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FOREWORD

During the UK-India Tech Summit last month, both Prime Ministers emphasised working together to promote employability and entrepreneurship.

The field of social enterprise is an area of mutual learning between India and UK and the British Council supports research and practice of this emerging sector in 28 countries around the world.

This report forms one part of a research programme carried out in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Ghana. It is informed by the methodology adopted in mapping social enterprises in the UK over the past decade and its findings are based on responses from 258 social enterprises in India, of which 24% are led by women and 27% by youth. The primary beneficiaries are found to be women and disadvantaged communities.

This report builds on the 2015 report: ‘Social Enterprise Policy Landscape in India’ which includes a recommendation on establishing an Inter-Ministerial co-ordination group for social enterprise.

This report is a useful baseline survey, expected to serve as a key reference point for interested parties on the subject.

Alan Gemmell, OBE
Director, British Council India
OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The main aim of the study was to better understand the profile of social enterprises in India and map the larger ecosystem within which they operate. The study is a part of ongoing work by the British Council under its Global Social Enterprise programme, which draws on the UK experience in social enterprise to promote its growth around the world. It seeks to build capacity in the sector, forge international networks, and support policy leaders in creating an ecosystem wherein social enterprise and social investment can thrive. Currently running in 28 countries across four continents, the programme:

• provides aspiring and existing social enterprises with skills training, consultancy, mentoring, and access to funding;
• disseminates best UK and global practices to assist policy makers in creating and facilitating ecosystems for social enterprise and investment;
• supports educational institutions in embedding a social enterprise, exchanging best practices, and delivering joint research on social enterprise;
• facilitates the use of social enterprise approaches in international development programmes;
• commissions research and organises high profile events that foster social enterprise and social investment; and
• build international networks linking social entrepreneurs, intermediary organisations and social investors.

It will serve as a baseline survey. The survey has also been conducted in Pakistan, Ghana, and Bangladesh, with the additional objective of comparing social enterprise sectors in different countries. A similar methodology has been used across the four countries, with adaptations, where appropriate, to country context.

The key aspects that the study endeavours to cover in India are:

• a breakdown of social enterprise activity
• the average annual turnover for social enterprises
• the average number of employees per social enterprise
• the number of beneficiaries reached by social enterprises over the last year
• the number of new employees in social enterprises over the last year
• the proportion of social enterprise employees who are women
• the number of youth-led (under 35) social enterprises
• the number of women-led social enterprises
• initiatives taken by government to support social enterprise activity
• the number of higher education institutions delivering social enterprise-related courses

Similarly, the study explores the extent to which institutions of higher education in the country currently provide social enterprise-specific educational options supporting a new generation of social entrepreneurs and acting as a baseline to observe how this changes over time.

Mapping the sector is a challenge and this study fully acknowledges it. The British Council acknowledges that the survey did not generate a sufficiently large dataset to allow for the results to be fully representative, but it offers an important sample pool to facilitate more scientific and robust research in future. It is hoped that others will build upon it and that the British Council will be able to conduct a follow-up survey in five years’ time.

The study was led by Ennovent India Advisors Pvt. Ltd. with the support of Aspen Network of Development Entrepreneurs (ANDE). The survey and the research methodology were designed in consultation with SEUK, ODI, and UnLtd UK. The study was divided into three interrelated phases:

1. Desk-based review of existing information on social enterprises
2. Stakeholder interviews and discussion groups
3. Survey of social enterprises (online, telephonic, and in-person)

The desk-based review of existing research on the subject also included accessing the databases of Ennovent, Ashoka India, Villgro, UnLtd India, Thomson Reuters Foundation (Trust Law), ACCESS-ASSIST, and the World Bank. The stakeholders consulted were from among the practitioners, experts and academicians. The survey tool was sent out to over 2400 organisations registered under different segments – for-profit as well as not-for-profit. Of these, 498 organisations were able to complete the survey. After analysis of their detailed responses, 258 organisations were qualified as social enterprises under this study and were sought later on to gather additional insights through interviews.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Social enterprises address social and environmental problems through innovative business solutions that improve the lives of underserved communities. They are businesses which trade for a social purpose, re-invest surpluses into their social objective, and make themselves accountable for their actions, rather than simply maximising profits for owners and shareholders.

The survey finds that social enterprise is a growing and dynamic sector of the Indian economy that is creating jobs for disadvantaged groups, empowering women, and addressing social exclusion across the country.

However, there is limited data available about their activities, and only a handful of research has been done in the past to gauge the size and scope of this fast-growing space in India. This study seeks to expand our knowledge of this sector and has taken into account the findings of previous researches on the subject. It employed both secondary as well as primary research tools and was modelled on best practice research methodologies developed in the UK over the past several years to map social enterprise activity there.

It is expected that this study will serve as a reference point for future studies on the subject, contributing to their study design, methodology and sampling frame. It has attempted to answer some questions, while posting additional questions for future research.

There are two components to the study:

(i) Surveying social enterprises to collect data on key indicators, which are currently unavailable;

(ii) Taking stock of the existing support system available for social enterprises through government policy and programmes of institutions of higher education.

Findings from the survey of 258 social enterprises

These findings can be classified into two categories - those relating to economic value creation and those related to employment and beneficiary characteristics as follows.

Economic Value Creation

Sector focus of social enterprises: 53% of the social enterprises are engaged in skill development activities; 30% in education; 28% in agriculture, fisheries, and dairy; 26% in financial services; 26% in energy and clean technology; 22% in healthcare; 17% in non-farm livelihood; 16% in food and nutrition; and 14% in water and sanitation. Only 5% of social enterprises are active in affordable housing space.

Total value of the social enterprise sector: The study has not ascertained the total value of the social enterprise sector. This would require obtaining the average turnover of different organisation types that qualify as social enterprises and amalgamating those together after assigning value and weights to those figures vis-à-vis their GDP contribution.

Average annual turnover: The average annual turnover of those classified as social enterprises was INR 7.8 million (GBP 80,000), and nearly three-quarters of the social enterprises expect a substantial increase in their turnovers in the next financial year. 78% of the social enterprises aim to expand into new geographical areas, and 73% of the ventures aim to increase their customer base in the coming years.

Engaged in business: 80% of the social enterprises earn more than half of their incomes from trading activity (the activity or process of buying, selling, or exchanging goods or services), whereas 45% of them are earning all of their income from trading activity.

Making a profit/surplus and furthering social objectives: 43% of the social enterprises reported a profit/surplus, with another 22% breaking even. Almost 80% reinvest a proportion of the surplus in furthering their social or environmental goals.
through growth and development activities.

**Finance, funding, and barriers faced:** 85% of the social enterprises faced financial constraints while trying to secure finance or funding, compared to only 15% of mainstream businesses. The major constraint identified by social enterprises is the lack of access to investors due to limited networks.

**Employment and Beneficiary Characteristics**

**Average number of employees:** The social enterprises have 19 employees on average (17 full-time and 4 part-time). In comparison, MSMEs employ 2 people on average and the NGOs about 5 people.

**Employment generation:** The total number of new employees added by the 258 social enterprises in 2015 was 13,077, whereas the total employment generated by these was 61,548, comprising both full-time and part-time personnel. The study has not been able to determine the total employment generated by social enterprises in the country due to lack of adequate evidence. More than half of the social enterprises create direct employment by hiring from disadvantaged groups in their workforce, nearly two-thirds work with the objective of creating employment, and over 50% provide skills training to vulnerable groups.

**Women leadership and employment:** The study found that 24% of the social enterprises mapped are led by women, while 25% of the full-time employees and 65% of the part-time employees are women. Over 70% of the female-led social enterprises employ higher than the average proportion (25%) of female staff employed by social enterprises in general.

**Youth leadership:** The total number of youth-led (under 35 years) social enterprises was 27%. 57% of the social enterprises are also led by individuals between the ages of 25 and 44 years.

**A growing sector:** Close to half of the identified social enterprises are five years old or younger.

**Quality of staff:** Over 50% of the social enterprises feel that there is a shortage of adequate managerial and technical personnel in the social enterprise sector. By comparison, less than 10% of the mainstream businesses face this constraint.

**Beneficiary outreach:** While mapping the beneficiaries served by the 258 social enterprises, it emerged that 70% of the social enterprises are working with individuals from socially and economically disadvantaged communities, 82% are working with women, 31% are working with differently-abled individuals, and 46% are working with children, indicating a significant social impact on the country and its people.

**Government Policy and Initiatives by Institutions of Higher Education**

**Favourable government policies:** The study mapped 39 social enterprise-related government policies and schemes. Of these, 26% of the key policies had been framed by the Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises and 16% by the Department of Financial Services (Ministry of Finance).

**Support through institutions of higher education:** The study mapped 42 institutions of higher education delivering social enterprise-related courses. 88% of the courses offered are of the master’s level, and 46% are
full-time degrees, indicating an interest in positive change from young people and their career choices.

**Comparison with the UK**

The research briefly delved into the UK experience in social enterprise to explore common grounds between the two countries. It found that the UK has made a long-term commitment to mapping social enterprise activity, enabling data to become more robust and meaningful over time. The first survey of this kind was done in the UK in 2007, and thereafter every two years, namely in 2009, 2011, 2013 and the latest in 2015. Thus, each new survey adds to the findings of the previous survey, and this has helped to refine the methodology and expand the data-sets on social enterprise. Table 1 presents a quick comparison between the characteristics of social enterprises in India and the UK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Enterprises in India</th>
<th>Social Enterprises in the UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22% in healthcare</td>
<td>19% in health and social care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average turnover £80,000</td>
<td>Average turnover £151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% by women leaders</td>
<td>40% by women leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% by young leaders under 35 years</td>
<td>24% by young leaders under 35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88% of HE institutions support SEs</td>
<td>80% of HE institutions support SEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of social enterprises earn more than 50% of their income from trading activity</td>
<td>73% of social enterprises earn more than 75% of their income from trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of social enterprises are working with individuals from socially and economically disadvantaged communities</td>
<td>31% of social enterprises are working in the top 20% most deprived communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ENTERPRISES

In the past decade, India has witnessed considerable growth in its social enterprise activity. The number and quality of innovative ideas and business plans have improved due to growing awareness, support, and quality training and workshops available for social entrepreneurs and social enterprise leaders. The social enterprise ecosystem has evolved with support organisations providing direct, indirect, financial, and advisory assistance to social enterprises. Despite the developing ecosystem and valued potential of the sector, limited literature is available on social enterprises in India. Indicators such as the number of social enterprises in India, their contribution to India’s GDP and workforce, and characteristics of social enterprise leaders are still unclear. Moreover, there is lack of a holistic understanding of the government policies and courses offered by higher education institutions that seek to support the social enterprise sector in India. Organisations like Intellecap, Villgro, Dasra, UnLtd, Shujog, GIZ, Asian Development Bank, British Council, and Okapi have contributed significantly to the understanding of social enterprise in India, producing reviews of the overall landscape (Intellecap, 2012; Asian Development Bank, 2012), sectoral and regional studies (Intellecap, 2012a; GIZ, 2014; Villgro and Okapi, 2014), reports on human resourcing challenges (Intellecap, 2012b), social innovation (Shambu, 2013), and policy contexts (Darko et al, 2015).
HiSToRy oF SoCIAL eNTeRpRiSeS iN IndiA

Social impact and entrepreneurship is deeply rooted in the Indian ethos. Some of the major historical milestones in the social enterprise sector in India are:

1950: Land Gift Movement and Amul Dairy Cooperative
Vinoba Bhave, India’s first social entrepreneur, founded and led the Land Gift Movement in South India. He facilitated the redistribution of over seven million acres of land to India’s poor and landless. The movement is credited with creating a moral ambience that put pressure on the rich to assist the deprived.

Simultaneously, in West India, Dr. Verghese Kurien transformed the Amul Dairy Cooperative (established in 1946) and spurred ‘the white revolution’, turning India from a milk-deficient country into the world’s largest milk producer. Amul was the first business model where low-income dairy farmers formed a professionally managed and privately owned supply chain. They took ownership of distribution and lifted themselves out of poverty.

These two movements set the precedent for India’s future social enterprises.

1960: Fabindia’s Community-Owned Business Model
In 1960, John Bissell founded Fabindia and linked 80,000 artisans to the urban market by making them the shareholders. Fabindia’s unique community-owned model offered artisans a regular income and also dividends from the company’s growth.

1981: Ashoka
The term ‘social entrepreneurship’ was formally introduced in India when Ashoka set up operations in 1981. Ashoka formed a community of change-makers who sought to design, launch, and scale high-impact ideas in low-income markets.

1995-96: Sustainable Business Models
In 1995, Harish Hande set up SELCO Solar, a social enterprise which provided low-cost products, servicing, and financing through Grameen (village) banks and cooperative societies.

In 1996, realising the need to attract mainstream financial resources, Vijay Mahajan (the President of Microfinance Institutions Network of India) conceptualised BASIX, an institution devoted to promoting livelihoods for the poor on a sustainable basis.
At a time when limited financial and non-financial support was available to social entrepreneurs, SELCO and BASIX developed sustainable business models for bringing rural services to poor households.

1997: India’s First Social Venture Capital Firm In 1997, Grassroots Innovations Augmentation Network became India’s first non-profit social venture capital fund. It marked the beginning of what is now an extensive network of social enterprise enablers.

2001: India’s First Impact Investment India saw its first impact investment in 2001 when Acumen Fund invested in Aravind Eye Hospital.

In the same year, Vineet Rai established Aavishkaar – India’s first for-profit impact fund. The presence of the Acumen Fund and Aavishkaar in India spurred the demand for early-stage investments in for-profit organisations with a social impact.

2007: India’s First Social Enterprise Related Academic Course In 2007, recognising the growing interest in this sector in India, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, introduced the first course with social business focus – Masters in Social Entrepreneurship. This move created a viable and sanctioned pathway for a new generation of socially-motivated entrepreneurs and leaders.

2009: Sankalp Summit In 2009, Sankalp Forum hosted the first social enterprise-focussed gathering in Mumbai. It brought together diverse players in the social sector, from entrepreneurs to investors, funders, and other enablers. This community in India has now evolved into a network of over 400 stakeholders.

2013: Companies Act, 2013 The Act mandates that corporates spend 2% of their net profits on corporate social responsibility activities. According to Paul Basil, Founder of Villgro, “This 2% is going to do a lot of good for non-profit social enterprises in India, because a lot of such funding can go there.” (Source: YourStory). The original legislation of the Companies Act was revised later to exclude the term “social business” under the list of activities that corporations can take up for their CSR initiatives.

The social impact space in India has evolved considerably in the past decades and continues to evolve still.
OVERVIEW OF KEY ACTORS SUPPORTING SOCIAL ENTERPRISES IN INDIA

Cooperative and community-owned business models like Amul and Fabindia have existed in India since the 1950s, and the global social entrepreneur support organisation, Ashoka, introduced the term ‘social entrepreneur’ in 1981. The Indian social enterprise ecosystem is the most developed in the developing world, with a wide and growing range of domestic and international investors and support organisations. This section provides a brief overview of some key actors and their activities.

Incubators and Accelerators

Social enterprise incubators like UnLtd India and Villgro provide financial and advisory support to seed-stage and early-stage social entrepreneurs who are looking to develop and pilot their social impact ideas. Villgro is further involved in evolving social enterprise ecosystems in Tier-II and Tier-III cities through its ‘Unconvention’ initiative.

