPD), both of which which finance programs and projects (both long-term and short-term) developed by NGOs and other non-profits.

Even more so than in the other countries and regions examined here, the main actors in the Middle East are both regional and national government ministries, although the involvement of the private sector has increased significantly over the last two decades in the Arab World. In Turkey, five ministries together with the Prime Ministry have a number of departments and agencies directly dealing with the poor and with social exclusion. The private sector is also increasing its role in Turkey, for example several profit companies implement 'corporate responsibility' aiming at increasing the capacity of poor and disadvantaged groups, often working with and empowering CSOs, as well as with the government. Universities and university students are also quite active in participating in projects aimed at supporting poor and disadvantages groups. Social entrepreneurship is growing fast in Turkey and there are many foundations and associations working for the disabled, working children, children with severe illnesses, the homeless and vulnerable women. In contrast, the role of non-profits and non-government in the Middle East is not large but is growing slowly with some prominent examples.

1.5 SOCIAL INNOVATION PRACTICE FIELDS

The main social innovation focus in Northern Europe for tackling poverty and exclusion is on groups which are not able for many reasons to be fully integrated into the labour market. These include, for example, vulnerable young people and persons who are handicapped in some way causing them to be at risk of marginalisation, especially in relation to preparing for or finding jobs. There is an emphasis on vocational training skills, but even more on job creation initiatives tailored to the special needs of the unemployed and the under-employed,

especially by matching job seekers with job providers, and social innovations creating employment for vulnerable groups, including people with special psychological and physical needs. Both Denmark and the UK are highly innovative economies and societies, yet Denmark has a shorter and less developed history of social innovation probably due to the existence of a strong welfare state which continues to be among the most developed in the world. The UK, in contrast, has a longer social innovation history responding to the significant poverty, social exclusion and marginalisation problems which have been significantly exacerbated by the country's shrinking welfare state since the 2007-08 financial crisis. Given this, it is unsurprising that the UK is also a leader in social innovation tackling these issues, as well as social innovations more generally. This also springs from a long history of social and cooperative movements, charities and of social entrepreneurship, as well as philanthropic funding and grass roots activism. A number of social innovations in the UK aimed at tackling poverty relate to health and social care, as well as issues around food and unhealthy life styles. In both Denmark and the UK, there are also many initiatives addressing disadvantage and vulnerability, especially in relation to children and families, as well as to both young people and older people. A few 'environmental' social needs are also tackled in relation to housing issues. In Denmark, but not in the UK, there is also strong emphasis on cross-cutting issues, particularly social innovations which help coordinate and improve the supply of public and civil/volunteer services for the poor and marginalised, as well as providing general advice to such groups. It is perhaps surprising that examples of such cross-cutting social innovations have not been found in the UK given the clear need for such initiatives with a still relatively siloed public sector.

In Southern Europe, in some contrast to Northern Europe where the differences are relatively small though important, there are some very heterogeneous experiences, responding to a variety of needs and challenges and pointing to the emergence of different practice fields. In Italy, many social innovations addressing poverty are supported by foundations, banks and Catholic organizations, sometimes in collaboration with local municipalities. As in the UK, there are initiatives that tackle the housing challenge, whilst as in Denmark but not in the UK, there are important cross-cutting integrating initiatives, and these include food aid, health care, support to the Roma people, legal advice, and others. Food banks have become important as in the UK but unlike Denmark, as well as initiatives to recover unsold food for solidarity purposes which are seen in both Denmark and the UK. Also in Italy, like in the two Northern European countries, there are microfinance initiatives. Western Balkan social innovations tackling poverty further exemplify the heterogeneity of European approaches, which for this region are also often related to EU funding support. Specific examples include 'brain gain' measures, as well as a number of environmentally focused initiatives such as raising awareness and combatting CO2 emissions, as well as repair projects and recycling and circular economy initiatives. Social entrepreneurship is also well developed in most if not all Western Balkan countries.

In Southern and Eastern Asia, as in Europe, there are relatively strong contrasts in social innovation practice fields between China and India. Since the economic reforms in China, the state has taken economic growth as the main aim of national development. In this context, many social innovation practices were first piloted locally innovated and then scaled nationwide if successful. Thus in China, despite the fact that the social policy model is applied from the top, social innovations play an important role in many diverse programmes. In India by contrast the major practice fields tend to be in areas like financial inclusion and micro enterprise development, creating employability and social capital, equal access to resources, social mobilization, education for under privileged children, marginalized groups like caste and women, inclusive health, disaster preparedness, protecting the commons, improving the quality of life, initiatives in tackling environmental vulnerabilities and equal access. As in China and Southern Europe, this is a diverse set of practice fields, but unlike in China, much of this is bottom up and uncoordinated, which both increases empowerment and local impact but perhaps makes it more difficult to achieve large scale impact.

