



*Combating Inequalities through Innovative Social Practices
of and for Young People in Cities across Europe*

Policy frameworks to tackle social inequalities experienced by young people in 10 cities across Europe

Citispyce Work Package 3

Compiled and edited by:
Simon Güntner, Anne-Marie Gehrke, Louis Henri Seukwa
HAW Hamburg, February 2014



Content

- 1. Introduction and explanation 4
- 1. Policy frameworks in a nutshell 7
- 2. City level policy frameworks to tackle social inequalities of/among young people..... 14
- 3. References19

1. Introduction and explanation

In this brief overview, we try to map the policy frameworks that are in place in the ten partner cities of the CITISPYCE project and relevant for the analysis of social inequalities experienced by young people.

With the term “policy frameworks”, we refer to arrangements of public policies and regulations that guide social interventions. We do not aim at a comprehensive account of all interventions, but are particularly interested in their overarching guiding principles. These principles inhibit specific frames and definitions of the problem to be addressed by a policy. In reading and making sense of these principles, we follow the critical realism perspective developed in WP 2 (Stigendal 2013, see also Jessop 2005): We do not assume that policies and their guiding principles are per se an inevitable and necessary reaction to factual problems; rather, policies are politically derived reactions to perceptions of problems. As Stigendal put it in the CITISPYCE comparative baseline study: “the same causal forces can operate in different contexts but get different outcomes due to the differences in actualization” (Stigendal 2013: 4).

By “mapping” these policies (or: actualisations of problem perceptions by policy makers), we mean a description of the “landscape” of these frameworks (in a metaphorical use of the term), highlighting the outstanding features that characterise the respective framework. The WP 2 comparative report set the ground for these maps as it deciphered key characteristics of the macro-economic structures and welfare systems (we prefer the term “system” here to “regime”) within which the relevant policies are embedded and operate. The policy frameworks of interest here are more specific than the broader welfare systems. Within the wider landscape of a welfare system they can be seen as a particular region covering specific issues and problems.

To illustrate this conceptual approach, take for example “youth unemployment”: “Youth unemployment” is a social problem that currently receives much political attention. It arrived on the political agenda when it was seen that the current economic recession had a dramatic negative effect on employment opportunities for young people in Europe. Policies to tackle this problem typically address the “employability” of young persons, and include a whole range of measures including training, apprenticeships and subsidised workplaces. The respective policy framework includes agreements at EU level (Youth Employment Initiative), national level policies such as employment policies and youth policies, regional and local programmes and initiatives, including partnerships with businesses and NGOs. The emphasis (or, in Stigendal’s terms: the actualisation), we assume, will differ between localities as will the set of interventions.

Basically all cities involved in our project, however, report a lack of coordination among the organisations involved. This can be despite numerous youth plans and administration levels (Barcelona) or in the absence of sustainable policies targeting long-term effectiveness (Athens), the absence of any specific policy at all (Krakow) or despite explicit and even partly successful attempts at improving coordination (Rotterdam). An attempt to address the fragmentation that seems so typical for this policy field has recently been initiated in the city of Hamburg. There, the local employment authority has begun to experiment with a specific Job Centre for young persons (“Jugendberufsagentur”), which will coordinate the different municipal, national and non-governmental actors in the area so that young unemployed persons have a one-stop-shop they can turn to. This does not mean, however, that the agencies involved follow the same orientation. Under the

umbrella of this one-stop-shop, about four different orientations (and respective laws and regulations) can be found, which are, broadly speaking: work first (employment agency staff), adequate financial support (municipal social policy staff), motivation and activation (outreach workers), rights of the child (municipal youth department staff). Conflicts between these perspectives are to be expected, they are not solved or suppressed, but internalised into the new structure. Similar approaches have already existed for some time in Rotterdam. There, the “Youth Counters” act as a one-stop shop for work, education and social assistance and recently also in-house care (contracts with 11 partners).¹

Another phenomenon that has in some countries and cities turned from a social problem into a political issue is “residential segregation”. Across the EU, as policy makers perceive it as problematic when urban areas are dominated by specific social groups, many cities have developed strategies to promote a social mix in their neighbourhoods. Emphasis has differed over time and across countries and prevailing problem discourses, at times focusing on segregation according to ethnicity (“migrant quarters”), at others along lines of social and economic status (“pockets of poverty”) or both (in public media referred to as “ghettos”, or simply “problem areas”). Often, such policies had their origins in youth riots and protest voting. The dominant story line resembles the controversial “broken windows” theory that states (metaphorically and literally) if one window is broken, it is more inviting for vandalism than if all is in proper order and functional: when many problems come together, they reinforce each other, and eventually the area stumbles into a downward spiral (Wilson/Kelling 1982). The policy framework that has emerged over the years includes EU level funding instruments as part of the Cohesion policy (Community initiatives URBAN and more recently URBACT, in the 2014-2020 funding period the provisions for Integrated Territorial Investment ITI), specific provisions in national urban policies and programmes (such as the New Deal for Communities in Great Britain), and of course local and regional programmes and plans in the discretion of local and regional authorities. An example is the numerous successive initiatives in Rotterdam to address social segregation in the southern parts of the city, „pact op zuid“, „kop van zuid“ and „kwaliteitssprong op zuid“, and to make this area attractive to new uses and users.

