

Mainstreaming Social Inclusion

Working for the Prevention and Elimination of
Poverty in a Changing Europe

6-7 June 2003
Seminar Report

EUROPEAN FOUNDATION
for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions
Loughlinstown, Co. Dublin, Ireland

Transnational Partners

The European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN), is an independent coalition of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and groups involved in the fight against poverty and social exclusion in Europe. EAPN involves organisations whose main and explicit purpose is to empower people and communities facing poverty and social exclusion to exercise their responsibilities and rights, and to enable them to break their isolation and counter their social exclusion.

The Institute for Solidarity and Social Security (Instituto de Solidariedade e Segurança Social) in Portugal is a department of the Ministry of Social Security and Labour. It is responsible for developing and co-ordinating social policies, supporting the development of partnerships between key stakeholders, and co-ordinating of the National Action Plan Against Poverty and Social Exclusion (NAPs Inclusion process).

The National School of Public Health (Ecole Nationale de la Sante Publique) in France undertakes comparative research into poverty issues and is a member of the French National Observatory on Social Exclusion. The National Observatory reports on the situation in relation to poverty and social exclusion in France. The membership of the Observatory includes representatives of seven government departments, representatives of NGOs, researchers and academics.

Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM) in Northern Ireland is responsible for the overall promotion of New Targeting Social Need (TSN) which is the over arching strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion in Northern Ireland. OFMDFM also co-ordinates the Northern Ireland contribution to the UK NAPs Inclusion.

The Office for Social Inclusion in the Department of Social and Family Affairs in Ireland is the lead government department charged with the implementation of the Irish National Anti-Poverty Strategy and the NAPs Inclusion. It is also responsible for poverty proofing.

The National Economic and Social Forum in Ireland is a representative body of the social partner institutions including: members of parliament; employer, trade union and farmer organisations; the community and voluntary sector; and central and local government. The focus of the Forum's work is to evaluate the implementation of policies dealing with equality and social inclusion issues. It convenes a Social Inclusion Forum to review the National Anti-Poverty Strategy.

The Combat Poverty Agency in Ireland has, as its role, the promotion of a just and inclusive society by working for the prevention and elimination of poverty in Ireland. As a state advisory agency, Combat Poverty advises the government on how poverty can be eliminated. Combat Poverty has a central role in supporting the implementation of the Irish National Anti-Poverty Strategy and the development of the NAPs Inclusion.

Acknowledgements

The Project *Mainstreaming Social Inclusion* was part-financed by the European Commission under Phase I of the Transnational Exchange Programme budget line of the Social Exclusion Programme; the Office for Social Inclusion, Department of Social and Family Affairs, Ireland; and the Combat Poverty Agency, Ireland. The views and comments expressed in this Report do not necessarily reflect those of the European Commission.

European Anti-Poverty Network Mr. Fintan Farrell, Director

Portugal

Institute for Solidarity and Social Security Ms. Gisela Matos, Senior Research Fellow

France

The National School of Public Health Professor Michel Legros

Northern Ireland

Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister Dr. Gerry Mulligan, Head of Equality and Social Needs Division
Ms. Harriet Ferguson, Head New Targeting Social Need Unit

Ireland

Combat Poverty Agency Ms. Helen Johnston, Director
Mr. Pádraig Carmody, Policy and Research Analyst
Ms. Fidelma Joyce, Policy Liaison Officer
Ms. Anne Bride, Administrator
Ms. Naomi Feely, Research Assistant
Ms. Rose McGrath, Research Co-ordinator and Seminar Report's Main Author

Office for Social Inclusion, Department of Social and Family Affairs Mr. Eoin Ó Seaghdha, Assistant Principal

National Economic and Social Forum (NESF) Mr. Gerard Walker, Policy Analyst

We would like to thank:

All those who contributed to the seminar

- Seminar delegates
- Seminar contributors
- Workshop facilitators and note-takers
- Staff of the Combat Poverty Agency
- Interpreters, translators and technician
- Staff at the European Foundation

Councillor Donal Marren, Chairperson of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council, councillors and the staff of its Social Inclusion Unit for receiving us at Dún Laoghaire Town Hall and for welcoming us to the County.

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions for kindly offering the use of its facilities.

Contents

Transnational Partners

Acknowledgements

Introduction 1

Section One 2

Seminar Programme 2

Section Two 4

Day One Morning Session 4

Day One Afternoon Session 15

Day Two Morning Session 25

Day Two Afternoon Session 32

Appendix 1: Presenters

Appendix 2: Seminar Delegates

Appendix 3: Contact Details for Partners and European Commission

Introduction

This Seminar Report summarises the inputs and discussions at the *Mainstreaming Social Inclusion Transnational Seminar*, held in June 2003 at the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in Dublin. This Seminar was a key component of the European Commission funded project *Mainstreaming Social Inclusion*.

Section one of this Report sets out the Seminar Programme. This consisted of a mix of plenary presentations and discussions and country/region based workshops and discussions. Appendix 1 contains details of all plenary and workshop presenters. Section two contains summaries of the discussions held over the two days of the Seminar.

The aim of the transnational seminar is to explore the challenges of developing and implementing mainstreaming approaches within the context of the National Action Plans Against Poverty and Social Exclusion (NAPs Inclusion).

The objectives of the Seminar were:

- To explore mainstreaming as an approach to placing poverty and social inclusion at the centre of policy making, and to facilitate an exchange of information and learning in relation to approaches to mainstreaming
- To provide an overview of poverty and social exclusion in Europe and of the role of the European Union Social Inclusion Strategy
- To review the outcomes of a draft research report which examines existing mainstreaming practice
- To facilitate the participation of key actors including organisations representing people experiencing poverty and social exclusion
- To gain input into the design of mainstreaming pilot projects for Phase II of the Transnational Exchange Programme, based on the learning achieved in Phase I.

The seminar brought together approximately 50 participants from the partner organisations including national, regional and local government officials, social partners, social policy experts, and representatives of anti-poverty non-governmental organisations. Appendix 2 contains details of the participants.

Section One

Seminar Programme

Friday 6 June 2003

Morning Session

Chairperson Helen Johnston, Director, Combat Poverty Agency

- 08.45 Departure from hotel
09.15 Arrival and Registration
09.40 **Get to know each other session in the Plenary**
10.00 **Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- M. Raymond-Pierre Bodin, Director of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working and Living Conditions
 - Ms. Helen Johnston, Director, Combat Poverty Agency, Ireland
- 10.30 **Welcome Address by Mr. Gerry Mangan, Director of the Office for Social Inclusion, Department of Social and Family Affairs, Ireland**
- 10.40 **Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe**
- Ms Gisela Matos, Institute of Solidarity and Social Security, Portugal
- 11.0 BREAK
- 11.20 **Origins and Evolution of Mainstreaming: The Gender Approach**
- Ms. Camille Loftus, Equality for Women Measure, WRC Social and Economic Consultants
- 11.50 **Mainstreaming Social Inclusion: Working for the Prevention and Elimination of Poverty in a Changing Europe**
Presentation of Preliminary Findings of the Research Report
- Rose McGrath, Mainstreaming Project Co-ordinator
- 12.20 **Open Forum**
- 13.15 LUNCH

Afternoon Session

Chairperson Dr. Gerry Mulligan, Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Northern Ireland

- 14.30 **Approaches to Mainstreaming Poverty and Social Inclusion at National and Local Level – Case Study Presentations.**
- ❖ Bending the Spend – New Targeting Social Need and Poverty Proofing (Northern Ireland)
 - ❖ Access to Health Care: Joining the Stream or Mainstreaming (France)
 - ❖ Local Partnership to Combat Poverty and Social Exclusion (Portugal)
 - ❖ Review of the Poverty Proofing Process: Issues and Opportunities (Ireland)
- 16.20 BREAK
- 16.35 **Summary Reports from the Workshops**
16.50 **Plenary Discussion: Panel**
- Ms. Gisela Matos, Institute for Solidarity and Social Security, Portugal

- Ms. Harriet Ferguson, Office of the First Minister & Deputy First Minister, Northern Ireland
 - Prof. Michel LeGros, National School of Public Health, France
 - Mr. Eoin Ó Seaghdha, Department of Social and Family Affairs
 - Mr. Fintan Farrell, European Anti-Poverty Network
- 17.20 **End of session**

Saturday 7th April

Morning Session

Chairperson Ms. Gisela Matos, Institute for Solidarity and Social Security, Portugal

08.45 Departure from Hotel

09.30 **Opening Remarks**

09.40 **Mainstreaming Poverty and Social Inclusion ... The Next Steps....Phase II**

- Mr. Pádraig Carmody, Combat Poverty Agency

11.15 Discussion Groups
BREAK

- Discussion Groups

12.00 **Plenary Discussion**

- Feedback from the working groups will form the basis of the discussion

13.00 LUNCH

Afternoon Session

Chairperson Ms. Fidelma Joyce, Combat Poverty Agency

14.15 **Perspectives on 'Mainstreaming' – Strategies for effective implementation**

- Mr. Gerard Walker, Policy Analyst, National Economic and Social Forum, Ireland
- Mr. Fintan Farrell, Director of the European Anti-Poverty Network

15.10 **The Future of Social Europe**

- Mr. Proinsias De Rossa, Member of the European Parliament and Member of the Convention on Europe

15.30 **Open Forum**

16.00 **Concluding remarks and close of the seminar**

Section Two

Day One Morning Session

Welcoming and Opening Addresses

*Helen Johnston,
Director Combat Poverty Agency, Dublin, Ireland*

Ms Johnston welcomed all participants and guests to the Mainstreaming Social Inclusion seminar, especially those who had travelled far. She was very pleased to see such a broad range of interests represented including, national and local government officials, non-governmental organisations, public bodies, academics and researchers.