There is a strong contrast between the social innovation practices found in Latin America and the Caribbean compared to Europe and China, but also with India given that social innovations tackling poverty are carried out in rural areas and especially in isolated places which are very difficult for the state to reach. In the other countries and regions analysed, there are both rural and urban initiatives, and often the distinction is unimportant in Europe, but like India, Latin American practices also tend to be non-state sponsored compared to a mix in Europe. Given this lack of state involvement in the practices themselves, coordination with other stakeholders becomes essential to find new efficient mechanisms for achieving a significant reduction of poverty. Among the most important innovations is the generation of income, either by supporting family businesses, improving production, providing banking and loan services to low-income families that would not otherwise have any access to financial services otherwise, etc. The innovations are mainly directed at women,

indigenous communities, the elderly and people with low education. There is a very wide range of projects across different practice fields in Latin America and the Caribbean covering economic, environmental, social and crosscutting practice fields. Colombia also exemplifies this given that the common qualities for most initiatives are grounded in collective issues rather than individual ones, so that the local community is involved in most of the projects as an active player which can participate in generating social that can also be easily measured at community level. In Colombia most social innovation initiatives are thus designed and applied by collective groups and perhaps later supported by the government or one or more foundations.

In the Middle and Near East, social innovation practices, as in the other regions examined with the exception of Europe, are highly diverse. In the Middle East, they cover each of the three sustainable development pillars: economic, social and environmental, but there are few if any practices which cut across these three. The target groups and beneficiaries of these state and non-state initiatives are typically women, youth, new graduates, handicapped people, as well as marginalized groups in rural and underserved regions in the Arab World. Three common objectives can be noticed in all practices: the employment of youth and women, education for literacy, and services for improving the quality of life of poor people. In the Near East, Turkey also has a diverse range of practices often based on philanthropic funding, much of which is faith-based. Township-based social innovations in cities are also important especially for the poor moving from rural areas in order to tackle social exclusion. Other social innovations address the needs of the unemployed and the under-employed, for example by creating employment for women. Some social innovations are aimed at health and social care needs and education, as well as disadvantage and vulnerability, especially in relation to children and families, young people and older people. A few environmental social needs are also tackled which aim, for example, to create a sustainable income for the poor. A few initiatives address some cross-cutting social needs in order to establish the institutional and legal environment for social enterprises.

Table 2 below provides a systematic and comprehensive picture of the above conclusions in the form of a social needs and practice fields framework giving an overview across all countries/regions surveyed. The data in Table 2 have been derived inductively from all the partners contributing to the poverty and sustainable development policy field by mapping actual and appropriate projects in each country or region, and allocating each to one or more specific categories of this 'social needs' framework. This current version has, in this way, been derived through various iterations with WP10 partners and represents an initial mapping of the status in each country/region, as well as enabling geographic comparison between countries/regions. All partners have agreed to and are using this current, initial, iteration. Table 2 does not claim to be an accurate picture as it is only based on this initial mapping, but it does provide a starting point. It will be adapted, refined and updated in subsequent versions of this report.

1.6 THE ROLE OF ICT

In Northern Europe, both Denmark and UK are highly digital societies with some of the highest global levels of ICT usage both for personal use and in the work place, and both have relatively small digital divides. ICT is generally deployed across most of the practice fields, focused on employment, job matching and vocational skills training (most jobs require some ICT skills), on young people (ICT is seen as a powerful means of targeting these groups), and in Denmark initiatives for the physically and mentally disabled. Also in Denmark, ICT is used to coordinate the social innovation supply side for the poor or socially excluded.

In Southern Europe, this initial survey seems to show that technology has generally not played a major role so far, perhaps because the target groups themselves have limited access to and use of ICT. Where ICT is being used is in improving the visibility of initiatives and for seeking resources, and in some cases the web is used to provide advice. In the Western Balkans, the availability of United Nations Development Programme funding, alongside EU funding, seems to be stimulating the use of ICT to some extent given that these programmes support technology use. Examples of such initiatives include reducing the risk of a widening digital divide, and improving accessibility to education, employment and other opportunities by marginalized groups, but also through the focus on universities, NGOs and private companies in their use of ICT.

In Southern and Eastern Asia, ICT is to date little used in social innovation. In China, social innovation for poor relief is mainly in the field of social administration, whilst in India and South Asia there are significant digital divide issues. However, ICT use does have significant potential, for example in China to develop

information services for local communities and for knowledge-based learning, and in India to develop social and technological access models that address both the fundamental poverty issues and key barriers to ICT usage by the poor. In both countries, ICT can also be used for targeted relief for the poor and excluded.

