



## Policy framework as a challenge and opportunity for social innovation initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia

Héctor Javier García Higuera<sup>a</sup>, Todora Rogelja<sup>b,\*</sup>, Laura Secco<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Padova, Department of Historical and Geographic Sciences and the Ancient World, Via del Vescovado 6, 35141 Padova (PD), Italy

<sup>b</sup> University of Padova, Department of Land, Environment, Agriculture and Forestry (TESAF), Via dell'Università 16, 35020 Legnaro (PD), Italy

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Policy analysis  
Social innovation  
Tourism  
Rural development  
Colombian politics  
Content analysis

### ABSTRACT

Colombia confronts a multitude of societal and environmental problems, which severely manifest in rural areas, leading to loss of biodiversity, reduced legal income opportunities, marginalization, poverty, etc. Alternatives that can voluntarily mobilize collective agency, such as social innovation (SI), have emerged as a means for addressing the challenges of rural areas due to the potential they proved to have in other countries to enhance outcomes on societal well-being. This study focuses on the current policy conditions (domains and instruments) for the development of SI in eco-tourism in Colombia, both those registered as legal entities or individuals or networks operating informally. A total amount of 25 policy documents from tourism, cohesion, rural and regional development, forest, environment, and innovation policies were analysed using qualitative content analysis. Our results show the slow introduction of SI concepts and the inoperability of instruments into the national policy framework. Formally recognised SI initiatives in eco-tourism bear strict requirements for operating in natural and protected areas with numerous administrative procedures. The SI is not addressed explicitly in most of the explored policies. Its significance and untapped potential are shadowed by other overarching terms such as “entrepreneurship”. Consequently, SI remains informal in practice. This context is challenging for the development of both formal SI initiatives in eco-tourism as well as for the formalization of the informal ones.

### 1. Introduction

In rural areas worldwide, various challenges, including social issues (e.g., extreme poverty), demographic shifts (e.g., ageing populations), economic constraints (e.g., limited income opportunities), and environmental concerns (e.g., the commodification of strategic ecosystems), have been documented (Ashley and Maxwell, 2002; Biggs and Ellis, 2001; Green, 2018; Potter et al., 2008; UN, 2019). These challenges intensify in the context of climate change, particularly in developing nations across Latin America, Asia, and Africa, where rural communities are susceptible to famine, poverty, social exclusion, and environmental injustices (Mihai and Latu, 2020).

Efforts to address these complex social-environmental issues in rural areas introduced new concepts, such as social innovation (SI) and eco-tourism. SI is characterised by its non-linear, non-traditional approach to innovation, focusing on creating novel social arrangements, governance structures, and practices to maximise social benefits (OECD, 2021). On the other hand, eco-tourism involves travel practices centred around exploring natural destinations with a deep respect for their

cultural context and a commitment to protecting their environmental integrity (Khanra et al., 2021).

Colombia, as a nation, confronted its own substantial social, environmental and economic challenges, which manifest as inequality and multidimensional poverty (Gómez-Salazar et al., 2019). These issues are particularly acute in Colombian rural areas, where poverty rates stand at three times those of urban areas (37% versus 11%, respectively), and access to basic services (such as healthcare and education) remains limited (DANE, 2021). Poverty in these regions is further exacerbated by the dearth of economic opportunities and access to basic services (Gómez-Salazar et al., 2019). Small-scale farmers encounter significant hurdles when trying to access markets and financial resources, impeding their ability to invest in their farms and enhance their livelihoods (Rubio-Leonel et al., 2019). Moreover, rural areas have borne a disproportionate burden of the country's armed conflict, resulting in displacement, human rights violations, and pervasive violence (Gómez-Salazar et al., 2019).

To address these issues, Colombia witnessed the emergence of diverse socioeconomic initiatives, including the introduction of the SI

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [todora.rogelja@unipd.it](mailto:todora.rogelja@unipd.it) (T. Rogelja).

concept, leading to the creation of the Center of Social Innovation and the National Agency for Overcoming Extreme Poverty in 2011, aimed at reducing poverty in vulnerable areas (Parada et al., 2017). Eco-tourism also gained recognition as a key driver of sustainable development in Colombia due to its rich natural heritage, encompassing 67,000 species in over 59 protected areas covering 14 million hectares (Minambiente, 2022). The government's efforts to promote eco-tourism aimed to stimulate economic growth, reduce poverty, and preserve natural resources (Toro-Jarrín et al., 2020). Involving local and indigenous communities in eco-tourism initiatives can generate economic benefits and enhance well-being (Saenz, 2018), vital for the preservation of Colombia's biodiversity, carbon sequestration, water resources, and the livelihoods of these communities (Pereira et al., 2018).

However, significant obstacles hinder SI from scaling beyond local levels and limit eco-tourism's potential to deliver multiple benefits (CEPAL, 2016; Domanski et al., 2016). Weak institutional frameworks, insufficient policy instruments, knowledge management gaps in SI, and a lack of supportive services for project scaling (e.g., technical and financial support) have been identified as barriers (Chamorro et al., 2013; Serrano, 2012; Villa and Melo, 2015). Chamorro et al. (2013) highlighted the creation of the National Entrepreneurship Network and support from institutions like SENA in Colombia's entrepreneurship policy. Villa and Melo (2015) noted that SI is still predominantly a policy discourse.

Although Colombia's legal framework has the potential to boost entrepreneurship and innovation through laws like the Entrepreneurship Culture (Law 1014 of 2006) and Science, Technology, and Innovation (Law 1286 of 2009) (Álvarez, 2018), there is a lack of recent detailed studies investigating policies for the development of SI initiatives in eco-tourism. This study aims to examine the current policy framework for SI initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia, based on the premise that the application of SI to eco-tourism can help mitigate social-environmental issues. The research seeks to answer two key questions:

RQ1. What are the legal requirements for SI initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia?

RQ2. What policies could support or hinder the development of eco-touristic SI initiatives in Colombia?

We broadly conceptualise SI initiatives in eco-tourism as all forms of voluntary collective actions, e.g., provision of services and management of natural resources, that distribute benefits equally among local and indigenous communities and contribute to the improved management and use of local natural resources. Such initiatives might have legally recognised forms and display themselves as enterprises, cooperatives, or organisations working in eco-tourism, but often are also rooted in informal institutions and without legally recognised forms such as support groups and local networks.

The interrelation of SI in rural areas, eco-tourism and policy relevance is explained in Section 2. Section 3 presents the methods used. Section 4 refers to results structured according to two research questions; each further organised according to policy domains. Section 5 discusses the results, highlighting three major findings on the broader political context of Colombia and reflecting on studies on Latin America and Europe, while Section 6 concludes the paper.

## 2. Social innovation in rural areas, eco-tourism, and policy support

Through two subsections, this section presents conceptual background on the major concepts (social innovation, eco-tourism, policy support).

### 2.1. Social innovation in rural areas and eco-tourism

Social Innovation (SI) demonstrated the potential to transform and foster development in rural regions, contributing to sustainable and inclusive economies (Ravazzoli et al., 2021; Živojinović et al., 2019; Lindberg, 2017). In the realm of natural resource management and protected areas, SI is closely intertwined with rural areas (Olmedo et al., 2021; Nijnik et al., 2021; Secco et al., 2019; Živojinović et al., 2023). SI can be defined as changing social practices related to natural resources to impact collective well-being positively. It is driven by voluntary and/or collective agency, sparked by local manifestations of global issues (Polman et al., 2017; Nijnik et al., 2019; Secco et al., 2019; Živojinović et al., 2023). The core of SI lies in civil society's voluntary engagement in collective actions aimed at broader social, environmental, and economic benefits.

On the other hand, eco-tourism focuses on responsible travel to natural areas, emphasising environmental conservation, respect for local cultural heritage, and sustainability (Font and McCabe, 2017; Khanra et al., 2021). Eco-tourism encompasses various forms, such as ethno-tourism, agro-tourism, wildlife tourism, and rural tourism, closely related to natural resources (Ministerio de Ambiente Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial, 2006). Unlike SI, eco-tourism's core is environmental sustainability rather than the voluntary engagement of local communities.

Although SI primarily addresses social aspects and eco-tourism emphasises environmental concerns, they intersect in their shared focus on natural resources, common goals of addressing social challenges, achieving sustainability, and benefiting larger social groups, including local and indigenous communities. Eco-tourism challenges conventional tourism practices with potentially adverse environmental and societal impacts (Scheyvens and Russell, 2016). By promoting eco-friendly tourism activities, eco-tourism introduces a new, environmentally responsible approach to tourism (Torres-Delgado and López Palomeque, 2012). SI could enhance eco-tourism economic, social, and environmental sustainability by contributing to nature management, conservation practices, and ecosystem regeneration while generating economic benefits for rural communities. Numerous studies have highlighted the potential of eco-tourism to contribute to environmental conservation, poverty reduction, and sustainable development (Scheyvens and Russell, 2016; Buckley, 2012).

