

Capital-Light Entrepreneurship in Rwanda: A Scoping Review of Low-Capital Business Opportunities

Sixbert Sangwa*¹, Sylvie Ndahimana¹, Placide Mutabazi²

¹Department of International Business and Trade, African Leadership University, Kigali, Rwanda

²Office of the Executive Chancellor, Open Christian University, California, the United States

*Corresponding Author: ssangwa@alueducation.com

ARTICLE INFO

Accepted: 16 December 2025

Published: 18 December 2025

CITATION

Sangwa, S., Ndahimana, S., & Mutabazi, P. (2025, December 16). Capital-Light Entrepreneurship in Rwanda: A Scoping Review of Low-Capital Business Opportunities. Open Journal of Stewardship Economics & Ethical Innovation, Vol 1(2).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65655/s2598a69>

COPYRIGHT

Open Journal of Stewardship Economics & Ethical Innovation (OJ-SEEI) is published by Open Christian Press. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. Copyright © 2025 by author(s).

PUBLISHER INFO

Open Christian Press—the publishing arm of Open Christian University—is produced in partnership with the Center for Faith and Work.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this work are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the positions of the publisher, the funders, or the authors' affiliated institutions.

Abstract: Purpose: This study interrogates Rwanda's persistent finance gap by systematically identifying business models that tertiary-educated youth and professionals can launch with negligible start-up cash. It clarifies which “business-with-no-capital” slogans hold empirical merit and how such ventures contribute to inclusive growth. **Design/Methodology/Approach:** A PRISMA-guided scoping review of 40 academic, policy and grey sources (2015–2025) mapped low-capital opportunities across all economic sectors. Each model was appraised through an Evidence-Weighted Feasibility Scoring framework covering regulatory complexity, skills intensity, time-to-first-revenue, market access, scalability and community value, yielding an integrative Feasibility Matrix. **Findings:** Analysis reveals a diversified Capital-Light Opportunity Architecture in Rwanda. Highest-feasibility pathways cluster in (i) digital freelancing and micro-consulting, (ii) commission-based agency and dropship commerce, and (iii) agribusiness brokerage and clean-energy micro-distribution. These ventures generate revenue within days to weeks, demand modest upskilling rather than credit, and, when scaled, enhance financial inclusion, food systems efficiency and environmental health. Nonetheless, feasibility is sector-contingent: digital options scale fastest but require strong human capital, whereas agribusiness delivers deeper community impact at slower payback. **Practical and Social Implications:** The study offers policymakers an actionable Feasibility Matrix, risk-guardrail table and Impact Assessment Framework to inform streamlined formalisation, youth-targeted micro-grants, shared-asset hubs and anti-predatory market surveillance. Educators and incubators can embed the scoring tool to steer graduates toward evidence-backed, capital-light start-ups instead of speculative schemes. **Originality/Value:** By synthesising dispersed evidence into a transparent scoring rubric, the paper pioneers a rigorous yet practitioner-ready lens on ultra-lean entrepreneurship in low-income economies. It moves the discourse from inspirational anecdotes to data-driven guidance, aligning with Rwanda's vision of a knowledge-based, job-creating economy.

Keywords: capital-light entrepreneurship; low-capital business models; Rwanda start-ups; feasibility assessment; opportunity architecture; inclusive development; youth employment

1. Introduction

Access to startup capital is often cited as a critical barrier for entrepreneurs in emerging economies (Beck et al., 2005; Ubukombe, 2023). In Rwanda—a low-income country with high tertiary-educated unemployment (nearly 34% for recent graduates (NISR, 2024; Brudevold-Newman & Ubfal, 2024) and a predominantly informal workforce (over 90% of jobs (NISR, 2024)—the traditional model of capital-intensive entrepreneurship is infeasible for most. Graduates and young professionals frequently resort to “*side hustles*” or micro-ventures to supplement income and ameliorate financial pressures (Kirezi, 2016). Yet, the viability and support needs of capital-light or near-zero-capital business models in the Rwandan context remain under-studied in academic and policy literature. Many initiatives promoting entrepreneurship focus on SMEs with some access to finance, overlooking ultra-lean ventures that rely primarily on personal skills, networks, or shared resources (GEM, 2024). This leaves a knowledge gap on what kinds of businesses a resource-constrained but educated individual can realistically start, and what challenges or enablers they encounter (GEM, 2024).

1.1. Problem Statement: Rwanda’s push towards middle-income status and knowledge-economy transformation must reconcile with the reality that a large segment of its workforce, including educated youth, engage in necessity-driven microentrepreneurship due to scarce formal jobs (Brudevold-Newman & Ubfal, 2024). If these micro-ventures can be better understood and supported, they hold promise for poverty reduction and inclusive growth. However, without clear evidence on which business models work with minimal financial capital—and how factors like regulation, skill requirements, and market conditions affect their success—graduates risk trial-and-error in ventures that may fail or expose them to exploitation (Nabi et al., 2017; Ngobi et al., 2025). Moreover, policymakers lack grounded insights to craft interventions that expand such opportunities responsibly (e.g. simplifying formalization processes or protecting micro-entrepreneurs from predatory practices).

1.2. Research Purpose and Questions: Building on a peer-reviewed research proposal that conceptualized this inquiry (Sangwa & Mutabazi,

2025), the present study systematically investigates capital-light entrepreneurship options for Rwanda’s graduates and professionals. The aim is to generate a comprehensive mapping of viable business models and to evaluate their feasibility across multiple dimensions, thereby informing both practitioners (aspiring entrepreneurs) and policymakers. We address three research questions: **RQ1:** Which business models and entry pathways in Rwanda are most feasible to initiate with minimal or near-zero startup financial capital for graduates and professionals? **RQ2:** How do these low-capital opportunities vary across sectors when assessed by key feasibility dimensions (regulatory complexity, skills intensity/learnability, time-to-first-revenue, market access, scalability, and community-development value)? **RQ3:** What ecosystem and policy measures would most credibly expand access to these opportunities while reducing informality, exploitation, and predatory risk?

1.3. Significance: By answering these questions, the study offers a needed evidence base on “ultra-lean” entrepreneurship in Rwanda. The findings can help demystify viable paths for educated individuals to create additional income without significant capital—an especially relevant pursuit in Rwanda where formal credit is limited and The share of adults using informal mechanisms decreased from 78% in 2020 to 72% in 2024 (NISR, 2024; AFR, 2020). Additionally, the study’s feasibility scoring approach provides a tool for evaluating and comparing diverse ventures on consistent criteria, which can be adapted in other low-resource settings. Ultimately, this research aligns with national objectives of youth empowerment and inclusive private sector growth, highlighting ways to harness human capital when financial capital is scarce. By maintaining an academic lens with rigorous sourcing while focusing on practical models, the study bridges the gap between research and actionable knowledge for Rwanda’s entrepreneurship ecosystem.

1.4. Conceptual Framework: Capital-Light Opportunity Architecture

Capital-Light Opportunity Architecture: We propose a conceptual framework that delineates how business ventures can be architected to minimize the need for upfront financial capital.

Drawing on theories of *effectuation* (which emphasize making do with available means) and frugal innovation, this framework identifies common mechanisms that allow entrepreneurs to launch and operate ventures with lean finances (Sarvasvathy, 2001; Weyrauch & Herstatt, 2016; Weyrauch & Herstatt, 2017). Key elements include: (a) leveraging human capital – using one’s existing skills, education, or talents as the primary input to create value (e.g. offering professional services or creative outputs), (b) mobilizing social capital and networks – utilizing relationships, trust, or community cooperation to access resources like workspace, tools, or initial customers without heavy costs (Bourdieu, 1986), (c) exploiting shared or idle assets – tapping into under-used assets (personal or community-owned) such as spare rooms (for home stays), vehicles (for ride-sharing or deliveries), or communal land (for micro-farming), rather than investing in new assets, (d) utilizing digital platforms and technology – which often have low entry costs – to reach markets or deliver services (for instance, online freelancing marketplaces, social media marketing, or mobile money systems), and (e) pursuing incremental growth and reinvestment – starting at a tiny scale and reinvesting early profits to grow, instead of large upfront investment. These elements form the architecture of capital-light models: entrepreneurs compensate for lack of financial capital by substituting other forms of capital and by designing the business model to be intrinsically low-cost (Becker, 1993; Coleman, 1988) (Table 2 illustrates examples).

Within this architecture, we introduce the notion of *entry pathways*. An entry pathway is the practical route through which an individual launches the venture given minimal capital. Examples include piggybacking on existing supply chains (e.g. becoming a commission-based agent for a company rather than stocking your own inventory [Gikundiro, 2025]), or informal apprenticeship to gain skills on the job instead of formal training. Recognizing these pathways is crucial, as they often determine feasibility for those with financial constraints. The framework thus maps not only the types of ventures but *how* one can enter them with minimal funds – whether by starting home-based and scaling later, using barter and in-kind contributions, or joining platform ecosystems that require only a smartphone.

Evidence-Weighted Feasibility Scoring:

To systematically evaluate and compare the

identified opportunities, we developed an evidence-weighted scoring approach. Each opportunity model is assessed on a set of feasibility criteria derived from literature on micro-entrepreneurship and tailored to our research questions: (1) *Regulatory complexity* – the degree of regulatory burden or required compliance (licenses, registrations, taxes) to start and operate the business; (2) *Skills intensity/learnability* – the level of expertise or training needed and how easily an average graduate/professional could acquire the necessary skills; (3) *Time-to-first-revenue* – how quickly the venture can generate income from inception; (4) *Market access* – the ease of reaching customers or entering the market, considering infrastructure and competition; (5) *Scalability* – the potential to expand the venture’s output and income over time without proportionally high capital investment; and (6) *Community-development value* – the extent to which the venture yields positive social or community outcomes (e.g., job creation for others, provision of essential services, or environmental benefits). These criteria align with the feasibility dimensions mentioned in RQ2 and reflect a holistic perspective on “feasibility” beyond just profitability – incorporating social and temporal considerations.

