

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP PARADIGM SUPPORTING CO-DEVELOPMENT: CASE STUDIES.

Irene Bengo

Politecnico di Milano

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Gestionale

Via Lambruschini 4, 20156 Milano

irene.bengo@polimi.it

Carlo Locatelli, Veronica Chiodo

Make a Change

Piazza Ercolea 11, IT

20122 Milano

www.makeachange.it

Introduction

In the last times, we are coping with a gradual as much as impressive change in the global geopolitical balances. The recent economic crisis has underlined some critical aspects in the current economic system, which fails to answer to the interdependency principles and social problems of global development. **Moreover the local and foreign policies, organizations and multilateral institutions in some instances have failed to provide a real response to the need of access to basic services, creation of real systems that involve the active participation of stakeholders, ability to form stable employment and enable the integration of disadvantaged people.** Thus, there are more and more social needs which remain dissatisfied due to an increasingly severe crisis in welfare state.

This situation has highlighted the need of new **economic, entrepreneurial and social development structures** to meet the needs of at least a part of the problem; and this necessity is pressing either for developing and developed countries.

A configuration which appears potentially interesting to answer to this problem is the **social entrepreneurship** (SE). The social enterprise is an entity capable of grasping, converting, and responding to unmet social needs through the creation of profitable projects; it is an approach in which profit maximization becomes no longer the ultimate goal of acting, but a means to the creation of social value. Hence, above all, SEs pursue a broad social goal (Nyssens, 2010), they try to promote a new model of economic development, fostering a more democratic decision-making process (Campi, et al. 2006).

Over the past decade, the growth of social entrepreneurship globally has been impressive. In Europe, there has been more than 11 million jobs in social economy and the companies' subscription to social economy is even greater: 160 million. The SEs are 2 million, the 10% of the total number of companies in Europe and they provide jobs for more than 11 million paid workers, the 6% of European active population (European Commission- Enterprise and Industry 2011).

Social business and co-development

In 2012, it has been observed a huge presence of immigrant workers in SEs, underlining their fundamental role as tool enhancing economic and cultural integration.

Considering this evidence, we can introduce the concept of **co-development**: it generally means the set of policies and initiatives that **involve migrants and their social networks**, devoted to the economic and social development of both birth and destination countries; it is based on the idea of countries' interdependency in the development processes. It is also a new way of approaching international aid centered on migrant communities as lead actor, no more just as recipient. Hence, this new development perspective is based on a sort of positive circle which consists in three components: the **origin country**, the **destination country** and the **migrant subject** as channel of knowledge between the two.

Bearing in mind the above-mentioned idea of co-development, the social entrepreneurship paradigm presents several features that makes it appear a new and right way to address the socio-economic development of LDCs. Indeed, the characteristics that shape a social enterprise seem to perfectly respond to the **increasingly urgent challenges of empowerment and innovation**.

They are able to provide **access to basic services** (social, educational, health) to local communities, integrating innovative schemes for **people who are unable to pay**; contribute to a more **balanced and sustainable use of local resources**, reinforced by the broad participation of local actors; create new jobs as a result of new provided services and promote integration into the labor market of disadvantaged people (minorities, women, persons with disabilities, etc.), otherwise excluded from income-generating opportunities; break the poverty traps, enabling financial inclusion for self-employment; contributing **to take informal activities out of the underground economy** for instance by regularizing the situation of illegal workers on the black market; also contributing to a fair integration of small economic actors into markets.

There is a very important issue to note. SE need to adopt **inclusive governance models that integrate the local community in the strategic decision-making**: involving those who are the social need bearers may help a more effective interpretation of the context where it is planned to intervene; they become main actors and customers, no more simply beneficiaries.