She pointed out that progressing mainstreaming into all policy areas to address poverty and social exclusion is a very important concern of the Combat Poverty Agency. Work has been on-going on this project with partner organisations for over six months. This has provided an opportunity to reach a better understanding of 'mainstreaming' as a concept and of its application in a number of fields especially with respect to the elimination of poverty and the promotion of social inclusion. She noted the timeliness of this seminar, providing as it did the opportunity to review findings to date and to explore the challenges of developing and implementing mainstreaming approaches within the context of the NAPs Inclusion.

Ms Johnston was looking forward to lively discussion that would enhance our understanding of mainstreaming. She saw the seminar as an important space to identify what was needed for mainstreaming to be progressed collectively in the future, in particular identifying key elements for the Phase II application to the European Commission.

In conclusion, she expressed gratitude for the financial support received from the European Commission through its Transnational Exchange Programme and from the Irish Department of Social and Family Affairs, as well as for the commitment and work to date of all partners involved.

*Mr Raymond-Pierre Bodin,
Director, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, Ireland*

Mr Bodin welcomed the participants to the Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, explaining that the European Foundation was one of the first foundations set up by the European Union. It has 4 pillars of work:

First Pillar – deals with issues relating to working conditions such as health, environment, working times, training and working management

Second Pillar – deals with issues relating to living conditions such as childcare, transport, education, social welfare services

Third Pillar – deals with issues relating to industrial relations between social partners and also participation of workers

Fourth Pillar – a new pillar that came into existence following the Nice Summit, as a result of a proposal by the Commission and the social partners. It is the European Observatory for Change known as the European Monitoring Centre on Change (EMCC). One of the main issues it addressed is management and change.

Mr Bodin concluded by saying that the Foundation was very pleased to welcome all those involved with the Mainstreaming Social Inclusion Seminar, as social exclusion is part of the 5 cross-cutting themes addressed by the Foundation.

*Mr Gerry Mangan,
Office of Social Inclusion (OSI), Department of Social and Family Affairs,
Ireland*

Mr Mangan pointed out how particularly pleased he was that Ireland is involved in this project. Combating poverty and social exclusion has been a key priority of successive Irish governments for decades. In fact, Ireland has been fully involved in the social inclusion process at European level from the outset. This engagement did much to raise consciousness about poverty and its effects as well as assisting greatly in policy development. For example, when in the early 1990s the proposal for the Fourth Poverty Programme did not have a proper legal basis in the Treaty, Ireland proposed such a basis for incorporation in the Treaty of Amsterdam, and this was accepted (reference Article 137. 1 of the consolidated Treaty). This provided for *initiatives aimed at improving knowledge, developing exchanges of information and best practices, promoting innovative approaches and evaluating experiences in order to combat social exclusion*. Essentially, these processes are integral to both the project and seminar.

Mr Mangan provided this example to illustrate the value that Ireland, as a small country, places on exchanges that enable it to tap into the 'best thinking' and practice in other EU countries about Ireland's greatest ongoing challenge – the combating of poverty and social exclusion.

The project was also especially welcome because it appears to herald a new phase in meeting the challenge of preventing and eliminating poverty. This challenge is set in a changing Europe especially given the ageing of European society. With this project we can examine how to mainstream what has come to be termed social inclusion. In view of these realities there is likely to be a greater reception to mainstreaming social inclusion than would have been the case even five years ago. The sub-title of the seminar is also instructive. This process is about preventing and eliminating poverty, not just about combating and reducing it.

But what will mainstreaming achieve? Poverty and social exclusion are multifaceted phenomena. The poor have been, and in some cases still are, blamed for their poverty. In many instances, however, poorly designed policies and programmes, especially in the areas of social protection, were not as effective in combating poverty as they might have been. In this respect Mr Mangan recalled a statement made in 1988 by former President of the EU Commission, Jacques Delors:

How is it possible to imagine that we have social protection budgets that represent between 22 per cent and 28 per cent or even 30 per cent of our gross national income and still we have many poor people? This is because the poverty of today slips through the meshes of the social protection net ... The fact is that this costly system is not fulfilling its task.

One outcome of the concerns articulated by Jacques Delors has been the policy of modernising social protection. Provision for exchanges on this process at EU level and for the Social Protection Committee to drive it forward have been made in the Treaty of Nice. In many other policy areas, however, little if any thought has been given to the impact these policies and programmes would have on causing poverty or perpetuating it. Mainstreaming should, in particular, counter this as it should raise awareness on how every policy area, even the most unlikely, can have an impact on poverty. The process should then facilitate how such policies can be modified and developed to have a positive impact. Since 1998, government departments are required to poverty proof all significant areas of policy. If the proposal is found to have the effect of increasing poverty levels, then departments are asked to consider the options that might be identified to ameliorate this effect. Similarly, if the proposal has no effect on the level of poverty, departments are asked to identify the options that might produce a positive effect.

Following the initial poverty-proofing pilot across government in 1998-1999, it was agreed that the National Economic and Social Council (NESC) should assess the programme. The NESC reported in November 2001 that there was a high degree of formal compliance, but that the objectives and the operations of the process needed to be clarified. (Dr. Síle O'Connor, Director of the NESC at that time, provided more details on the process later in the Seminar.)

A key function of the Office of Social Inclusion (OSI) is to disseminate guidelines and advise departments in relation to poverty-proofing techniques. The Office has also been charged with responsibility for the development of an enhanced poverty-proofing process taking into account the recommendations of the NESC. As part of that process OSI has initiated, in co-operation with the National Equality Authority, a pilot project on integrated proofing combining equality and poverty dimensions. Increasing the development of poverty proofing and the process of mainstreaming generally will become a major priority. Therefore, this transnational project is timely.

In conclusion, Mr Mangan thanked Helen Johnston and the Combat Poverty Agency for organising the Seminar and once more wished the deliberations every success.

Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe

Ms. Gisela Matos, *Institute of Solidarity and Social Security, Lisbon, Portugal*

Policy on social inclusion in the European Union moved up a gear in 2000. What has become known as the 'Lisbon Triangle', encompassing *Economic Policy* (competitiveness, dynamism) *Employment Policy* (full employment, quality of work) and *Social Policy* (social quality and social cohesion) was set out by the Lisbon European Council at its meeting in March 2000.



This 'triangle' recognises the key role that social policy has to play, alongside economic and employment policies, in reducing inequalities and promoting social cohesion, and ensures effective links between these policies in the future. In achieving a competitive, dynamic, solidaristic and knowledge-based economy, the strategic priority, according to the European Council, is the interaction between technological change, globalisation, the new knowledge-driven economy, new social dynamics and the demographic evolution.

A new strategy of co-operation has been adopted to advance social policy in the European Union. This is the 'Open Method of Co-ordination' which consists of:

- The setting of common objectives on poverty reduction and social inclusion
- The development of NAPs Inclusion
- The development and use of common indicators to measure progress
- A Community Action programme (including transnational exchange projects, such as Mainstreaming Social Inclusion)
- An assessment of the NAPs Inclusions by the European Commission in the form of a *Joint Report on Social Inclusion*.

The four common objectives for the NAPs Inclusion were adopted at the Nice European Council in December 2000. These are:

- To promote the participation in employment and access by all to resources, rights, goods and services
- To prevent the risks of exclusion
- To take action for the most vulnerable
- To mobilise all stakeholders.

The common objectives are actioned in national policies by setting specific targets in the NAPs Inclusion. The common indicators, agreed at the Laeken European Council in December 2001, measure achievement of these targets, and the application of evaluation criteria enable the comparison of best practice. The Commission makes its own assessment of the NAPs Inclusions which is augmented by peer review (national governments) so that each participating Member State can learn from the process.

The second round of the NAPs Inclusion will come into effect in 2003.

Gender Mainstreaming

Camille Loftus, Equality for Women Measure, Workers Research Co-operative, Dublin, Ireland

The following is an overview of the approach to gender equality in the European Union:

- The legal base for gender equality is laid out in the EC Treaty, and amended in the Amsterdam Treaty. Articles cover the promotion of equality between men and women and the elimination of inequalities. They state that the Council 'may take appropriate action to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation'
- Also, Article 23.1 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights in the EU states that equality between women and men must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay
- There have also been a number of EU Commission Communications dealing with this issue, e.g. COM, 1996:67 which deals with incorporating equal opportunities for women and men into all Community policies and activities and COM, 2002:276 on integrated impact assessment.