India also has a small number of accelerators that directly support social enterprises by facilitating access to funding, mentoring, conducting workshops and training, refining business models and innovations, and providing research support to measure impact. Some of the prominent accelerators in India are Impact Investment Holding, the Centre for Innovation Incubation and Entrepreneurship at the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, and Dasra’s Social Impact Accelerator Programme.

Impact Investment Holding invests up to €300,000 (~£250,000)1 in early-stage social enterprises and also helps these ventures scale their impact and profits by providing strategic advice and business support. Since 2011, it has supported five social enterprises working in energy, healthcare, education and skills development.

A majority of the incubators and accelerators in India are located in urban locations due to better infrastructure, availability of clients, access to networks, funding and business development. More are needed in non-urban locations to serve regional entrepreneurs and ensure inclusivity.

Impact Investors

There are over 50 impact funds and investors operating in India. They are mainly located in four cities – Bengaluru, Mumbai, New Delhi, and Chennai. According to a 2014 study, $1.6 billion has been invested in 220 social enterprises from 2000 to 2014 (Intellecap, 2014).

Impact investors engage with social enterprises at multiple stages:

- **Seed Funding** – Typically, seed investors invest from INR 15 lakhs to INR 1 crore (£15,000 to £100,000). Examples include Unitus Seed Fund and Impact Investment Holding.
- **Early-Stage Funding** – These funds invest in early-stage companies with investments from INR 1 crore to INR 6.75 crore (£100,000 to £700,000). Examples include Aavishkaar Fund, Indian Angel Network, Elevar Equity, LGT Venture Philanthropy and Venture East.
- **Growth-Stage Funding** – The investments at this stage are commonly over INR 6.75 crore (£700,000) but are rarely made. There is a lack of investors and funds in India that have a purely scale focus. Examples include Lok Capital, Grassroots Business Fund, Bamboo Finance, Acumen Fund, and Aavishkaar Fund.

In 2015, Aavishkaar invested INR 4.2 crore (£465,000)2 in Ergos Business Solutions and INR 32 crore (£3.5 million) in Connect India. Acumen Fund invested INR 11 crore (£1.2 million) in Sahayog Dairy, INR 4.4 crore (£480,000) in

---

1 1 EUR = £0.83 (as on 28 June, 2016)

2 1 INR = £0.011 (as on 28 June, 2016)
SEED, INR 6.8 crore (£750,000) in BioLite, INR 2.7 crore (£300,000) in Frontier Markets, and INR 1.7 crore (£190,000) in Ignis Careers.

Out of the total impact investments in India as of 2014, 70% were concentrated in the microfinance and financial inclusion sector. Agri-business, clean energy, and healthcare have attracted investments worth $341 million (£256 million)\(^3\) (Intellecap, 2014). By the end of 2014, three ‘follow-on’ investments had been made in social enterprises working on water and sanitation.

**Multilaterals and Donor Agencies**

Multilateral agencies operate in the social enterprise sector through impact investors, incubators, and accelerators by funding and collaborating on immersion and incubation programmes, capacity-building workshops, and research studies. Agencies fund programmes, organisations, events and awards to promote innovation and social enterprise. Direct support in the form of grant equity and debt to social enterprises is also on the rise.

The UK Department for International Development (DFID) and GIZ have collaborated with Intellecap to set up the virtual incubation platform Start-up Wave. The Lemelson Foundation, Michael & Susan Dell Foundation, and Rockefeller Foundation fund incubators and support organisations like Villgro and Ashoka. Organisations like GIZ, DFID, and NESTA support and/or conduct research in the social enterprise space, making important contributions to the sector.

Some of these institutions have also partnered with government agencies. DFID’s Samridhi Fund in collaboration with Small Industries Development Bank of India supports scalable businesses in eight low-income states. USAID in collaboration with the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry provides seed funding, grants, incubation, and accelerator services through the Millennium Alliance.

**Corporations**

The biggest step towards engaging the private sector in social development has been the amendment to the Companies Act, 2013. The Act made it mandatory for companies with a net worth of INR 500 crore (£55 million) or more, or a turnover of INR 1,000 crore (£110 million) or more, or a net profit of INR 5 crore (£550,000) or more, to constitute a committee towards corporate social responsibility (CSR). The act mandates that at least 2% of the average net profits made during the three immediately preceding financial years are spent in pursuance of the company’s CSR policy. The mandate has considerably increased the funds available for non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in India.

**Chambers of Commerce and Industry Associations**

There are 24 associations in India that predominantly work to influence small and medium enterprises and thereby carry the potential to support social enterprises. Industry associations are fostering growth in the social enterprise space by providing accreditation and empanelment facilities, enabling access to corporate donors, providing networking opportunities with peer entrepreneurs, conducting seminars and discussions, running grand challenges and funding awards, and producing knowledge products. Prominent industry associations include the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce, Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India, the Confederation of Indian Industry, the National Association of Software and Service Companies, and the Indian Impact Investors Council.

**Online Platforms and Media**

Online communities and platforms promote, support, and publish news about the social enterprise ecosystem. YourStory’s Social Story segment is a media platform that publishes stories and updates from the social enterprises sector.

\(^3\) 1 USD = £0.75 (as on 28 June, 2016)
enterprise sector. Since its inception in 2008, YourStory has profiled stories of over 15,000 entrepreneurs in India. Other media platforms include The Better India, Think Change India, and The Alternative. These highlight social enterprises that are doing good work and identify emerging social enterprises to watch out for. Newspapers and magazines such as Outlook, India Today, Mint, and The Economic Times dedicate sections to social business news as well.

**Forums and Networks**

India has active forums where the social enterprise community can discuss, network and engage more closely with other stakeholders. This allows organisations to share updates, opportunities, and challenges across sectors and locations. The Sankalp Forum is the largest gathering of stakeholders from the social enterprise sector in Asia. National Entrepreneurship Network supports student entrepreneurship across colleges and institutions in India. The Aspen Network of Development Entrepreneurs is a network of more than 110 organisations in India (and over 240 globally), encouraging entrepreneurship in the developing world. The Indus Entrepreneurs (TiE) is a network of 13,000 members, including over 2,500 charter members in 61 chapters (approximately 15 of which are in India) across 18 countries. TiE’s mission is to foster entrepreneurship globally through mentoring, networking, education, incubating, and funding. Jagriti Yatra (‘Awareness Journey’) is an annual train journey that takes hundreds of young Indians, especially those from small towns and villages, on a 15-day, 8,000-kilometre national odyssey to meet social and business entrepreneurs around the country.

**Co-working Spaces**

The co-working culture in India is brimming with opportunities. Spaces such as Bombay Connect, 91Springboard Ventures, Jaaga, Numa Bangalore, and Alpha Lab host young commercial and social start-ups, organise events, and conduct workshops and programmes that facilitate networks and learning for entrepreneurs.

**Social Innovation Events and Awards**

There are numerous events and competitions that actively promote innovation and social entrepreneurship in India. They include the Tata Social Enterprise Challenge, NASSCOM’s 10,000 Start-Ups, Schwab Foundation’s Social Entrepreneur of the Year Award, Unconvention by Villgro, the Manthan Award, and the Seed Initiative Award. The ‘Makerspace’ movement, in which entrepreneurs get together to create, invent, learn and brainstorm, has gained momentum. Examples include Kerala Startup Mission’s Fablab, and the Workbench Project in Bengaluru. These events allow social enterprises to test products and services in front of an audience and build networks and teams.
STUDY DESIGN

Defining Social Enterprise
Various countries and organisations have attempted to define a social enterprise by incorporating the revenue, purpose, and impact aspects as accurately as possible.

The EMES network defines social enterprises thus: “Social enterprises are not-for-profit private organisations providing goods or services directly related to their explicit aim to benefit the community. They generally rely on a collective dynamic involving various types of stakeholders in their governing bodies. They place high value on their autonomy, and they bear economic risks related to their activity.”

The Social Enterprise Alliance, USA, states that, “a social enterprise is an organisation or initiative that marries the social mission of a non-profit or government program with the market-driven approach of a business”.

The UK Government defines a social enterprise as “a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose.”

Intellecap in India recognises social enterprises as independent businesses “with the goal of generating profit”, having an “explicit mission to create social impact” whose operations “directly improve the lives and livelihoods of those residing at the bottom of the social pyramid”.

The Asian Development Bank’s India Social Enterprise Landscape Report looks at social enterprises in terms of triple bottom-line returns. “They address social and environmental needs, such as affordable health services and energy, and have a financially sustainable revenue model (or plan to become sustainable in the near future).”

There are some elements common to all the definitions:

Social return
• Goal/mission to achieve social, cultural, community-based, economic and/or environmental outcomes
• Redirection of a significant portion of surplus in the pursuit of social and environmental goals

Financial return
• Business that earns revenue
• Aims to be financially sustainable

Therefore, for the purpose of this research, an inclusive and broad definition has been used in order to be open and flexible about defining social enterprises:

“A business with a primarily social or environmental purpose, which aims to be financially self-sustaining and to principally re-invest a proportion of its profit or surplus either back into the business or for a social or environmental cause.”

The database created for the research included:
• All organisations which describe themselves as social enterprises
• All organisations which are described by others as social enterprises (e.g. in reports, during key informant interviews, stakeholder databases)

The survey was sent to organisations that fit the above broad definition.

The research conducted so far on social enterprises in India has largely been focussed on social enterprises registered as private limited companies, partnerships and sole ventures. This study does not distinguish between social enterprises on the basis of their legal structure and, instead, looks at whether the organisation has a revenue model. Any for-profit or not-for-profit organisation with a revenue model has the potential to qualify as a social enterprise as per this study.

Methodology
The research comprised three phases:
1. Desk-based review of existing information on social enterprises
2. Stakeholder interviews and discussion groups

3. Survey of social enterprises (online, telephonic, and in-person)

**Desk-based research**

Desk-based research was conducted to identify and review existing literature on social enterprise activity in India and explore the online presence of social enterprises operating in India to consolidate a database.

The information sought through the literature review was on social enterprise activity and ecosystem in India, financial and non-financial support environment in India, India’s private sector, small and medium enterprise sector, and revenue-generating non-governmental organisational activity, and social enterprise-relevant government policies in India. The latter included any programme or intervention that could have a direct or an indirect impact on the start-up, operation, funding, or investment for social enterprises.

**Key informant interviews**

These workshops were hosted in Delhi (at the British Council India office), Bengaluru (at the Ashoka India office), Mumbai (at the Thomson Reuters Foundation office), and Kolkata (at IIM Calcutta’s Innovations Park). At the onset, an inception workshop was also conducted in New Delhi (at the GIZ India office) to validate the methodology and plan outreach. A field visit to Guwahati (North-East India) was carried out to interview entrepreneurs and enablers in the region. The purpose of the zonal workshops was to discuss interim findings from the survey and the desk research pertaining to the specific zone of the workshop. Discussions revolved around regional nuances and experiences in the social enterprise sector and were a networking ground to tap into further social enterprise networks.

81 stakeholders from the social enterprise sector participated across the five workshops, including social enterprises, impact investors, incubators, networks, academic institutions, and industry experts.

Workshops organised by external organisations pertaining to the social enterprise sector in India were also attended, including Unconvention Jaipur by Villgro, The Huddle 2015 by UnLtd and the Global Social Entrepreneurship Network, Inclusive Finance India Summit by ACCESS-ASSIST, Livelihoods Asia Summit by Access Development Services, Decoding Healthcare Panel Discussion by Unitus Seed Fund, Open House: a talk on Global Action on Poverty by TiE Bangalore, and Social Enterprise Policy Dialogue by the British Council.

**Focus Group Discussions**

Nine focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted with experts in the following sectors: financial services, affordable housing, water and sanitation, energy and clean technology, education, healthcare, agriculture, dairy, and fisheries, skill development and non-farm livelihood, and forest and environment. 33 experts participated in the FGDs.

The following information was identified and deliberated upon during these discussions: the nature of social enterprises activity in specific sectors, support and barriers faced by the sector in terms of social entrepreneurial work, and specific sector-wise policies that influence social enterprise activity.

**Interviews**

Interviews were conducted in person and telephonically with social enterprise incubators, impact investors, faculty from academic institutions, social entrepreneurs and managers, social enterprise employees, and sector experts. Interviewees were spread across South India (Belgaum, Bengaluru, Chennai, Coimbatore, Hyderabad), North India (Bhopal, Delhi, Gurgaon, Jaipur, Lucknow, Nainital, Noida), West India (Ahmedabad, Mumbai), Northeast India (Gangtok, Guwahati), and East India (Bhubaneswar, Kolkata, Patna, Raipur). 48 interviews were conducted for the study.
The interviews sought to understand the activities of social enterprises, the barriers faced by them, and the kind of support available to social enterprises in India.

**Survey Tool Outreach**

The social enterprise survey was central to the study and provided the main data findings. A draft survey was produced by ODI in consultation with the British Council and SEUK, which was in turn modified by Ennovent to include India-specific edits and then vetted by ANDE.

A pilot survey was conducted with 100 NGOs. These NGOs were contacted and surveyed separately to confirm whether or not they fit the study’s definition of a social enterprise (primarily, whether they are trading or not), and to test out the survey tool for any language difficulties or technical glitches.

Educational institutions without a specific focus on the disadvantaged and social enterprise accelerators, and incubators like Ashoka and UnLtd India that are working with social startups, were excluded from the study. Young social startups (usually less than 2 years old) tend to have earned incomes below 25%. Such startups were also excluded from the study, but it is important to note that they may potentially qualify as social enterprises for future studies.

**Reporting and Caveats**

The survey responses are self-declared by social enterprises. 10% of the survey responses were randomly cross-checked through phone calls. Data on beneficiaries is self-reported and has not been verified. The survey asked the social enterprises how many different categories of beneficiaries they have supported; no definition of beneficiary was provided.

Survey results have been rounded off to zero decimal places, due to which some figures might not add up to 100%. Some survey questions have multiple answers (such as organisations operating in more than one sector, or facing multiple barriers); responses in these cases will add up to more than 100%.

The report gives regional cuts of data wherever relevant. Where there is a risk of distorted figures (arising due to outliers, where a few large or small organisations skew figures in their favour), the report has used median averages and not mean averages – this gives a more accurate picture of the status of social enterprise.

According to survey data, participants took 28 minutes on average to complete the survey, and most did not require any assistance with it. It was noted that some respondents were reluctant to share financial data. Perceptions about the survey in general were positive, with many participants acknowledging through optional feedback that the survey provided them with the opportunity to raise the profile of their organisation and a platform to voice their concerns and feedback about the sector.

Social enterprises that are located in metropolitan cities with access to networks and a stable internet connection were more likely to respond to the survey than those social enterprises located in tier-2 and tier-3 cities and those that are non-English speaking.

For the purposes of the study, the term ‘funding’ is used to mean grants, donations, and government contracts, and the term ‘finance’ is used to mean equity, investment, capital grants, and loans.

According to survey data, participants took 28 minutes on average to complete the survey, and most did not require any assistance with it. It was noted that some respondents were reluctant to share financial data. Perceptions about the survey in general were positive, with many participants acknowledging through optional feedback that the survey provided them with the opportunity to raise the profile of their organisation and a platform to voice their concerns and feedback about the sector.

---

4 The Indian government ranks cities by population – Tier 2 and 3 cities are typically regional hubs and more minor cities, respectively.
**Social Enterprise Survey Sample and Size**

Identifying entities to survey was a significant challenge for the project team, mainly due to a lack of information or the absence of any directories of social enterprises. Existing databases of social enterprises, micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs) and NGOs were used as one starting point, where they were available, followed by engagement with key stakeholders to access their networks and portfolios.

