



Inter-Agency Task Force on
Social and Solidarity Economy

Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals through the Framework of the Social and Solidarity Economy in Africa: Scope, Constraints and Options

Innocent Chirisa
University of Zimbabwe
Zimbabwe

Tariro Nyevera
University of Zimbabwe
Zimbabwe

May 2019

Draft paper prepared in response to the
UNTFSSSE Call for Papers 2018

**Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals:
What Role for Social and Solidarity Economy?**

The responsibility for opinions expressed in this document rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the SSE Knowledge Hub for the SDGs (unsse.org) does not constitute endorsement by the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE), or its institutional members, partners or observers, of the opinions expressed in it. No publication or distribution of this document is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.

This document is made available on the SSE Knowledge Hub for the SDGs in the form and language in which it was received.

Abstract

Africa is rich in terms of the social and solidarity economy (SSE). This is evidenced by a great number of social capital movements in operation in various socio-economic and environmental aspects of society. The study is premised on three main propositions, namely: that co-optation into political processes, lack of clear benchmarks and the absence of good governance frameworks hinder the smooth running of the SSE which, in turn, prevents the attainment of the broader developmental goals set by any society or community. As such, when the loopholes and gaps are closed, the progressive and sustained implementation of projects and programmes is assured of expected results. The paper argues that with a well-structured SSE, the implementation of SDGs is made easier and targets of SDGs can be sustained with ease. However, streamlining the SSE is not without its challenges. Africa is the region of focus of this paper. It is a continent plagued by issues relating to governance, as well as civil wars and strife especially during and post-election periods. However, the region is not as homogenous as it might appear in general presentations made by some organisations, scholars and think tanks.

Keywords

Social and solidarity economy; Political co-optation; Cooperatives; SDGs; Development policy

Bio

Innocent Chirisa is a professor at the Department of Rural & Urban Planning, University of Zimbabwe. He is currently the deputy dean of the Faculty of Social Studies at the University of Zimbabwe and a Research Fellow at the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of the Free State, South Africa. His research interests are systems dynamics in urban land, regional stewardship and resilience in human habitats.

Tariro Nyevera is an MSc Rural and Urban Planning student at University of Zimbabwe. He holds a BSc degree in Rural and Urban Planning from University of Zimbabwe. His research interests are, among others peri-urban transformation, urban growth, land conflicts, and inclusive cities.

Introduction

This study seeks to explore the challenges and options for the social and solidarity economy (SSE) in Africa in terms of achieving the objectives of the SDGs. Three SDGs are of focus in this paper and these are: Goal Number 1, 2 and 5. Goal number one target no poverty, Goal number two focuses of zero hunger and Goal number three is about gender equality. The SDGs under study are: Borzaga *et al.* (2017: 3-4) have defined SSE as “a broad set of organisations and enterprises that are specifically geared to producing goods, services and knowledge, while pursuing economic and social aims and fostering solidarity”. Over the past decades, organisations and enterprises that constitute the SSE have been growing faster than any economy around the world (Cvetanovic *et al.* 2015). However, in Africa, the SSE is not uncontested (Filipenko, 2017; Steinman, 2017; Laville, 2013; Wanyama, 2012). There are constraints and hurdles that need to be addressed first so that the full benefits of the SSE can be realised and the SSE can contribute effectively to achieving the SDGs (Utting, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

This study adopted two theoretical underpinnings namely, the Theory of Social Capital (TSC) and the Human Factor Approach (HFA). These two theoretical paradigms provide insights on the establishment and operations of the SSE.

Social capital is considered to be the least tangible form of capital as it only exists in relationships among individuals (Liou *et al.* 2008). As observed by Cvetanovic *et al.* (2015: 76), social capital “is the capital of cooperation, joint action, mutual trust, and mutual assistance, which are formed in the course of economic relations between individuals”. Social capital is composed of institutions, interactions, relationships, values and attitudes that govern social connections, thereby contributing to wider social and economic development (Cvetanovic *et al.* 2015; Lollo, 2012). Social systems and networks are assets and if they are exploited, they can contribute to meaningful development. Through social capital, the benchmark of SSE is developed.