Moreover, eco-tourism could serve as a platform for SI by offering opportunities for local communities to engage in entrepreneurial activities that benefit both the environment, the local economy and improve local wellbeing (Font and McCabe, 2017; Almeida and Wasim, 2023; Scheyvens and Russell, 2016; Rogelja et al., 2023). Almeida and Wasim (2023) argue that SI can foster innovation and collaboration among stakeholders, leading to development of eco-tourism. This, in turn, can promote social enterprises (SE) by creating innovative products or services that meet eco-tourists needs (Chell, 2015). SE maximise both social and economic value through commercial and marketing strategies without being strictly innovative (Ludvig et al., 2018; Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2022). In contrast, SI is not solely profit-driven and often lacks an institutionalised form (Živojinović et al., 2023).

Barrena-Martínez et al. (2017) emphasise the role of SI in promoting sustainable tourism development, creating new value chains, and innovative business models that enhance local communities' economic and social well-being. Rural communities can leverage their natural and cultural resources for more sustainable and resilient economies by integrating sustainable tourism practices, such as eco-tourism, into these value chains.

However, critical studies have pointed out that eco-tourism can sometimes lead to negative consequences, such as the exploitation of

local communities and ecosystems, especially when profit and politics drive its development (Blackstock, 2005; Duffy, 2002). Local and indigenous communities often have diverse objectives and may not align with tourism policies or market-driven approaches (Scheyvens and Russell, 2016). This instrumental market approach can lead to power imbalances, disempowering those who should benefit the most (Phillips et al., 2023)

To address these challenges, SI could play a crucial role in facilitating local and indigenous communities' voluntary and active involvement in responsible natural resource management through eco-tourism activities. SI is recognised as a societal glue connecting actors across multiple domains and scales (Bock, 2016; Castro-Arce and Vanclay, 2020), so it is vital for eco-tourism initiatives to prioritise community empowerment in environmental conservation rather than solely catering to tourist demands and market-driven services. SI initiatives, led by local entrepreneurs or community groups, should form the cornerstone of eco-tourism.

## 2.2. Social innovation and policy support

SI initiatives are often regulated by a wide range of sectoral and structural policies (Ludvig et al., 2021). Policies are written and negotiated plans of action that contain policy goals, targets, and measures that are to be implemented on the ground (Knoepfel et al., 2007; Crabbe and Leroy, 2008; Fischer and Miller, 2019). Ultimately, they contain policy instruments as “the set of techniques by which governmental authorities wield their power in attempting to ensure support and effect social change” (Vedung, 1998, p. 21). Even if structured and sectoral policies may ensure ample range of instruments and flexible support, the policy interactions may also hinder the boosting of SI initiatives (Lukesch et al., 2020), by creating policy and governance gaps. Niskanen et al. (2007a) recognizes the importance of knowledge and information instruments for reducing risks in operations; finance instruments to develop infrastructure and services; networking instruments for the development of linkages among actors across the forestry, tourism, recreation, economic development and environmental sectors, as well as local and regional municipalities.

Even with a robust government and policies aiming to broaden policy experimentation and hybrid models, the SI initiatives need a momentum to achieve a transformative role (Gordon et al., 2017). It can be assumed that policies at local level should leverage the national top-down approach. It is more effective to work locally than centrally, since the needs of the territories are individual and localized (Pinto et al., 2021). From one side, communities are those at one end of the multi-level socioeconomic restructuring (Fink et al., 2013), and tightly connected to local places, especially in a multicultural country such as Colombia. Meanwhile, municipalities should focus on the alignment of partners and promote networking and act as funders through internalizing the role of a paradigm shift, compelling the community to reflect

on what is SI, forms of financing, etc. (Pinto et al., 2021).

SI in eco-tourism is characterised by the collective action around nature and its ecosystem services. The benefits to local and indigenous communities often cannot be appropriated as surplus within direct markets, so SI initiatives in eco-tourism do not necessarily follow a business-oriented logic. Additionally, weak policy conditions can inhibit SI to easily emerge from the local level in a bottom-up manner (Ludvig et al., 2018). Among the obstacles, SI in the Colombian context face the tensions between communities and high-level institutions, lack of political support for social needs, lack of planning for the creation of a public agenda, formulation of policies, decision-making processes, implementation and evaluations (Rodríguez, 2018).

## 3. Methods

This study used a deductive qualitative approach, focusing on the national-level written policies of potential relevance for SI initiatives in eco-tourism. We conducted policy mapping on the national level in Colombia methodologically following similar studies (Ludvig et al., 2018; Rogelja et al., 2018; Živojinović et al., 2023). Ludvig et al. (2018) suggest seven policy domains relevant for the development of SI: cohesion, regional development, rural development, tourism, forestry, environment and innovation. Policies were identified during the period August–September 2021, by conducting online research in different institutional databases and institutional portals (e.g Unique system of Normative Information – SUIN, the National Planning Department platform -DNP, etc.). Combinations of keywords “policy”, “social innovation”, “entrepreneurship”, “tourism” “ecotourism”, “innovation”, “social enterprise (i.e. “social innovation policy”, “social innovation tourism”, “social innovation ecotourism” “social innovation environment”) were used for selecting policy documents for further screening.

All identified documents were screened, and twenty-five potentially relevant documents for SI initiatives in eco-tourism were selected for content analysis (Annex A). Documents were considered to be relevant if they satisfied the following criteria (C): (C1: the document was on force) AND (C2: document explicitly refers to SI; OR C3: document explicitly refers to SE; OR C4: document implicitly refers to SI initiatives). Implicit referral to SI addresses the behaviour and actions of various actors (among which local, rural and indigenous communities), aiming to create new relationships, institutions and/or organisational forms in eco-tourism. Further desk research was performed in order to understand legal requirements for enterprises in Colombia related to eco-tourism and current policy discourses in the touristic sector. Detailed list of policies together with fulfilled criteria, is presented in Annex A. As C1 is a precondition for C2 and C3, only C2, C3 and C4 are reported.

Once the policy documents were screened, a qualitative content analysis was performed. Content analysis is “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18).

**Table 1**  
Coding criteria, definition and coding rule of content analysis.

Coding category	Definition	Coding rule
S	statements (S) refer to formal, but general proclamations on objectives, importance, needs, or instruments for SI/SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>formal, but general proclamations on objectives, importance, needs, or instruments without prescribed means for implementation</li> </ul>
RI	regulatory instruments (RI) include all formal regulatory or strategic documents and measures for SI/SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explicit prescription of regulatory instruments and means for their formulation and/or implementation</li> </ul>
EI	economic instrument (EI) includes financing mechanisms and schemes for SI/SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explicit prescription of types of economic instruments and means for their implementation</li> </ul>
II	informational instruments (II) are those used for informing, educating, training, and promoting of SI/SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explicit prescription of types of informational instrument and means for their implementation</li> </ul>
NI	networking instruments (NI) are those used for establishing and developing cooperation for SI/SE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>explicit prescription of the type of the networking instruments and means for their implementation</li> </ul>

Source: adapted from Rogelja et al. (2018).

Qualitative content analysis was used, as a “a set of techniques for the systematic analysis of texts of many kinds addressing not only manifest content but also the themes and core ideas found in texts as primary content” (Mayring, 2000, cited in Drisko and Maschi, 2016, p. 85). Following Ludvig et al. (2018) and Rogelja et al. (2018), we distinguished between regulatory, economic, information and networking instruments. Documents were coded in Spanish based on the criteria presented in Table 1:

A standardized table was used in order to collect the information with the interpretation of formal statements and explicit or implicit mention of instruments.

An example of coded policy is the document “Basis for the National Development Plan 2018-2022 – Law 1995 of 2019” provided in the Annex B.

4. Results

This section presents results structured according to our two research questions. In this research, we took a broad understanding of SI, and we looked at SI initiatives in eco-tourism, both as formal, legally recognised as well as informal initiatives. In Section 4.1, we present legal requirements for SI initiatives in eco-tourism run by organisations in Section 4.2, we present potentially supportive policy instruments structured according to the policy domains. Table 2 presents the overview of the seven analysed policy domains together with policies with four types of identified policy instruments (regulatory, information, economic, and networking).

Table 2  
Analysed policies with coding categories.