Most cities report some experience with such programmes. In Barcelona and in Malmo, the URBAN Community Initiative presents an important point of reference, albeit with quite different results. In Barcelona, whilst at the beginning there were collective protests to claim an appropriate functioning of the housing facilities (e.g. solar thermal energy of new buildings), later on the local sense of community decreased, in part due to the persistent bureaucratic problems with the implementation of the programme. This was nonetheless linked to other elements, such as the relocation of some people in other areas of the neighbourhood (due to the demolition of old buildings), the ageing of the population and the lack of engagement of younger generations in collective issues. In Malmo, on the other hand, the programme is remembered more positively, and led to cultural initiatives that remain important hubs for youth activities today. From Malmo is reported, however, that, under the surface of a policy vocabulary that has not changed much, urban policy has been subject to a neoliberal shift.

Both examples, “youth unemployment” and “segregation”, have over recent years seen a career from analytical categories to well established and legitimate policy areas. There is a lively debate about how the respective goals can be achieved, and political parties compete for hegemony with their respective

¹ Also the City Marines in Rotterdam are an attempt to improve local coordination of services. Although they're not specifically targeted at young people, and more driven from public safety perspective, these city marines are also involved in preventive social policies for young people at risk. The Youth Jobcenter in Rotterdam on the other hand has already been established in 1996 as a one-stop shop but doesn't automatically involve integrated services.

recipes and proposals. This competition is essentially played out locally, where the policies are implemented, and where the intended and unintended consequences are felt. Furthermore, such policies do not arrive in an institutional void. Rather, the organisations involved have often been around for some time, and keep traces of previous policies and orientations in their collective memories and eventually also in their practices.

Against this background, we see it as important to highlight the main orientations and features of the local policy frameworks and spot similarities and differences. When we know how much variation is possible, we can engage in formulating ideas and initiatives that may break with a locally dominant approach in a more profound sense. We will particularly focus on youth related social policies, but also at area-based policies, as it is at the level of individuals (Work Package 4) but also localities and communities (Work Package 3) that we are looking for inspiration to develop and support social innovation against inequalities (Work Package 6).

We see this mapping exercise as important because current policy frameworks are the context within which our analysis takes place and within which our pilot initiatives will be implemented. We will have to be sensitive to this context and see how our ideas can be linked up to these frameworks so that they have a chance to be implemented and do not remain nice but remote fantasies.

1. Policy frameworks in a nutshell

The information in this table has been provided by the project partners from each city. More detailed information can be accessed in the local baseline studies (CITISPYCE Work Package 2) and case study reports (CITISPYCE Work Package 3).

City	Level of municipal discretion/autonomy (can the city take wide- reaching decisions or is it rather dependent on national provisions)	Explicit youth policy and youth work	Explicit area-based policy Yes/no	Explicit youth employment policy	Relation between public sector and NGOs in implementing policies	Other important issues
Athens (Piraeus Agia Sophia, Elefsina)	After a period of centralism, some responsibilities were shifted from central government to municipalities, whilst state funds to municipalities were reduced by 60% (Ministry of Interior, 2013), triggering municipal cooperation around limited resources	At local level, there are limited policies targeting youth.	Both municipal areas have recently introduced a social welfare, area-based policy aiming at alleviating socioeconomic problems that arose due to the long-standing economic crisis. Indicative examples of this social welfare policy are the Municipal Social Groceries, Agencies for Homeless people, and Common Meals Programmes. Furthermore, the Municipality of Elefsina has introduced lately an urban development policy, adopting an environmental friendly orientation and renovating public buildings, squares, monuments, sports facilities etc.	The only existing youth employment policy is implemented by Manpower Employment Organization (OAED, national institution), where employment, internship and entrepreneurship programmes, explicitly addressed to young people, are implemented at a national level. These programmes are part of a national policy framework in collaboration with local government.	At the local level there is in some cases collaboration between local government and NGOs for the implementation of certain programs/projects.	