Humans are at the core of development and make up what is known as the human factors (Chivaura, 1998). Accordingly, it is humans that should be developed, humans that should champion their own development and ultimately humans who develop themselves (Adjibolosoo, 1998; Chivaura, 1998). Through SSE, humans can champion their own development and improve their welfare. The human factor approach to development implies improvements in human welfare and the means that are needed by people for development (Chivaura, 1998). The HFA acknowledges that humans must be capacitated to participate in the production of such goods and services. Through social enterprises, cooperatives, unions, associations and friendly societies, humans can have a platform to champion their own development.

Literature Review

The SSE as a phenomenon is gaining currency on the agendas of national and international policies. However, conceptualising the SSE remains complex both in the theoretical discourse and in practice. Utting (2015) suggests that the SSE is used as an umbrella term to denote forms of economic activity that consider social and environmental objectives over profits. The main forms of SSE include social enterprises, cooperatives, unions, associations and friendly societies (Morais, 2014; Laville, 2013). As argued by UNRISD (2014), although organisations, enterprises and networks that constitute the SSE are diverse in nature, they share common features in terms of development objectives, organisational forms and values.

Initially, the SSE was largely composed of traditional organisations and actors such as cooperatives, mutual, associations and foundations. In Europe, for example, associations started operating soon after democracy took hold and they have been influential in both the creation and expansion of welfare systems (Filipenko (2017; Steinman, 2017). Similarly, cooperatives and mutual organisations in South America have been instrumental since the early 19th century in helping groups of people gain access to basic goods and services (Utting, 2015). Closer to

home, traditional practices that included collective ownership, co-operation and solidarity in Africa have long been in existence, serving to address specific social, economic and environmental needs (Laville, 2013, Wanyama, 2012). With the passing of time, varied SSE organisations such as social enterprises have risen particularly in countries that include South America, Europe and Asia (Laville, 2013). The evolution of social enterprises was largely influenced by non-profit organisations and traditional social economy organisations particularly cooperatives (Laville, 2013; Wanyama, 2012). To date, social organisations and trends have grown significantly and diversified to include activities in education, financial services, food production, and general services (Filipenko, 2017; Steinman, 2017).

In most countries, SSE organisations and enterprises have proved to be useful instruments for social and economic development (Borzaga *et al.* 2017). Where there is social entrepreneurship, solidarity becomes more common and this is the case globally (Filipenko, 2017). Social sector organisations contribute more than five percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in various countries that include, among others, Spain, United Kingdom (UK), United States (US), Germany and Canada (Filipenko 2017; Steinman 2017).

In Asia, the SSE has been particularly helpful in economic development in Japan and Bangladesh (ILO, 2010). Microcredit and other forms of financial assistance have been used in Bangladesh as a way of eradicating poverty and improving the social livelihoods of vulnerable people (Borzaga *et al.* 2017; ILO, 2010). In Africa, a continent characterised by poverty and social marginalisation, SSE practices are mostly related with philanthropy and actions of NGOs (Wanyama, 2012; ILO, 2010). Efforts are, however, being made in Africa for the SSE to include socio-economic developmental projects that focus on peace, governance, democratic participation and regional cooperation (ILO, 2010). Looking at Arab states, the development and functionality of the SSE has been affected to some extent by social and civil unrest (ILO, 2010). However, cooperative enterprises have thrived in Arab states and enabled the rural folk to pool resources, accumulate savings and provide credit. In Europe, numerous public policies directed towards SSE have been developed. In UK, SSE structures are recognised under the Company Law or Industrial and Provident Society (IPS) (Steinman, 2017). However, that absence of specific laws for some specific types of SSE such as laws for voluntary organisation and co-operatives laws is a cause for concern. In ameliorating this, policies in the last years have been mostly dedicated to promoting charities and social enterprises. ILO (2010) observes that in Latin America and the Caribbean, the significance and its promotion of SSE are increasing. Government policies in countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia and Colombia have developed SSE mechanisms to face challenges such as social exclusion, poverty and inequality (*ibid.*). Evidence in North America, particularly Canada, reveals that SSE continues to contribute significantly to the formulation of innovative strategies for socio-economic development (UNRISD, 2014). The United States, however, does not have specific polices on the SSE (ILO, 2010).