Policy domain	Document name	Explicit SI					Explicit SE					Implicit SI				
		S	EI	II	RI	NI	S	EI	II	RI	NI	S	EI	II	RI	NI
Tourism	Sectorial Plan for tourism (2018–2022).											X	X	X		X
	Guide of Policy for the Development of Community-based tourism in Colombia 2012											X	X	X	X	X
	Guide for the Communitarian Ecotourism (2013)											X		X		X
	Law 2068 of 2020 (modified the General Law of Tourism or Law 300/1996)												X	X		X
	Policy for Sustainable Tourism (approved in Decree 646 of 2021)											X	X	X	X	X
	Policy for the ecotourism development												X	X		X
	Guide of Communitarian Ecotourism for National Natural Parks of Colombia (PNN) and their influence zones (2020)											X		X	X	X
Environment	Policy of Nature Tourism										X	X	X	X	X	
	National Plan for Green Businesses											X	X	X	X	
	Strategy for the Implementation of the SDG in Colombia. CONPES Document 3918.										X	X			X	
Innovation	Decree 1007. Ecosystem payment services												X			
	Resolution 0531 of 2013										X	X	X	X	X	
	Public Policy of Science, Technology and Innovation (ST + I) 2019–2038 CONPES D.C. 04	X	X	X		X					X				X	
	CONPES 4011 – National Policy for Entrepreneurship (2020). Conceptual Basis of a policy for social innovation (2013)	X									X	X	X	X	X	
Cohesion	Strategic plan for Science, Technology and Innovation in the agricultural sector 2017–2027					X	X							X	X	
	National Development Plan 2018–2022 (NDP) (Law 1955 of 2019)										X	X	X		X	
Rural development	Decree 810/ 2020 Patrimony for the women entrepreneurship										X	X	X		X	
	CONPES 3616 / 2009 Guidelines for the income generation policy						X					X	X		X	
	Policy for agro and rural development 2018–2022										X	X	X	X	X	
Regional Development	Law 1776 / 2016 Interest Zones for the rural, economic and social development -ZIDRES-											X	X	X	X	
	General Law for Planning law 1454 of 2011											X		X		
	Law No 1876 / 2017 Agriculture Innovative National System												X	X	X	
Forestry	Guidelines for the development of agricultural activities of low impact 2021												X	X		
	National Forestry Development Plan 2000–2025										X		X			
	Forest Policy 1996											X	X		X	

Source: Own elaboration, based on García, 2021.

4.1. What policies and laws regulate SI initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia?

The legal requirements for SI initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia may vary based on specific circumstances and regulations that could be subject to change. However, SI initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia are on the national level regulated by policies and laws from three policy domains: tourism, environment, and innovation.

To operate these initiatives, it is necessary to have a legal form and fulfil a variety of criteria from the tourist, environmental and innovation sectors. There are numerous legal entity types of organisations in Colombia (Villamizar, 2023), commonly including Sole Proprietorship (Persona Natural), Simplified Stock Company (SAS – Sociedad por Acciones Simplificada), Limited Liability Company (LTDA – Sociedad de Responsabilidad Limitada); Corporation (SA – Sociedad Anónima) and Cooperative (Cooperativa) (Supersociedades, 2023).

Formal SI initiatives in eco-tourism run by one of these types of organisations must acquire a tourism license that demonstrates compliance with quality standards and numerous requirements set by the government, including safety and emergency measures. Such registration in the National Touristic Register (NTR) needs to be done online in the respective Chamber of Commerce (Law 300 of 1996 or General Law of Tourism and Decree 1836 of 2021). This licensing provides legal entitlement to provide touristic services, including eco-touristic activities and should be renewed on a yearly basis. Depending on the activity, other prerequisites are also needed in order to proceed with the NTR, such as the Merchant Register, the Register for non-profit entities or Unique Tributary Register (RUT) (MCIT, 2022).



Furthermore, the touristic sector also includes the Sectorial Technical Norms (NTS), i.e., standard guidelines for the provision of touristic services. Since 2006, Colombia has been updating the NTS on touristic sustainability, which defines sustainability criteria for touristic operators. The certification of sustainable tourism based on these norms is possible by a third party that guarantees the accomplishment of requirements – Incontec, which is aligned with international normalisation organisations such as the ISO (International Organization for Standardization), IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission) and Copant (Panamerican Commission of Technical Norms). In the environmental domain, Resolution 0531 of 2013 defines the services that eco-tourist activities can perform: hosting, transport, food and beverages, guides and interpretation of the natural patrimony. It also incentivises communities to start eco-touristic services and offers them technical support. It also requires environmental permits and certifications. This includes environmental impact assessments, biodiversity conservation plans, and adherence to protected areas and wildlife conservation regulations.

Although social enterprises (SE) are not officially recognised as a legal form in Colombia, policies in the innovation domain explicitly address the concept of SI and SE. Recently, institutional efforts have launched Law 2234 of 2022, the base guideline for the promotion and acknowledgement of SE at the national level.

While more information on policies is provided in the next subsection, in general, SE should (1) register the social enterprise as a valid legal entity with the Colombian Chamber of Commerce or relevant authority; (2) define the social or environmental mission in constitutive documents, and consider incorporating governance mechanisms aligned with the social mission; (3) comply with tax regulations, including obtaining tax identification numbers, filing tax returns, and fulfilling tax payment obligations; (4) adhere to labour laws regarding employee rights, benefits, contracts, and workplace safety; and (5) consider implementing mechanisms to measure and report on social or environmental impact, even though it may not be a legal requirement (Secretariassenado, 2023).

#### 4.2. What policies could support or hinder the development of SI initiatives in eco-tourism in Colombia

This sub-section presents policies and instruments potentially available for SI initiatives in eco-tourism, even those not formally operating in eco-tourism.

##### 4.2.1. Tourism domain

Tourism domain is based on the principles of responsible tourism and sustainable development, so documents may interchangeably use the eco-tourism term as a form of “nature-based tourism”, or “community-based tourism”. The Policy for the Ecotourism Development and the Guide for the Communitarian Eco-tourism (2013) does not explicitly mention SI, while indirectly, it generically refers to the concepts of ecotourism and the roles of local and indigenous communities in it. The Guide of Policy for the Development of Community-based tourism in Colombia (2012) highlights the importance of having enabling conditions for entrepreneurship, as a means for strengthening human and social capital and avoiding welfare assistance (Ministerio de Comercio Industria y Turismo (MinCIT), 2012, p. 10). The Policy of Nature Tourism recognises nature-based tourism as a social and economic driver for development in rural areas, as well as an alternative for mass tourism. (MinCIT, 2012, p. 17).

Another policy relevant for SI initiatives in eco-tourism is the General Law of Tourism. Although it does not address directly SI, it contains instruments, such as smart touristic destinations, digitalisation of

touristic-related products, free advisory services about the registration (licensing) of touristic operators, sanctions, tax and incentives for formal operators, exemption of VAT and land taxes due to COVID-19 (Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2020). Also, it contains economic instruments such as incentives (in specific regions) for touristic activities aiming at protecting the ecosystem and managing natural resources. It also promotes networking between tourist companies and universities (Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2020). Other policies (see Table 2) also feature mostly information and networking instruments that target eco-touristic operators or local and indigenous communities.

##### 4.2.2. Environmental domain

Law 99 of 1993 regulates protected areas in Colombia. The institution “Natural National Parks of Colombia (PNN)” is responsible for the planning and overall management of protected areas and national parks. This law also imposes strict requirements related to touristic activities (see Section 4.1), and contains regulatory, financial and information instruments pertaining to tourism operators as well as local and indigenous communities. The National System of Protected Areas includes mechanisms for the participation of local communities in the management of protected areas, and the NDP 2018–2022 includes strategies for promoting SI in the development of sustainable tourism activities in protected areas.

Environmental policies also address the green businesses and “green entrepreneurship” concept, e.g. in the Green Business Plan (National Planning Department, 2018). SE or SI could apply to the plan’s instruments such as eco-ticketing, Clean Development Mechanism (carbon bonus), certification, reforestation and forest conservation, and Payment of Ecosystem Services. It also includes tax incentives: VAT deductions, elimination of predial payment; and instruments for promoting science and innovation by means of investment in innovative projects (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2014, p. 72). Similarly, the Decree 1007 of 2018 Payment for Ecosystem Services (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2018) mentions the economic benefits to organisations that perform preservation and conservation activities, for instance, in eco-tourism (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2018, p. 5). Nevertheless, there are no direct statements referring to SI.

##### 4.2.3. Innovation domain

SI is explicitly referred to dominantly in the innovation domain, directly addressing the SI at its conceptual level, especially by referring to well-renowned institutions such as the OECD or by definitions given in the Conceptual Basis of a Policy for Social Innovation (National Planning Department, 2018). Only in a few cases, in the CONPES 04 DC (CONPES, 2019) or Pact for Entrepreneurship (NDP 2018–2022), is there an explicit mention of SI where it is related to economic development (green businesses, rural entrepreneurship) in a general manner without proposing a transcendental SI meaning.

In the Innovation domain, the Conceptual Basis of a Policy for Social Innovation (DNP, 2013) is the first governmental attempt to introduce the SI into the policy framework at least from its conceptual level. SI is presented as a hybrid concept blending sociological, economic, managerial, political and participative aspects (DNP, 2013, p.8). The document does not include any instruments for the implementation of SI.

The National Policy of Entrepreneurship CONPES 4011 of 2020 contains statements about entrepreneurship and implicit references to SI, including instruments (economic, information, networking and regulatory) that benefit both. It defines three types of entrepreneurship that aim to improve the livelihoods of local and indigenous communities and contribute to larger social inclusion goals: the subsistence business, inclusive business and wealth-oriented businesses (CONPES, 2020, p. 11).

