



ASIAN SOLIDARITY
ECONOMY COUNCIL



UP ASIAN CENTER



UP COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
SYMPOSIUM ON SOCIAL AND SOLIDARITY ECONOMY
AS AN ALTERNATIVE
DEVELOPMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY**

Sponsored by
Asian Solidarity Economy Coalition,
UP Asian Center, and
UP College of Social Work and Community Development

2 March 2013, 2.30 to 5.00 PM

Venue: UP CSWCD Library

Chair: UP Asian Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

Program

Proceedings

Annexes

A—"Global Public Policy: Ensuring Social Solidarity Economy is a Cornerstone of Sustainable Development Agenda" by Datuk Dr. Denison Jayasooria

B—Reflection on Social & Solidarity Economy (SSE) as an Alternative Development Policy and Strategy
by Prof. Nathalie A. Verceles

C—Reflection on Social & Solidarity Economy as an Alternative Development Policy and Strategy
by Mr. Jay Bertram Lacsamana

D—Registration List and Directory of Participants

E—Photos

F—5th RIPESS Global Forum of Social Solidarity Economy: Building SSE as an alternative model of development: Program, Manila, Philippines, 15-18 October 2013

BACKGROUND

In the midst of the ongoing global crisis, people have lost faith in the old way and are now looking for a new recipe for sustainable development. An emerging alternative to the neoliberal economy is the social and solidarity economy (SSE). This has recently caught the attention of the UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) as it prepares its research focus for the international development community to consider its post-2015 development agenda.

Researchers, advocates and practitioners of development work are also looking for new ways to advance sustainable development, especially in the light of the failure of Rio+20 to reach a new consensus on our planet's conservation. The "Symposium on Social & Solidarity Economy as an Alternative Development Policy and Strategy" addresses this important concern.

The main speaker of the symposium is Datuk Dr. Denison Jayasooria, former commissioner of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia and concurrently the ASEC Continental Asia Vice-Chair and Board Member of the RIPESS global network (Intercontinental Network for the Promotion of Social and Solidarity Economy). He presents his views on SSE, and how it could become part of the global sustainable development agenda and be recognized as a viable option.

Registered participants are provided with an e-copy of two background papers: one by Dr. Jayasooria, "Global Public Policy: Ensuring Social Solidarity Economy is a Cornerstone of Sustainable Development Agenda," and the other by Dr. Benjamin R. Quiñones, Jr. (ASEC Chairman and Executive Coordinator of RIPESS), "Rediscovering Solidarity Economy."

It is the hope of the symposium's organizers that the March 2 Symposium will pave the way for a robust dialogue on SSE to blossom in the University of the Philippines.

PROGRAM

1.30-2.30 *Registration*

2.30-3.00 *Introduction of Participants*

3.00-3.15 *Welcome and Introduction of Guest Speaker*

Welcome Remarks

—by Dr. Carolyn I. Sobritchea
Dean of the Asian Center (AC)

Introduction of the Guest Speaker

—by Dr. Benjamin R. Quiñones, Jr.
Chairperson of the Asian Solidarity Economy Council (ASEC)

3.15-4.15 *Talk and Reflections*

Talk

—by Datuk Dr. Denison Jayasooria
Principal Research Fellow, Institute of Ethnic Studies, UKM
Honorary Chair, Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Binary University
Deputy Chair, Asian Solidarity Economy Coalition
Board Member, RIPESS

Reflections from Panel of Reactors

—by Dr. Ed C. Tadem
Professor, UP AC

—by Prof. Nathalie A. Verceles
Professor, Department of Women and Development Studies,
UP CSWCD

—by Mr. Jay Bertram Lacsamana
Executive Director, Foundation for Sustainable Society Inc. (FSSI)

—by Mr. Wyden King
President, Armadillo Holdings Inc. (AHI)

4.15-4.45 *Open Forum*

4.45-5.00 *Closing Session*
—by Dr. Benjamin R. Quiñones, Jr.

—Announcement on the RIPESS Global Forum
October 15-18, 2013, Manila, Philippines

Moderator: Dr. Rosalinda Pineda-Ofreneo
Dean, UP CSWCD

PROCEEDINGS

Introduction of Participants

Dr. Rosalinda Pineda-Ofreneo
Dean, UP CSWCD

Welcome Remarks

Dr. Carolyn I. Sobritchea
Dean, UP AC

I ask permission from the organizers to introduce myself not only as a member of the academic community but also as a long-standing member of the NGO movement in the Philippines.