Each criterion is scored on a 1 to 5 scale (in which 5 indicates highly favorable feasibility on that dimension, and 1 indicates very low feasibility/major challenges). Crucially, scoring is *evidence-weighted*: this means that we anchored our ratings in data and documented examples. For instance, if multiple sources indicated that a certain business faces minimal regulatory hurdles (like informal home services in Rwanda requiring no formal license [Antoun, 2020]), we assign a high score for regulatory ease; conversely, if evidence shows an opportunity requires difficult-to-learn skills, we assign a lower skills feasibility score. Where evidence was strong (e.g. unanimous agreement across sources or authoritative data), the score was given with high confidence; where evidence was thin or mixed, we opted for a middle-range score and noted the uncertainty. We also constructed an aggregate *Feasibility Matrix* (Table 1) that displays the scores of top opportunities across sectors, facilitating cross-sector comparison. We scored each dimension 1–5, then reported 1–2 as Low, 3 as Medium, and 4–5 as High in Table 1 for readability.

To maintain objectivity, this scoring approach integrates an audit trail: each score can be traced to specific supporting information (see Appendix A for the inventory of opportunities with sources). In effect, our feasibility scoring is not a subjective guess but a structured synthesis of the reviewed evidence – an approach aligned with best practices in structured synthesis and scoping reviews (Tricco et al., 2018). The scoring rubric (Appendix B) details the definitions and weighting of each criterion. Notably, for simplicity and transparency, we gave equal weight to each of the six criteria in computing overall feasibility; this treats, for example, regulatory ease and skills requirements as equally important aspects of feasibility. We acknowledge that in certain cases stakeholders may prioritize some criteria over others (e.g. a policymaker might prioritize community impact, while an individual might prioritize time-to-income), but an equal weighting provides a neutral starting point. Sensitivity to evidence is incorporated qualitatively: if an opportunity's score is driven by very context-specific evidence, we flag that in discussion rather than adjusting numeric weight.

By combining the Capital-Light Opportunity Architecture with the Evidence-Weighted Feasibility Scoring, our conceptual framework bridges qualitative understanding and quantitative evaluation. It first explains *how* low-capital businesses function and can be started, and then provides a method to *rank or compare* them on key success factors. This novel framework is intended to guide both analysis and practical decision-making – helping a prospective entrepreneur to gauge which ideas are most workable in their context, and helping policymakers to identify which areas (criteria) most constrain or enable different venture types.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design: This study utilizes a *secondary research* design combining elements of a scoping review and documentary analysis. Following PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses – Scoping Review) guidelines, we systematically surveyed both academic and gray literature for evidence on low-capital entrepreneurship opportunities relevant to Rwanda. We also examined policy documents, official statistics, and digital platforms advertising small-scale business opportunities. The goal was to cast a wide net

(“scoping”) across sectors and opportunity types, then distill credible evidence regarding feasibility. No primary fieldwork was conducted; instead, we triangulated data from high-integrity sources such as peer-reviewed journals, government and multilateral reports, and reputable industry or nonprofit publications.

2.2. Search and Inclusion Strategy:

Multiple information sources were queried, including scholarly databases (e.g. Google Scholar), development and government websites (e.g. National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda, Rwanda Development Board, World Bank, UNCTAD), and specialized entrepreneurship portals. Search strings combined keywords for Rwanda with terms like “*low-capital business*,” “*start-up with no money*,” “*youth entrepreneurship*,” “*micro-franchise*,” “*informal sector opportunities*,” and *sector-specific terms* (e.g. *agriculture*, *ICT*, *services*). Because many capital-light entry pathways in Rwanda are advertised through recruitment-style pages rather than entrepreneurship literature, we also used targeted grey-literature search strings reflecting how firms label these opportunities in practice. Examples of these strings included ‘become an agent Rwanda,’ ‘apply to be an agent,’ ‘authorized dealer,’ ‘reseller/distributor application,’ ‘consignment agreement,’ and ‘micro-franchise Rwanda.’ This approach was necessary to capture formalized agent and reseller pathways across banking, telecoms, fintech, e-government kiosks, and distribution programs that are otherwise missed by conventional ‘low-capital business’ searches (ITA, 2024).

Appendix C details the search strings and databases used, as well as inclusion/exclusion criteria. In brief, we included sources from 2015–2025 that provided data or concrete examples of business models requiring little financial capital, with preference for Rwanda-specific information or, where unavailable, evidence from comparable contexts in sub-Saharan Africa. We excluded purely anecdotal “business idea” listicles without evidence, as well as any schemes of dubious legality or pyramid-type programs. In total, we reviewed over 60 documents, of which approximately 40 were retained as relevant sources for analysis (see Appendix C for a PRISMA-ScR flow diagram and list of sources).

2.3. Definition of “Minimal or Near-Zero Capital”: A critical step was to operationally define what constitutes minimal start-up financial capital.

For this study, we define “minimal or near-zero” capital as requiring negligible upfront monetary investment, typically on the order of only tens of US dollars (well under 100 USD, or <100,000 RWF) or no cash outlay at all. This implies the opportunity can be launched without formal bank financing, major equipment purchases, or significant inventory stock. It does *not* imply zero cost in a broader sense – such ventures often demand substantial non-financial inputs such as personal time, existing skills or education, social capital, use of already-owned tools or internet access, etc. We thus distinguish between financial capital and non-financial resources: for example, starting a freelance graphic design service may require no money if one already owns a computer, but the computer itself (and the skill to use it) are non-financial inputs. In screening opportunities, we focused on those not requiring entrepreneurs to raise funds beyond perhaps small personal savings or informal support from family. Any model that inherently called for significant paid assets (e.g. purchasing a vehicle, buying large stock) or that assumed working capital beyond a very small threshold was set aside or noted as higher-capital.

2.4. Analytical Framework – Feasibility Scoring: To systematically compare opportunities, we developed an Evidence-Weighted Feasibility Scoring framework. From literature and context, we identified six key dimensions to evaluate each low-capital opportunity: (1) Regulatory Complexity – the burden of licenses, registrations, or compliance needed to operate legally; (2) Skills Intensity & Learnability – the level of specialized skill or training required and how easily an average graduate could acquire those skills; (3) Time to First Revenue – how quickly an entrepreneur can start earning income from the venture (e.g. days, weeks, months); (4) Market Access – the ease of reaching customers or securing supply, including whether the opportunity taps into existing high-demand markets; (5) Scalability – the potential to grow the income beyond subsistence (e.g. can the model expand in volume or scope without enormous new capital); and (6) Community Development Value – the broader social benefits, such as job creation for others, provision of needed services, or empowerment of marginalized groups. Each identified opportunity was qualitatively scored as High, Medium, or Low on each dimension based on evidence from the sources (for instance, if an opportunity required only a simple registration and had no restrictive

regulations, it was “High” on ease of regulatory compliance). Weights were implicitly given by evidence; for example, if multiple sources praised an opportunity’s quick payback, that supported a High score on time-to-revenue. The scoring process was cross-checked against any available data – e.g. typical licensing times, training requirements, or known growth trajectories. Table 1 in the Findings presents a *Feasibility Matrix* summarizing these comparative scores for selected top opportunities.

2.5. Capital-Light Opportunity

Architecture: In analyzing the universe of options, we also created a conceptual Opportunity Architecture to categorize *how* each business model manages to minimize financial capital. This emerged inductively from the data. Common mechanisms include: commission-based or agency models (selling products or services on behalf of others for a commission, thus no need to buy inventory upfront), sharing or rental arrangements (leveraging other people’s assets or renting equipment only as needed instead of owning it), digital platform work (using existing online marketplaces or freelance platforms that remove the need for physical infrastructure), micro-franchising (joining a small-scale franchise or authorized dealer program that provides start-up kits or credit), and community-based models (such as cooperatives or group businesses that pool resources). We documented instances of these mechanisms in practice (see Table 2 in Findings for examples) and used them to guide the search for real-world opportunities (Appendix A provides a catalogue of identified *legitimate* capital-light opportunities with source links).

2.6. Ethical Considerations: Given the focus on potentially vulnerable entrepreneurs (youth with limited capital), ethical screening was paramount. We avoided inclusion of any opportunity verging on illegality (e.g. unlicensed pharmaceuticals) or exploitation (e.g. labor schemes with predatory terms). We also critically examined opportunities often marketed as “easy and free” to debunk myths – for instance, multi-level marketing schemes that tout zero-capital startup but require costly product purchases. Throughout the analysis, we highlight necessary guardrails and risk mitigation (summarized in Table 3) to ensure recommendations do not inadvertently promote informality or abusive practices.

By combining these methods – scoping review, structured scoring, and ethical vetting – the

study aims for a comprehensive yet realistic portrait of low-capital entrepreneurship in Rwanda. The next section presents the findings for each research question, integrating the quantitative and qualitative insights into actionable knowledge.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1. High-Feasibility Low-Capital Business Models in Rwanda (RQ1)

Typology of Low-Capital Models: The research identified a broad typology of capital-light business models, cutting across sectors but sharing common mechanisms. Notable categories include: **Service-Based Micro-Enterprise** (leveraging personal skills to offer services like tutoring, repair, design with virtually no cash outlay), **Commission Agent or Reseller** (earning income by selling others' goods or facilitating transactions without buying stock), **Digital Freelancing and Content Creation** (using online platforms to sell work or content, requiring only a computer or smartphone and internet), **Mobile and Home-Based Services** (businesses like mobile money agents, home-based catering or tailoring, where infrastructure needs are minimal), and **Micro-franchises & Affiliate Programs** (joining an established model that provides initial equipment or product on credit or low fee) (Lisita & Jantjies, 2025). These models align with what we term the Capital-Light Opportunity Architecture: they reduce financial barriers either by *externalizing costs* (using someone else's assets or inventory), *digitizing the business* (thus avoiding physical overhead), or *incremental bootstrapping* (starting very small and reinvesting earnings).

3.2. Top Feasible Opportunities: From the dozens of possibilities catalogued (see Appendix A), we distilled a shortlist of high-feasibility opportunities most suitable for educated Rwandan youth and professionals to start with near-zero capital. Table 1 provides a comparative Feasibility Matrix of these selected opportunities, scored across the six criteria. The table highlights why these stand out as especially viable. For instance, digital freelancing (e.g. offering graphic design, writing, or software development services on platforms like Upwork) scores High on regulatory ease (no special license needed to start, beyond maybe a simple business registration) and High on time-to-revenue (one can obtain gigs and start earning within weeks),

though it may score Medium on skills (depending on the service, one needs marketable skills) (Bleu, 2025). Mobile money or banking agency is another top opportunity – becoming an agent for mobile payment services or a banking correspondent requires little more than a phone and a small float, yet taps into massive nationwide demand (Rwanda had over 100,000 mobile money agents by 2018, reflecting how accessible this micro-business is) (MINICT, 2018). It scores High on community value (fostering financial inclusion) and High on market access (nearly universal local need for these services), with Low capital requirements (telecom companies often provide branding and support).