We would like to focus on two main specificities that characterize the essence of SEs and make this model relevant in the light of co-development concept: are (1) **multi-objective** organizations characterized by a (2) **multi-stakeholder** governance (Defourny, 2001; Nyssens, 2006; Weerawardena, 2006). Indeed they strive to achieve goals that meld socio-political and environmental objectives, the simultaneous pursuing of multiple different targets is a major challenge for these organizations (Nyssens, 2006). As for the first point, they are driven by the need to be financially sustainable, using the surplus to support economic growth and social environment of the communities they serve. **The second key characteristic is that they are multi-stakeholder systems.** SEs are highly participative in nature and are characterized by a constant involvement of internal and external subjects in their strategic choices. **They try to promote a new model of economic development, fostering a more democratic decision-making process** (Campi, et al. 2006). Groups of citizens, local trade unions, associations, local banks, municipalities are generally represented in the decision-making bodies and are integrated into all stages of the decision-making process (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Emes, 2008). This kind of involvement is essential (i.e can't do without) to understand the real needs of the context and the great deal of knowledge of their markets and to be able to give an adequate long term response (Pättiniemi, 2007).

For these reasons these organization can play a fundamental role, in addition to governments, to better understand the socio-cultural context having a key role in reaching low-income communities.

Regarding the intervention methodology, it is based on the **participatory approach**; in this process the community participates in the evaluation of their problem and the implementation of the projects with the help of the institution in charge of carrying out the project or activities. In general, this method is appropriate for work with low-income communities because it: (1) promotes the emergence of sustainable solutions, (2) generates a progressive change in the community, (3) increases community participation, (4) generates consensus regarding the objectives and planning of activities in the community, and the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders, (5) results in the implementation of more productive technologies for each community's specific characteristics, (6) facilitates feedback and adjustments regarding the proposals and (7) generates long-term commitment.

All the previous issues refer to a specific form of social enterprises named **Community-based enterprises.**

In this kind of social enterprise, the community plays an active role in the decision-making process guided by an institution in such a way that commitment is generated, allowing the local population to gain awareness of the problems and to facilitate the decision-making process by increasing knowledge and experience. The social missions and objectives of such enterprises address the social and financial needs of diverse groups within a society while embracing values integral to their cultural identity and recognizing their dependence upon specific resources necessary for their collective survival in a specific place (Anderson et al. 2006; Cornell 2006).

The organizational structures and institutions of such enterprises are directed **to strengthening cultural practice and achieving socio-economic empowerment.**

With such an approach, they certainly contribute to **enhance social capital** at the local level based on a **strong sharing and participation.**

Thus, it can be stated that the **Community-based** model may be the best model to set up social enterprises in the **developing countries (origin countries)**. Such a **local-community's inclusive approach** is the unique way to succeed in understanding effectively the social needs of the specific context and consequently to be able to define the suitable objectives and activities of a SE which really may affected the society.

The sustainability of the local social enterprises depends on the way in which they are integrated in the local cultural and social context, environmental and economic conditions, institutions and available technologies.

Coming back to the perspective of **co-development**, the use of such approach, **when if you plan to set up the initiative from the developed country (the destination country), can lead to the same desired performance of Community-based model. This may happens thanks to the involvement of migrants which come to be a vehicle of competences and of the knowledge required to a correct analysis of local needs**, enabling an exchange between the origin and destination country. What is really fundamental is that, even if you are not integrated in the territory, the migrants are aware about the social problems of their origin countries as well as the local community; thus, they are similarly a great driver in deciding which activities is desirable to be done by a social enterprise.

Combining the potential role of migrants with the SE's inherent high need of grass-roots participation, **the social entrepreneurship model may become a concrete proposal in activating**

sustainable income-generating activities for these categories, not just as employees, but giving them **the opportunity to create their own companies** with repercussions both on the Italian area and on origin countries assuring a better understanding of each countries' social needs and spreading the impact globally.

This consideration leads to identify social entrepreneurship as well as a **new paradigm for international development cooperation** as it can give an answer to the problem of disparities by **providing new solutions to the inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalized populations in LCDs**, assuring basic goods and services for these communities.