The survey sample was non-randomised and non-scientific. The approach taken was to reach as many organisations that were reasonably likely to meet the social enterprise criteria used for the study (see Table 2). The databases were not sufficiently large to be divided into sub-national or other sub-sets for more systematic sampling, and using stakeholder portfolios, memberships and networks for outreach also meant that a formal sampling process was not possible. As such, the surveys are an indication of social enterprise activity, not a representative sample of such activity. In the absence of social enterprise databases, however, the study provides an important first sample pool which can form an initial database to facilitate more scientific sample selection in the future.

The sampling process was neither systematic nor representative as the study aimed to maximise the number of responses by including all possible contacts. Although outreach sought to be as inclusive as possible, the channels used posed a probable bias in the findings towards urban social enterprises with access to support networks and the internet and with fluency in written English.

We acknowledge these here and hope that future research and surveys can find ways to overcome this potential bias.

Survey data was collected between September 30, 2015 and January 2, 2016. The survey was predominantly conducted through an online survey platform called Typeform. Surveys were also conducted telephonically, through email, and in person at workshops.

A total of 498 organisations completed the survey (186 private limited; 15 public limited; 215 NGOs, trust and societies; 17 partnerships; 3 Section 8; 30 sole proprietorship; 1 limited liability; 2 institutions/university). Using

### Table 2: Social enterprise qualification criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question detail</th>
<th>Social Enterprise classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact criteria</td>
<td>Does your organisation place emphasis on profit first, social/environmental mission first, or both jointly?</td>
<td>Organisations reporting ‘profit first’ were eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profit first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social/environmental mission first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both jointly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(one answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit/</td>
<td>What proportion of your income comes from earned income?</td>
<td>Organisations reporting less than 25% as earned income were eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surplus use</td>
<td>0-24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(one answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income source</td>
<td>If you do make a profit/surplus, how is it used?</td>
<td>Organisations which selected ‘Profit sharing with owners and shareholders’ only were eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth and development activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewards to staff and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profit sharing with owners and shareholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross subsidising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding third party social/environmental activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (multiple answers possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the social enterprise inclusion criteria, 258 respondents (61 NGOs, trust and societies; 9 section 8; 12 partnership; 150 private limited; 10 public limited; 15 sole proprietorship; 1 limited liability) were classified as social enterprises for the purposes of this study (52%). Data from the remaining 240 organisations was also analysed and is reported to contrast with the social enterprise data.

Out of the 498 survey respondents, 219 organisations prioritised social/environmental mission over profits, and 261 organisations placed social/environmental mission alongside profit-making. 321 organisations were earning at least 25% of their income from trading and income-generating activity (and not grants), and 494 organisations were using the surplus generated to further their organisation’s mission (and not only sharing the profits with owners and shareholders).

468 respondents self-identified as a social enterprise, and 30 did not. Of the 468 respondents who self-identified as social enterprises, 210 did not qualify as social enterprises as per the criteria used for the study. Of the 30 respondents who did not identify themselves as social enterprises, none qualified as social enterprises as per the definition criteria.

**Figure 1: Survey respondents as per social enterprise criteria (Total respondents = 498)**

This study does not distinguish between social enterprises on the basis of their legal structure and, instead, looks at whether the organisation has a revenue model.
Social Enterprise Leadership

Age
Indian social entrepreneurs (i.e. the owners, CEOs, directors of enterprises) are most likely to be in their 30s and 40s. The survey found that people aged 35-44 are the most likely to lead a social enterprise (31%). 27% of the social enterprises were led by an individual younger than 35 (youth-led).

Female leaders are slightly younger than their male counterparts. The highest proportion of social enterprise female leaders is in the age group of 25-34 (35%), with the highest proportion of social enterprise male leaders in the age group of 35-44 (34%).

The skills development (43%) and education (31%) sectors have the highest proportion of youth-led enterprises. On the other hand, sectors like tourism (3%) and affordable housing (1%) have the lowest proportion of youth-led enterprises (possibly due to the high capital requirements of these sectors, which are easier to meet for an older professional). The majority of social enterprise leaders across all sectors are over 35 years old.

Gender
24% of the social enterprises in the survey are female-led. Social enterprises perform significantly better on gender ratios than the average mainstream enterprise in India. According to the World Bank’s Enterprise Survey data, 8.9% of mainstream enterprises in India have a woman top manager, and 2.8% have majority female ownership (World Bank, 2014).

The highest proportion of female-led social enterprises is in South India (35%), followed by North India (31%) and West India (23%), whereas it is much lower in East India (8%) and North-East India (3%). There were several non-responses to this question in the North. The fact that the north-eastern region has the lowest number of social enterprises overall means women entrepreneurs are fewer too.

Years of Operation
The survey indicates that 57% of the social enterprises in India were registered between 2010 and 2015, of which private limited companies formed the highest proportion (71%). Overall, the social enterprise sector seems to be doubling in size every ten years.

Most social enterprises across regions followed the overall trend of having started after 2010. 57% of the social enterprises in the North, 27% in the South, 50% in the West, and 45% of the social enterprises in the North-East have been registered since 2010. Interestingly, in the East, 61% of the social enterprises were registered in or before 2010 (65% of which were registered as NGOs, indicating a large presence of NGOs in East India).

There is a notable trend in terms of the form of registration over time, with the proportion of NGO forms decreasing from 73% of social enterprises before 2000 to 7% between 2011 and 2015. Conversely, 19% of social enterprises were registered as private limited companies before 2000 compared to 53% between 2000 and 2010 and 71% in 2011 to 2015.

Location: Where Were Respondents Based?
Outreach activities for the survey took place in the states and territories of National Capital Territory of Delhi, Karnataka,
Maharashtra, West Bengal, and Assam. It is expected that location findings are biased towards these regions. As such, it is unsurprising that the survey found that 50% of the social enterprises are headquartered in Bengaluru (Karnataka, South India), Mumbai (Maharashtra, West India), and New Delhi (Delhi, North India). These were followed by the states of Tamil Nadu and Telangana (South India), which are also states with decent infrastructure, access to financial capital, and a good pool of knowledge, skills and talent. There are fewer social enterprises headquartered in poorer and less populous states, according to survey responses, including West Bengal and Assam.

The highest proportion of social enterprises are found in Maharashtra, West India (16%) followed by Karnataka, South India (15%). Delhi and Telangana each accounted for 8% of the responses followed by Uttar Pradesh (7%), West Bengal (7%), Tamil Nadu (5%), Gujarat (5%), Bihar (4%), Odisha (4%), and Rajasthan (4%).

The remaining 15% of the respondents were spread across 12 states (Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, Assam, Kerala, Manipur, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Andhra Pradesh, Nagaland, and Sikkim).

Survey findings revealed the tendency for social enterprises to be headquartered in metropolitan and major capital cities. 55% of the social enterprises were headquartered in just nine cities (Mumbai, Bangalore, New Delhi, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Bhubaneswar, Gurgaon, Chennai, and Ahmedabad). The remaining 45% were spread thinly across 72 smaller ‘tier 2’ and ‘tier 3’ cities.5

5 These refer to India’s population-based classifications for urban centres.

**Geographical Reach**

The survey asked social enterprises about the reach of their operations. 32% of the social enterprises in India operate regionally, 46% operate at a national level, and 21% operate internationally.

Of the social enterprises operating internationally, the largest proportions worked in North India (29%) and South India (29%). Only 10% of the international social enterprises were operating in the East or North-East regions. By contrast, 45% of operations in the Eastern region and 36% of operations in the North-Eastern region are regional only.

**Legal Status**

In spite of India having a legal form which closely mirrors the social enterprise model – the Section 8 company – 58% social enterprise survey respondents reported that they operate as private limited companies, followed by 23% operating as NGOs (societies and trusts).

There is growing diversity in the way social enterprises are registering themselves. Before

---

5 A Section 8 Company is a company (for charitable or not-for-profit purposes) established ‘for promoting commerce, art, science, sports, education, research, social welfare, religion, charity, protection of environment or any such other object’, provided the profits, if any, or other income is applied for promoting only the objects of the company and no dividend is paid to its members.
2000, social enterprises were primarily of two kinds – private limited companies or societies/trusts (plus a few sole ventures). However, as of 2015, social enterprises are operating in various forms such as Section 8 companies, limited liability companies, public limited companies, partnerships, and sole ventures (although private limited companies and societies/trusts still form a large proportion of the sector).

The growing popularity of the private limited structure over NGO registration could be explained by private limited companies having greater autonomy over how they use their profits/surplus. Even though there are no restrictions on Indian NGOs’ business, commercial and economic activities, their profits/surplus must be applied fully towards charitable objectives. This makes them unfavourable for equity investors, who expect a return on investments. The number of social enterprises registering themselves as NGOs has been declining, according to comparison of legal status and registration dates, whereas the choice to register as a private limited company has seen a significant increase.

Areas of Focus
Objectives of social enterprises
The survey asked about the overall objectives of the social enterprise. The most commonly stated objective of social enterprises in the survey is creating employment (62%), followed by improving health (41%), protecting the environment (40%), addressing social exclusion (40%), supporting agriculture and allied activities (36%), empowering women (33%), promoting education (32%), addressing financial inclusion (31%), and supporting other social organisations (20%).

Survey data also showed that organisational objectives vary with the regional location of a social enterprise. Creating employment opportunities was the highest stated objective across all five regions. In the North-East, a majority (64%) of the social enterprises stated that their key objective was to support agriculture and allied activities. In North India, the most prominently

### Table 3: Legal status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Limited Company</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO (Trust or Society)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Proprietorship</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Limited Company</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 Company</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Liability Company</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Social enterprise objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating employment opportunities</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving health and well-being</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing social exclusion</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the environment</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting agriculture and allied activities</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering and uplifting women</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting education and literacy</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing financial exclusion</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting other social enterprises and organisations</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting vulnerable children and young persons</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing affordable housing</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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stated objective was addressing social exclusion (43%); in the West, it was empowering and uplifting women (33%); and in the South and East, it was improving health and well-being (44% and 52%, respectively).

Key objectives among female-led social enterprises are empowering and uplifting women (40%) and promoting education and literacy (31%). For male-led social enterprises, key objectives included supporting agriculture and allied activities (43%) and protecting the environment (44%). Objectives that were prioritised by both male- and female-led social enterprises were improving health and well-being, creating employment opportunities, and addressing social exclusion.

Principal income-generating activity that social enterprises engage in

Social enterprises are achieving their objectives by engaging in a range of income-generating activities: providing a service; providing business and entrepreneurial development support; sales; and manufacturing.

76% of the social enterprises provide services as one of their principal income-generating activities. Social enterprises that are providing a service tend to operate in skills development, financial services, education, or healthcare. Examples of services provided include linking products made by traditional artisans with domestic and international markets, or training teachers, nurses and local communities.

42% of the social enterprises rely on sales and trading of goods as a principal income-generating activity. 33% manufacture products to enhance productivity in sectors like agriculture, dairy, energy, water, and sanitation.

41% of the social enterprises focus on business development and entrepreneurial support to other organisations. For most social enterprises, business development is an additional source of income. Only 3% of the social enterprises were engaged in business and entrepreneurial development and support as their sole income-generating activity, where they were involved in training local communities on how to become entrepreneurs. These social enterprises operate in the non-farm livelihoods, skills development, forestry, and tourism sectors.

Sectors that social enterprises work in

Over half of the social enterprises surveyed operate in the skills development sector – providing skills training to producers, artisans, and unskilled/semi-skilled labourers. Other prominent sectors are education, agriculture, fisheries, and dairy, financial services, energy and clean technology and healthcare. Social enterprises in the clean energy sector feature strongly in South India, with 75% of the sector’s activity based there.

The survey shows that affordable housing, water and sanitation, eco-tourism, and forestry and environment have the lowest proportion of social enterprise activity in India. 5% of the social enterprises surveyed work in the affordable housing sector, and 86% of these are primarily focused on housing finance, not construction or management of housing. Other areas of activity reported by social enterprises are governance,
cultural development, disaster risk reduction, social gaming, and networking.

The most prominent sectors of activity for female-led social enterprises are skills development (55%), followed by education (29%) and non-farm livelihoods (26%).

### Social Impact

#### Primary purpose

A key aspect of social enterprise is that the venture benefits groups of people beyond those directly involved in the business. 72% of the social enterprises surveyed stated that their core purpose was to pursue profit and a social/environmental mission jointly, while 28% focus primarily on social/environmental impact.

#### Beneficiaries

The survey asked respondents to report how many beneficiaries they had supported, but did not specify a time frame. Of the 258 social enterprise respondents, 21% had a rural focus, 21% had an urban focus, and 58% worked in both rural and urban areas. 70% of the surveyed social enterprises work with people from socially and economically disadvantaged communities, 82% work with women, 31% work with people with disabilities, and 46% are working with children.

Table 6: Beneficiaries reached by social enterprises (N = 258)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Beneficiary</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from backward communities</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from underserved regions</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women form one of the main groups of beneficiaries of social enterprises (82% of the social enterprises work with women). However, there is a difference between female-led and male-led social enterprise with respect to children and people with disabilities, with female-led ventures far more likely to work with children than male-led social enterprises (71% to 55%) and also more likely to work with people with disabilities (46% compared to 23%).

#### Employment Generation by Social Enterprises

According to the survey, the average number (median) of employees in a social enterprise in India is 19 (17 full-time employees and four part-time employees).8

### Table 5: Social Enterprise sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Respondents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Development</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Fisheries and Dairy</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Clean Technology</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Farm Livelihood</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Nutrition</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and Environment</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, Rehabilitation and Human Rights</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Other areas of activity reported by social enterprises were governance, cultural development, disaster risk reduction, and social gaming.

8 Two part-time employees are treated as equivalent to one full-time employee. The mean average number of employees in social enterprises in India: full-time = 177, part-time = 70.
54% of surveyed social enterprises have fewer than 20 full-time employees, and 11% of the social enterprises have between 20 and 40 full-time employees. 3% of social enterprises have over 1,000 full-time employees – these were mainly microfinance institutions that have been operational for over 10 years.

56% of the social enterprises create employment directly by employing disadvantaged groups in their workforce, 62% of the social enterprises work with the objective of creating employment, and 53% of the social enterprises provide skills training to vulnerable groups.

At 25%, the proportion of female full-time employees in social enterprises is higher than the 14% in mainstream businesses in India (World Bank, 2014). Moreover, a large proportion of social enterprise employees are part-time female employees (46% of total employees).

Social enterprises were asked if they expect their staff numbers to change in the next year. Just over half (52%) of female-led enterprises stated that they expected the number of employees to increase a little, and nearly half (49%) of male-led enterprises said that they expected staff numbers to increase substantially.

On an average, 25% of the employees in a social enterprise are women. 71% of female-led social enterprises employ more than the average 25% women, compared to 55% of male-led social enterprises, indicating that female-led social enterprises are more likely to hire women.

The total number of new employees added by the 258 social enterprises in 2015 was 13077, whereas the total number of employment generated by these is 61,548, comprising both full-time and part-time personnel.

Table 7: Gender distribution of social enterprise jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of employment</th>
<th>Women employees</th>
<th>Male employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a 27% increase in the total number of employees in social enterprises from 2014 to 2015, while 89% of social enterprises expected their staff numbers to increase in the next financial year.

Turnover expectations

The survey responses indicate that 35% of the social enterprises are incurring a loss, 43% are making profit, and 22% are breaking even. Among the social enterprises incurring a loss, 62% have been operating for less than three years.