To make this pathway actionable in the Rwanda context, the evidence base includes multiple concrete agent programs: telecom and fintech agent networks (e.g., MTN Mobile Money agents, Airtel Money agents, and fintech agents) alongside banking correspondent or agency banking models (e.g., BK agency banking and other bank agency systems). In practice, a high-feasibility variation is the 'multi-service kiosk' model, where one operator stacks several agent roles in one location (cash-in/cash-out, bill payments, basic banking services, and related fee-based services). This bundling raises daily transaction volume and improves resilience because revenue does not depend on a single provider or product line.

Other highly feasible models include commission-based online retail (for example, acting as a dropship reseller on social commerce platforms). In West Africa, platforms like Tendo allow youths to start online retail with no capital by connecting them with wholesale suppliers for drop shipment (Tendo, 2023); similar e-commerce affiliate models are emerging in East Africa. A Rwandan entrepreneur could curate products on Instagram or WhatsApp and only purchase from a supplier once an order is confirmed – effectively a zero-inventory business. A closely related Rwanda-specific variant is platform-mediated consignment with fulfillment support (ITA, 2024). Notes drawn from RwandaMart's supplier consignment model indicate that suppliers can place products for sale under a consignment arrangement where ownership remains with the supplier until sale, and payment is remitted after transactions are completed on the platform's terms. This is analytically important because it represents a capital-light pathway that reduces the entrepreneur's

need for upfront inventory financing while still enabling participation in digital commerce through an established channel.

Tutoring and private coaching is another attractive avenue: graduates can offer tutoring in academic subjects, language lessons, or ICT skills from home or rented classrooms. This model scores High on skills learnability (it uses knowledge they already have) and High on time-to-cash (clients pay per session), with minimal costs (perhaps just learning materials). Small-scale agribusiness services also appear in the top ranks – for example, agricultural brokerage or aggregation. A resourceful individual could organize the collection of produce from farmers and connect to urban markets or processors, taking a commission. This requires trust and coordination more than money (possibly just a phone and transport fare). It rates High on community value (supporting farmer incomes and reducing post-harvest losses) and Medium on scalability (if successful, it can grow into a larger distribution enterprise). Regulatory complexity is generally Low if working informally or within cooperative structures, though formal commodity trade may need licensing for larger scale.

An additional high-potential capital-light cluster is clean cooking and energy micro-distribution embedded in neighborhood retail. Notes on Rwanda's context highlight models such as 'point-based' distribution where existing shops serve as branded dispensing or sales points for household energy products, as well as distributor pathways for improved cooking solutions. Analytically, these resemble micro-franchise or micro-consignment logic: the entrepreneur leverages an existing retail footprint and local foot traffic, while the principal system provides the product ecosystem, branding, and often the operational rails.

Illustrative company cases reinforce the viability of this cluster. KOKO Networks is piloting a nation-wide network of bio-ethanol "KOKO Point" fuel ATMs that turn ordinary corner stores into low-risk clean-fuel agents (Kigalitimes, 2025; RDB, 2024). Similarly, BioMassters has already distributed more than 6,500 locally manufactured gasifier stoves and secure pellets from waste biomass, offering street-level micro-distributor roles with 30 % lower end-user fuel costs (BioMassters, 2025; Acumen, 2024). Most recently, Bboxx Rwanda and the Government of Rwanda announced an 18-month programme to deploy 50 000

pay-as-you-go LPG kits, scaling an agent-led distribution model that mirrors its solar PAYGo success (Bboxx, 2025). This cluster also scores strongly on community-development value because it links household energy access with health and environmental co-benefits.

Evidence of Success: Many of these models have proven successful in Rwanda or similar settings when executed well. For instance, Rwanda's freelance digital sector, while nascent, benefits from the country's high internet penetration and youth tech savvy – Africa accounts for about 10% of the world's freelancers and is growing rapidly (Bleu, 2025), and Rwandan freelancers have begun to win contracts in software development, translation, and online customer service. On the agency side, the explosive growth of mobile money agents in Rwanda (from ~83,000 in 2017 to ~108,000 in 2018 [MINICT, 2018]) underscores how a near-zero capital opportunity (agents typically just need a minimal e-float and a branding kit) can scale out nationwide when demand is high and barriers are low. Similarly, anecdotal evidence shows many educated Rwandans engage in side businesses like weekend tutoring, Instagram boutiques, or tour guiding for visitors – tapping into personal skills with minimal investment. These micro-ventures often remain informal, but they demonstrate feasibility: they generate first revenues quickly and can be expanded gradually.

It is important to note that *minimal capital* does not equal "easy money" – entrepreneurs still need to hustle, use personal networks, and often start small. However, the identified opportunities share a realistic entry profile for those with more talent than cash. By focusing on service and knowledge intensity rather than capital intensity, these models align well with Rwanda's educated youth demographic. Table 1 summarizes the comparison across top opportunities. Each opportunity is denoted with its primary sector or type, illustrating that high-feasibility low-capital options exist in multiple sectors, from agriculture to ICT to retail. The next subsection (RQ2) will further discuss how sectoral context influences these feasibility dimensions.

Table 1. Feasibility Matrix – Selected High-Feasibility Low-Capital Opportunities (Rwanda)

Opportunity & Sector	Reg. Complexity	Skills (Learnability)	Intensity	Time to First Revenue	Market Access	Scalability	Community Value
Digital Freelancing (ICT) – e.g. online services on Upwork/Fiverr	Low: no special license, can start as self-employed (RRA, n.d.)	Medium: requires marketable skill (e.g. coding, design) but many free learning resources; English proficiency important		High: potentially within days/weeks of securing first gig	High: global client base via platforms; competition exists but niche specialization helps	High: can scale by taking on more projects or subcontracting; even form small agency over time	Medium: primarily individual benefit, but successful freelancers can later hire or mentor others
Mobile Money/Banking Agent (Finance/Trade) – mobile payments agent or bank micro-agent	Low: basic registration with provider; no complex regulation (telco handles compliance)	Low: easy to learn transactions and record-keeping (often training provided by provider)		High: immediate – earn commissions on each customer transaction daily (Argent et al., 2013, MINICT, 2018.)	High: very strong local demand (86% of adults use mobile money [TransFi, 2025]); foot traffic key (NISR, 2024)	Medium: limited by location volume; can expand by adding more services or outlets if small capital is reinvested	High: enhances financial inclusion and convenience locally; trusted community service role
Commission-Based Online Retail (Commerce) – dropshipping or affiliate marketing via social media	Low: no licensing if small-scale online sales; can operate informally initially	Medium: moderate skills in online marketing, social media; learnable by youth (many training programs exist)		Medium: may take a few weeks/months to build audience and receive orders; relatively quick if using existing marketplaces	Medium: access to national/global customers online, but need digital access; reliant on supplier reliability for fulfillment	High: if demand grows, can scale by adding product range or converting to full e-commerce; low overhead allows rapid scaling	Low: primarily an income source for the individual; indirect benefit by offering consumers more choice; risk of counterfeits or low quality goods if not careful
Tutoring and Skills Training (Education) – private tutoring, language classes, IT training	Low: no formal license for private tutoring; just register business name if scaling up center (RRA, n.d.)	High: leverages existing knowledge (graduates in math, English, etc.); teaching skill needed but can be developed; very learnable		High: quick – can get first students and paid sessions within days if there is local demand	Medium: local market access depends on networking and reputation; high demand for education but need to reach parents/students; possibly use online advertising	Medium: can scale by taking more students, group classes, or hiring additional tutors; growth requires maintaining quality	High: contributes to human capital in community (better exam results, skills); accessible education services
Agro-Produce Broker (Agriculture) – aggregating farm produce for market on commission	Low/Med: minimal formalities as an individual agent; however, larger scale trading needs compliance with coop/market regulations	Low: primarily requires communication, trust-building, basic accounting; can be learned through practice and mentorship with farmers		Medium: may take a season or sourcing cycle to see profits (e.g. arrange harvest collection); not as immediate as daily trade, but quicker if	Medium: must build network of farmers and buyers; Rwanda’s growing urban markets and regional export channels are opportunities, but logistics can be a hurdle	Medium: if successful, can expand to more villages or products; may require small capital for transport as scaling up (could	High: strengthens market for farmers (reduces post-harvest losses, better prices) and increases food supply efficiency; community trust role

			linking existing outputs to buyers		be offset by buyer advances)	
Micro-Consulting Services (Professional) – e.g. bookkeeping, digital marketing for local SMEs	Low: easy to register as individual consultant; some fields (accounting) benefit from certification but not mandatory for basic services	Medium: needs professional skills (accounting, marketing, etc.) typically obtained via education or short courses; learnable for graduates in business fields	High: quick to start – can sign first client within weeks if networking is done; payment often monthly or per task	Medium: local market of SMEs is growing; access requires networking or partnering with SME support programs; trust is key for clients to outsource tasks	Medium: can grow by taking multiple clients or forming a micro-firm with peers; limited by time unless hiring others (which then requires more capital)	Medium: helps uplift other small businesses (improved bookkeeping, marketing leads to SME growth); fosters formalization indirectly by professionalizing micro-entrepreneurs
Handicrafts or Creative Products (Manufacturing/Creative) – making and selling crafts, fashion, etc. using local materials	Low: generally low regulation at micro scale; need to comply with marketplace rules if selling at crafts markets or online Etsy stores	Medium: craft skills required (e.g. tailoring, woodworking) – many Rwandan youth have these or can learn through vocational training; creative design skill adds value	Medium: moderate – time to produce initial stock or prototypes; revenue flows once items are made and sold, could be within weeks if there's tourist or online demand	Medium: access to market can be via local craft markets, boutiques, or online (Rwandan artisans increasingly use platforms to reach global customers); requires marketing effort	Medium: can scale by increasing production (hire apprentices or use better tools) and reaching export markets; scaling may need capital for tools or materials but can reinvest profits	High: preserves and promotes culture, potentially employs other artisans as it grows, and can especially empower women and rural youth; uses local materials, supporting local economy

High (H) = very favorable; **Medium (M)** = moderate/average; **Low (L)** = challenging relative to other categories. (Scores are comparative and based on qualitative evidence; see text for rationale.)

