# MAPPING THE WELLBEING ECONOMIES LANDSCAPE IN CANADA

By **Tara Campbell**, David Suzuki Foundation, **Maham Kaleem**, David Suzuki Foundation, **Naryan Wong**
MARCH 2024

# CONTENTS

WEAll Can

# INTRODUCTION

The current dominant economic system depends on endless growth, extraction and exploitation of workers. It is a causal factor in the global ecological and social crises we face today. **Wellbeing economies** are an alternative to our current economic reality and are centred on a different purpose: to enable the flourishing of all life. There is no recipe for a wellbeing economy. In fact, we like to speak about them in the plural to indicate that they can manifest in myriad forms. However, there are a few principles they might have in common[1]:

1. **Dignity:** Everyone has enough to live in comfort, safety and happiness.
2. **Nature:** A restored and safe natural world for all life.
3. **Purpose:** Institutions serve the common good and create real value.
4. **Fairness:** Justice is at the heart of the economy.
5. **Participation:** Citizens are actively involved in their communities and locally rooted economies.

The Wellbeing Economies program at the David Suzuki Foundation (DSF) is looking to catalyze an alliance of organizations, projects and people to support a transition in the Canadian economy toward a **wellbeing economy**. We are affiliated with the Wellbeing Economy Alliance (WEAll), a global collaboration working for economic systems change. Part of WEAll's organizing structure is to develop **hubs**: "self-organising, place-based groups that facilitate collaboration and activity towards building a Wellbeing Economy in different territories." We are in the early stages of developing a hub in Canada.

In our journey toward creating a Canadian hub, we are building off of previous convenings we have hosted (Design Lab and Northern Woods), as well as extensive relationship-building and network knowledge that we have developed from being in this space over the past couple of years. Some of this includes an awareness that:

- there are many **overlapping and adjacent networks** with similar values working for economic transition;
- we need to be **intentional about inclusion** as there are a lot of dominant voices in the next economy space that tend to end up in the centre of conversations, projects and resources;
- "wellbeing economies" is a powerful and appealing frame to all sorts of people, but we need to be clear about what it means so it doesn't get co-opted and so that there is a **clear indication** of what it means to support it.

---

1 These principles come from the Wellbeing Economy Alliance https://weall.org/what-is-wellbeing-economy

We are hoping to build off of these learnings to create a healthy self-governing network. DSF does not wish to hold sole stewardship of this alliance, but rather to encourage shared leadership from within the network. As we transition from a phase of unstructured network learning into this next intentional chapter, we felt the need to begin with a *landscape map* and some initial analyses.

Our purpose for developing a landscape map was two-fold:

1. There are many similarly aligned actors working for economic transition in Canada. In creating a new alliance, we need to **understand what role our alliance should play** without unnecessarily duplicating existing efforts.

2. With an intention to centre voices and perspectives that have historically been marginalized from conversations about what future Canadian economies could look like, we felt a need to have a better sense of who is an actor in the landscape in order to **know who to invite and centre in the alliance.**

**Our mapping team**

This initial mapping project was a collaboration between Tara Campbell and Maham Kaleem from DSF's Wellbeing Economies team and Naryan Wong, a network and systems specialist (our biographies are included in Appendix A). We also had contributions from several individuals we saw as part of the landscape through informal meetings and interviews. See our Methodology section below for further details.

# METHODOLOGY

## PROCESS

Our mapping and insight-generation process roughly followed these steps:

1. **Scanning the landscape** We began by scanning — looking for people, groups and projects that fit our inclusion criteria (see below). We worked through our existing relationships and knowledge of the landscape, we attended events and participated in adjacent networks and we did desk research on relevant news, social media, etc. As we identified landscape actors and elements, we added them to our database. We also mapped relationships between elements when we were aware of them. In Appendix C, you can see a definition of each of the fields that we may have tracked for all of the elements we included in our map.

2. **Interviews and feedback** We engaged more directly with approximately 20 of the organizations and individuals we mapped. These interviews were largely informal conversations, and all of them looked different (you can see questions we drew from in Appendix B). We used these conversations to get feedback on our map and see the landscape from different perspectives.

3. **Collective processing and synthesis** We met weekly as a mapping team to share our findings and make sense of the landscape together. We evolved our mapping approach as we went and collectively arrived at insights and next steps.

Our process was iterative — we went through these steps over and over, and often they were happening in parallel.