As people continue to face various social challenges that include, among other things, unemployment, exploitation, poor living conditions, climate change and natural resource depletion, the new social paradigm of the SSE becomes more critical (Steinman, 2017). Social capital is considered by Borzaga *et al.* (2017) as one important paradigm that can be harnessed to counter the inadequacy and deficiency of capitalism and state-centric approaches to development. The need for the SSE to address societal challenges has seen the expansion of this economy in terms of heterogeneity and diversification even in countries where there is no public support (Wanyama, 2012). The major impetus of this expansion includes the need for inclusive growth, poverty reduction, equity and sustainability (UNRISD, 2014). This does not necessarily mean that SSE is a quick fix solution to a crisis and that when the crisis is over, SSE will not be necessary. UNRISD (2014) argues that SSE is always necessary in countries and it provides innovative solutions to social, economic and environmental problems.

SSE pursues environmental, economic and social goals (Steinman, 2017). Since it is multifaceted in nature, SSE differs from other sector economies such as private, public and informal economy sectors (ILO, 2010). UNRISD (2014) posits that as an economic approach,

SSE favours decentralisation and local development through initiatives such as local economic development and ecotourism. This economic dimension of the SSE provides a myriad of opportunities that include, among other things, job creation, access to markets, economies of scale and provision of financial assistance (Steinman, 2017). The environmental domain prevents the depletion of the environment by the pursuance of economic goals (UNRISD, 2014; ILO, 2010). The social domain of the SSE is mainly premised on protecting social settings and this is facilitated by principles of mutuality and reciprocity (Laville, 2013), which foster social protection and redistribution (*ibid.*). The adoption of Agenda 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs meant that it was no longer ‘business as usual’ in the development fraternity across countries (UNRISD, 2014). The SDGs place great emphasis on eradicating poverty, hunger, vulnerability and inequalities, prevention of climate change and preservation of the environment (Steinman, 2017). Some of the SDGs coincide with the goals of the SSE (Steinman, 2017; ILO, 2010).

Methodology

The study adopted case study approach in exploring the challenges and options relating to the SSE in Africa. South Africa, Zimbabwe, Somalia, Rwanda and Nigeria were the study areas examined. Data was collected through literature and document review. Published books, book chapters and journal articles constituted the literature that was reviewed for this study. For document review, reference was made to newspaper publications, reports, policy documents web resources.

Case Studies (Results)

This section presents the results from five case studies that were used in this study. The case countries are: South Africa, Zimbabwe, Somalia, Rwanda and Nigeria.

South Africa (as a well-performing economy)

The economy of South Africa is considered to be the second largest in Africa after Nigeria (Steinman and van Rooij, 2012). South Africa has an advanced industrial sector, robust financial systems, abundant resources and a progressive legal framework. The World Bank ranks South Africa as an upper middle income nation (*ibid.*). South Africa is a relatively politically stable country (Steinman and van Rooij, 2012). Through the SSE, South Africa has realised that businesses with both social and economic objectives ensure a more inclusive economy and a fairer and more just world (Utting, 2015). This realisation has led to the enactment several laws and public policies that directly and indirectly promote the SSE (Steinman (2017). In recent years, Steinman and van Rooij (2012) observe that the SSE in the form of cooperatives, non-profit organisations and social enterprises in South Africa was a significant employer and surpassed sectors such as mining and the public service. In addition to several laws that were enacted in support of SSE, synergies between universities and local authorities have been instrumental in promoting the SSE in South Africa. Some universities in South Africa have been setting up incubators to assist the development of SSE. City of Johannesburg once partnered with University of Johannesburg in the training of social enterprises in the area of sustainability. Non-profit organisations (NPO) and cooperatives are the major stakeholders of the SSE in South Africa (Utting, 2015; Steinman and van Rooij, 2012). Currently, the NPO sector has about 76, 000 registered non-profit organisations (*ibid.*). Steinman and van Rooij (2012) attribute this growth to government assistance. Similarly, cooperatives have been receiving support from government, which has contributed to the growth of these enterprises since 2005, when legislation on cooperatives was adopted.