Moreover, it allows **to go beyond the idea of pure grant**, making the provision of good and service at least partially independent from donations and fundraising campaigns that until now have characterized the traditional patterns of international cooperation. The model of SE in behalf of co-development entails a new role of disadvantaged: he passes from being a beneficiary to being the promoter and protagonist of the activities, thus protecting and guaranteeing human self-development and self-promotion.

Development cooperation need to renovate its way of operating and it is increasingly shifting towards to creation of social entrepreneurship: human development has far more time than a project, it is necessary, if we want to implement something effective, **arrange activities managed locally** who will survive to individual projects and move towards self-sustainability and long term planning perspective.

On the other hand, the social enterprise may be also the mean for the implementation of social policies and services for migrants in our country, where they are still insufficient and unable to solve real social problems.

Thus, some of the elements that make the SEs able to support co-development and cooperation are:

1. **Local roots** in term of activities sector and use of existing resources;
2. **Community membership:** ability in pinpointing the demand;
3. **The hybridization of resources** for the sustainability of the business project (for-profit, nonprofit, government);
4. **The involvement of all stakeholders:** participation and co-decision in managing the company;

5. **Inter-organizational linkages:** at local and international level, forms of collaborative and cooperative local business initiatives with those of others communities and countries manufacturers and markets.

In conclusion, **social enterprises and cooperatives can better understand the socio-cultural context playing a paramount role in reaching low-income communities by providing accessible and sustainable services, ensuring the appropriate level of awareness and ownership and guaranteeing a balance between social, political environmental and economic**

Based on the above mentioned reasons, **it becomes necessary to define new models of social entrepreneurship related to the potential of co-development interventions whereas the private sector alone often fail to reach the marginalized classes.**

We'll show some examples of organizations and social enterprises that promote system community-based and we analyze these realities based on these dimensions (where available): Problem Addressed, Impact areas, Strategy, Impact to Date, Product Sourcing, Revenue & Affordability, Distribution model, Social Impact.

Case Studies

1. BlueEnergy

BlueEnergy is a nonprofit that installs small-scale hybrid wind and solar installations in rural villages in Nicaragua. Brings affordable, sustainable electrification, water, and sanitation to marginalized communities in rural Nicaragua and worldwide, implements a reliable clean energy model for poor communities and puts development in the hands of residents by emphasizing the local manufacture and maintenance of wind/solar energy systems.

Problem Addressed

The poor rural communities in Nicaragua lack access to the basic tools they need to develop their communities, including grid power.

Impact areas

Nicaragua

Strategy

The blueEnergy model based on the local manufacture, operation, and maintenance of hybrid wind/solar energy systems, with a strong focus on local capacity-building and community

development. Its wind turbine design is as simple as possible to facilitate local manufacture and maintenance. By combining wind and solar technology, blueEnergy's energy systems produce a cheaper and more reliable source of power; these hybrid systems can generate more continuous power output under most weather conditions. With the help of The National Technological Institute of Nicaragua (INATEC), blueEnergy hosts workshops and provides training materials for technicians, blueEnergy employees (who are either Nicaraguans or international volunteers), and operators of the energy systems within each community. Once trained, employees in blueEnergy's local plant manufacture the turbines and install them in Caribbean coast communities. In this way, BlueEnergy creates technical jobs in impoverished areas where they are desperately needed.

In details:

- blueEnergy teaches local people underserved how to construct energy systems using solar panels
- The training builds a base of knowledgeable people who can maintain the power stations, and creates desperately needed local jobs.
- Entire communities are benefiting from the new economic opportunities that come with electrification.
- In addition, blueEnergy makes a broader impact by helping others replicate its implementation methods through a network of renewable energy producers at the national level in Nicaragua (Renovables), and a network of local wind turbine producers at a global level (Wind Empowerment).

Impact to Date

- 15 communities served
- 3,544 beneficiaries
- 6.5 kW of installed wind capacity
- 5.8 kW of installed solar PV capacity
- 47 home systems
- 175 home efficiency retrofits
- 253 portable LED lights
- 61 water filters
- 5 wells dug
- 11 local employees

Product Sourcing

BlueEnergy designs its own community power systems to meet its target users' needs and manufactures and assembles these systems locally, and trains target communities how to maintain them. BlueEnergy also distributes off-the-shelf products, including delight solar lanterns.