			Some of the above initiatives are part of a wider national policy framework.			
Barcelona	The local government has limited power in youth policies, as the autonomous regions like Catalonia have the main competencies in terms of youth. Yet, currently both government levels seem to approach youth issues in a similar way, as the ruling political party is the same.	City Authority Plan for Youth and Adolescents 2013-2016, Regional Youth Plan 2013-2016 of the area of Barcelonès; National Youth Plan of Catalonia 2011-2020	Community Plans in some deprived neighbourhoods following the Neighbourhood Law (Llei de Barris)	Barcelona Activa is the local governmental body in charge of dealing with employment policies. It has a Youth Employment Office at city level and Youth Information Points in each district, which also deal with employment issues.	Main youth associations and NGOs are formally articulated through the Youth Council of Barcelona, which is a recognised partner to deal with the City Hall.	
Birmingham	Only limited local discretion due to dependence on national funding programmes and national planning/policy frameworks/legislation	<p>Positive for Youth Strategy (national policy) 2013</p> <p>Birmingham Youth Service (local policy and provision), revised priorities & service 2011 onwards. Reduction in local district based services/staff. Now only 23 youth delivery units across whole city.</p> <p>A centralised 'Youth Hub' to support young homeless. (local policy)</p> <p>A Youth Engagement Commission (local) is being established to look at policy & future provision for youth</p>	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 -national agenda for the planning system to deliver sustainable growth & support economic recovery. Under this come:</p> <p>Aston, Newtown, Lozells Area Action Plan (local) 2012;</p> <p>Bordesley Green Area Action Plan 2013 (local);</p> <p>Enterprise Catalyst (local policy, but with national and EU funding). Purpose: provides support to help individuals in specific districts to start out and develop their business ideas)</p> <p>Social Enterprise quarter launched to help develop social enterprises in city. (City Leader's Policy Statement 2013)</p>	<p>Work Programme and Youth Contracts (both national policy), Connexions Service (national policy), Careers Advice Service (national policy) formerly delivered by LA, but now the responsibility of individual schools);</p> <p>Young Talent for Business (local policy - under Birmingham Jobs Fund see WP2 report).</p> <p>A Multi-Agency Employment Team (local).</p> <p>Jobcentre Youth Hub in city centre (Local).</p>	The Local Authority (LA) reduced services/staff and stopped commissioning NGOs to deliver services as a result of funding cuts. Youth services are increasingly delivered by NGOs & voluntary bodies. But partnership working by LA with other agencies and voluntary sector remains through local coordinating groups incl. police, NGOs Cllrs, LA Youth Service which determine local priorities and how to tackle jointly.	<p>Public funding cuts mean there is less engagement with local communities and fewer Local Authority personnel working on areas of employment, enterprise and regeneration. An increase in central pathways for support is leading to disengagement among young people .</p> <p>Welfare reform on young people at risk of homelessness, in particular a range of changes to Housing Benefit.</p> <p>Local Welfare Provision Policy The Welfare Reform Multi-Agency Committee reduced the age criteria to</p>

		(2013/14).			training & employment	16 to help vulnerable young people access crisis fund.
Brno	Limited to services not related to employment or education; provided through social services community plan	State policy strategy on children and youth 2007 – 2013 – limited local impact No strategy at the local level	Integrated Urban Development Plan – renovations of municipal houses (nearly no impact on disadvantaged youth) Municipal initiative to prevent indebtedness and evictions Lack of any social housing	no	NGOs provide most of the publicly funded social services, also for Roma	Limited to services not related to employment or education; provided through social services community plan
Krakow	Limited, but increasing due to devolution programs. At the same time Polish municipalities lack adequate financial resources and taxing capabilities to pursue policy goals truly independently.	“Young Krakow” initiative, concentrated on civic education and facilitating ways of spending spare time by the youth. Local policy.	No, but being developed, as stated in the „Principles for the Rehabilitation of Multi-Family Housing blocks in the Area of Krakow Municipality” document (local policy).	Based on the Promotion of Employment and Labour Market Institutions Act of 20th April 2004 (National level policy).	Some coordination through the „Social economy development programme, combating unemployment and vocational activation in the Krakow labour market” document (local policy). Apart from EU funds, no particular emphasis put on co-operation with NGO’s.	Regional level: Malopolska Voivodship Development Strategy for 2011–2020 includes a Strategic Programme – Intellectual Capital and the Labour Market City of Krakow Social economy development programme, combating unemployment and vocational activation in the Krakow labour market (adopted 2006)
Hamburg	Rather autonomous, as Hamburg is a city state, the seven districts have a status that is similar to local authorities and, for instance, own planning powers	Implementation of the youth welfare Act through youth departments, youth work and public social services; since 2012 gradual roll back as schools start to open in the afternoon (all-day-schools)	The RISE programme (Rahmenprogramm Integrierte Stadtteilentwicklung) combines various urban development promotion programmes, each district has a department for socio-spatial development	Youth Job Centre (Jugendberufsagentur) since 2012	Most programmes are delivered through NGOs (based on contracts), but in education (Schools), social protection and in the Job Centre the (local) state acts through its own staff (civil servants)	
Malmö	High degree of decentralisation. Regional and local authorities are being	“I live in Malmö”: A local policy for youth participation. The City of	“Area Programme for a socially sustainable Malmö”: a local policy for five of the most	“Youth at work”: National policy including government funding for more opportunities	In line with the Social Democratic welfare regime, the public sector has been the	High degree of decentralisation. Regional and local authorities are