### SCOPE

Determining the scope of this analysis was difficult! Defining "wellbeing economies" and who to include when mapping the "landscape" was an ongoing conversation with our mapping team. Reflecting back, these are the loose inclusion criteria we followed:

## INCLUSION CRITERIA:

- **Based in Canada or has some affiliation/impact in Canada**
  We prioritized groups, individuals and projects that were active at provincial/territorial and national scales, although we didn't exclude any significant local or regional work that we came across in our research.
- **Working on at least one aspect of economic systems.**
  These include:
  o Production and consumption
  o Social security and basic needs
  o Labour, jobs and work
  o Money and exchange
  o Wealth and redistribution
  o Deliberation, regulation and planning related to any of the above economic system aspects

We also included groups that may not be directly working on these aspects, but that are working on deeper factors like public narratives, cultural change, etc. that we felt could affect the economic system.

- **Oriented by wellbeing economies values and principles.**
  We have drawn on many sources to develop our own internal understandings of the values and principles of wellbeing economies, but for simplicity's sake we will illustrate this using WEAll's (see Figure 1). The entity only needed to be guided by some or even one of these values and principles.

**Figure 1** This figure is borrowed from the WEAll Scottish Hub. It shares the five values central to wellbeing economies: dignity, fairness, nature, participation and purpose.



**DIGNITY**
Everyone has enough to live in comfort, safety, and happiness.

**PURPOSE**
Institutions serve the common good and create real value.

**NATURE**
A restored and safe natural world for all life.

**PARTICIPATION**
Citizens are actively involved in their communities and locally rooted economies.

**FAIRNESS**
Justice is at the heart of the economy.

We were generous in our inclusion at this stage since we were operating without a tightly scoped definition of wellbeing economies. We acknowledge that the values and principles are only loosely defined, and what one entity may say is oriented by valuing "nature," for example, may conflict with another entity's perspective. We know that clearer boundaries will be needed as we move into alliance-building.

## LIMITATIONS

All maps are partial, yet each may be useful in its own way. With this landscape map, we attempt to make visible a fraction of a much larger landscape — the part of the landscape that is most visible to us from where we are. There are several limitations of the map:

- It is based on personal relationships and knowledge as well as a limited number of interviews.

- The scope and inclusion criteria underrepresent grassroots and informal groups.

- Yet, the scope and inclusion criteria are quite broad and might include elements that aren't really aligned with a wellbeing economy.

- There are more relationships that connect these groups than we were able to notice: friendships, family ties, shared experiences, past working relationships and more. Without crowdsourcing the data, the true extent of this informal network is hard to see.

We know that many other organizations and individuals that would meet these inclusion criteria are not on the map. We could not be exhaustive in our search and we did our best to see beyond our current network awareness. We would love your feedback if you would like to see someone or something on the map that isn't there.

# NETWORK MAP

## THE MAP

**You can find our living Kumu map here.** At the time of writing, we included around 500 elements (groups, individuals and projects). The map will continue to grow as we learn more about the landscape and get feedback and contributions. You can map alongside us! You can add new elements or connections to the map with this form. If you want to edit any data in the map please reach out to us directly and we can help with that. Kumu has a lot of features for navigating the map. We have attempted to make navigation as straightforward as possible, and you can continue to learn more about the tool in the Kumu documentation.

**Figure 2** Screenshot of our Kumu network map

## FOCUS AREAS

As we mapped elements in the wellbeing economies landscape, we recorded their "focus areas"; i.e., their areas of interest and work. We generally opted to use their own language or terminology to describe these focus areas. At this stage, we have come across 180 distinct focus areas. However, many of these areas overlap and cluster into similar categories. We have developed a categorization system that you can see below, which includes eight high-level categories made of several sub-categories (see Table 1).

**Table 1** Focus Area Categorization

| TOP-LEVEL CATEGORY | SUB-CATEGORY |
|---|---|
| BASIC NEEDS | • Housing<br>• Health<br>• Food & Agriculture<br>• Transit<br>• Education<br>• Childcare<br>• Energy |
| ENVIRONMENT | • Climate<br>• Nature<br>• Sustainable Communities |
| ENTERPRISE | • Finance<br>• Social Enterprise<br>• Labour & Work |
| COMMUNITIES | • Trade & Localization<br>• Community Economies |
| JUSTICE & PLURALITY | • Indigenous Economies<br>• Justice & Equality |
| GOVERNANCE | • Policy & Regulation<br>• Measurement & Goals<br>• Democracy & Deliberation |
| CHANGEMAKING | • Systemic Innovation<br>• Leadership<br>• Movements & Visions<br>• Culture & Faith |
| TECHNOLOGY | • Technology |

The entities we mapped often had several focus areas and could have interests spanning several of the high-level categories that we developed.