Revenue & Affordability

An average village energy installation costs between \$10-15,000, which covers the solar power system, battery bank, and 3 years of maintenance visits. This is paid for by donors. The home systems are sold for a subsidized price of \$1-500, depending on how many lights etc are desired. They are generally bought on credit from a local microfinance bank. Customers pay \$3-5 every few weeks to charge the batteries. The sale of these application systems to local households at affordable prices generates revenue for reinvestment in blueEnergy and also contributes to community development beyond mere electrification. For example the residents of one community have begun charging their cell phone batteries at the community charging station for \$.40 apiece, which has become very popular and is fueling the success of blueEnergy's model through local demand.

Distribution

BlueEnergy's primary focus is on community development and the long-term results of the power it delivers. Before installing a system in a community, blueEnergy holds a community workshop to understand the community's needs and expectations. It then helps the community elect a village energy committee to help with installation and be responsible for the system long term:

- In most villages, blueEnergy installs a solar panel system connected to a set of deep-cycle batteries.
- Villagers then buy home electrical systems including lights, a battery and wiring to power TV and radio.
- Generators are generally placed in a community buildings such as a school and used to power that as well.
- BlueEnergy trains local technicians to maintain the systems so they are as self-sufficient as possible.

Social impact

The rural Nicaragua, where blueEnergy's community-based initiative operates, has very low levels of education and infrastructure; blueEnergy has found that in this type of environment it is impossible to sustainably deliver energy solutions without including a great deal of capacity building and focus on community development.

Without a larger community focus, either the power system will not last due to lack of maintenance capacity or its benefit to the community will be minimal due to a lack of capacity to take advantage of it. BlueEnergy remains in contact with communities long after installation to assess and facilitate the impact of their systems.

The impact is measured in 3 ways:

- Number of kw installed and people helped
- Anecdotal narrative from community members as to how the installation has affected their lives
- Anecdotal narrative from blueEnergy staff, who have a higher level perspective, about the impact of the system and its relative effect compared with installations in other communities.
- The blueEnergy's global impact is achieved through its knowledge dissemination programs:
- Renovables, the Nicaraguan renewable energy association
- Wind Empowerment, the global wind power association, and
- the Global Leadership student training program.

2. DESI Power

DESI Power is a for-profit organization that installs biomass power plants in Indian villages while at the same time helping villagers develop businesses to turn generated power into value addition and boosted income.

Problem Addressed

The most rural villages in India have no electricity, limiting the possibilities for local, income-generating businesses. Poverty and lack of electricity perpetuate one another, and many leave their villages to seek work in already overcrowded cities.

Impact areas

India

Strategy

DESI sales of power to villagers paying for lighting and enterprise power and also sales of power to agribusinesses and mobile phone companies.

The simultaneous development of plants supplying power and enterprises demanding it creates a self-sustaining system boosting economic growth.

Indeed the Micro-enterprises using generated power include villagers pumping and selling irrigation water, charging batteries, and making ice.

DESI creates further demand for generated power by supplying powered products such as home wiring and LED lanterns, and by supplying power to businesses in the vicinity of the villages, such as agribusinesses needing irrigation and off-grid mobile phone towers. DESI's installations typically cost \$200,000, 60% of which pays for the plant, 30% for enterprise development, and 10% for capacity building and training.

DESI has found it much easier to raise investor money for the plant than for the enterprises and especially for the training, so it seeks grant money for the latter. DESI's optimal investment structure is a 50% equity base, a 10% subsidy it automatically receives from the Indian government for delivering renewable energy, and a 40% loan which is paid back over 7 years.

Impact to Date

- Biomass gasifier developed
- Plants running in 3 villages
- Registered under CDM mechanism
- Development of DESI Mantra management training program

Product Sourcing

- Plants:

DESI has developed its own power plants through a laborious 10 year process, building 9 pilot power stations in different parts of India to do field testing, improvements, and redesign, with the goal of a plant which can use a variety of biomass feedstocks.