	<p>granted considerable autonomy, although the national government provides the framework and structure for local government activities.</p> <p>The regions are responsible for health care and public transport. The municipalities impose tax on private income and are legally bound to be in charge for several key institutions, such as social services, education and childcare, elderly care, planning and building and environmental issues.</p> <p>Labour market issues are national in Sweden. Municipalities supplement local needs e.g. for those with income support. Municipalities are responsible for income support but not for unemployment benefits and sickness benefits which is a national task (See WP2 Malmö, p. 3, EU national youth report: Sweden, p 2).</p>	<p>Malmö uses expertise, opinions and experiences of young people in an active and structured way. The policy has been developed with broad participation of politicians, civil servants, NGOs and young people.</p> <p>“Power to decide – right to welfare“ The current national Swedish youth policy is governed by a Government bill adopted by the Swedish parliament in 2004. The two overarching objectives of the national youth policy outlined in the Government Bill are that all young people should have real access to influence and that all young people should have real access to welfare. Currently, there is a new national proposal for youth policy under consideration: "Young people should have the power to shape their lives and influence society".</p> <p>“The municipal</p>	<p>deprived areas in Malmö. The programme is run by the City of Malmö during 2010-2015, with the aim to tackle the lack of social sustainability in Malmö.</p> <p>By influencing development in the five areas, the programme seeks to enhance the social sustainability throughout Malmö.</p> <p>”Local Development Agreements” and “URBAN 15”: The Local Development Agreements were a national policy based on the Regulation on urban development, where 23 areas in 15 cities/municipalities signed agreements with the national government about urban development to decrease social exclusion. The agreements focused on better cooperation between the state and municipal level but also between different local actors. No grants from the government were issued for the work within the agreements.</p> <p>In 2013 the Local Development Agreements were replaced by URBAN 15, a national measure initiating various ways of facilitating socio-economic development and reducing residential segregation in the 15 most deprived areas in Sweden</p>	<p>regarding jobs for young people.</p> <p>“The Job Guarantee”: This national policy is directed towards young people (16-24) who have been listed with the employments services for more than three months consecutively. The aim is to offer unemployed young people activities so they can find work as soon as possible, or initiate or go back to an education within the regular educational system. Within the guarantee young people is offered intensified support, with in depth mapping, guidance, counseling and job search activities with coaching.</p> <p>“New start jobs” This national policy implies that an employer hiring a person, who has been outside the labour market a certain period of time, due to for example unemployment or illness, has a right to an economic compensation from the state.</p>	<p>most important actor when it comes to implementing policies.</p> <p>The civil sector, has however, been a very important part of the welfare regime in other aspects, for example strengthening democracy. The civil sector is receiving substantial state and municipal grants for various assignments. Consultation with the organisations of the civil society constitutes an important part of the gathering of information within the Swedish government offices.</p> <p>Furthermore, many NGO’s are receiving EU funding for organizing and implementing social projects, often in co-operation with the public sector.</p>	<p>being granted considerable autonomy, although the national government provides the framework and structure for local government activities.</p> <p>The regions are responsible for health care and public transport. The municipalities impose tax on private income and are legally bound to be in charge for several key institutions, such as social services, education and childcare, elderly care, planning and building and environmental issues.</p> <p>Labour market issues are national in Sweden. Municipalities supplement local needs e.g. for those with income support. Municipalities are responsible for income support but not for unemployment benefits and sickness benefits which is a national.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