Turnover and Profit/Surplus Use

The survey estimates average annual turnover (median) of a social enterprise to be INR 7.8 million (approximately £80,000).9

Of the social enterprises with a turnover of less than INR1 million (£10,200), 60% have been operating for less than five years. 4% of social enterprises indicated that their turnover was over INR 1 billion (£10,200,000) annually. Of these ventures, 50% were microfinance institutions, and 25% of them are involved in the manufacturing and distribution of clean energy products.

The survey reveals that 80% of the social enterprises in India earn more than half of their income through trading activities. Among these, 45% earn all of their income this way.

Use of profit/surplus

Social enterprises use most of their profit or surplus to focus on growth and development, although a significant proportion also use profit/surplus to reward their staff

---

8 Mean turnover of social enterprises in India = INR 174,957,289 (approximately £2 million).

9 52 social enterprise respondents (20%) chose to not display their turnover information. All turnover data comes from the 206 respondents that declared turnover figures.
and employees. Cross-subsidising into less commercially viable components of the business (usually for social purpose) is not common among the social enterprise respondents.

Table 8: Use of profit/surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of profit/ surplus</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth and development activities</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards to staff and beneficiaries</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross subsidising</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding third party social/ environmental activities</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth Plans and Barriers

Growth Plans

In terms of growth plans, the highest proportion of surveyed social enterprises is looking to expand into new geographical areas in the future (78%). Other growth plans include attracting new customers (73%), developing and launching new products and services (71%), increasing sales with current customers (64%), and attracting investments to expand (56%). Only one of the 258 social enterprise respondents reported having no growth plans (being a public limited company, it is not allowed to make growth forecasts).

Social enterprises that are less than five years old identified attracting new customers as their top growth plan (81%); social enterprises between five to ten years old and those older than ten years identified expanding into new geographical areas as the top growth plan (88% and 73% respectively). Planning to attract investments to expand was most commonly seen in organisations that were less than five years old (64%) and least commonly seen in organisations over ten years old (32%). It is worth noting that expanding into new areas, new products, and new customers are all stated as growth plans ahead of attracting investment.

Barriers to growth

Although investment was not a top growth plan, access to finance was the largest stated barrier identified by social enterprises, with 57% of the social enterprises identifying access to capital (debt/equity) as a constraint, 50% identifying access to grant funding as a constraint, and 33% identifying cash flow as a constraint.

Over 50% of the social enterprises identified access to finance as a significant barrier to growth.
enterprises felt that there was a shortage of adequate managerial and technical personnel in the social enterprise sector; less than 10% of mainstream businesses face this constraint (World Bank, 2014). This barrier was particularly high in North-East India, where 80% of the social enterprises face the challenge of a shortage of technical skills. 30% of the enterprises in the remaining regions in India also reported facing a challenge with staffing (with the lowest proportion of 16% reported in South India). The main staffing challenge is finding and retaining junior to mid-level talent.

Through interviews and discussions with social enterprise leaders and employees, it was found that individuals who don’t speak English or Hindi are often neglected, and their access to finance and support is almost non-existent. It is estimated that there are at least 122 regional languages spoken across India, of which 22 are officially recognised by the government. In spite of this, a strong bias exists in favour of English and Hindi speakers, and the support ecosystem is mainly available in largely English-speaking metropolitan cities. Enterprises that work regionally have negligible contact with these enablers. This barrier was felt by social enterprises in tier 2 and tier 3 cities across India.

Finance Sources and Constraints

Sources of funding and finance

Respondents were asked what forms of funding and finance they have received either in the last year or since they started operating (aggregated). The types of funds received include: grants from governments; grants from foundations; contracts from government; fees, sales and charges; and donations – cash and in-kind (e.g. equipment, volunteer time). The types of finance received include: capital grants; concessional loans (loans with below-market interest rates); commercial loans (market interest rate loans); and equity or equity-like investments.

In the past year, 12% of the respondents had relied solely on sources of financing, 13% of the respondents had relied solely on funding, 59% of the respondents had relied on both funding and financing sources, and 16% of the respondents had not applied for funding or financing.

84% of the surveyed social enterprises have sought financing or funding in the past. The most common source of funding is grants from foundations (36%), and the most common source of finance is equity or equity-like investments (33%). Social enterprises have also received in-kind cash and donations (26%); capital grants (26%); commercial loans (24%); grants from governments (21%); contracts from governments (17%); and concessional loans below the market rate (17%).

Social enterprises registered as not-for-profit entities (NGOs and...
Section 8 companies) receive almost 60% of their funds in the form of grants from foundations and in-kind aid and donations (for example, volunteer time and equipment). The most common type of finance source for for-profit social entities (like private limited companies, partnerships, and sole ventures) was equity or equity-like investments. 50% of these social enterprises depend on equity investments as a major source of finance and 27% on grants from foundations.

Younger social enterprises are becoming increasingly interested in repayable finance as a method to grow their business. According to the survey, younger social enterprises are also accessing diverse non-traditional sources of finance such as: Facebook’s ‘internet.org’; crowd-funding (such as Kickstarter); social loans from Milaap (an online micro-lending platform); and business school consortia (organised by management institutions like Indian School of Business in Hyderabad and the Indian Institute of Management in Calcutta).

**Financing constraints**

86% of the social enterprises surveyed for the study stated that access to finance was one of their major constraints. There is a stark difference between social enterprises and mainstream business, as only 15% of the mainstream businesses in the World Bank Enterprise Survey said that they faced some form of financial constraint (World Bank, 2014). 33% of the social enterprises said that they faced a lack of access to investors due to limited networks. This was especially pronounced in the North-East region, where support institutions are scarce and social enterprises are few.

Of the 50% of social enterprises that identified grant funding as a major barrier, over 60% were more than ten years old. 57% of the social enterprises identified access to debt/equity as a major barrier, of which over 60% were less than five years old.

**Table 9: Sources of finance and funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding sought by Social Enterprise</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from foundations</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind cash and donations (e.g. equipment, volunteer time)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants from governments</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts from governments</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financing sought by Social Enterprise**

| Equity or equity-like investments  | 33%            |
| Capital grant                      | 26%            |
| Commercial loans (market interest rate loans) | 24%            |
| Concessional loans (loans with below-market interest rates) | 17%            |

**Figure 7: Constraints to funding and finance faced by social enterprises**
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- Access to investors is low due to limited network
- Limited supply of capital
- Revenue for equity investors
- Revenue and profitability requirement for bank loans
- Limited track/profitability record
- Business model is not refined/appealing
- Regulatory constraints when securing capital from international sources
- Securing capital and financing is not one of our major constraints
Social Enterprise Policy and Higher Education Findings

Social Enterprise Policy

Social enterprise and entrepreneurship-relevant government policies (legislations, schemes, programmes and Acts) were compiled through research reports, journals, and websites of ministries.

Any programme or intervention that could have a direct or an indirect impact on the start-up, operation, funding, or investment for social enterprises was considered. Examples of departments and ministries reviewed are the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, and the Ministry of Finance.

Information was gathered on schemes and plans that would have an impact on social innovation, MSME development, private sector engagement, and social enterprise operations. Various seminars and discussions were attended, wherein the policy landscape for social enterprises was discussed. Questions regarding policy support were asked to stakeholders as part of the interview process.

39 government policies that are relevant to social enterprise and entrepreneurship have been mapped. Of these, 26% of the key policies have been framed by the Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises, and 16% have been launched by the Department of Financial Services (Ministry of Finance).

A notable policy launched recently with a specific mention of social enterprises was the ‘National Policy on Skill Development and Entrepreneurship’, announced on 15 July, 2015 by the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship. The policy includes a section on social enterprises with an aim to foster social entrepreneurship and grassroots innovation.

Institutions of Higher Education

The study mapped 42 institutions of higher education that deliver social enterprise-related courses. These offer diplomas, certification, electives, and master’s degrees. 88% of the courses offered are of master’s level, of which 46% are full-time courses offered by institutes like the Institute of Rural Management Anand (IRMA), Entrepreneurship Development Institute of India (EDII), Ahmedabad, Indian Institute of Management (IIM), Ahmedabad, Indian Institute of Forest Management (IIFM), Bhopal, and Indian Institute of Management (IIM), Bangalore. Two of these institutions of higher education provide full-time master’s level courses in social entrepreneurship – Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) Mumbai and Ambedkar University Delhi (AUD).

The study also mapped 9 short-term courses and training programmes initiated by social enterprise stakeholders such as Acumen’s Global Fellowship Program (leadership training) and the Hand in Hand Global Academy of Social Entrepreneurship (short-term courses).

In Annexure 2, the complete list of social enterprise-related academic courses in India can be found.

Over half of the social enterprises surveyed operate in the skills development sector – providing skills training to producers, artisans, and unskilled/semi-skilled labourers.
In order to frame the value and importance of undertaking mapping studies, this section shares some of the rationale, learning, experiences and outcomes from the UK sector and the impact this has had on developing a strong ecosystem. The UK is often considered to be a market leader in the support and development of social enterprise. A recent poll conducted by Thomson Reuters places the UK at number three globally as a market leader.\textsuperscript{13} The sharing of the UK experience will hopefully present researchers, policy-makers and other wider stakeholders with an opportunity to understand the emerging trends in social enterprise activity in the two countries, opening a new avenue for bilateral cooperation.

The UK has made a long term commitment to mapping, enabling data to become more robust and meaningful over time. In India, most studies of social enterprise activity have only been carried out once. Social Enterprise UK, the country’s national sector body, has carried out a series of social enterprise surveys every two years and so has built up data over time. The first ever survey of this kind was done in 2007, and thereafter every two years, in 2009, 2011, 2013 and the latest one in 2015. Thus, each new survey adds to the findings of the previous survey, and this has helped refine the methodology and expand the data-sets on social enterprise. Table 10 illustrates a few India/UK comparisons, indicating that social enterprises can have global synergies in terms of their areas of operation, the communities of need they serve and perhaps who are the most likely groups to lead and develop them in the future. This will help to better understand where support might be best placed for growth and investment.

Mapping of social enterprises in the UK was found to be a vital tool in the development of strategies both for the sector and Government. Developing an evidence base for social impact, along with the contribution the sector makes to the economy and job creation, is crucial in order to gather resources, and encourage policies that enable growth of the sector. Figure 8 presents a brief history of how policy has evolved in the UK and how the data has helped create an ecosystem that encourages growth.

While the social enterprise mapping exercise was on, the UK saw the creation of the Community Interest Company as a bespoke legal structure. There are now 11,000 Community Interest Companies registered. This means that roughly one in every 200 companies registered in the UK chooses this as their governance model, perhaps suggesting a huge shift in the way people are thinking about and doing business.

Mapping in the UK has regularly highlighted issues associated with lack of access to finance. In direct

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Social Enterprises in India & Social Enterprises in the UK \\
\hline
22% in healthcare & 19% in health and social care \\
\hline
Average turnover £80,000 & Average turnover £151,000 \\
\hline
24% by women leaders & 40% by women leaders \\
\hline
27% by young leaders under 35 years & 24% by young leaders under 35 years \\
\hline
88% HE institutions support SEs & 80% HE institutions support SEs \\
\hline
80% of social enterprises earn more than 50% of their income from trading activity & 73% of social enterprises earn more than 75% of their income from trade \\
\hline
70% of social enterprises are working with individuals from socially and economically disadvantaged communities & 31% of social enterprises are working in the top 20% most deprived communities \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparison in India-UK findings}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{13}http://poll2016.trust.org/?_sm_au_=iV4FkF1k1WtTff
response to this, the Government set up a social investment fund of 100 million pounds. The social investment market in the UK is now estimated at £1.5 million.

The policy changes enabling a ‘Right to Request’ and the set-up of social enterprises from the health service now indicates that 19% of all social enterprises operate in activities relating directly to health and social care.

There are strong comparisons to be made from the India mapping and the UK experience, and given that social enterprise is recognised in India as a relatively new term, the statistics are impressive.

**Figure 8: Social enterprise related policies in the UK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Prime Minister Tony Blair commits to supporting social entrepreneurs in his first policy speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>UNLTD launched to promote and develop social entrepreneurs with £100m endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Unit formed as part of the Department for Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Coalition (now Social Enterprise UK) established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Community Interest Companies (CICs) – legislation to create a new form of corporate entity introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Investment Fund - £100 million fund established for investment in new and existing social enterprises delivering health and social care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Right to request introduced to support National Health Service staff to establish social enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>All main parties’ manifestos have strong commitments to social enterprise Social Enterprise features in the Queen’s speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Francis Maude commits that 1 in 6 public sector employees will work for staff-owned social enterprises and mutuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Community Rights to Challenge, to Bid and to Build enshrined in the Localism Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>First ever Social Impact Bond launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Launch of Big Society Capital with £600m of investment for social enterprises and charities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Passing of the Public Services (Social Value) Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prime Minister David Cameron launches the GB Social Investment Taskforce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings and Implications

Growing recognition and support for young start-ups but a lack of awareness about social enterprises: 32% of social enterprises reported that there is a lack of understanding or awareness among banks and support organisations with regard to social enterprises. 20% also stated that there is a lack of awareness among the public and customers about social enterprise goals and objectives. This lack of awareness often causes social enterprises to be neglected when they are looking to raise capital through debt funding and investments. In order to create awareness about the work done by social enterprises, especially among banks and other financial institutions, it is important to formally differentiate between commercial and social start-ups – their objectives, impact, and needs. While the government has recognised the work of start-ups (through the Start-Up India programme launched in 2016), there is no specific mention of social enterprises. By earmarking a proportion of the Start-Up India Fund for social enterprises, the government can send encouraging signals to other financial institutions about investing in such enterprises. Provisions should also be made to divert CSR funds into social enterprises irrespective of their legal structure (presently, only NGOs are eligible for CSR funds). The lack of awareness in the social enterprise support ecosystem regarding the needs of and challenges faced by social enterprises has made it ‘difficult for social entrepreneurs to secure capital and loans at low interest and low return expectation’, according to a social enterprise leader interviewed for the study.

Large youth population but a lack of skills: There is high potential for productivity and energy to flow from a country where more than half the people are under 35 years of age. Social enterprises in India have turned their focus towards educating and keeping healthy the millions of young people who join the job market every month. 73% of the social enterprises in the North, 66% in the South, 69% in the East, 59% in the West, and 91% in the North-East are working with the youth. 89% of social enterprises are also looking to increase their employee numbers in the next financial year. In spite of the high proportion of social enterprises expecting to employ more people, staffing was still one of the most common barriers faced by social enterprises, with 31% of the social enterprises reporting a shortage of managerial skills as a barrier to growth, 26% reporting recruiting other (junior) staff, and 24% reporting a shortage of technical skills.

For India’s youth to be able to fuel its great demographic dividend there needs to be a simultaneous growth in their professional skills to enable an effective and fruitful social enterprise ecosystem. Social enterprises have started equipping young people with skills that could sustain them in the workforce: 56% of the social enterprises were creating direct employment by employing disadvantaged groups in their workforce, 62% worked with the objective of creating employment, and 53% were providing skills training to vulnerable groups.

However, skills development needs to start at an earlier, academic level, with more educational institutions delivering courses to equip young professionals with the management skills necessary to lead social enterprises and the technical skills necessary to drive forward their activities.

