

SVK, PL, CR - SI BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES

Slovakia	Czech Republic	Poland	Hungary	Universal	Indicators form indexes
<p>Low level of knowledge and capacity for measuring the impact</p>	<p>Lack of formulation of own impact, lack of best practices</p> <p>Confusion with “social innovation” term– lack of existing and checked solutions, and more opened for new approaches</p>	<p>Dealing with the complexity</p> <p>Unsufficient investment in knowledge gathering and learning on social innovation</p>	<p>There is no representative database of social innovation/social enterprises, there are some not representative researches. The state focuses on social enterprises using the SBI definition (also has a separate own definition), supporting only certain legal forms and mainly employment purposes.</p> <p>Impact measurement is not widespread (there is a working group for that).</p>	<p>We need more knowledge, data, indicators,</p>	<p>Social innovation research and impact - The existence of government-led data collection and policy needs to support social innovation (EIU rating) - they collect or they don't collect</p> <p>Existence of national policy on social innovation - The existence of a government-led national policy to encourage social innovation (EIU rating) - they have strategy to promote or they don't have strategy to promote social innovation</p>
<p>Disproportional support in different innovation stages</p>	<p>Lack of experience with lobbying and advocacy toward systematic change</p>	<p>Communication issue and advocacy</p>	<p>There is a lack of visibility of SI and SE among the general public, lack of communication campaigns, tools.</p>	<p>Mature PR based on data, results, proofs</p>	<p>Availability of government financing to promote social innovation</p> <p>The availability and ease of use of financing mechanisms such as social innovation funds, government grants, social impact bonds and business incubators.</p>
<p>Lack of space for networking and sharing experience</p> <p>Strained intersectoral relations and mutual expectations</p>	<p>Ability to cooperate – little openness of public authorities</p> <p>Few opportunities for changemakers across different topics, business authorities to meet. Underused potential of</p>	<p>Cooperation, Lack of trust, high costs of cooperation, Unsufficient examples of people, experts rotation between silos/sectors</p>	<p>Cooperation among SI organizations is low. There are advocacy organizations for social cooperatives and social enterprises, but their impact on policy-making is not high.</p>	<p>Constant network, exchange, platform for cooperation (precise and constantly tested cooperation methods and tools)</p>	<p>Political participation</p> <p>Willingness of citizens to participate in public debate, elect representatives and join political parties</p>

	<p>cooperation between changemakers in civil society, and unused potential between citizen sector, higher education/ academia</p>		<p>There is a low level of trust in political institutions and in institutions in general. Citizens are not very active regarding volunteering and in membership in CSOs. However, even if certain CSOs would try to influence public debate and political decision-making, there is no room for that: Hungarian politics is more and more centralized and regards critical organizations and individuals as enemies. There is a high level of state-level corruption, client-patron relationship is characteristic.</p>		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differences between expectations of donors and innovators 2. Limited resources for long-term and institutional funding of organisation 3. Low public authorities interest in Social Innovation field and innovative solutions 	<p>Little know – how/ experience with donors / ability to diversify funding</p>	<p>Financial issues Lack of patience (short term projects as a standard) Insecurity in Social Innovation field Lack of ability for dealing with risk and experimentation Bureaucracy as a dominative logic Ineffective legal system</p>	<p>For a long time, the state only focused on social cooperatives and employment related NPOs as part of the social economy, not directly focusing on SI. Currently , there are EU co-financed support programs for social enterprises, but with no long-term strategy. These are grant programs with also mentoring and other kinds of professional support, and there is also employment related</p>	<p>Extended ecosystem to support innovative solutions – full support from public entities. (Well designed public policies and law system to support innovation)</p>	<p>Availability of government financing to promote social innovation (financing mechanism, grants, incubators) - EIU rating Total public social expenditure - % of GDP</p>

			<p>credit available. The programs are largely criticized for their narrow focus, unrealistic conditions and requirements.</p> <p>There are no tax advantages/benefits directly for SI organizations. Instead, tax burdens and problems stemming from bureaucracy and the legal framework connected to certain legal forms can be observed. SI organizations also lack beneficial loans and credit systems from banks (there are only two banks, Erste and Magnet, offering good conditions for social enterprises and CSOs).</p> <p>There are also non-state organizations that develop and support SI (e.g. Ashoka, NESsT), they can provide long-term, more professional development, but their funding sources are limited, the number of their supported organizations is not high.</p>		
Missing support for development of multi-disciplinary teams in organisation	Few opportunities for leadership development of key changemakers	Hierarchy Experiments are not welcome	Socially responsible public procurement is a possibility but is not exercised.	?	Does the institutional framework provide space for the entry of non-state actors in public service provision? Dose the isntitutional framework

			<p>Public service provision is rarely outsourced to independent organizations, and even if it is so, their costs are not fully covered, which makes their sustainability problematic (they are very dependent on the state and the local government).</p>		<p>provide space for experimentation and the co-existence of various institutional solutions?</p>
<p>Unequal support for regions in comparison to Bratislava</p>			<p>There are weak ties to the business sector (e.g. CSR activities), there also relevant regional differences in Hungary, which affects the conditions of SI organizations as well.</p>	<p>Elitarism of Social Innovation field -</p>	