According to the EU Commission¹ gender mainstreaming is

¹ On the Communication from the Commission – Incorporating equal opportunities for women and men into all Community policies and activities – 'mainstreaming' (COM, 1996:67 – C4 – 1996/0148' by the Committee on Women's Rights

not restricting efforts to ... specific measures to help women, but mobilising all general policies and measures specifically for the purpose of achieving equality by actively and openly taking into account at planning stage their possible effects on the respective situation of men and women

Another definition is from the Council of Europe (1998)² and states that gender mainstreaming is *the (re)organisation, improvement, achievement, development and evolution of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy making.*

Gender mainstreaming is important because it helps to increase the understanding of the existence of inequality; the nature of inequality, and most importantly, the causes of inequality. It also helps to evaluate what works and why.

The Commission adopts a dual approach to achieving gender equality:

- Mainstreaming
- Specific actions.

It also undertakes impact assessment and proofing, benchmarking and monitoring, develops gender-disaggregated data and mobilises all services. The Commission's approach is also based on anchoring responsibility for training and awareness raising on structures such as the Group of Commissioners on Equal Opportunities, Inter-Service Group on Gender Equality, and the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for women and men (AC).

Examples of the application of gender mainstreaming include: the structural funds; the employment strategy; the social inclusion strategy; representation in decision making; and the enlargement process. In terms of the Irish experience, gender mainstreaming is required in the National Development Plan.³ The NDP Gender Equality Unit was established to assist departments in data gathering and analysis, training of key staff and impact assessment and proofing tools. A mid-term evaluation is currently underway to examine what use departments have made of resources and how the gender impact has been improved.

In terms of the European experience the AC Opinion (2001)⁴ on Implementation of gender mainstreaming in EU policies acknowledged

² Council of Europe (1998), Gender Mainstreaming: Conceptual Framework, Methodology and Presentation of Good Practice. Report of Activities of the Groups of Specialists on Mainstreaming. (EG-S-MS (98) 2). Strasbourg

³ National Development Plan (2001-2006) to meet Ireland's social and economic investment needs.

⁴ Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men, (2001), Opinion on the Implementation of Gender Mainstreaming in EU Policies. DOC.EQOP 59-2001 (rev. 20 February 2002) Final.

commitment and valuable gains and concluded that the *ambitious goal of mobilising all services remains largely unachieved*. Gender mainstreaming was not applied in a *coherent and effective way*. The AC's conclusion on requirements for successful gender mainstreaming were that it was critical that the approach taken is goal-oriented, systematic, co-ordinated, and that there is high-level commitment and specific action in favour of women. The AC's conclusions on barriers to mainstreaming were that there was a lack of political will, a lack of resources – human and budgetary – and a lack of appropriate expertise. These are three inter-related problems and their resolution depends on mobilisation of political will.

The following is a summary of the key elements of mainstreaming:

- It must be systematic and co-ordinated where it is applied to all policies and actions, not just making programmes and resources more accessible. This requires co-ordination of structures and reporting
- It should be based on sound statistical analysis, relevant comparative data and structural factors and differences in conditions, situations and needs
- It should be goal-oriented – have a clear vision of objectives to be attained and targets to be monitored
- It must reinforce, not replace, targeted measures
- It must have a high level of leadership and commitment including awareness raising for all and training for decision makers and staff
- It must include consultation and participation that can be resourced by relevant expertise, e.g. centres of expertise and advisory committees
- There must be external, autonomous critiques from NGOs and shadow documents which identify the gaps between policy commitments and outcomes and contribute to better understanding via analysis.

Mainstreaming Social Inclusion

Rose McGrath
EU Co-ordinator, Mainstreaming Social Inclusion,
Combat Poverty Agency, Dublin, Ireland

This presentation was a summary of the research to date on mainstreaming social inclusion which was undertaken as part of this Project. As such the research finding presented was 'work in progress' and the Seminar allowed the Partnership the opportunity to receive comment and feedback on its findings to date. The presentation first outlined the case for mainstreaming; the evolution of mainstreaming social inclusion in Europe; the understandings of mainstreaming and associated case studies in each of the partner jurisdictions; and the possible key features of mainstreaming that were emerging from the understandings and case studies.

The following are some points relating to the case for mainstreaming social inclusion:

- Poverty and social exclusion are multi-dimensional problems requiring multi-dimensional responses at all levels of governance. Social protection and direct assistance is evident in all EU Member States (to varying degrees). However, approximately 15 per cent of all people in the EU, or about 65 million people, are at risk of poverty
- Inter-related economic and social structural barriers contribute to poverty and social exclusion and prevent the effective participation of people in society. Consequently, there is a need to increase policy coherence in order to reduce or reverse negative impacts of existing policies on poverty and social inclusion.

The Mainstreaming Project found that mainstreaming is a relatively new concept in European social policy. The term is widely used but there is no consensus on its meaning. There is also very little literature specifically on mainstreaming social inclusion in a European context. This is an English term and there is no direct translation in other languages.

The European Commission has requested Member States to mainstream social inclusion under Objective 4 for the NAPs Inclusion: To mobilise all relevant bodies in the fight against poverty and social exclusion. Here it specifically states that this objective is achieved through mainstreaming social inclusion into overall policy, in particular:

- By mobilising the public authorities at national, regional and local level, according to their respective competence
- By developing appropriate co-ordination procedures and structures
- By adapting administrative and social services to the needs of people suffering exclusion and ensuring that front-line staff are sensitive to these needs.

In the review of the first NAPs Inclusion *Joint Report on Social Inclusion*, the Commission points to a number of Member States that undertake some mainstreaming but adds that *additional efforts were needed to mainstream the issue of poverty and social exclusion in a wider range of policy domains other than social protection and social assistance*. Most recently, at the Brussels Summit, the concluding statement is as follows: *Combating social exclusion requires, in addition to employment policy, the mainstreaming of this objective into all relevant strands of policy, recognising that this is first and foremost the responsibility of Member States and their regional and local authorities*.

At the international level there is some application and understanding of mainstreaming social inclusion and poverty elimination. The World Bank's policy of mainstreaming poverty reduction demands that lending and assistance are conditional on assisted countries introducing poverty reduction strategies. All international agencies follow the DAC Guidelines⁵ on Poverty

⁵ OECD (2001), The DAC Guidelines Poverty Reduction. OECD Publication Service, Paris, France

Reduction. These set out how to undertake organisational re-alignment of development agencies so that structures, corporate systems and culture are aligned with poverty reduction.

There are also other applications of the term mainstreaming. These are:

- Spreading the innovation relating to policy, practice and projects from specific pilots to the general, whether geographically, between sectors or between groups
- Providing access to mainstream services for people with disabilities
- Incorporating a gender perspective into existing policies.

The presentation then moved on to the understanding of mainstreaming social inclusion in the partner countries and region.

In France the understanding of mainstreaming is that of facilitating people to (re)join the mainstream. This occurs at two levels: (1) improving the access and participation of excluded people in the mainstream and (2) co-ordinating of policy making and implementing of services by encouraging people from different fields to work together. The case studies from France were TRACE (an active employment scheme) and PRAPS (a regional health network).

In Portugal there are two understandings: (1) strategies for ensuring that poverty is given priority in all policy making. This involves the integration of a poverty perspective across all policy areas, building synergy across all policy areas and forging policy coherence; (2) locally-based processes from the bottom-up which act as a focal point for campaigning by organisations. The case studies from Portugal were the PNAI (NAPs Inclusion) and the Social Network Programme (locally based social inclusion network).

In Northern Ireland there is a targeting of efforts and available resources within existing policies and programmes towards people, groups and areas in greatest social need. This is known as New Targeting Social Need and involves: (1) changing corporate policies; (2) changing existing policies; (3) skewing or shifting resources within existing programmes. The case studies from Northern Ireland were 'Bending the Spend' which provided examples of how resources are skewed and the Children's Executive Fund.

In Ireland, mainstreaming social inclusion is the incorporation of poverty and social inclusion into the policy and political agenda by: (1) thematic and global targets; (2) poverty proofing; (3) cross-area working mechanisms. The case studies from Ireland were poverty proofing and the Cork City Council Social Inclusion Unit.

The presentation then outlined how the case studies were compared and contrasted in order to identify the key features of mainstreaming:

- Binging people into the mainstream
- Mainstreaming innovation and learning
- Making poverty more visible in policy making.

Bringing people into the mainstream involved:

- Empowerment of people so as to allow them to participate through education/skills/training, better housing outcomes and better health outcomes
- Reshaping of mainstream services so that they are accessible for people through better information and learning, reduction of inequalities in service delivery and better co-ordination of people from different areas working together.

Mainstreaming innovation and learning involved:

- Dissemination of learning and innovation from within the local area, from the local level to other areas, and from the local to the national level and vice versa
- Putting in place a structured system that facilitates such dissemination.

Making poverty more visible in policy making involved:

- A mechanism across existing policy areas to ensure that resources are directed towards poverty and social inclusion
- Placing a poverty perspective in existing policy making through improved information and knowledge
- Cross-area working arrangements for management, monitoring and review.

Because of the existence of recent evaluations (Deloitte Touche, 2003, and NESF, 1999)⁶ and some original research conducted as part of this project, it was possible to undertake some critical analysis of the features relating to *making poverty more visible in policy making*. This found that there has been some redirection of resources in the case of New TSN. Furthermore, the incorporation of a poverty perspective through improved knowledge and learning was a strong point in the *making poverty visible* feature. The research revealed that Ireland and Northern Ireland point to an increased awareness and 'sensitising' of staff working with disadvantaged people. Ireland has engaged in poverty proofing, the production of guidelines and resource material, training at local level (CPA Local Government Anti-Poverty Learning Network) but no monitoring. In Northern Ireland there is ex-ante poverty proofing of all policies and programmes, monitoring and training.