Women social entrepreneurs face challenges in securing funding: Although social enterprises perform significantly better on gender ratios than the mainstream businesses in India (24% women leaders in social enterprises versus 8.9% in mainstream enterprises), the disparity between male and female leaders is still high. Female entrepreneurs and leaders of social enterprises interviewed for the study identified challenges around gender biases when trying to source funding and investments. They claimed that they are often asked questions around family, maternity leave, and work-life balance as a means to judge their performance and capability. Assets and businesses,
Enabling access to finance for proof of concept and reducing regulations to receive foreign capital: 33% of the social enterprises reported that access to investors was low due to limited networks, and 21% reported that their limited performance record was a major constraint to securing finance. Social enterprises find it difficult to attract funding without having shown an impact on the ground first. However, social enterprises are usually constrained for resources that enable them to carry out pilot work, thereby trapping them in a vicious cycle. A pilot investment fund could be set up to enable social enterprises to prove their impact and assess whether they should receive further funding. Moreover, opening up NGOs to capital investments would further encourage social enterprises operating under the legal structure of an NGO. According to a social entrepreneur surveyed for the study, “India has a very restrictive non-profit policy, wherein if someone invests, or if sales are made, it is treated as a ‘donation’, and it is not possible to give any investor a return on investment. This restricts our financial sources by making us ineligible for investments from venture capitalists or impact investors.” 14% of the social enterprises also reported that a major hindrance to securing finance is regulatory constraints when securing capital from international sources. Foreign investments and equity have to be approved by the Central Bank, resulting in excessive regulations and delay. When it comes to foreign funding, the strict Foreign Contribution Regulation Act (FCRA) guidelines and the time period restriction for an FCRA grant hampers momentum (an organisation becomes eligible to receive foreign donations only after three years). Social enterprise staff and leaders suggested in interviews that relaxing FCRA regulations would enable increased foreign funding, which could potentially accelerate early-stage social enterprises that are registered as NGOs.

The social enterprise sector in India needs significant further support from key audiences to fulfil its growth potential, to attract talent, to have policy influence, and to secure external investment. It is becoming increasingly important for the government to promote awareness of social entrepreneurship and enterprise. More schools, universities, and research organisations need to encourage an entrepreneurial mindset among young people, particularly one geared towards tackling social challenges in communities and generating more jobs.

Lessons for Future Research

Outreach could be furthered by surveying social enterprises telephonically and in-person (in addition to online surveying). Translating the survey to Hindi and major regional languages (such as Tamil) could reach significantly more regional social enterprises, reducing the sampling bias towards social enterprises located in metropolitan and English-speaking cities.

A larger and more representative sample for future surveys would be useful for a more nuanced understanding of the social enterprise sector. Periodic follow-up surveys should be conducted to continue tracking growth of the social enterprise sector in the coming years.

Studies pertaining to specific regions within India can delve into a deeper understanding and overview of social enterprises and capture regional ecosystems, challenges, needs, lessons, and nuances effectively.

Developing an evolving database of social enterprises to foster better networks and leanings and assist future research in the sector would be valuable. Such data is collected, but often it is either static (so it quickly goes out of date) or not public. To date, there has been limited appetite to fund a public and regularly maintained national or global database.
Social Enterprise Stories

MENTOR TOGETHER
Sector of Focus: Education
Established: November 2009
Sector of operation: Education
Geographical outreach: Bengaluru (headquarters), Mumbai, Chennai, Pune, New Delhi
Beneficiaries: 2,000 children (as on May 2016)

Being born into adverse conditions leads to children having to face inequality of opportunity. Traditional networks of support are unavailable to many children, affecting their potential to thrive and work. It is essential to supplement naturally occurring relationships between children and adults with programmatic efforts to help children from under-served backgrounds realise their full potential.

Mentor Together is India’s first community-based youth-mentoring social enterprise that links urban poor children, enrolled in formal education programmes, to professionals who serve as mentors in helping them build skills and gain access to resources and opportunities. The mentees (14-21 years of age) are from low-income families. The mentors come from varied professional backgrounds and undergo extensive screening and training. Mentor Together leverages corporate and community partnerships to ensure that its training processes are followed stringently.

vREMNID
Sector of Focus: Healthcare
Established: August 2014
Sector of operation: Healthcare
Geographical outreach: Hyderabad (headquarters), pan India
Beneficiaries: 18,000 families and 42,000 SMS reminders sent

According to WHO estimates, 100,000 children (aged under five) in India are losing their lives annually to diseases that could be prevented by timely vaccines. vRemind is a mobile-based health app that gives timely vaccination reminders to parents with children up to the age of five by sending out SMS reminders (one reminder seven days before the appointment and another a day before the scheduled vaccination date). To widen the reach of this solution and not to limit it to just smart phones, the reminders are sent out via SMS.

vRemind currently has 18,000 subscribers (parents/caregivers) and 42,000 SMS reminders have been sent out till date. With the data they collect from their subscribers, there is also a plan to provide effective insights and analytics to improve the supply chain management of vaccines. As the solution is scalable, it has potential to be expanded globally.

The organisation has recently tied up with LifeSpring Hospitals in Hyderabad that provide low-cost maternal care for the urban poor.

GREEN LEAF ENERGY PVT LTD.
Sector of Focus: Clean Energy
Established: 2009
Sector of operation: Clean energy
Geographical outreach: Bihar (headquarters), Jharkhand
Beneficiaries: 150,000+

Due to recurrent droughts, large parts of the agricultural land in Bihar have been rendered barren and wasted. This has led to problems of unemployment, poverty, and the eventual migration of labour to cities, leaving the state devoid of productive activity and its own people.

Kumar Ankit and Manish Dayal have found a one-stop solution for creating green spaces and providing sustainable livelihoods. Green Leaf Energy, established under the guidance of XLRI Entrepreneurship Development Centre, is planting Pongamia Pinnata – a bio-diesel-producing plant – on the wastelands of Bihar.

This social forestry model provides employment to villagers by linking 200 plants with four rural households, ensuring 100 days of employment under MGNREGA (a wage-employment Act for rural households). Green Leaf has garnered support from the Bihar Government to cover material and labour costs for plantation activities.
BASIX KRISHI SAMRUDDHI LTD.

**Sector of Focus:** Agriculture, Fisheries, Dairy  
**Established:** 2010  
**CEO:** Mihir Sahana  
**Sector of operation:** Agriculture, fisheries, dairy  
**Geographical outreach:** Kolkata (headquarters), Bihar, Odisha, Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand  
**Beneficiaries:** 30,000 farmers  

BASIX Krishi Samruddhi Ltd. (BKSL) provides technical support services to a wide range of farmers engaged in agriculture and allied activities. The mission of BKSL is to improve the lives of the poor, primarily targeting the rural poor and women, through the provision of integrated financial services and technical assistance. The organisation is among the first microfinance companies in the world to attract commercial debt and equity investments, both internationally and from within India. BKSL offers a range of services, including savings and insurance, agricultural, livestock and non-farm enterprise development, and institutional development, to rural producers and their groups.

BKSL supports fish farming by providing feed, medicine and technical inputs to farmers. BKSL has encouraged crop diversification by making available quality tissue culture plants, providing inputs and technical support, and linking farmers with ripening centres and processors. The enterprise has tied up with PepsiCo and ITC to facilitate the link between farmers and the processing companies.

PRIYADARSHINI TAXI SERVICES

**Sector of Focus:** Non-Farm Livelihoods  
**Established:** 2008  
**Sector of operation:** Non-farm livelihoods  
**Geographical outreach:** Mumbai (headquarters), Mumbai Metropolitan Region  
**Beneficiaries:** 100 women  

Taxis are a preferred mode of transport for women who travel alone, especially at odd hours. Further, large sections of women across India do not have access to good education, health and hygiene and are discouraged from earning a dignified livelihood.

Priyadarshini Taxi Services is a women-run enterprise where women drivers undergo rigorous and holistic training for 90 days to become efficient and skilful drivers. Many women who were employed by the company have become entrepreneurs themselves.

The taxi service is attached to the pre-paid counter at the Mumbai airport and has tied up with various corporate houses for pick-up and drop facility for their women staff (particularly at night). The service caters to the travel arrangements of various medical tourism companies as well as the hotel and hospitality industry.

The company has secured permits from the government under the Women Phone Fleet Taxi Scheme, and by mid-2016, it will be putting 200 taxis on the road after training adequate numbers of eligible women from the backward strata of society.

TRASH TO CASH

**Sector of Focus:** Skill Development  
**Established:** 2013  
**Sector of operation:** Skill development  
**Geographical outreach:** Delhi (headquarters), Ajmer, Hoshangabad, Varanasi, Kolkata  
**Beneficiaries:** 8000 differently-abled individuals  

Trash to Cash is the for-profit arm of the Society for Child Development, a non-profit venture that works on quality education and life skills training. Trash to Cash provides an opportunity to differently-abled individuals to be financially independent.

The initiative that started with training is now providing differently-abled people with sustainable livelihoods. The initial challenge was to secure funding for procuring raw material which would be used for making products. The approach to solving this issue has been to locally procure unused or waste material. The waste flowers collected from

vRemind is a mobile-based health app that gives timely vaccination reminders to parents with children up to the age of five.
temples and hotels are used for making lean and innovatively designed products, like dry, coloured powder and incense sticks. Trash to Cash has further developed an innovative model to link the products with the market.

They have used renovated rickshaws, functioning as mobile retail outlets, to sell products made by the differently-abled people trained by the company.

**WELDYNAMICS**

**Sector of Focus: Water and Sanitation**

**Established:** 2013

**Sector of operation:** Water and sanitation

**Geographical outreach:** Madhya Pradesh, worked with railways across India

**Beneficiaries:** 40-50 households

In an attempt to end open defecation, thousands of toilets are being built across villages with soak pits constructed in small, confined areas, without evaluating impact on the groundwater table. Additionally, a large amount of human waste collected from septic tanks is discharged into rivers, causing river and groundwater pollution.

Weldynamics, co-founded by two engineers, provides environment-friendly solutions for the disposal of human waste and wastewater in urban as well as rural areas.

Their low-cost product PAWITRA (Portable Anaerobic Waste Water Treatment Assembly), along with reed bed technology, has zero carbon footprint, no maintenance cost, and can treat all kinds of household wastewater. It can in fact 'regenerate' water and make it suitable for non-drinking purposes, e.g. crop/plant irrigation, cleaning, and flushing. Weldynamics is now in the process of further lowering their cost of production so as to take it to remote villages.

**RICKSHAW BANK**

**Sector of Focus: Financial Services**

**Established:** 2004

**Sector of operation:** Financial services

**Geographical outreach:** Assam, Gujarat, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh

**Beneficiaries:** 12,000+ rickshaw drivers

There are currently an estimated 10 million rickshaw drivers in India. They are among the poorest sections of the population, providing last mile transport services in cities and towns on a meagre daily income of often less than INR 100. About 95% of them do not own the rickshaws but rent them on a daily basis, as a result of which their earned income becomes insufficient even for survival.

Aadhan is a pioneer in recycling retired shipping containers into mobile infrastructure for the social sector.
Rickshaw Bank, the flagship activity of the Centre for Rural Development, aims to influence the lives of rickshaw drivers across India. It provides a means of self-employment to the poor and the marginalised rickshaw community by offering a “rent-to-own” financing option for rickshaws. Based on the principle of micro leasing, rickshaw pullers and drivers under this scheme are able to pay daily instalments for a maximum of 12-18 months. Rickshaw Bank provides them with a newly-designed rickshaw that is lighter in weight, has an improved centre of gravity, contains more luggage space, and has a canopy to cover both the driver and the passengers. The initiative also provides insurance cover for the rickshaw against damage and the driver against injury or death, and third party insurance for the passengers.

AADHAN INFRASTRUCTURE PVT LTD.

**Sector of Focus: Forest and Environment**

**Established:** 2015  
**Founder:** Nikhil Dugal  
**Sector of operation:** Forest and environment  
**Geographical outreach:** New Delhi, Uttar Pradesh  
**Beneficiaries:** 140 skill trainees

Aadhan Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. seeks to make it easier for private and public sector organisations to operate in remote areas and to work towards balancing the inequality in delivery of services to bridge the divide between urban and rural India. It is a social enterprise that provides mobile and ready-to-make room space for sanitation, education and healthcare delivery purposes.

Aadhan is a pioneer in recycling retired shipping containers into mobile infrastructure for the social sector. It manufactures temporary structures from shipping containers retired from their tenure at sea, thereby emphasising on a culture of sustainability.