Recently, there has been a rise of interest and eventual support of SSE in South Africa. It is worth noting that South Africa is ranked one of the leading countries in the SSE sector. Progress in terms of SSE development is mostly noted in energy, health and education sectors. As noted by (World Bank, 2017: 20), SSE in South Africa is “mainly home-grown and driven by local concerns about addressing the country’s societal and developmental challenges”.

Zimbabwe: The Example of a Troubled State

Since the attainment of independence in 1980, social, political and economic challenges have bedevilled Zimbabwe (Mhembwe and Dube, 2017; Cain, 2015). As Cain (2015: 1) mentions, Zimbabwe has been subjected to “gross violations of property rights, including state-sponsored expropriation and vandalism, corrupt politicians, restrictive business regulations, and an abysmal monetary policy”. Moreover, the devastating impacts of droughts due to climate change and the HIV and AIDS pandemic have also adversely affected the country (Mhembwe and Dube, 2017). All these challenges and circumstances have increased poverty in Zimbabwe, triggered civic unrest and hindered the country from development (Chakawarika, 2011).

In response to some of the challenges highlighted above, the SSE in Zimbabwe has operated through organisation and enterprises that include, among others cooperatives, NGOs and unions. Typical examples of the SSE in Zimbabwe are unions for example farm organisations that emerged post-2000 to address challenges facing smallholder farmers (Chiweshe, 2014). Another example is that of the National Vendors Union of Zimbabwe, which was created in 2008, when the country underwent a massive economic meltdown that resulted in the closure of companies, rising unemployment and hyperinflation (Dorman, 2001). Other significant SSE organisations and enterprises in Zimbabwe are NGOs and cooperatives (Chiweshe, 2014).

There are no robust legislations and policies, however, that promote the SSE and this has somehow impeded SSE. Pieces of legislation in the country relating to the SSE are disjointed and fragmented. The SSE in Zimbabwe faces a myriad of challenges that include the lack of an enabling environment, political interference and poor national governance. The political tension in Zimbabwe has raised scepticism over the operations of NGOs and civic organisations. The political environment that was unfavourable to NGOs since 2004 when the Non-Governmental Organisations Bill was established resulted in a significant number of them leaving the country and others ultimately ceasing operations (Chakawarika, 2011).

Co-optation of SSE into political systems has affected the autonomy and operation of SSE in Zimbabwe. Within housing cooperatives, for example, the politics of patronage largely resulted in the abuse of resources, members and power (Mhembwe and Dube, 2017; Dorman, 2001). However, not all cooperatives in Zimbabwe experienced the same challenges as housing cooperatives. Cooperatives in rural communities, for instance in Shurugwi, have managed to deliver significant positive outcomes such as employment generation, women empowerment, increased food production and social cohesion (*ibid.*).

Somalia: The Example of a Failed State

In the horn of Africa, Somalia has been characterized by several conflicts resulting from territorial disagreements and competing interests among and within countries, just to mention a few (Blok, 2010). Since independence in 1960, Somalia has been ravaged by political conflicts and civil wars (Blok, 2010). In 1991, the Somalia Central Government collapsed and since then, civil wars had been the order of the day (*ibid.*). Despite the homogeneous nature of Somalia’s population, the nation continues to experience lack of social cohesion and widespread poverty (*ibid.*).

The collapse of Somalia’s government in 1991 brought devastating effects to some organisations and enterprises such as agricultural cooperatives (Blok, 2010). Prior to 1991, agricultural cooperatives were contributing significantly to improving food security and creating employment opportunities for women, youths and marginalised small-scale farmers (Marangio, 2012). However, all these operations seized when that government collapsed in 1991 (Venugopalan, 2017). The aftermath of and civil conflict in Somalia adversely affected the economic dimension of SSE and birthed several humanitarian associations that include interest groups, NGOs, and informal and formal professional networks (Blok, 2010).