In behalf of the Asian Solidarity Economy Coalition, the UP Asian Center, the UP College of Social Work and Community Development, I welcome all of you, our distinguished guest, my faculty colleagues, friends, students, non-teaching staff of UP to this afternoon's symposium on "*Social and solidarity economy as an alternative development policy and strategy.*"

Allow me to congratulate ASEC for inviting us to participate in this very important event. This is very important for us, primarily, because we are bringing into the campus knowledge that we hopefully can mainstream into our academic program—experiences that come from civil society, from the musings and struggles of our friends outside of academe. I would like to say though that UP is composed of faculty members who straddle both the academe and the civil society world. So, it is not as if we are really oblivious to what is happening in the outside world. Although we are situating this afternoon's discussion within the context of ongoing global crisis, I want to believe that many of us have, over the past 50 years, already participated in various initiatives to challenge mainstream development agendas and paradigms to address class, ethnic and gender issues in our society.

As a senior faculty, allow me to share with you some of my memories. For my friends over here, remember the labels we used to frame our politics and ideological locations. These were labels that we took seriously because with this identity we managed to start what you are doing now—look at innovative, untested but hopefully useful strategies to address many of the festering issues that our country has confronted since time immemorial. I want to believe that these were all initial attempts to put flesh and blood to what is known now as solidarity economy or social enterprise and more modern ways by which we try to engage society.

On a more personal note, I remember, for instance, having participated in many NGOs and PO initiatives. I have sat as the member of the board of directors of nearly 18 NGOs. I remember PPI (Philippine Peasant Institute), when we started promoting alternative marketing for rice. That was one initiative to control the market. So we did this for several years while some of us were in Congress trying to pass the land reform bill. So we were doing strategies at the local level and others were doing policy-advocacy. Then, we went and ventured into organizing all the fisherfolk in the Philippines and we ended having the National Coalition of Fisherfolk. We know Lito Anofñuevo, for instance, who played a great role.

My friends in Anthropology also did their own share in trying to organize the IPs and all the anthropologists. The outcome is the IPRA law which is up to now a very controversial law. I remember Kaisang Palad also; Kaisang Palad tried fair trade, which is now being carried out by Alter Trade. I am very proud of these initial musings. So now we have a long experience of fair trade with other countries, with friends and comrades from other countries.

We went through a long journey of promoting gender equality and women's rights in this country. With this initiative, we have many strategies, approaches, policy-advocacy initiatives. And I want to believe that we did some good things for this society. But that is not the end of the story. I tell my students, "We deserve a little pat on the shoulders. But that should be quick because *tama ba yong nagawa namin?*" Did we do the right thing? Everytime we open the newspapers, we read that 30% of Filipinos still live in poverty. I will end my opening and welcome remarks with this challenge.

I want to believe that we, the mothers, the fathers, the pioneers, have done some good things but I think we committed mistakes along the way. Perhaps things have moved very fast that what we thought were right ways of doing are no longer appropriate today.

I welcome solidarity economy and its initiative to interrogate all the new challenges in the context of all the crises in this globalized world. With that as welcome remarks, let's have an engaged afternoon *at mabuhay tayong lahat!*

Introduction of the Guest Speaker

Dr. Benjamin R. Quiñones, Jr.
Chairperson, ASEC

Talk

“Global Public Policy: Ensuring Social Solidarity Economy as a Cornerstone of Sustainable Development Agenda”

Datuk Dr. Denison Jayasooria
Principal Research Fellow, Institute of Ethnic Studies, UKM
Honorary Chair, Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Binary University
Deputy Chair, Asian Solidarity Economy Coalition
Board Member, RIPESS

[See Annex A]

Reflections from the Panel of Reactors

Dr. Ed C. Tadem
Professor, UP AC

Summary:

Dr. Tadem presented a perspective that is contrary to the view laid out by Dr. Denison. He thinks it is difficult to work with business and for-profit corporations. Saying that he is not a believer in the role of the state, he thinks that grassroots economic initiatives that are oblivious of or not really influenced by the state are actually the harbingers of true change, a change that is autonomous and people-centered.