Revenue is generated through direct sale to agencies, CSR initiatives of corporates, and through low-cost monthly rentals paid to utilise the temporary units for skills training, and as health clinics and sanitation facilities. Aadhan also undertakes commercial projects (for example, ‘container hotels’ in Goa and Uttarakhand) to cross-subsidise its development work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICCI</td>
<td>Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBP</td>
<td>Great Britain Pound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIH</td>
<td>Impact Investment Holding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIM</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSME</td>
<td>Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDBI</td>
<td>Small Industries Development Bank of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiE</td>
<td>The Indus Entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# SOCIAL ENTERPRISE-RELATED POLICIES AND GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES IN INDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of Policy/Initiative</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Science and Technology Entrepreneurship Development Board</td>
<td>Ministry of Science and Technology</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>The objective is to promote and develop high-end entrepreneurship for S&amp;T manpower as well as self-employment by utilising S&amp;T infrastructure and using S&amp;T methods. The board maintains a network of agency support systems, academic institutions, and Research &amp; Development (R&amp;D) organisations to foster entrepreneurship and self-employment using S&amp;T, with special focus on backward areas as well. It acts as a policy advisory body with regard to entrepreneurship.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nstedb.com/Developing-Eco.pdf">www.nstedb.com/Developing-Eco.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Safai Karamcharis Finance and Development Corporation</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NSKFDC is an Apex Corporation for the socio-economic upliftment of scavengers and their dependents across India through various loan- and non-loan-based schemes. NSKFDC has been designated as the Nodal Agency for implementation of the Central Sector Self Employment Scheme for Rehabilitation of Manual Scavengers (SRMS).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nskfdc.nic.in/content/marketing-link-agsemelasexhibitiontrade-fairs">www.nskfdc.nic.in/content/marketing-link-agsemelasexhibitiontrade-fairs</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kisan Credit Card Scheme 1998-99</td>
<td>RBI &amp; NABARD, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The credit card scheme, run by the Reserve Bank of India and National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), provides affordable and easy-to-access credit to farmers.</td>
<td>Darko, et al.¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Credit Guarantee Fund for Skill Development</td>
<td>Department of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Credit Guarantee Fund Scheme for skill development (CGSSD) will guarantee skill development loans sanctioned by member banks of the Indian Banks Association (IBA) or other banks /financial institutions as may be directed by the Government of India.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.c27web2.saas.talismaonline.com/NSDA/FAQs_NSDA.pdf">www.c27web2.saas.talismaonline.com/NSDA/FAQs_NSDA.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Credit Guarantee Fund Trust for Micro and Small Enterprises</td>
<td>SIDBI-Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises (MSME), Government of India, launched Credit Guarantee Scheme (CGS) to strengthen credit delivery systems and facilitate flow of credit to the MSE sector. To operationalise the scheme, the Government of India and SIDBI set up the Credit Guarantee Fund Trust for Micro and Small Enterprises (CGTMSE).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cgtmse.in/schemes.aspx">www.cgtmse.in/schemes.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MSME Development Act (2006)</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The Act establishes legal definitions for MSMEs and provides both a range of national support programmes and a requirement that states do the same.</td>
<td>Darko, et al.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name of Policy/Initiative</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The role of the M/o MSME and its organisations is to assist the states in their efforts to encourage entrepreneurship, employment, and livelihood opportunities and enhance the competitiveness of MSMEs in the changed economic scenario.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msme.gov.in/mob/home.aspx">www.msme.gov.in/mob/home.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aam Aadmi Bima Yojana</td>
<td>Department of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Aam Admi Bima Yojana has been created by merging the Janashree Bima Yojana and Aam Admi Bima Yojana with effect from 01.01.2013. It provides life insurance protection to people who are below poverty line or marginally above poverty line. Persons aged between 18 and 59 years and who are members of the 45 identified occupational groups are eligible to be covered under the scheme.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.licindia.in">www.licindia.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>National Manufacturing Competitiveness Programme, 2008</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The programme aims to build the capacity of manufacturing MSMEs through support and tax preferences. The ‘Support for entrepreneurial development of SMEs through Incubators’ programme has been in operation since April 2008 and is a component of the NMCP.</td>
<td>Darko, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Employment</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana provides health insurance coverage for Below Poverty Line (BPL) families. Beneficiaries under RSBY are entitled to hospitalisation coverage up to Rs. 30,000/- for most of the diseases that require hospitalisation.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rsby.gov.in/">www.rsby.gov.in/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prime Minister Employment Generation Programme</td>
<td>Khadi &amp; Village Industries Commission, Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The objective of this programme is to generate employment opportunities in rural and urban areas by setting up new self-employment ventures/projects/micro enterprises, bring together widely dispersed traditional artisans/rural and urban unemployed youth, and provide continuous and sustainable employment to a large segment of traditional and prospective artisans and rural and urban unemployed youth so as to help arrest migration of rural youth to urban areas and to increase the wage earning capacity of artisans.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msme.gov.in/mob/SPMEGP.aspx">www.msme.gov.in/mob/SPMEGP.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deendayal Disabled Rehabilitation Scheme to Promote Voluntary Action for Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>Department of Disability Affairs, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>To facilitate delivery of various services to persons with disabilities by voluntary organisations, the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment is administering the DDRS scheme and providing grants-in-aid to NGOs for vocational training, sheltered workshops, special schools for persons with disability, home-based rehabilitation programmes, etc.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.socialjustice.nic.in/schemespro3.php">www.socialjustice.nic.in/schemespro3.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>India Opportunities Fund</td>
<td>SIDBI</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>India Opportunities Fund is a close-ended fund established in August 2011 with a life of 10 years. IOF is a sector-agnostic fund focussed mainly on the growth capital needs of India’s growing and unlisted MSMEs operating in emerging sectors such as light engineering, clean-tech, agro-based industries, logistics, infrastructure, educational services, IT/ITES, etc. IOF will also invest in early- as well as late-stage companies selectively.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sidbiventure.co.in/svc-0204.htm">www.sidbiventure.co.in/svc-0204.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of Policy/ Initiative</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Samridhi Fund</td>
<td>DFID-SIDBI Venture Capital Ltd.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The SAMRIDDHI Fund is a Rs.430 crore social venture capital fund set up with contributions from the Department for International Development (DFID), Small Industries Development Bank of India (SIDBI), Life Insurance Corporation of India (LIC), and United India Insurance Company Limited (UIIC). The primary objective of the Fund is to provide risk capital to scalable enterprises which provide economic, social or environmental benefits to the poor in eight low-income states of India, while achieving attractive risk-adjusted returns through long-term capital appreciation.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.samridhifund.com/content.php?seo_url=context/">www.samridhifund.com/content.php?seo_url=context/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Millennium Alliance</td>
<td>FICCI, USAID &amp; Ministry of Science and Technology (Technology Development Board)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The Alliance provides innovators with services such as seed funding, grants, incubation and accelerator services, networking opportunities, business support services, knowledge exchange, and technical assistance, and will facilitate access to equity, debt, and other capital. Through the Millennium Alliance, USAID, FICCI, TDB, and other partners, will help realise India's role as a global innovation laboratory.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.millenniumalliance.in/millenniumAlliance.aspx">www.millenniumalliance.in/millenniumAlliance.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Companies Act 2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Corporate Affairs</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Companies Act 2013 came into force in August 2013, replacing the old Companies Act 1956. The act focuses on the rules, procedures and formalities of incorporating, operating and closure of a company in India. The Section 8 specifies the provisions for registration of a non-profit entity as a company.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/Companies-Act2013.pdf">www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/Companies-Act2013.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>India Inclusive Innovation Fund</td>
<td>National Innovation Council and Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The IIIF is a for-profit entity with a social investment focus and will invest and provide funding to social enterprises with the aim of maximising social impact with modest financial returns. The total fund will initially be Rs.500 crore (£50 million) and will have a maximum limit of Rs.5,000 crore (£500 million).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.innovationcouncilarchive.nic.in">www.innovationcouncilarchive.nic.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Ministry of Corporate Affairs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>With effect from 1 April 2014, as per Section 135 of the Companies Act 2013, every company, private limited or public limited, which either has a net worth of Rs.500 crore or a turnover of Rs.1,000 crore or net profit of Rs.5 crore, needs to spend at least 2% of its average net profit for the immediately preceding three financial years on corporate social responsibility activities.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mca.gov.in/SearchableActs/Section135.htm">www.mca.gov.in/SearchableActs/Section135.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Start-up Village Entrepreneurship Programme</td>
<td>National Rural Livelihoods Mission, Ministry of Rural Development</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Long-term vision of the SVEP is to provide start-up support to 1 crore individuals and village enterprises and provide direct employment to 2 crore people. In the first phase, SVEP is expected to support creation and strengthening of about 1.82 lakhs village enterprises across 29 states in the target four years, 2015-19, and expected to create employment for about 3.78 lakhs persons. It has an estimated cost of Rs.158.21 crore and a central share of Rs.97.79 crore.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ajjeevika.gov.in/sites/default/files/nrlp_repository/SVEP%20Guidelines.pdf">www.ajjeevika.gov.in/sites/default/files/nrlp_repository/SVEP%20Guidelines.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana</td>
<td>Department of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana (PMJDY) is the National Mission for Financial Inclusion to ensure access to financial services namely banking/savings &amp; deposit accounts, remittance, credit, insurance, pension in an affordable manner. The scheme has been started with a target to provide ‘universal and clear access to banking facilities’, starting with “Basic Banking Accounts” with overdraft facility of Rs.500 after six months, a RuPay debit card with inbuilt accident insurance cover of Rs.1 lakh, and a RuPay Kisan Card.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pmjdhy.gov.in/home">www.pmjdhy.gov.in/home</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of Policy/Initiative</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Swachh Bharat Abhiyan</td>
<td>Ministry of Urban development, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Drinking water and Sanitation</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Swachh Bharat Abhiyan, or the Clean India Mission, is a national campaign by the Government of India, covering 4,041 statutory cities and towns, to clean the streets, roads and infrastructure of the country. The programme plans to construct 12 crore toilets in rural India by October 2019, at a projected cost of Rs.1.96 lakhs crore ($29 billion).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swachhbharat.mygov.in">www.swachhbharat.mygov.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A Scheme for Promotion of Innovation, Rural Industry &amp; Entrepreneurship (ASPIRE)</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>ASPIRE is a nationwide district-level incubation and accelerator programme. A fund with a corpus of Rs.200 crore has been created to establish a Technology Centre Network to promote innovation, entrepreneurship and agro-industry. The fund will be used for: automation of agricultural practices and activities related thereto; value addition to agriculture and forest produce; recycling of agricultural pre/post harvest wastages, off farm but farm linked animal husbandry etc.; business models for aggregation and value addition relevant for rural areas, creation of local employment in rural areas, and business models for social impact.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msme.gov.in/WriteReadData/Whatsnew/ASPIRE-Guidelines-Final-03Jun15.pdf">www.msme.gov.in/WriteReadData/Whatsnew/ASPIRE-Guidelines-Final-03Jun15.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Micro Units Development &amp; Refinance Agency</td>
<td>Department of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The Micro Units Development Refinance Agency (MUDRA) Bank, with a corpus of Rs.20,000 crore and Credit Guarantee Corpus of Rs.3,000 crore, has been created to aid micro-finance Institutions through the Pradhan Mantri Mudra Yojana. It prioritises SC/ST enterprises. These measures will increase the confidence of young, educated, and skilled workers who can now aspire to become first generation entrepreneurs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mudra.org.in/mudra.php">www.mudra.org.in/mudra.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana</td>
<td>Ministry of Skill Development &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>This is the government's Skill Certification and Monetary Reward Scheme. The objective is to encourage skill development for youth by providing monetary rewards for successful completion of approved training programmes. The programme aims to: encourage standardisation in the certification process and initiate a process of creating a registry of skills; enable and mobilise a large number of Indian youth to take up skill training and become employable and earn their livelihood; reward candidates undergoing skill training by authorised institutions at an average monetary reward of Rs.8,000 per candidate and thus benefit 24 lakhs youth at an approximate total cost of Rs.1,500 crore.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pmkyofficial.org/App_Documents/News/PMKVY_Scheme-Document_v1.1.pdf">www.pmkyofficial.org/App_Documents/News/PMKVY_Scheme-Document_v1.1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>National Policy for Skill Development &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Ministry of Skill Development &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Through various programmes, the policy aims to create a demand for skilling across the country; correct and align skilling with required competencies; connect the supply of skilled human resources with sectoral demands; certify and assess in alignment with global and national standards; and catalyse an ecosystem wherein productive and innovative entrepreneurship germinates, sustains and grows, leading to creation of a more dynamic entrepreneurial economy and more formal wage employment.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.skilldevelopment.gov.in/assets/images/Skill%20India/policy%20booklet-%20final.pdf">www.skilldevelopment.gov.in/assets/images/Skill%20India/policy%20booklet-%20final.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>National Skill Development Mission (Skill India Campaign)</td>
<td>Ministry of Skill Development &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The Skill India Campaign is a step towards achieving the Government’s mission of skilling 40.2 crore workers by 2022 across the country. MSDE has initiated it across ministries and departments to scale up skill training efforts. Eight cross-sectoral, overarching MoUs have been signed between MSDE and other key Ministries. In addition to this, two tripartite MoUs have been signed between NSDC, NSDF and National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) as well as Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.skilldevelopment.gov.in/entrepreneur-ship.html">www.skilldevelopment.gov.in/entrepreneur-ship.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of Policy/ Initiative</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Scheme of Fund for Regeneration of Traditional Industries (SFURTI)</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The scheme aims to organise the traditional industries and artisans into clusters to make them competitive and provide support for their long term sustainability and sustained employment, to enhance marketability of products of such clusters, to equip traditional artisans of the associated clusters with the improved skills, to make provision for common facilities and improved tools and equipment for artisans, to strengthen the cluster governance systems with the active participation of the stakeholders, and to build up innovated and traditional skills, improved technologies, advanced processes, market intelligence and new models of public-private partnerships, so as to gradually replicate similar models of cluster-based regenerated traditional industries.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msme.gov.in/mob/SchemeNew.aspx">www.msme.gov.in/mob/SchemeNew.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>India Aspiration fund (IAF)</td>
<td>SIDBI, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The India Aspiration Fund acts as a fund of funds under SIDBI and invests in venture capital funds for meeting the equity requirement of MSME start-ups. An initial corpus of Rs.400 crore has been already allocated to various venture funds under it. The fund has committed up to Rs.60 crore for Ivy Cap Ventures, up to Rs.30 crore for Blume Ventures, and up to Rs.20 crore for Carpediem Capital Partners.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.venturefund.sidbi.in">www.venturefund.sidbi.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SIDBI Make in India Loan for Small Enterprises (SMILE)</td>
<td>SIDBI, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The idea behind the launch of the Rs.10,000 crore SMILE Scheme is to provide soft loans in the nature of quasi-equity and term loans on relatively soft terms to MSMEs to meet the required debt-equity ratio norm, as also for pursuing opportunities of growth by existing MSMEs. The focus will be on the 25 identified sectors under ‘Make in India’ programme, with emphasis on financing smaller enterprises with the MSME sector.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2015-08-18/news/6530232_1_sidbi-sidbi-msmes">www.articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2015-08-18/news/6530232_1_sidbi-sidbi-msmes</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Accessible India Campaign (Sugamya Bharat Abhiyan)</td>
<td>Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The campaign has been launched to make India disabled-friendly. The Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD), Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, has formulated the Accessible India Campaign (Sugamya Bharat Abhiyan) as a nationwide campaign for achieving universal accessibility for PwDs. The Department has asked various state governments to identify about 50 to 100 public buildings in big cities and also identify citizen-centric public websites which, if made fully accessible, would have the highest impact on the lives of PwDs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pib.nic.in/newsite/mbErel.aspx?relid=126123">www.pib.nic.in/newsite/mbErel.aspx?relid=126123</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Venture capital Fund for Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>This is a concessional finance scheme to provide financial support to entrepreneurs from scheduled castes.</td>
<td>Darko, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Credit Enhancement Guarantee Scheme for Scheduled Castes 2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>This is a credit guarantee scheme to provide financial support to entrepreneurs from scheduled castes.</td>
<td>Darko, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Startup India, Stand Up India</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Startup India is a flagship initiative of the Government of India, intended to build a strong eco-system for nurturing innovation and startups in the country that will drive sustainable economic growth and generate large scale employment opportunities. The Government, through this initiative, aims to empower startups to grow through innovation and design.</td>
<td>Start Up India Event, January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name of Policy/ Initiative</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Cooperation, and Farmers Welfare</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Union Cabinet has approved the launch of Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (Prime Minister Crop Insurance Scheme), under which the premium rates to be paid by the farmers have been brought down substantially so as to enable more farmers to avail of insurance cover against crop loss on account of natural calamities. The scheme will come into effect from the upcoming kharif (monsoon) season in 2016.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.agricoop.nic.in/imagedefault/whatsnew/sch_eng.pdf">www.agricoop.nic.in/imagedefault/whatsnew/sch_eng.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Scheme for providing establishment of new institutions (EDIs), strengthening the infrastructure for EDIs under ATI Scheme</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Under this scheme, assistance shall be provided to training institutions in the form of capital grants for creation/strengthening of infrastructure and programme support for conducting entrepreneurship development and skill development programmes. Any State/Union Territory Government, Training Institutions, NGOs and other development agencies can apply for assistance for creation or strengthening of infrastructure.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msme.gov.in/mob/SchemeNew.aspx">www.msme.gov.in/mob/SchemeNew.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Scheme for ‘Support for entrepreneurial and managerial development of SMEs through incubators’</td>
<td>Ministry of Micro, Small &amp; Medium Enterprises</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The objective is to provide early-stage funding for nurturing innovative business ideas (new indigenous technology, processes, products, procedure, etc.), which could be commercialised in a year. Any individual or MSME having an innovative idea near commercialisation can apply to the host institution (e.g. IITs, NITs, technical colleges, research institutes, etc.). The host Institutions can apply to the office of the DC-MSME or their nearest DI for application.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msme.gov.in/mob/SchemeNew.aspx">www.msme.gov.in/mob/SchemeNew.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Atal Innovation Mission</td>
<td>National Institution for Transforming India - Aayog</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>AIM will be an Innovation Promotion Platform involving academics, entrepreneurs, and researchers drawing upon national and international experiences to foster a culture of innovation and R&amp;D in India. The platform will also promote a network of world-class innovation hubs and grand challenges for India. In the budget for 2014-15, Rs.150 crore was allotted for the innovation mission, which will replace the National Innovation Council. A significant difference between the two will be in the powers to disburse funds.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.niti.gov.in/content/aim.php">www.niti.gov.in/content/aim.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>National Policy on Skill Development and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Ministry of Skill Development &amp; Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>This initiative recognises that social enterprises have emerged as important business instruments to address the issues of poverty, unemployment and inequity in society through socially oriented business innovations. It proposes the following: (i) Encourage universities and academic institutions to launch a course on ‘Social Entrepreneurship’ to actively promote social entrepreneurship in the country; (ii) Foster a social capital market place by offering fiscal incentives to attract investors and make provision for funding support, like a social venture fund, to facilitate social entrepreneurs’ access to credit; (iii) Facilitate creation of social enterprises even with a modest capital base through social incubates across the country; (iv) Encourage innovators, universities and institutions to patent innovative entrepreneurship ideas and technologies by promoting and strengthening Intellectual Property Rights; (v) Create, promote, and encourage grassroots technology innovation hubs to harness and scale-up the innovation potential of grassroots innovators; (vi) To encourage innovation, collaborate with organisations such as the National Innovation Foundation to encourage grassroots technological innovation and integrate with the national research and innovation ecosystem. Using the national network of E-Hubs and other platforms, assist entrepreneurs in commercialising and scaling up their products and services.</td>
<td>National Policy for Skill Development and Entrepreneurship Report 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOCIAL ENTERPRISE-RELATED ACADEMIC COURSES IN INDIA