With respect to cross-area working arrangements, the research found that there is a need for more senior official and political level endorsement and

⁶ Deloitte & Touche (2003), Interim Evaluation of New TSN: Summary and Synthesis Report VI. (Not published). OFMDFM, Belfast, Northern Ireland
National Economic and Social Council, (2001), Review of the Poverty Proofing Process. Dublin: National Economic and Social Council

training of officials and an increased awareness and understanding of poverty and social inclusion. There is also a need for departments to develop a sense of ownership and responsibility for social inclusion outcomes. An expert unit to provide knowledge is required as is the direct engagement of people experiencing poverty.

Plenary Discussion

The main points made were as follows:

- Some concerns were expressed that too positive a 'spin' was being put on government policies such as New Targeting Social Need in Northern Ireland. New TSN does not resource people on the ground working with people in poverty – if you want to deal with poverty it should be bottom-up rather than top-down.
- It was noted that cultural change takes a long time. Assessment can only detect the beginning of change. For example, it takes at least ten years for health indicators to improve in response to improved policies. At the moment mainstreaming has not been in place long enough to say that it is good practice.
- It was felt that if there was no definition of mainstreaming there would be no implementation. Therefore there is a need for a common way of thinking.
- It was stated that mainstreaming should be changed to accommodate and reflect the reality of disadvantaged people rather than just bringing people into the mainstream. What are society and governments doing which is excluding people? Mainstreaming is about changing what we bring people into.
- It was felt that in Ireland there was a need to poverty proof taxation policy, not just income taxation.
- The view was also expressed that there was a need for NAPs Inclusion Reports to have more input from civil society.

Day One Afternoon Session

Case Study Presentations

- Bending the Spend – New TSN and Poverty Proofing (Northern Ireland)
- Review of the Poverty-Proofing Process: Issues and Opportunities (Ireland)
- Local Partnership to Combat Poverty and Social Exclusion (Portugal)
- Access to Health Care (France)

The plenary group dispersed into different workshops and then reconvened to hear the discussion and feedback.

Northern Ireland

Bending the Spend – New Targeting Social Need and Poverty Proofing (Northern Ireland). Dr Gerry Mulligan of the Equality and Social Needs Division and Dr Stephen Donnelly of the Equality Research Branch of the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister

The Northern Irish political context was presented and it was pointed out that there was a radical change in the region's political and legislative environment over the 1990s.

The presentation provided some socio-economic background to poverty in Northern Ireland. This highlighted the importance of social security transfers to Northern Ireland where benefits account for 21 per cent of household income overall. In Britain the equivalent figures is 12 per cent. Gross incomes and average earnings in Northern Ireland are lower than those for Britain. This is due *inter alia* to lower rates of economic activity and higher levels of long-term unemployment. There are also significant differences in unemployment rates between both communities, with Catholic unemployment rates twice that of Protestants. Research by the Equality Research Branch reveals that a number of different indicators reveal there is slow progress overall in the poverty reduction situation in Northern Ireland. However, certain groups in society, e.g. lone parents and those with disabilities, are faring worse than other groups.

Historically there has been no relative income poverty measure in Northern Ireland. However, with the Northern Ireland Household Panel Survey and Poverty Social Exclusion Surveys in 2003 this has changed.

The findings of the recent evaluation (Deloitte Touche, 2003) of NewTSN were also presented:

- 'Social Need' is poorly defined
- There are too many actions with too few targets and a lack of tangible measures
- There is no global measure of poverty

- There are good developments in statistics, research and the measurement of poverty
- There is evidence of targeting disadvantage
- There is good awareness of the policy
- There is a need for a greater focus on trends among disadvantaged groups
- Northern Ireland needs to develop income indicators.

There have also been the following developments with respect to New TSN. These include the following: relative income surveys have been established, the spatial index of deprivation has been up-dated and there has been a review of methods for collecting information on (a) ethnic groups and (b) disabled people. Surveys are identifying the vulnerable groups and the Noble index of deprivation has been updated to allow more precise targeting. A definition of skewing is being developed, as is a new 'social wage' survey and a new TSN 'relevance' template.

Workshop Conclusions

In its report to the Plenary this workshop raised the following points from its discussion:

- It was felt that New TSN provides a new focus on poverty issues. The consultation process is important in bringing a wide range of views into overall strategy development. This helps to build up partnership and consensus
- It was stated that clearer priorities are needed – agreed at the political level – and that there should be a targeting of actions and budgets at these prioritised areas
- At the moment there is no dedicated budget for New TSN and this was viewed as problematic. Some participants also felt there was a need to cost the administration of New TSN to see whether funding could be used more directly to alleviate poverty
- It was felt there was a need for structures which bind departments into the strategy so that all are pulling together, particularly as there are over 500 discrete actions across departments and there is therefore a need for greater coherence and clarity of purpose.

It terms of aspects that can be further progressed at transnational level, it was felt there was a need for evidence-based policy analysis supported by independent evaluation of the outcome of actions to determine whether they are making a difference. Another issue identified was the importance of the development of quantitative and qualitative statistical indicators of need that can be weighed to prioritise actions and influence public expenditure.

Some concerns were raised about mainstreaming. For example, proofing is a burden and there needs to be a streamlined process. Some participants

expressed the view that mainstreaming can be an excuse for inaction. Others felt that mainstreaming was about tinkering, not changing social structures. Consequently, there is a need to look at broader social structures and issues such as redistribution and tax policies. The consensus was that there was a need to be realistic about what mainstreaming can achieve and that it itself needs targeting. It was noted that mainstreaming could not be a substitute for targeted approaches. For example, there are no outcomes for Travellers from a mainstreaming approach. There is then the question of how to set priorities in the context of limited resources. In part this can be based on spatial indicators of deprivation such as the Noble index, statistics, and a sound evidence base.⁷

In order to be effective it was felt that mainstreaming needs clarity of purpose, coherence, consistency with the NAPs Inclusion process and assessment of local need.

IRELAND

Review of the Poverty-Proofing Process in Ireland: Issues and Opportunities. Professor Sile O'Connor of the School of Policy Studies at the University of Ulster, Magee and ***Rose McGrath, EU Research Co-ordinator, Mainstreaming Social Inclusion Project, Combat Poverty Agency, Dublin, Ireland***

The presentation provided a context for poverty proofing in Ireland, beginning with the launch of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy in April 1997. In July 1998 poverty proofing was introduced in Irish government departments and in 2000-2001 there was a review of the poverty-proofing process. Poverty proofing is:

...the process by which government departments, local authorities and state agencies assess policies and programmes at design and review stages in relation to the likely impact they will have or have had on poverty and on inequalities likely to lead to poverty with a view to poverty reduction⁸

In terms of the objective of the poverty-proofing process, the explicit objective was that poverty impact assessment would be mandated on 'self-contained proposals' and 'large integrated projects' such as the Budget and the National Development Plan. It was also envisaged that poverty proofing would change the policy formation process through ensuring that there would be assessment of policy for its impact on poverty and thus would become part of the policy formation ethos. It was decided that poverty proofing would be undertaken by officials who develop policy proposals. The alternative of a dedicated unit was rejected in view of the objective of institutionalising policy proofing in the mainstream policy formation process.

⁷ It was noted that there was a need to add low birth weight and social unrest indicators to the Noble index.

⁸ National Anti-Poverty Strategy Unit (1999), 'Guidelines for the Implementation of Poverty Proofing Procedures'

In the poverty-proofing process there are specific questions relating to poverty:

- Does the proposal/policy ...
 1. help to prevent people falling into poverty?
 2. reduce the level (in terms of numbers and depth) of poverty?
 3. ameliorate the effects of poverty?
 4. have no effect on poverty?
 5. increase poverty?
 6. contribute to the achievement of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy targets?
 7. address the inequalities that might lead to poverty?
 8. reach the target group(s)?
- What is the rationale and basis of the assessment behind each of these replies?

The NESC conducted a review of poverty proofing which was published in 2001. The approach of the review was to undertake documentary research, and conduct interviews with civil servants and representatives of the community and voluntary sector. The emphasis was on identifying the constraints on the achievement of objectives of poverty proofing and on how the process might be improved to achieve effective poverty impact assessment.

The review found that, looking at poverty proofing of 'self-contained' proposals, there was a high level of compliance at a formal level with the requirement that significant proposals to cabinet be poverty proofed. However, this did not indicate rigorous poverty impact assessment. Usually it was presented in terms of a qualitative rationale for the action taken. None of the interviewees identified a change in policy proposals as a result of proofing and so it could not be said to have had an impact on resource allocation or application.

The review also highlighted some key issues to be addressed in terms of resources and training, data deficiencies and requirements, institutional mechanisms and structural supports, guidelines and questions over the level of impact assessment. It noted the importance of the definition of poverty and its operationalisation in a way that was useable by officials carrying out poverty proofing. Other issues were the need for transparency, institutional supports, screening and integrated proofing and the extension of poverty proofing.