Prof. Nathalie A. Verceles
Professor, Department of Women and Development Studies, UP CSWCD

[See Annex B]

Mr. Jay Bertram Lacsamana
Executive Director, FSSI

[See Annex C]

Mr. Wyden King
President, AHI

Summary:

Mr. King talked about change of heart and change of values. A big part of solidarity economy bottom line is the emphasis on the values that animate people and how these should direct all initiatives towards the right path.

Open Forum
Comments and Questions from the Participants

Ms. Tina Ebro
Coordinator, Asia-Europe People's Forum

Ms. Ebro commented on the fact that it is important to promote SSE at this time of crisis, which threatens humanity and the planet. She emphasized the need to advance alternatives like the solidarity economy; by doing so the SSE poses as a challenge to neoliberal capitalism. Also, she pointed to the need to promote the principles of SSE, saying that the market should be embedded in the economy in order to serve the needs of the people, especially the poor majority. She hoped that the state is reclaimed and transformed to a people-centered one.

Ms. Rhea Teves
National Food Coalition

Ms. Teves agreed with Mr. Lacsamana who mentioned in his reflection that power-relations are critical in the advancement of economic growth, that there is a need for the continuation of the agrarian reform program. She advocated the need for the continuance of the agrarian reform program, emphasizing that it is critical to identify who are the vulnerable groups. She pointed out that there is a need for infusion of capital in order for the people to develop the micro-economic enterprises they want. This, however, is hindered by weak implementation and formulation of government policies. She requested from the panel their recommendations for government policy reforms and programs that will assist SSEs in the future.

Response to Ms. Teves from Mr. King

Mr. King pointed out that the government already has many programs. However these programs are not implemented due to corrupt practices. He stressed on the importance of change that must come from the heart.

Response to Ms. Teves from Dr. Tadem

Dr. Tadem does not believe in policy reforms, saying that in his experience policy-making and recommendations (anti-poverty-measures, etc.) are a waste of time. He mentioned that all these will fall on deaf ears. Stressing that he believes in self-empowerment, he said that the only way people can change their lives is by empowering themselves. Communities must undertake their own economic programs by establishing at the community level their own organs of powers and practicing indigenous ways of engaging the market.

Response to Ms. Teves from Dr. Jayasooria

Dr. Denison emphasized the need to bring these concerns to the public, in terms of making policy public in the public space and public reasoning. Public reform has to be initiated through popular advocacies and public lobbying, moving the advocacy to the grassroots.

Response to Ms. Teves from Mr. Lacsamana

Mr. Lacsamana emphasized the need to push for economic justice. He mentioned that FSSI lobbied for the passing of the Social Enterprise Bill. However, he believes that there is a need to move in two fronts—advocacy and moving within the network supporters who are in the policy arena.

Response to Ms. Teves from Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo

Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo informed the group that there is already a Magna Carta for Workers in the Informal Economy filed in both Houses of Congress. This bill contains provisions embodying the principles and practices of solidarity economy.

Dr. Emmanuel M. Luna

Chair, Social Protection Cluster

Professor, Department of Community Development, UP CSWCD

Dr. Luna mentioned that, in his observation, there have been previous labels to the same concept of SSE. He asked for a clarification whether SSE is a new label to social-oriented economy. He asked if SSE exists as one concept or if it exists in several pluralist types/models.

Ms. Ma. Theresa Matibag

MAWD Student, UP CSWCD

Ms. Matibag shared her experience on community enterprise in the Southeast Asian region. She likened the concept of solidarity economy to nirvana, and feminist solidarity economy to a higher nirvana. By saying this, she believes that community enterprises which are culture-based, rights-based, etc. will be able to link to communities through regional exchanges to a wider national, regional network.

Ms. Princess Nemenzo

Kampanya Para sa Makataong Pamumuhay

Ms. Nemenzo commented on the fact that SSE must be promoted. Since there is a need to look at the problems and the needs of the poor and the marginalized, there is a need to campaign for transformative social protection. Contributions to the SSE concept from the feminist and the environmentalist movement ensure that there is harmony between human beings and nature. She hoped to see more discussions on social solidarity economy leading to the October global forum.