Organisations and enterprises operating in contravention of the political system ideologies in Somalia are challenged by political elites and labelled as perpetrators of violence and instability (Marangio, 2012). Acts of terrorism are also rampant in Somalia and they have impacted negatively on SSE performance. Acts of terrorism, political instabilities and violence in Somalia increase operating costs for social and solidarity organisations and enterprises in terms of protecting employees and asserts. Humanitarian aid organisations have faced security challenges as they made efforts to alleviate the suffering of Somalis (Blok, 2010). To date, humanitarian organisations are struggling to run their operations in an environment that lacks security assistance for international organisations (Venugopalan, 2017).

Somalian society is diverse and often divided (Blok, 2010), and the lack of social cohesion in Somalia is cited as one of the chief causes of persisting civil wars and hindrances to the SSE (*ibid.*). Clan structures in Somalia dominate society and determine how people in Somalia relate to each other and with foreign organisations and enterprises (Marangio, 2012). However, religious clans, particularly Islamic groups, have been providing safety nets for most impoverished Somalis (Marangio, 2012). Most Somali members of Islamic groups have joined religious groups as opportunists trying to get out of poverty (*ibid.*).

Rwanda: The Example of an Iconic and Rising State through private sector-driven development

Rwanda met most of its MDGs, as seen in improved living standards, poverty reduction, significant decreases in child mortality and a reduction in inequality from 0.49 to 0.45, as measured by the Gini coefficient (World Bank, 2017). The social, political and economic context of Rwanda was largely devastated by the civil war and genocide in the 1990s (Gready, 2010). Despite these devastating events, Rwanda has gone through significant positive political, social and economic developments recovering its turbulent history (Finn, 2017; World Bank, 2017). However, some social effects seem difficult to recover from. The devastating events increased poverty levels, increased vulnerability levels, gave rise to child- and women-headed families, the deterioration of health care in Rwanda, amongst other problems (Kantengwa, 2009; Gready, 2010; Finn 2017; World Bank, 2017).

The post-genocide challenges can be best addressed through collaboration between government and the SSE (Gready, 2010). However, Rwanda is a hard case for social and solidarity organisations and enterprises. As observed by World Bank (2017), Rwanda focuses more on private sector-driven development and not specifically as much on as much on SSE. Unlike in South Africa, (World Bank, 2017: 20) argues that Rwanda sees “low SEE activity in service sectors beyond faith-based organizations and local companies”. Kantengwa (2009) argues that this is largely a result of personalised and ad hoc policies on the SSE. Politically, Rwanda is known for its autocratic style of leadership. The autocratic government is described by Finn (2017: 206) as ruthless, violent, and oppressive as it suppresses and prevents the civil society from criticising the government. Gready (2010) asserts that social enterprises and organisations which seem to divert from prevailing government ideologies are characterised by the government as being ‘against us’ and often suspended. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and NGOs have been the victims of the government’s iron fist. Members of the Rwanda Patriotic Fund (RPF), for instance, infiltrated top posts in local NGOs, ‘umbrella’ groups and collectives as a way of gaining control of SSE organisations and enterprises (Finn, 2017; Gready, 2010).

Not all of Rwanda’s policies have brought the much-needed SSE recovery (Kantengwa, 2009; Gready, 2010). Some of Rwanda’s intolerant policies are actually having a significant negative impact on the SSE (Finn, 2017). This is evidenced by urban policies in Rwanda that are against informal traders in urban areas (Finn 2017; Gready, 2010). Kigali for instance has policies that focus more of a utopian city that is clean and efficient but these policies, however, do not cater for the majority of the people in the city (Finn 2017). Social groups that should be encouraged and supported are, rather, discriminated, criminalised and excluded in Rwanda (Kantengwa, 2009; Gready, 2010; Finn 2017).

Nigeria: The Example of a Country with a Bigger Potential in the Demographic Dividend

Regarded as the most populous country in Africa, Nigeria is on the verge of experiencing a potential demographic dividend (Reed and Mberu, 2014). Despite having vast resources, Nigeria has a myriad of social problems (Reed and Mberu, 2014; Olutuyi, 2016). Nigeria is considered to be one of the African countries with a large population living in poverty. Apart from poverty challenges, Nigeria faces other challenges that include income disparities, malnutrition, illiteracy and diseases, just to mention a few. Olutuyi (2016) suggests that Nigeria needs the SSE to address these social ills. However, the country lacks clear public policies and legislations in support of SSE.