### a. Courses offered by institutions of higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Course Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School of Business, Public Policy and Social Entrepreneurship, Ambedkar University</td>
<td>MA Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Delhi, New Delhi</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The programme aims to help student’s gain better understanding of the social issues and challenges faced by the society and find creative solutions to address these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Azim Premji University</td>
<td>MA Development</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bengaluru, Karnataka</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The curriculum is broad-based and encompasses theory, practice, and research relating to development. It prepares individuals capable of informed and thoughtful development action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Azim Premji University</td>
<td>MA Public Policy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bengaluru, Karnataka</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The programme contributes to learning about the ideas, mechanisms, practices, and outcomes that comprise public policy which in turn emerges from a conceptual understanding of governance as the exercise of political authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Birla Institute of Management Technology</td>
<td>Post Graduate Diploma in Management – Sustainable Development Practices</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>The programme is a blend of academic rigour and practice through a six-month field experience practicum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Development Management Institute</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Management – Development Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Patna, Bihar</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>A two-year full time course, it is a blend of management, decision and social sciences. Experiential learning through development immersion, enterprise learning, and management internship creates a cadre of development management professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Development Institute</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Management – Business Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Gandhinagar, Gujarat</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Designed specifically for entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial managers to nurture ideas and enable new ventures through an academically rigorous and practical learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Development Institute</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Management Development Studies</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Gandhinagar, Gujarat</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>A two-year course with a broad and multi-disciplinary programme that equips students with knowledge and analytical and conceptual skills of social and economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Name of Course</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Course Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faculty of Management Studies, Banaras Hindu University</td>
<td>Diploma in Microfinance &amp; Entrepreneurship (Part-Time)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The course intends to develop the basic awareness of management functions and various dimensions of organisational life. It also attempts to provide exposure of the ethical dilemma in management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty of Management Studies, Banaras Hindu University</td>
<td>Masters of Business Administration – Agribusiness</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The course aims to create a cadre for food and agribusiness and allied sector. The curriculum builds a managerial foundation and proficiency, with a focus on food and agribusiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty of Management Studies, Institute of Rural Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma – Rural Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Jaipur, Rajasthan</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The course aims to meet the need for professional managers in rural organisations and rural market-oriented business houses, bearing in mind the complex environment in which these organisations work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Management, Kolkata</td>
<td>Elective on Social Entrepreneurship course under Behavioural Sciences-II</td>
<td>Masters (Component)</td>
<td>Kolkata, West Bengal</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The course is designed to give students the opportunity to understand the challenges of a broad spectrum of not-for-profit, hybrid and for-profit social enterprises and apply themselves to addressing these challenges through live projects. The course is aimed at students who are likely to be involved with social enterprises in a variety of ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Forest Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Forestry Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>The two-year course design offers specialised modules on conservation and livelihood, environmental management, and development management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Health Management &amp; Research</td>
<td>MBA – Rural Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Jaipur, Rajasthan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The flagship course aims at developing trained professional managers with requisite skills for managing rural development organisations, both in the public and private sectors. The focus is self-learning through participatory approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme – Agribusiness Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Ahmedabad, Gujarat</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>The course prepares students for careers in management related to food &amp; agribusiness and allied sectors in an international environment. The curriculum has a leading-edge managerial foundation firmly rooted in the institutes’ ‘management’ culture and proficiency, with a focus on food and agribusiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme – Public Policy &amp; Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bengaluru, Karnataka</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>The course integrates public policy and general management skills into a single programme and enables cross-learning between participants from the private and public sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Name of Course</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Course Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme in Agribusiness Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The course aims to develop agribusiness leaders and entrepreneurs with vision, competence and appropriate attitude for promoting/growing agribusiness and agro-based enterprises with a strong international orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme – Sustainable Development Practices</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Noida, Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The programme focuses on environmental, social, and economic sustainability of businesses, change-management preparation, critical perspectives on policy and institutions, cross-sector collaboration and policy analysis, and systemic linkages among environmental, social, and economic issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Plantation Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme – Agribusiness Programme Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Bengaluru, Karnataka</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The course aims at providing management education for plantation and associated agribusiness sector. It combines the grassroots action with global competition and equips the students for managerial positions in agri-plantation business sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai</td>
<td>M Phil – Planning and Development Advanced Post Graduate Research Degree</td>
<td>Advanced Post Graduate Research Degree</td>
<td>Mumbai, Maharashtra</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>A programme of Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, it offers a specialisation in planning and development. Its theoretical-practical thrust provides the students with a holistic understanding of socio-economic realities and the impact of technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai</td>
<td>M Tech – Technology &amp; Development</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mumbai, Maharashtra</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The course aims to train professionals to work in diverse fields, playing different roles at the interface between technology and development, through public, private, and civil society organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Indian Institute of Technology, Madras</td>
<td>Minor in Innovation &amp; Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The course is a joint initiative of IIT Madras and Villgro Innovations Foundation and aims to provide an analytical and practitioner’s perspective on innovation and social enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Indian School of Business</td>
<td>Certificate Short Term Programme in CSR Management (Component)</td>
<td>Masters (Component)</td>
<td>Hyderabad, Telangana</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A short-term course jointly offered by ISB and IICA. Offered as a hybrid model, combining classroom and online learning, the programme will be spread over a period of 16 weeks which includes three on-campus contact sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Indian School of Business</td>
<td>Management Programme – Public Policy (Component)</td>
<td>Masters (Component)</td>
<td>Hyderabad, Telangana</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The course aims to equip students with useful skill-sets and the latest in policy thinking and implementation around the world while facilitating a cross border and cross cultural knowledge exchange between the private and public sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Name of Course</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Course Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Indira Gandhi Institute of Cooperative Management</td>
<td>Higher Diploma in Cooperative Management (HDCM) (Correspondence)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>The course aims to strengthen and professionalise the management in cooperatives by providing opportunities to executives in different cooperative sectors and officers of cooperative departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Institute of Rural Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme –Rural Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Anand, Gujarat</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>This course aims to prepare talented young managers to assume challenge-filled responsibilities in rural cooperatives and development organisations. The participants are highly valued in local, national and international cooperatives, NGOs, development organisations, and funding agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jindal School of Government &amp; Public Policy (O P Jindal University)</td>
<td>MA Public Policy</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Sonepat, Haryana</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The course enables students to address contemporary political, economic and social issues in a coherent and comprehensive manner. It imparts a strong training in theory, covering key literature and debates along with quantitative and qualitative analytical skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Madhusudan Institute of Cooperative Management</td>
<td>Higher Diploma in Cooperative Management</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Bhubaneswar, Odisha</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>The programme is designed to improve the conceptual capabilities and understanding of the managerial problems of the cooperatives. It helps them upgrade their skills and abilities and adopt appropriate techniques for managing cooperatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Madhusudan Institute of Cooperative Management</td>
<td>Diploma in Rural Management</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Bhubaneswar, Odisha</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The course curriculum helps the student acquire conceptual and analytical abilities required for making and implementing managerial decisions effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies</td>
<td>Part-Time MBA Social Entrepreneurship &amp; Sustainability Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mumbai, Maharashtra</td>
<td>2007 (1991 provided certification)</td>
<td>The programme aims to develop a holistic perspective on contemporary issues in management of social sector, help focus on execution of projects, and develop sustainability of development organisations through innovative management approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Management –Agribusiness Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Hyderabad, Telangana</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The programme aims at enabling meritorious agricultural graduates acquire the critical competencies to function as effective agribusiness managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>National Institute of Rural Development &amp; Panchayati Raj</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Rural Development</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Hyderabad, Telangana</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The course design rests on the tripod of rural development philosophy concepts, principles, policies, programmes and organisations; rural development management practices; and rural social sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Name of Course</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Course Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>S.P. Jain Institute of Management &amp; Research</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Programme – Development Management</td>
<td>Masters (part time)</td>
<td>Mumbai, Maharashtra</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The programme helps graduates take up management roles in the various social sector agencies, like NGOs, Non-profits, CSOs, CSR Foundations, social entrepreneurs, funding agencies and government bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tata Institute of Social Sciences</td>
<td>MA Social Work in Livelihoods &amp; Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Mumbai, Maharashtra</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The programme aims to inculcate entrepreneurial spirit in the emerging social sector. The placement target for this programme is primarily leading the students to an entrepreneurial path or be placed in an MFI, NGO, social enterprise, cooperative or the CSR division of business houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tata Institute of Social Sciences</td>
<td>MA Social Innovation &amp; Entrepreneurship at Tuljapur Campus</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Tuljapur, Maharashtra</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The programme is structured around: the field of social innovation and entrepreneurship, the business structures used in rural context, and the strategies used for implementing the social ventures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>TERI University</td>
<td>MA Sustainable Development Practice</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Delhi, New Delhi</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The programme aims to develop an international cadre of development professionals well-equipped to tackle interwoven challenges of poverty, diseases, and climate change and ecosystem vulnerability specific to the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TERI University</td>
<td>MBA (Business Sustainability)</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Delhi, New Delhi</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The programme aims to enhance the knowledge of management education by providing a mix of conventional and new management skills and ethical practices in management education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Vaikunth Mehta National Institute of Cooperative Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Cooperative Business Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Pune, Maharashtra</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>The objective is to provide latest management techniques and practices, to infuse and inculcate professional skills, and to expose the participants to the actual functioning of the cooperatives through field visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Vaikunth Mehta National Institute of Cooperative Management</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Management – Agribusiness Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Pune, Maharashtra</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The programme teaches students to combine the use of technical skills with the understanding of the socio-cultural system to emerge as leaders in their fields and make significant contribution through management in all sectors of the society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Xavier Institute of Development Action and Studies</td>
<td>Post-Graduate Diploma in Management – Rural Management</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Students are exposed to core concepts of management. The core courses lay a strong foundation and help students in developing a sound understanding of major functional areas of management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The programme addresses the issue of lack of managerial skills needed to implement various projects in the social sector.

It is the flagship programme of XIME to develop skills of students in order to tackle complex social issues.

In order to address development of rural masses, the programme moulds the students into change agents and facilitators in the process of development.

### b. Courses offered by social enterprise enabling organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Name/Nature of Course</th>
<th>Course/Fellowship</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acumen Global Fellow Programme</td>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>Mumbai, Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ashoka India Fellows</td>
<td>Support for individuals who want to start a venture focussing on social causes</td>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>New Delhi, Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Centre for Social Initiative &amp; Management</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Management</td>
<td>Course (Part-Time)</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deshpande Foundation</td>
<td>Masters in Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Hubil, Karnataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hand in Hand Global Academy of Social Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Global Social Entrepreneurship Programme</td>
<td>Course (Short-Term)</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indian School of Livelihoods – BASIX India</td>
<td>Training and workshops</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Hyderabad, Telangana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sambodhi Research and Management Institute</td>
<td>Training and workshops</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>New Delhi, Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School of Social Entrepreneurship (PwC)</td>
<td>Social Start-up Programme</td>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>New Delhi, Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Villgro Fellowship</td>
<td>Leadership Training Programme</td>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERVIEWEES AND WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Interviewees

1. A. B. Chakravarthy, Villgro
2. Aditya Bhandari, Incofin Investment Management
3. Alpana Srivastava, Asha Impact
4. Anoop Mitra, Margdarshak
5. Arushi Aggarwal, The Initiative
6. Asma Kathiwalla, Thomson Reuters Foundation
7. Devi Vijay, Asst. Prof., IIM Calcutta
8. D. R. Mehta, Bhagwan Mahaveer Viklang Sahayata Samiti, Jaipur
9. Devyani Pershad, Pratham
10. Dr. D. V. Deshpande, Bankers Institute of Rural Development
11. Dr. Pradip Kumar, Sarmah Rickshaw Bank
12. Dr. Sali Panicker, Indian Institute of Rural Management, Rajasthan
13. Dr. Tara Nair, The Gujarat Institute of Development Research
14. Dr. V. Shubhalaxmi, Ladybird Environmental Consulting
15. Ghasiram Panda, Action Aid
16. H. Pamarthy, Consultant- financial Inclusion
17. Harihara Mohapatra, Sa-Dhan
18. Hemant Nitturkar, Consultant
19. Kartik Desai, Asha Impact
20. Kashyap Shah, Michael & Susan Dell Foundation
21. Kulwant Singh, UN Habitat
22. Kumar Jyoti Nath, National Ganga River Basin Authority
23. M. S. Sriram, IIM-Bengaluru
24. Mahesh Venkateswaran, National Skill Development Corporation
25. Manikandan KP, Indian Housing Federation
26. Manisha Gupta, Start Up!
27. Marco Ferrario, Micro Home Solutions
28. Megha Phansalkar, Tisser
29. Mohit Arora, School of Social Entrepreneurship, India
30. Nahar, Minla Strategies
32. Vidhee Garg, Affordable Housing Institute
33. Murali Srinivas, Affordable Housing Technical Assistance Centre – Habitat for Humanity
34. Nadeem Rahim, State Innovation Council-Rajasthan
35. Narayan Kumar, Hindustan Cleanergy Limited
36. Natasha Garcha, Impact Investment Asia, Shujog
37. Neelam Jethwani, Maid in India
38. Nelson Deb, The Eco Hub Small Industries
39. Nikhil Chandra, Micro Finance Institutions Network
40. Nishant Advani, Acumen Fund
41. Olina Banerji, Ashoka Innovators
42. P. Venkatraman, You Too Can Run
43. Prabu Guthi, Milky Way
44. Pranjal Baruah, Mushroom Development Foundation
45. Priya Thachadi, Villgro
46. Prof. Sushil Kumar, IIM, Lucknow
47. Prof. N. N. Sharma, Birla Institute of Management Technology
48. Rahul Nainwal, UnLtd Delhi
49. Rashmi Sawant, Culture Aangan
50. Ravi Shankar B, Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty
51. Roselin Osana, Habitat for Humanity
52. S. Arun, The Energy and Resources Institute
53. Sairam Subramanian, Technoserve
54. Sanjay Daswani, Habitat for Humanity
55. Saurabh Lahoti, Grassroots Business Fund
56. Sachin Hirani, MIX
| 57. | Shama Karkal, Swasti Health Resource Centre |
| 58. | Shantanu Garg, Jharkhand State Livelihood Promotion Society |
| 59. | Shubhadeep Sanyal, Omnivore Partners |
| 60. | Siddharth Arur, Cap Aleph Advisors India Private Limited |
| 61. | Shubhadeep Sanyal, Swasti Health Resource Centre |
| 62. | Somesh Dayal, Sa-Dhan |
| 63. | Sreejith Nedumpully, Upaya Social Ventures |
| 64. | Subhrangshu Sanyal, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta |
| 65. | Sudhanshu Malani, Villgro Innovations Foundation |
| 66. | Ullas Kumar, Meghshala |
| 67. | Vijay Aruldas, Independent Consultant, Healthcare |
| 68. | Vikram Jain, FSG |
| 69. | Vinay Kumar, Digital Green |
| 70. | Vinay Tiwari, NR Management Consultants |
| 71. | Vipul Patel, Centre for innovation Incubation and Entrepreneurship - IIM Ahmedabad |
| 72. | Yash Ranga, Jaipur Rugs Private Limited |
| 73. | Harish Chandra Chaudhary, Faculty of Management Studies - Banaras Hindu University |
| 74. | Nagendra Sharma, Birla Institute of Management Technology |
| 75. | Ashish Kumar, Livelihood School |