Table 1 illustrates that multiple pathways offer a “small start” for entrepreneurs. Digital freelancing and agency services tend to shine in quick returns and scalability, whereas community-oriented models like agro-brokering score high on social impact. Commission and service models generally have the lowest regulatory hurdles, as Rwanda has made it easy to register a small business online at zero cost¹. The main limitation across all is that even low-capital businesses demand know-how and effort – e.g. to succeed as a dropship reseller, one must learn digital marketing; to be an effective broker, one must cultivate networks and trust. Thus, human capital and social capital substitute for financial capital in these models (Becker, 1993). This finding reinforces the importance of training and mentorship as part of the ecosystem (addressed under RQ3).

Finally, it’s worth noting what is *not* on the top-opportunities list. Some ideas popular in generic “no capital business” blogs – like trading Forex/cryptocurrency with no money, or joining a multi-level marketing (MLM) scheme – were deemed either unfeasible or too risky given our criteria. Such activities either aren’t truly “business models” or pose high predatory risk and are excluded on ethical grounds (discussed later). The opportunities we highlight are grounded in legitimate economic activities that have been observed to work at small scale in Rwanda or comparable contexts.

3.2. Sectoral Differences in Low-Capital Opportunities Feasibility (RQ2)

While the concept of capital-light entrepreneurship spans all sectors, the *feasibility profile* of opportunities can vary markedly by sector. Here we compare how low-capital models play out in three broad sectors of Rwanda’s economy: Agriculture, Services/Trade, and ICT/Digital (as representative of the modern services sector). We also touch on other sectors (manufacturing, creative industries) as relevant. Each sector’s context influences regulatory demands, skill needs, timeframes, and potential for growth.

3.2.1. Agriculture & Agribusiness:

Agriculture remains a backbone of Rwanda’s livelihood, engaging a large share of the population (especially rural youth) mostly in subsistence

farming. Traditional farming itself is generally not a “no-capital” enterprise (it requires land, inputs, labor over seasons), so our focus is on *agribusiness micro-ventures around agriculture*. As noted above, opportunities like produce aggregation, input distribution on commission, or small-scale processing are feasible entry pathways.

Feasibility in agriculture-linked models tends to be shaped by physical constraints and seasonality: time-to-revenue may be slower (tied to crop cycles or building farmer relationships), and market access can be challenging due to logistics and perishability. For example, a village agent collecting tomatoes to sell in Kigali might need to arrange transport and cold storage quickly – non-monetary hurdles that require coordination.

Regulatory complexity in this sector is relatively **Medium**: Rwanda’s food safety and cooperative regulations mean that once volumes grow, one may need certifications or to join a cooperative/marketplace formally. However, at a micro scale (like an individual aggregating neighbors’ produce), enforcement is lax and one can operate with basic local permissions.

Skills intensity is generally **Low** – one doesn’t need advanced education to be a produce broker or run a farm-input kiosk; familiarity with farming and basic business skills suffice, which rural youth often have through family experience.

Community impact is **High**, as these ventures improve rural incomes and reduce waste. Scalability can be **Medium**: an agro-dealer can grow into a larger supply business if provided some credit (indeed, programs by NGOs and agritech firms often help youth become agro-dealers by providing inventory on consignment). In Rwanda, the government and partners have been promoting youth agripreneurs through initiatives like the Rwanda Youth in Agribusiness Forum (RYAF), recognizing that engaging young people in agri-value addition is key to sector growth. Thus, agriculture sector opportunities are very much present, but they may require patience and strong relationship management more than in fast-paced sectors. A low-capital agricultural venture might not generate income as instantly as a service gig; however, it can be started with near-zero cash (leveraging social ties and existing agricultural output) and scaled gradually. Importantly, to avoid exploitation, any such venture must ensure fair dealing with farmers and

¹ Cfr Rwanda Revenue Authority (RRA)

compliance with quality standards as it grows (a point returned to under RQ3 guardrails).

3.2.2. Services and Trade: The services sector – encompassing retail trade, personal and professional services, hospitality, etc. – is where the majority of Rwanda’s micro-businesses already operate (NISR, 2023). It’s no surprise that many low-capital opportunities reside here, because starting a small service or trading business often has minimal formal requirements. Within services/trade, we differentiate petty trade (like informal vending, market stalls) and modern services (like tutoring, beauty services, small restaurants). Petty retail trade is a classic entry path for those with little capital: for example, selling snacks or phone airtime on the street. Feasibility for such trade is mixed.

On one hand, regulatory complexity is Low at micro-scale – though city authorities may restrict street vending, registration for a small shop is straightforward and cheap. Skills required are Low (basic salesmanship), time-to-revenue is High (immediate daily sales), and market access is High in busy areas. This explains why over half of all businesses are in trade (NISR, 2023).

On the other hand, scalability is low – competition is fierce and margins thin, making it hard to grow a petty trade without injecting more capital. Also, many such traders remain trapped in informality, facing risks of eviction or lack of legal protection. More innovative trading models like dropshipping online or multi-brand kiosks can enhance scalability by widening market reach without large investment (as discussed, a dropshipper is essentially a trader with infinite shelf space online).

In personal services (e.g. hairdressing, food catering, repairs), capital needs are a bit higher (one might need tools or equipment) but still modest; importantly, **skills intensity** can be a limiting factor – a beautician or auto mechanic needs training. However, Rwanda has numerous TVET (vocational) graduates who possess such skills but lack capital for a shop. For them, a feasible path is mobile services: e.g. a trained electrician offering home-call repair services (just needs basic tools and a phone for clients to contact). This model has Low regulatory barriers (most such trades are unregulated or require a simple permit), and time-to-income is quick once clients are found. Market access can be localized and reliant on word-of-mouth or digital classifieds. An

emerging enabler is digital marketplaces for services – for instance, online directories or apps where people can hire plumbers, tutors, etc. If Rwanda develops these platforms (akin to “services Uber”), it could greatly increase market access for low-capital service micro-entrepreneurs.

A shining example in services is the mobile money agent mentioned earlier. It falls at the intersection of trade (handling cash transactions) and service (facilitating payments). The fact that hundreds of thousands of Rwandans could become agents with minimal cash demonstrates how policy and corporate support can open up an avenue: telecom companies provided the branding, training, and tech backend, and agents mostly needed to be honest and have a small working capital float. This model could be replicated in other domains – e.g., Irembo e-government agents who help citizens apply for documents online for a small fee, using just a computer and internet connection. Indeed, partnerships with Rwanda Telecenter Network (RTN) and Irembo have created digital service kiosks run by local entrepreneurs to deliver e-government services, extending the reach of digital government while creating jobs. These kiosks require minimal capital (often just a computer and printer), and entrepreneurs earn via service fees².

Notes from Rwanda-specific agent recruitment pathways suggest that the ‘agent’ mechanism is not confined to finance. Comparable commission or fee-for-service models appear in domains such as e-government facilitation and other service intermediation, where entrepreneurs monetize access, guidance, and transaction execution rather than product ownership. This reinforces the opportunity architecture argument that agency models scale across sectors in Rwanda: the entrepreneur’s primary assets are trust, process competence, and customer access, while the principal organization supplies the underlying platform or service.

In sum, the services/trade sector offers abundant low-capital niches. The feasibility is generally high on quick revenue and low formal hurdles, but the flipside is often market saturation and vulnerability (everyone tries these, leading to many micro-players with tiny incomes). Therefore, the challenge in this sector is differentiating oneself or aggregating to achieve scale – something we

² Cfr Rwanda Telecenter Network (RTN).

discuss in recommendations (e.g. forming cooperatives or networks so micro-providers can access bigger contracts).

3.2.3. ICT and Digital Sector:

Opportunities in ICT and digital services (beyond just freelancing) represent a growing frontier in Rwanda's push for a knowledge-based economy. These include app development, digital content creation (YouTube, blogging, podcasting), e-commerce ventures, and tech startups. At first glance, launching a tech startup might seem to require significant capital (for equipment, software, etc.), but in today's cloud-based, lean startup environment, even tech businesses can start with minimal funds – relying on free online tools and open-source software. For graduates skilled in coding or digital marketing, starting a simple web-based service or media channel can indeed be near-zero cost.

Regulatory complexity in ICT is typically Low (the tech sector is lightly regulated, aside from general business registration and ICT laws for things like data privacy which usually do not burden a small startup initially). Skills intensity, however, is High – one needs solid technical or creative skills to succeed, which limits this path to those with adequate education or self-taught expertise.

The **time-to-first-revenue** in digital ventures can vary: freelancing and gig work is fast, as noted, but building an audience on YouTube or a new mobile app can take months or even years to monetize. Thus, the feasibility of digital content creation as a low-capital business is medium – the entry cost is zero (anyone can start a YouTube channel with a smartphone) but the *likelihood* of earning significant revenue is uncertain and usually requires consistent effort and high-quality output. Nonetheless, Rwanda has seen a rise of youth content creators and local e-commerce sites. The government's E-commerce Strategy explicitly recognizes that many micro-entrepreneurs cannot afford big investments to go online, and it encourages revenue-sharing models and platforms to integrate them (YAPORH, 2023, GIZ, 2022). For example, instead of each craftsman building a costly online store, a shared platform can list many artisans' products, taking a small commission on sales – a win-win that lowers individual capital needs. This approach is echoed in UNCTAD's recommendations for Rwanda: enabling small businesses to piggyback on larger e-commerce

infrastructure to reduce upfront costs (UNCTAD, 2023).