## ADJACENT NETWORKS

We also encountered many similarly aligned groups and networks. Our intention is for WEAll Can to position itself strategically in awareness of what all these other groups are doing, as well as be a connector across networks.

### ADJACENT GROUPS & NETWORKS:

This list is partial, and some groups and networks are closer in spirit to wellbeing economy transitions than others.

- CCEDNET & People-Centred Economy Group
- Canadian Purpose Economy Project
- Investment Readiness Program
- Table of Impact Investment Practitioners
- Green Economy Network
- Blue Green Canada
- Canadian Wellbeing Knowledges Network
- Canadian Society for Ecological Economics
- Planetary Health and Societal Wellbeing Working Group
- Degrowth Collective
- Alliance for a Liveable Ontario
- SaskWellbeing
- Community Econopmies Network - Shorefast
- The Wellbeing Project
- Alliance 2030
- Canadian Labour Congress
- Ontario Nonprofit Network
- Transition Innovation Group
- ACORN Canada
- Progressive Economics Forum
- Flourishing Enterprise Institute

## TERMS AND MOVEMENTS

Many different terms are used to label movements and visions for different economies. We came across just transition, degrowth, solidarity economy, green economy, social economy, sustainable economy, regenerative economy, cooperative economy, post-growth economy, progressive economy, inclusive economy, circular economy, ecological economy, purpose economy, etc. (see Figure 3 for some examples from WEAll). These aren't necessarily different words for the same thing; there are differences but also lots of overlaps.

**Figure 3** Some of the different terms and strategies at work (image from WEAll)

# SOME WELLBEING ECONOMY STRATEGIES
### SUPPORTED BY THE MOVEMENT



**CIRCULAR ECONOMY**
Transform production and consumption processes to reuse resources, design waste and pollution out of the cycle, and regenerate the natural world. The primary ways to do this are recycling waste for new production or using waste for conversion to energy.

**COMMUNITY WEALTH BUILDING**
Identifies 'anchor' economic institutions with strong linkages to the local economy, to foster 'bottom-up' and inclusive development.

**REGENERATIVE ECONOMY**
Focuses on building an economy that mimics nature by regenerating the social and ecological assets needed for wellbeing.

**ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY**
Ensures equitable distributions of economic power through democratic management of economy via policy, social enterprises, and community wealth management.

**COMMON GOOD ECONOMY**
Evaluates business success not by profits, but rather by their contribution to the 'common good' and alignment with values of Dignity, Social Justice, Environmental Sustainability, and Transparency.

**SOLIDARITY ECONOMY**
Promotes the expansion of economic activities and behaviours that are based on principles of reciprocity, cooperation, and solidarity.

**DOUGHNUT ECONOMIES**
Supports the design of economic systems that ensure necessary social foundations, while respecting planetary limits.

**CORE ECONOMY**
Recognizes central importance of economic activities that occur amongst families, friends, and communities, which are non-monetized and driven by values of love, empathy, responsibility, and care. Transparency.

**FOUNDATIONAL ECONOMY**
Advocates for the use of public policy to secure the supply of basic goofs and services to all people in a sustainable manner (e.g. socially and environmentally responsible).

# INSIGHTS

## INSIGHTS ABOUT THE LANDSCAPE

### INSIGHT 1

**There are many communities in the landscape united by geography, focus area or theory of change. While there are some bridges between these communities, it doesn't seem like the landscape is "working together."**

Looking at this map (partial though it may be), we notice pockets of connection, clustering into communities/networks. These communities often gather around either 1) a similar **geographic focus**, and/or 2) a similar **focus area** and/or 3) a similar **theory of change** (see Table 2). The communities we have observed gather around one or more of these factors.