#### 4.2.4. Cohesion domain

The Cohesion policy documents aim at enhancing the coordination among institutions, capacity building for women and those in extreme poverty or with displacement status, increasing and improving the availability of financing mechanisms for rural areas, bringing technical support and creating networks and associations. The main country-level guiding document, National Development Plan (NDP) 2018–2022, establishes a concept of entrepreneurship under an economic vision driven by market-based priorities in order to provide the means for achieving productivity goals but not directly connected with social goals. It contains economic, information and networking instruments, mainly through incubators and acceleration programs, innovation competitions, coordination with the SENA (technical formation institute) and INNpursa (National Agency of Entrepreneurship and Innovation) and the creation of the think-tanks such as the Observatory of Entrepreneurship. However, the SI is not mentioned in the NDP Entrepreneurship Pact.

The informative and networking instruments refer especially to the technical training and capacity building in the different governmental institutions with an ample range of topics (environment, business, incentives, finances, communication, soft and hard skills) as well as the conformation of networks at the local, regional and national level for the promotion of touristic routes. The SENA (education and training), and INNpursa are two of the most important institutions promoting education for entrepreneurship and innovation in Colombia. This aims at the regional articulation among actors, the creation of Urban Labs and district information systems. At a rural level, technical units UMATA offer consulting, technical support for the expansion of services that can be offered, which could include logistic support, information gathering, general activities that promote agricultural and rural development and partnerships with the municipal level (Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2017).

#### 4.2.5. Rural development domain

The Policy for rural development mentions the finance inclusion and management of rural public goods under schemes of association, commercialisation and contract farming for non-agricultural activities, namely tourism, environmental conservation and services for rurality (e. g. in the Interest Zones for the rural, economic and social development ZIDRES). Financial schemes are also possible in the form of credits (with subsidised rate of interest) and micro and collective insurances for small and medium enterprises, microfinancing mechanisms, incentives and special credit pipelines.

#### 4.2.6. Regional development domain

The Regional Development Policy documents do not explicitly mention SI, SE or entrepreneurship, but all policies provide economic and networking instruments (see Table 2). In those policy documents, economic instruments and supporting institutions such as the National Fund for Tourism (Fontur), National Royalty System (Regalias), Fund of Modernization for Innovation in SMEs (MIPYME), BioEnterprise INNpursa call, FINAGRO, micro-insurances with FUTUREX, Department of Science, Technology and Innovation (Colciencias) are mentioned. These institutions could broaden opportunities and engage social innovation initiatives or enterprises to participate in regional or local projects in eco-tourism.

However, Law 1454 of 2011 (Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2011) allocates resources and financial mechanisms for poverty reduction projects, which theoretically may benefit SI initiatives depending on the project size and scope. Furthermore, the Law on Agriculture Innovative National System (SNIA) proportionate multiple features that

are closely related to the concept and characteristics of SI, such as Open Innovations. Also, the structuring of Territorial Systems of Agriculture Innovation (TSAI) enables the conditions for nurturing innovative capacities in the agriculture sector. It also brings the opportunity to be a space for the formulation of strategies, plans and projects that are needed at the territorial level.

#### 4.2.7. Forestry domain

The Forest Policy (1996) constitutes one of the cornerstones of the forestry sector management. However, the terms SI or SE are not included, but only some features and instruments that can be beneficial for such initiatives. Similarly, the National Forestry Development Plan 2000–2025 does not include SI or SE. However, the Plan highlights the inclusion of businesses and communities in the development of programs. This aims at reducing informality in the value chains of the forest sector and implementation of technologies with low impacts on the environment (Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, 2000, p. 20). Examples are the productive activities using non-timber products.

## 5. Discussion

In this section, we discuss the findings that deductively emerged from our results in the light of previous relevant studies, structured into three sub sections.

### 5.1. Complex regulatory landscape and market-driven policies

Colombia's policy landscape for social SI initiatives in eco-tourism presents a complex and fragmented scenario. These initiatives find themselves subjected to a web of regulations stemming from various domains—environmental, tourism, and innovation (Niebles-Núñez et al., 2022; Villamizar, 2023). However, these regulations neither coordinate effectively with each other nor establish clear connections to the realms of eco-tourism and social innovation (Rodríguez, 2018). To navigate the bureaucratic maze, SI initiatives must adhere to a set of preconditions linked to tourism and environmental standards (CONPES, 2020). Unfortunately, these conditions create formidable barriers that hinder the growth of SI, particularly the establishment of recognised legal entities (RECON, 2021). As the evidence indicates, a significant proportion of social entrepreneurship endeavours in Colombia remain informal (RECON, 2021), reflecting the numerous challenges that entrepreneurship faces, including issues with the country's legal framework (Niebles-Núñez et al., 2022; Villamizar, 2023). Shifting from informal networks and grassroots initiatives to formally recognised organisations that offer socially innovative eco-touristic experiences supporting local communities while safeguarding the environment does not align with the fragmented policies and the stringent regulations governing businesses in this sector (Rodríguez, 2018).

In this context, the prevailing market-driven policy approach tends to redefine the essence of SI. While these policies highlight the economic value generated by SI, they often prioritise economic growth over broader social, cohesive, and environmental goals (National Planning Department, 2018; Blackstock, 2005). This shift is notable, given that formal eco-tourism organisations may not necessarily represent the shared interests of local and indigenous communities (Blackstock, 2005). This can lead to an unequal distribution of power, where the voices of individual entrepreneurs and community members often go unheard in the process of tourism development (Blackstock, 2005). This deviation from the core tenets of SI, characterised by participation, inclusivity, networked structures, and representativeness, underscores a critical policy challenge in Colombia's eco-tourism sector (Pinto et al.,

2021).

Furthermore, weak institutional support is often seen in practice due to the high heterogeneity of the products and services, which does not allow institutions to develop and evolve, as in the case of forestry in which the institutional support is based on a rather narrow productive structure of forests (e.g. timber) (Niskanen et al., 2007b). Strong traditions (e.g. in forest legislation or in forest owners associations), customer-oriented tourism instead of community-oriented tourism (Alkier et al., 2017), lack of transparency in decision-making mechanism, asymmetric information with knowledge exchange (Nijnik et al., 2019) and small single business may have limited institutions to evolve and to provide greater support by means of policy instruments (Niskanen et al., 2007b). Similar findings are reported by Živojinović et al. (2023) where dispersing responsibilities among a plurality of ministries, departments, agencies and hybrid organisations reduces the efficacy of State institutions overseeing SE/SI and further contributes to the informal institutional voids.

### 5.2. Conceptual ambiguity and integration challenges

Colombian policy documents reveal a recurring issue: the interchangeable use of concepts related to SI (e.g., social innovation – social entrepreneurship – social entrepreneur – social business – green business), or eco-tourism (e.g. nature-based tourism – sustainable tourism), without systematically relating to each other (see Table 2). The policies in Colombia offer general guidelines for promoting communities as leaders of eco-touristic initiatives, namely using bottom-up approach (DNP, 2013; MinCIT, 2021, 2003), but is no further common framework for the establishment of SI initiatives. Although analysed policies contain a plethora of regulatory, informational, economic and networking instruments within all analysed policy domains, they could only implicitly refer to SI initiatives in eco-tourism. This indicates the lack of horizontal integration of SI concepts in other structural (e.g., regional policies) or sectoral policies (e.g. forestry policies, agriculture). Moreover, SI initiatives in eco-touristic are constrained by top-down policies to generate surplus, generation of income, creation of economic value, connection with the production system, growth, and internationalisation (CONPES, 2020) if they want to flourish.

In this way, policies are contributing to the misuse of the concepts (such as SI), and also might lose synergies or create contradictions across policy domains and actors involved. This leaves space to very different underlying concepts and approaches to be implemented in practice without clearly prescribed instruments and mechanisms in place, that might lead to inefficient policy implementation and exploitation of local and indigenous communities and natural resources. Moreover, such a situation could result in policy misfits, instrument redundancies, coordinative disorders, overlapping competences and imperfect allocations of resources (Krlev et al., 2020). Such could have negative consequences for both local and indigenous communities as well as management of natural resources (Saarinen, 2019). SI is not limited to only innovative products and services, but it includes an ample gamma of interventions such as the adoption of IT (information technology), new forms of intervention in a community, new community forms of organization for producing chains of value, new collective business structures, systematization and management of (tacit) knowledge, among other ways of “doing things”. The SI could also imply its application in the public sector (Barlagne et al., 2021) by adoption of new technologies, administrative structures and ways to interact and communicate with community, information and knowledge management, new monitoring and evaluation systems, or use of geographic information systems (DNP, 2013).

Other Latin American countries (e.g. Argentina and Brazil) present a similar picture (Gordon et al., 2017) as our study. Challenges are evident when SI programs with national reach struggle to go beyond the initial boundaries set by the public policy, especially regarding to mechanisms to establish multiple feedback loops and scale up feedback facilitating the transposition of national policies to local level. Krlev et al. (2020) evidenced similar findings in nine European countries, showing that although policies across countries share a general focus on economic growth and social cohesion, the practical pathways to achieving these aims differ. Furthermore, policy makers have rather vague and quite general expectations and link SI with a vast number of subjects and matters. Therefore, concepts of SI may be easily interchangeable and interpreted differently as we go from top-level institutions to actors working on the field (Krlev et al., 2020; Pinto et al., 2021). According to Krlev et al. (2020), it may be possible that SI largely defies the principles governing traditional innovation policy regimes and might necessitate new classification and prediction frameworks (Krlev et al., 2020).