Initially DESI's plant was designed to run on 35% diesel and 70% biomass fuel. When the cost of diesel went up, DESI switched to a pure biogas engine, which has led to the need for further development, but should be stabilized within the next few months. When DESI started the project, solar PV was too expensive to be feasible, but now solar has now become cheaper and DESI is looking at hybrid solutions involving solar, wind, and hydro.

- Fuel:

The plant runs primarily on rice husks and a weed known as daincha, but is designed to run on multiple fuel sources to insulate DESI from price fluctuations. DESI also did not choose a pure rice husk gasifier because it cannot run 24 hours per day, and therefore is unfeasible for some of DESI's potential power customers, such as mobile phone companies. DESI will source feedstock for its plants from village-based biomass plantations to ensure the security of feedstock supply and keep prices down.

Revenue & Affordability

The DESI funds the building of plants as an investment which will be paid back through the sale of power. To cover capital and operating costs DESI estimates it needs to generate and sell 65% of a plant's 100kW power capacity. Until enterprises are developed, villagers use plant energy mainly for lighting, but this is generally not enough to buy 65% of the plant's power, so other income streams are needed- the most viable one being mobile phone towers.

There are 150,000 off-grid mobile towers currently operating in India. They run on diesel generators, and the telecom industry is the 2nd largest user of diesel after the Indian Railways. This diesel currently costs 4 times as much as DESI Power's fuel. DESI is currently partnering with the Rockefeller Foundation in a project to cover 40% of the costs of plants by powering nearby mobile towers, which become the plant's anchor customer.

Other plant income sources are large-scale farmers needing powered irrigation, and buyers of cooking fuel generated from biomass residues. Another affordability challenge is the up-front cost of lighting products.

While villagers can easily pay the monthly costs of charging a lantern or powering their home (as it is generally cheaper than the kerosene they are replacing), buying a lantern or connecting their home to the plant is often too expensive for them, so DESI seeks donor subsidies for these products or offers them through a financing scheme.

Distribution

DESI Power seeks to use its power plants as a catalyst for growth by not only supplying power, but unlocking latent demand for that power. Therefore it specifically chooses sites for its plants where there is potential for power to be used profitably (i.e. nearby mobile phone towers, large population in need of lighting, nearby agribusiness). All plants are managed by a village cooperative which is responsible for maintenance. Lighting is delivered to villagers either through home wiring systems connected to the plant, or lanterns recharged at a central station, both sold by DESI.

3. One Acre Fund

One Acre Fund is a social enterprise that focuses on helping hard-working farm families in East Africa to increase farm profit. One Acre Fund's business model focuses on working with smallholder farmers across Kenya, Rwanda, and Burundi to promote an integrated agriculture package; it facilitates activities and transactions at each level of the farming value chain, from organizing farmer groups to negotiating with export markets

Problem Addressed

75% of the world's poorest are farmers and over a billion people are still subsistence farming. This organization focuses on farmers with only one acre of land and outdated farming techniques. The "market" simply does not work for these farmers: they are stuck in a cycle of poor yields, do not be able to access to the right farm inputs and trainings, and keep on producing poor yields season after season.

Impact to Date

- 135,000 farmer families in Kenya, Rwanda, and Burundi with repayment rates (where applicable) of 98%.
- The average farmer return on investment is 100%.
- Repayments are covering 85% of field costs.

Strategy

They provide a comprehensive group of services to farmers:

- Farm inputs on credit: an \$80 loan in the form of basic seed and fertilizer.
- Delivery: delivering this within walking distance of the people that we serve.
- Training: training on correct usage of farm inputs, which dramatically improves farm profitability.
- Harvest sales: enabling farmers to sell their harvests at a significant profit.

Impact Area

One Acre Fund began in East Africa, and we currently serve farmers in Kenya, Rwanda, and Burundi

Revenue & Affordability

They cover 85 percent of their field operating costs through farmer loan revenue. They use donor grants for some very expensive activities such as new region launches or R&D projects.

