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The Observatory was created at the beginning of 1990 by the Commission of the European Communities, Directorate General V (Employment, Social Affairs and Industrial Relations). It operates under the responsibility of Division V/E/2 (Social Security and Actions in the Social Domain).

This synthesis report is based upon national reports prepared by the members of the Observatory, independent experts who are listed below. It accompanies the general report which the Observatory is also producing during 1993 concerning national policies to combat social exclusion. The report does not necessarily represent the views of the European Commission and final responsibility for the report rests with the Observatory co-ordinator.

Here, as in much of the previous work of the Observatory, the investigation was hampered by deficits in the information available. Nevertheless, in some cases at least this provided the spur to new empirical enquiries. For example, our Portuguese expert undertook a pioneering survey of the main agencies in his country, although with a varied response: central government departments (including health, housing, social protection, employment, education and departments concerned with particular population groups); regional co-ordinators of projects to combat poverty; local municipalities; trade unions; non-governmental organisation (NGOs); and political parties. Similarly, a survey was carried out by our Greek expert.
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1.1. INTRODUCTION

Until now, the principal focus of the Observatory’s studies has been on the effectiveness of different national, regional and local policies. What do these policies aim to achieve, in particular in relation to the social rights which they promise? How far do they reach these aims? What barriers do citizens face in seeking to make a reality of their rights? And what consequences then follow, in terms of their non-participation in the major institutions of society and their long-term disadvantage?

These studies have revealed that in many - perhaps all - countries of the Community, a persisting political concern is with the relationships and links between agencies at different levels and with the co-ordination of institutions and programmes. The same concern surfaced repeatedly in meetings with Government experts held in May and July 1992. This concern is driven in part at least by evidence that social exclusion is becoming a more significant social problem in the countries of the Community - or, at least, threatens to do so - at a time when cost containment remains a high political priority. Improved co-ordination of different programmes, institutions and actors may enable existing resources to be used more effectively. But, in a period of economic uncertainty and new forms of social exclusion, co-ordination can also sometimes be a means by which the various institutions involved can pool risks and can, through collective action, maintain some stability in their environment.

Previous reports from the Observatory have made reference to the different actors who seek to shape policies to combat social exclusion and the institutions through which these policies are implemented. The present report looks in more depth at their interrelationships and at the strategies by which the authorities in the different countries of the Community are seeking to render their efforts more coherent.

1.2. PATTERNS OF INSTITUTIONAL INCOHERENCE

It is unsurprising that there is general concern over the co-ordination of different institutions and services among those who are concerned to combat social exclusion. Social exclusion is a multidimensional phenomenon (as was emphasised in the Council of Ministers Resolution on which the work of the Observatory is based) and as such, it requires action in many different policy fields and at many different levels. This raises questions concerning the coherence of these actions and the relationships among the agencies concerned. Indeed, in some countries (such as France), the Social Exclusion debate is, first and foremost, a debate about the lack of harmonisation of social policies, services and agencies, in face of these interrelated social needs.
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A number of national governments have in recent years launched programmes which are targeted upon multiple disadvantage. Many of the programmes launched to combat problems of social exclusion in specific locations involve similar efforts to improve the co-ordination of different institutions, in order to deal more effectively with needs which are closely interrelated. These efforts are the subject of Chapter 2.

However, incoherence and mal-coordination do not always happen by accident and they cannot be regarded as merely technical problems. Any institutional arrangement represents an accommodation - arising out of negotiation, co-operation and conflict within specific power relationships - among the dominant socio-political actors: employers and trade unions, confessional "pillars", professional organisations, different levels of government, etc. Existing institutional arrangements - with their rigidities, their fragmentation, their barriers to access - express these accommodations and the stakes which these various actors have invested. So do existing and new forms of "partnership" (*). Any effort to bring greater coherence, to remove barriers, to re-orientate a programme or policy, must involve political negotiation with this cast of actors. These interests and accommodations are the concern of Chapter 3.

There are some common patterns of institutional incoherence to be found in the different countries of the Community, as far as social exclusion is concerned. One is the way in which individual agencies tend often unwittingly to unload their clients onto other agencies, so that those clients then circulate among these different agencies in an endless Armutskarousel: seeking to make connections between these agencies but often failing to do so. This institutional maze - the antithesis to a preventative policy - can then reinforce clients' subjective sense of exclusion and powerlessness, as well as sometimes creating perverse disincentives to using such services as exist, as pathways out of such situations. One area in which this is a problem for many countries is the de-institutionalisation of mentally ill people, where local community support services remain fragmented.

However, the differences between countries are as important as the similarities. The pattern of incoherence in institutional relationships and the efforts that are being made to overcome this incoherence vary from country to country (as earlier Observatory reports have revealed). In the Netherlands, for example, some of the more recent institutional reforms are, in part, responses to the decay of the system of "pillarisation" which dominated Dutch social welfare during the first half of this century. Such pillarisation, with social welfare agencies linked to different pillars, but offering complementary or similar services within the same local area, was the subject of frequent criticism for its mal-coordination; but as the pillars have decayed, a plethora of services has been left behind whose fragmentation now has little rationale. The Social Renewal Policy, which has established new powers for local government in the social and employment field and attempts to devolve central government power, accompanies the move from a society where these policies are the responsibility of the pillars to one where, to a greater extent than previously, they are the responsibility of

(*) The field of institutional linkages and realignment is replete with terms having such positive symbolic content: partnership, efficiency, cooperation, integration, democratisation, reform, etc. Whatever institutional relationships are proposed - even if they are motivated by the pursuit of power, competitive aggrandisement or disregard of established social entitlements - they are likely to be defended and legitimated from within this positive lexicon.
the local municipalities, even if private agencies continue to play an important role in realizing the plans of the municipalities.

In Belgium in contrast, pillarisation remains a dominant feature. The major consequences for institutional co-ordination are two-fold. First, as in the Netherlands, a plethora of services and institutions is organised under different pillars. Second, there are ideologically powerful vested interests, in face of which substantial changes in social policy are particularly difficult to effect, especially in times of national austerity. In contrast, in face of the social partners - the other dominant group of actors who have shaped the Belgian welfare system - central government has made increasing efforts to extend its intervention, rather than treating consultations between the social partners as a "private" matter. These institutional relationships involving the pillars and the social partners have been further complicated by the federalisation of Belgium during the last quarter century: a federalisation which involves three Regions, four language regions and three Communities, each with specific policy responsibilities.

In Germany, the Bismarckian health insurance system remains centre stage and has placed major institutional barriers on the development of social, as distinct from medical care, especially for those requiring long-term support. Moreover, the principle of subsidiarity means that in the field of social welfare non-governmental organisations have priority and the statutory authorities face severe difficulties in developing coordinated and coherent social planning. For there is no obligation on the private welfare organisations to act in accordance with the social plans of the municipality, even though it is from the municipality that they are largely financed; and they may even act in contradiction with those plans. As in the Netherlands, therefore, although the plurality of these welfare organisations to some extent makes for diversity and choice, it can also serve as an obstacle to coherent planning and coordination. Statutory efforts to bring some coherence to this plethora of agencies and activities are centred in the social office, the youth office and the health office of each municipality, which use workgroups to bring together the different actors concerned with a given field (although in Germany's decentralised federal system, the manner in which this is done itself varies). During the 1990s, however, the tightening economic situation - notably in relation to social expenditure - is producing a new political impetus to devise organisational forms more capable of surmounting the incoherence and duplication of the existing system.

In Spain, social welfare policy is still in a process of transition from a "Tutelage Model" of the State over NGOs to a model of cooperation. At the same time, struggles over decentralisation - on the one hand, between the central government and the regions, on the other between the regions and the municipalities - are still under way. In France also, reforms aimed at shifting the balance of power between the State, the regions and the departments have largely shaped the debate about the coordination of institutions, especially those involved in efforts to combat social exclusion. Not that concern about the geographical fragmentation of the French polity is solely the product of the regionalisation of the 1980s: over a much longer period public policy has been defined in part by reference to such persistent fissures. In particular, the continuing fragmentation of administration, among a multitude of communes, exposes the vulnerability of those whose attachment to work or to family is precarious, especially in times of rapid socio-economic change.
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In Italy, current reforms of social welfare are set against the legacy of the reform laws of 1977 and 1978. These sought integration of social and health protection through decentralisation and a stronger preventative approach, with a central role for municipal government and for client participation. Yet in the event, the persistence of vested interests in specific sectors and of clientelism within Italian political life, notably in the south, ensured the incoherent development of welfare services and gaps between legal entitlements and the services actually offered. How far the current political upheavals will modify this remains to be seen.

In contrast, Denmark might seem to offer a relatively straightforward opportunity for coherent planning and institutional coordination, given the dominant role of the public authorities and their strict supervision of voluntary sector organisations which use public funds to provide welfare services. And certainly, our Danish expert suggests that "the Danish tax financed system allows for a high degree of coherence across sector boundaries, ... so that it is possible to coordinate the different social services". On the other hand, problems of institutional coordination between national, regional and local statutory bodies reveal that even within the public sector, different goals can be in contradiction. Decentralisation of Danish labour market programmes have enhanced the role of the local authorities, in the drive for decentralisation, but their efforts to promote employment can compete with those of central government, notably because of the very different fiscal and budgetary incentives which they face.

In all of this analysis, however, it is important not to assume that institutional relationships are constructed and re-constructed exclusively de haut en bas. The decision-makers at the apex who formally decide on institutional rearrangements will - but to greatly varying extents - be responding to, reinforcing and extending their respective constituencies of support within the society at large. The social and political actors involved in re-shaping institutional relationships therefore include self-help groups, social movements and other pressures for "bottom-up" reform. Institutional reforms can therefore serve as means of mobilising citizens and organisations for broader social - indeed, moral - goals. Indeed, there is in general a close relationship between the response - in terms of political support and altruistic action - of citizens to particular social programmes and the benefits, sanctions and moral obligations which particular programmes involve. This principle is central to a number of recent initiatives, including for example the Social Development Programme (SUM) in Denmark and some of the new legislation in Italy.

1.3 THE WIDER CONTEXT OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

This report is concerned with those institutional relationships - and political programmes aimed at changing these relationships - where there is a specific concern with social exclusion. However, other and broader processes of institutional change are under way which must not be overlooked: processes which are being driven, on the one hand, by the political programmes of national government and, on the other, by processes of European integration.
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1. Institutional Reform by National Governments

Various governments have set in motion programmes of institutional reform which are intended to shift substantially the locus of policy decisions and service provision. Not least, these reforms involve changes in the extent to which the public authorities are suppliers, funder or regulators of service provision. These reforms are re-shaping the cast of actors involved in policy implementation and the balance of power between them. Many involve privatisation or decentralisation.

Privatisation and "Contracting Out"

In the UK, privatisation of public services - and of State activities more generally - is a key element of government policy. This has been radically re-defining the cast of actors and the institutional relationships among them. Services previously provided - as well as financed - by government are, increasingly, being "contracted out" to the commercial and non-profit sectors. Even services which remain in the public sector are being reorganised in terms of surrogate markets: in education, for example, and health care. At the same time, although developments in the personal social services (in particular, the Children Act (1989) and the Community Care Act (1990)) are reinforcing the role of the local authority, this is as a purchaser and coordinator of services, rather than as a major supplier.

These developments are most obvious and visible in the UK. Elsewhere efforts at privatisation have varied widely. In Portugal, recent health reforms allow a stronger role to the private sector and to other non-statutory providers, but under contract to the national health service. Private health insurance is encouraged. The aim, as in the UK, is increased efficiency at a time of rising costs, but one of the consequences could be growing inequalities in access and treatment, as between different socio-economic groups. In Greece, although privatisation has been a key policy, at least until the 1993 changes in government, efforts to implement such a policy - initially in the area of the public utilities - have run into strong resistance and have made little progress. Nevertheless, private sector organisations have been entering the welfare field to an increasing extent to meet unmet demand, for example in the fields of residential care of the elderly and childcare. In Ireland - sharing as it does much of the British social policy tradition - government appears to have considered, but set its face firmly against, programmes of privatisation of this sort, preferring to re-affirm the importance of the central role of the public sector.

Decentralisation

Nowhere has decentralisation proceeded further than in Belgium. There, decentralisation of responsibilities to the regions and Communities has been transforming institutional arrangements, in ways which affect efforts to combat social exclusion. In Spain, a more modest decentralisation to the regions during the 1980s nevertheless made for major changes in the administration of social policy; so has the increased involvement of the NGOs and the trade unions in the formulation and implementation of policy. The Observatory reports from Spain refer to some of the ways in which these broad changes are affecting the institutional arrangements and relationships among different actors, in ways that are relevant to efforts to combat social exclusion. In particular, central government by stressing the importance of equal social rights seeks to regain in practice some of the social
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policy powers lost through the laws on decentralisation; while within the individual regions, the governments are developing such programmes as schemes on minimum income in part in order to consolidate their power vis-à-vis the municipalities.

In France, decentralisation has changed the balance of power - or, more precisely, rendered uncertain the division of responsibility - between, on the one hand, the local representatives of the State - the prefects - who are administrators and, on the other, the presidents of the regional and departmental councils: politicians with a legitimacy that rests in their local constituencies. In this situation, the function of the prefect oscillates between that of an intermediary charged with reconciling the conflicting interests of different local actors, and local application of the policies of the central government according to national administrative procedures.

Greece, in contrast, provides an example of decentralisation which has had much less substance. Decentralisation has been a policy objective of successive governments: manifested for example in the establishment of open care centres for older people (KAPI), operated by local authorities. Nevertheless, with local authorities continuing to lack powers of local taxation, these centres remain funded directly by central government, which also supervises their operations: they have little if any autonomy.

In these various changes, it is worth noticing that the significance attached to the regional tier of government - as distinct from the local and national - varies enormously. In the UK, Ireland, Greece and Portugal, for example, the regional tier remains virtually non-existent, except perhaps in one or two specific policy fields - health care, for example - or, in Portugal, as the agent of central government. It may however be that such recent Community developments as the Committee of the Regions, established following the Maastricht agreements, will give greater prominence everywhere to the regional tier.

ii. Institutional Effects of European Integration

The interrelationships which are analysed in this report are likely to be re-shaped by the processes of European integration, even if these effects are difficult to forecast at this stage.

At an economic level, the convergence requirements of economic and monetary union could impose major restrictions on social spending, probably affecting the weaker economies in particular. What remains to be seen is how far the most vulnerable will be protected from the consequences of these restrictions. But the development of the Single Market could affect the "welfare market" in other ways also: for example, the behaviour and influence of those commercial organisations which already act as providers in the social welfare field. This will, in turn, affect the type of cooperative and conflictual relationships with these organisations which other actors will face.

At a political level, the Maastricht agreements confirm the importance of the principle of subsidiarity, by giving greater weight than hitherto to the regions and to the social partners and recognising their specific responsibilities. This may stimulate new connections and synergy among these actors, relevant to efforts to combat social exclusion.
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More generally, the accelerating scale of cross-national contacts among policy-makers and practitioners, prompted in part by specific programmes of the EC, is liable to put in question some of the established patterns of cooperation and the traditional coalitions among different social actors. The harmonisation of professional qualifications is already affecting domestic training and recognition procedures in the field of social work (Harris et al, 1992). Social service departments in border areas are examining how they may cooperate more intensively with partners from adjacent countries.

Programmes launched under the auspices of the Community could be of particular significance in steering and stimulating new lines of cooperation and accommodation among these different social and political actors. And indeed, in some Community countries they are already playing such a role. In Spain, entry into the EC has introduced new styles of coordination, not least through the programmes on poverty and social exclusion. Participation in these programmes has also given a boost to the voluntary sector. In Ireland, the EC programmes to combat poverty have increased recognition of the role that local development initiatives can play in providing guidelines for policy reform. In Portugal similarly, these EC programmes stimulated the launch of a national Poverty Programme in 1990: implemented through two regional commissariats, under the direction of the Ministry of Employment, and involving a variety of local projects.

These EC programmes have also been influential in institutional re-structuring in Greece, where the scale of EC funds relative to those from domestic sources has been sufficiently great to give EC programmes and policy priorities a major role in re-shaping social welfare programmes. But this domination by EC programmes has not necessarily made for greater overall coherence in Greek social welfare policies: EC programmes and funds can develop in a rather ad hoc manner and their incoherence at Community level is then echoed within the major beneficiary countries, with each government department developing its own separate dependency upon its Brussels counterpart. Nor has Community involvement ensured programme effectiveness: the EC investment in vocational training, for example, remains dubious, and bodes ill for any new wave of EC funding in the field of social exclusion.