Dr. Marlyne Sahakian

Post-doctorate Fellow, Ateneo de Manila University

Dr. Sahakian posed a question for Dr. Jayasooria. Pointing out the failures of the Rio+20, she asked if economic growth is compatible with social

equity and environment concern. In the Philippines, she pointed out that the values system of SSE is made more explicit—people first. She asked if people and planet should come first, and make economy as a third objective.

Response to Dr. Sahakian by Dr. Jayasooria

Dr. Denison thinks that the Rio+20 Document has been criticized for not being inclusive—people-focus is not enough. However, he believes that there are lessons and insights from the document. He recommends using the clichés and terms in the document by giving depth to these. He pointed out that there is a need to bring the focus to people. There must be an emphasis on a healthy balance through people-empowerment.

Ms. Myrna Magbitang
Project Manager, Homenet SEA

Ms. Magbitang mentioned that the values of SSE are also the values behind cooperativism. She pointed out that cooperatives are the real social enterprise.

Mr. Jun Aguilar
OFW Advocates

Explaining that land-based workers pay higher placement fees in comparison to sea-based workers, who do not pay placement fees at all, in the ASEAN region, Mr., an OFW, asked what the SSE and its linkages can do to help change this. He pointed out that migrant workers have an impact on SSE as they provide capital for the SSE in the Philippines.

Closing Session

Dr. Benjamin R. Quiñones, Jr. gave his closing remarks as well as comments to the questions raised from the floor.

Former Mayor of Quezon City, Mr. Jun Simon, Chair of the National Organizing Committee (NOC) and Vice-Chair of ASEC, invited the UP CSWCD through Dr. Rosalinda Pineda-Ofreneo to co-chair the coming RIPESS Global Forum which will be held in Manila, Philippines on October 15-18, 2013. In response, Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo, as current Dean of the UP CSWCD, gladly accepted the invitation.

Book and other publication materials were exchanged as gifts between the ASEC and UP CSWCD. The UP CSWCD, through Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo, gave ASEC and Dr. Jayasooria copies of the 4-volume Philippine Journal of Social Development. ASEC, through Dr. Quiñones and Dr. Jayasooria, gave the UP CSWCD (and the

Asian Center) a copy each of “Developments in Solidarity Economy in Asia” (Jayasooria, 2013), and “Sowing the Seeds of Solidarity Economy: Asian experiences” (Quiñones, 2012).

ANNEX A

“Global Public Policy: Ensuring Social Solidarity Economy is a Cornerstone of Sustainable Development Agenda”

Datuk Dr. Denison Jayasooria

Principal Research Fellow, Institute of Ethnic Studies, UKM
Honorary Chair, Centre for Social Entrepreneurship, Binary University
Deputy Chair, Asian Solidarity Economy Coalition
Board Member, RIPESS

Introduction

- In the context of global economic crisis there is a global search for alternative economic arrangements. There is a loss of confidence towards state driven economic models and initiatives as well as market driven, while the free market models continues to dominate the global business environment.
- The critical question in this public policy discussion is how the social solidarity economy is surfacing at the global and national public policy formulation process
- One major global process for global consensus was the Rio+20 event and policy outcome. The global event United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development took place in Rio, Brazil from June 20 to 22, 2012. Emerging as an outcome is the document entitled ‘The Future we want’
- In this paper an analysis is made based on the outcome document and the urgent agenda over the next few years to raise the global profile of social solidarity conceptual framework as well as effective models so as to make a policy impact and incorporation of this agenda a core ideological and strategic component of sustainable development.
- However this paper does not undertake a critical analysis of the outcome document nor make reference to the alternative people’s summit and the 14 People sustainability treaties which have articulated the shortcoming of the UN outcome document.

Core themes from Rio outcome document comparison

- The UN outcome document has a number of core values which is also shared by social solidarity economy. Central to this dimension is the theme of inclusive and equitable economic growth and distribution
- In paragraph 9 there is a commitment to human rights, in paragraph 10, it is towards democracy, good governance and rule of law and in paragraph 13 is an emphasis on participation, decision making and voicing concern
- In addition the key features of sustainable development are highlighted namely economic, social and environmental dimensions as indicated in paragraph 1. These are similar to the triple bottom approach.
- Dr Ben Quinones in his article 'Social Economy as an approach to building sustainable communities territories' develops a five dimensional framework'. These include governance, edifying values, social development services, environmental conservation measures and economic sustainability.

