

CONFRONTING CRITICAL WORK FORCE CHALLENGES



Collaborative Global Framework -For achieving Sustainable goals(SDGs) by Application of Technology(Innovation) and Management (Social Entrepreneurship)

Sunil Kulkarni

As per the UN's 2030 identified agenda, seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are to be achieved. Conceptually, sustainable development goal (SDGs) is a Holistic approach, interlinking the 3 areas viz. Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Environmental Sustainability. All the countries of the world are expected to achieve them in the next 15 years.

This task could be easy for Developed countries since many of them have already adopted them either fully or partially in their Developmental policies thanks to their focus on Technology and Management since beginning.

However, for Developing countries, because of overall poverty, their development in the field of Technology and Management has been slow. They could not understand and capitalize on the importance of adopting Technology and Management techniques in increasing their standard of development.

However, by now the Developing countries have seen the remarkable progress (both Economic and Social) achieved by the Developed nations by adopting Technology and Management techniques and thereby have realized its importance.

Although because of Technology world is getting smaller, to thrive, Technology needs a support system in the form of nurturing Innovations.

As far as Management is concerned, developing countries cannot straight way replicate the western management concepts because of the fundamental structural differences however, considering their huge populations, Social entrepreneurship could be their anchor, upon which further localized layering (either western or Indian) could be applied.

However, before they do this, they need to have the conceptual clarity of Innovation (Technology) and social entrepreneurship (Management)

Innovation-A-Definition:

The practical refinement and development of an original invention into a usable technique or product, or a process in which, creativity is applied to every facet of an organization's value chain, from beginning to end, to develop new and better ways of creating value for customers. The ultimate goal of innovation is sustained competitive advantage.

Three levels of Innovation :

The first is the innovative individual; the second is the innovative team and the third is the innovative organization (which could be replicated on a country level)

Innovation models :

Model 1-The Focused Factory: (Singapore)The focused-factory innovation model combines a clear strategic intent with a concentration of infrastructure and high-octane talent, in an effort to discover and deploy new solutions to big challenges. For. e.g. The Singaporean government has devoted more resources to the life-sciences than to any other field, by creating Bio polis (2003), a 2 million square foot Biomedical Research center, for stem cell research.

Model 2-Brute Force (China) The brute force model is an innovationversion of the law of large numbers. By applying massive amounts of low-cost labor and capital to a portfolio of innovation opportunities, countries (most obviously China and India, but also Brazil) hope that a huge quantity of ideas from a substantial number of talented people will eventually yield valuable discoveries. Many of these companies will fail, but some may prove to be world-beaters.

Model-3-Hollyworld : The Holly world model is all about providing opportunities to build what author Richard Florida has described as a “Global Creative Class”. India, for example, is shifting its role as the world’s Back office to that of Innovation Epicenter. Tata, for example, now outsourcers some of its IT Development Assignments to Chile and Ecuador and in 2005 acquired a Chilean financial–services back-office outsourcing firm. By exporting its own back-office work, Tata, has been able to move up the value chain. Singapore is also adopting this model successfully.

Model-4-Large-scale Ecosystems-(Finland) Several countries have developed End-to-End innovation systems combining Stewardship Mechanism, Funding bodies, Research institutions, and Structures for Business and Academic collaboration, all in support of an overall national strategy.

CASE- Innovation at Royal Dutch Shell- (Game changer groups)

At Royal Dutch Shell, Corporate and Business Unit ‘Game changer’(1990) teams use Seed Funding to sponsor radical and long-term ambitious innovations. Anyone could come to the group with a Research or Innovation proposal to seek funds. Each proven idea will be moved to Research & Development or to an Operating Company for Second Stage Financing. A separate budget of 10%of the R&D budget is allocated to the Game Changer initiatives. This initiative incubates as many as 30% of Shell’s R&D projects.