Finally, programmes and initiatives from Brussels can shape the language in terms of which a wider range of institutional reforms are debated: in several member states, including for example Ireland, the current popularity of notions of "partnership" stems in part from their currency within these EC programmes. They can also stimulate the development of new networks and pressure groups within individual countries: thus, for example, the creation of a European Anti-Poverty Network has led to the development of national networks which did not exist before in Italy and in Germany. In Germany, for example, the National Poverty Conference which has developed out of this EC initiative appears to have established a highly visible position for itself within national debates on anti-poverty policy.
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MULTI-DIMENSIONAL NEEDS, COORDINATED ACTION

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Social exclusion is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. As such, it requires action in many different policy fields and at many different levels. However, the sectoral policies which dominate the welfare systems of the EC countries - health, education, etc. - express a bureaucratic division of labour defined by reference to specific professional skills (medicine, teaching, social work, etc.) and population risks (unemployment, homelessness, etc.). Each of these sectoral policies can, almost by definition, be concerned with only one set of needs. However, those who most require their support tend to have multiple needs for assistance. These needs may well reinforce each other and persist. This is the more likely, where entitlements within one sector depend upon rights built up within another: for example, where access to health care depends upon a continuous record of employment.

In France, for example, considerations such as these have been important in efforts to create new forms of "partnership" among social institutions active in the welfare field. However, in some countries, such as Greece, there is no tradition of cooperation among public agencies, let alone among public and private agencies. Yet even here there is growing recognition of the need for the formation of partnerships and for the effective coordination of various sectoral services in order to tackle complex multi-dimensional problems such as social exclusion. The challenge of social exclusion [therefore] provides a unique opportunity to revamp structures of social welfare and service provision that have long been in need of change.

In some cases, new institutional arrangements are being adopted in order to develop links among these sectoral programmes. In others, specific new programmes targeted on multiple disadvantage have been launched.

2.2. NEW INSTITUTIONAL LINKS BETWEEN SECTORAL POLICIES

In Belgium, within the central government an interdepartmental commission has been responsible for bringing together different sectoral programmes and policies which seek to combat poverty. With the progressive transfer of powers to the Regions and Communities, the role of this commission has somewhat diminished, but analogous bodies are developing at the level of each Community.

In Greece, Law 2082 of September 1992 provides for the formation of a new Advisory Committee of Social Affairs at national level, charged with advising on the overall planning of social welfare and drawing together representatives of the main actors involved in this field. This increased representation of the various interest groups involved is mirrored in the changed composition of the executive councils of the three main social protection...
agencies whose activities fall within the scope of this new social welfare law. In Ireland, the new coalition government is establishing a new type of national consultative body, the National Economic and Social Forum, which involves the various political parties, the social partners and groups representing disadvantaged sections of the population. Its purpose appears to be broadly similar to its Greek counterpart.

In Spain, the National Plan on Drugs (1985) has been an important but complex initiative aimed at coordinating statutory agencies - six national ministries and the regional governments - and NGOs. And indeed, the involvement of the NGOs has enabled them to create for themselves a national assembly at the headquarters of the plan. As far as coordination of statutory agencies is concerned, the role of regional coordinator has been vulnerable to changes in the strength and goals of different political parties and the role of the municipalities has been unclear.

In Italy, a series of new laws during 1990-92 have been aiming at surmounting the failures of administrative reform in the 1970s and 1980s, so as to reshape the responsibilities of, and the relationships among, local government, voluntary associations and social cooperatives. However, these laws pay little attention to users' rights and service effectiveness in the non-statutory sector. In Portugal some links are being forged between educational, employment and vocational training policies, in part with the support of EC funds: stronger links with the social security system are also being developed.

At a more local level, in Germany, the creation of a General Social Service at the level of each municipality, while not apparently novel when seen from abroad, represents a new attempt to surmount the traditional separation of youth, social and health services and the fragmented multiplicity of public and private agencies which deliver them. Within the individual fields of health, social and youth services, workgroups (Ausschüsse) at the level of the commune, the district and Land bring together representatives of these agencies as well as independent experts. Not least, these workgroups - in the youth field in particular - have responsibility for allocating public funds to the private agencies working in the field and for attempting some overall planning of services. Among the cities which have come to be seen as to the fore in developing new forms of service organisation are Bremen and Dortmund.

Of course, none of the partnerships mentioned above can be neutral vis-à-vis the interests and power of the different participating groups. For they involve new institutional frameworks within which the different actors involved are able to pursue their respective interests more - or less - effectively. But this framework will give precedence to some interests over others. Thus, for example, in the UK new partnership arrangements such as the Training and Enterprise Councils bring together business, local government and the "community" but the balance of interests within these Councils, and their lines of accountability have proved controversial. So also, "partnerships" between existing public bureaucracies and voluntary organisations in the field of health and social services have left the former as the dominant partner. In the Netherlands, similarly, the functioning of the Regional Manpower Boards has to some extent been damaged by the divergent interests of the members - employers, trade unions and local government - and their struggle over the shape of employment policy.
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2.3. SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES

The general reports of the Observatory have given a prominent place to "global policies": policies which seek to go beyond "sectoral" policies (health, education, etc.) and "categorical" policies (concerned with particular population groups) and which aim to deal in an integrated manner with those who are socially excluded or at risk of exclusion. Among these global policies, our reports have highlighted those which focus on multi-dimensional exclusion, those having a specific spatial focus and those which aim to combat exclusion through measures which are medium and long-term. However, those earlier reports have not dealt extensively with the institutional reforms which these global policies involve and it is with these that we now deal.

I. Programmes Focused on Multiple Disadvantage

A number of national governments have recently launched programmes which are targeted upon multiple disadvantage. One is the Dutch government's Social Renewal Policy. Active labour market measures are targeted on the long-term unemployed, ethnic minorities, young people, people with disabilities and women; this includes the creation of a "job pool" by the local authority, paid at the minimum wage, for those unable to move into the labour market proper. Alongside these employment measures, the Social Renewal Policy targets the physical rehabilitation of city neighbourhoods on the one hand, welfare, health, culture and education on the other. The Policy as a whole is highly decentralised to local authorities, within the general framework set by central government. No new budget is involved but a large number of previously separate funds for municipalities are brought together. And in approving local expenditure proposals, priority is given to the creation of new local partnerships. The Dutch report examines the effectiveness of this policy and the significance of the new institutional relationships which it involves.

In Greece, the most prominent example of new types of cooperation is that of the National Foundation for the Reception and Resettlement of Repatriated Greeks (EIYAPOE). In Greece these programmes are novel because they entail multi-sectoral approaches to the problems of vulnerable social groups. Also important in offering new multi-dimensional approaches are the local projects which are being funded through Poverty 3. Nevertheless, it seems that the public administration remains ill-equipped to monitor and coordinate policies and to ensure their coherence.

II. Programmes having a specific Spatial Focus

Many of the programmes launched to combat problems of social exclusion in specific spatial locations involve similar efforts to improve the coordination of different institutions, in order to deal more effectively with closely interrelated needs.

In France, the DSQ programme (Developpement Social des Quartiers) involves intervention focused on the multi-dimensional disadvantage of certain urban districts. DSQ, involving urban renovation, service development, programmes to support families, etc., has established partnerships between the education, housing, social work and criminal justice
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departments, and has involved central, regional and municipal government in new forms of "vertical coordination", albeit without a strong involvement of the departments.

In Belgium, new poverty funds are being made available to municipalities. In Flanders at least, the selection of the municipalities to benefit from these funds is in terms of the concentration of migrants and the numbers of people receiving means-tested social assistance; the level of funding also takes account of the numbers of young unemployed and the fiscal resources of the local community. Young people form the largest target group. These initiatives have been under way for five years, although a detailed overall evaluation is not available.

In Portugal, legislation in 1987 aimed to secure more effective cooperation between government agencies in the social housing field, the local municipalities and non-profit organisations. This is targeted on slums in particular: the housing and the infrastructure. However, despite the central government grants which are being offered, the financial difficulties of the municipalities appear to have severely limited the implementation of these new schemes.

In the UK, the Urban Programme and the "Action for Cities" programme are instruments for combating urban disadvantage: by increasing investment (especially private investment) and employment, improving housing and land use, and promoting community development. Action for Cities includes schemes to encourage local employers to look to local unemployed people when new job opportunities are available, even if they will require additional training. "City Challenge", launched in May 1991, gives greater priority to collaboration with local government. Local authorities are expected to construct integrated area development plans, involving a wide range of local actors, and to enter into a contract with central government and the other "key partners" - the Housing Corporation, the private sector, and other local participants - about implementation.

How far have these initiatives been able to transcend institutional barriers to produce integrated packages of action? In general, the criteria for evaluation of these urban initiatives remain elusive. Nevertheless, some positive evaluations of City Challenge have been made, in terms of giving local communities more of a voice in local development decisions; and a more general evaluation of these initiatives is to be completed for the UK government during 1993.

In Ireland, government and the social partners have agreed at national level to establish a programme of pilot projects, in twelve selected pilot areas, with high levels of long-term unemployment. In each local area partnerships have been established, with representatives of employers, trade unions and local community organisations. Each partnership is preparing an Area Action Plan, focused first on education, health, training and social welfare, and second on enterprise and employment creation. Interim evaluations indicate that at partnership level there has been a considerable improvement in the coordination of service delivery for the long-term unemployed and the accessibility of services has greatly improved.

In Denmark, a rather different sort of "spatial" reorganisation on institutions is in prospect, under the proposals of the Zeuthen Committee on labour market policies. Addressed to the
present coordination problems between local government and the regional employment service, this committee proposes new regional labour market councils to coordinate the entire effort within each region, bringing together the municipalities, the employment service, the unemployment insurance funds and private institutions. The proposal envisages the further upgrading of the role of the social partners, although this has led to some fears that it will be the unemployed from organised groups who are then given priority, as distinct from weaker groups. In the Netherlands, a somewhat parallel initiative is under way. The Central Manpower Board and the Federation of Industrial Insurance Boards have agreed four local pilot projects to develop new forms of cooperation to help unemployed people: cooperation with municipal social services aimed at reinsertion of the long-term unemployed are also developing.

III. Programmes which have a Long-Term Perspective

Where citizens fail to secure their social rights, they may suffer generalised and prolonged disadvantage. Their links with major social institutions are liable to be progressively eroded, in a process which cannot easily and quickly be reversed. Many of the responses to social exclusion are immediate and short term; and in some countries, such as France, the growing resort to contracted-out programmes encourages this short time perspective. Nevertheless, some programmes involve more durable and sustained action, in recognition of the processes of cumulative exclusion which are sometimes evident.

A number of the programmes which have been analysed in previous Observatory reports have a strong inter-temporal dimension. Thus, for example, the French Revenue Minimum D’Insertion, as well as providing financial assistance and affiliating beneficiaries to health insurance cover, involves social and occupational “insertion contracts”, by which recipients are given support to re-establish themselves at work and in the local community. So also, the Luxembourg guaranteed minimum income (RMG) was put forward as a ‘global’ strategy to combat poverty, providing not only financial support but also opportunities for entry into training and employment.

In both countries, these strategies have required new forms of institutional cooperation among existing services and/or the creation of new agencies. In Luxembourg, for example, the contacts which existing services already enjoyed with the likely clients of the RMG led to those services being retained in a key role. Nevertheless, it is evident that their new role in relation to the RMG has, on the one hand, changed the relative importance of these various pre-existing services and has, on the other, put in question their continuing separation.

In Flanders, the Weerwerk-actie programme, started in 1989, and addressed to the long-term unemployed who are living on social assistance, involves a “reintegration protocol”, under which a professional counsellor provides support to the client, within an agreed plan, from the initial identification of needs until after the person has secured employment. And since March 1993, all recipients of social assistance under the age of 25 must sign such an integration contract: refusal to respect its provisions can result in suspension of social assistance.
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In Spain, similar programmes of social integration coupled with minimum income have been introduced, notably in such regions as Madrid and the Basque country. In Madrid at least, the scheme represents an agreement between the trade unions of the region and the regional government, who established a monitoring committee, which as well as the trade unions and the regional and local governments is also now being extended to include employers organisations and the NGOs.

The development of such an inter-temporal dimension demands sustained inter-agency coordination which is by no means common. In Denmark, for example, where such schemes are being tried by the municipality of Frederikshavn, this active approach has demanded a restructuring of the public authority, with all departments dealing with income transfers and labour market integration being put together. As with its counterparts in France, Luxembourg and Flanders, the aim is said to be to re-fashion the relationship between client and social administrator, with the social worker acting merely as an adviser or consultant to the client. However, whether this is feasible, in view of the threat of withdrawal of benefit with which the client is constantly confronted, is perhaps doubtful.

No less a medium- to long-term dimension is evident in some programmes of community care, aimed at reincorporating people who have lived in institutions back into the community. The same goes for the strategies envisaged under the UK Children Act of 1989. This requires local authorities to plan for, and train, young people to leave their care and to become integrated into normal independent living; to this end, local authorities are now required to provide after-care to any young people ceasing to be looked after by them and to coordinate help from local housing, education and health authorities. In many cases, however, the sustained coordination between different agencies which such programmes require has not yet been developed. Even in Denmark, with its reputation for ambitious social care services, lack of coordination between the hospitals (regional government) and social care services (local government) has been marked.

2.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter has been concerned with the coordination of agencies and institutions as a prerequisite for efficient action to combat social exclusion. Social exclusion is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, having temporal and, sometimes, spatial dimensions. Action to combat it must accordingly be well-coordinated, if wastage of effort is to be avoided, along with possibly perverse interactions among different instruments of public policy.

As stressed in the opening chapter of this report, it would be wrong to assume that institutional relationships are constructed and re-constructed exclusively de haut en bas. Those who formally decide on institutional rearrangements will be responding to, reinforcing and extending their respective constituencies of support within the society at large. Institutional reforms can therefore serve as means of mobilising citizens and organisations for broader social goals. Accordingly, the national reports on which the present document is based give many examples of local community organisations and social movements being involved in institutional reform. In Germany, for example, there may be some 40,000 self-help groups in the social services field, employing 4000 full-time
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professional workers and receiving subsidies from the public authorities and maintaining some coherence at national level through an information-exchange system.

It would also be wrong to give the impression that global policies of the sort discussed here have everywhere become more important. In Italy, for example, the awareness that multidimensional needs require coordinated action at different levels and by different agencies is far from being an explicit or a conscious target of policies either at the national or local level. On the contrary, many new trends in social legislation point to what appears increasing specialisation and division between different kinds of interventions and agencies. This awareness was much more present, at least in the political and service culture, during the 1970s, when the importance of de-centralisation and of local, community-based social services was stressed. Thus, for example, the two main laws of 1977 and 1978 concerned with social and health protection envisaged integration of services to meet multidimensional needs: integration was to be achieved through decentralisation and a stronger preventative approach, with a central role for local government and for client participation. Social services were expected to develop institutional mechanisms for cooperating. This has not happened to the extent envisaged and it is against this background that the reform legislation of the 1990s has been framed.

Yet if the coordination of agencies and institutions is a prerequisite for efficient action to combat social exclusion, the arrangements which are established for this coordination express accommodations among different social and political actors. It is these interests and accommodations that are the concern of the next chapter.
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PATTERNS OF INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Social and employment policies involve major stakes for employers and trade unions, organised welfare professionals, central and local government, etc. The institutional arrangements prevailing in the various countries of the Community express, in part, the balance of power among these organised interests, as do the fragmentation and incoherence of public policy. New institutional forms will produce shifts in this balance of power and in the terms under which the different actors are able to pursue their respective interests.

How far, then, do the biases against more vulnerable groups which exist within our social welfare systems express these accommodations among the powerful? In what direction are these accommodations changing, as a result of the organisational and institutional changes which current national and European policies are producing? And, finally, how easily can these accommodations be modified, in the interests of the socially excluded? These questions provide the focus for this chapter.

The previous synthesis reports of the Observatory have presented brief overviews of the cast of actors, showing how the social partners, the public authorities and the NGOs in particular shape and implement social and employment policies. However, these overviews have remained at a rather general level. What is now needed is a more detailed analysis of the ways in which particular accommodations among these actors impinge on efforts to combat social exclusion, for better or worse, for example by impelling action in one direction rather than another, and by obstructing or facilitating new and coherent action to combat multi-dimensional exclusion.

3.2. THE SOCIAL PARTNERS

The social partners - taken as being the trade unions and employers organisations (but also, in countries such as Ireland, the farmers organisations) - do not only contribute to the general debate; they are also heavily involved in the implementation of social and employment policies. Interest in their role has increased with the Maastricht Social Accord, which some have seen as providing an opportunity for a reinvigorated "corporatism" at Community level.