Specific references from the Rio outcome document

- There are three specific references on themes related to alternative economies and arrangements:
 - The first is reference to corporate social responsibility in paragraph 46 (page 8) which focused on public and private sector cooperation for sustainability development.
 - The second reference is on the valuable contributions of the non-governmental organizations as noted in paragraph 53 (pg 9) especially in promoting sustainable development.
 - The third reference of relevance is paragraph 70 (page 12) where there is an acknowledgment of the role of cooperatives and microenterprise in addressing poverty and enabling social inclusion.

Strategies for future action

- The UN Rio +20 outcome document has a number of specific strategies over the next few years towards 2015 especially so in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).
- The United Nations has established an intergovernmental committee comprising 30 experts with the mandate of developing sustainable development goals (SDG) which will replace the MDG in 2015.
- SSE partners in Asean through Asian Solidarity Economy Coalition (ASEC) could play a key role in networking with the Asean Connectivity section to ensure that Asean member countries adopt the social business and solidarity economy as a key policy
- At the Global level ASEC must work with other continental partners through RIPESS to influence both the national and regional bodies of both public sector and NGO sector

- One process that ASEC has initiated is documenting grassroots examples through case studies using a five-fold framework developed by Dr. Ben Quiñones, Jr..

References

- Benjamin R Quinones (2012) *Sowing the Seeds of Solidarity Economy, Asian Experiences* (Malaysia: JJ Resources)
- Denison Jayasooria (2012) *Developments in Solidarity Economy in Asia* (Malaysia: JJ Resources) forthcoming
- Denison Jayasooria (2012a) 'Rio Commitments for sustainability- The future we want' (Malay Mail, July 9, 2012)
- Denison Jayasooria (2012b) 'Sustainable Development for benefits of all' (Malay Mail, July 5, 2012)
- Denison Jayasooria (2012c) 'Towards a more inclusive capitalism' (Malay Mail, April 23, 2012)
- Denison Jayasooria (2012d) 'Global Movement for alternative economy' (Malay Mail, April 30, 2012)
- Muhammad Yunus (2010) *Building Social Business, The new kind of capitalism that serves humanity's most pressing needs* (New York: Public Affairs)

ANNEX B

Reflection on Social & Solidarity Economy (SSE) as an Alternative Development Policy and Strategy

by Prof. Nathalie A. Verceles
Professor, Department of Women and Development Studies
UP College of Social Work and Community Development

Good afternoon. My dissertation, which is a work in progress, is on solidarity economics, and it is tentatively entitled "Livelihood Practices of Women in the Informal Economy in the Philippines: Forging Pathways Towards a Feminist Solidarity Economy."

Dr. Ben Quiñones, one of our speakers, is a member of my dissertation panel. After reading my dissertation proposal, he asked, and I quote him: "What is a feminist solidarity economy? Is it a solidarity-based economy where interdependent enterprises are managed and operated by women throughout the entire supply chain? Or is it an economy that upholds feminist values such as "compassion," "caring," "sharing," "relationship-building," "social inclusion," as against the masculine values of "dominance," "competition," "performance," "logistics," etc.?"

Well, it is the latter, but much more nuanced, as it is both sensitive and responsive to women's gender-specific needs and interests. A feminist solidarity economy is not characterized by the sex of its actors (that is, all female), but rather, by the feminist principles that should animate it, namely:

it values all work that contributes to human well-being (reproductive, productive, and community work)
the key actor goes beyond the gender-based roles dictated by capitalist economics in terms of paid and unpaid work (or the gender division labor)
it aims for the breakdown of all oppressive economic hierarchies (such as that between capitalist and worker, monopolist and buyer, monopsonist and producer)
the key actor is a solidaristic person who is socially-responsible and cooperative
it actively rejects gender, class, race, ethnicity hierarchies and all forms of domination and subordination
it reorients economies from profit-making to the provision of human needs
it strives for ecological sustainability and is premised on respect for nature

Most of these principles have already been articulated by proponents of the solidarity economy as fundamental if it is to succeed as an alternative to the dominant capitalist/ neoliberal model. As a proponent of a feminist solidarity economy, I must emphasize that the solidarity economy, as envisioned by its champions, cannot realize its goal of meeting the triple bottom line targets of social and human development, environmental and economic sustainability if it is not also gender-transformative.