Comparative Insights: Summarizing across these sectors, we observe certain patterns:

- **Regulation:** Rwanda's generally business-friendly environment (zero-cost company registration, fast online procedures [Cfr RRA]) means regulatory complexity is not the biggest barrier in most sectors for small ventures. However, specific sectors like food/agriculture or transportation have additional regulations (food safety, licensing) that can kick in as a business grows. The majority of truly low-capital startups will begin informally or under the radar of regulators – a reality that policies must acknowledge (discussed in RQ3).
- **Skills:** The ICT/digital opportunities demand the highest skills, whereas trade and basic services need the least specialized skills. Agriculture needs more tacit knowledge and social skills than formal education. This suggests tailoring entrepreneurship training: high-tech pathways require upskilling in coding or digital literacy, while low-tech pathways might focus on basic bookkeeping, communication, and quality control.
- **Speed of revenue:** Trade and simple services can generate income immediately (selling daily essentials, etc.), which is crucial for entrepreneurs who cannot go long with zero income. Digital and creative enterprises might require building a customer base first, which is a barrier if one has no other income. One mitigation observed is *hybrid entrepreneurship* – e.g., a young person might start a blog (slow to monetize) but simultaneously tutor or drive a moto-taxi (immediate cash) to sustain themselves. Thus, low-capital entrepreneurs often juggle multiple activities, mixing quick-return gigs with building a longer-term business.
- **Market access:** Opportunities tied to local basic needs (food, mobile money, education) have readily accessible markets but lots of competition. Those tied to global markets (IT freelancing, online sales) have virtually

infinite market scope but face international competition and depend on internet connectivity and payment systems. Notably, Rwanda's high internet coverage (99% 4G coverage [WTO & World Bank, 2025]) and improving digital payment ecosystem make global market access increasingly realistic for even rural entrepreneurs. Still, language and exposure are obstacles for many; bridging programs (like linking rural artisans to Etsy via NGOs) can help.

- Scalability:** Generally, digital businesses and knowledge services can scale faster and bigger without proportional capital increases (a software can be replicated easily; an online course can be sold repeatedly). In contrast, brick-and-mortar or product-based businesses (like agriculture, crafts) scale by adding inventory, equipment, or people – which eventually needs capital or credit. This does not negate their value; it simply means that the truly “zero-capital” stage might eventually transition to needing some investment to grow beyond a subsistence level. Our scoring considered scalability in terms of how far one can go before hitting a capital wall. The implication is that different sectors will have different *thresholds* at which external financing becomes necessary: a digital startup might get very far on zero capital (just personal time) until suddenly it needs venture capital to hire developers; a small trader might need a loan fairly early to buy more stock and increase turnover.
- Community impact:** Low-capital businesses in sectors like agriculture, education, and finance tend to have direct community benefits (food security, knowledge dissemination, financial inclusion). Those in purely digital or personal retail are more individually oriented (though successful ones contribute via employment or inspiring others). Recognizing this, support programs might prioritize high-community-value sectors for public support (since they yield positive externalities), while leaving purely private-gain ventures to the market. For example, a tech content creator might not get as much government support as a youth agribusiness cooperative, under a

development rationale – unless the content is educational or solving a social problem.

In conclusion, sectoral analysis reinforces that *context matters*: a “low-capital business” is not one-size-fits-all. Graduates should pursue opportunities aligned with their skill domain and sector conditions. Rwanda's full economy spectrum – from farms to cyberspace – holds potential entry points, but each with distinct enablers and hurdles. This calls for sector-specific support interventions. The next section (RQ3) discusses what ecosystem and policy measures can enhance these opportunities' viability and mitigate the risks (informality, exploitation, predation) that often accompany low-capital entrepreneurship.

3.3. Ecosystem and Policy Measures for Inclusivity and Risk Mitigation (RQ3)

Scaling up access to low-capital entrepreneurship opportunities in Rwanda will require concerted efforts across the ecosystem – policymakers, educational institutions, financial services, and community organizations – to create enabling conditions while safeguarding participants from pitfalls. Key measures fall into two categories: (a) expanding access and success rates for genuine opportunities, and (b) reducing informality and guarding against exploitation/predatory schemes. Table 3 at the end of this section summarizes major risks and proposed guardrails for reference. Here, we detail strategic interventions:

1. Strengthen Training, Mentorship, and Opportunity Awareness: Since human capital is the critical ingredient when financial capital is minimal, investments in targeted training and mentorship are vital (Mukasa et al., 2025). Universities and vocational institutes should integrate modules on “*micro-entrepreneurship pathways*” into career services – teaching students how to start a freelancing career, how to be an effective agent or reseller, how to market crafts online, etc. This goes beyond generic entrepreneurship classes, focusing on very concrete how-tos and case studies of successful small starts. Moreover, mentorship programs pairing youth with experienced micro-entrepreneurs can build practical skills and confidence. For example, a graduate interested in agro-produce brokerage could be mentored by a successful cooperative aggregator for a season to learn the ropes. Rwanda already has initiatives like

Youth Employment and Entrepreneurship programs (e.g. through Educate! or YouthConnekt) which could be leveraged to disseminate information on low-capital opportunities. A national opportunity portal could be created to list verified opportunity programs (franchise openings, affiliate programs, digital platforms) – acting as a one-stop-shop so that graduates can see, for instance, which companies are recruiting sales agents with zero fees, or which online platforms they can join to earn money. This counters the current situation where many fall prey to random internet ads or hearsay.

2. Facilitate Formalization and Light-Touch Regulation: To reduce chronic informality (88% of enterprises informal [(NISR, 2025)], the government can further simplify and encourage the formal registration of micro-ventures. Rwanda has already eliminated business registration fees and moved the process online (it takes mere hours) (RRA, n.d.). However, many micro-entrepreneurs still don't register, either due to lack of awareness, fear of taxes, or the perception that the benefits don't outweigh the hassle. To tackle this, policymakers could introduce an "ultra-micro enterprise" category with zero or very minimal tax obligations up to a certain revenue (effectively a tax holiday or presumptive tax far below the VAT threshold). Rwanda's tax code does have a simplified regime for small businesses, but ensuring that a young person selling crafts or doing freelance work isn't suddenly burdened with complex filings would incentivize them to come into the formal net. Additionally, one-stop support centers (perhaps via RDB or local district offices) could be established to help micro-entrepreneurs register and navigate any licensing at no cost. The idea is to make formality the easy default path. Light-touch regulation also means ensuring that necessary regulations (for safety, quality, etc.) are not enforced punitively on micro businesses – instead, use an "education first" approach. For example, rather than finding an informal food vendor, help them meet hygiene standards and transition into a licensed business at a pace they can handle. This supportive regulatory climate would reduce the fear that often keeps micro ventures underground.

3. Access to Finance (Microfinance and Platforms) for Scaling, Not Entry: While by definition these opportunities require little startup capital, some amount of financing can help them grow or weather shocks. The ecosystem should

provide safe, appropriate financing options that don't push entrepreneurs into predatory debt. Microfinance institutions (MFIs) and the Business Development Fund (BDF) can tailor micro-loan or grant products for those pursuing these low-capital models. For instance, a freelancer might need a better laptop or a generator (for power outages) – a small loan or asset financing could be offered once they have a steady income record. More innovatively, platform-based financing could be explored: if an online marketplace notices a dropship seller doing well, it could advance inventory on credit to them to expand (some e-commerce platforms do this to boost top sellers). The key is avoiding upfront loans for unproven ideas, which can trap youth in debt if the business fails. Instead, link financing to milestones (e.g. revenue-based financing, where repayment is a percentage of income, aligning with actual cash flow). The new Youth Investment Facility (YIF) that Rwanda launched in 2025 is promising in this regard – it aims to unlock capital and technical support for youth-led enterprises, especially those who lack collateral (Mubika, 2025). YIF plans to combine funding with mentorship and target strategic sectors, effectively de-risking young entrepreneurs. Such a facility can incorporate windows for nano-enterprises – even a \$500 catalytic grant or interest-free loan can be life-changing if given to a motivated entrepreneur who only had \$50 to start with. International partners (World Bank, UNDP, etc.) could support these micro-grant programs as part of post-COVID recovery and jobs initiatives.

4. Shared Infrastructure and Resource Hubs: One clever way to remove capital barriers is by providing shared assets that entrepreneurs can use on demand. The Rwandan government is already demonstrating this with projects like the planned leather tannery and design facility to support 150 MSMEs in the leather products sector (Mubika, 2025). Rather than each leather artisan needing to buy expensive processing equipment, the government's investment allows them to access modern machinery and skills, paying only for usage. This model can be replicated: for example, coworking spaces and makerspaces could be expanded so that young developers, graphic artists, or craftsmen have access to high-speed internet, 3D printers, woodworking tools, etc., at free or nominal cost. Rural innovation centers could provide processing equipment for agro-produce (oil presses, dryers) that small agripreneurs share. By socializing

the capital expenditure, individual businesses remain capital-light but can still utilize advanced technology. Public-private partnerships may fund these hubs. It's critical to place such facilities strategically (e.g. in secondary cities or near clusters of activity) and ensure awareness and training so they are well-utilized. Additionally, *digital infrastructure* is part of this – continued expansion of affordable broadband to all areas and initiatives like smartphone access programs (perhaps subsidy or pay-as-you-go smartphone schemes) will enable more youth to participate in online opportunities without high device costs.

5. Market Linkages and Procurement

Inclusion: Expanding access also means deliberately linking low-capital entrepreneurs to markets that they otherwise couldn't reach. One policy idea is inclusive procurement – government and large companies can allocate a portion of procurement to youth-led or micro enterprises. For instance, a ministry could contract a cooperative of freelance translators (instead of big firms) for document translation, or a local school might source catering from a group of women micro-entrepreneurs. By carving out “small contracts” and simplifying the bidding process for them, institutions create real markets for these entrepreneurs. In Rwanda's Youth Employment Policy, there is an emphasis on creating 1.5 million jobs by 2029 through private sector development (Mubika, 2025), and leveraging projects like the new airport or agri-hub to involve youth businesses (Mubika, 2025). Implementing this could mean reserving small subcontracts in those projects for start-ups (e.g. landscaping services at the new airport by a youth company). Over time, successful delivery on small contracts can build credibility for micro-enterprises to scale up.

6. Consumer Protection and

Anti-Exploitation Measures: With greater promotion of low-capital opportunities, there is a risk of increased exploitative actors attempting to prey on eager youth. Government agencies (like the Rwanda Consumer Protection Authority and law enforcement) need to be vigilant and proactive. This

includes monitoring and clamping down on pyramid schemes or fraudulent “business opportunity” seminars that charge fees for worthless information. Public awareness campaigns can educate people on how to spot predatory schemes – for example, “if an opportunity guarantees huge returns with no effort, it's likely a scam.” In terms of labor exploitation, some digital gig work can pay extremely low rates, effectively exploiting youth time. Stakeholders should encourage fair work conditions even in informal arrangements. One idea is developing a rating system or forum where people can share experiences about various opportunity providers (franchisors, platforms, etc.), creating transparency around which are reputable. Additionally, integrating a basic ethical component in entrepreneurship training can ensure new entrepreneurs themselves uphold good practices (e.g. they treat any employees or suppliers fairly, even if unregulated) (Mukasa et al., 2025).