In Denmark, the social partners are strongly integrated into labour market policy, according to the well-known Scandinavian model. Their cooptation into corporatist bodies is now long-established; and it goes hand-in-hand with an active labour market policy, including for example the relatively new job-offer scheme for the long-term unemployed, under the responsibility of the local municipalities. Luxembourg has seen similar corporatist arrangements since the steel crisis of the 1970s. However, such arrangements have
sometimes been criticised for their orientation to the interests of "core" groups of employed workers, rather than the labour force in general, and for their tendency to by-pass normal channels of political accountability.

Policies can of course be coherent, based on well-established forms of institutional cooperation, but they may still have little regard to problems of social exclusion: indeed, the very stability of these institutional forms may militate against new initiatives directed to those problems. Nevertheless, in Denmark recent years have seen a number of new initiatives involving the social partners, government and the NGOs, recognising their joint responsibility for the social welfare of local communities and for labour market integration of the long-term unemployed, people with disabilities, etc. For example, collective arrangements using public subsidies allow groups of employees to receive in-service training while they are substituted by groups of long-term unemployed people.

In France, the social partners are involved in many of the new contractual partnerships which have become commonplace in social policy in recent years. In some countries they are heavily involved in the implementation of social security policies: for example in Italy and in the Netherlands (where their role has also become especially evident in the central and regional manpower boards, which involve equal representation of local government, trade unions and employers' organisations).

In Portugal, the social partners are involved in policy-making through their membership of the Economic and Social Council, created in 1991 in place of several earlier fora, in order to ensure more active involvement of different social and economic interests - but not merely the social partners - in national economic and social agreements. Two recent agreements (in 1990 and 1991) are of particular relevance to problems of social exclusion, for example in regards to the role of the social partners in vocational training and professional certification.

In Ireland, similarly, the social partners are involved in policy-making through their membership of the National Economic and Social Council and through major national agreements such as the Programme for Social Progress of 1991, to which previous reports of the Observatory have referred. As for their involvement in the implementation of social welfare policies, this is limited to the network of unemployment resource centres, run by the Irish Congress of Trade Unions and part-funded by government, and the area-based response to long-term unemployment (see above, Section 2.3(ii)).

But this development is not uniform. In the UK, the trade unions have been squeezed out of their former role in the development of public policy. Meanwhile, the role of industrial and business management has increased, to some extent displacing the functions of local government. Urban Development Corporations and Task Forces, Training and Enterprise Councils represent new forms of collaboration among agencies at the local level, with business playing the dominating role.

In Greece, the social partners continue in general to be absent from the field of social policy (and not surprisingly, therefore, they failed to respond to the questionnaire enquiry undertaken by our Greek Observatory expert). Nevertheless, one new form of cooperation among agencies has been the establishment of vocational training and employment councils,
organised at national, regional and local levels and involving a multiplicity of bodies, including the social partners.

In Germany, while the involvement of the social partners is fundamental to the administration of the social insurance system, this is essentially as a private matter outside the purview of the State (albeit governed by public law). Tripartite cooperation between the social partners and government is undeveloped, not least in social policies relevant to social exclusion. Certainly the social partners are not involved in any national round table of the sort which has recently emerged in Ireland (see section 2.2 above) or which is long-established in such countries as Denmark and the Netherlands. Only in the sphere of health care has the cost explosion of recent years prompted the establishment of a "joint action on the health service" in which the social partners also are represented. Nevertheless, in eastern Germany, with massive use of employment promotion schemes, labour offices have been promoting new agencies which may be able to organise such schemes on a large scale; many of these are developing within a joint institutional framework involving the social partners as well local and regional authorities and other commercial bodies.

3.3. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS (NGOs)

The NGOs are significant in most countries: in some cases, increasingly so. Their institutional involvement shapes policies relevant to combating social exclusion, driving these policies in specific directions and creating resistance or support for new institutional arrangements.

In Portugal, NGOs have a long-established role in social welfare, but one which is tending to expand further. Some - most notably the "Misericordias" - find their origins and inspiration in the Catholic Church even if they are now under the supervision of the public authorities. This supervision involves licensing by the Regional Social Security Centres, with whom the NGOs have cooperation agreements, involving from the side of the RSSC technical and financial support to the NGOs. New legislation in mid-1992 regulates this cooperation.

In Luxembourg similarly, a variety of "conventions" between the central government and private organisations regulate the social services which the latter provide, involving different degrees of government control and supervision. These conventions stipulate standards of service (including, for example, ratios of staff to clients). Hotly debated, however, is whether such conventions should be underpinned by legislation, rather than having the status of mere administrative regulations. Such legislation would enhance the role of the public authorities as regulator if not as provider and it would be debatable in what sense the private services remained "private" at all.

Legislation recognising the NGOs and allowing them to develop their activities has been relatively recent in some countries: Spain, for example, where NGOs have developed strongly in Catalonia and the Basque country, but more weakly in poor and rural areas. Only with such a development does their relationship with other sectors - notably with statutory agencies - have to be addressed. Some continue to have a privileged status as
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"tutelary organisations", recognised by the State. In Italy, 1991 saw a new legal framework established for public/private cooperation at the local level, which is likely to promote a new welfare "mix"; but this may discourage the involvement of smaller innovatory projects, by stipulating what sorts of organisations are eligible and requiring them to be formally organised.

In Belgium - and especially in Flanders - the new poverty funds for local action have meant an increased importance for the NGOs, through the partnerships which are being established. This reflects in part the specific social and political context: in particular, the political importance in Flanders of the Catholic "pillar", with which many of these NGOs are associated. In Wallonia, in contrast, where the socialist pillar has been traditionally dominant, local social welfare initiatives are being developed primarily through the Public Welfare Centres.

In Ireland, the 1990s have seen a growing debate as to the role of voluntary organisations. The Programme for Economic and Social Progress (January 1991) anticipated the establishment of a new and clear framework for a partnership between the state and voluntary activity, although the details of this are still under discussion and until now, the links between the two sectors have been irregular.

In Greece, a large portion of personal social services are provided by private voluntary agencies and the Church. Often, they fill the gaps left by state action and in some cases, they play the major role. In recent years, a new array of NGOs has developed specifically in response to the availability of EC funds. However, in some cases they are connected to political parties and enmeshed in the clientistic politics of Greek social and economic life, representing just one more mechanism by which political clans seek to appropriate new sources of public funds.

The national reports present a very varied picture of the influence which voluntary organisations have on public policy and the consequences of this influence. In Germany, 1991 saw the establishment of the National Poverty Conference, bringing together the principal welfare organisations and a variety of other networks active in the field, to press politically for more attention to problems of poverty, both nationally and across the EC as a whole. In Ireland in contrast, there are few consultation mechanisms and even where they exist, little evidence that they produce specific policy changes.

In Italy, on the other hand, there are fears that the new Framework Law on Voluntary Activities and Associations will surrender public policy to the more fashionable priorities of these voluntary organisations - such as working with immigrants and drug addicts - ignoring less fashionable groups such as drunks, the chronically ill, violent families. This highlights the risk that the NGOs, rather than filling the gaps left by state action, may instead create new gaps, because of the specific interests which they represent. Or, at least, that the criteria of eligibility used by voluntary organisations tend to be so discretionary that service provision is often inadequate and arbitrary.

A separate (but no less interesting) question concerns the extent to which the institutional involvement of the NGOs in public programmes affects the role, functioning and priorities of the NGOs themselves. In some cases, the ad hoc character of statutory funding for
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Voluntary organisations leaves them in a precarious and marginal position and make
significant partnership arrangements between the two sectors unlikely: for, as our Irish
expert comments, "when everything is discretionary, there is little reason to engage in
planning and partnership". In Spain, however, some progress has been made within the
laws of the regional administrations in reducing this discretion and rendering more
transparent the procedures governing relations between the two sectors. Indeed, one of the
most important changes in recent years in coordination between the State and the NGOs has
been the substitution of contracting-out agreements for general subsidies. In Italy,
however, public funding of non-profit agencies has in some cases been driven by clientelist
relationships, thwarting coordination of the services provided by the public and voluntary
sectors.

On the other hand, statutory funding can become so important to voluntary organisations
that their interests and priorities shift significantly and NGOs may be distracted from their
other activities concerned with socially excluded groups. In Ireland, again, studies of some
associations of the unemployed and of community development projects reveal that statutory
funding severely constrains their programmes of work. This fear is also expressed in such
countries as the UK: the colonisation of organisational aims by the statutory authorities. In
Denmark, there are fears that the commitment of time and effort by volunteers will be
jeopardised by the subordination of NGOs to the public authorities. And in Spain there are
fears for the economic - and therefore political - dependence of NGOs on the public
authorities.

3.4. LOCAL, REGIONAL AND CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

Local, regional and central government are also part of the cast of actors which previous
reports of the Observatory have examined. In many countries of the Community, the
division of responsibility between them for funding, regulating and managing social policies
has been changing substantially during recent years, with concomitant changes in their
interrelationships.

In Italy, new laws of 1990 strengthen the powers of local government in relation to
economic development and social services (but not health) and enable the smallest
authorities to set up joint arrangements for the management of services. At the same time,
however, the new laws give an impetus to a "mixed economy of welfare", with greater
scope for contracting-out of local authority services to non-profit and other agencies. There
appears to be some risk that these new arrangements will render more difficult integrated
approaches in the area of social exclusion, in particular the links between social assistance
and health care.

In Spain, a new law of November 1992 regulates the patterns of cooperation between
central government and the regional authorities. Although the regions have exclusive
jurisdiction over policies to combat social exclusion, national legislation continues to
guarantee equal access to services for all citizens. This in turn makes coordination between
the two levels necessary in matters affecting social exclusion. As for the relationship
between regional and local government, however, legal ambiguities in the respective powers
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of the two levels remain and impede efforts at institutional cooperation. The Concerted Plan of Social Services - an agreement between the central government, the regions and the municipalities - aims at creating a nation-wide network of municipal social services. This important initiative, taken by central government notwithstanding its lack of legal mandate in social welfare apart from general coordination, was justified in 1988 by the need to ensure that the decentralisation of social welfare agencies would not generate inequality of social rights. This plan is coordinated through a series of technical and political working groups which involve the different levels of government. Notable among these is the Planning and Evaluation Work Group, charged with ensuring consistent application of the Plan. The Plan appears to be working successfully, not least in promoting an administrative culture of collaboration in social services. Nevertheless, the ambiguities already mentioned in the powers of the municipalities vis-à-vis the regional governments place constraints on this success.

In the Netherlands, the Social Renewal Policy of recent years has raised important political questions concerning the powers of local authorities in developing local programmes to combat social exclusion. For, while the Social Renewal Policy involves little if any additional expenditure, it does involve significant increases in the responsibilities of local authorities for efforts to combat social disadvantage. The reform follows a period of controversy during the 1980s, when local municipalities were obliged to acknowledge their lack of political competence to implement an incomes support policy of their own.

In Belgium, recent years have seen the devolution of administrative responsibilities to the regions; and Flanders in particular has developed its own policies for combating social exclusion. Substantial additional financial resources have been allocated to cities in Flanders to support vulnerable population groups, in part out of fear that large concentrations of disadvantage may fuel inter-ethnic conflicts. The granting of these poverty funds - for the integration of the poor and of migrants - requires the existence of local partnerships of local authorities and non-governmental organisations, even if the local authority (or the centre for social aid) must be the principal promoter of the projects proposed. However, these proposals have still to be approved by the Flemish government and only in some limited respects, therefore, are local authorities being given greater autonomy.

In Portugal, the municipalities have a long-established tradition of local autonomy, one which was consolidated with the revolution of 1974. This autonomy has, if anything, been strengthened further in recent years, even if central government defines the institutional framework for these municipal powers. One instrument of this central supervision is the Municipal Guide Plan (PDM), a plan for municipal action for the medium to long-term which must be approved by central government and which must ensure coordination of the actions of adjacent municipalities.

In France, recent political and administrative decentralisation have prompted concern over policy incoherence and programme inefficiency: not least because of the small size of some of the administrative units now having a responsibility for actions to combat social exclusion. And of course, while decentralisation may make for a closer link between welfare providers and their clienteles, it can also permit the development of substantial territorial inequalities in the treatment of particular needs, unless accompanied by specific
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redistributive measures as between different local authorities. Thus the establishment of a national minimum income scheme after 1988 was in part a response to the diversity of benefit levels offered by the local schemes of minimum income which developed during the 1980s.

Even in Greece, where the development of local government as an independent actor remains constrained by their lack of fiscal independence, local authorities are becoming significant in efforts to combat social exclusion. Nevertheless, as well as the funding constraint, there are also important deficiencies in the institutional framework within which they must operate. The hierarchical and bureaucratic structures of the public sector, tightly controlled by the central ministries, still leave little autonomy for local government to develop forms of institutional partnership and service provision attuned to local conditions.

In Denmark, reforms in labour market policy and, in particular, the job-offer scheme have thrust municipalities to the fore in policies to combat labour market exclusion. But this is, in turn, putting in question the traditional administrative arrangements, with the consistency of local and national initiatives being questioned and geographical uniformity of standards put in doubt. At the same time, the incapacity of local action alone to deal with employment opportunities, against the background of wider-scale economic restructuring, has underlined the need for close concertation of action between these different levels. In Germany similarly, some significant developments have taken place in the role which the municipalities are playing in employment policy. Hamburg is one of the cities which is a pioneer in this field, but the German report also refers to initiatives in such cities as M"unchen/Ladbach and Saarbr"ucken, which involve a "labour market conference" which brings together the various actors working in this field.

Thus, although at first glance it seems that in many countries of the Community there has been a decentralisation to regional and local government, it is clear that in some cases at least this amounts to little more than the local implementation of policies still determined at central level; in others, greater local responsibility has been granted but without financial autonomy; in still others, local devolution may in part represent an effort by central government to distance itself from unpopular political choices in a period of cost containment in welfare services.

3.5. CONCLUSION

This chapter has considered the new frameworks for collaboration that are emerging in different countries of the Community, involving the social partners, NGOs and different levels of government. The final chapter will attempt to distil from the foregoing certain general conclusions, as far as efforts by the public authorities to prevent and combat social exclusion are concerned. In particular, by what means can the public authorities promote new institutional arrangements and partnerships, relevant to efforts to prevent or combat social exclusion? And how effective are they?
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STRATEGIES AND DILEMMAS OF INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

4.1. THE PROMOTION OF INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION

On the basis of the analysis undertaken in previous chapters, it should be possible to characterise a number of typical strategies for promoting institutional reform and coordination, together with the rigidities and barriers which they encounter and the ways - if any - in which these can be surmounted.

i. New Frameworks of Collaboration

One approach is to re-define the framework for collaboration among the different actors involved: offering new incentives, evoking new moral obligations and threatening new sanctions. At one extreme lie the National Plans which have had an important place in Spanish policy-making during recent years: plans which must be understood in relation to the new powers of the regions in the field of social welfare, even while central government retains a responsibility for ensuring some general common standards in basic social rights. Our Spanish expert evaluates these plans positively: "they strengthen an administrative culture of collaboration and negotiation ... and they are a pathway for incorporation of NGOs". Nevertheless, they also face continuing problems: how to develop sufficient decentralisation to the municipal level and how to avoid excessive financial dependence of the NGOs on the State.

More generally, coordination aims to establish a framework for cooperation among institutions that would otherwise compete with each other, or react self-protectively. Thus, for example, the French report analyses a range of forms of such coordination: extending from the mere exchange of information to the formation of enduring coalitions and, finally, to the imposition of an obligatory planning process and even the fusion of formerly distinct institutions.

A very different type of framework is being developed in the UK, where the government has been extending the incentives and disciplines of the market, arguing that these will best secure effective cooperation among the various actors involved. The new "framework" takes the form of markets and quasi-markets and "collaboration" takes the form of competition and contracts. Funding continues to come from the State but producers are obliged to compete for "customers". These reforms will, government claims, extend the choices available to the citizen-as-consumer and strengthen his or her rights vis-à-vis hitherto monopolistic public services.