### 5.3. Policy instruments and implementation barriers

In the realm of SI initiatives in eco-tourism, policy instrument selection is a complex process influenced by the prevailing ideas and concepts about regulatory tools (Arts et al., 2010). Niskanen et al. (2007a) recognise the importance of knowledge and information instruments for reducing risks in operations; finance instruments to develop infrastructure and services; networking instruments for the development of linkages among actors across the forestry, tourism, recreation, economic development and environmental sectors, as well as local and regional municipalities. While a diverse array of policy instruments exists to support these initiatives (i.e. urban labs, networking platforms for entrepreneurs, funds for tourism and female-led businesses, voluntary compensation schemes, payment of ecosystem services, capacity building and education, taxes and sanctions, and budget lines for eco-tourism projects) their practical implementation is deeply influenced by the underlying political discourses, as evident in the Sustainable Tourism Policy’s rhetoric emphasising productivity and economic growth (Santana et al., 2019). For instance, the Policy of Sustainable Tourism uses rhetorical expressions like “Produce while conserving, conserve while producing” (Santana et al., 2019, p. 45), and the NDP relies on the formula for well-being “Legality + Entrepreneurship = Equity”. The neoliberal political discourse is further reinforced by centralisation in regions like Antioquia, Valle, and Bogotá, characterised by technological advancement and a wealth of human capital (Serrano, 2012). These findings are also similar to other Latino-American countries in which the public investment in Science and Technology is mostly dedicated to universities and research centres, causing a ‘crowded out’ effect of human capital in private to public sectors (Serrano, 2012).

The choice of instruments is also deeply intertwined with the political context, resource availability, and institutional culture (Cubbage et al., 2007). Local and indigenous communities, in particular, may face resource constraints and challenges in attracting investments for touristic infrastructure development. Instruments for land acquisition and partnerships (e.g., ZIDRES zones) could lead to even greater land concentration, generation of state franchises controlled by global and national corporations prioritising economic development over social justice and land restitution claims. This strengthens the power relationships and dependence on large companies, perpetuating the market-driven logics, rural gaps, and the agency of rural and indigenous communities (Graeme and Angosto-Ferrandez, 2020). Community participation in eco-tourism involves sharing and devolving power and

authority from central government and industry to local and indigenous communities. Local control methods can promote self-determination, allowing communities to express their interests and influence planning and development processes (Saarinen, 2019).

Moreover, there is a noticeable gap in institutional efforts to emphasise the importance of eco-tourism or SI, resulting in a fragmented policy landscape (Rodríguez, 2018). The lack of access to financial resources, credit barriers, weak financing for clusters and networks, and institutional disarray (MinCIT, 2022; Rodríguez, 2018) further hinder the effective implementation of these instruments, contributing to a policy framework that falls short of reshaping Colombian society. Forest and environmental policies have primarily prioritised regulatory instruments for sustainable forest management and correcting market failures, exemplified in Payment for Ecosystem Services (Decree 1007) and Green Business. These conditions reflect limited institutional capacities and uncoordinated management of actors in the touristic sector, leading to low national budget lines (0,035% of the total national budget in 2022 for tourism) (MinCIT, 2022). This led to the policy framework without real implications in the (re)configuration of Colombian society (Rodríguez, 2018).

Innovation is not only dependent on institutional systems but also on their interaction capabilities, underscoring the importance of networking instruments in social innovation development (Ludvig et al., 2018). Colombia is making strides in recognising the need for specific policies to address emerging innovation challenges. Recent developments have seen the emergence of soft-policy instruments for forest use, management, and conservation, signalling a shift from government-centric to more pluralistic policymaking (Arts et al., 2010). However, these policies still face hurdles in terms of limited tools for local participation and a lack of emphasis on local strengths and visions (MinCIT, 2022).

As societal challenges evolve alongside changing socio-technological landscapes, Colombia is learning from past policy mistakes to build a more mature and concrete framework for social innovation (Tabares, 2021). For instance, the Public Policy of Science, Technology, and Innovation (ST + I) 2019–2038 CONPES D.C. 04 (CONPES, 2019) represents a positive step in consolidating social innovation within the policy framework, especially at the district level.

The newly adopted Law on Social Entrepreneurship (Law 2234 of 2022) holds the potential to recognise social entrepreneurs in the national territory, offering benefits like self-recognition as “Social Enterprises” and various instruments akin to those analysed, such as financing and business training (Secretariasenado, 2022). Furthermore, the coming public policy on social entrepreneurship will establish instruments for obtaining certain benefits (similar to analysed instruments e.g. financing, business training, etc). However, its success hinges on long-term vision and adequate budget allocations.

#### 5.4. Study limitations

In this study, the combination of the concepts used (SI and eco-tourism) was used to broadly capture policy domains and policies that can influence (support or hinder) SI initiatives in eco-tourism while simultaneously helping to identify policy instruments and gaps within the policy framework for SI in Colombia. As such, this study was not intended to dive into a detailed analysis of specific policy processes or discourses, so other theoretical approaches, such as actor-centred institutionalism (Scharpf, 1997) and policy arrangement approach (Arts et al., 2010), would be valuable for such analysis. These approaches could reveal the details of the policy actors and institutions in formulation and implementation processes. More research on the interests and power relations among specific actors, existing discourses

and narratives, as well as in-depth analyses and evaluations of specific policy instruments, could also be undertaken. Methodological limitations could be related to a national level of analysis of policy documents, as well as the ambiguity of concepts used. With that said, employing a higher number of cases could lead to more robust generalisations.

## 6. Conclusions

This study aimed to contribute to a better understanding of national policy framework conditions (domains and instruments) for the development of SI initiatives in eco-tourism, both those legally registered as legal entities or individuals or networks operating informally in eco-tourism. Our results point out that SI initiatives in eco-tourism that formally operate are regulated by laws and policies from tourism, environment and innovation policy. They bare strict requirements for operating in natural and protected areas and tourism-sector, and impose numerous administrative procedures and high taxes. Consequently, the entrepreneurship development is ambiguous, and social entrepreneurship often remains informal in practice.

The conducted policy analysis shows that the SI is not addressed explicitly in most policy domains. Its significance and the untapped potentials are shadowed by other overarching terms such as “Entrepreneurship”. This is considered a more relevant concept that is even included in the “formula for wellbeing”. The overall policy framework boosts the “business-as-usual” type of entrepreneurship, oriented to economic growth and by market logics, as a pillar for the development of the country. Therefore, their foundations are seen as market-driven, in order to increase productivity levels. Under these circumstances and dominant approach, social aspects and socially innovative ways of supporting local economies while protecting the environment do not have a significant role.

From the policy perspective, our results point that there is a need to improve policy coherence across and within all analysed domains, recognize regional potentialities and, and scale-down policies, decisions and instruments to the municipal and ultimately local level strengthen the local innovation processes related to eco-tourism. The policies should also take into account the heterogeneity of the productive structures, bioregions, the high amount of small and micro enterprises based on eco-tourism, and various types of ecosystem services. Most importantly, they should recognize the potential of SI as well as the right to and value of participation of local and indigenous communities, as well as other actors (e.g., municipalities, hubs, etc.) in eco-touristic activities and management of natural resources. The consolidation of innovation networks and value chains as well as strengthening human capital in local and indigenous communities could be the key to contributing to solving the still unlocked potential of these initiatives, assuming that political and border societal challenges in Colombia (such as increased conflicts, corruption, illicit activities) will also be addressed.

This opens a further debate of whether the Colombian policies need to challenge the current configuration of innovation policy domain, and be more inclusive of eco-tourism, or whether more efforts in the integration of SI in sectorial policies such as tourism, forestry, rural development and environment should be prioritized. Furthermore, given the complexity of policy frameworks and political discourses, the interplay of national level institutions and SI initiatives on the local level need to be addressed, empowering local and indigenous communities in the management of natural resources through sustainable eco-tourism activities. Only through such deep systematic changes, national level policies could be efficiently implemented on the local level benefiting local and indigenous communities and management of natural resources.



**CRedit authorship contribution statement**

**Héctor Javier García Higuera:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Investigation, Visualization, Data curation, Formal analysis. **Todora Rogelja:** Methodology, Conceptualization, Resources, Supervision, Writing - review & editing. **Laura Secco:** Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Supervision.

**Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors declare that they have no know competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence

the work reported in this paper.

**Data availability**

Data will be made available on request.

**Acknowledgements**

This study is based on the M.Sc. thesis funded by the University of Padova, Regione Veneto scholarship. We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers and editors for their valuable comments and suggestions for improving this article.