The presentation added information to this workshop from: (1) the interviews conducted with senior Irish government officials as part of the Mainstreaming Social Inclusion Project; and 2) the Poverty and Inequality Report produced in June 2003 by the Combat Poverty Agency.

The interviews with government officials found that poverty proofing in the Irish context was not about redirecting resources and was not about replacing

government decision-making in the allocation of resources. A need was also identified for the customisation of poverty proofing within specific departments; the guidelines were perceived to be too general. The fact that there were a number of different types of proofing (rural, environment, gender and poverty) was also identified as an issue, as was the consequent need to align them. Training could be from existing training budgets, but there was an identified need for courses and materials. Additionally there was an identified need for monitoring and the better use of the expertise of the Office of Social Inclusion.

The Poverty and Inequality Report was based on the question contained in the Poverty Proofing Guidelines, of inequalities that might lead to poverty. It was found that the application of the question was proving difficult because of limited awareness of the links between inequality and poverty and the implications of inequality and equality for particular poverty areas.

Workshop Conclusions

The main point brought back from the workshop to the Plenary was that while poverty proofing was valued and welcomed, a number of weaknesses exist, including the definition of poverty, and the guidelines themselves. There was also an acknowledgement that the application of poverty proofing needs to be improved and strengthened in a number of areas, in particular:

- Greater senior official support for it
- Training (in-house training for trainers)
- Customising poverty proofing to a broad range of areas (poverty proofing is not the same in all areas as demands on officials will be different)
- Assessment of the extent to which policies/programmes are making a difference.
- Consultation with people affected by these policies/programmes
- Work with people in communities around poverty proofing. Examples include the Ballymun Tenant Training Initiative, involved in establishing a local management committee representing different community groups. The initiative devised a joint training programme on local tenant participation in designing their own areas. Training should be targeted on participants from local areas and statutory agencies (for example the Gardaí and health boards).

Another principal topic of discussion in the workshop was whether poverty proofing is a useful approach in other national, regional or local contexts. There was agreement around the table that it was. The group discussed poverty proofing in Northern Ireland in particular (regional) and acknowledged that poverty proofing can have an impact on some levels, but that there was limited capacity for it to influence major policy commitments, such as tax policy and education benefit because these are set at national level. This represents a constraint for mainstreaming a poverty-proofing approach. However, there was a positive in the Northern Ireland dimension where there is strong equality legislation that ensures different groups are taken into account in relation to the impact that particular policies have on them.

In terms of aspects to be further progressed, the group discussed the value of placing poverty proofing on a legislative basis. The French experience was referred to in particular here and the fact that they have put poverty and social exclusion on a legislative basis. The group discussed what contribution this could make. The jury is still out on this but perhaps the issue could be explored further in the context of this project.

Mainstreaming must be comprehensive, based on consensus, and thereby able to generate 'buy in' from officials undertaking it.

PORTUGAL

Local Partnership to Combat Poverty and Social Exclusion - Local Social Network Programme in Portugal. Gisela Matos, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Social Security and Solidarity, Lisbon, Portugal

The programme is focused on the development of partnership structures and the promotion of local and social development through the introduction of participation in strategic planning. The fundamental principles of the programme are integration, co-ordination, subsidiarity, innovation, and participation.

The purposes of the programme are:

- To achieve participation in the planning process
- To promote co-ordinated interventions at municipality and parish levels
- To search for solutions to the problems/ needs of families and individuals through mainstreaming poverty and social exclusion
- To promote proper coverage of services and equipment in council areas
- To promote and disseminate knowledge and information about every-day realities in municipalities.

The social network operates in practice as follows. Partnership structures work at two levels:

- (1) The Local Social Action Committee (CLAS), at a municipality level
- (2) The Social Parish Council (CSF) or Inter-Parish Social Council (CSIF), at a parish level.

The programme began in 2000 and, in June 2003, had 176 municipalities in the social network.

Local Social Action Committees (CLASs) and the Social Parish Councils (CSFs) are partnerships cutting across all sectors of social intervention. They define their intervention priorities in relation to services and new equipment applications to national and international programmes. The successive introduction of participatory strategic planning processes ensure that appropriate conditions are in place to enable different actors to articulate their outputs, resources and needs. The social network also gives direction to local

development interventions, enabling them to overcome traditional sectoral interests.

Social needs analysis (known as a social diagnosis) is the first stage of the strategic planning process. It has a twofold purpose:

- It contributes to a wider, geographically based knowledge and understanding of poverty and social exclusion
- It can be used as a source of information for future NAPs Inclusions that, in their turn, will produce guidance (goals, measures and programmes) for local social development plans. Social diagnosis also increases the participation and mobilisation of social intervention programmes and of people accessing these services.

Workshop Conclusions

The discussion in this workshop on local social networks was focused on a definition of mainstreaming and what it relates to. It was felt that the Seminar sensitised the participants to the idea of mainstreaming. This was described as intense interaction between and across institutions, resulting in a change in practice and policy to focus on poverty and social inclusion. It was noted that there was a need for strong links between national and local level in order to make change possible. Local partnership was seen as creating the conditions to enable mainstreaming to happen at the local and national level.

However, it was felt that there needs to be commitment at the highest political level and a willingness to listen to, and act on, what is happening locally. It was also felt that partnership at local level does not simply 'happen'. It must be supported with finance, technical aid and strategic planning. Mobilising communities is a slow process that takes time and resources.

FRANCE

***Les Programmes Regionaux d'accès a la Prevention (PRAPS)
Health Networks in France. Dr Pierre Larcher, Official Representative with
responsibility for Health, Jeopardy and Networking Systems, General
Directorate for Social Action***

Regional programmes regulating access to prevention and care were created through enactment of the 1998 legislation termed *Lutte contre les exclusions* (Anti-exclusion act). The first PRAPS were set up in 1999 and were scheduled to run until 2002. The second generation of PRAPS are currently underway from 2003 to 2006. The aim of these programmes is to reduce inequalities in the provision of health care and promote access to assistance services on the part of the less affluent through the intervention of regional bodies.

PRAPS aims at facilitating the mobilisation and co-ordination of the various factors involved in health care. Consequently, the programmes define:

- Co-ordinated actions of prevention and health education, care, reinsertion and follow-up undertaken by the departments on a yearly basis
- The conditions under which the services of the state, territorial communities, social security bodies, regional hospitalisation agencies, insurance schemes, associations and nursing homes will participate in the implementation of prevention programmes
- Undertakings designed to combat pathological conditions worsened by insecurity or social exclusion.

The network results in the mobilisation of three groups:

Firstly, the Regional Programming Committee is chaired by the regional prefect and is made up of the local social work department, the rectorate, the regional hospitalisation agency, the regional council, the general council and that of the communes, the regional union of health insurance funds, the Social Action Fund and certain highly qualified persons. This Committee provides guidance for the PRAPS, confirms their envisaged operations and the proposed objectives of the Regional Technical Group, promotes concerted actions and the follow-up to these, and evaluates the multi-year programmes of the *Conférence Régionale de la Santé* (Regional Health Conference).

The second group is the Regional Technical Group which works out a synthesis of the region's requirements. They commence with an analysis of the more immediate needs and then submit to the Regional Programming Committee the goals to be established and a plan of action for their achievement; the group also provides technical advice and support for those participating in the drawing up of the PRAPS.

Thirdly, there are the Departmental Work Groups. These consist of General Council representatives, local health insurance bodies, institutions providing public hospital services, CCAS (*Centre Communal d'Action Social* – Communal Centre for Social Action), associations, municipal policy makers and representatives of local health networks. They work together in drawing up a departmental programme for access to prevention and care services in integration of the departmental analysis of existing needs and regional and departmental objectives.

By locating their interventions upstream (easier access to rights and care facilities, better health care education), PRAPS aim at forestalling the development of situations likely to generate serious health problems. This is especially relevant for people experiencing poverty who are unable to avail of assistance facilities. It also results in restricting social inequalities in the health care area.

An evaluation of the first phase of PRAPS is currently underway. While result indicators cannot show the impact of PRAPS on the health conditions of those experiencing poverty, there is positive evidence in the following:

- The mobilisation of approximately 10,000 people to participate in over 1,500 projects

- Significant evidence of cross-boundary working arrangements across state departments, territorial communities, hospital staff, NGOs, and people experiencing poverty
- Increased promotion of health education
- The creation of intermediate areas for the assistance of severely underprivileged persons, e.g. consultation centres and reception centres in hospitals
- The upgrading of relations between mental health facilities and social workers.

Workshop Conclusions

The key learning from this workshop was that there is a rights-based approach to health in France. This involves bringing people who have fallen through the social net back into the mainstream and also impacts on the 'mainstreaming of policy and practice'. This is supported by legislation combating social exclusion that validates the role of PRAPS in implementing health policy.

Mainstreaming requires sustained commitment as real change happens over a long time. It requires political commitment, resources and commitment to engaging with people experiencing poverty. There is also a need for support instruments in terms of training, evaluation, communication and co-ordination.