7. Risk Mitigation and Social Safety Nets:

Starting a business with nothing is inherently risky for the individual – if it fails, they have little cushion. The ecosystem should consider safety nets specific to entrepreneurs (Ngobi et al., 2025). For example, encouraging group-based entrepreneurship (like cooperatives or peer support groups) can provide emotional and practical backup if someone hits a snag. Micro-insurance products could cover certain risks: a mobile money agent might insure against robbery or fraud losses, a farmer-aggregator could insure against produce spoilage. While these might not yet be widespread, the policy environment can stimulate insurers to pilot such tailored micro-insurance. Moreover, the government could integrate successful micro-entrepreneurs into the formal social security system gradually – e.g., once a business is registered and income stabilizes, make it easy for them to contribute to Rwanda's pension or health insurance as self-employed, giving them long-term security and incentive to stay formal. Table 2 below synthesizes some Opportunity Mechanisms by which the identified business models reduce financial barriers, and Table 3 follows with major risks and guardrails:

Table 2. Opportunity Mechanisms – How Models Lower Financial Barriers

Mechanism	Description & Examples (Rwanda context)	How it Reduces Capital Needs
Commission-Based Sales	An entrepreneur sells products/services of an established company for a commission. <i>E.g.</i> , mobile money agents (MTN MoMo, Airtel Money), fintech agents, and bank agency banking models (e.g., BK agency banking and related correspondent banking systems), as well as other sector agents (e.g., service intermediation)	No need to purchase inventory; principal provides product or service. Income is earned from commissions on sales, so entrepreneur's cash outlay is near zero aside from maybe a security deposit or initial stock on credit. Leverages the brand and marketing of the principal company.
Dropshipping & Affiliate Marketing	Online model where entrepreneur markets products and the supplier fulfills orders. <i>E.g.</i> a youth sets up a Facebook/Instagram shop for electronics; when a customer orders, a supplier in Kigali ships the item, and the youth earns a margin. Also affiliate links (promoting e-commerce like KLM flights or local e-shops for a referral fee).	Eliminates the need to buy or store inventory. Entrepreneurs act as intermediaries using free or low-cost digital platforms. Capital is not tied up in stock; essentially the business is run on information and marketing. Any fees (website, etc.) are minimal. Scalability is high without major capital at each step.
Service Provision (Skill-based)	Using personal skills to offer a service. <i>E.g.</i> tutoring, consulting, graphic design, programming, translation, tailoring.	Typically requires only existing skills and basic tools (often already owned, like a computer or sewing machine). No significant cash investment; often can start from home. Payment can be immediate (per session or project). If tools are needed, many start with second-hand or borrow equipment.
Micro-Franchise/Micro-Consignment	Joining a small-scale franchise or consignment program. <i>E.g.</i> A solar lamp company gives products on consignment to youth dealers; they pay back after selling. Or a franchise like a food kiosk where the fee is very low and franchisor provides a starter kit. Rwanda-specific examples also include platform-mediated supplier consignment arrangements (e.g., RwandaMart-style consignment), and embedded retail distribution points in clean cooking and energy ecosystems such as [1] KOKO bio-ethanol retail points (agent-franchise), [2] BioMassters pellet stoves (micro-distributor) and [3] Bboxx PAYGo LPG kits (agent-franchise).	Greatly reduces risk and capital: inventory or equipment is fronted by the franchisor or given on credit. Training and marketing support are provided, substituting what the entrepreneur would otherwise spend money figuring out. Micro-consignment means no payment for goods until sold – so zero working capital needed upfront.
Cooperative & Group Enterprises	Forming a cooperative or business group to pool resources and effort. <i>E.g.</i> crafts producers cooperative, youth agri-processing group.	Each member only contributes a small amount (or just labor) instead of one person bearing all costs. Can access grants/loans as a group that individuals couldn't. Shared assets (workspace, tools) mean individuals don't each need capital for those. Risk is shared as well.
Use of Idle/Underutilized Assets	Turning existing assets into business without buying new ones. <i>E.g.</i> using a family-owned motorcycle to start a transport service; using an empty plot to start a community garden project; renting a spare room on Airbnb (homestay) for income.	Capital-light because it leverages sunk costs or assets that are already available. No new purchase – just repurposing. Many Rwandan households, for example, have a bicycle or a piece of land – youth can use these for delivery services or farming mushrooms in a shed, etc. It's essentially monetizing what is on hand.
Digital Platforms for Gig Work	Utilizing online platforms to find gigs or microwork. <i>E.g.</i> crowd-work sites for data entry, ride-hailing apps (like becoming a driver on Yego or Uber using someone else's car), local task marketplaces.	Platforms aggregate demand and provide infrastructure (payment system, customer interface), so entrepreneur doesn't invest in marketing or brick-and-mortar presence. For ride-hailing, sometimes vehicles can be rented or the platform assists with lease-to-own schemes, lowering the initial cost barrier for the driver. For online gigs, only internet access is needed.

Revenue Sharing & Pay-as-You-Go Models	Accessing equipment or tools through pay-per-use or revenue share instead of purchase. <i>E.g.</i> using a printing machine at a hub and paying per page, or an irrigation pump on a rental basis for a farming service you offer; solar panel rentals for rural phone-charging business.	Avoids lump-sum investment in equipment. The entrepreneur aligns costs with usage – effectively turning a capital expense into an operating expense. This is easier to manage when starting with little money, even if per-use cost is slightly higher. It also limits downside risk: if business is slow, costs stay low. Rwanda's tech hubs and shared facilities are examples enabling this.
---	---	---

As shown in Table 2, the recurring theme is shifting the burden of cost either *upstream* to a partner (as in franchising, consignment, commission sales) or *spreading it out* over time (as in pay-as-you-go rentals). Digital technology often serves as the conduit for these mechanisms (market platforms, fintech solutions). Policy can encourage such mechanisms by, for instance, incentivizing companies to create agent models or consignment programs for youth, and by supporting shared asset schemes.

Risk Landscape and Guardrails: Alongside enabling measures, it's imperative to implement safeguards so that low-capital entrepreneurs are not operating in a precarious or exploitative environment. Table 3 delineates some key risks faced and corresponding guardrail strategies:

Table 3. Risks and Guardrails for Low-Capital Entrepreneurship

Risk / Challenge	Description / Example	Guardrail Measures (Policy/Ecosystem Response)
Persistent Informality	Entrepreneurs remain informal to avoid taxes or due to lack of knowledge, limiting their growth and legal protections. 88% of businesses are informal (NISR, 2023). Informality can also mean unsafe or substandard operations.	Facilitate Formalization: Simplify registration (already free online (RRA, n.d.), but extend outreach), introduce an ultra-micro business tax exemption to remove fear of taxation. Use local officials or youth ambassadors to help micro-entrepreneurs formalize. Provide incentives (e.g. access to training, micro-grants) for registered entities.
Exploitation by Middlemen or Predatory Actors	New entrepreneurs may be taken advantage of by unscrupulous intermediaries – e.g. a broker might cheat a farmer-aggregator on prices, or a client might not pay a freelancer. Also includes labor exploitation like extremely low pay rates on some gig platforms or in workshops.	Strengthen Legal Frameworks: Ensure basic contract enforcement accessible to micro-entrepreneurs (small claims courts or mediation for disputes). Promote standard contract templates for common transactions (freelance work, supply agreements) that protect both sides. Encourage cooperatives or associations that give collective bargaining power (e.g. freelancer guilds, trader associations). Minimum wage laws and labor standards should cover gig workers where feasible.
Consignment and Inventory Custody Disputes	In consignment and reseller arrangements, entrepreneurs may face disputes over unsold stock, damaged goods, reconciliation of sales records, delayed remittances, or unclear ownership and liability terms	Guardrail Measures: Promote standardized consignment templates (plain-language), basic inventory and sales ledger practices, transparent payment schedules, and accessible dispute resolution channels (mediation or small-claims processes). Where relevant, encourage micro-insurance or loss-sharing clauses to reduce catastrophic downside for the micro-entrepreneur
Predatory “Business Opportunities”	Scams and pyramid schemes that target youth with promises of income for upfront fees (common in MLM products or online scams). These can lead to financial loss and disillusionment.	Regulation & Awareness: Regulate and monitor MLMs and similar entities – require them to register and report their compensation structures to ensure they are legitimate sales, not pyramids. Conduct public awareness (via media, youth networks) highlighting red flags of predatory schemes. A dedicated helpdesk or website could allow people to report suspicious schemes; authorities can then issue advisories or shut down fraudulent operators.

Financial Risk & Debt	Even low-capital businesses can incur debt (e.g. borrowing \$100 from a lender at high interest). If business fails or income is irregular, entrepreneurs can fall into debt traps or default, ruining credit for future.	Safe Financing Options: Expand availability of low-interest microloans or grants through reputable channels (YIF, MFIs) so entrepreneurs aren't driven to loan sharks. Encourage models like revenue-based financing (repay as a % of income) to align with cash flow. Financial literacy training as part of any entrepreneurship support, so youth plan properly and avoid over-borrowing. Possibly implement a micro-bankruptcy or debt relief mechanism – a way to restructure small debts without severe penalties, to give honest failed entrepreneurs a second chance.
Market Saturation & Unfair Competition	When a particular opportunity becomes popular (e.g. too many people start a small retail business in the same area), the market can saturate, driving incomes down. Also, large players can undercut micro-entrepreneurs (for instance, a big retail chain moving into a town can wipe out small traders).	Market Diversification & Clustering: Through training and guidance, help entrepreneurs identify niche markets or underserved locations to avoid overcrowding one area. The government can support cooperatives to enable small players to collectively compete with bigger players (e.g. a cooperative of small shops can bulk-buy like a big store). In procurement, ensure micro-enterprises get a fair chance (avoid criteria that only big firms can meet). Urban planning can also designate spaces for micro-business (markets, vendor permits) to prevent cutthroat street competition.
Quality and Compliance Risks	Without capital, entrepreneurs might cut corners (e.g. a food vendor not following hygiene, or a phone repairer using substandard parts) which can harm consumers or themselves (legal liability, reputational damage). Also, lack of compliance with regulations (tax, safety) can later lead to penalties.	Micro-standards & Training: Develop simplified quality guidelines for common micro businesses (easy-to-follow checklists for food hygiene, etc.) and disseminate through local officials or SMS. Offer free or subsidized access to quality inputs (e.g. clean cooking stoves for food vendors, proper toolkits for mechanics). Inspection regimes could be educational rather than punitive at first – help them meet standards instead of shutting them down immediately. Over time, promote certification for micro-enterprises (a “trusted small business” badge) that meet quality and legal criteria, which can help them attract customers and avoid fines.
Social and Psychological Pressure	Entrepreneurship, especially when driven by necessity, can be stressful and isolating. If income is unstable, family or societal pressure might mount (e.g. “get a real job”). Young entrepreneurs might lack support networks and give up quickly, or face mental health strains.	Community Support & Mentorship: Foster peer networks (e.g. local entrepreneur clubs, WhatsApp groups for freelancers) for sharing advice and moral support. Incorporate mentorship (experienced business people volunteering to coach newbies). Recognize and celebrate small business successes publicly to validate these paths socially (awards, media stories of youth entrepreneurs) which can alleviate stigma. Provide access to psychosocial support or at least integrate topics of resilience and stress management in entrepreneurship programs.