What does this mean? There is recognition of gender asymmetries in wealth and asset ownership, in income, power, decision-making, access to and control over economic and social resources, in roles, opportunities, and constraints. The transformation of unequal gender relations must clearly be on the agenda for action, otherwise there is the danger that women will continue to be discriminated against, exploited, marginalized, oppressed and subordinated even within the solidarity economy model. This requires the promotion of shared power and decision-making between women and men, greater access to and control over economic and social resources by women, and support for women's empowerment across the institutions of the state, the market, the community, and the household. Women's cultural, economic, and social rights must be upheld; reproductive work should be recognized, reduced, and redistributed; and the gender division of labor and the socially constructed image of women as subordinate must be opposed.

Again, solidarity economics cannot live up to its promise of ensuring environmental and economic sustainability, social and human development for all its stakeholders unless it is explicitly feminist in both its conception and in its practice.

ANNEX C

Reflection on Social & Solidarity Economy as an Alternative Development Policy and Strategy

by Mr. Jay Bertram Lacsamana
Executive Director
Foundation for a Sustainable Society Inc. (FSSI)

Reflection 1. The first question that came to my mind when I learned of the title/topic of the symposium (and was asked to share my reflections) is: “Aren’t all (the Philippine MT) Development Plan(s) and policies, if they profess to be pro-poor and adhere to an economic system for the poor, the marginalized, and the economically-excluded, necessarily or already support social and solidarity economy and its principles?” I am speaking here both as one that have been into government service and now as head of FSSI, an NGO. The topic inevitably brings me back to my days in the Philippine development planning agency, NEDA, where principles and frameworks whose features are very much consistent with SSE and its principles were written into DPs and respective RDPs and local plans. To name a few: Gender and development integration, population and development (correct identification and targeting of the poor & convergence of projects to poor communities and sectors), social reform agenda (SRA) and safety nets for the economically vulnerable sector, agrarian reform, rural industrialization and physical framework and land use planning, disaster-sensitive and climate change framework, etc.

Reflection 2. The obvious answer is that: (1) Plans are indeed SSE sounding and pro-poor but there’s the rub: they remain plans – lofty and academically elegant. And as in most plans, they remain in the shelves gathering dust and revisited when assessment comes and new political administrations assume office. They remain unimplemented. (2) In cases where plans are translated in programs and implemented, much of the results and impact are mediocre and have not really favored the poor in an economically meaningful way. Also, while plans may indeed embody pro-poor policies, they are also incorporate aspirations of the economic elite and the conglomerates that may not necessarily support social and solidarity economy especially when their interests are at stake.

Reflection 3. It is the practice and implementation that matters when it comes to public policies that favor and support the SSE frame. Here, I can cite two pathways where there are shortcomings: (a) delivery of economic justice and public entitlements and (b) policies and programs to promote enterprise for the poor and economically excluded.

Reflection 4. Economic justice remains elusive, unfinished and support to it remain sporadic at best and biased at their worst:

a. Land Reform and support services:

i. Lands undistributed are the most productive lands – While CARP target coverage is “almost finished” (it’s in the high 80s%), the remaining lands for

distribution are actually the most productive and are still in the hands of the economic and political elite;

ii. Land distributed revert back to owners, converted, or experience reversals and bound to long and arduous litigation processes; (some laws on industrial estates and export processing zones actually take back land already distributed to farmers!)

iii. Support services are pro-rich – “farm to mayor’s house roads”, farm to feeder roads for industrial estates and export processing zones;

iv. Common service facilities and machineries provided are inappropriate and are supplier-driven, not demand driven and informed of sound economies of scale

b. Level playing field and preferential option for the poor’s enterprises - Government procurement – experience of Tahanan and Foundation for These Abled in school chairs and tables and educational toys and props.

c. Social and economic protection of vulnerable – 2015 lifting of tariffs on imported sugar threatens the sugar industry and SEs in Negros

Reflection 5. Government programs for the SSE sector or the social enterprises (SEs) are not customized and designed to address social enterprises of the poor as primary stakeholders. Micro and Small and Medium enterprise program are still generic:

a. Most of those who have benefitted from mSME program of DTI are
i. Small and Medium enterprises – P3m to P99m – even among these enterprises, access and preferential system from the banks remains much to be desired. The SME reached are those that are tied to the large corporation’s value chain.