However, the exercise of these rights depends crucially on the information available to these consumers and this may be very incomplete. Moreover, in the increasing competition among providers, there is some evidence that "consumers" who are likely to impose a heavy burden are being excluded: for example, disruptive and less able children from school. And finally, notwithstanding these institutional reforms and the affirmation of
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citizen rights, the precise entitlement to services remains unresolved. Educational and social needs may be acknowledged - for example, by a local education authority - but the resources to meet them may simply not be available.

ii. New Institutions

Another approach to institutional reform is to create new institutions, rather than re-fashioning the relationships among those already existing. One example is the new Centre for Racial Equality in Belgium, established in 1993 (and not without precedents in other Community countries such as the UK). Resort to new institutions is especially common in France: for example, the Revenu Minimum d'Insertion involved the creation of a new inter-ministerial delegation on RMI; new “councils of insertion” of the departments; and local “committees of insertion”. However, the over-abundance of institutions that this policy engenders can merely compound the problem of institutional duplication. In Greece, similarly, there has been a multiplicity of collaborative efforts by an apparently endless range of agencies and bodies, with serious overlap of provision of certain services and collaborative programmes of dubious effectiveness. This has been particularly evident in the field of vocational training, due to the availability of EC funds, which has stimulated a wide range of purely opportunistic partnerships.

iii. Joint Working Arrangements

Even if no new institutions are created, joint working arrangements and forums may be possible, in order to formalise the links between different agencies. In Germany, “workgroups” have long been an important response by the public authorities to the plethora of agencies working in the social field and, under the principle of subsidiarity, able to take precedence over statutory effort. These are common at the local level but at national level also, where a workgroup brings together the six central welfare organisations.

iv. Institutional Reform through small-scale innovation

A fourth approach is to promote the visibility of programmes of small-scale institutional innovation which are being developed at the local level, so that these can be taken up more generally. In some cases, particular local or regional authorities may emerge as pioneers of social welfare reform and institutional innovation. In France, for example, local initiatives in providing a minimum income, involving local partnerships, supplied the stimulus for the larger national effort initiated in 1988 (CERC, 1988). More generally, many EC programmes of cross-national action-research have this rationale. The Spanish report, for example, gives several examples of these and indicates their role in stimulating institutional reform.

4.2. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION

How effective are these various approaches to institutional coordination? And indeed, how should such effectiveness be judged? First, presumably, in terms of the more coherent definition of organisational goals, the reduced duplication of effort, the ease of access for
CHAPTER FOUR

the individual client. But second, at least for this Observatory, in terms of the consequent effectiveness with which the various institutions involved mobilise their resources in relation to the prevention and alleviation of disadvantage and exclusion.

What of the barriers to institutional collaboration? Several different types are mentioned in the national reports.

First, there are those posed by the legal and institutional framework. In Italy, for example, recent legislation affects different parts of the non-profit sector in rather arbitrary ways, notwithstanding the similarity of the functions they perform. In Greece, local authorities are severely restricted as to the partnerships in which they can participate with other public and private sector agencies, as a result of the prevailing legislative framework. In particular, they are as yet not permitted to join with such agencies in the establishment of non-profit making associations (societe civile), as distinct from commercial enterprises. This has severely hampered various new initiatives aimed at developing such partnerships, including those within the Poverty 3 projects. Collaboration has either to remain at the informal level, or to function as appendages of ministries. In Luxembourg, the small size of the country - and hence the proximity of political leaders to the local communities who elect them - while it has many positive consequences, can also impose severe limits on the new initiatives that can be taken: for example, in developing new support systems for recipients of the guaranteed minimum income or for the children of immigrants.

Second, there are obstacles posed by the hierarchical and bureaucratic structures of the public sector. In Spain, the flexibility which programmes of social reinsertion require is being hampered by the rigidities of bureaucratic administration. In the Netherlands, the Social Renewal Policy, while it aims at encouraging new integrated approaches by local government, is developing against a background where central government departments continue to work on a sectoral basis, and where such non-governmental bodies as industrial insurance boards remain highly centralised. In Greece, various bottom-up initiatives aimed at improved institutional cooperation have been encountering severe obstacles arising from the hierarchical and bureaucratic structures of the public sector, tightly controlled by the central ministries, which are themselves seriously influenced by the subjugation of public administration to the concerns of the political parties. This leaves little autonomy for local government to develop forms of institutional partnership and service provision attuned to local conditions. Finally, in Ireland two pilot projects established to improve service coordination for the elderly at local level during 1987-91 reveal how the rigidities of administrative divisions and existing reporting arrangements impede efforts to develop partnership arrangements (with a lack of training and resources, and over-ambitious aims, only making matters worse).

Third, private sector agencies - in particular, employers - have few incentives to increase their concern with problems of social exclusion and with the new forms of institutional cooperation that may be required, especially if this imposes increased cost on them at a time of growing international competition.

Fourth, it is a truism, but one easily overlooked, that the creation of institutional linkages requires specific professional skills. These may be lacking. The Greek report in particular highlights this problem in both public and private sectors, explaining it in part in terms of
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the hiring and promotion practices of the public sector, in part the inefficient utilisation and training of human resources. Shortages have also been highlighted in the debates in Luxembourg, in particular in face of demands for staff with multiple skills; and in France, where social workers are being faced with demands to exercise skills in relation to employment creation and enterprise development, for example. Where, on the other hand, professional authority is strongly developed and entrenched, new initiatives at coordination can provoke efforts to protect professional territories and prevent transfer of knowledge to other professional groups.

Finally, in such countries as Greece and Italy, the occupation of public institutions by political parties has long been seen as a barrier to institutional modernisation. The recent reforms in Italy involve efforts to shift responsibility from politicians to professional managers, in an effort to reduce the influence of clientelism and to strengthen and value professional expertise, complemented by efforts to improve the transparency of bureaucratic functioning. Even so, these reforms also have the danger of removing from public debate into the realm of professional autonomy decisions which are only apparently administrative.

The role which politicians should play in the implementation of welfare policies is also under debate in Luxembourg. Here there are signs that in some communes the offices responsible for administration of the RMG (guaranteed minimum income) are being subverted on the one hand by politicians hostile to the law, on the other by staff who are wedded to more traditional forms of relief. This lack of professionalism has been heavily criticised in Parliament, although to overcome it might require some encroachment on the autonomy of the communes.

4.3. CONCLUSION

Finally, it is worth re-emphasising that one of the principal tests against which institutional reforms should be judged is whether or not they strengthen the practical realisation of social rights. Here, as highlighted at various points in this report, at least two quite different notions of social rights are to be found - and hence two quite different views as to what sort of institutional reforms can strengthen them.

On the one hand are quasi-market solutions, with the State continuing to provide the resources but with consumer "exit" from an existing service the main expression of the citizen's rights. Contrasting with these are solutions which aim to harness professional and organisational energies to specific political goals: goals which the individual citizen is able to shape through the normal political process, as well as through self-help groups, social movements and other pressures for "bottom-up" reform.

This report has highlighted some of the dilemmas and consequences associated with these different paths of institutional reform. But it has also revealed that the paths which are chosen will, to some extent, be influenced by programmes and policies implemented at Community level. As seen in Chapter 1, various of the national reports on which this synthesis is based point to the significance of EC programmes and funds for new patterns of institutional relationships in the field of social exclusion. Some of these experiences are
positive: in particular, those that begin to develop local partnerships capable of orchestrating an integrated network of services at neighbourhood level. Others, however, are more ambiguous: Community funds and programmes may stimulate the development of agencies and partnerships set up solely to receive such funds, irrespective of their experience or effectiveness. In judging and evaluating Community actions, their impact upon patterns of institutional coordination in the various member states - so crucial for the changing content of citizenship rights - deserves a central place.
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SUMMARIES OF NATIONAL REPORTS
SUMMARIES OF NATIONAL REPORTS

BELGIUM

Until the middle of the 80's, programmes to combat poverty were restricted to the creation of specific income-guaranteeing measures such as the Guaranteed Income for the Elderly or the Right to a Guaranteed Subsistence Income. This is but an illustration of an approach that was characteristic for Belgian welfare policy. Public authorities have always directed their attention to one or another aspect of the welfare state. The result is that each branch of the social security system -pensions, family allowances, education, health care, sickness and invalidity insurance, and subsistence income programmes -successively stood at the core of public policy. Never have they been integrated into a coherent global social policy. Two important reasons for this 'fragmentation' are the pillarisation of Belgian (welfare) society and its corporate democracy character. In spite of the recent remodelling of the Belgian institutional context they probably will continue to determine the political decision-making process.

Only since 1985 and first at the federal level, a number of related initiatives have been taken that aimed at improving several aspects of the living conditions of the poor. This became possible because decentralisation transferred many competencies related to poverty and social exclusion to the Regional and Community governments. This led to a new dynamism that was expressed in a series of specific or global initiatives to combat exclusion. The results of the elections in November 1991, which were very successful for a right-wing party in Flanders, reinforced this trend.

On top of this institutional transferral of competencies, a second devolution process has taken place in the specific domain of policies to combat poverty and social exclusion; that between the Community or Regional government and local authorities. More specifically in Flanders but also in Brussels regional authorities only provide for a general framework that has to be implemented at the local level. In this way, local partnerships between both public and private actors are encouraged.

NEW PROGRAMMES AND POLICIES TO COMBAT SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Two innovative programmes deserve special attention. Firstly, the memorandum and Emergency programme for a more solidary society of the former (federal) Minister of Social Integration is presented as an example of a more integrated approach to combat poverty and social exclusion. Such policies and specific actions in the field of housing, employment, education, public safety and integration were presented in the policy declaration of the present Government Dehaene as an attempt to counter the 'gap between the citizen and politics', which was seen as causing the electoral success of right-wing parties. Secondly, the Flemish Fund for the Integration of the Underprivileged (1991 - 1998) is discussed, not only because it has important financial means but also because of its focus on poverty in urban areas and on local partnerships.
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Recent programmes and policies to combat social exclusion are characterised by a number of specific accents. Next to institutional factors, they are also determined by electoral motives (the victory of extreme-right and the debate on migrants) or by financial motives (the budgetary problems of the cities and the debate on urban poverty).

Firstly, special attention is paid to the concentration of poverty and social exclusion in specific urban neighbourhoods. These programmes are aiming at the improvement of the co-ordination of different institutions, to deal more effectively with closely interrelated needs. The special funds in Flanders are an example of this emphasis on urban marginalisation and programmatic integration.

Secondly, although the new programmes are targeted upon multiple disadvantage, the debate on the integration of ethnic minorities has promoted a categorical accent in poverty policy; migrants and asylum seekers are isolated as special target groups. The activity of the Royal Commissioner on Migrants has stimulated this debate.

A third accent is a functional one. Specific policies focus on different 'sectors': income, employment, housing, education. Because of the growing concern for the rising unemployment rates and the presence of employment initiatives at all levels, the report comments a series of actions in this domain.

THE NEED FOR COORDINATION

The need for co-ordination has always been there; it results from the multi-dimensional nature of poverty and social exclusion. This requires a debate about the (in)coherence of social policies, institutions and agencies. As in other countries, incoherence of policies is a problem in Belgium, and this has been complicated by the process of devolution. This process not only has increased the number of relevant decision-making levels. Whereas sectoral policies at the federal level tend to be co-ordinated, specific and integrated policies and programmes are developed at different policy levels (federal/regional) and by different policy sectors (employment, health, education,...). Somehow the new regional Ministers wanted to identify themselves in the new structure which resulted in a multiplication of new decrees and programmes. All this has increased the need for cross-overs between federal and regional policies and between sectors. Particularly in Flanders, this has led to a debate about the need for 'integrated' and 'inclusive' policies.

STRATEGIES AND DILEMMAS OF INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

During the 1980's it became widely accepted that poverty is a structural phenomenon, that can not be reduced to its income component alone. It is a situation of related deprivations on the labour market, on the housing market, in the educational system, in health care. The more recent notion of social exclusion was included in this broader definition. In policy terms this meant that combating poverty could no longer be related to one policy field: the one that provides for minimum incomes. A poverty policy should be the concern of general
policy; it should include measures in other policy domains such as education, health care, employment, housing.

Since 1990, the notion of inclusive policy has been introduced in the debate in Flanders, as a guideline for developing an adequate poverty policy. "Inclusive" means that policies on poverty should no longer be an isolated matter, but that combating poverty should be "included" in all departments. In this respect, the link between policies to combat poverty and the so-called "hard" sectors such as employment, housing and education is crucial.

CONCLUSION

By what means can the public authorities promote new institutional arrangements and partnerships relevant to the prevention of social exclusion and how effective are they?

Strategies consist of the redefining of the framework, of the introduction of new incentives and of new moral obligations or the creation of new institutions. Funds have brought about a new relationship between the central and the local level. Incentives have been given to the local level in order to develop poverty policies. At the federal and regional level, new interdepartmental contacts have been established by new institutions like the 'Interdepartmental commission to combat poverty' and the 'Flemish intersectoral commission to combat poverty'.

Barriers to institutional co-operation are posed by the legal and institutional framework, by the hierarchical and bureaucratic structures of the public sectors. The creation of institutional linkages requires specific professional skills.
Organisations and institutions play an important role in the Danish political and administrative system. Through interest articulation and implementation, institutional actors influence social and labour market policies on behalf of their members or users. A number of themes may be identified. Firstly, the general political and administrative framework with particular regard to national programmes in the field of social and labour market policy.

In Denmark, public social services are organised within a strongly decentralized public system, in other European social services, organised around social insurance systems. The Danish tax financed system is based on both state tax (common to all) and regional and local taxes which differ from one region/local area to another. This system allows for regional and local authorities to coordinate the different social services, because the responsibility for the organisation and delivery of the services is situated at these levels. In contrast to insurance based systems, the resources are not allocated on a national basis, which allows local and regional political leaders to allocate and coordinate resources in a flexible and comprehensive manner.

The Danish Welfare State has during the last two decades gone through a process of restructuring. Political autonomy has been decentralized to regional and local levels, a development that has been even further accentuated by current institutional programmes and reforms. A more detailed investigation into the nature of the process of decentralisation is therefore necessary, to understand the political and administrative context in which organisations and actors in the Danish Welfare State operate.

An analysis of institutional coordination in Denmark therefore has a horizontal in contrast to a vertical perspective. Our starting point is the coordination of policies between authorities and organisations within the different horizontal levels of the administrative and political systems.

Secondly, the role of the social partners in relation to labour market exclusion leads us to focusing on the relationship between labour market organisations and the state, and the corporate features of the so-called “Danish Model”. Representation of the social partners in the national and regional labour market committees gives them substantial influence in the planning and implementation of employment policies.

The cornerstone of Danish policies to integrate the unemployed in the labour market is the job-offer scheme. Evaluation of the scheme shows that it has a limited employment effect, and the perspectives of involving the social partners further in the fight against social exclusion are discussed.

The traditional division of responsibility between the state and the NGOs in Denmark is undergoing changes; in the 1980s and 1990s, voluntary, private-non-profit organisations
have become more prominent in the fight against social exclusion. The challenge is to establish a proper balance between public and voluntary, private-non-profit organisations, combining the different advantages of the two sectors.

The third theme is the decentralisation of the Danish Welfare State. The process of regionalization and municipalization in the realm of labour market and social policy, fundamentally changes the relationships between institutions and organisations in the Welfare State. When policies are decentralized, the potential for local and regional actors to increase their influence on the formulation and implementation of policies may well result in greater geographical variation in policies to combat social exclusion. One possible consequence of this is that the administrative and political systems experience conflicts between national and local policy objectives.

The fourth theme is that of models for cooperation between the different actors in the Danish Welfare State. We may divide initiatives into three groups: initiatives based on a "partnership" between a public municipality, the social partners and other local actors; initiatives to prevent labour market exclusion and to facilitate labour market integration; initiatives targeted towards improving public social services. Common to the chosen initiatives is that they aim to coordinate policies in order to prevent social exclusion, and that they are of an innovatory nature insofar as they experiment with new forms of cooperation between public and private actors.

Recently a new social fund "50 M" passed through parliament. The purpose of the fund is to combat social exclusion primarily in the big cities. 50 million DKK has been granted to target more resources towards excluded groups in recognition of the fact that the problem of social exclusion has grown, especially due to rising numbers of homeless mentally ill and core groups of persons with multiple problems.

Local and regional authorities are encouraged to cooperate with central government trying to find "permanent solutions" for excluded persons particularly by establishing housing and lodging facilities for the homeless. These facilities include personal care, activities and treatment for target groups, and they are considered to be a new kind of social care in between traditional institutions and private housing. Also outreach work with these groups is reinforced. In the 50-M fund, it is especially emphasised that voluntary, not-for-profit organisations working with excluded persons should be involved in the projects.

The final theme is that of the promotion and effectiveness of institutional coordination in relation to social exclusion. The restructuring of the Danish Welfare State has implications for policies to combat social exclusion. One of the political motives behind welfare reforms is to create more flexible organisations, responding more easily to the needs of users. Organisational accountability demands more active user participation, a development posing a potential problem to excluded and marginalised groups. People who are most in need of specific services, face a potential danger of being prevented from receiving them, because they can not participate for various reasons.
The decentralisation of autonomy to the local level and to the level of institutions, logically results in a greater variation in policies and services. A positive aspect of this development is that it become easier to adapt welfare policies to local problems. The drawback of this is that the significant Danish Welfare State features of universalism and equality are undermined.