There should be continuous evaluation by all actors to assess mainstreaming so as to determine what kind of difference it makes and what is the best way to engage with people. Mainstreaming is all about attitude-change, contextual change and a more generalised 'paradigm shift'. Integrated approaches at regional level need both top-down connections and bottom-up connections and mechanisms to filter and circulate information up, down, and between players. It was also felt that mainstreaming is not just a 'project'; it is also a necessity if we are to recognise the complexity of people's lives so that the system respects the dignity of people. Health and poverty proofing might also need to be integrated.

Official Reception by Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council

This was an opportunity to meet councillors and officials from this council to get an insight into their work on poverty and social inclusion. Councillor Donal Marren, Chairperson of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council welcomed seminar participants to the county, especially the Transnational Partners and their delegates. Councillor Marren explained that on first appearances the County of Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown was affluent. However, there are pockets of severe disadvantage in the area and, through the work of the council's social inclusion unit in co-operation with other services in the area, a strategy was being implemented to address key needs.

Helen Johnston, Director of the Combat Poverty Agency, thanked Councillor Marren, councillors and officials for the warm welcome to Dún Laoghaire. She

welcomed the opportunity for participants to hear first hand the work of the council in tackling poverty and social exclusion. She went on to say that there was close co-operation with the council and in particular the social inclusion unit through collective work in the Local Government Anti-Poverty Learning Network. Combat Poverty Agency runs the Anti-Poverty Learning Network which is a support resource for local authorities.

Day Two Morning Session

Next Steps ... Phase II

*Pádraig Carmody,
Combat Poverty Agency, Dublin, Ireland*

Transitional Exchange Programmes (TEPs) are being implemented in two Phases: an initial preparatory phase of 9 months followed by a main phase of up to 2 years. This second phase will build on the work of Phase I which is to be completed in August 2003. In the case of this Project the work from Phase I is to be produced in a research report. Applications for Phase II have to be submitted by 20 June 2003 and therefore the seminar offered an opportunity for delegates to inform the Project on the direction of the work for the next Phase.

Mr Carmody set out five broad sets of possible activities that the Partnership had identified. These were:

- Research
- Transnational exchange
- The development of evaluation systems
- The production of training materials
- Pilot projects.

Research

Based on the work to date, a number of possible strands of research were floated for consideration. These were:

- A further examination of mechanisms and approaches to mainstreaming (including a partner from one of the accession countries)
- Ex-post impact assessment to examine whether or not mainstreaming is making a difference
- Process assessment to examine how mainstreaming is impacting on institutional cultures.

Transnational Exchange

The suggestions in terms of transnational exchange were:

- Sponsoring exchange of personnel between offices responsible for developing the NAPs Inclusion
- Promoting a 'learning network' among national offices for social inclusion.

Evaluation Systems

It was felt there was a need for more rigorous evaluation systems. Some possible methods of ex-ante assessment are poverty proofing and social cost/benefit analysis. Ex-post techniques would also need to be developed to examine outputs and outcomes.

Production of Training Material

A suggestion was a handbook on 'how to mainstream' and training material on particular techniques such as social inclusion, poverty proofing, top slicing and legislative approaches.

Pilot Projects

Pilot projects could also be run on transferring techniques such as poverty proofing.

PHASE II Discussion Groups

The seminar then dispersed into discussion groups based on the jurisdiction of members, in order to discuss priorities for Phase II.

FRANCE

The group presented a summary of its discussions as follows: Mainstreaming should be both vertical and horizontal. A legislative framework and political will are central to its implementation. Developing a mainstreaming approach requires a consciousness of its impact on the most vulnerable. Mainstreaming needs to be co-ordinated and monitored and be allocated a specific budget.

Some difficulties identified in implementing mainstreaming at the national level included the fact that key policies are made at the European level by institutions such as the European Central Bank, where poverty and social exclusion are not priorities.

Mainstreaming social inclusion has an impact on people experiencing poverty in Europe, but what about those in the rest of the world? People are the targets at the end of the day – they have needs that have to be taken into account.

The group felt that the priorities were to:

- (1) Further clarify the concept
- (2) Explain and refine the definition to enable its application by other countries.

It was felt that elected representatives should be included in training that would build awareness about mainstreaming. In terms of additional partners for Phase II it was noted that Denmark and Sweden practise poverty proofing; their inclusion would provide for comparative possibilities.

IRELAND I

Given the smaller number of Northern Ireland delegates⁹ and the relatively large number from Ireland, it was decided that the former should join the latter and then split into two similar sized groups.

⁹ Some of the delegates were unable to attend the Seminar for the second day

The technical, political and administrative dimensions to mainstreaming were noted along with the need for national and local foci and the need to develop links between them and within the NAPs Inclusion.

- Organised transnational study-visits were not felt to be feasible generally but could be facilitated on an individual basis, according to need
- There was support for the idea of developing impact assessment systems, particularly to assess impacts of mainstreaming on people living in poverty. The need to improve existing systems was also noted, along with the idea of the development of a toolkit or manual
- In Phase II, in the Irish context, there might be a role for a co-ordinating group of social partners, possibly to capitalise on the role of the National Economic and Social Forum or the existence of the Social Inclusion Consultative Forum.
- Training on mainstreaming should be incorporated (mainstreamed) into existing training provision and people in poverty should be involved in developing the training. Participative democratic methods such as Community Audits and Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPA) as in Uganda¹⁰ should be explored.
- The focus of our collective effort should be on economic ministries, supporting them to poverty proof but not only that. An additional possible focus would be on local authorities and the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government.

Ireland 2

The group noted the benefits of mainstreaming as follows:

- Advances social inclusion provided there is leadership and political commitment
- Projects poverty and exclusion issues into the culture of organisations
- Sensitises officials and addresses the potential for filtering awareness upwards in organisations
- Ensures that responsibility for poverty issues is shared
- Enhances the capacity to lever budgets in favour of tackling poverty (as has been the case with competitiveness)
- Ensure it complements (rather than competes with) targeted approaches. The optimum is possibly a targeted approach within a mainstreamed environment.

The group then noted some of the challenges of mainstreaming:

-

¹⁰ This programme set up in 1998 aims to bring the voices of people in poverty into the planning process. The tools of the PPA are: mapping, transect walks, livelihood/survival strategies, wealth rankings, trend analysis, ranking, gender tools.

- It can be an excuse to do nothing – a formal process is undertaken at a surface level but there is no real change
- It is difficult to measure change and difficult to tie actions and outcomes
- It could lead to a loss of focus. Poverty and social exclusion can become an issue targeted on day-to-day work rather than being an integral element
- It is a long-term approach and not necessarily a quick fix, so it is more difficult to secure support, particularly from politicians
- It can be remote from the lived experience of people in poverty. The language and jargon around ‘mainstreaming’ itself can be exclusionary
- It is vital that there is a linkage with resources – ‘social cost-benefit analysis’ – and it also must be backed up with indicators/data/analysis skills/training
- It can be difficult to get government departments to look beyond their own area of focus so as to achieve ‘joined-up working’, shared ownership and shared credit, and to overcome institutional boundaries and rivalries
- Potential exists for ‘backward mainstreaming’, in other words, the same structures that allow for positive outcomes can equally facilitate negative outcomes
- Mainstreaming is weaker in the absence of a legislative (rights) base.

In terms of future priorities for Phase II the group felt that:

- While interesting of itself, a pure research project exploring the conceptual framework for mainstreaming would not ultimately be of great value
- There may however be scope for drawing on the positive outcomes from the experience of gender mainstreaming
- A critical area centres on evaluation systems and the best means of undertaking impact assessments. It is possible to envisage a range of actions that could include focused study visits, pilot projects, production of training materials and handbooks, etc. The use of qualitative as well as quantitative data would be a means of ensuring the involvement of people experiencing poverty and exclusion. There is a need to demonstrate impact assessment
- A learning network (involving officials dealing with NAPs Inclusion) would be an unwieldy structure and the project is at too early a stage for such a development
- As regards transnational exchanges, the emphasis should be placed clearly on practical and very focused ‘study-visits’.

Portugal

The group summarised its discussion as follows:

- The multi-dimensionality of poverty should be taken into account when developing the tools and techniques to mainstream
- There is a need for streamlining in order to ensure coherence

- Mainstreaming applied across sectors should aim to increase efficiency and the involvement of different actors increases visibility and empowerment
- Getting people around the table however, is difficult
- The lack of evaluation systems makes it difficult to assess costs and there is also a lack of specific budgets
- Priorities should be:
 - Consistent evaluation systems that assess outcomes and are adapted to specific needs in order to determine the impact of mainstreaming on reducing poverty
 - An observatory of good practice on mainstreaming that would bring together all future options and directions.

Reaching a Common Understanding on the Key Features of Mainstreaming

Following extensive discussion, an agreement emerged on what constitutes a shared vision of mainstreaming. This allowed the project to move forward from case study analysis towards identifying the key features of mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming was viewed as a long-term approach that requires resources, time and will. It is an approach that may not only have the potential to improve efficiency of policy making but also produce positive outcomes for people experiencing poverty. However, at the moment mainstreaming is a rather neutral concept and this project must explore its limits and its feasibility with respect to achieving real outcomes for people experiencing poverty.