The SSE in Nigeria can be said to be diverse in nature. However, there are significant challenges that hamstring it (Olutuyi, 2016). For instance, CSOs in Nigeria tend to be exclusive to certain spatial areas and classes (Ikelegbe, 2013). That way, CSO can be interpreted as being mostly the terrain of the privileged elite and middle class, while side-lining the poor (Ikelegbe, 2013; Reed and Mberu, 2014). This has resulted in social enterprises and organisations becoming biased against the poor and the less privileged, for instance more CSOs are urban based and tend to marginalise the rural side (Olutuyi, 2016). There are some success stories relating to social enterprises in Nigeria. Paradigm Initiative Nigeria (PIN) and Foodbank Nigeria, for instance, are social enterprises that have been instrumental in empowering youths with Information and Communication Technology (ICT)-enabled opportunities and food production respectively (Reed and Mberu, 2014; Julius, 2015). In addition, cooperative societies to farmers have resulted in improving food security in areas such as Abia State and Enugu State.

Discussion and Synthesis

The success of the SSE in SDGs is largely hinged on enabling environments created by governments through policies and legislation. Operations of the SSE are largely a result of the existing political, legal and institutional environment (Cvetanovic *et al.* 2015). The autonomy and security of the SSE organisation and enterprises are critical for the smooth operation of SSE. The relations between state and SSE are at times complex and this complexity is tailor-made by states in less developed countries (Kabeer, 2011). This is a pure indication of the unwillingness together with incapacity of states to guarantee basic security for the social organisations and enterprises (Utting, 2015). In a scenario where citizens, organisations and enterprises do not have autonomy, security and rights, they become vulnerable to manipulation by powerful elites (Kabeer 2011).

As argued by Ikelegbe (2013), governments are particularly distrustful and suspicious of the social organisations that receive foreign funding, collaboration and support. In Zimbabwe and Nigeria, for instance, the operations of NGOs with foreign support once resulted in mistrust between the government and the NGOs, making in the environment in which NGOs operate tense (Dorman, 2001; Julius, 2015). Without trust between actors in governments and the SSE, the latter will be used as a hegemonic instrument to secure compliance to existing power structures (Cater, 2006).

SSE often faces challenges of co-optation into political processes, lack of clear benchmarks and the absence of good governance frameworks. In Zimbabwe for instance, cooperatives were useful in housing before 2000 when policies that were politically motivated were introduced. Since 2000, the politics of patronage in cooperatives affairs largely resulted in the abuse of resources, members and power. In Rwanda for instance, CSOs and NGOs have been the victims of infiltration of members of the Rwanda Patriotic Fund (RPF) and thereby disrupting the performance of CSOs and NGOs. More so, members of RPF infiltrated ‘umbrella’ groups and collectives as a way of gaining control of SSE organisations and enterprises. This affected the autonomy and independence of SSE and thereby affecting the potential of SSE in the realisation of SDGs.

From the discussed case studies, it has been observed that lack of robust policies and legislations promoting SSE hinder the success of SSE. In Zimbabwe for instance, pieces of legislation in the country relating to the SSE are disjointed and fragmented. In Nigeria for instance, it has been noted that there is lack of clear public policies and legislations in support of SSE. More so, social enterprises and organisations in Nigeria have become biased against the poor and the less privileged, for instance more CSOs are urban based and tend to marginalise the rural side. In Rwanda, it has been observed that some of Rwanda's intolerant policies are actually having a significant negative impact on the SSE (Finn, 2017). This is evidenced by urban policies in Rwanda that are against informal traders in urban areas.