As a response to the problems connected to the process of decentralisation, the Social Democratic Party in government has put forward proposals suggesting that the social minimum rights should be formulated, applicable to local, regional and national authorities, in order to maintain basic public responsibility for the planning and provision of social welfare and guarantee the existence of adequate social services towards the most vulnerable groups.
FRANCE

Active policies in the fight against social deprivation in France fall within an institutional and organisational framework that is becoming ever more complex.

This complexity is due to the large number and wide diversity of the social and political players (central and local government, welfare organisations, associations, friendly societies, social workers, etc.), the multiplicity of functions and services, their increasing specialisation and diversity (guarantees of funds, jobs, housing, education, migrants, etc.), and finally to hierarchical systems that are either too complex or poorly defined.

Faced with this situation there is a growing demand for greater coordination among institutions, policies and social schemes. The main aims of this coordination would be:

- to enhance the efficiency of political measures, e.g. by managing social innovation, reducing the cost of allocating services and above all by providing a solution to the multidimensional nature of social deprivation,
- to ensure equal treatment among service consumers, by tackling the imbalances that are the result of decentralisation, among other factors,
- to improve the regulation of powers, by limiting the effects of dependency or by defining the part played by each social player in each social policy.

Coordination is the keystone of new global policies in the fight against social deprivation.

The word coordination is a generic term that covers a multitude of different situations. It represents real situations that range from very basic liaisons between social players via participation, partnership, contractualisation, cooperation, coalition and planning right down to mergers between institutions or organisations. Coordination can mean a more or less informal process of action among various protagonists or it can be an established device that defines the role of the players within a complex system of service provision.

Although the forms of coordination change in the course of time and vary depending on their sphere of application, they all concern three main types of players: operators, fund providers and regulators. The operators have the job of supplying material aid to those in need, and it is often they who publicly express the demand for coordination. In this case, coordination is horizontal, i.e. it is between operators of the same type or between players with different status in a geographically defined area (urban social development, USD).

The financial stakes are considerable, especially since the decentralisation of the local government. Under the controversial principle of « who pays decides », specific institutions tend to provide specific services, fund providers are encouraged to specialize and the opportunities for cooperation are restricted. Faced with the call for an overall social
response to the problems of social deprivation, the answers to the problems posed can no longer come from a single public authority; the techniques of co-management, co-financing, crossed or joint financing and contractualisation are now essential to unite various sources of finance around any one project.

The regulators are responsible for the implementation and widespread use of services and schemes throughout the country. They are usually integral parts of a sometimes complex system of vertical coordination. They apply the hierarchical and custodial relations among the social players, relations which they sometimes also define.
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GERMANY

"Responsibility" and "legal claim" are the main principles underpinned the social security system in the Federal Republic of Germany which works according to the casuality principle which regulates the amount of benefits. The question is whether coordination or even the integration of different agencies would be more effective in combating multidimensional causes of social exclusion than is currently the case.

In recent years a number of projects, programmes, clearing institutions have been established in Germany, some locally, others nationally. They are characterised by decentralization, neighbourhood support and self-help and are financed from a number of sources, including the EC. This includes the National Poverty Conference as well as initiatives in the fight of employment/qualifications, housing, health and age.

The Community level (and to a lesser extent the regional level) offers clear possibilities of overcoming the limits of traditional "legal structures". This is because of the "closeness" of the community and the agencies (unions, churches, businesses, organizations, etc.) to the appearance of the social problems. Furthermore, communities are, as regards "jurisdiction" already bound up with a large part of these problems alone by being expected to aid the community anyway. And finally the communities traditionally have their own instruments, close cooperation with independent actors and social institutions that they are in the position to deploy for the - in the sense of traditional social welfare structures - unconventional aid.

A change in the legal framework may have enormous financial and organizational consequences. This concerns also the experimentation with various structures in administration, or rather new cooperation models between traditional and new forms of organization.

On the other hand present promoting innovation without strengthening self-help potential are unthinkable. Portions of social care that are taken on, or rather by, are falling to the communities' responsibilities in phases of less social exclusion are here partially reprivatized or rather they are left to the activities of private initiatives. These initiatives want to also remain partially private, meaning neither sheltered by the communities nor by welfare associations. Problem situations, partially also related to a local unity of structures newly revived, that - without encouraging any romanticization of past times - once existed in the family connections and/or the neighborhood, because of demographic changes, have been lost in the individualization of lives and forced mobility on the job market.

And finally, these initiatives and models are in the end looking for at least a partial financing through the present responsible legislated financial pots of the social state. Partially it is argued that to be able to efficiently implement present means via these starting points, partially recruited with a qualitatively better structure of offer, partially referring to the plain fact that the existing distribution structures not only do not remove present processes of social exclusion but simply aggravate them. Within the social state, thus, a redistribution is being striven for, on the one hand from more privileged groups to more
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disadvantaged ones, on the other hand within the means for the formerly disadvantaged from general aid to a targeted, effective but thereby more efficient one.

All of these three elements: decentralization, self-help and participation in the financial assets of the social state are in themselves ambivalent: they are formed in the act to be especially helpful, nevertheless they are always in danger, too. For these initiatives come last at least in conflict cases and in phases of restrictive budget conditions in the competition for traditional services of the social state and are then in special ways threatened with reductions. Even then, when these public means fail, concepts that are decentralized and based on self-help as a rule can not be maintained. On the other hand challenges are already created by the presently integration-oriented starting points again for the traditional vertically and horizontally organized structures of the social state that must face them.

The social political activities of the EC were restricted for a long time to a single labour market. Only recently new activities started not only because of decisions by the European court. The need for regulations is there. Many schemes and support for model schemes show as an example the importance of the EC to find an integral strategy to combat social exclusion. It becomes visible that the national administrations in Germany partly because of their own insight, partly as result of the need of an inner-European unification and partly because of their interests to the means of the EC accept these projects and their pilot-function for Germany too.

It is too early to conclude from the schemes and model schemes of the EC an influence of facts on German social policy. Too different are the importance between the social security system, based on the two principles of "responsibility" and "legal claims", on the one hand and the newly formed ideas on the other hand.

Too strong are also socio cultural traditions in ideas of "social security" in the different countries so that a reorientation cannot be fast and easy. It is a problem that social security was integrated too late in the idea of European integration and that the present development brings social exclusion or even new frontiers. Examples are the migration movements in Europe and the enormous socio-cultural tensions which are even reflected by war.
GREECE

The challenge posed by the problem of social exclusion is the challenge to the traditional system of social welfare and service provision on Greece are one and the same. Social exclusion is a multidimensional problem: mono-sectoral, single agency approaches that characterise Greek social policy are clearly inadequate to confront the problem of social exclusion.

In Greece, there is no tradition of cooperation among public agencies, let alone among public and private agencies, or among various types of private sector agencies. Nor have the social partners been involved in the formulation and implementation of social policy, either alone or in cooperation with others.

New forms of partnership and cooperation among agencies and bodies will have to be pioneered if the problems of social exclusion are to be addressed. The challenge of social exclusion provides a unique opportunity to revamp structures of social welfare and service provision in Greece that have long been in need of change.

There is growing recognition in Greece of the need for the formation of partnerships and for the effective coordination of various sectoral policies in order to tackle multidimensional problems such as social exclusion. Today we are witnessing a rapid increase in partnership agreements among various agencies and bodies.

For the purposes of this report, we carried out a survey of the main agencies and bodies that implement social policies related to the problems of social exclusion. The findings of this survey are presented in the full national report. We examine the relevant policies of each agency, and lastly the collaboration and partnerships the agency has formed with other bodies.

Contrary to developments in other countries of the European Community, in Greece no broad programmes of institutional change have been adopted. We can however discern changes in the balance between the various sectors providing social welfare and services. The expansion of the state sector has slowed down and the private sector, including both non-profit organisations, is moving in to fill various gaps. Local authorities appear to be an emerging force in the area of social policy. On the other hand, the social partners continue to be absent from the realm of social policy (apart from the narrow areas of policy that have traditionally been their focus, such as wage negotiation). While broad programmes of institutional change are lacking, we can identify some types of institutional reform that are being carried out through specific programme.

The pioneering attempts being made at present by various agencies and bodies to form collaborations and partnerships are confronted by a range of practical problems and obstacles; those posed by the legal and institutional framework, those posed by lack of efficient planning, those posed by hierarchical and bureaucratic structures, those posed by
present hiring and promotion practices in the public sector and those posed by lack of expertise.

A number of strategies and dilemmas associated with institutional reform can be identified. The long history of serious weaknesses in the functioning of the state sector in Greece makes it doubtful whether these can be overcome in order to permit central government to play an effective role in the fight against social exclusion. We discuss alternative models for fighting social exclusion and point to the potential of local authorities in this area. It is emphasized that the adoption of adequate procedures for the evaluation of social programmes and actions is a prerequisite so that the effectiveness of the various actors in the different sectors - state, local authorities, and the non-profit and for-profit organisations of the private sector - can be compared and the most effective models be given resources to flourish.
IRELAND

In the introductory chapter (chapter 1), the contents of the reports are related to the «terms of reference» as given, and a certain framework, or schema, for analysing the relevant issues, and making connections between the system of public administration and social exclusion, is introduced.

Next, an overview of the Irish administrative system, with a summary diagram, is presented (chapter 2). Chapters 3 and 4 deal with the involvement of the social partners and NGOs respectively in policy planning and administration. The role of local development groups, which are increasingly favoured by government, is discussed in chapter 5. The issue of privatisation of social policy provisions, which has important implications for social exclusion in some other countries but not in Ireland, is adverted to in chapter 6. The report concludes with an account of current issues and developments in policy planning and administration (chapter 7).

Here we summarise the main points in the report under the three headings identified in the schema presented in chapter 1:

- levels of administration
- co-ordination
- participation

LEVELS OF ADMINISTRATION

For historical and constitutional reasons, and because of the size and political culture of the country, Ireland has a very centralised administration. However the planning of government policies and services is conceived of almost exclusively in economic terms, and provisions for overall «social planning», or «economic and social planning» are weak. Recently it has been proposed that all government departments and agencies should be required to include policy proposals and monitor progress towards such a goal should be established, but there is no such unit at present.

There is no rationale for the distribution of policy functions between the different levels of administration. The main local authorities at county and city level have a limited range of functions relating mainly to planning, infra-structure and housing. Recently County enterprise Partnership Boards have been established to deal with job creation, but such ad hoc measures are no substitute for local government reform which would rationalise the allocation of functions within education, to take in example, there is no «intermediate tier» of administration between national government and most schools. This means that the allocation and targeting of resources to counter educational disadvantage is difficult if not impossible.
Below the level of the county, or city, the only general purpose structure are non-governmental local development bodies. Too much is expected of them especially in disadvantaged areas: since they are outside the system of public administration their impact on social exclusion can only be limited.

COORDINATION

Social exclusion is multi-dimensional, but policies are usually defined in terms of one dimension of personal or social need, and the delivery of services is usually specialised and differentiated.

At the national level, as we have mentioned, provisions for overall social policy planning are weak. However, there are now two consultative bodies which have a general remit and which can adopt a more holistic or co-ordinated approach to major policy issues. These are the NESC, National Economic and Social Council (consisting of representatives of the social partners and government departments plus independent experts), which has been in existence for twenty years and the NESF, National Economic and Social Forum (consisting of representatives of the political parties, the social partners and NGOs concerned with economic and social issues), established in 1993. The NESC has analysed many economic and social issues and made proposals on them; the NESF has only begun its work.

« Multidimensional » policy analysis has always been done in reports by government commissions, task forces and working groups. There have been reports, for example, on the elderly and on persons with a mental handicap/learning disability. The problem has been that the implementation of proposals has had to be left to unreformed, fragmented and specialised departments and agencies. In 1993 the report of the second Commission on the Status of Women was published and at the end of the year a Commission on the Status of People with Disabilities was established. This latter was an initiative of a new Government Minister in a newly established department, the Department of Equality and Law Reform. The present government, which came into office in January 1993, is the first to have a member of the government with responsibility for equality issues, including women's affairs, people with disabilities and travellers (an indigenous nomadic people).

Some specific aspects of social exclusion require policy co-ordination within a specific field. For instance, the Department of the environment has assumed overall responsibility in respect of homelessness. However there are many fields, such as child deprivation and disability, where co-ordination is lacking. The « unemployment trap » and the « poverty trap » are two aspects, or causes, of social exclusion which are linked to lack of an overall policy strategy and anomalies in the pattern and interrelationships of existing policies. Often the emphasis is placed on alleged disincentives of welfare measures. Against that background the Government is committed to examining the closer integration of the tax and social welfare systems.

The divisions in administrative responsibility at the executive level undoubtedly hamper efforts to combat social exclusion. Local government at county and city level has no
extensive co-ordinating functions and there are no co-ordinating bodies at regional or at sub-county (or sub-city) level yet, as was recommended in an official report in 1989.

PARTICIPATION

Broadly speaking all interests are represented in democratic government. But the socially excluded are a minority and if policies are to be developed to combat social exclusion the extent to which excluded people, and those who genuinely represent their interests, can participate in policy planning and administration is important. At the national level the involvement of the trade union movement (together with the employers and agricultural organisations) in multi-annual agreements with the Government, and in Government programme, over the past twenty years has undoubtedly helped to protect and improve the position of the low paid and welfare recipients. More recently the NESF is a forum where disadvantaged groups and their organisations are represented in policy discussions.

The programmes agreed by the government and the social partners have in recent years put a lot of emphasis on local area development, particularly in relation to co-ordinating educational, training and job creation activities. More generally there is a plethora of local development programmes and schemes of grants, some of which are part funded by the EU. Local groups are grateful for funds but chary of the assumption that they can deal with social exclusion when the Government cannot do so. The issues of who represents the socially excluded and what are the respective functions of the state and local organisations is still very much under discussion.
ITALY

Starting in 1990 a series of legislative measures either in principle or de facto have been radically modifying the social service framework which had developed through the reforms of the seventies. This trend has accelerated during the past six months.

The radical transformation of part of the social security system as well as of the welfare state as a whole (motivated by the need to meet the budget and deficit criteria as laid out by the Maastricht Treaty) is also changing the overall balance of actors, responsibilities, but also financing systems and systems of social rights.

This report analyzes the laws which, since the beginning of the 1990, have been shaping what has been termed "the reform of the reforms". Together, these laws seem to share the aim of a radical overcoming of those government (or management) failures which hampered the reformist movement of the seventies.

The laws we are referring to are the following:

a) Law 142, 1990, on "New normative framework of local autonomies"

b) Law 241, 1990, on "New norms concerning administrative proceedings, and the right to accede to administrative documents"

c) Law 226, 1990 on volunteer associations

d) Law 381, 1991 on social cooperatives

e) Law 421, 1992 and decree 502, 1991 on "Re-ordering of norms concerning the National Health Service"

The consequences which may derive from such institutional changes may be summarised as follows:

AMBIVALENT DECENTRALISATION

Many of the legislative innovations aim at empowering, as well as rendering more responsible, local governments - be it the municipalities (as in law 241), or regions, as in the reform of the National Health Service. This should fulfil a dual goal: to move the decision making process nearer to where needs arise and resources are collected; to render spenders and consumers more responsible towards the use of available resources on the one hand, and towards citizens on the other. Yet, such decentralization occurs within a given hierarchy of powers, rather than within a division of competences, with the state keeping a
string control in resources and rules, while revealing high levels of inefficiency. Laws are approved and burdens imposed on local governments and citizens apparently with a relative disregard for possibilities for coupled implementation.

This is with a laudable effort at cutting political clientelism, through a strengthening of the administrative power and responsibilities of managers and professionals, both within local administrative bodies and within the National Health System. This is a very important passage, although there might be the risk of stealing from public debate decisions which are only apparently purely administrative, while they have important consequences for the collectivity.

AN UNEASY ALLIANCE BETWEEN DELEGATION AND MISTRUST IN THE WELFARE MIX

In Italy as in other European countries there seems to be a growing reliance in the market. So much so, that not only there is a trend towards "giving back" to the market many tasks and enterprises the state had assumed over the years, but also towards incorporating market discipline within the generation of public sector itself. Measures as diverse as the division between managerial and political responsibilities at the local government level, the introduction of private practice within hospitals, the possibility of shopping for health services are all explained in terms of infusing market values and attitudes within the public sector. Yet, this aim is contrasted not only by a much slower process in the transformation of the contracts of public employees, but also by an expansion of bureaucratic rules and of the bureaucratic apparatus.