		responsibility of monitoring ": National policy; according to the law, every city in Sweden has the obligation to follow up and monitor what young people age 16 – 20 who are not in school are doing.	(a set of indicators were used for the selection). One of the 15 areas in the programme is South Sofielund. 11M EUR are issued from the government for the programme. The grants are performance-based, meaning that the ones who show the greatest success regarding the used indicators get most funding for the next period in the programme.			
Rotterdam	Discretion for social assistance with local government (since 2004); from 2014/1015 onwards also for youth care, social support and public health (= decentralisation process). Budgets and legal frameworks are national discretion, actual policies local.	Local Youth Counter since 2004 (=job centre for young unemployed, including obligatory education/starting qualification officers, homeless young people and ex-convicts) Positive youth policy (local policy document still in development) Youth council (local)	'Pact op Zuid', 'Kop van Zuid', Kwaliteitssprong op Zuid'. Large scale programs to develop areas in the South of Rotterdam	Act on investing in young people abolished in 2011, new legislation (Participation Act = social assistance reform) coming in 2014, in which previous youth policies are more or less included and broadened to include also other age/target groups. Youth Counter	Public-private/NGO cooperation mainly through tendering procedures and contractual relations. New development emerging: public-private cooperation through joint investments and sharing of 'profit' (savings on public expenditure), creation of private 'social investment funds'.	
Sofia	Relatively wide jurisdiction for formulating and implementing policies, concerning the municipality, defined by the Local Self-government and Municipal Administration Act. The municipal budget is based on own income (municipal taxes and other revenues) and state subsidies.	National Youth Strategy 2010-2020: objectives include encouraging employment and work activities, and better access to information and services (national level) National Youth Programme 2011-2015: development of network	Sofia is divided into 24 districts, each with its own District Administrations with jurisdiction to take autonomous decisions and implement policies in the fields of culture, education, sport, health care and social care. Sofia municipality has passed a Strategy for Prevention of Social	Work for Young People in Bulgaria 2012-2013: among the most important strategic documents dealing with the youth employment policies; special attention to the permanently unemployed who are not engaged in any economic or educational activity (national level) National Youth Strategy 2010-	A large variety of NGOs and civil society initiatives try to compensate for the lacking or insufficient public / municipal services. Many tangible results and a genuine impact on life of young people in deprived areas, but long-term sustainability and financing are permanent problems. In some cases, NGOs have very	

	<p>Permanent Commission on Children, Youth, Sport and Tourism at the Sofia Municipal Council is responsible for implementation of youth policies in Sofia.</p> <p>Directorate “Prevention, Integration, Sport and Tourism” of the Sofia Municipality coordinates implementation of the municipal programme in the sphere of physical education, sport and youth activities.</p>	<p>of youth consulting centres; youth initiatives and campaigns; youth participation in volunteering activities; development and recognition of youth employment (national and local level)</p> <p>Strategy for Development of Sofia Municipality until 2015: includes youth policies in the sphere of education, sports, cultural activities and employment (local level)</p>	<p>Exclusion in the City of Sofia 2011 – 2015: it focuses on Roma neighbourhoods like the two case study areas (Fakulteta and Hristo Botev)</p>	<p>2020: aims at improving career development of young people and encouraging them to participate more actively in society; special attention given to young people who grew up in social institutions (national level)</p> <p>National Employment Action Plan 2013: pays special attention to the problem of youth unemployment and envisages measures for improving the opportunities for young people on the labour market (national level)</p> <p>Career Start: implemented by the Employment Agency to assist young people with higher education to start work after graduating (national level)</p> <p>Strategy for Development of Sofia Municipality until 2015: includes youth policies in the sphere for improvement of youth employment (local level)</p>	<p>good cooperation with the municipality, in others relationship is very problematic. Authorities are often not interested in genuine cooperation, but prefer outsourcing – NGOs or civil society organisations are expected to take over some of municipality’s responsibilities and solve certain problems.</p>	
Venice	<p>Most powers allocated at regional level, but implemented at municipal level.</p> <p>The city takes quite wide-reaching decisions and has got a partial economic autonomy because the municipality can finance the social policies and the social projects with the</p>	<p>At Local level there is a specific Youth Policy Department that coordinates social projects for young people, but without organic continuity or an organic frame.</p>	<p>The administrative socio-spatial divisions of the City of Venice are called “Municipality”. They are constituted to represent their communities, to keep up the their interests and to promote the development of unity within the City of Venice, in the perspective of the Metropolitan City.</p>	<p>“Employment services” (allocated at National level, but implemented at regional and municipal level);</p> <p>Veneto Region: First Job Agreement (regional level);</p> <p>Tools for youth employment (regional level);</p>	<p>Strong traditions of religious groups and leftist-communist groups providing social services.</p> <p>Good coordination between municipal institutions social services’ and Ngo (It’s a Venice’s prerogative, not an Italian prerogative)</p>	<p>Street level educators, Etam (Community and Territory Animation Service of the City of Venice)</p>

	revenue of the gamble of the casino (in Venice there is one of the four Italian casino).		<p>The Neighborhood</p> <p>Municipalities have got the administrative functions of the City Municipality to locate the resources at local level, in full explication of the principles of differentiation and adequacy, that characterize the subsidiarity.</p>	<p>Inclusion – Innovative System for Persons with Difficulties Place to Work (local level)</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

2. City level policy frameworks to tackle social inequalities of/among young people

The following information has been provided by the project partners from each city. More detailed information can be accessed in the local baseline studies (CITISPYCE Work Package 2) and case study reports (CITISPYCE Work Package 3).