Although ICT has experienced growing development over the last twenty years in Latin America and the Caribbean, there is, in the same way as in Southern and Eastern Asia, high inequality of access, so its use is largely limited to urban areas and those countries where ICT development has been prioritized by government. An example of the latter is Colombia which has made big investments to improve Internet connectivity and is, in fact, the first Latin American country to provide high-speed Internet access to every municipality. Current plans up to 2018 focus strongly on ICT as a way to overcome inequalities with a special focus on agriculture, education, justice and health.

In the Middle and Near East, ICT is a cross cutting instrument for sustainable development, although there are few applications focused on poverty and disadvantage. Examples of the latter include telemedicine and e-health in the Arab countries and more commercial online shopping applications for women and disadvantaged groups in Turkey. However, the chief use of ICT is for training and education of youth and new graduates, as well as the use of social media.

In the Middle and Near East, ICT is a cross cutting instrument for sustainable development, although there are few applications focused on poverty and disadvantage. Examples of the latter include telemedicine and e-health in the Arab countries and more commercial online shopping applications for women and disadvantaged groups in Turkey. However, the chief use of ICT is for training and education of youth and new graduates, as well as the use of social media.

1.7 SUMMARY TABLES OF SOCIAL NEEDS AND PRACTICE FIELDS

Social needs and practice fields framework -- overview of social innovation practice fields across all countries/regions surveyed (1 of 5)

Social need (& sub categories)	Practice fields (possible solutions)	Europe				South East Asia		Middle & Near East		Latin Amer & Carib	
		Denmark	Italy	UK	W. Balkan	China	India SA	Middle East	Turkey	LA & Carib	Colombia
ECONOMIC Inadequate or unstable wages / income	Minimum or living wage initiatives adopted by employers										
	Wage / income support from third parties (government, charities, foundations, etc.)										
	Initiatives providing free or cheap access to basic living needs (food, housing, utilities, health, mobility, etc.)										
	Safety net initiatives										
	Initiatives tackling income creation for housing, food, etc.										
Inadequate savings / financial resources	Saving initiatives including community saving, low/no interest rates, special lending conditions, etc.										
	Micro-financing initiatives										
	Social funding initiatives (including banks for the poor, ethical banks, etc.)										
	Cash benefit and allowance initiatives										
Unemployment / under-employment	Matching job seekers with job providers										
	Initiatives to boost / support self employment										
Exclusion from labour market	Vocational skills training, including entrepreneurial and on-the-job skills training										
	Support and preparation schemes to (re)enter the labour market (apart from skills training)										
Inadequate supply of suitable good quality work	Job / work creation initiatives										
	Initiatives to improve the skill requirements, status or quality of the work available										
	Initiatives to improve the preconditions for work (space, tools, supports, information, regulation, culture, etc.)										
Unhealthy and/or unfair work	Initiatives aimed at improving physical working conditions										
	Initiatives aimed at improving the terms and conditions of work, such as contracts, job descriptions, etc.										

--	--

Social need (& sub categories) SOCIAL (1 of 2)	Practice fields (possible solutions)	Europe				South East Asia		Middle & Near East		Latin Amer & Carib	
		Denmark	Italy	UK	W. Balkan	China	India SA	Middle East	Turkey	LA & Carib	Colombia
Poor education and skills (not directly vocational)	Education / skill development initiatives provided by public entity										
	Education / skill development initiatives provided by commercial entity										
	Education / skill development initiatives provided by non-profit, community, informally, etc.										
Poor general health and care	Initiatives to improve access to health and care										
	Initiatives to improve health by tackling poor life styles										
	Initiatives to improve health by tackling poor living conditions, housing or environment										
	Initiatives to improve health by tackling unhealthy working conditions										
Lack of, poor, un-nutritious and unhealthy food	Food banks										
	Food vouchers and subsidies										
	Food subsistence help										
	Initiatives to reduce food waste										
	Self help through growing food										
	Initiatives tackling income creation for housing, food, etc.										
Poor and unhealthy life styles and 'quality of life'	Initiatives tackling poor diets or unhealthy eating habits										
	Initiatives tackling smoking										
	Initiatives tackling excessive drinking										
	Initiatives tackling drug abuse										
	Initiatives promoting exercise and fitness										
	Initiatives tackling loneliness and promoting community and relationship building										