At the same time, there is little or no attempt at regulating and controlling the flourishing private-market sector in helath and hospital services, even in the instances where there is some contracting out.

Even with regard to the non profit sector we could point simultaneously to over-regulation (de facto limiting strictly what is considered non profit from the point of view of public administration) and under-regulation, in so far there are no systems of monitoring and evaluation. This in turn, while it exposes clients to possible abuses, renders it difficult to communicate and circulate innovation.

DEVIOUS UNIVERSALISM OR GROWING RESIDUALISM?

There are many risks, in terms of coverage and entitlements, as well as of protecting from social exclusion, arising from recent welfare state reforms, particularly that in the National Health Service. Yet, it is difficult to understand in exactly which direction the Italian welfare regime is moving, due not only to the multiple changes, but to their different meanings and consequences. We can point to the higher check on perverse redistribution introduced by the pension reform, and to the progressive homogenization of criteria in this field as indicators of increased equity and decreased discretion and fragmentation of
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benefits. We may also point to increased costs of the National Health Service for higher income strata as a redistributive mechanism which supports the universalistic feature of this service. But we can at the same time point to the increasing use of a mélange of means-tested mechanisms and various forms of charges in breaking up the universalistic framework of the national Health Service. Partial privatization of public services, offering different services to "general citizens" and privately paying ones, is not without risk from the point of view of universalism, since a dual system might be created within the public system itself, with the richer having the best of the two worlds.

There are many actors involved in these processes and cannot be categorized according to the public, market and non-profit sectors. This is too simplistic. Involved are also the professions, and the different categories of citizens with their different vested or otherwise interests and needs. There are also the old and new political parties and trade unions which are currently being implemented will be shaped not only by their institutional, legislative framework (which is far from being totally settled), but also by the interaction between these multiple and sometimes diverging forces, in the context of high economic and political turbulence.

The relevance of "Europe" and of the Maastricht treaty in this process cannot be forgotten. The Maastricht requirements have been the main driving force and legitimization behind most social policy reforms approved in the Fall and Winter 1992.
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LUXEMBOURG

This report, in fact, follows on from an earlier work entitled: "Social Services in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg" 1.

(i) One of the major topics dealt with in the review was the independence / dependence of "private" organizations and their relationships with the authorities, in light of the fact that nearly all associations promoting social services have agreements with government ministries. Approved services are entirely financed by the State, and as such, represent all social services activities (the guaranteed subsistence income (the "RMG"), the welfare network, day centres for OAPs, children, young people's homes, sheltered accommodation for women, the homeless etc ...). The promoters of these initiatives are either small associations, associations of a more substantial size or major NGOs like Caritas and the Red Cross. These, unlike the smaller associations, also benefit from private funding (donations), and are therefore in a stronger position in their dealings with the authorities. The authorities, for their part, continue to sponsor certain social work activities completely. If this were to be the case, there would no longer be any sources of enlightening comparisons between the working methods of the different organizations working to the same ends.

The independence of the "private" sector remains largely hypothetical, in particular for the promoters of smaller scale operations, in the sense that they, in theory at least, have to follow the guidelines laid down by the authorities 2.

(ii) The way in which the relationships between the various administration levels - between the national and local levels - are interpreted, has been illustrated by certain measures adopted in the field of National Education policy, for example: attempts at reform - for which the Ministry requires the support of the Commune-level administration - are often delayed at local level, particularly when it comes to the question of integrating socially excluded members of society. One example of this was the project for schooling for immigrant children: use of the mother tongue during classroom hours should have been introduced years ago, but due to the pressure exerted by the local lobby, the stage has hardly been passed of introducing pilot schemes and temporary test sites in a limited number of Communes.

Another example is that of the Social Welfare Offices, which are Commune-level organizations working specifically with the professional organizations. These operate in only 4 Communes and are, in practice, one secretary working a few hours per week to handle all the administrative business of the Commune. Often, these offices erect a barrier to progress, with the setting up of the RMG scheme being one example of this.

One final example would be the hospitals' restructuring programme and the policy reforms in the field of psychiatric care: the Commune where the major psychiatric hospital is situated refused to integrate the psychiatric ward into its general hospital.

1 Luxembourg, November 1992 SNAS
2 It should be noted that there are considerable differences between the various sectors of activity when it comes to the freedom of actions accorded to the organizations, depending on the Ministry and the Ministerial department involved.
SUMMARIES OF NATIONAL REPORTS

To sum up, all efforts to integrate excluded groups (immigrants, beneficiaries of the RMG, psychiatric patients etc.) inspired by the national administration, are obstructed at local level. The regional services, on the other hand, do nothing whatsoever, except perhaps to bring together various departments in the interests of economy and to eliminate exclusion trends which appear at Commune level, in the field of social work. To deal with this, the idea of creating regional Social Welfare Offices has been mooted, bringing together a number of Communes into one organization (as is already the case through the Communal Syndicates, which manage certain services).

(iii) As far as the reform of psychiatric services is concerned (and the hospitals reform, which is of interest to us because it affects the psychiatric services), we have identified the following problems:

- **decentralization** is happening in a very sporadic way: at the end of the day, the proposals made are only to be adhered to in a partial sense: in all likelihood, new external structures are going to be created, the majority of which will remain in the Communes where the major institutional body is based at present, instead of new, external services being scattered over the whole territory. Geographical concentration will probably remain the norm.

- a **typically Luxembourg-style compromise**, combining elements of French structures with smaller, German-style units. The overall strategy was compiled by a German institute which proposed decentralization and the creation of external services, which would require neither the user to go to a specific centre, nor the centre to accept a given user. At the same time, we are looking at the French idea of "sector-based psychiatry", resulting in specific locations having specific responsibilities in terms of the services offered and the public's obligation to go to specific centres, located nearest to their homes. The result of the debate between the two types will probably be a mixture, which will raise questions relating to definitions, obligations, responsibilities and freedom of choice.

- None of this has as yet been discussed in public; exclusion and integration are both underlying principles of the reform (maintaining integration policy at Commune level), and as such, need to be explained to the population as a whole. The concept that has been outlined in the 1992 ZISG proposal can only work if the Communes are ready to re-integrate their psychiatric patients. The negotiations are most likely to be held behind closed doors. It remains to be seen as to whether the whole of the Government's decentralization programme will be presented to the public.

In general terms, the subject of decentralization needs to be put into the perspective of the limited size of the country. Whilst in other countries, Communes are establishments which tend more to integrate rather than to exclude, it must be borne in mind that here, we are talking about 110 Communes with fewer than 5,000 inhabitants, where in all likelihood, relationships between local politicians and the community are too close. This certainly results in some cases in the politicians practising a degree of demagogy to enlist local support. It would be interesting to know whether Communes of a similar size in other countries produce the same sort of reaction.

3 Specifically, the ZISG study (1992, "Grundlagen und Leitlinien einer modernen Gemeindepsychiatrischen Versorgung, Mannheim"), commissioned by the Government so as to investigate an overall strategy for the reform.
THE NETHERLANDS

INTRODUCTION

The EC Observatory on National Policies to Combat Social Exclusion had so far its principal focus on the effectiveness of national, regional and local policies in EC Member States. This report takes a step further and investigates the relationship and links between agencies at different levels and the coordination of institutions and programmes in the Netherlands. Social exclusion is a multi-dimensional phenomenon which requires the integration of sectoral policies. This should facilitate the cooperation of organisations, citizens and policy makers and policy executors. The Dutch government has launched the social renewal policy to overcome obstacles which hinder integral policy making to combat social exclusion. The social renewal policy focuses on multiple disadvantage.

The issue under study in this report is: What is really new about the social renewal policy in combating social exclusion? This problem has been analysed as a case study on social renewal policy with special reference to labour market policy.

THE TARGETS OF SOCIAL RENEWAL

Social renewal is a policy to combat multi-dimensional social exclusion. A clear definition of social exclusion, however, is lacking. Social renewal involves three areas, the so-called policy circles: 1) income, education and paid work; 2) quality of daily living environment (social climate in impoverished city districts), and 3) innovations in the social-cultural realm (welfare sector).

Basically, social renewal is about redefining the welfare state. On the one hand this concerns a renewal of social welfare policy. Further, it should lead to administrative renewal by means of decentralising tasks and budgets. The performance of the welfare state has been severely criticised for being highly ineffective and inefficient. At the end of the eighties, the political climate ripe for change and social renewal was launched as a new concept, partly in order to reshape the welfare state.

THE WELFARE STATE AND THE THEORY OF ACHIEVEMENT SOCIETY

To answer the question what is new about social renewal, we used the insights of the theory of achievement society. This theory offers a description of modern western industrial-democratic societies as achievement societies and enables us to incorporate in it the rise of the welfare state and welfare policies such as social renewal. The essence of the theory of
achievement society is a model of development starting from economic growth based on industrialisation, driven by science and technology and leading to a graduate and unilinear evolution directed to an open society, hinged on competition.

The theory of achievement society dominates policy oriented thinking on future developments and reflects a conflict between economic (achievement principle) and social policy (need principle). This tension characterises the social renewal policy which is related to fundamental societal contradictions. These contradictions, among them the contradiction between the need principle and the achievement principle, however, are not solved. Therefore, modern western industrial-democratic societies are confronted with conflicting values resulting from the competing demands of rationality, individualism, social justice, and cultural norms. With regard to the welfare state this means, for example, that the unemployed are still confronted with the duty to work, yet they are still eligible for benefits on the ground of not having achieved.

The reforms of the welfare state (social renewal) have transformed security measures into an effective labour market policy, i.e., it is targeted at reintegrating the unemployed into the labour process. Trimming the social security system should result in a lean system of welfare measures; decision making is decentralised to local governmental bodies and non-governmental organisations. Social renewal policy is therefore directed at striking new balance between the achievement principle and the need principle.

SOCIAL RENEWAL WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LABOUR MARKET POLICY

This report studied the social renewal policy, with special attention given to labour market policy (the policy circle: income, education and work) and elaborated on two themes: first, the consequences of social renewal for regional and local labour market policy and second, the administrative renewal that is involved within the process.

As regards the former, a description was given of the setting-up of a new structure of the employment policy organisation which is managed by government, management and trade unions together, the «tripartization». At national level, Central Manpower Board. The governmental part has been privatised after a reorganisation within the Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment. At regional level operates the Regional Manpower Board. There are 28 RMBs where local government, management and trade unions are jointly responsible for the employment policy. The RMB tasks include mediating between demand and supply on the labour market, and creating networks with the other two policy circles. Within the realm of social renewal, the RMBs focus on target group policy, i.e., groups in society with a relatively weak labour market position.

The second subject, the administrative renewal, includes functional decentralisation, territorial decentralisation and sectoral integration. Functional decentralisation refers to delegating tasks and competences from government to social organisations and citizens («horizontal subsidiarity»), whereas territorial decentralisation refers to delegating tasks and competences from the national governmental level to that of regions and municipalities.
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Sectoral integration means combining various sectoral policies into an integral (inter-sectoral) policy.

This policy has resulted in covenants between central and local governments and between local governments and social and municipal organisations. In financial terms municipalities receive a budget to implement social renewal policy which is connected with the agreements made in the covenants. Municipalities have, for example, agreed on (horizontal) covenants with RMBs concerning labour market policy objectives. The CMB and RMBs have their own budgets. RMBs operate as the regional director of employment policies and the director between participating organisations (educational institutes, social and medical organisations and so on) and also form the administration employment policy organisation in the region.

The report offers secondary empirical results of the labour market policy of ten cities in the Netherlands with special reference to individual mediation, i.e., activities to reduce unemployment as a made-to-measure policy for individuals, and of the results in placing unemployed people by the CMB and RMBs.

CONCLUSION

We conclude that administrative renewal has been successful. We note, however, that it had already started before the social renewal policy was launched. The social aspect of social renewal is not innovative. It is, in fact, a continuation of already existent social policies. Since a serious integration of policy circles and sectoral policies has not come about to a large extent thus far, the social aspect of social renewal cannot be regarded as a success.

Referring to the theory of achievement society the study illustrated that various fundamental contradictions have not been solved and that new contradictions have come into being. These contradictions concern both administrative and social renewal and occur at national and local levels. With reference to the theoretical framework we conclude that social renewal policy gives expression to the starting points of the theory of achievement society, and that, within this theory, the concept of industrial convergence (achievement principle) is preponderate over the reformist perspective (need principle).

The main recommendations for further policymaking are to undertake an in-depth research into social exclusion and to monitor the effectiveness of social renewal policy through a cost-benefit analysis of covenants, including the budgets and the policy targets, versus the policy results in combating social exclusion.
PORTUGAL

For the purpose of analysing policies to combat social exclusion in Portugal, coordination is taken as a general principle that governs the design and implementation of social policies, which translates into specific actions which are undertaken by the government intending to increase the effectiveness of policy measures, by preventing the duplication of actions, reducing external social costs resulting from these interventions when they have different objectives and promoting the complementarity of policy measures and social practices by the cast of actors involved.

There is no tradition of effective coordination of social policies in Portugal, as far as social exclusion is concerned - a relatively new concern of the government. But some trends are visible, in the last few years, on the intention to do that in some directions that corresponds to a typology that follows:

a) The coordination of sectoral social policies, which implementation is kept under the responsibility of each of the ministries involved, but oriented towards the complementarity of the policy action, thus reinforcing the efficacy of each of them taken separately. There are a number of examples of this form of coordination in Portugal, but one should stress coordination between education policy, on the one hand, and employment and vocational training policy, on the other hand. Vocational training policy has been, since 1990, an important component of social policy in Portugal, very much addressed to the initial training of young population, training of workers in order to facilitate their integration in the labour market, and, in general, those more vulnerable groups facing more serious problems in such integration. Some convergence is evident of education policy with the objectives of vocational training policy. Education policy followed in Portugal since 1986 (when the reform of the educational system was initiated) is very much oriented to combat social exclusion in education (school failure and early abandonment of the school). The raising of the school leaving age from 9 years to 15 years was accompanied by curriculum reform and the implementation of educational programmes. Changes may be taken as a measure of the willingness of the government to better prepare the students for employment, and to remove some of the obstacles which still exist. An illustrative example of the former is the creation of vocational training as a special education module.

b) The creation of programmes involving several ministries to address a specific social problem, which corresponds to a more visible intention of policy coordination, involving the creation of coordination bodies for their implementation, without major changes in the structure of the public administration, but mostly cooperation among institutions. Illustrative examples of this form of coordination may be found on the creation of inter-ministerial programmes intended to face the socio-economic barriers to the educational success, and the national programme to combat drug-addiction ("Projecto Vida").

c) Some (more effective) coordination appears with the creation of new institutions oriented to face problems experienced by specific social groups, and intending to develop categorical
policies aimed at these groups, involving further changes in public administration with respect to the design and implementation of such policies. Examples include the creation of General Directorates and Institutes with the responsibility for policies addressed of some social groups: elderly people, women, young people, handicapped people, etc.

d) The creation of programmes to address multidimensional disadvantage of the most vulnerable groups. Specific policies, of multidimensional character, to combat situations of social exclusion, have consisted on the design and implementation of programmes to combat poverty, some of them launched by the EC in the context of the EC Poverty 3 Action Programme, and others, the country-wide financed by the state, coordinated by two Regional Commissariats (one for the North and the other for the South), and involving, presently, about 90 projects, running for a period (on average) of 2 to 5 years.

Such projects involve the participation of several social actors (central administration, municipalities, NGOs and other private bodies at the local level) as a basic feature of their design and implementation. But, as the problem of poverty in Portugal is determined by structural factors which are rooted in the model of economic development followed in Portugal (and which remain as a structural constraint that limits the possibility of the eradication of poverty in the short term) these projects can not be seen as a programme for such poverty eradication in the country. It is mostly a programme oriented, on the one hand, to solve (or to alleviate) local situations of poverty and, on the other hand, to create synergy effects which, through the mobilisation of local social actors, can contribute to create mechanisms of local development.

The design and implementation of social policy involves a wide range of actors (government departments at the central, regional and local level, social partners, professional organisations NGOs, etc.) which are linked through a given institutional (formal or informal) arrangement, which determines the forms of their functioning in the society.

This institutional arrangement is dynamic, and the way in which it evolves may lead to greater coherence in their action and thus to greater effectiveness in combating social exclusion, it may also create new barriers to the exercise of social rights and ineffectiveness of implementation of policies and programmes. In the last few years, some institutional changes have occurred in Portugal which have changed the role of social actors in social policy which have had an affection policies to combat social exclusion. Some of these changes seem to have had potentially positive effects efforts to combat social exclusion. Others seem to have had perverse effects.