**Table 2** The uniting factors for communities within the landscape

| UNITING FACTOR | EXAMPLE |
|---|---|
| Geography | **Alliance for a Livable Ontario**<br>Focused on Ontario-based issues |
| Focus Area | **Climate Action Network Canada**<br>Focused on climate issues |
| Theory of Change | **Canadian Wellbeing Knowledges Network**<br>Focused on reforming the existing system through policy change and measurement (a symbiotic logic — see the "Modes of transformation" table further in this section) |

These communities are highly networked within but not necessarily across networks. As a corollary, there are many groups that aren't connected even if a connection might be fruitful. For example:

- There is a beautiful system of different organizations working together to enhance wellbeing in the Toronto neighbourhood of Parkdale, including a land trust, food co-op, recreation centre, job centre and health centre. Leaders of these organizations meet regularly to talk about issues facing their neighbourhood.

- Climate Action Network Canada connects 150-plus organizations focused on climate justice. They convene calls and webinars for members to learn from each other and support joint projects.

The organizations working in Parkdale aren't visibly connected to the organizations in the Climate Action Network — why would they be? Why include both sets of communities in this map? This leads to our next insight:

## INSIGHT 2
### Leaders think about strategy at the level of complexity managed by their group

Chatting with leaders in this space, many would describe their strategies at the level of complexity managed by their group — team strategy for team leaders, organizational strategy for leaders of organizations, network strategy for leaders of networks. Some would describe larger hopes for systems beyond their group, but very few would describe an integrated strategy that would include the amount of diversity found in this map.

Some countries, such as Scotland, New Zealand and Finland, have efforts to describe a national strategy to transition toward wellbeing economies (see Lindsay McLaren's article for more detail), while Canada does not. A national strategy could help describe a big-picture shift that includes efforts across all the facets of our economy — such as housing, employment, production, food, data, social support, education and more. We also see utility in developing shared strategies across that landscape of actors working in this space; it doesn't necessarily need to start from a government-led strategy.

Our mapping revealed that great effort is happening in different sectors, not yet connected enough to create the kind of transformation we can imagine. The conditions seem ripe for a larger strategy to emerge out of new conversations that bring together varied perspectives with the hope of describing a more multifaceted vision for a Canadian economy that works for the wellbeing of people and the planet.

## INSIGHT 3
### Many of the landscape actors are not connected to international movements

As part of the tendency for communities to focus around a similar geographic scope, many of the communities are not connected to international movements for economic transformation.

## INSIGHT 4
### Not everyone we saw as part of the landscape sees themselves as playing a role in economic system transformation

Because the scope of what we see as included in economic transformation is so large, we set a wide scope for what we included in our landscape analysis. During some of our interviews with people and organizations with a tighter focus, we noticed that they did not necessarily see their work or activities as contributing to shifts in the dominant economic system. This is a thread for discussion as WEAll Can further develops a strategy and actions.

# INSIGHTS ABOUT CHALLENGES

### INSIGHT 5
### People and organizations in the landscape are pursuing different visions. Some of these visions support each other and others might compete

Through our observations of the landscape, we found that when getting concrete about the different kinds of futures that groups and individuals are pursuing, there are many overlaps but also many differences. Given the ambiguity of terms like "wellbeing economy" and other visions, it's easy to see how this happens. To us, a wellbeing economy would enable the flourishing of a tapestry of economies and ways of life. There doesn't have to be just one vision that we all agree on. However, there is a need to create at least a loose boundary around "wellbeing economies" so that the language and narrative aren't watered down or used in service of ideas that might not lead to economies that are truly equitable and that exist within ecological limits. For example, does an economy that looks exactly the same but powered by renewables lead to a wellbeing economy? Does a kind of tamed capitalism meet our vision of justice and equity? These are places of conflict among the different individuals and groups that we mapped.

### INSIGHT 6
### There can be a sense of territory within the landscape

Through our experience of existing in this landscape, we have noticed the sometimes-territorial culture that exists as new and old organizations wrestle for recognition. There can be competition over funding and attention. Often one focus area or strategy is elevated over others as "the most important leverage point." This sense of territory and competition can get in the way of meaningful relationships and collaboration.

### WHAT THESE INSIGHTS MIGHT MEAN FOR THE ROLE OF WEALL CAN

We (Tara, Maham, Naryan) see a possibility for many people in Canada to become more conscious of how they are already working to create a wellbeing economy. We suspect that an intentionally held collective process may support diverse groups to contextualize their work as part of a larger strategy that adds up to a shift in the economic system larger than any group would choose to pursue alone. Erik Olin Wright outlined three modes of societal transformation: ruptural, interstitial and symbiotic (see box below). He states that none of these strategies on their own is enough, and often they are pitted against each other. What if we could coordinate across these modes, seeing their value even if we have a strong inclination toward one of them?

