

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Situation in the peer country relative to the host country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions to the host country
Bulgaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A process for building a policy and legal framework on social enterprises has started few years ago. • Multispectral initiatives for cooperation between various stakeholder groups have been started. • A process of collecting data on SE sector has started in 2013 by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy in partnership with the National Statistical Office. • A process to study the SE sector in Bulgaria is ongoing parallel to the above mentioned initiatives. • Several funding programmes were launched with a focus to support SE development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The perception of the welfare state and its role and the economic and social context in both countries is different. • Nonetheless a process of establishing a framework for SE in Bulgaria has started; the topic is still not recognized as a horizontal tool by specific policy sectors whereas in Norway the situation presents a slightly different level of horizontal recognition of SE. • Similarly to Norway, in Bulgaria there is also lack of clear and coherent definition of SE and on the roles that each stakeholder group should play in the sector. • Similarly to Norway, in Bulgaria there is also lack of systemic and constructive discussion on the sector policy and its development that involves in a systematic way various interested parties. • Similarly to Norway, in Bulgaria there is also lack of impact measurement tools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recognition of the specific role that each of the stakeholder groups involved in SE initiatives and practices should play in building a sustainable eco-system • The recognition of social impact measurement tools as an instrument to monitor the successfulness of a particular SE initiative and of a particular policy (including such as a funding scheme) measure in that area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the regulations and practices for collaboration between state authorities and SE when providing public funded services in the area of healthcare, education and social care? • How public funding schemes for SE can measure their effectiveness and efficiency involving the supported SE as a partner in this process?
Czech Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its economy is in a very good condition with the lowest unemployment in the EU. • There is a well developed and functional civil society. • There is no overarching policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The welfare state and a provision of public services is perceived in a different way because of the different history in each country. • The system of social services in the Czech Republic is kept strictly apart 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Norwegian discussion about the collaboration between social enterprises and the welfare state might be very helpful. Reasons are in both countries similar. • Norway has opened the debate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the question of the collaboration between social enterprises and the various levels of the welfare state reflected by Norwegian politicians?

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Situation in the peer country relative to the host country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions to the host country
	<p>framework nor legal definition of social enterprise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A white paper on the law on social entrepreneurship was passed by the Government. • The increase of work integration social enterprises was financed from the EU structural funds. 	<p>from social entrepreneurship and Norway considers how it might be connected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a different policy attitude to the integration of young disadvantaged people by the means of social enterprises. It is not a priority in the Czech Republic as in Norway. • Local authorities in both countries have a limited knowledge of social enterprises. They look for a way how to make use of them but their needs differ. • The social economy ecosystem is not well developed both in Norway and in the Czech Republic. 	<p>whether social services should stay outside the market or not and it will help Czechs to kick off their discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Norwegian social economy sector is in much better condition in citizens' participation, cooperation and networking than the Czech social economy sector. • The involvement of academic institutions in research and mapping of the social enterprise sector is another success factor that would be good to transfer. • The host country discussion can be a good start of the Czech debate how to diminish the negative consequences of the challenging trends and how to change them into opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the role of academia in this discussion? • What is the relationship between social services and social entrepreneurship in Norway nowadays and what can be its further development? • In which way academic institutions cooperate on a social economy research? • Is there a discussion going on in Norway about digitalisation and social entrepreneurship? If so, who are its actors and what are the questions?
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to distinguish between social entrepreneurship and social enterprise • Three periods of emergence and institutionalization... • Last period between 2013-2017 depicts as blurred situation • Policy embrace of SE, but limited support for a national eco-system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and programs targeting SE differ between the two countries • Not obvious that social entrepreneurship takes place within the framework of social enterprise • Social entrepreneurship targeting children and youth concerns leisure-time and sport • Social entrepreneurship targeting socially excluded labour market situation takes place in the framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due welfare state trajectory potential for transferability is large • In both countries a formal eco-system concerning both social entrepreneurship and social enterprises is needed • Transferability of Danish experiences with learning and education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequences of not distinguishing between social entrepreneurship and social enterprise? • Potential of social entrepreneurship being exposed to forces of colonization from either state or market (Habermas) or intensified processes of isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell)

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Situation in the peer country relative to the host country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions to the host country
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many activities at municipal level. 	of WISE		
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public sector reform Marketization of welfare and employment services Social enterprises are emerging but modest impacts/ not well observed Some developments in the ecosystem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of national vision on the role of social enterprises Work integration social enterprises do not work, not expected impacts Hard to evaluate impacts, size, markets, employment and social impacts Paving the way for privatisation of welfare and employment services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sector driven development – markets Value based organisations active in renewing their approach Social Impact Bond experiments (not exclusively for social enterprises) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More “hard data” information is required What is the niche for social enterprises in the markets EU regulations and competition rules, open markets Public responsibilities and marketization, pros and cons