ii. Microenterprises reached are only the minority of the formal and above-ground enterprises; the more numerous informal, underground micro enterprises and petty traders are not reached by the mSME program of DTI.

b. DA-DAR and DENR - convergence has not taken off in a significant and encompassing way. Most ARCs, particularly the far-flung ones and away from the major markets, are largely underserved. While we do not discount success stories of ARCs that have graduated from rights-based struggle and advocacy-based work to enterprise and local economy work, these have been largely assisted and enabled by foreign assisted projects, civil society organizations, international NGO donors and other funders. On example of successful ARCs/POs, which have transformed themselves into a large enterprise and also a SE is Alter Trade which has solidarity market and practices solidarity trading with Alter Trade Japan in organic muscovado.

c. Microfinance and microcredit programs have been successful in alleviating poverty. With more than two decades of microfinance practice, we have seen the growth of that sector in a very lucrative business while serving the poor of

their micro credit needs for their microenterprises. Microfinance, however, will not sustainably reduce poverty – they may alleviate poverty but not sustainably reduce it. Studies show that only 4 out of a hundred microcredit borrowers graduate into regular businesses (from backyard livelihood and petty trading). Of late, there was an article in the newspaper that quotes a study on microfinance – asserting that microfinance even puts the poor into the debt trap, concluding that microcredit does not reduce poverty in a sustainable and permanent manner.

Reflection 6. At FSSI, we welcome SSE and the whole excitement with the SE sector. Social entrepreneurship has become a byword in the mainstream economic circles and the media. We welcome the various contributions to the SE ecosystem – the cooperative movement, the Go Negosyo program of the business sector, corporate-based social entrepreneurship (or even CSR), the multi-awarded Gawad Kalinga group, the young and innovative social entrepreneurs from the top business schools who practice entrepreneurship with a social mission, etc. At FSSI, what we want is to contribute to the development of a critical mass and a contagion of social enterprises – those that SEs with the poor as primary stakeholders or SEPPS – so that these complement significantly in the value chains across a community economy and across a common ecosystem. This is the subset that we want to create a niche in, the SEPPS. Here, the poor are not only treated as suppliers of raw material or produce, or suppliers of labor. Gradually we want the poor to have say in enterprise decision making or even owning stocks, shareholdings in the enterprise itself. This contagion of SEPPS forms the backbone of the SSE.

Reflection 7. In our advocacy, we want to contribute to the favorable enterprise environment for SEs and SEPPS to thrive, become mainstream and/or create their own space in the “market”. And we shall continue to support the promotion and practice of SSE as an alternative development policy and sustainable way of reducing poverty through the extension of development and financial assistance to multiple bottom lines SEs with the poor as primary stakeholders.

ANNEX D

List of Participants

Participants of the Symposium Invited by ASEC	
Azwin, Arnold	ASP-UP
Aguilar, Jun	M4NT
Azurin, Miriam	FSSI
Bernardo, Jeanne Marie	OEWDF
Biolena, Marion	WFTO-Asia
Biolena, Maritess	WFTO-Asia
Cairo, Chosica	AHI
Casuga, Petronila Jr.	OEDWF
Cordero, Adelinda	WEDPRO
Corpuz, Rey	AHI
de Guzman, Ed	OEWDF
de Ocampo, Norberto	AHI
Habito, Cielito	ACERD
Habito, Pilar	LLOP
Jayasooria, Dr. Denison	UKM
Jaylo, Loreto	AHI
King, Wyden	AHI
Lacsamana, Jay	FSSI
Lee, Joseph	OEWF
Nieves, Cora	
Ofreneo, Dr. Rene	M4NT
Pacantao, Bubut	KAMP-IPD
Padilla, Rojo	Earth Conservation. Asia
Panganiban, Hilda	OEWF
Panganiban, Jeremy	WLB
Pascual, Maitet	PilipinasEcofiber Corp
Person 1	APPEND
Person 2	APPEND
Quiñones, Dr. Benjamin Jr.	RIPESS
Rasquero, Rose Sharon	OEWF
Reyes, Per	AHI
Sahakian, Dr. Marlyne	Post-doctorate Fellow, Ateneo de Manila
Santos, Ernita	AHI
Sapinoso, Janice	OEWDF
Simon, Brigido Jr.	OEWDF
Tanedo, Mark Andre	FSSI
Veluz, Elaiza	FSSI