--	--

Social need (& sub categories) SOCIAL (2 of 2)	Practice fields (possible solutions)	Europe				South East Asia		Middle & Near East		Latin Amer & Carib	
		Denmark	Italy	UK	W. Balkan	China	India SA	Middle East	Turkey	LA & Carib	Colombia
Disadvantage, vulnerability and / or discrimination	General initiatives tackling or disadvantage, vulnerability and / discrimination										
	Initiatives tackling / coping with physical disability										
	Initiatives tackling / coping with mental disability										
	Initiatives tackling racial / ethnic disadvantage & discrimination, incl. refugees & asylum seekers										
	Initiatives tackling religious disadvantage and discrimination										
	Initiatives tackling gender disadvantage and discrimination										
	Initiatives tackling sexual orientation disadvantage and discrimination										
	Initiatives tackling disadvantaged children and families										
	Initiatives tackling disadvantaged young people										
	Initiatives tackling disadvantaged poor and needy students										
	Initiatives tackling disadvantaged older people										
Initiatives tackling cultural disadvantage and discrimination											
Unbalanced migration	Initiatives tackling de-population										
	Initiatives tackling the 'brain-drain'										
	Initiatives tackling population over-concentration & crowding, including slum & ghetto formation										
Cultural poverty	Initiatives to enrich cultural activities and understanding										
	Initiatives to strengthen, disseminate and preserve cultural legacy and heritage										
Behavioural problems	Initiatives tackling stress and behavioural problems										
	Initiatives tackling dysfunctional family and relationships										
	Initiatives tackling crime and delinquency										
	Initiatives tackling anti-social behaviour										

--	--

Social need (& sub categories)	Practice fields (possible solutions)	Europe				South East Asia		Middle & Near East		Latin Amer & Carib	
		Denmark	Italy	UK	W. Balkan	China	India SA	Middle East	Turkey	LA & Carib	Colombia
Lacking, sub-standard or dangerous accommodation	Supported or subsidised accommodation build, maintenance or repair										
	Self- or community accommodation build, organisation, maintenance or repair initiatives										
	Accommodation sharing										
	Initiatives tackling income creation for housing, food, etc.										
Lacking, sub-standard or dangerous mobility / transport infrastructures	Supported or subsidised mobility / transport initiatives										
	Car and bike or other mobility share schemes										
	Self- or community mobility design, organisation, build, maintenance or repair initiatives										
Lacking, sub-standard or dangerous amenities	Supported or subsidised amenities initiatives										
	Amenities share schemes										
	Self- or community amenities design, organisation, build, maintenance or repair initiatives										
Lacking, depleted, sub-standard or dangerous utilities (e.g. water, land, natural resources, energy, sanitation)	Supported or subsidised utilities initiatives										
	Utility share schemes										
	Self- or community utilities design, organisation, build, maintenance or repair initiatives										
Sub-standard or dangerous environments	Initiatives tackling congestion										
	Land, water and other natural resource re-generation / reclamation / upgrade initiatives										
	Re-cycling / circular economy initiatives										
	Initiatives tackling pollution (including CO ₂)										
	Initiatives tackling climate change (incl. e.g. de-forestation, desertification, drought, flood, soil erosion, etc.)										
	Initiatives supporting bio-diversity (incl. species, ecosystem and habitat survival, restoration and maintenance)										

--	--

Social need (& sub categories)	Practice fields (possible solutions)	Europe				South East Asia		Middle & Near East		Latin Amer & Carib	
		Denmark	Italy	UK	W. Balkan	China	India SA	Middle East	Turkey	LA & Carib	Colombia
CROSS-CUTTING Lack of integrated/institutional support to the poor or excluded	Supply-side coordination of support provision to the poor or excluded (e.g. coordination amongst providers)										
	Active inclusion initiatives										
	Advocacy initiatives										
	Citizenship initiatives										
	Community building initiatives										
	General help, advice, mentoring, etc.										
	Lack of, poor environment for social innovators										
	Lack of, poor legal and institutional infrastructures										
Place-specific poverty / exclusion	Urban poverty										
	Rural poverty										
Corruption (i.e. against the law)	Initiatives tackling political corruption										
	Initiatives tackling administrative corruption										
	Initiatives tackling financial corruption										
Exploitation / unfair / unethical treatment (i.e. not against the letter of the law)	Initiatives tackling political exploitation / unfair / unethical treatment										
	Initiatives tackling administrative exploitation / unfair / unethical treatment										
	Initiatives tackling financial exploitation / unfair / unethical treatment										
Impoverishment / disruption / displacement caused by human agency	Initiatives supporting people affected by armed conflict										
	Initiatives supporting people affected by political persecution										
	Initiatives supporting people affected by crime / corruption										
Ditto caused by natural disaster	Initiatives tackling natural disasters										

--	--	--