1) Athens-Attica: Agia Sophia (Piraeus) and Elefsina: Piecemeal emergency aid

The Greek welfare system has been described as fragmented and “dysfunctional” (Avatangelou/Papadimitriou/Pothoulaki 2013: CITISPYCE local WP 2 report, p 12). The systems in place seem to reinforce inequalities rather than address these, in particular with regards to immigrants and people in need who have little or no access to social and health care services. The economic crisis has forced local authorities and civil society to create new emergency structures, such as municipal groceries and municipal pharmacies, food and clothes banks and other social services. But these are not always efficiently operating and sufficient in order to meet the needs of all people, as they are often hampered by bureaucracy and eligibility rules that often play out against those in most need. In general, private initiatives play an important role as public services targeting specifically young people are largely missing. This is particularly the case in Agia Sophia, whilst in Elefsina, some municipal services are in place for young people. In addition, youth unemployment and its impact are not properly addressed in either of the two areas neither by private nor public initiatives. This has resulted in qualifying youth unemployment as one of the most ominous social problems. Given the difficult situation in Athens-Attica, the policy framework can be described as “piecemeal emergency aid”, as initiatives emerge spontaneously, are fragile and do not provide a long-term perspective. Furthermore, with regard to the adverse economic situation both local and national policies are subject to constant change and adjustment.

2) Barcelona: Much work done, but lacking cooperation

In Barcelona, it seems, there is an oversupply of youth policies, as a result of the different administration levels which coexist within Spain. At the national level, the Youth Institute is responsible for managing youth issues, but the main competencies in youth within the State are ascribed to the autonomous regions like Catalonia. Then, within Catalonia, the City Council of Barcelona is applying youth policies on a voluntary basis (it is not obliged by the law) which are currently articulated through the “Plan for Youth and Adolescents 2013-2016”. Moreover, the region of Barcelona (Barcelonès) and the province of Barcelona (Diputació de Barcelona, which is the legal representation of the national administration in the autonomous regions) have their own youth plans, but they seem not to have as big a prevalence as the regional and local ones. To tackle youth unemployment, the socialist government first pushed for better job contracts for young people (through financial subsidies), but when the conservative party took over, it emphasised self-employment and vocational training - a similar shift is being observed at city level following the 2011 municipal elections (Roiha/Jubany/Güell 2013: CITISPYCE local WP 2 report, p8). At city level, a youth employment office provides information for job seekers and the local governmental body Barcelona Activa runs a number of training and work experience programmes. There is an independent Youth Council that is a recognised partner by the city council in its youth policy. In

Catalonia, there is a strong tradition for young people to affiliate with associations who provide all range of services. But the crisis has resulted in more competition for resources and there appears to be little coordination and cooperation among them. So-called “Youth tables” have been established at neighbourhood level (in both case study areas) to facilitate communication and coordination among associations, but are reported not to be so effective. An overarching framework is hard to identify, given the amount of organisations with different aims and purposes around.

3) Birmingham: Towards an Inclusive City?

The City of Birmingham is in a process of significant policy shifts with a tendency of services being reduced and fragmented (Hussain et al 2014: CITISPYCE local WP 3 report, p3). As youth work depends pretty much on national funding streams, it has to adapt to the underlying policy direction. So, more recently, it needs to demonstrate activities against anti-social behaviour and promote ‘work first’ ideals rather than empowerment and school attainment (p 24). Reduced budgets increase competition amongst service providers, and there is a tendency to centralise resources, favouring bigger providers over smaller organisations. At city level, a Welfare Reform Multi-Agency Committee has been put in place to coordinate the local response to the welfare policy reforms. The city’s commitment to promoting social inclusion was in 2013 documented by the multi-agency initiative and strategy: “Making Birmingham an Inclusive City“.

4) Brno: A low level social inclusion policy

The Czech welfare system has been subject to many reforms since the end of communism in 1989. Its current mix of provisions has been characterised as a “low social expenditure” system (Armingeon 2006, Sirovatka/Valkova 2013: CITISPYCE local WP 2 report). Despite its recent liberal orientation, however, indicators of poverty and social exclusion are comfortably low. Reasons for that are seen in low levels of unemployment, low income inequality and an effective and targeted system of social transfers (Sirovatka/Valkova 2013). When it comes to tackling youth unemployment, municipalities have limited powers, their main competences are with social services. Employment policies are a national level competence, social assistance has merged with employment offices recently. Education is also framed at national level. Schools, however, are mainly managed by the municipalities, which leaves them some room for discretion. Employment policy seems to be rather targeted towards protecting those already in jobs, whilst active labour market policies are less developed, public employment services are understaffed. This system structurally disadvantages young people (ibid).