**Annex A: List of analysed documents according to three criteria**

Policy domain	Name of document	Type of document	Year	C2 Explicit SI	C3 Explicit SE	C4 Implicit SI
Cohesion	National Development Plan 2018–2022 (NDP) (Law 1955 of 2019)	Law	2019			
	Decree 810/ 2020 Patrimony for the women entrepreneurship	Decree	2020			
Rural development	CONPES 3616 / 2009 Guidelines for the income generation policy	Guidelines	2009		X	
	Policy for agro and rural development 2018–2022	Policy	2018			
	Law 1776 / 2016 Interest Zones for the rural, economic and social development -ZIDRES-	Law	2016			
Regional Development	General Law for Planning law 1454 of 2011	Law	2011			
	Law No 1876 / 2017 Agriculture Innovative National System	Law	2017			
	Guidelines for the development of agricultural activities of low impact 2021	Guidelines	2021			
Forest ry	National Forestry Development Plan 2000–2025	Plan	2000			
	Forest Policy 1996	Policy	1996			
Environment	National Plan for Green Businesses	Plan	2014			
	Strategy for the Implementation of the SDG in Colombia. CONPES Document 3918.	Strategy	2018			
	Decree 1007. Payment of ecosystem services	Decree	2018			x
Innovation	Resolution 0531 of 2013	Decree	2013			X
	Public Policy of Science, Technology and Innovation (ST + I) 2019–2038 CONPES D.C. <sup>1</sup> 04	Policy	2020	x		X
	CONPES 4011 – National Policy for Entrepreneurship (2020).	Policy	2020			X
	Conceptual Basis of a policy for social innovation (2013)	Guidelines	2013	x		X
	Strategic plan for Science, Technology and Innovation in the agricultural sector 2017–2027	Strategic Plan	2017		X	X
Tourism	Sectorial Plan for tourism (2018–2022).	Plan	2018			X
	Guide of Policy for the Development of Community-based tourism in Colombia 2012	Guidelines	2012			X
	Guide for the Communitarian Ecotourism (2013)	Guidelines	2013			X
	Law 2068 of 2020 (modified the General Law of Tourism or Law 300/1996)	Law	2020			X
	Policy for Sustainable Tourism (approved in Decree 646 of 2021)	Policy	2021			X
	Policy for the ecotourism development	Policy	2003			X
	Guide of Communitarian Ecotourism for National Natural Parks of Colombia (PNN) and their influence zones (2020)	Guidelines	2020			X
	Policy of Nature Tourism	Policy	2012			X

C1: the document was on force.

C2: document explicitly refers to SI.

C3: document explicitly refers to SE.

C4: document implicitly refers to SI initiatives.

<sup>1</sup>Capital District.

**Annex B. An example of the coded policy document**

Basis for the National Development Plan 2018–2022 – Law 1995 of 2019

Comment No.	Text (english)	Page and Chapter	Specific reference to	Times in which concept appears	Does it align with other document (e.g. policy)?	Theme	Explicit / Implicit mentioning	Instruments					Comments
								Statement	Economic	Informational	Regulatory	Networking	
1	The Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism (MinCIT) and the Ministry of Labor (MinTrabajo) will develop, according to their competences and offer, a program that considers two stages of accompaniment for innovative enterprises with growth potential. First, the institutions that carry out incubation processes will advise the structuring of the business idea. Second, the institutions that develop acceleration processes will support the ventures to be successful in encounters with potential buyers. These entities will coordinate with the relevant actors, the identification of enterprises with high growth potential to participate in these meetings, which must be held at least once a year. This program must be articulated with existing initiatives such as the Aldea	1) Objective 1: Develop a mindset, culture and other enablers of entrepreneurship	Entrepreneurship	4	No	Financing / Technical support	Implicit	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	The text refers to the support from the government to nurture the entrepreneurs and their skills. Mainly it seeks to boost incubators and acceleration programs (for more advance ventures). Therefore, there is a compromise in the national policy to boost the entrepreneurship and its coordination with other similar programs from other external institutions such as SENA (education and training), INNPulsa (National Agency of Entrepreneurship and Innovation) and Ministries, among others. Although they are no regulations given in the paragraph, there are responsibilities shared among different entities, as well as coordination needs of institutions. The culture of entrepreneurship would be also engaged as a national objective so it is possible to enhance the

(continued on next page)

*(continued)*

Comment No.	Text (english)	Page and Chapter	Specific reference to	Times in which concept appears	Does it align with other document (e.g. policy)?	Theme	Explicit / Implicit mentioning	Instruments					Comments
								Statement	Economic	Informational	Regulatory	Networking	
	<p>program of the Business Growth Management Unit (iNNPulsa) of the MinCIT, the Entrepreneur Fund of SENA and Apps. co of the Ministry of Information Technologies and Communications (MinTIC). Additionally, it should promote iterative and structured experimentation through different instances in which entrepreneurs can receive feedback as cheaply, early and often as possible. Public financial support for strengthening the incubators and accelerators of the program will depend on their results and the success of the projects they execute.</p> <p>The MinCIT, in coordination with the MinTrabajo, will develop a program to consolidate a culture and generation of capacities around investment in entrepreneurship</p>											investment towards ventures.	

*(continued on next page)*

(continued)

Comment No.	Text (english)	Page and Chapter	Specific reference to	Times in which concept appears	Does it align with other document (e.g. policy)?	Theme	Explicit / Implicit mentioning	Instruments					Comments
								Statement	Economic	Informational	Regulatory	Networking	
2	and its different modalities, impacting individuals, professional managers and entrepreneurs. The implementation of this action will be in charge of these ministries and private actors that are allies in this regard, such as chambers of commerce and compensation funds. The MinCIT, in coordination with the MinTrabajo, the DNP and other competent entities, will design and implement a national entrepreneurship policy that clarifies the roles played by institutions and entities at the central and regional level; define strategic lines to facilitate the access of the different types of entrepreneurs to the institutional offer; and include, among others, the characterization of the entrepreneurship ecosystem and the strengthening of	1) Objective 1: Develop a mindset, culture and other enablers of entrepreneurship	Entrepreneurship	4	No	Articulation	Implicit	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	It states the relevance in the articulation of different institutional sectors to give entrepreneurs opportunely the offers (capacitation, contests, etc., financing). Mechanisms would also be supported at a regional level for improving businesses. Although there is no mention about SI or SE, it is important the statement in terms of coordination among institutions.

(continued on next page)



*(continued)*

Comment No.	Text (english)	Page and Chapter	Specific reference to	Times in which concept appears	Does it align with other document (e.g. policy)?	Theme	Explicit / Implicit mentioning	Instruments					Comments
								Statement	Economic	Informational	Regulatory	Networking	
	<p>actors such as incubators, accelerators, among others, by MinCIT. This policy will take into account the connection with other policies such as productive development and formalization. Likewise, support mechanisms should be generated for regions to sophisticate their ventures. In particular, it is important to strengthen programs that enhance the growth of innovative ventures, such as Aldea or Apps.co, but it is also necessary to create new mechanisms that connect corporations with ventures, to promote their financing and the strengthening of capacities, for example, accelerators. Corporate and corporate investment vehicles.</p>												