Three major trends are evident when we look at the legislation and/or the actual policy practices, (notably since the early 1990s) broader and more active participation of the social actors on the design, implementation and monitoring of social policy; more decentralisation and fragmentation of activities; privatisation of services, changing the role of the state on its traditional role on the provision and financing of such services. Illustrative aspects of such trends are evident mainly in the following areas of social policy: health care, social protection and employment and vocational training.
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Health policy is a domain of the state intervention where the impact on social exclusion may have perverse effects following legislation in 1990s. The health care system in Portugal evolved a predominantly social insurance based system in the late 1970s to a tax-financed National Health Service in 1979, a change which is justified on the grounds of equity (either in terms of distribution of the burden of payments or in the provision of health care). The policy in the 1990s, following the principles described above is characterised by higher direct payments (flat rate co-payment for health care), the creation of an alternative health insurance (which benefits the better-off population), and heightening public and private competition in the provision of health services. These policy orientations correspond to a development of the health care system on the grounds of efficiency, with potential negative effects on equity. The costs will be a rising inequality on the access to health care, and social exclusion for the more vulnerable social groups.

As far as social security policy (regimes) is concerned, policy measures have recently been taken to better coordinate existing schemes, and provide incentives to take out alternative (private) social security protection. The annual updating of pensions, although above the inflation rate creating serious economic difficulties to the population groups for whom the social security pensions is the main income source. No important policy measures have been envisaged to face this serious problem, generating social exclusion for a high percentage of the portuguese population. As far as social services are concerned there is a political willingness to better coordinate public services with the setting up of a General Directorate of Social Action. Other forms of cooperation have been designed, through the more-active intervention of private institutions (the NGOs) and coordination among these and the public services. A tendency for greater decentralisation of social services, through the creation of local services, corresponds to the need of increasing effectiveness in dealing with problems of the most vulnerable population at the local level. However, in spite of increasing the capacity to respond to the social needs, and better coordination among social actors, there still exists serious limits in the capacity to meet all social needs.

As far as employment and vocational training is concerned, some relevant institutional changes have occurred since 1990, intending to improve the employment and vocational training policies by changing the role of the social actors involved and by encouraging more active participation of social partners and NGOs, with a view to better coordinate policies and institutions, following the Social Agreement on the Policy of Vocational Training in 1991.

Effectiveness state is still dominant in Portugal, and rather centralised, as intermediate decision making levels, between the central administration and the local administration (municipalities are still absent). This centralisation creates, sometimes, difficulties of coordination with other social actors. The trends, visible in some areas of social policy of decentralisation of competences to lower levels of the administration, looks as through they may facilitate the coordination of the implementation of social policies and to facilitate cooperation among the social actors involved. This may improve effectiveness in the fight against social exclusion. But it is sometimes difficult to distinguish decentralisation (as a form of approximation of the administration to the real needs of the population) from the de-responsabilisation of the central government to deal with these problems. For example, the transfer of competences to the municipalities has been met by financial constraints imposed by central government (with responsibilities on providing part of the financial
resources needed for the implementation of activities of the municipalities). The dependence of the NGOs, the state (their legal tutelage on the state and the dependence on the state for financial resources) also raises some doubts about the actual effectiveness of their increasing intervention that they are called to make in some domains of social policy.
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SPAIN

The Spanish report on the coordination of institutions and agencies against social exclusion can be summarised as follows:

1. Coordination in Spain is now conditioned by the process of decentralization of powers to regions, the emergence of a new relationship between the State and civil society, the imbalance of responsibilities between regional and local powers and the impact of the EC on the Spanish policy and programmes to fight social exclusion. Although the experience and political relevance of coordination is very important social and political debate has not managed to reflect the nature of these phenomena.

2. In Spain there are three main administrative models of coordination: the Paeted Coordination between State and Regions negotiated coordination to facilitate the development of specific programmes where the Central Administration offers technical and financial supports; Acquired Coordination by Regions in social matters under the Spanish Constitution, that is, legal coordination that is assured by Independent Communities or Regions although is opened to State participation; Granted Coordination by Regions to Local powers and by the State sector to NGOs, whereby the region facilitates partnership relations between local authority institutions and NGOs.

3. The report also analyses coordination in Associative Development since, in general, initiative and support for creating instruments to ease internal coordination have come from the State. Internal coordination between associations is uneven, provisional and, to a large extent, caused by the need for financing.

4. Some national programmes (National Plan for Drugs and Plan for Rendering Social Services at Municipal Level) and regional programmes (Minimum Income for Integration in the Madrid Region) in order to show the advances and problems in coordination against social exclusion. We must emphasise particular issues: in general coordination has been "top-down" initiated by public agencies, not with a substitution effect but rather an innovative, experimental one providing technical and financial support for specific programmes. Second, in the coordination process local powers or municipalities are limited because power is concentrated at regional level; at political level, local powers are controlled by regions in order to participate fully in the coordination and reforms. Thirdly, NGOs are taking part in the coordination process from above, that is directly in conjunction with the financial support and encouragement of State, at least at the beginning of any reforms; also relevant are the internal difficulties of NGOs to ensure they are coordinated with each other. Policies aiming to foster coordination are leading to the development of new types of collaboration between public and private welfare agencies.

5. European Programmes against poverty are central to stimulating new types of flexible coordination and promoting the development of collaboration between partnership structures and the State sector. This amounts to a new method of social and policy work and
particularly organisational work of organic nature where the mobilisation and participation of social organisations foster new mechanisms of social management.

6. Two problems with regard to the evaluation of reforms and programmes may be mentioned.

a) In relation to organisational effectiveness or reforms and new programmes, progress in coordination can be noted, a policy of negotiation and pacts, the enabling role of NGOs, some progress in transversal administrative coordination at a regional level. There remain crucial problems: difficulties in achieving horizontal coordination, the financial dependence of NGOs that limits their role and the ineffectiveness of Municipalities in coordination.

b) In relation to ultimate effectiveness we must say that although the coordination in a decentralized institutional framework has achieved a lot in the fight against social exclusion, we are less clear if these advances have increased access of excluded groups to social welfare institutions and resources. This is an issue to investigate in some detail: current research can provide information on organizational effectiveness but not with respect to their impact on social exclusion.
The UK report focuses on three main, linked themes: the implications of the introduction of quasi-markets into a number of areas of British social policy over the past five to ten years; the contrasting positions in the debate between individualism, choice and consumer rights, on the one hand, and collective social rights on the other; and the challenge posed to local democracy by the institutional changes which have taken place.

It is generally agreed that the late 1980s saw a major break with the post-war development of social policy. Despite an almost legendary willingness to confront change and overturn traditional institutions, the early Thatcher administrations left much of social policy intact. Important changes were introduced by the reform of Social Security in 1986; but it was not until 1988 that measures were introduced which were radically to alter the principles on which much of state welfare provision rested. By the end of the decade, education, housing, the National Health Service, and provision for frail elderly and other dependent groups had been overhauled.

The role of local government, where it remained, had changed its emphasis from service provision to service purchasing, and the client had become a consumer. Increased demand for services followed increasing expectations and demographic change; increasing expenditure was problematical; the solution seemed to lie in increased efficiency. These gains in efficiency were to be stimulated by the disciplines of market-type pressures. The market arrangements which were introduced were "quasi" in the sense that, although high quality provision was to be rewarded and financial incentives would be linked to consumer reaction to services, the consumers did not actually pay for them themselves.

At the same time, concern has been growing about the declining strength of some British democratic institutions. A number of ways of reinforcing them, or of providing alternative structures are described in the report. The approach favoured in many of the recent policies promoted by government has involved the formation groups of people who are thought to be especially well-qualified to advise on and direct in a particular field, in "partnership" with local democracy (local government) and/or people who are somehow representative of the community. These groups - "unaccountable quangos" in the view of one commentator - are explicitly linked to the market through the bias in membership towards business expertise.

Other observers deplore the changing role of local government. Even in the case of community care, it is argued, financial control has moved away from the local to the central level, and local government is left with responsibility without power. Some have recommended the development of direct democracy at local level, or an increasing use of service contracts between local government and representative groups, like tenants' association, as the basis for developing citizens' rights - solutions which others see as impracticable or incomplete.
The questions of accountability and democratic control raised by the new institutional structures remain unresolved. At the operational level, policy-makers and practitioners have tried to develop new forms of inter-agency collaboration - in the fields of community care, for example, or urban policy - designed to focus more effectively on disadvantage and deprivation. All of these experiments and innovations aim through improved coordination to improve diagnosis of a manifestly multiple condition, and provide a package of medicines which - taken simultaneously - will have greater combined effect than if taken consecutively. The management of the disease may be greatly improved. Its original definition remains in question.

This Observatory has linked its work specifically to the notions of social rights originally expounded in the work of TH Marshall. In the Second Annual Report of the Observatory, Room reiterates that, "an essential part of the Observatory's work must be to be to extend this type of analysis, studying the extent to which public authorities have been effective in implementing the citizenship rights which are implicit or explicit in their declarations." Citizenship, he continues, does not only consist of social rights, but also of civil and political rights: political rights are a legitimate concern for the Observatory insofar as they are directly linked to our analysis of social exclusion.

In a recent commentary on Marshall, Tom Bottomore draws attention to social systems which, while elaborating social rights, have had no tradition of securely founded civil and political rights: "Instead of a progression from civil and political rights, and then to a growth of social rights, as Marshall conceived it, these totalitarian state-socialist societies established some important social rights while virtually extinguishing major civil and political rights." There is then, no immutable, inevitable progression; and the possibility of erosion exists. It is this erosion which some commentators have identified with the doctrines of the New Right, which "divorce" freedom from any notion of redistribution linked to enforceable, unconditional social rights.

Observation of recent developments in British policy relevant to social-exclusion cannot, therefore, only be concerned with the management of social welfare, and responses to the call for more and better coordination. There are examples of integrated packages of action, and there are major evaluations in progress - in relation to urban policy, health care and community care - which may pinpoint the initiatives which have delivered better services and a better quality of life to users. But more fundamental changes are implied by the new systems, which involve a discussion of the basic democratic health of the nation.
WHO DOES WHAT?
The relations between the different actors have been changing during the 1980s. A first stage was the decentralisation of the fight against exclusion from the national level to the level of the regions and communities. This has nothing to do with priorities for a better poverty policy, but is the result of the federalisation process. During the last years the regions developed their own policies. Most new initiatives were realised in Flanders. Non-governmental organisations in Flanders have been increasingly important. These NGOs are increasingly accepted as full partners by the regional & local authorities. At a regional level legislation has been introduced leading to a better financial support for NGOs, allowing them to professionalise. In Wallonia the Public Centres for Social Welfare remained the most important actor in a local level. NGOs are less important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Consumption Social Security &amp; Debt</td>
<td>Minister of Economic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The relations between the different actors have been changing during the 1980s. A first stage was the decentralisation of the fight against exclusion from the national level to the level of the regions and communities. This has nothing to do with priorities for a better poverty policy, but is the result of the federalisation process. During the last years the regions developed their own policies. Most new initiatives were realised in Flanders. Non-governmental organisations in Flanders have been increasingly important. These NGOs are increasingly accepted as full partners by the regional &amp; local authorities. At a regional level legislation has been introduced leading to a better financial support for NGOs, allowing them to professionalise. In Wallonia the Public Centres for Social Welfare remained the most important actor in a local level. NGOs are less important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flemish Council: Minister of Education</td>
<td>NGOs providing educational support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputies responsible for the provincial schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the French Community: Minister of Education. Minister of Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the German Community: Minister of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Minister of Labour</td>
<td>Flemish Council: Minister of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the German Community: Minister of Vocational Training &amp; Adult Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Council of Wallonia: Minister of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the Brussels Regions: Minister of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Working Conditions | Minister of Labour | Flemish Council: Minister of Housing  
Regional Council of Wallonia: Minister of Housing  
Council of the Brussels Region: Minister of Housing  
Minister of City Renvatation  
Minister of Social Housing | Local Councils and Public Centres for Social Welfare providing social housing | Regional housing societies representing the local housing societies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Minister of Social Affairs</td>
<td>Minister of Public Health</td>
<td>Flemish Council:</td>
<td>Depute responsible for provincial health care</td>
<td>Health insurance organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister of Welfare, Family Health &amp; Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the French Community: Minister of Social Affairs &amp; Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the German Community: Minister of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of the Brussels Region: Ministers of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister of Urgent Medical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Belgium**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Minister of Social Integration</td>
<td>Flemish Council: Minister of Welfare, Family &amp; Health Institutions</td>
<td>Depute responsible for provincial social care</td>
<td>NGOs (e.g. VIBOSO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Income & Consumption, Social Security & Debt | Ministry of Social affairs are responsible for laws of:  
- sickness benefits,  
- social assistance,  
- early retirement pensions,  
- old age pensions,  
- child benefit. | Ministry of Labour are responsible for laws of:  
- unemployment insurance benefit,  
- early retirement pay. | Ministry of education are responsible and administrator of:  
- the state education fund. | Union insurance system are responsible and administrator of:  
- unemployment insurance benefit  
- early retirement pay | Family allowance has been changed with the tax reform in 1987. The Ministry of Social affairs is still responsible for child benefit, while the Ministry of Tax (finance) is responsible and administrate the general family allowance. |
Transfers of more responsibility to local government (the municipalities) concerning the unemployment situation

**Education**
- Ministry of Education have the overall responsibility for education
- Ministry of Culture: folk high school

**Employment & Vocational Training**
- Ministry of Labour have the overall responsibility for employment and vocational training
- Ministry of Social affairs: extraordinary employment effort
- Ministry of Social Affairs: youth allowance programme
- Ministry of Social Affairs: rehabilitation

**Working Conditions**
- Ministry of Labour

**Housing**
- The Ministry of Housing

**Regional Government**
- The counties are responsible for high schools (upper secondary schools)

**Local Government**
- The municipalities are responsible for public schools
- The municipalities administer rehabilitation
- The municipalities are the administrator and responsible to find employment for especially hard-hit groups and can refer work to persons receiving social assistance

**Other Actors Responsible for Implementing Public Policies**
- Private schools public funded
- Employees' health service
- Housing associations