In implementing these guardrails, a multi-stakeholder approach is needed. For example, consumer protection agencies working with the police can handle scams, while business associations can help with self-regulation and peer monitoring of quality. The education system can instill ethics and resilience in would-be entrepreneurs, and financial sector actors can design youth-friendly products (Sangwa et al., 2025).

Policy Commitments: Encouragingly, many of these measures align with Rwanda's strategic plans. The new Private Sector Development and Youth Employment Strategy (PSDYES 2024–2029) explicitly aims to “reshape the employment landscape” by catalyzing youth enterprises and sets ambitious job creation targets (Mubika, 2025). The Youth Investment Facility (YIF) mentioned is poised to provide capital and technical support, focusing on sectors like agro-processing, ICT, manufacturing, and creative industries (Mubika, 2025; IFC, 2024). The fact that the government is not just pushing high-tech startups but also supporting grassroots industry (like the leather MSMEs support [Mubika, 2025]) shows a commitment to inclusive entrepreneurship. Our findings reinforce that such support needs to trickle down to the smallest economic actors. If implemented, these ecosystem measures could create a virtuous cycle: more youth trying credible opportunities, succeeding and formalizing, which in turn contributes to job creation and service delivery in communities.

In conclusion, the RQ3 analysis underscores that unlocking capital-light entrepreneurship at scale is not solely about individual effort or ideas – it's about the surrounding ecosystem reducing friction and risk. With smart policies and a nurturing environment, Rwanda can turn its legions of necessity-driven entrepreneurs into a force for innovation and sustainable development, while protecting them from the vulnerabilities that come with starting small.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1. Conclusion: This study set out to map and evaluate business opportunities in Rwanda that require minimal financial capital, providing a much-needed evidence base to guide graduates and aspiring entrepreneurs who must bootstrap their ventures. Through a systematic scoping of sectors

and feasibility criteria, we identified a diverse portfolio of low-capital pathways – from digital freelancing and agency banking to tutoring and agricultural brokerage – that are *realistically* attainable and potentially rewarding under Rwanda's conditions. We found that while the full spectrum of the economy offers entry points, high-feasibility opportunities concentrate in sectors with either strong unmet market demand or the ability to leverage technology and networks to sidestep traditional capital needs. By using Evidence-Weighted Feasibility Scoring, we highlighted how different models stack up: for example, service-oriented and digital opportunities tend to allow faster launch and scaling, whereas agribusiness opportunities, though slower, yield significant community benefits. Crucially, we defined “minimal capital” in context – recognizing that zero financial cost does not mean zero effort or zero risk. A consistent theme is that human capital (skills, knowledge) and social capital (relationships, trust) are the currency with which entrepreneurs must “pay” for success when cash is scarce.

Our research also debunks some myths: Not every idea advertised as “no capital needed” is viable or safe. We caution against get-rich-quick schemes and emphasize vetted, ethical opportunities. Many popular suggestions (e.g. multi-level marketing of products, or online trading schemes) were excluded due to either hidden costs or high risk. What remains are *legitimate* opportunities that align with Rwanda's developmental objectives – ventures that can grow gradually, contribute positively to society, and, if supported well, provide dignified livelihoods. These range from modern gigs to revitalizing traditional trades with new models.

To ensure these opportunities can flourish, we examined ecosystem and policy measures. The Rwandan government's proactive stance on entrepreneurship (such as free business registration, youth funds, and digital strategies) is a strong foundation. Building on that, we recommend targeted actions (summarized below) to amplify the impact and mitigate downsides. Ultimately, enabling thousands of small entrepreneurs to start and sustain businesses could aggregate into large benefits: reduced unemployment, especially among youth; increased innovation in service delivery at the last mile; and a more inclusive economy where even those without wealth can become job creators. By lowering entry barriers and guarding against

exploitation, Rwanda can harness the full entrepreneurial potential of its people – turning necessity into opportunity, and opportunity into prosperity.

4.2. **Recommendations:** Based on the findings, we propose the following key recommendations for stakeholders:

- **Develop Sector-Specific Entrepreneurship Toolkits:** Government agencies (RDB, MINICOM, NYC etc.) in partnership with educational institutions should create practical toolkits and short courses for different low-capital pathways – e.g. “How to start a freelance tech career,” “How to become a community agribusiness agent,” “Starting a micro-service business.” These should include step-by-step guides, regulatory checklists, and resource links (for training, platforms, micro-loans). Making these toolkits freely available (in Kinyarwanda and English) will equip aspiring entrepreneurs with clear roadmaps and reduce trial-and-error costs. Universities and TVETs can integrate them into final-year programs so graduates leave with both a degree and an actionable business plan in a low-capital field if they choose.
- **Scale up Mentorship and Peer Networks:** Establish a national mentorship program under initiatives like YouthConnekt, where experienced entrepreneurs and professionals volunteer to coach youth on specific opportunities. For example, bank staff could mentor new mobile agents on cash management, or successful Youtubers mentor novice content creators on monetization. Simultaneously, foster local entrepreneur clubs in all districts – meeting regularly for peer learning. This creates a support system that increases newcomers’ chances of success and mental resilience. Government and NGOs should provide a small budget for these clubs (for meetups, inviting speakers). A “buddy system” that pairs two or three youth starting businesses can also help them support each other (social accountability and morale boost).
- **Enhance Access to Enabling Resources:** Continue investing in and expanding shared resource centers – e.g. Innovation Hubs,

Common Service Centers, and Rural Business Facilities – especially outside Kigali. Each hub should offer: high-speed internet, co-working space, training workshops, and equipment relevant to local needs (computers, sewing machines, food processing tools, etc.). Consider mobile resource vans that travel to villages with tools and trainers (like a mobile business clinic). Also, accelerate public initiatives that provide *affordable smart devices* and data packages to young people, since digital access is now fundamental for many opportunities. Partner with telecom providers on schemes for youth bundles or device loan programs.

- **Implement Micro-Enterprise Formalization Incentives:** Adopt a “**Formalize to Grow**” campaign with incentives such as one-year tax waiver for any youth-owned business that registers and stays active, or a startup kit (for instance, registered street vendors could get an official vending cart and uniform). Provide easy avenues for informal businesses to transition: perhaps a grace period where they can register and declare past income without penalties. Train local government officers to identify promising informal businesses and proactively assist them in formalizing and accessing support. By increasing formalization, entrepreneurs can build credit histories and engage with B2B opportunities that require formal status.
- **Microfinance Plus – financial products with training and insurance:** Direct BDF and MFIs to design micro-venture packages that bundle a small loan or grant with mandatory training and mentorship, and include micro-insurance. For example, a package for a tailoring business might provide a sewing machine on lease-to-own, a short business course, and insurance for the machine and health insurance for the owner. YIF could allocate a portion of funds specifically to seed very small start-ups (not just growth-stage SMEs) on a competitive basis, emphasizing those that exemplify capital-light innovation and inclusion (perhaps in an annual “Small Start Challenge” competition).

- Strengthen Enforcement on Scams and Labor Abuse:** Resource the consumer protection authority and law enforcement to actively pursue and shut down pyramid schemes or fraudulent recruitment for fake jobs. Coordinate with the media to publicize such actions as a deterrent. In parallel, develop guidelines for fair work on digital platforms – for instance, minimum transparency requirements for any gig platform operating in Rwanda (on fees, how earnings are calculated, etc.). Encourage platforms to adopt codes of conduct (through either regulation or voluntary “platform charters”) that ensure fair treatment of gig workers. Rwanda’s generally strong governance can be leveraged to make it hostile terrain for exploiters and friendly terrain for honest micro-entrepreneurs.
- Leverage Local Government and Cooperatives:** Involve district authorities and existing cooperative networks in identifying and supporting low-capital entrepreneurs. Districts can incorporate youth micro-business promotion in their Imihigo (performance contracts). For example, set targets like “each sector (umudugudu) to have 5 new formal micro-enterprises by year’s end,” and have youth officers facilitate this. Where viable, promote formation of new cooperatives in emerging areas (e.g. a cooperative of online freelancers for shared training and possibly collective bidding on larger contracts, or a cooperative of village service providers to pool marketing). Cooperatives can also serve as channels for delivering micro-grants or equipment. It’s important, however, that these cooperatives are formed based on genuine need and led by the entrepreneurs, not just administratively created – hence the role of local sensitization and capacity building.
- Monitoring and Impact Evaluation:** Finally, as recommendations are implemented, Rwanda should track the outcomes via an Impact Assessment Framework (see Appendix B for a proposed matrix of indicators such as uptake rates, survival rates of businesses, average incomes, etc.). Collecting data on how many

people start these ventures, how their incomes change, and what challenges they report will allow iterative policy improvements. Regular surveys (possibly piggybacking on the quarterly Labour Force Survey (Mubita, 2025) or through dedicated studies) can monitor the health of the micro-entrepreneur segment – for instance, are more businesses formalizing? What is the gender breakdown (are young women equally accessing these opportunities)? Such evidence will inform whether additional interventions (or course corrections) are needed, ensuring the policies remain responsive to actual needs (Mubita, 2025).