**Workshop participants**

**INCEPTION WORKSHOP (NEW DELHI) – 25th August, 2015**

1. Adarsh Bhatt, UnLtd Delhi
2. Aditya Pant, Aspen Institute
3. Alpana Srivastava, Asha Impact
4. Amit Jain, Health Point
5. Bhawana Negi, British Council India
6. Dan Gregory, Social Enterprise UK
7. Deepak Shandilya, Ennovent
8. Devyani Singh, Ennovent
9. Guru Gujral, British Council India
10. Katharina Kuehn, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
11. Mohit Arora, School for Social Entrepreneurs, India
12. Olina Banerji, Ashoka
13. Rahul Kanvinde, Dasra
14. Tristan Ace, British Council
15. Vimlendu Jha, Swechha

**SOUTH INDIA WORKSHOP (BENGALURU) – 2nd November, 2015**

1. Amit A Alex, Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves
2. Ashim Roy, Uber Diagnostics
3. Govind Sivakumar, Gray Matters Capital / Wings Learning
4. Hariharan PV, Agro-Biogenics
5. Jyotsana Taparia, Upaya Social Ventures
6. Lijo Chacko, Head Held High Foundation
7. Vijayarajan, InnAccel
8. Nagaraja, CTI-PFAN (Climate Technology Initiative – Private Financing Advisory Network)
9. Nishant Advani, Acumen
10. Priya Thachadi, Villgro
11. Ramakrishna Pappu, InnAccel
12. Robin Brenner, S3IDF (Small Scale Sustainable Infrastructure Development Fund)
13. Shanmuga Rajan, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham Business School
14. Ullas Kumar, Meghshala
### WEST INDIA WORKSHOP (MUMBAI) – 17th November, 2015

1. Anurag Chaturvedi, Dasra
2. Anushree Parekh, Samhita Social Ventures
3. Asma, Thomson Reuters Foundation
4. Athul Ravunniarath, Acumen
5. Jitendra Sinha, SAI Sustainable Agro
6. Jui Gangan, Villgro
7. Manasi Shah, Acumen
8. Megha Phansalkar, Tisser
10. Prabu Guthi, Milky Way
11. Prerna Khanna, Acumen
12. Sairam Subramanian, Technoserve
13. Satyajit Majumdar, Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Tata Institute of Social Sciences
14. Sunanda, TechnoServe
15. Urvashi Devidayal, Thomson Reuters Foundation
16. Usha Ganesh, Intellecap
17. Vishnu Shankar, Azad LP
18. Nishita, Azad LP

### NORTH INDIA WORKSHOP (NEW DELHI) – 26th November, 2015

1. Abhay Sen, Dharma Life
2. Abhishek Sinha, Eko
3. Aditya Pant, Aspen Network of Development Entrepreneurs
4. Akash Bansal, Zouk Loans
5. Amit Bhattacharya, Dharma Life
6. Anoop Kaul, BASIX
7. Dr. Charvi Mehta, Ministry of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship
8. Jaspal Shakya, Opportunejobs.com
10. Kashyap Shah, Michel & Susan Dell Foundation
11. Katharina Kuehn, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
12. Krishna Thacker, PNB Metlife
13. Manisha Gupta, Start Up!
14. Mohit Arora, School of Social Entrepreneurship
15. Nagendra Nath Sharma, Birla Institute of Management and Technology
16. Priya Tripathi, Technoserve
17. Purnendu Hota, NIIT Foundation
18. Rachana Gangavarapu, LumenEd
19. Rini Singhal, Lok Capital
20. Shweta Gandhi, Karmany
21. Thomas Kreek, LumenEd

### EAST INDIA WORKSHOP (KOLKATA) – 30th November, 2015

1. Devi Vijay, Asst. Prof., IIM, Calcutta
2. Gitali Thakur, Maitreyee Development Society
3. Meghna De, Switch ON
4. Mihir Sahana, BASIX Krishi
5. Piyali Mazumdar, Prayasam
6. Samir Narayan, CINI community Initiative
7. Sanjeev Srivastawa, Vedic Krishi
8. Santosh Dash, Sahaj-e-village
10. Dr. Sharmishtha Banerjee, University of Calcutta
11. Shubhankar Sengupta, Consultant
12. Suman Mukhopadhyay, Banglanatak
13. Swapan Chakraborty, Sahara Utsarga
14. Swarup Ghosh, Tomorrow’s Foundation
15. Vasant Subramanyan, Nirdhan
16. Vidyanand Jha, IIM Calcutta
SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. What is the name of your organisation?

2. About the organisation:
   a. In what year did your organisation formally begin operations?
   b. Where is your organisation headquartered? (City, State)
   c. Is the organisation regional, national or international? (please choose only one)
      □ Regional        □ National        □ International
   d. What legal form is the organisation registered under? (Please choose only one)
      □ Sole Proprietorship
      □ Partnership
      □ Public Limited Company
      □ Private Limited Company
      □ Section 8/Section 25 Company
      □ Institution or University
      □ NGO/Trust/Society
      □ Public or Government Organisation
      □ Other (please specify)

   e. What is the name of the person currently in-charge of your organisation?

   f. What is the gender of the person currently in-charge of your organisation?
      □ Male         □ Female

   g. What is the age of the person currently in-charge of your organisation?
      □ 18-24
      □ 25-34
      □ 35-44
      □ 45-54
      □ 55-60
      □ 60 and above
3. What are the overall objectives of your organisation? (Choose as many as you like)
   - Creating employment opportunities
   - Improving health and well-being
   - Addressing social exclusion
   - Supporting agriculture and allied activities
   - Promoting education and literacy
   - Protecting the environment
   - Addressing financial exclusion
   - Providing affordable housing
   - Supporting vulnerable children and young person’s
   - Supporting other social enterprises and organisations
   - Empowering and uplifting women
   - Other (please specify)

4. In which of the following sectors does your organisation operate? (Choose as many as you like)
   - Agriculture, fisheries, dairy
   - Education
   - Skill development
   - Non-farm Livelihood
   - Energy and clean technology
   - Financial services
   - Forestry
   - Healthcare
   - Food and nutrition
   - Affordable housing
   - Justice, rehabilitation, human rights
   - Water and sanitation
   - ICT
   - Tourism
   - Other (please specify)

5. How does your organisation conduct operations in selected sectors?
   - Manufacturing
   - Sales
   - Business Development and Entrepreneurship Support
   - Other (please specify)
6. What market does your organisation cater to?
   - Rural markets
   - Urban markets
   - Both

7. What is the total number of beneficiaries impacted by your organisation?

8. Do you consider any of the following groups to be your beneficiaries? (If yes, please indicate the approximate number of beneficiaries in each group)
   - Children (14 years old and below)
   - Youth (15 to 30 years of age)
   - Women
   - Disabled or differently-abled individuals
   - Individuals from backward communities
   - Individuals from underserved regions
   - Organisations (NGOs, micro and small businesses, social enterprises, self-help groups, community, and religious groups)
   - Employees (Number of people from disadvantaged backgrounds (for example, disabled employees, employees from poor socio-economic backgrounds, etc.)
   - Other (Please specify type of beneficiary and number)

9. Which of the following does your organisation place the most emphasis on? (Please choose only one)
   - Profit First – we prioritise maximising profits and strive to make a social impact only when it enhances profitability
   - Social/Environmental Mission First – we prioritise maximisation of impact over profit, we may not (always) be commercially viable
   - Both Jointly – we pursue both financial and social/environmental objectives equally

10. What proportion of your organisation’s income comes from earned income?
    - 0%
    - 1-24%
    - 25-49%
    - 50-74%
    - 75-99%
    - 100%

11. Turnover:
    a. What was your organisation’s turnover last year? (1 April 2014-31 March 2015)
    b. How do you expect your organisation’s turnover to change next year?
       - Increase substantially
       - Increase a little
       - Stay the same
       - Decrease

11. Profits:
    a. Currently, your organisation is:
       - Making a profit
       - Incurring a loss
       - Breaking even
b. If you do make a profit or surplus, how is it used? (Choose as many as you like)

- Growth and development activities
- Rewards to staff and beneficiaries
- Profit sharing with owners and shareholders
- Cross-subsidising i.e. covering costs of less commercially viable components of work
- Reserves
- Funding third party social/environmental activities
- Other (please specify)

13. Full-time employees (35+ hours per week)
   
a. Number of full time employees (as on 31 March 2015)
b. Number of full-time female employees (as on 31 March 2015)
c. Number of full-time employees in the last year (as on 31 March 2014)
d. Number of full-time female employees in the previous year (as on 31 March 2014)

14. Part-time employees (34 or fewer hours per week)
   
a. Number of part-time employees in the current year (as on 31 March 2015)
b. Number of female part-time employees in the current year (as on 31 March 2015)
c. Number of part-time employees in the previous year (as on 31 March 2015)
d. Number of part-time female employees in the previous year (as on 31 March 2014)

15. How is the number of employees in your organisation expected to change in the next year?
   
- Increase substantially  
- Increase a little  
- Stay the same  
- Decrease

16. How does your organisation plan on achieving growth over the next year? (Choose as many as you like)
   
- Increase sales with existing customers
- Expand into new geographic areas
- Develop and launch new products and services
- Attract new customers or clients
- Replicate or franchise
- Attract investment to expand
- Merge with another organisation
- Acquire another organisation
- Win business as part of consortium
- We have no growth plans
- Other (please specify)
17. What are the major barriers that your organisation faces? (Choose as many as you like)

- Capital (debt/equity)
- Grant funding
- Maintaining cash flow
- Recruiting non-executive directors or trustees
- Recruiting other staff
- Shortage of managerial skills
- Shortage of technical skills
- Lack of access to technical support and advisory services
- Understanding/awareness of social enterprise among banks and support organisations
- Understanding/awareness of social enterprise among general public/customers
- Lack of demand for product/service
- Economic climate (fiscal regulation/prohibitive commissioning)
- Access to public services
- Red tape
- Taxation, VAT, business rates
- Availability/cost of suitable premises
- Late payment
- Other (please specify)

18. What forms of funding has your organisation received in the past? (Choose as many as you like)

- Grants from governments
- Grants from foundations
- Contracts from governments
- In-kind cash and donations (e.g. equipment, volunteer time)
- None
- Other (please specify)

19. What forms of finance/investment has your organisation received in the past? (Choose as many as you like)

- Capital grant
- Concessional loans (loans with below market interest rates)
- Commercial loans (market interest rate loans)
- Equity or equity-like investments
- None
- Other (please specify)
20. What are the constraints to securing financing that your organisation faces? (Choose as many as you like)

- Revenue for equity investors
- Business model is not refined/appealing
- Access to investors is low due to limited network
- Limited track/performance record
- Revenue and profitability requirement for bank loans
- Limited supply of capital
- Regulatory constraints when securing capital from international sources
- Securing capital and financing is not one of our major constraints
- Other (please specify)

21. Do you consider your organisation to be a social enterprise?

- Yes
- No

22. Respondent’s email address

23. Did you face issues while completing this survey? If yes, please feel free to elaborate.
# KEY PLAYERS IN THE SOCIAL ENTERPRISE ECOSYSTEM IN INDIA

## Incubators, accelerators, and enablers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Organisation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka: Innovators for the Public</td>
<td>Network and Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Network of Development Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Network and Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Innovation Incubation and Entrepreneurship, IIM Ahmedabad</td>
<td>Incubator, Accelerator, and Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasra Social Impact</td>
<td>Incubator and Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deshpande Foundation</td>
<td>Incubator and Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH</td>
<td>Technical Service Provider and Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennovent India Advisors Private Limited</td>
<td>Enabler and Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grameen Foundation in India (Subsidiary of Grameen Foundation)</td>
<td>Technical Service Provider and Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEX Accelerator</td>
<td>Incubator and Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Alchemy Consulting Pvt. Ltd.</td>
<td>Incubator and Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insights Applied</td>
<td>Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khosla Labs Private Limited</td>
<td>Incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okapi</td>
<td>Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Technology and Business Incubator - IIT Madras</td>
<td>Incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhita Social Ventures</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwab Foundation</td>
<td>Platform for Social Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shujog</td>
<td>Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup Oasis</td>
<td>Incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup!</td>
<td>Incubator, Angel Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technoserve</td>
<td>Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British Council</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnLtd India</td>
<td>Incubator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villgro Innovation Foundation</td>
<td>Incubator and Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yunus Social Business Fund Mumbai Private Limited</td>
<td>Incubator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact investors, development finance institutions and multi-lateral funding organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Organisation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aavishkaar Venture Management Services Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accion Gateway Fund LLC</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acumen Fund Advisory Services India Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankur Capital Markets Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asha Impact</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution, Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspada Investment Advisors Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo Finance</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellwether Microfinance Fund Pvt. Ltd.</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Capital Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Orchard Impact Investment Managers</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvert Foundation</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspian Impact Investment Advisors Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Group Plc (Commonwealth Development Corporation)</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Square Foundation</td>
<td>Foundation, Technical Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charioteer Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Investments Social Ventures Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Investitions- und EntwicklungsgesellschaftmbH (DEG)</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiaVikas Capital (Subsidiary of Opportunity International Australia)</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevar Equity</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incofin Investment Management</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Finance Corp. (IFC)</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khosla Impact</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemelson Foundation</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGT Venture Philanthropy Foundation</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lok Capital LLC</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael and Susan Dell Foundation</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MicroVentures Marketplace Inc.</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Development Finance Company</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Microfinance Initiative) Frontier Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omidyar Network India Advisors Private Limited</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnivore Capital Management Advisors Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Affordable Learning Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragati Capital</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Organisation Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponsAbility India Business Advisors Private Limited</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHA Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samridhi Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skoll Foundation</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Venture Partners</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Investment Company</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorenson Impact Foundation</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedfund International AB</td>
<td>Development Finance Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitus Capital</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitus Seed Fund</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaya Social Ventures</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID India Mission</td>
<td>Multilateral Funding Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Capital</td>
<td>Impact Investor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Women leaders of the surveyed organisations that did not meet the social enterprise criteria used for the study were older by comparison, with the highest proportion (33%) being in the age group of 45-54 years.

2. The surveyed organisations which did not meet the social enterprise criteria used for the study were comparatively older, with 66% having started operations before 2010.

3. The surveyed organisations that did not meet the social enterprise criteria used for the study worked at a smaller scale, with 47% reporting operating regionally and 39% nationally.

4. The surveyed organisations that did not meet the social enterprise criteria used for the study had an average annual turnover of Rs. 2.5 million (approximately GBP 26,000).
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