4. Practical Action Peru

Practical Action Peru installs off-grid power facilities in villages in rural Peru. 90% of their work is in hydro, though they also work in wind, solar, and biomass.

Problem Addressed

6.5 million people in Peru have no electricity (23.7% of the national population and 67% of rural population). Of the 6.5 million, 5.3 million can eventually be reached via the grid, 1.2 million can only be reached cost-effectively by renewable energy. It is estimated that only 3% of energy in Peru

is generated by renewable sources, most of which is from sugar cane residual gasification in coastal regions.

Impact areas

Practical Action International:

Bangladesh, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Sudan, Kenya, Latin America, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, India, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador

Strategy

Previous to an installation, villages get light from kerosene, candles, and batteries, each family spending about \$6/month on average for about 2/hours/day of electricity. With a hydro system, families pay \$5/month for 24 hours of electricity with no pollution.

Impact to Date

- Impacted 4,000 families (20,000 people) through 2010
- 2250 people provided with energy in 2010 (450 families @5 people/family)

Revenue & Affordability

Generally there is a 3 way cost-split between an international donor, the government and the community members. The installation is paid for by the government and international donors. Communities provide labor. The Local government technically owns the plants, but they are run by community members as a community business. Families pay based on usage of electricity(tracked by meters), and the money is used for maintenance.

Distribution

Practical Action seeks out communities appropriate for hydro projects, and is sometimes approached by the communities. When a community is chosen, Practical Action creates a community energy plan that identifies value chains and economically productive uses of energy. These plans identify the most appropriate energy source for the community, and are incorporated into local municipal development plans. After Practical Action installs a project, they no longer maintain a direct relationship with the community.

5. Honey Care Africa (HCA)

Honey Care is a for-profit social enterprise that has launched its business in a Beehive program to provide smallholder farmers in rural areas with the inputs, training, services and market access necessary to become commercial honey producers.

Problem Addressed

In Kenya, half of the population lived below the poverty line. The poorest 10 per cent accounted for two per cent of total household consumption. Agriculture employed 75 per cent of Kenya's labor force, contributed 16.3 per cent to the gross domestic product (GDP), and generated two-thirds of foreign exchange earnings. Small-scale farmers accounted for more than three-quarters of total agricultural production and over half of its marketed production¹. Farmers were typically reimbursed eight to 12 months after the crop had been collected. For other commodities, such as tea, coffee and milk, produced and marketed by farmer cooperatives, corruption, mismanagement and frequent political interference meant that the farmers often waited many months to be paid for their produce.

HCA wants to help millions of farming families in East Africa to grow out of poverty and to achieve rural development.

Impact areas

East Africa: Kenya, Tanzania.

Strategy

HCA offers a micro-enterprise opportunity for farmers to raise bees, produce honey and sell it to a reliable customer. The model would purchase honey from small rural farmers and resell it to Kenya's urban consumers. HCA markets primarily to African consumers through supermarkets and corporate partners that use honey in their products. It also sells Langstroth beehives to individuals communities and development organizations; by customizing this hives to the Kenya environment , HCA had dramatically expanded the productivity. Moreover, HCA trains local famers as beekeepers: model is based on the fully-managed Business in a Beehive service, provided through SWARM field teams (a package that gives farmers everything they need to start producing honey- a beehive, equipment, training, hive maintenance, and a contract for a guaranteed cash purchase of the resulting honey at fair market prices). Honey Care works across the entire honey value chain—from manufacturing and selling hives to farmers; harvesting and processing honey and distributing the final product to retail outlets in Kenya. The organization is a member of the World Fair Trade Organization, guaranteeing a competitive fixed purchase price for honey on a contract basis. This enables farmers to repay their loans quickly and sell to a stable market.