**Main Changes in Cast of Actors Since 1990**
- Transfers of more responsibility to local government (the municipalities) concerning the unemployment situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>National Government</th>
<th>Regional Government</th>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Other Actors Responsible for Implementing Public Policies</th>
<th>Main Changes in Cast of Actors Since 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education have the overall responsibility for education</td>
<td>The counties are responsible for high schools (upper secondary schools)</td>
<td>The municipalities are responsible for public schools</td>
<td>Private schools public funded</td>
<td>Transfers of more responsibility to local government (the municipalities) concerning the unemployment situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour have the overall responsibility for employment and vocational training</td>
<td>The counties administer rehabilitation</td>
<td>The municipalities are the administrator and responsible to find employment for especially hard-hit groups and can refer work to persons receiving social assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employees' health service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>The Ministry of Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>The Ministry of Health</td>
<td>The counties are responsible for: - the National Health Service - Hospitals - Alcoholic clinic</td>
<td>The municipalities are responsible for: - visiting nurses for babies, - health care in schools, - medical examination of children, - pregnancy control and preparation</td>
<td>Family doctors (general practitioners and specialists)</td>
<td>There has been a change in the social services away from the big institutions and in the direction of small institutions and individual solutions. Support to development projects in the local community as strategy to improve and solve social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>The Ministry of Social Affairs</td>
<td>The counties are responsible for institutions for mentally and physically disabled</td>
<td>The municipalities are responsible for: - day care institutions, - residential institutions, - family care for children and adolescents, - nursing homes, - sheltered dwellings and day care centres for elderly, - home help, etc.</td>
<td>Private relief organizations (non-government-organizations) runs many institutions for children and elderly people but funded by the public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The creation of the RMI (Minimum Subsistence Income) replaced local RMI initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsistence incomes: RMI, Old People’s Subsistence Allowance, API...</td>
<td>RMI inter-ministerial delegation (DIRM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commune-based Social Action Centre (CCAS) (stamps)</td>
<td>Consumer bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State Office for Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Commune-based Social Action Centre (CCAS) Dire circumstances relief</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Action Funds attached to Social Security Offices</td>
<td>Extension of aid programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertion</td>
<td>Government: Ministry for Employment: Ministry for Social Affairs: DIRMI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Urban Policy</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>The Regional Council (Conseil Régional)</td>
<td>Communes: Low-Rent Housing</td>
<td>BESSON Law [May 1990]</td>
<td>Demonstrations against evictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry for Housing</td>
<td>Funding for DSU projects</td>
<td>Urban Social Development (DSU)</td>
<td>Help for the Homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry for Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Deposit and Consignation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban social development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank (Caisse des Dépôts et</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy (DSU, formerly DSG)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consignation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PACT-ARIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rent-Payers' Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associations Providing Help for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Homeless: FNARS, Abbe Pierre,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATD Quart-Monde etc...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>Communes: Child Protection agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry for Health</td>
<td>Regional Health Insurance Funds</td>
<td>(PMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social security</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital, hospital to home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Insurance Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care</td>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>Commune-based Social Action Centre (CCAS)</td>
<td>Youth Centres</td>
<td>Social Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Insurance Office</td>
<td>Social Actions Funds</td>
<td>Retirement Centres</td>
<td>Home Health-Care Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' Nursery Scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Works' Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Consumption, Social Security &amp; Debt</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Labour &amp; Social Affairs (Social Security System)</td>
<td>Corresponding Ministry at Länder level (structure varies from State to State)</td>
<td>Financing of social assistance</td>
<td>National health insurance organisations (public &amp; private)</td>
<td>Federal office for labour (autonomous body, administered by the Government &amp; social partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Family and the Elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public insurance organisations for pensions (old age invalidity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- old age income systems; pensions for war victims; unemployment subsidies; child allowance; housing allowance; social assistance; health insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare organisations assisting families in debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of education &amp; Science (general coordination)</td>
<td>Ministries of Education</td>
<td>Decision on the local supply of schools</td>
<td>Welfare organisations to combat illiteracy &amp; provide tuition in German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial assistance for pupils &amp; students</td>
<td>- special schools for disabled pupils</td>
<td>- assistance for homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Labour &amp; Social Affairs:</td>
<td>Corresponding Ministry at Land level (structure varies from State to State)</td>
<td>Local employment offices</td>
<td>Federal office for Labour (labour exchange, unemployment insurance, vocational training)</td>
<td>Job creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Education &amp; Science:</td>
<td>promotion/financial assistance for further vocational training; unemployment benefits; financing of jobs for long-term unemployment; financing of jobs for disabled persons (40%–80% of the wage/salary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Labour &amp; Social Affairs</td>
<td>Corresponding ministry at Länder level (structure varies from State to State)</td>
<td>Factory inspectorates</td>
<td>Labour Unions, Labour court, Professional association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- various regulations for job security, technical equipment, dangerous materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Housing &amp; Urban Development</td>
<td>Ministries for Housing &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Housing Office Department for Social Affairs (council flats, housing allowance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Housing &amp; Urban Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tax reduction for persons who build/buy flats/houses; housing allowance for low income families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Health - health insurance; income security in the case of sickness; rehabilitation of disabled people</td>
<td>Ministries of Health</td>
<td>Public health department</td>
<td>National health insurance organisation (public &amp; private)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for family &amp; the Elderly</td>
<td>Corresponding ministry at Länder level (structure varies from State to State)</td>
<td>Department for Social Affairs (administration of social welfare &amp; partly, social services)</td>
<td>Welfare organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education organises, supervises &amp; funds primary, secondary &amp; tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>Government controlled compulsory arbitration of earnings abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour Manpower Employment Organisation (OAED), manages unemployment benefits, employment subsidies &amp; regulates EC funds for training, Regional Administration</td>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>Greed Productivity Centre (ELKEPA) organises training programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour sets minimum wage, regulations concerning working hours, responsible for safety enforcement; regulation of foreign labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New legislation envisaging committee for working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Organisation for Workers' Housing (OEK) grants subsidised housing loans to workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Ministry of Health, Welfare &amp; Social Security: provision of public health care system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of the National Health System (ESY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Ministry of Health, Welfare &amp; Social Security: responsible for wide array of services &amp; benefits for children &amp; families, the elderly &amp; disabled as well as public assistance and social housing</td>
<td>Open care centres for older people (KAPI)</td>
<td>National Welfare Organisation (ESO): operation or rural and urban community centres which provide services for children, the elderly and other groups, Greek Red Cross: help at home programme</td>
<td>KAPI appeared Private sector homes for the elderly increased dramatically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Department of Labour: overall responsibility for policy &amp; funding including the administration of the ESP in Ireland</td>
<td>FAS has a regional tier of administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employers (apprenticeship, day release courses)</td>
<td>The establishment of FAS, the State Training &amp; Employment Agency, in 1987, following the amalgamation of AnCo (the training authority), the National Manpower Service (the placement agency) &amp; the Youth Employment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAS: the state Training &amp; Employment Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employers: Work Safety Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Labour: overall responsibility for policy &amp; for Inspectorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of the Environment: overall responsibility for policy &amp; funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local authorities are planning &amp; housing authorities, with responsibility for developing &amp; managing public housing, needs &amp; administering various grant &amp; local schemes</td>
<td>More emphasis on role of voluntary housing associations as envisaged in the Programme for Economic &amp; Social Progress &amp; “A Plan for Social Housing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Consumption, Social Security &amp; Debt</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare: overall responsibility for policy &amp; administration, virtually all income maintenance services</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare: has a regional tier of administration</td>
<td>The Health Boards: administrator the Supplementary Welfare Allowance Scheme, i.e. the residual public assistance, &amp; the income maintenance services</td>
<td>The Credit Union movement and the Society of St. Vincent de Paul have co-operated with the Department of Social Welfare in relation to money lending and debt management</td>
<td>None except for certain administrative changes with the Department of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Department of Education: overall responsibility for policy, funding, curricula and examinations</td>
<td>Regional Technical Colleges (RTCs) run by Vocational Education Committees (VECs) offer technical courses at second level Senior Cycle and third level</td>
<td>VECs, sub-committees, of local authorities, run RTCs Vocational second level schools and certain comprehensive schools called Community Colleges</td>
<td>Secondary Schools are independent but largely State funded Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Department of Health: overall responsibility for policy and funding</td>
<td>Health Boards, funded mainly from central funds, responsible for administration of all health services</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Voluntary Hospitals&quot; are independently owned &amp; controlled but funded almost entirely by the State National &amp; local groups concerned with health issues are grant aided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Department of Health: overall responsibility for policy. Department of Social Welfare: responsible for the Community Development Programme (grants to approximately 20 projects). National Social Service Board: advice to &amp; development work with voluntary bodies; accreditation of &amp; backup to Community Information Bureaux</td>
<td>Health Boards employ social workers &amp; minister statutory welfare services, e.g. in relation to childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>A very wide range of national, regional and local groups get State funding for services provided. They can be differentiated as follows: a) Religious Orders and other voluntary bodies which run residential facilities</td>
<td>Assumption of role in relation to community development projects by the Department of Social Welfare. The establishment of the Combat Poverty Agency in 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Department of Justice: responsible for welfare policy relating to offenders; welfare service connected with courts &amp; prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) National bodies concerned with specific problems e.g. Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat Poverty Agency: remit includes interest in community development. Legal Aid Board: provides legal aid in civil cases to low income applicants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Regional (e.g. city-wide) &amp; local bodies providing services to specific groups, e.g. aged, families under stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Consumption, Social Security &amp; Debt</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour: old age &amp; retirement pensions, invalidity &amp; handicapped pensions, social pension, various forms of unemployment indemnity; responsible for financing local policies</td>
<td>Regional social assistance laws concerning Vital M. &amp; various income support measures</td>
<td>Vital Minimum for the elderly &amp; handicapped; various income support measures for individuals &amp; families</td>
<td>National Social Security Institute (INPS) administers pensions &amp; unemployment indemnities</td>
<td>Increased local responsibility for implementation, but no responsibility for financing (taxation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education: the public school system up to the university, part of kindergarten school system Ministry of University: public universities</td>
<td>Responsible for providing buildings &amp; some extra activity in schools: for part of kindergartens &amp; all public day care (for children under 3); some projects for children at risk in the school</td>
<td>Public financed private childcare services</td>
<td>Trade Unions &amp; non-profit assistance in adult education with public funding</td>
<td>Decrease in public (State) financing for local services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour: funding of training &amp; work projects &amp; of specific ad hoc projects; Reform of projects, etc; Earning Integration; early retirement</td>
<td>Regional laws &amp; projects: providing vocational training</td>
<td>Public works projects</td>
<td>Non-profit associations providing training with public financing; Social Security Institute for paying unemployment indemnity &amp; earning integration (through workers', employers' &amp; State contributions)</td>
<td>Increased local responsibility in formulating policies Reform of Earning Integration &amp; unemployment indemnity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour; Ministry of Health - formulating policies; creating the Office for Supervising Work Health &amp; the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local offices for supervising Work Health and the Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour; Ministry of Public Works - funding (also through workers' contributions); Formulating policies</td>
<td>Providing some public housing</td>
<td>Public funding for Institution for building and letting (IACP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>National Health Service: public funding (through taxation &amp; workers contributions) &amp; regulation</td>
<td>Defining policies: priorities, distribution of hospitals &amp; particular services within the regions; implementation</td>
<td>Implementation: material organisation of local health services (family doctors, etc.)</td>
<td>Increased distinction between health and social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Regional framework laws</td>
<td>Childcare services; day hospitals; Home help services for the handicapped, drug addicts, mentally ill, etc</td>
<td>Voluntary associations &amp; cooperation within local public funded contracts</td>
<td>Increased role of voluntary associations &amp; cooperation after 1991 and 1992 laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1987 a new Unemployment Act was passed. Industrial Insurance Boards provide for unemployment benefits until the legal period expires (maximum period is related to the periods of employments); thereafter the Municipal Social Services provide minimum benefits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education &amp; Science</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Local Government: Burgomaster &amp; Aldermen</td>
<td>As a result of the Pillarisation process each group of citizens can found &amp; manage a school for primary &amp; secondary education. Private primary &amp; secondary schools are dominant in the Netherlands' educational system &amp; are financed by National Government, which regulates the minimum numbers of pupils &amp; teachers per school &amp; total expenditure. Local Government may also found public schools.</td>
<td>From 17–27 years old a student can apply for a study grant. Administration of grants was privatised during the 80's &amp; is handled by a former part of the Ministry of Education &amp; Science acting as a private organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs &amp; employment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Burgomaster &amp; Aldermen Municipal Social Services</td>
<td>Regional Manpower Boards (RMB) Local Employment Services Local educational &amp; vocational training centres (e.g. PBVE (Primary Vocational Adult Education), CBB (Centre for Occupational Orientation &amp; Training)) Job Pool organisations - cooperation between Regional Manpower Board &amp; Manpower Board &amp; local municipalities</td>
<td>In 1991 RBA's were created replacing Local Employment Services (GAB) councils, with participation from Local Government, trade unions &amp; employer organisations. After 1985 the first Job Pool organisations were developed. Recently Local Government has become responsible for realizing the Youth Work Guarantee Plan providing temporary jobs for young unemployment. A number of municipalities have integrated these new tasks in the Job Pool organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs &amp; Employment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trade Unions &amp; Employers' organisations are represented in the Council on Working Conditions (ARBO-raad) acting as an advisory board for national policies on working conditions</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour Inspectorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Ministry of Housing, Physical Planning &amp; Environment Protection</td>
<td>Department of Housing Provincial Planning Service Regional departments of the Ministry of Housing (HID)</td>
<td>Local Government Local building inspection authorities Housing Associations</td>
<td>Responsibilities and powers of Local Government have increased due to deregulation and decentralisation Financial budgets are allocated by National Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Ministry of Welfare, Health &amp; Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Municipal Medical &amp; Health Authority (GGD)</td>
<td>Health Insurance Funds: a large number of private organisations which implement the Health Insurance Act &amp; the Exceptional Medical Expenses (Compensation) Act</td>
<td>Responsibilities and tasks are shifting between the main actors. In 1991 a stage-wise implementation of financial restructuring of the health services began. Political debate on the results of this has not yet been concluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Council consisting of representatives of the Health Insurance Funds, health insurance companies &amp; hospitals responsible for hospital planning</td>
<td>On a national level the District Nursing &amp; the home Help organisations merged in 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Ministry of Welfare, Health &amp; Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>Department of Welfare of the provincial Government is responsible for the planning of homes for the elderly</td>
<td>Local Government is responsible for developing and implementing policies in the area of social services &amp; neighbourhood support</td>
<td>A large number of local organisations in the field of welfare are subsidised by Local Government but have great autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education: overall responsibility for policy, funding, curricula; Institute of Socio-Educational Support (BASE): social action for students</td>
<td>Regional Departments of Education</td>
<td>Participation of local authorities in educational support initiatives &amp; programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Law (1986) Implementation of several programmes after 1986 to combat school failure (PISE, PEPT, PEDI, etc.) involving several Ministries &amp; local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Ministry of Employment &amp; Social Affairs: Institute of Employment &amp; Professional Training (IEFP), responsible for the design, implementation &amp; evaluation of employment policies &amp; professional training; Unemployment protection.</td>
<td>Regional Employment Services (IEFP)</td>
<td>Local Employment Services (IEFP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Ministry of Employment &amp; Social Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Ministry of Public Works, Transport &amp; Communications: National Institute of Housing (INH): providing loans to finance social housing projects</td>
<td>Municipalities (promoters of projects for social housing)</td>
<td>Municipalities (Housing Cooperatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PORTUGAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employers (apprenticeship &amp; creation of jobs)</td>
<td>Great improvement of operational programmes (employment &amp; professional training) since 1990, involving several actors in its implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Social Security Centres (local programmes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Schools (joint action with Ministry of Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs (job creation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directorate General of Basic Health Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Mental Health Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community development programmes involving several institutions (e.g. Emergency Plan for Setubal district, support actions for people from Timor, support actions for refugees, projects to combat poverty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directorate of Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre for the Prevention &amp; Treatment of Drug Addiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighbourhood Support</td>
<td>Ministry of Employment &amp; Social Affairs: Directorate General of Social Action</td>
<td>Regional Social Security Centres (RSSC)</td>
<td>Local services (branches of RSSC)</td>
<td>NGOs (e.g. &quot;Misericordias&quot;) Other Government departments (health administration, social action in various Ministerial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income &amp; Consumption, Social Security &amp; Debt</td>
<td>General planning Art. 149, 1. 13</td>
<td>Promotion &amp; performance in the framework of national policy Management of social services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Basic legislation &amp; economic management Art. 149, 1. 17</td>
<td>Management of education services according to Regional Laws</td>
<td>Cooperation in management Participation in planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Vocational Training</td>
<td>Total competence Art. 149, 1. 7</td>
<td>Management of some programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Total competence Art. 149, 1. 7</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) In order to promote the coordination between Central Government and Autonomous Governments, there are General Conferences (Conferencias Sectorales) contracting out agreements. The new Regional Agreement of 28 February 1992 increases the legal competences for regions other than the historical ones (Basque, Catalonia, Galicia) (the majority of them).

(2) According to the Law 7/1985, 2 April, the Municipalities can develop many competences delegated or agreed by Central and Regional Governments.
In order to promote the coordination between Central Government and Autonomous Governments, there are General Conferences (Conferencias Sectorales) contracting out agreements. The new Regional Agreement of 28 February 1992 increases the legal competences for regions other than the historical ones (Basque, Catalonia, Galicia) (the majority of them).

According to the Law 7/1985, 2 April, the Municipalities can develop many competences delegated or agreed by Central and Regional Governments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</th>
<th>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Security &amp; Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Department of Education &amp; Science (national policy)</td>
<td>Equivalent Government departments for Scotland, Wales &amp; Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Local Education Authorities (local policy)</td>
<td>Higher Education: University Funding Council, Polytechnics &amp; Colleges Funding Council, Further Education Funding Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Department of Employment</td>
<td>Equivalent Government departments for Scotland, Wales &amp; Northern Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Department of the Environment (policy)</td>
<td>Equivalent Government departments for Scotland, Wales &amp; Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Local Authority Housing Departments</td>
<td>Housing Corporation</td>
<td>Housing Corporation has increasing influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY AREA</td>
<td>NATIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>REGIONAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>OTHER ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PUBLIC POLICIES</td>
<td>MAIN CHANGES IN CAST OF ACTORS SINCE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Department of Health (national policy)</td>
<td>Regional Health Authorities</td>
<td>Environment Health Departments</td>
<td>N.H.S. Management Executive</td>
<td>N.H.S.M.E. Establishment of F.H.S.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Service Departments for Community care</td>
<td>District N.H.S. structure – Family Health Service Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Services &amp; Neighborhood Support</td>
<td>Department of Health (personal social services policy)</td>
<td>Equivalent Government departments for Scotland, Wes &amp; Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Local Authorities S.S.D.s (purchasers &amp; managers of services)</td>
<td>Health Education Authority</td>
<td>Private sector &amp; voluntary sector contractors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>