Game changer groups are small consisting of very experienced Senior Executives looking for Entrepreneurial excitement and also bright youngsters, who are rotated though the Game changer groups for about two years, and then moved back into the business. Game changergroup collaborates with one another through an Online Innovation Network.After six years of standing, now it enjoys the status of a full-fledged department.

Such Game Changer groups could be one initiative for countries for achieving speedy SDGs.

Another conceptual idea could be Social entrepreneurship.

Social entrepreneurship is exercised where one individual or a group of individuals :

1. want to create some social value, either exclusively or by some prominent way.
2. at the same time, they have a capacity to recognize and take advantage of such opportunities which will lead them to their envisioned value creation.
3. could use either existing methods or bring outright invention to adapting existing/new idea while creating and or distributing social value idea.
4. They are willing to accept an above-average degree of risk while implementing this social value creation process.
5. is/are comfortable with relatively scarce assets while pursuing their social ventures.

Social entrepreneurship, being a commitment to providing social value, is fundamentally different than the other forms of entrepreneurships

In other words, every leading social entrepreneur could be termed as a mass recruiter of local citizens, who channels their passion into action to do almost anything.

Organizational models :

(1) Leveraged non-profit ventures

The entrepreneur sets up a non-profit organization to drive the adoption of an innovation that addresses a market or government failure. In doing so, the entrepreneur engages a cross section of society, including private and public organizations, to drive forward the innovation through a multiplier effect. Leveraged non-profit ventures continuously depend on outside philanthropic funding, but their longer term sustainability is often enhanced given that the partners have a vested interest in the continuation of the venture.

(2) Hybrid non-profit ventures

The entrepreneur sets up a non-profit organization but the model includes some degree of cost-recovery through the sale of goods and services to a cross section of institutions, public and private, as well as to target population groups. Often, the entrepreneur sets up several legal entities to accommodate the earning of an income and the charitable expenditures in an optimal structure. To be able to sustain the transformation activities in full and address the needs of clients, who are often poor or marginalized from society, the entrepreneur must mobilize other sources of funding from the public and/or philanthropic sectors. Such funds can be in the form of Grants or Loans, and even quasi-equity.

(3) Social business ventures

The entrepreneur sets up a for-profit entity or business to provide a social or ecological product or service. While profits are ideally generated, the main aim is not to maximize financial returns for shareholders but to grow the social venture and reach more people in need. Wealth accumulation is not a priority and profits are reinvested in the enterprise to fund expansion. The entrepreneur of a social business venture seeks investors who are interested in combining financial and social returns on their investments.

Conclusion:

If we look at the SDGs, the areas of Clean water and sanitation, clean energy, industry monitoring, infrastructure, sustainable cities and communities, climate action, life below water etc. Could be acted upon by using social business venture models with technology interface.

On the other hand, for contributing in the SDGs in the areas of Poverty, Zero Hunger, Good health, Quality education, Gender equality, Responsible Consumption and Production etc. either Leveraged non-profit or Hybrid non-profit model could be thought of with technology interface.

Remaining goals like Economic Growth, Life on land, Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions could be handled by the Government itself.

At Macro level, achieving SDGs could be the task between Developing and Developed Countries, but at Micro level it could be the Technology sharing/ Transfer and exchange of social entrepreneurial system. (Organizations/Individuals/Ideas).

While doing this, a Game changer group (like Royal Dutch Shell as above) could also be thought of!

References:

- (1) "Theory and Practice of innovation in India compared with the world" an article by Dr.S.V. Kulkarni published in 8M (A journal of strategic consulting group, New Delhi)-Volume 16, No,3 July-Sept, 2011 (ISSN-0973-9343)
- (2) "The rise of Innovation Labs" article in Brand Equity of economic times dated 6th April, 2011
- (3) "India has no choice but to innovate" article by soumitra Dutta in economic times of 12th march, 2011
- (4) India emerging- innovation-article in ET, 8th January, 2011
- (5) www.schwabfoundation.org/
- (6) www.ashoka.org
- (7) Ana Maria P. and Mueith McLean (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept --Journal of Business 41(2006)-56-65