## References

- Alkier, R., Milojević, V., Roblek, V., 2017. Challenges of the social innovation in tourism. <https://doi.org/10.20867/tosee.04.24>.
- Almeida, F., Wasim, J., 2023. Eco-innovation and sustainable business performance: perspectives of SMEs in Portugal and the UK. *Soc. Bus. Rev.* 18, 28–50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBR-12-2021-0233/FULL/PDF>.
- Álvarez, C.S., 2018. *Emprendimiento social e innovación social: espacios y lugares* 2018, pp. 89–108.
- Arts, B., Appelstrand, M., Kleinschmit, D., Püzl, H., Visseren-Hamakers, I., Atyi, R., Enters, T., McGinley, K., Yasmi, Y., 2010. Discourses, actors and instruments in international forest governance. Embracing complexity: meeting the challenges of international forest governance. A global assessment report. In: Prepared by the Global Forest Expert Panel on the International Forest Regime, 28. [online] Available at: <https://edepot.wur.nl/163887>.
- Ashley, C., Maxwell, S., 2002. Rethinking rural development. *For. Trees Livelihoods* 12, 155–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14728028.2002.9752420>.
- Barlagne, C., Melnykovich, M., Miller, D., Hewitt, R.J., Secco, L., Pisani, E., Nijnik, M., 2021. What are the impacts of social innovation? A synthetic review and case study of community forestry in the Scottish highlands. *Sustain* 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084359>.
- Barrena-Martínez, J., López-Fernández, M., Romero-Fernández, P.M., 2017. Towards a generation of socially responsible human resource management policies and practices: findings from an academic consensus. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 30, 2544–2580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1332669>.
- Biggs, S., Ellis, F., 2001. Evolving themes in rural development 1950s–2000s. *Dev. Policy Rev.* 19, 437–448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7679.00143>.
- Blackstock, K., 2005. A critical look at community-based tourism. *Community Dev. J.* 40, 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cd/bti005>.
- Bock, B.B., 2016. Rural marginalisation and the role of social innovation; a turn towards nexogenous development and rural reconnection. *Sociol. Rural.* 56 <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12119>.
- Buckley, R., 2012. Sustainable tourism: research and reality. *Ann. Tour. Res.* 39 (2), 528–546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.02.003>.
- Castro-Arce, K., Vanclay, F., 2020. Transformative social innovation for sustainable rural development: an analytical framework to assist community-based initiatives. *J. Rural. Stud.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2019.11.010>.
- CEPAL, 2016. *Claves de la innovación social en América Latina y el Caribe*. Edited by A. Rodríguez. Santiago de Chile, Chile: Naciones Unidas.
- Chamorro, E.T., Ceballos, H.O., José, J., Villa, B., 2013. Política de emprendimiento en Colombia, 2002–2010. *Estud. Gerenciales* 29, 274–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.estger.2013.09.001>.
- Chell, E., 2015. Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: concepts and definitions. In: *Social Entrepreneurship and Enterprise: Concepts in Context*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-49835-3\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-49835-3_1).
- Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2011. LEY 1454 DE 2011. Bogotá D.C. Available at: [www.bibliotecajuridica.com.co/LEY\\_1454\\_DE\\_2011.pdf](http://www.bibliotecajuridica.com.co/LEY_1454_DE_2011.pdf).
- Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2017. Ley No 1876 de 2017 Agriculture Innovative National System. Bogotá D.C.
- Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2020. Ley No 2068 de 2020 Ley General de Turismo. Bogotá D.C.
- Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2022. Ley 2234 de 2022 Social Entrepreneurship. Bogotá D.C. <https://www.funcionpublica.gov.co/eva/gestornormativo/norma.php?i=189388>.
- CONPES, 2019. Política pública de ciencia, tecnología e innovación 2019–2038 -CONPES DC 04. Bogotá D.C.: Secretaría Distrital de Desarrollo Económico, Industria y Turismo, p. 45.
- CONPES, 2020. Política Nacional de Emprendimiento – Conpes 4011 de 2020. Bogotá D.C., p. 94. Available at: <https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/CDT/Conpes/Economicos/4011.pdf>.
- Crabbe, A., Leroy, P., 2008. *The Handbook of Environmental Policy Evaluation*. Earthscan, London, UK.
- Cubbage, F.W., Harou, P., Sills, E.O., 2007. Policy instruments to enhance multi-functional forest management. *For. Policy Econ.* 9 (7), 833–851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2006.03.010> [online].
- DANE, 2021. Available at: <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/pobreza-y-condiciones-de-vida/pobreza-monetaria>.
- DNP, 2013. Bases Conceptuales De Una Política De Innovación Social. Bogotá D.C. Available at: <https://www.mincit.gov.co/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=aadc3049-7f8e-4c99-bbd0-7e5aed227fd6DNP>.
- Domanski, E.D., Monge, N., Quitiaquez, G., Rocha, D., 2016. *Innovación Social en Latinoamérica* (2016). Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios UNIMINUTO, Bogotá.
- Drisko, J.W., Maschi, T., 2016. *Content Analysis, Pocket Guide to Social Work Research Methods*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Duffy, E.J., 2002. Biodiversity and ecosystem function: the consumer connection. *Oikos* 99, 201–219. <https://doi.org/10.1034/J.1600-0706.2002.990201.X>.
- Fink, M., Lang, R., Harms, R., 2013. Local responses to global technological change - Contrasting restructuring practices in two rural communities in Austria. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 80, 243–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.10.001>.
- Fischer, F., Miller, G.J., 2019. *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*. Routledge, New York, USA.
- Font, X., McCabe, S., 2017. Sustainability and marketing in tourism: Its contexts, paradoxes, approaches, challenges and potential. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 25 (7), 869–883. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1309043>.
- García, H., 2021. *Social Innovation Policies Fostering the Preservation of Ecosystems and Natural-Based Initiatives in Colombia: An Overview and Case Study*. Master's Thesis. University of Padova.
- Gómez-Salazar, M., Restrepo-Calle, F., Salcedo-Pastrana, C., 2019. Social, political and environmental factors determining rural poverty in Colombia: A multidimensional approach. *Land Use Policy* 87 (104), 060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104060>.
- Gordon, A., Becerra, L.D., Fressoli, M., 2017. Potentialities and constraints in the relation between social innovation and public policies: Some lessons from South America. *Ecol. Soc.* 22 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09493-220,402>.
- Graeme, G., Angosto-Ferrandez, L., 2020. *Symbolism and Politics*, 1st edn. Routledge, Sydney, Australia.
- Green, G., 2018. Place-based approaches to poverty alleviation. Institutional Innovation and Asset-Based Community Development. In: Kenny, S., McGrath, B., Phillips, R. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Community Development. Perspectives from around the Globe*. Taylor & Francis, New York, USA, pp. 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2021.1894285>.
- Khanra, S., Dhir, A., Kaur, P., Mäntymäki, Matti, 2021. Bibliometric analysis and literature review of ecotourism: Towards sustainable development. *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* 37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100777> [online]. pp. 100777.
- Knoepfel, P., Larrue, C., Hill, M., 2007. *Public Policy Analysis. The Policy Press*, University of Bristol. Bristol, UK.
- Krippendorff, K., 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, 2nd ed. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, USA.
- Krlev, G., Einarsson, T., Wijkström, F., Heyer, L., Mildnerberger, G., 2020. The policies of social innovation: a cross-national analysis. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* 49, 457–478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764019866505>.
- Lindberg, M., 2017. Promoting and sustaining rural social innovation. *Eur. Public Soc. Innov. Rev.* 2 <https://doi.org/10.31637/epsir.17-2.3>.
- Ludvig, A., Weiss, G., Sarkki, S., Nijnik, M., Živojinović, I., 2018. Mapping European and forest related policies supporting social innovation for rural settings. *For. Policy Econ.* 97, 146–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2018.09.015>.
- Ludvig, A., Sarkki, S., Weiss, G., Živojinović, I., 2021. Policy impacts on social innovation in forestry and back: institutional change as a driver and outcome. *For. Policy Econ.* 122, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2020.102335>.
- Lukesch, R., Ludvig, A., Slee, B., Weiss, G., Živojinović, I., 2020. Social innovation, societal change, and the role of policies. *Sustain.* 12, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12187407>.
- Mayring, P., 2000. Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum Qual. Soc. Res.* 1 (Art 20) <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-1.2.1089>.
- MCIT, 2022. Decreto 1836 de 2021 - Gestor Normativo [online] Available at: <http://www.funcionpublica.gov.co/eva/gestornormativo/norma.php?i=175266> [Accessed 16 May 2023].
- Mihai, F., Latu, C., 2020. Sustainable Rural Development under Agenda 2030. In: Bastante-Ceca, M.J., Fuentes-Bargues, J.L., Hufnagel, L., Mihai, F., Iatu, C. (Eds.), *Sustainability Assessment at the 21st Century*, pp. 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.78105>. London.
- Minambiente, 2022. Colombia tiene 67.000 especies de fauna y flora registradas - Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible [online] Available at: <https://www.minambiente.gov.co/bosques-biodiversidad-y-servicios-ecosistemas/colombia-tiene-67-000-especies-de-fauna-y-flora-registradas/> [Accessed 16 May 2023].
- MinCIT, 2003. Política para el Desarrollo del Ecoturismo. Bogotá D.C., pp. 1–58.
- MinCIT, 2012. Política de Turismo de Naturaleza. Bogotá D.C. Available at: <https://www.mincit.gov.co/getattachment/minturismo/calidad-y-desarrollo-sostenible/politicas-del-sector-turismo/politica-de-turismo-de-naturaleza/politica-de-turismo-de-naturaleza/politica-de-turismo-de-naturaleza.pdf.aspx>. (Accessed 16 May 2023)
- MinCIT, 2021. Política de Turismo Sostenible: Unidos por la naturaleza. Bogotá D.C.
- MinCIT, 2022. Plan Sectorial de Turismo 2022–2026 Turismo en Armonía con la vida. Bogotá. Available at: [https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/CDT/portalDNP/PND-2023/05022023\\_Plan\\_Sectorial\\_Turismo.pdf](https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/CDT/portalDNP/PND-2023/05022023_Plan_Sectorial_Turismo.pdf).
- Ministerio de Ambiente Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial (MAVDT), 2006. *Lineamientos Para El Ecoturismo Comunitario En Colombia Republica De Colombia*.
- Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible (Ed.), 2014. *Plan Nacional de negocios verdes*, 1st ed. Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, Bogotá D.C.
- Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, 2018. Decreto 1007 de 2018 Reglamentación Pagos por Servicios Ambientales. Bogotá D.C., pp. 1–13.
- Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, 2000. *Plan nacional de desarrollo forestal*. Bogotá D.C.
- National Planning Department, 2018. *National Development Plan 2018–2022: Pact for Colombia, Pact for Equity*. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Niebles-Núñez, W.A., Pitre-Redondo, R., Hernández-Palma, H., 2022. Legal framework for entrepreneurship in Colombia. *Entramado* 18, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.18041/1900-3803/entramado.1.8627>.
- Nijnik, M., Secco, L., Miller, D., Melnykovich, M., 2019. Can social innovation make a difference to forest-dependent communities? *Forest Policy Econ.* 100, 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.01.001> [online].
- Nijnik, M., Kluvanekova, T., Melnykovich, M., Nijnik, A., Kopyi, Serhiy, Brnkalačková, Stanislava, Simo Sarkki, L.L., Kopyi, Igor Fyzik, Barlagne, C., Miller, D., 2021. An institutional analysis and reconfiguration framework for sustainability research on post-transition forestry – a focus on Ukraine. *Sustainability* 13 (8), 4360. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084360> [online].
- Niskanen, A., Lunnan, Anders, Ota, I., Blatner, K.A., Herbohn, J., Bull, L., Ferguson, I., Hickey, G.M., 2007a. Policies affecting forestry entrepreneurship. *Small-scale Forest.* 6 (3), 233–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11842-007-9025-z> [online].