## MODES OF TRANSFORMATION

In Envisioning Real Utopias, Erik Olin Wright outlines three strategic logics for societal transformation.

1. Ruptural - confront the dominant system and seek to replace it
2. Interstitial - build alternatives outside the dominant system
3. Symbiotic - transform the existing system, institutions and infrastructure

*"None of these strategies is unproblematic. None of them guarantees success. All of them contain risks and dilemmas. In different times and places, one or another may be the most effective, but typically none of them is sufficient by itself. It often happens that activists become deeply committed to one or another of these strategic visions, seeing them as universally valid. As a result, considerable energy is expended fighting against the rejected models. A long-term project with any prospects for success must grapple with the messy problem of combining these strategies, even if the combination inevitably means that struggles often operate at cross-purposes.."*
- Erik Olin Wright, "Compass Points"

We wonder what our role might be in supporting such a process. Over the past year, our role has been to notice and make sense of the wellbeing economies landscape in Canada and to reflect back what we've found. Some important roles that WEAll Can might play going forward include:

- **Seeing the system:** Observing the landscape and tending to the systems-level learning that we need to build systemic strategies

- **Connecting across geographies, focus areas, and theories of change:** Creating spaces for relationship-building and fostering connections across the different communities in the landscape

- **Facilitating the pathway from an uncoordinated landscape to an impact network:** Working to shift the landscape along a developmental pathway by increasing relationships, shared knowledge, and ability to self-organize

We hope that what we're seeing is meaningful for those we share it with, and that others feel attracted to joining us on this journey.

# NEXT STEPS

It has been difficult to create boundaries around this mapping project. With a broad definition of what contributes to wellbeing economies, there are always more groups and individuals that we could include and whole sectors (e.g., housing, food) that we could dive into. We could continue to research and map indefinitely. And we will in some fashion, but we are shifting our scanning and mapping into a background task so that we can start to move forward with building the alliance, leveraging our findings from this research.

## AS NEXT STEPS, WE INTEND TO:

- **Form a core group** The next step in our alliance-building process is to form a core group that will co-govern WEAll Can alongside us. We have come to learn that this is an important step if our long-term goal is collaborative leadership. We intend to use our map to identify potential core group members and feed our mapping insights into our strategy.

- **Launch the alliance** In collaboration with the core group, we intend to publicly launch WEAll Can. The concept has been "soft-launched." We have a website and small social media presence, but we intend to move into a participatory phase where people can join, participate and shape the alliance and its activities.

- **Continue mapping!** We want to continue to grow our awareness of corners of the map that we currently don't know that much about and discover our "unknown unknowns". We also hope to continue to synthesize insights from the network awareness we are developing.

## CALL TO ACTION

- **Please feel free to use the map as a resource. We really appreciate additions, edits and feedback.**

- **If you are interested in being a part of a wellbeing economies alliance in Canada, please reach out so that we can get introduced!**

- **If you want to stay aware in a low-commitment way, you can subscribe to our newsletter, or follow us on X**

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A: AUTHORS

### TARA CAMPBELL

Tara (she/her) is a designer specializing in change-enabling collaborative processes. In her role at the David Suzuki Foundation she is working alongside a national network of organizations, alliances and individuals to accelerate the transition to an economy that prioritizes human and planetary wellbeing. She is also a design fellow at the Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience, where she studies and prototypes collaborations. She has a Master of Design in Strategic Foresight and Innovation from OCAD University where she cultivated her practice of design thinking, systems thinking and strategy development. She loves riding her bike outside, weaving, woodworking and learning about fungi. You can reach Tara at tcampbell@davidsuzuki.org.

### MAHAM KALEEM

Maham (she/her) is a wellbeing engagement specialist at the David Suzuki Foundation, leading efforts to reshape our economic paradigm toward a sustainable future. Previously, Maham spearheaded campaigns advocating for environmentally conscious voting at federal, provincial and municipal levels. Emphasizing principles of belonging and inclusion, Maham focused on community spaces to foster social capital and linguistic diversity. Her work reflects a passionate commitment to national environmental advocacy and community empowerment. Maham loves using poetry as a way to connect to her Pakistani heritage, is fond of chai and loves meeting people who share her passion for holistic ways of building community. You can reach Maham at mkaleem@davidsuzuki.org.