As has been observed in Zimbabwe, South Africa, Nigeria and Somalia, cooperatives have proved useful in service delivery to the poorest populace in societies. In Zimbabwe, cooperatives have proved useful in housing delivery to the poor and vulnerable group. In Somalia, agricultural cooperatives proved useful in contributing significantly to improving food security and creating employment opportunities for women, youths and marginalised small-scale farmers. By improving food security, cooperatives help in addressing Goal Number 1 and 2 of the SDGs. The SSE through cooperatives has proved to be important for the realisation of SDGs such as gender equality, zero hunger and no poverty. The dynamics of coalitions and groups can help to eliminate some unwanted challenges which fragmented societies cannot eliminate (Birkland, 2007). With SSE, societies can benefit from 'strength in numbers', since their concerns quickly gain the attention of decision-makers. Moreover, the SSE enables the poor and vulnerable to take part in development and to be represented effectively.

Participation (especially in the form of organised and membership groups) constitutes a very important pillar of implementation of SDG goals such as poverty reduction and gender equality. There is participation in development and participation as development. Participation in development implies that the public contributes to setting development goals as well as the implementation of goals. Participation as development implies that by the public participating, it is considered a step towards development. Bearing that in mind, the realisation of SDG goals calls for greater participation of vulnerable groups, women, youths, and the poor. With the efforts being made towards realising the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the SSE is a practical and useful vehicle to attaining the objectives of Agenda 2030. Social enterprises in Rwanda and Nigeria have proved useful in increasing participation of the general public on developmental affairs. A systematic review of the modalities of engaging the SSE is critical, learning from past experiences, especially how its successes and failures in the implementation of the ended Millennium Development Goals.

Conclusion and Policy Options

This study sought to explore the constraints and options relating to the SSE in Africa and how the constraints can be addressed for the SSE to contribute to achieving the SDGs in Africa. An examination of global experiences revealed that the SSE is being utilised to meet economic, social and environmental development goals. Emerging from the study are three major hindrances to the SSE namely: co-optation into political processes, lack of clear benchmarks and absence of good governance frameworks. It can be concluded that the SSE is underutilised in Africa. However, African countries need to fully benefit from the SSE by creating environments that are conducive for its operation. The SSE provides multiple opportunities to address the challenges of poverty, inequality, vulnerability and environmental protection. Moving forward, there is need for clear policies, legislations and environments to promote and guide SSE. Policies guide the operationalization of SSE. Improving the independence and autonomy of SSE is key in improving the functionality of SSE. This will improve the enabling environment for SSE. It has been observed from this paper that good governance is a prerequisite for the smooth operation of SSE.