- Niskanen, A., Pettenella, D., Slee, B., 2007b. Barriers and opportunities for the development of small-scale forest enterprises in Europe. *Small-scale Forest*. 6 (4), 331–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11842-007-9035-x> [online].
- OECD, 2021. Building Local Ecosystems for Social Innovation A Methodological Framework Building Local Ecosystems for Social Innovation. Available at: [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/bef867cden.pdf?expires=1632123387&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=0EEA0372B3C47BC\\_32B73126C19E2DAE9](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/bef867cden.pdf?expires=1632123387&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=0EEA0372B3C47BC_32B73126C19E2DAE9).
- Olmedo, L., van Twuijver, M., O'Shaughnessy, M., 2021. Rurality as context for innovative responses to social challenges – the role of rural social enterprises. *J. Rural. Stud.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.04.020>.
- Parada, J.E., Ganga, F.A., Rivera, Y.Y., 2017. State of the art of social innovation: a look at the perspective of Europe and Latin America. *Opcion* 33, 563–587.
- Pereira, H.M., Ferrier, S., Walters, M., Geller, G.N., Jongman, R.H.G., Scholes, R.J., Bruford, M.W., 2018. Essential biodiversity variables. *Science* 339 (6117). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1229931>, 277,278.
- Phillips, A., Luo, R., Wendland-Liu, J., 2023. Shifting the paradigm: A critical review of social innovation literature. *Int. J. Innovation Studies.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijis.2023.08.003>. Journal Pre-proof.
- Pinto, H., Nogueira, C., Guerreiro, J.A., Sampaio, F., 2021. Social innovation and the role of the state: learning from the Portuguese experience on multi-level interactions. *World* 2, 62–80. <https://doi.org/10.3390/world2010005>.
- Polman, W., Slee, T., Kluy'ankov'a, M., Dijkshoorn, M., Nijnik, V., Gezik, K., Soma, 2017. Classification of Social Innovations for Marginalized Rural Areas, H2020-SIMRA Deliverable 2.1, p. 32 Available at: <http://www.simra-h2020.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/D2.1-Classification-of-SI-for-MRAs-in-the-target-region.pdf>.
- Potter, R.B., Binns, T., Elliott, J.A., Smith, D., 2008. Geographies of development: an introduction to development studies. *Int. Reg. Sci. Rev.* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0160017604267629>.
- Ravazzoli, E., Torre, C.D., Da Re, R., Govigli, V.M., Secco, L., Górriz-Mifsud, E., Pisani, E., Barlagne, C., Baselice, A., Bengoumi, M., Dijkshoorn-Dekker, M., Labidi, A., Lopolito, A., Melnykovich, M., Perlik, M., Polman, N., Sarkki, S., Vassilopoulos, A., Koundouri, P., Miller, D., Streifeneder, T., Nijnik, M., 2021. Can social innovation make a change in European and Mediterranean marginalized areas? Social innovation impact assessment in agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and rural development. *Sustain.* 13, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13041823>.
- RECON, 2021. Formalizing the Road Towards Social Entrepreneurship's Sustainability. <https://www.reconcolombia.org/la-formalizacion-el-camino-hacia-la-sostenibilidad-del-emprendimiento-social/>.
- Rodríguez, S., 2018. Turismo comunitario en Colombia: ¿retórica de Estado? *Tur. y Soc. XXII*, 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.18601/01207555.n22.10>.
- Rogelja, T., Ludvig, A., Weiss, G., Secco, L., 2018. Implications of policy framework conditions for the development of forestry-based social innovation initiatives in Slovenia. *For. Policy Econ.* 95, 147–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2018.07.011>.
- Rogelja, T., Ludvig, A., Weiss, G., Prah, J., Shannon, M., Secco, L., 2023. Analyzing social innovation as a process in rural areas: key dimensions and success factors for the revival of the traditional charcoal burning in Slovenia. *J. Rural. Stud.* 97, 517–533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.12.030>.
- Rubio-Leonel, O.J., Ocampo-Valencia, L.A., Gil-Hernández, C.J., 2019. Finance, market access, and rural development: evidence from Colombia. *J. Agribusiness Dev. Emerg. Econ.* 9 (3), 268–282. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JADEE-01-2019-0004>.
- Saarinen, J., 2019. Communities and sustainable tourism development: community impacts and local benefit creation in tourism. In: *A Research Agenda for Sustainable Tourism*. Elgar Publishing, pp. 206–223. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788117104.00020>.
- Saenz, F., 2018. Sustainable tourism as a strategy for economic growth and reduction of poverty: the case of Colombia. *J. Clean. Prod.* 174, 1629–1642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.11.202>.
- Santana, C., Rodríguez, L., Viña, Á., 2019. Pacto por el emprendimiento, la formalización y la productividad: una economía dinámica, incluyente y sostenible que potencie todos nuestros talentos. In: *Desarrollo, C. de I. para el (Ed.), Critical Analysis Of The National Development Plan 2018–2022 "Pact For Colombia, Pact For Equity"*. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Scharpf, 1997. *Games Real Actors Play: Actor-Centred Institutionalism in Policy Research*. Westview Press, Oxford, UK. ISBN 0–8133–6879-0.
- Scheyvens, R., Russell, M., 2016. Tourism and poverty reduction: new pathways for development. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 24 (6), 757–774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1123419>.
- Secco, L., Pisani, E., Da Re, R., Rogelja, T., Burlando, C., Vicentini, K., Pettenella, D., Masiero, M., Miller, D., Nijnik, M., 2019. Towards a method of evaluating social innovation in forest-dependent rural communities: First suggestions from a science stakeholder collaboration. *For. Policy Econ.* 104, 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.03.011>.
- Secretariasenado, 2022. Leyes desde 1992 – Vigencia expresa y control de constitucionalidad [LEY 2234 2022]. [online] Available at: [http://www.secretaria-senado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/ley\\_2234\\_2022.html](http://www.secretaria-senado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/ley_2234_2022.html) [Accessed 19 May 2023].
- Secretariasenado, 2023. Leyes desde 1992 - Vigencia expresa y control de constitucionalidad [CODIGO\_COMERCIO PRO03] [online] Available at: [http://www.secretariasenado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/codigo\\_comercio\\_pro03.html](http://www.secretariasenado.gov.co/senado/basedoc/codigo_comercio_pro03.html) [Accessed 19 May 2023].
- Serrano, E.D., 2012. Una mirada a los procesos de innovación y desarrollo regional en algunos países de América Latina. *VIRAJES* 14, 171–207.
- Supersociedades, 2023. Conceptos Jurídicos [online] Available at: <https://www.supersociedades.gov.co/web/nuestra-entidad/conceptos-juridicos>.
- Tabares, S., 2021. A public policy for social innovation: lessons from Colombia in a nutshell. *Eur. Integr. Stud.* 17 (2), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.46941/2021.e2.51-63> [online].
- Toro-Jarrín, M.A., Plata-Díaz, A.M., Martínez-Cedeño, J.A., 2020. Eco-tourism development and its impacts on sustainable development: a Colombian perspective. *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.* 17 (100), 438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100438>.
- Torres-Delgado, A., López Palomeque, F., 2012. The growth and spread of the concept of sustainable tourism: the contribution of institutional initiatives to tourism policy. *Tour. Manag. Perspect.* 4, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TMP.2012.05.001>.
- UN, 2019. Expert Group Meeting on Eradicating Rural Poverty to Implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Vedung, E., 1998. Policy instruments: typologies and theories. In: *Bemelmans-Vidéc, M.-L., Rist, R.C., Vedung, E. (Eds.), Carrots, Sticks, and Sermons: Policy Instruments and Their Evaluation*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick and New Jersey, pp. 21–59.
- Villa, L., Melo, J., 2015. *Panorama actual de la innovación social en Colombia*. Banco Interam. Desarro, p. 81.
- Villamizar, F.R., 2023. Social enterprises and benefit corporations in Colombia. In: *Peter, H., Vargas Vasserot, C., Alcalde Silva, J. (Eds.), The International Handbook of Social Enterprise Law*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14,216-1\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14,216-1_25).
- Živojinović, I., Ludvig, A., Hognl, K., 2019. Social innovation to sustain rural communities: overcoming institutional challenges in Serbia. *Sustain* 11, 7248. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11247248>.
- Živojinović, I., Rogelja, T., Weiss, G., Ludvig, A., Secco, L., 2023. Institutional structures impeding forest-based social innovation in Serbia and Slovenia. *For. Policy Econ.* 151 (102), 971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2023.102971>.