Impact to Date

- 15,000 farmers generating supplemental income (6450 women, 600 men)
- \$250 average annual supplemental income

¹ Valente, M., Branzei, O. (2007). "Honey Care Africa: A different business model". Ivey Management Services, Richard Ivey School of Business.

- 3,500 beekeeping households in semi-arid areas
- 5,000 hives within 3km of forest, national park and riparian zone
- 15-30% crop yields increase

Revenue & Affordability

HCA's business model implies an important partnership arrangement with microfinance institutions and NGOs that allows the poorest farmers to buy hives with a microfinance loan that they pay back in honey production.

Product Sourcing

The company sources its honey from small-scale rural farmers, who are paid a guaranteed price in cash for the honey they produce.

Distribution

Honey Care sells honey for East-African domestic market and European specialty food market.

Conclusions

Ranging from the energy provision sector to beekeeping or agriculture, all the case studies have a strong attitude towards the **empowerment and participation of local population**, giving them either the role of builder and of beneficiaries of services. **BlueEnergy** relies on technicians and employees from the local community to manufacture and maintain its installation and at the same time it creates a cheaper and more reliable source of power for those. **DESI** makes the villagers both users and sellers of power from biomass plant they had installed, giving them not just a service, but a new way to increase their income. **Honey Care Africa** and **One Acre Fund** try to create the pre-conditions, supplying the villagers with training or raw materials (hives or fertilizers), in order to make them able to develop a sustainable business by themselves.

The several examples of Community-based social enterprises which have been presented help to show how a **high-level engagement of native community** guarantees **good performances** both in terms of self-sustainability and in terms of real improvements of local society's conditions. The positive results mainly come from a deep interpretation of territorial social needs attained through the participatory approach. So, the effectiveness of Community-based model turns to be already proved by existent experiments.

The successful model, ensuring to achieve as great outturns as ones of Community-based model, for the creation of SEs in developing countries starting from develop ones, is the **approach of co-development**. Even in this method, **the key point is engaging the beneficiaries (in this case, the migrants) since the beginning of the process**, taking advantages from their awareness and competences.

References

- Anderson, R. B., B. Honig, and A. M. Peredo. 2006. Communities in the new economy: where social entrepreneurship and Indigenous entrepreneurship meet. In *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, eds. C. Steyaert and D. Hjorth, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Borzaga, C., & Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction and loyalty in public and non-profit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(2), 225-248.
- Campi, S., Defourny, J., Grégoire, O., (2006). Work integration social enterprises: are they multiple-goal and multi-stakeholder organizations? In M. Nyssens (Ed.), *Social Enterprise. At the crossroads of market, public policies and civil society*. London: Routledge.
- Cornell, S. 2006. Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Self-Determination in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and The United States. *Joint Occasional Papers on Native Affairs* 2:1-48. http://www.jopna.net/pubs/jopna%202006_02_coverandinside.pdf.
- Defourny, J. (2001). From Third Sector to Social Enterprise. In C. Borzaga (Ed.), *The Emergence of Social Enterprise* (pp. 1–28). London and New York: Routledge
- EMES, 2008. Social Enterprise in Europe: Recent Trends and Developments. Working Paper n. 08/01
- European Commission- Enterprise and Industry, 2011. Social Economy. Available from <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/social-economy/>
- Honey Care Africa: Retrieved April 2013 from <http://honeycareafrika.com/>
- Ingegneria Senza Frontiere, “Progetto Sostegno allo Sviluppo Attraverso le Migrazioni” from http://isf.polimi.it/isf/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=12&Itemid=50

- Nyssens, M., (2006). *Social Enterprise at the crossroads of market, public and civil society*. London: Routledge.
- One Acre Fund. Org Retrieved May 2013 from <http://www.oneacrefund.org/>
- Pättiniemi, P., (2007). *Work Integration Social Enterprises in Finland* Institute for Rural research and Training. Co-operative Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland.
- Valente, M., Branzei, O. (2007). “Honey Care Africa: A different business model”. Ivey Management Services, Richard Ivey School of Business.
- Weerawardena, J., & Mort, G.S. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: a multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 21-35.