References

- Adjibolosoo, S., 1998. The Human Factor: Foundation for development and democracy. In: Chivaura, V.G. and Mararike, C.G., 1998. *The Human Factor Approach to Development in Africa*. University of Zimbabwe (UZ) Publications, Harare.
- Birkland, T.A. 2007. Agenda Setting in Public Policy. In: Fischer, F., Miller, G.J., and Sidney, M.S. (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*. Taylor & Francis Group: Boca Raton/London/New York.
- Blok, J.T.N. 2010. State Failure in Somalia: Causes of Instability and Insecurity. *Atlantisch perspectief*, 32(2), pp. 1-8.
- Borzaga, C., Salvatori, G. and Bonini, R., 2017. *Social and Solidarity Economy and the Future of Work*. Euricse Working Paper for the ILO/International Labour Office, Geneva: ILO.
- Cain, G. (2015). Bad Governance in Zimbabwe and Its Negative Consequences. *The Downtown Review*, 2(I), pp. 1-7.
- Cater, E. 2006. Ecotourism as a Western Construct. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 5(1-2), pp. 23-39
- Chakawarika, B. (2011). *Challenges Faced by NGOs in the Political Harsh Climate of Zimbabwe: Analysing the Effects on Sustainability and Promotion of Human Rights*. Masters Thesis. University of Gothenburg, Roehampton University and University of Tromsø
- Chivaura, V.G. 1998. Human Factor Development: Agenda for the Future. In: Chivaura, V.G. and Mararike, C.G., 1998. *The human factor approach to development in Africa*. University of Zimbabwe (UZ) Publications, Harare.
- Chiweshe, M.K. (2014). Understanding Social and Solidarity Economy in Emergent Communities: Lessons from Post-Fast Track Land Reform Farms in Mazowe, Zimbabwe, UNRISD Occasional Paper: Potential and Limits of Social and Solidarity Economy, No. 1, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva
- Cvetanovic, S., Despotovic, D. and Filipovic, M. 2015. The Concept of Social Capital in Economic Theory. *Ekohomhka*, 61(1), pp. 73-84.
- Finn, B., 2017. Quietly Chasing Kigali: Young Men and the Intolerance of Informality in Rwanda's Capital City. *Urban Forum*, 29(2), pp. 205-218.
- Gready, P. 2010. 'You're either with us or against us': Civil Society and Policy Making in Post-Genocide Rwanda. *African Affairs*, 109(437), pp. 637-657
- Ikelegbe, A.O. 2013. *The State and Civil Society in Nigeria: Towards a Partnership for Sustainable Development*. Centre for Population and Environmental Development: Benin City
- International Labour Organisation, 2010. *The Reader 2010: Social and Solidarity Economy: Building a Common Understanding*. Turin: International Training Centre of the International Labour Organisation.
- Julius, A. 2015. Comparative Analysis of Cooperative and Non-cooperative Farmers' access to Farm Inputs in Abuja, Nigeria. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, (41), pp. 39-50
- Kantengwa, A. 2009. Financial Cooperatives in Rwanda: Historical Background and Regulation. *Expert Group Meeting on Cooperatives*
- Laville, J.L. 2014. The Social and Solidarity Economy: A theoretical and Plural Framework. *Social Enterprise and the Third Sector*, 2(5), pp. 118-129.
- Liou, T.Y. and Chang, N.Y., 2008. The Applications of Social Capital Theory in Education. *Hsiuping Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11, pp.99-122.
- Lollo, E. 2012. Toward a Theory of Social Capital Definition: Its Dimensions and Resulting Social Capital Types. *14th World Congress of Social Economics*. Available at: <http://socialeconomics.orgPapersLollo1C.pdf>. [Accessed 17 July 2018].
- Marangio, R. 2012. The Somali Crisis: Failed State and International Interventions. Istituto Affari Internazionali Working Papers 1215
- Mhembwe, S. & Dube, E., 2017. The Role of Cooperatives in Sustaining the Livelihoods of Rural Communities: The case of rural cooperatives in Shurugwi District, Zimbabwe. *Jãmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 9(1), pp. 341-355

- Miller, E. 2006. Other Economies Are Possible! Dollars & Sense 266:11. Available at: http://www.geo.coop/sites/default/files/Other%20Economies%20Are%20Possible_GEO%20Section%20of%20D&S.pdf. [Accessed 17 July 2018].
- Morais, L.P. 2014. *Social and Solidarity Economy and South-South and Triangular Cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean: Contributions to Inclusive Sustainable Development*. ITC.
- Reed, H.E and Mberu, B.U., 2014. Capitalizing on Nigeria's demographic dividend: reaping the benefits and diminishing the burdens. *Etude Popul Afr*; 27(2), pp. 319-330.
- Steinman, S. 2017. *Public Policies for the Social and Solidarity Economy: Towards an enabling environment. The case of South Africa*. Turin: International Training Centre of the International Labour Organisation
- Steinman, S. and van Rooij, J., 2012, February. Developing Public Policies for the Social and Solidarity Economy in South Africa. *Universitas Forum*, 3(2), pp. 1-14
- United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), 2014. Social and Solidarity Economy and the Challenge of Sustainable Development. Available at: http://www.socioeco.org/bdf_fiche-document-3229_en.html. [Accessed 15 July 2018].
- Utting, P. 2015. Introduction: The Challenge of Scaling up Social and Solidarity Economy. *Social and solidarity Economy: Beyond the fringe*, 3(4), pp.1-37.
- Venugopalan, H. 2017. Somalia: A Failed State? Observer Research Foundation, Issue Brief No. 170
- Wanyama, F.O. 2012. *The social and Solidarity Economy in African Development: The Role of Cooperatives*. Paper prepared for a Cooperative Symposium on "Perspectives for Cooperatives in Southern Africa", Protea Hotel, Cairo Road, Lusaka, Zambia, 20- 21 August, 2012
- World Bank, 2017. The World Bank in Rwanda. Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/rwanda/overview>. [Accessed 17 July 2018].