In Brno, the main local policy frameworks related to social inclusion are the municipal social services community plan and the Integrated Urban Development Plan. This plan, however, is not helpful for disadvantaged youth. The situation of Roma is particularly worrisome; specific policies are coordinated and implemented by the Agency for Social Inclusion, a national level body that cooperates local with NGOs. In Brno, this body is not present. In both case study areas, social work projects are implemented rather by NGOs, which are financed from several sources: ESF, municipality and government programmes/schemes.

5) Krakow: “Young Krakow” strategy

The city of Krakow has a Municipal Labour Office that, amongst other things, implements a specific support programme for unemployed young adults that goes beyond what is in place for adults over 25 years. In addition, advice and job counselling is provided by Centres for Information and Career Planning, which are based in regional labour offices. Another relevant organisation is the Voluntary Labour Corps (VLC), which combines school education and vocational training (Mazur et al 2014: CITISPYCE local WP 3 Report). Social assistance is provided through the Municipal Social Assistance Centre. The “Young Krakow” programme was established at city level that aims at promoting social inclusion of young people. It sits on three pillars: a “Youth Forum for Civic Education” (a cycle of campaigns in support of social and civic involvement of young people), a “Support System for children and young people” (through youth clubs and street work) and a “partnership for youth” (information network to inform policies). In both districts containing chosen study areas (Rzaka, Mistrzejowice), Youth Councils were established in 2000 and have been in place since to involve young persons in policy-making. In terms of public policies, however, there seems to be a lack of enough weight put on the problems of youth employment. Instead the activities in the areas of culture (a host of youth cultural clubs), civic engagement (youth district councils) and sports (many different programmes and activities) are emphasized. Moreover, with the exception of the Young Krakow programme, no local or national strategy, devoted solely to the youth has been established.

6) Hamburg: An ambiguous “nobody should be left behind” strategy

Hamburg, as a city state, has significant political powers. Since 2012, some major reforms of social and youth policy have been pursued locally. The political vision is that “No one should be left behind”, which means in effect that mainstream institutions – child care, schools - are to be strengthened (e.g. through an whole-day-school, breaking with the long tradition of half day schools). This comes at the expense of previous, more autonomous youth work, which will lose legitimacy and funding. In 2013, Youth Job Centres have been established (one for each of the seven districts) to tackle youth unemployment. Here, various services around early school leaving, social assistance for young persons and employment schemes are pooled and coordinated.

Since 2009, a “social monitor” is in place that annually informs on socio-economic developments in all neighbourhood. When unfavourable trends are detected, areas are brought into an integrated urban development programme that pools various regeneration funds.

7) Malmo: Towards Social Sustainability (?)

In Malmö, social policies are positioned in a welfare system which is still characterised as Social Democratic but has been undergoing a transition in recent decades. The ideal-typical understanding of this model is that of a strong state caring universally for its citizens, but two things should be noted:

1) Sweden has since 2006 had a liberal-conservative government which has intensified a longer trend of adapting the welfare system to neoliberal agendas, with increased elements of workfare policy and a far-reaching privatization of welfare provisions (although the public sector is keeping its dominance when it comes to *commissioning* services).

2) In spite of the idea of the “strong state”, the municipal and regional levels are in fact key agents in the implementation of national policies, and these levels are in charge of providing care, education and social services, which means they have a prerogative of implementing social policies of their own, depending on their political ambitions (but always under the national law).

Social exclusion in Malmö shouldn't be understood as an effect of the European economic crisis but, perhaps ironically, as a side-effect of the city's economic *growth* (i.e., the finance-steered economic growth prevailing on a global scale that Malmö made itself part of in order to reverse the city's previous decline). It is an effect of a distribution of wealth – and, with it, health, schooling, housing conditions etc. – which has become alarmingly unequal. A key concept in Malmö's balancing the forces of neoliberalism with retained welfare ambitions is *social sustainability*. Between 2011 and 2013 the “Malmö Commission”, consisting of academics and city officials, has worked in order to propose measures for creating a more socially sustainable city. Its focus has been on counteracting health inequities (recognizing the social determinants of such inequities) and to treat the city as an entirety, realizing that the processes of exclusion and inequality can be understood only as a two-sided interplay. Other programmes in the city, however, have chosen to focus on its most deprived areas and neighbourhoods. For these different types of programmes the basic insight has been the same – that of health and welfare being very unevenly distributed throughout the city – but the policies implemented have been quite different in their view of what types of measures and interventions may prove instrumental. Typical for the Social Democratic welfare regime is a relatively small significance of civil society agents for welfare provision. However, this image, too, is changing to some extent, and a possible outcome of the Malmö Commission's work is the future establishment of so-called knowledge alliances, with a strong presence of public as well as private and civil society actors. If coming into effect, this new model of local governance may prove a more fertile soil for social innovations by and for young people than has previously been experienced.