There was broad agreement that the ingredients of mainstreaming social inclusion are as follows:

- (1) Participation of people and NGOs in policy making and review. There is a need for resources to develop greater empowerment of people. There is also a need for techniques such as participatory poverty assessment and greater consistency and autonomy in resource funding to allow NGOs to develop their work. This project has the potential to further develop the participation of people. However, it must not try and 'reinvent the wheel'. It should look at what exists already and how more creative and proactive use can be made of existing resources and organisations on the ground
- (2) Evaluation/assessment tools and techniques in order to see if mainstreaming can bring about positive change for people and greater efficiency in policy making
- (3) Training on poverty awareness and on poverty impact assessment
- (4) Reliable data on poverty and social exclusion

- (5) Targeted measures (specific actions) in conjunction with mainstreaming measures. Targeted measures need to fit within a mainstreaming environment – they are complementary. However, a mainstream environment does not automatically allow for specific actions. These are likely to be developed tangentially unless there is political will and intervention. Therefore information from targeted measures needs to flow through the mainstreaming structures and vice versa in order to increase knowledge.

Phase I was only the beginning of the research work on mainstreaming and there was a need for continued applied action research on mainstreaming, in particular to assess if it is likely to bring about greater equity and efficiency in policy making and in policies in general. This possibly could lead to greater outputs and outcomes for people experiencing poverty while using fewer resources. The extent to which mainstreaming may have a neutral impact on macroeconomic variables such as inflation and interest rates should also be investigated in further research.

The plenary group discussion included the possible development of a learning network at the transnational level that over time might lead to an observatory on mainstreaming. This learning network would provide a forum for exchange on assessment techniques and participation methods. However, some of the group felt that this was a more long-term development which might be feasible after there has been substantial learning and experience of mainstreaming.

The proposition was made that Phase I work on this project could constitute material for a Communication from the Commission on mainstreaming social inclusion.

The group also discussed some of the operational issues relating to the work for Phase II:

- In Phase II, particular partners should lead on issues in which they and/or their country/region may have particular experience or interest, e.g. the further development of poverty proofing in Ireland. However, there should be scope for transnational working arrangements on certain areas too, e.g. the development of transnational evaluation systems through clusters of partners such as local government in Portugal and Ireland
- The production of training materials should include case studies on how to develop training materials in relation to mainstreaming
- Evaluation systems should be developed and piloted, and followed up by study visits. There are Equality Commission guidelines on how to do this in Northern Ireland
- Mainstreaming has the potential through this project to begin to develop national and transnational dimensions that could then feed into the NAPs Inclusion process. For example, the Northern Ireland EAPN participated in a group in the UK which then fed into development of NAPs Inclusion.

A strong theme in the discussion was that political will and action must drive mainstreaming. It is a new and pro-active approach to fighting poverty. In the words of one French delegate, 'in reality mainstreaming is the opposite to the trickle-down theory that all will benefit from economic growth. This is a naïve opinion gaining hold in Europe. We do not believe in the optimism of the trickle-down theory and that we why we need mainstreaming.'

Day Two Afternoon Session

Mainstreaming Social Inclusion – Strategies for Effective Implementation

Gerard Walker,

Social Policy Analyst, National Economic and Social Forum, Dublin, Ireland

At a national level, social partnership has brought policy making into a more public forum and has created increased pressure for accountability and measurement of the success of national programmes. This provides an important context for building consensus on social exclusion and inequality. It also is important in gaining agreement on the mainstreaming of social inclusion policies.

Best practice models of regional and local governance featuring a strong involvement of social partners and the mobilisation of all relevant actors can enhance the outcomes of labour market and social inclusion measures.

At a national level there is a need to jointly consider social inclusion policies within the NAPS Inclusion and the National Employment Action Plan to get a clearer picture of the impact on the individual at the local level. National Employment Action Plans will now cover a three year period, over which time they will be monitored and evaluated.

The EU TEP projects provide challenges in relation to mainstreaming all the learning gained through the projects. There is a need for three-way linkages: between projects themselves; between the projects and national bodies who have responsibility for formulating and implementing policies; and between the projects and the EU. It is important that all social inclusion projects have a strong communication and promotion component built into them; also that the EU and national bodies provide opportunities for dissemination of the learning.

The availability of relevant and accurate data to benchmark and measure the outcomes of social inclusion measures is a key issue. Policy makers must have access to reliable data that not only cover their own specific policy area but also inter-related areas. This is important:

- As a means of monitoring and evaluating the NAPs Inclusion and to measure the progress of mainstreaming social inclusion
- To enable greater evidence-based policy making and accountability in decisions regarding the determination and delivery of public services.

The eighteen common social inclusion indicators agreed at the EU level will lead to a greater focus on improving data collection and generation and will facilitate comparison across countries. National indicators could also complement the common EU social inclusion indicators. These may include

measuring the mainstreaming experience of different groups, as the same outcomes may not be relevant to all.

In Ireland, the Report of the Steering Group on Social and Equality Statistics, National Statistics Board, 'Developing Social and Equality Statistics to meet policy needs', highlights the importance of concentrating on indicators based on social outcomes. These allow judgements to be made on the extent and nature of social progress – rather than on programme social outcomes and indicators relating to specific policy interventions that, while essential for policy evaluation, will not in themselves capture the dimensions of social change. The Central Statistics Office in Ireland has been asked to develop a comprehensive set of indicators that portray how Irish society is evolving and how social and economic policy is influencing these changes.

The training of staff within government departments to carry out poverty proofing has been identified as a key need. It is important to build up this capacity at national, regional and local levels. Improved poverty proofing will help to build up a consensus at the political level and is an important aid to good decision making. Consideration needs to be given to complexity and important policies being poverty proofed. The use of programmable assessment methods would greatly improve capability especially where the issue is complex and where other decisions may impact in a different way.

Cross-departmental approaches are essential to develop policies that address social exclusion and inequality and ensure the successful mainstreaming of social inclusion measures. Problems of social inclusion and inequality need to be addressed in a coherent way to ensure that the totality of the problem is considered and the most appropriate response delivered. There is a need to avoid a fragmented approach to tackling issues of social inclusion. Instead, as has been increasingly the case under the National Anti-Poverty Strategy, there is a need to provide a co-ordinated approach to tackling such problems.

Mainstreaming of social inclusion goes hand in hand with the modernisation of public services that ensure access to a consistently high quality of service provision. It is important that the quality of services is benchmarked and that mechanisms are in place at the local and regional levels which highlight areas of poor or inconsistent service and effect improvements.

*Fintan Farrell,
Director, European Anti-poverty Network, Brussels, Belgium*

EAPN's understanding of mainstreaming social inclusion is as follows:

- At a political level, mainstreaming attempts to address the failures of this dominant model¹¹ by aiming to correct its negative impacts, while also trying to shift towards a more sustainable model
- The mainstreaming concept works easier for an Anglo-Irish model than in other countries where economic and social policy is developed in a more connected way, at least in theory
- At the political level mainstreaming itself can be a little bit of a neutral tool and a lot can depend on the will behind it
- No matter what level of government, the challenges and struggles are very much the same
- It is important that the autonomy of NGOs is protected
- Mainstreaming at an EU level is not as developed as gender mainstreaming. There is a lot to learn and this needs to be developed further in Phase II of this Project.

The recent EU Communication on Streamlining has two objectives:

- (1) To strengthen the social dimension of the Lisbon Strategy by ensuring that there is better balance in policy formation between the social cohesion dimension and economic competitiveness and employment
- (2) To create an integrated framework for co-operation on the social protection areas which are currently the subject of an open method of co-ordination.

By 2005 the NAPs Inclusion process will be replaced by a report on social protection. It is regrettable that the process is now changing just as important players like local authorities, regional authorities and other actors are beginning to understand the NAPs Inclusion process.

The following is an assessment of how key features developed in the research on mainstreaming might apply at EU level:

The first theme is: *bringing people into the mainstream*. At the European level there are some interesting examples of efforts to bring the voice of people

¹¹ This model promotes economic growth and implies that all in society will benefit through the trickle down of economic growth. This model has not delivered in terms of gender, the environment, poverty and inequality.

experiencing poverty and exclusion into the mainstream of policy making and policy discussion, e.g.

- An enabling clause was included in the last revision of the guidelines on the structural funds. This allowed voices of NGOs to be heard at the monitoring of structural funds at a national level
- Objective Four of the Objectives underpinning the NAPs Inclusion process calls for the mobilisation of all actors
- Both the Belgium and Greek presidency of the EU sponsored major conferences on the participation of those experiencing poverty and they worked in partnership with EAPN
- The Convention on the future of Europe does recognise the role of participatory democracy and specifically recognises the role for 'representative associations and civil society'. The autonomy of social partners is respected. However, this is not extended to civil society actors.

Streamlining has the potential to mollify some of these gains; there is a danger that it will become a much more administrative mechanism and not one that involves all the actors, as currently pertains.

With respect to the second theme, *the mainstreaming of innovation and learning*, there has been progress at EU level, e.g.