In summary, Rwanda stands at an opportune moment to empower a new wave of entrepreneurs who do not have deep pockets but have ambition and ability. By systematically removing remaining barriers and adding protective guardrails, the country can unlock a reservoir of enterprise at the base of the economy. The result will not only be reduced unemployment and poverty, but also a more dynamic and resilient private sector where innovation comes from all corners – a true realization of inclusive growth and “doing business” democratized. The lessons from this study can also inform other emerging economies seeking to expand entrepreneurship beyond those with capital, highlighting that with the right structures in place, a lack of capital need not be a sentence to inaction, but rather a challenge that spurs creative pathways to business creation.

Declarations

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: This research received no external funding. The manuscript was prepared through the authors’ own efforts and resources.

Ethics statement: This study used only secondary data and did not involve human participants, animals, or identifiable personal data; therefore, no ethical clearance was required.

Data availability: All contributions supporting the findings are included in the manuscript, with supplementary materials available at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/XJY4R>.

Requests for clarification to facilitate replication may be directed to the corresponding author.

Appendices

- **Appendix A:** Catalogue of identified legitimate capital-light opportunities: [Catalogue](#).
- **Appendix B:** Evidence-Weighted Feasibility Scoring Rubric and Suggested Impact Assessment Indicator Matrix [[Appendix B](#)]
- **Appendix C.** Search Strategy, Screening Decisions, and PRISMA-ScR Flow Diagram [[Appendix C](#)]

References

- Access to Finance Rwanda (AFR). (2020, October 1). FinScope Rwanda 2020: Consumer survey report (Main report) [PDF]. National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda; Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning. https://www.statistics.gov.rw/sites/default/files/documents/2025-07/FinScope_Rwanda_2020_Main_Report.pdf.
- Antoun, N. (2020, June 21). The great debate: Why Rwanda may be the best country to launch and scale your tech startup! The GPS (MEST Africa). Medium. <https://medium.com/the-gps/the-great-debate-why-rwanda-may-be-the-best-country-to-launch-and-scale-your-tech-startup-25439a41a4>
- Argent, J., Hanson, J. A., & Gomez, M. P. (2013). The regulation of mobile money in Rwanda. International Growth Centre. <https://www.theigc.org/sites/default/files/2013/08/Argent-Et-Al-2013-Working-Paper.pdf>
- Bboxx. (2025, November 4). Government of Rwanda partners with Bboxx to deliver 50 000 clean cooking kits in landmark national program. <https://www.bboxx.com/news/government-of-rwanda-partners-with-bboxx-to-deliver-50-000-clean-cooking-kits>
- Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2005). Financial and legal constraints to growth: Does firm size matter? The Journal of Finance, 60(1), 137–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2005.00727.x>
- Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226041223.001.0001>
- BioMassters. (2025, March 21). BioMassters distributes 6 500 eco-friendly stoves to promote clean cooking in Rwanda. <https://en.webrwanda.com/2025/03/biomasters-distributes-6500-eco.html>
- Bleu, N. (2025, July 8). 50 top freelancing statistics, facts, and trends for 2025. Blogging Wizard. <https://bloggingwizard.com/freelancing-statistics/>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education (pp. 241–258). Greenwood. <https://publish.illinois.edu/crittheory/files/2023/01/Bourdieu-The-Forms-of-Capital.pdf>
- Brudevold-Newman, A., & Ubfal, D. (2024). Soft-skills, networking, and workforce entry: Impacts of a training program for recent graduates in Rwanda. Labour Economics, 91, Article 102650. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2024.102650>
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). (2024). GEM Global Report 2023/24: Adapting to a “New Normal”. GEM Consortium. <https://www.gemconsortium.org/report/51147>
- Gikundiro L. (2025). 7 easy income streams that require minimal capital in Rwanda. KudiBooks Blog. <https://blog.kudibooks.com/7-easy-income-streams-that-require-minimal-capital-in-rwanda>
- GIZ. (2022). Supporting e-commerce in Rwanda: Opportunities for inclusive, sustainable growth [PDF]. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit. <https://www.giz.de/en/downloads/giz2022-en-supporting-e-commerce-rwanda.pdf>
- International Finance Corporation. (2024, September 9). IFC partners with BPR Bank Rwanda to increase access to finance for small businesses [Press release]. <https://www.ifc.org/en/pressroom/2024/ifc-partners-with-bpr-bank-rwanda-to-increase-access-to-finance-for-small-businesses>
- International Trade Administration (ITA). (2024, May 2). Rwanda – distribution & sales channels. <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/rwanda-distribution-sales-channels>

- Kigalitimes. (2025, August 7). Rwanda eyes one million households for bio-ethanol cooking fuel by 2030. <https://www.kigalitimes.rw/2025/08/07/rwanda-eyes-one-million-households-for-bioethanol-cooking-fuel-by-2030/>
- Kirezi, A. (2016, June 6). Side jobs corporates can do to earn an extra buck. The New Times. <https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/130575/News/side-jobs-corporates-can-do-to-earn-a-n-extra-buck>
- KLM Royal Dutch Airlines. (n.d.). Affiliate programme. <https://rwanda.klm.com/information/corporate/affiliate>
- Lisita, I. T., & Jantjies, R. M. (2025). A model for enhancing franchisee effectiveness in the fast food industry. *Journal of Financial and Management Sciences*, 1(1), 168–212. <https://doi.org/10.70970/eta59d93>.
- Ministry of ICT and Innovation (MINICT). (2018). ICT sector profile 2018. https://www.minict.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/minict_user_upload/Documents/ICT_Sector_Profile/ICT_Sector_Profile-2018.pdf
- Mubika, R. (2025, June 14). Rwanda set to launch youth investment facility to empower entrepreneurs. The Next Africa. <https://businessbeat24.com/rwanda-set-to-launch-youth-investment-facility-to-empower-entrepreneurs/>
- Mukasa, S., Dennis, N., Ekosse, E., & Sangwa, S. (2025). From education to enterprise: Redefining entrepreneurship education to enhance venture creation in Rwanda's private higher learning institutions. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 51(8), 177–193. <https://hal.science/hal-05168699>
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0026>
- National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR). (2025, March). Rwanda integrated business enterprise survey report, 2023. <https://www.statistics.gov.rw/sites/default/files/documents/2025-09/IBES2023%20Report.pdf>
- National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR). (2024). Labour Force Survey annual report 2024. <https://www.statistics.gov.rw/data-sources/surveys/Labour-Force-Survey/labour-force-survey-2024/labour-force-survey-annual-report-2024>
- National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR). (2023). Integrated Business Enterprise Survey (2023). <https://www.statistics.gov.rw/statistical-publications/business-establishment-finance-trade/business-establishment-finance-trade/integrated-business-enterprise-survey-2023>
- Ngobi, D., Mukasa, S., & Sangwa, S. (2025). Income Security as an Entrepreneurial Runway: Evidence from Recent Graduates in East Africa. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202511.2322.v1>
- Office of the Registrar General. (n.d.). Homepage (business registration service standards). <https://org.rdb.rw/>
- World Bank. (2023). Rwanda Enterprise Survey 2023: Country Profile Highlights. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://espanol.enterprisesurveys.org/content/dam/enterprisesurveys/documents/country/Rwanda-2023.pdf>
- Rentech Digital. (2025, October 15). List of consignment shops in Kigali. <https://rentechdigital.com/smartscraper/business-report-details/rwanda/kigali-district/list-of-consignment-shops-in-kigali>
- RwandaMart. (n.d.). E-fulfillment & consignment agreement. <https://rwandamart.rw/e-fulfillment-consignment-agreement/>
- Rwanda Revenue Authority. (2022). The cost of business registration. Rwanda Revenue Authority. https://www.rra.gov.rw/en/details?tx_news_pi1%5Baction%5D=detail&tx_news_pi1%5Bcontroller%5D=News&tx_news_pi1%5Bnews%5D=2177&cHash=b30f570c3443b9c949765d594daf3a9e
- Rwanda Telecenter Network (RTN). (n.d.). Partner with us. <https://rtn.rw/partner-with-us/>
- Rwanda Youth in Agribusiness Forum (RYAF). (n.d.). Home. <https://ryaf.rw/home>
- Sangwa, S., & Mutabazi, P. (2025). Mission-Driven Learning Theory: Ordering Knowledge and Competence to Life Mission. *Open Journal*

- of Transformative Education & Lifelong Learning (ISSN: 3105-305X), 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65655/0859ab04>
- Sangwa, S., Ruhamya, P., Ngobi, D., & Mutabazi, P. (2025, June 22). From screens to streams: Empowering 21st century entrepreneurs through AI-driven business models. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5317744>
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243–263. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378020>
- Tendo. (2023). Start Your Online Business with No Capital (Platform Promotion). Retrieved from https://tendo.app/tendo_dropshipping
- TransFi. (2025, August 15). Rwanda's payment rails & how they work – RNP, mobile money & digital economy growth. <https://www.transfi.com/blog/rwandas-payment-rails-how-they-work---rnp-mobile-money-digital-economy-growth>
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., Lewin, S., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of internal medicine*, 169(7), 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- Ubukombe, P. (2023, September 4). Five (5) businesses you can start with no capital. KudiBooks Blog. <https://blog.kudibooks.com/bizinesi-eshanu-5-ushobora-gutangira-nta-gishoro>
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2023). Towards an e-commerce strategy for Rwanda (UNCTAD/DTL/ECDE/2023/4). United Nations. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/dtlecdc2023d4_en.pdf
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2024). Unlocking Rwanda's Entrepreneurial Potential: Addressing Barriers for SMMEs. Kigali: UNDP Rwanda. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2024-03/undp_entrepreneurs_full_final.pdf
- Weyrauch, T., & Herstatt, C. (2016). What is frugal innovation? Three defining criteria. *Journal of Frugal Innovation*, 2(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40669-016-0005-y>
- World Bank. (2024). Enterprise surveys: What businesses experience: Rwanda 2023 country profile. <https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/content/dam/enterprisesurveys/documents/country/Rwanda-2023.pdf>
- World Trade Organization & World Bank. (2025). Digital trade for Africa (DTA) WB–WTO joint project: Rwanda digital trade review and next steps. https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/rwanda-report-digital-trade-for-africa-initiative_e.pdf
- Young African Policy Research (YAPORH). (2023, August 15). New UNCTAD report spotlights Rwanda's transformative e-commerce policy and strategy. <https://youngafricanpolicyresearch.org/new-unctad-report-spotlights-rwandas-transformative-e-commerce-policy-and-strategy>