8) Rotterdam: From state support to self-help

The Dutch welfare system has been subject to many reforms over the last decades, the most important of which is a decentralisation of responsibilities and budgets from the national level to the local level (2004). This development is now broadened to include social support, youth care and public health. At the core of these reforms is a reconsideration of responsibilities and possibilities in solving problems, bottom-up: own strength of people, their social network, professional support aimed at strengthening social network (collective services, such as general community, employment, health services; area-development), individual services (such as income, activation, pathways to employment, housing, health). This reconsideration of responsibilities and possibilities is accompanied by cuts in public budgets (as a delayed response to the economic crisis), and privatisation of the delivery of services from 2004 onwards. Whilst policy making responsibilities have shifted downward, within local government also a development in the opposite direction can be witnessed, such as a part centralisation of youth work in Rotterdam from the district level to the city level. Another development that seems to take place is more conceptual: youth work is less bound to specific places (such as youth clubs) and becoming more output/outcome oriented and more flexible. Social/community services bound to specific localities are becoming a general service for all inhabitants rather than for specific target groups. The city of Rotterdam has a youth council in place at city-wide level and at district level to involve young people in policy-making. Public services relevant for young people are coordinated by the “Youth Counter”. Overall, public services in Rotterdam seem to be in a process of serious restructuring and severe cuts, which in addition is accompanied by the

winding up of district authorities imposed by national legislation. In Rotterdam district authorities will be replaced by area committees and area managers.

9) Sofia: Austerity, desperation and protest

In Bulgaria, municipalities have only limited powers in economic policies. Most of their jurisdictions are in the areas of education, health care, social care, housing and infrastructure, culture and sport. The general policies in all these areas, however, are formed on the national level, so the municipalities are free to act only within the frames set by the central government, and within the financial limits of the municipal budget. The financial resources are often insufficient to provide for good quality social and youth services. Since the deep financial-economic crisis Bulgaria experienced in 1996-1997, the macro-economic stability has been an absolute priority of the government, and to this end, the neo-liberal cost-cutting policies have all but dismantled the Bulgarian welfare system. A national strategy to tackle youth unemployment has been modelled on EU jargon, but had little impact to date. In fact, in recent years the employment policies seem to concentrate on providing additional qualifications for those who are already in a job (but at risk of becoming unemployed due to austerity measures) and do not hold much for the unemployed. On the local level, Sofia has developed its Strategy for Development of Sofia Municipality until 2015, which also includes measures and policies for improving youth employment. In an attempt to act against some of the most pressing social-economic problems in the city, Sofia municipality also passed a Strategy for Prevention of Social Exclusion in the City of Sofia 2011-2015, which mainly targets the Roma population that is facing severe discrimination and exclusion. Overall, the situation in the capital of the poorest EU member-state (nearly 40% of residents live in risk of poverty and social exclusion) remains quite desperate: with the rising levels of youth unemployment, deepening social inequalities and ongoing public protests.

10) Venice: “Stew Welfare”

The Italian welfare state is known for its complexity and fragmentation, and more recently for its dysfunctionality and crisis. Many responsibilities lie at regional levels and local levels. There are huge differences between the regional social policy systems. The Veneto region is in many instances favouring cash transfer over services (Campomori/Della Puppa/Ferrari 2013: CITISPYCE local WP 2 report). Overall, the social security system is rather unfavourable for young people, as it builds, in a Bismarckian tradition, on an unemployment insurance that only comes into force for those who have contributed already and, especially, that have contributed working with contract terms which are not covered in the “flexible” (precarious) contracts, recently introduced by the national legislation (L.30/2003; L.22/2011; L.92/2012, etc.) and largely applied to young workers. The local framework of youth services appears fragmented, civil society organisations play a big role. Much emphasis is being put on street work.

3. References

CITISPYCE resources

Work package 2 comparative report by Mikael Stigendal, September 2013

Work package 3 comparative report by Simon Güntner, Anne Gehrke and Louis Henri Seukwa, February 2014

Local reports for Work Package 2 (Baseline Study)

Local reports for Work Package 3 (Fieldwork 1)

Additional sources:

Armingeon, K. (2006). 'Reconciling competing claims of the welfare state clientele', In K. Armingeon and G. Bonoli (eds.) *The Politics of Post-Industrial Welfare States*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 100-22.

Jessop, Bob (2005): Critical Realism and the Strategic-Relational Approach. *New Formations* 56

Ministry of Interior, Decentralization and Electronic Government (2013) Financial Independence Monitoring of Local Authorities Organizations. [pdf] Available at:
http://www.ots.gr/files4users/files/Komvos%20Dialeitoyrgikotitas_Maragkos.pdf

Wilson, James /Kelling, George (1982): Broken Windows, in: *The Atlantic*, March 1, 1982

Websites

<http://www.youthpolicy.org/nationalyouthpolicies/>