## NARYAN WONG

Naryan (he/him) supports leaders and networks to navigate the complexities of the world around them to create a more beautiful future. He focuses on individual and collective learning, creating conditions for collaboration and healthy system dynamics. Professionally, Naryan works with senior leaders for some of the world's most innovative organizations in food-banking, education, technology, pharmaceuticals, consumer goods and more. He also founded the not-for-profit ThinkBetter, acts as an affiliate of the Post Growth Institute, sits on the board of an adult development community and stewards a learning network. In 2023, he co-authored the book **Human Work** and is helping organizations to create workplaces that bring out the best in each of us. You can reach Naryan through LinkedIn.

## APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Our interviews were only loosely structured, but we drew from the following questions:

**After sharing the draft map:**

- What stands out to you?
- Who/what would you add or change on the map?
- Who are you connected to?
- Who do you want to be connected with?
- Who do you trust/listen to?
- Who else should we speak to who would be able to add to the map?

**About the organization/their work:**

- What are you hoping to see in the future at your organization/with your work?
- What is the hardest part of your job?
- What frustrates you in your work?
- Do you have any offers/needs you would want to share with the wellbeing economies landscape?
- What frameworks or maps are you already using to orient yourself and your work?
- What risks or challenges do you anticipate as we move to build an alliance/network of networks in this landscape?

## APPENDIX C: DEFINITION OF FIELDS

| FIELD | TYPE | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|
| Element Type | Select one:<br>• Individual<br>• Group<br>• Project | Individuals are people; groups are organizations, networks, or informal groups; projects are pieces of work or resources created by individuals and/or groups |
| Description | Text | A description of the element, usually taken from the element's website. |
| Focus Areas | Short text (multiple entries allowed) | A list of an element's "focus areas" - the topics that they are engaged in and interested in. Generally these are in their own language. |
| Image | Image URL or image file | An image of the element - generally a logo or public photograph. |
| Location | Short text, generally: Municipality, Province/Territory. E.g., Toronto, ON | The location where the entity exists. If it is an individual it is the municipality where they live, if it is an organization it is the location of their head office. |
| Province/Territory | **Multi-select of:**<br>• Alberta<br>• British Columbia<br>• Manitoba<br>• New Brunswick<br>• Newfoundland<br>• Northwest Territories<br>• Nova Scotia<br>• Nunavut<br>• Ontario<br>• Prince Edward Island<br>• Quebec<br>• Saskatchewan<br>• Yukon | The province(s) or territory/territories where the entity is active. |
| Website | URL | The web address of the entity, if it exists. |

| Fields that apply to entities with type 'Group' only | | |
|---|---|---|
| Contact | A name | The contact we have established at an organization |
| Geographic Focus | **Multi-select of:**<br>• Neighbourhood<br>• Municipal<br>• Regional<br>• Provincial/ Territorial<br>• National<br>• First Nation<br>• International | The geographic scope the organization tends to focus on |
| Sector | **Select one:**<br>• Academic<br>• Business/ Enterprise<br>• Co-op<br>• Faith<br>• Government<br>• Grassroots<br>• Labour<br>• Media<br>• NGO<br>• Philanthropy<br>• Investment Fund<br>• Network | The sector of the organization |
| Year Established | A year | The year the organization was established |

## APPENDIX D: OTHER MAPS AND DATABASES WE CAME ACROSS

- **Real Economy Lab**

https://realeconomylab.kumu.io/new-economy-ecosystem-map

https://flourishingenterprise.org/

This project appears to not be active anymore - original data from 2015

- **Corporate Mapping Project**

https://www.corporatemapping.ca/

- The Potential of the Not-for-Profit Economy by Jennifer Hinton

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EMtpZ4EyNuM

- **New Economy Organizations by Guy Dauncey**

https://docs.google.com/document/d/19qwzQQk7sEz6xV2MvoZyLqWd6f4TUYMtTWxk-b6qTy4/edit

- **Purpose Economy Ecosystem Map**

https://embed.kumu.io/44bf23e6aa121159e91c41069714aeaa#spi-sna

- **Degrowth Database by the International Degrowth Network**

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18Z7kTs0smhOU9S3DyGNJ_MBQeu3XKW2qdxa3unOEn6I/edit#gid=0

## APPENDIX E: NARYAN'S MAPS

Visit our Miro Board to see some of the maps and diagrams we made as part of our own sensemaking through this project.

**Figure 4** A screenshot of a Miro Board containing some systems maps we made as part of our process