Participants of the Symposium Invited by UP AC	
Banares, Abba	Asian Center
Bernal, Ruby	Earth Conservation--Asia
Clemente, Tina	Asian Center
Ganadillo, Ivy	Asian Center
Sobritchea, Dr. Carolyn I.	Dean, Asian Center
Tadem, Dr. Ed C.	Faculty, Asian Center

Participants of the Symposium Invited by UP CSWCD	
Acosta, Atty. Persida	Chief, PAO; DSD Student
Allig, Ana	DSD Student
Bondoc, Frances	MAWD Student
Bravo, Leny Joana	Member, Social Protection Cluster
Cho Bin Yang	CAMP ASIA
Chui Sun Tin	CAMP ASIA
Defensor, Susan	KAMP
dela Cruz, Leonida	Head Librarian, CSWCD
Demigillo, Mary Jane	Administrative Officer, CSWCD
Dulay, Reileen	MAWD Student
Ebro, Tina	Coordinator, Asia-Europe People's Forum
Ferrer, Prof. Elmer	DCD Faculty
Formilleza, Prof. Sammie	DCD Faculty
Gascon, Charisma	CAMP ASIA
Geaga, Monina	Sarilaya
Golfo, Jo-Ann	Member, Social Protection Cluster
Guevara, Charm	MAWD Student
Jardeleza, Prime	Asst. Project Manager, PATAMABA
Kim Da Jeong	CAMP ASIA
Le Van Cong	DSD Student
Lee Chui Yong	CAMP ASIA
Lukban, Butch	Globalpro Workers Cooperative
Luna, Dr. Emmanuel	Chair, Social Protection Cluster
Magbitang, Myrna	Homenet SEA
Manaay, Monilita	President, CSWCD Cooperative
Manalo, Prof. Fermin	DCD Faculty
Matibag, Ma. Theresa	MAWD Student
Menor, Benjamin	Staff, CSWCD
Morfe, Noemi	DSD Student
Nemenzo, Ana Maria	KAMP
Ofreneo, Dr. Rosalinda Pineda	Dean, CSWCD

Participants of the Symposium Invited by UP CSWCD Continued	
Padilla, Prof. Lourdes	DCD Lecturer
Peteros, Carol	DSD Student
Rogers, Michelle	DSD Student
Salonga, Edwin	DSD Student
Tangi, Lucia	DSD Student
Teves, Aurea	FIAN
Ticzon, Fe	Board Member, CSWCD Cooperative
Velasco, Criselda	Member, Social Protection Cluster
Verceles, Prof. Nathalie	Member, Social Protection Cluster
Yoon Yea Jin	CAMP ASIA

ANNEX E

Some photos from the Symposium



Figure 1 Datuk Dr. Denison Jayasooria



Figure 2 Dr. Jayasooria with Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo, Mr. Jun Simon and Dr. Quiñones.



Figure 3 Dr. Jayasooria with Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo, Dr. Quiñones and Mr. Jun Simon.



Figure 4 Dr. Carolyn I. Sobritchea, Dean, UP Asian Center.



Figure 5 Dr. Benjamin R. Quiñones, Jr., Chairperson, ASEC.



Figure 6 Mr. Jun Simon, Vice-Chairperson, ASEC.



Figure 7 Prof. Nathalie Verceles, Professor of the UP CSWCD, with the panel of reactors, Dr. Jayasooria and Dr. Pineda-Ofreneo during the Open Forum.



Figure 11 Dr. Marlyne Sahakian, Post-doctorate Fellow, Ateneo De Manila University, asked a question directed to Dr. Jayasooria.



Figure 8 Dr. Ed Tadem, Professor, UP Asian Center.



Figure 12 Ms. Princess Nemenzo hoped to see more SSE discussions.



Figure 9 Mr. Jay B. Lacsamana, Executive Director, FSSI.



Figure 12 Atty. Persida Acosta and some participants of the symposium.



Figure 10 Mr. Wyden King, President, AHL.



Figure 14 Participants at the UP CSWCD Library where the symposium was held.

ANNEX F

5th RIPESS Global Forum of Social Solidarity Economy: Building SSE as an alternative model of development

Program

Manila, Philippines, 15-18 October 2013