- EU Poverty Programmes: These have influenced the thinking about poverty today, through the development of concepts such as multi-dimensionality, partnerships, participation. These have been mainstreamed into more general thinking on poverty and social exclusion
- EU Community Initiatives: These look at areas of poverty and social exclusion and try to mainstream any resulting good practice into national programmes and national delivery
- Local Social Capital (LSC): EAPN have fought very hard to have LSC included in the revised guidelines on structural funds, allowing structural funds to be more accessible to smaller actors and players. This is especially problematic now as budgets are very large and it is not feasible for smaller organisations to take part. LSC allows the smaller actors to take part in structural funds
- Peer review within the NAPs Inclusion has begun to allow for innovation and learning to be discussed and disseminated across different countries. For example, there will be 8 peer reviews in 2004. The EU must continue to bring in funding at levels that can include new actors who can bring innovation into this system

The third theme is *strategic mainstreaming*: There has been some progress in mainstreaming the issue of social inclusion at the European level. Stronger

emphasis on social inclusion in the revised employment guidelines is a very important development.

The EU Social Inclusion Strategy, the NAPs Inclusion, is a strategic effort in mainstreaming the fight against poverty and exclusion across the EU.

Progress in terms of strategic mainstreaming depends very much on the maintenance of a distinct EU Social Inclusion Strategy. This would result in a Spring Council producing a streamlining policy that safeguards social outcomes and an EU Constitution that reflects social inclusion in its values, objectives, competencies and policies.

*Prionsias De Rossa,
Member of European Parliament, Dublin*

The European Convention has a significant role in the development of a European Constitution. The Convention is important to the achievement of the totality¹² of the Lisbon Goal because it is a political process being carried out by parliamentarians from 28 states.

The Convention simplifies the EU treaties and effectively produces a constitutional document which sets out the values, objectives, the institutions and their competencies as well as how the resources of the EU will be acquired and spent. Also the Constitution will set out the role of the national and European parliaments.

Although significant progress has been made in recent years on the social policy front in the EU there is still considerable resistance in conceding competency in the social policy area at the Convention and in the Constitution.

The Constitution sets out the EU's values and objectives that cover the social, economic, cultural and environmental areas. It aims to set the framework for a Europe based on balanced economic growth with a social market economy aiming at full employment and social progress. It shall combat social exclusion and promote social justice and protection, equality between men and women, solidarity between generations and protection of children's rights. It shall promote economic, social and territorial cohesion, and solidarity among member states. It does not specially mention poverty except in the context of developing countries. These values and objectives are stronger than what currently exists in the treaties. However, there is limited competency given to European Institutions in the social policy area and hence they have limited power and resources to ensure that such values and objectives are adhered to. Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) needs to be extended to the social policy decision-making area as it is impossible to get unanimity in a 28 member state Union.

¹² This is the most competitive and socially cohesive economy in the world that not only delivers employment but high quality employment

With respect to the Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC) there is a movement to have a horizontal/generic clause outlining what OMC consists of and it is felt that it should include the European Parliament and national parliaments in its operation. When it is in use there needs to be full transparency and accountability.

The other important area is the current proposal for sectoral councils. There will definitely be an ECOfin, a Foreign Affairs committee and an EPN council and a general affairs committee. There is no reference to a council for employment and social affairs. It is essential to have a council to help drive the social and employment policy agenda. It may be achieved if it includes competition in the same council. There is a need for councils which work on the core objectives of the Union, i.e. is economic, social, environmental and development.

In all activities within its competencies, the European Union aims to eliminate inequalities and promote equality.

Plenary Discussion – Day Two Afternoon Session

There was some discussion on where the debate is at the moment on social rights in Europe. Is there a possibility that social and economic rights of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights will be recognised as rights which are justiciable and that the Charter of Social Rights will be integrated in the future European Constitution and will not only be an ideal of the convention.

Mr De Rossa pointed out that the Charter of Fundamental Rights was incorporated into Part 2 of the Constitution. It states that

The Union shall recognise the rights freedoms and principles set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights set out which constitutes part 2 of the Constitution. It also provides – we shall seek accession to the European Convention for the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

These rights should be justiciable at European level. Articles in the charter explain what these rights mean. Britain and Ireland and others argue these explanations should be incorporated at the very least as a declaration. But disagreement exists there because the European Commission could interpret rights as being confined by those explanations.

EAPN and the civil society perspective acknowledged that the Convention was a superior method of delivering the Constitution as opposed to an intergovernmental conference. More general engagement with civil society could have been achieved as the media only became involved at the latter stages. The wider debate has been fairly strong. Representatives of citizens are therefore more conscious of the need to reflect citizens' views in the process. That is not the case in an Intergovernmental conference. In the latter case, negotiations are done by high level civil servants, and politicians are

involved only at the end. At the Convention there is both a civil society forum and social policy group.

Concluding Remarks

Helen Johnston, Director of the Combat Poverty Agency and Rose McGrath, Mainstreaming Research Co-ordinator, made a number of concluding remarks and thanked everyone for their attendance, presentations and general contributions. They outlined that there was a consensus that the seminar was a success and had developed the concept of mainstreaming social inclusion well beyond that of the research findings. The seminar must be regarded as a critical juncture in the overall project as it, firstly, contributed to the conceptual development of a common understanding of mainstreaming – which led to the achievement of the aim of Phase I – and secondly, it provided direction on where the work should progress in Phase II.

Appendix One: Presenters

Plenary Presenters

Raymond Pierre Bodin

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Director of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions since 2000, Raymond-Pierre Bodin is also chair of the National Agency for Employment (Agence Nationale pour l'Emploi) in France, a member of the board of the Centre for Employment Studies (Centre d'Études et de l'Emploi) in France and an international expert at the International Labour Office. Mr. Bodin previously worked in the private sector where he was the managing director of a plastics company; as an academic as Professor of social psychology and as a public servant at the French Ministry of Labour.

Sadly, Mr Bodin passed away in July 2003.

Pádraig Carmody

Combat Poverty Agency, Ireland

Padraig Carmody was Policy and Research Analyst with the Combat Poverty Agency until September 2003. Prior to that he was Assistant Professor at the University of Vermont. He is currently a lecturer in geography at St. Patrick's College, Drumcondra, Dublin. His PhD is from the University of Minnesota, US. His research interests centre on the political economy of globalisation in Southern Africa.

Fintan Farrell

European Anti-Poverty Network

Fintan Farrell was a founder member and first Co-ordinator of the Irish Traveller Movement. The Irish Traveller Movement is a national network, of over 80 local organisations, that campaign for the achievement of human rights for all Travellers. He also served on the Board of the Combat Poverty Agency and the National Advisory Committee on Racism and Interculturalism. He was a member of the negotiation team for the Community and Voluntary Sector in their capacity as one of the four pillars of social partnership. He has been active in EAPN since its foundation and recently was appointed Director of that organisation. He is also a member of the Management Committee of the Platform of European Social NGOs.

Helen Johnston

Combat Poverty Agency, Ireland

Prior to her current position as Director, Helen Johnston was Head of Research at Combat Poverty. She has been working with the Agency for 10 years, during which time she has been centrally involved in the development and evaluation of Ireland's National Anti-Poverty Strategy. She has also led an EU-funded project, 'Involving excluded people and the organisations which

represent them in the development, implementation and evaluation of anti-poverty strategies’.

Camille Loftus

WRC Social and Economic Consultants, Ireland

Camille Loftus has worked with the Irish National Organisation of the Unemployed (INOUE) as welfare rights advocate specialising in welfare-to-work transitions; also with Clúid Housing Association (formerly St Pancras). She was a member of a range of social partnership fora engaging with issues of social welfare and tax reform, labour market policy, and the National Anti-Poverty Strategy. She was an advocate for the Childcare 2000 Campaign, and was a member of the National Economic and Social Forum and of its project teams on Alleviating Labour Market Shortages and Lone Parents. Since 2001, she has been employed by the WRC Social Economic Consultants as a member of the team contracted by the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform to provide technical assistance and policy advice to the Equality for Women Measure of the National Development Plan.

Gisela Matos

Institute for Solidarity and Social Security, Portugal

Gisela Matos is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Solidarity and Social Security in Lisbon. She holds both undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications in the area of sociology. She has also researched widely in this area. Through her work at the Institute for Solidarity and Social Security she is involved in the areas of poverty and social exclusion and in particular the Portuguese NAP Inclusion. Previous to her current appointment, Gisela worked as an environmental researcher.

Rose McGrath

Combat Poverty Agency, Ireland

Rose McGrath is the Research Co-ordinator on this project, Mainstreaming Social Inclusion, Phase I. She has responsibility for the day-to-day co-ordination of the project as well as the partners’ research inputs. She had responsibility for the production of the draft research report and its presentation at the Seminar in June 2003. She has worked as an economist in the transport and economic consultancy sectors as well as in the public sector. She has particular interest and experience in the social housing and social inclusion areas and has worked in Ireland, the UK and Australia.

Gerard Walker

National Economic and Social Forum, Ireland

Gerard Walker is a Social Policy Analyst with the National Economic and Social Forum, which advises government in relation to policies dealing with equality and social exclusion. His role is to prepare evaluation reports on policy measures and programmes identified in the context of social partnership arrangements, especially those concerned with the achievement of equality and social inclusion; and the provision of secretariat and other support services for the Forum. He joined the National Economic and Social Forum in January 2003. Prior to this, he worked in FÁS – the Training and Employment Authority – where he was involved in labour market and public employment services policy issues at both a national and European level.

Proinsias De Rossa

Member of the European Parliament and Member of the Convention on Europe

Proinsias De Rossa is the elected representative to the European Parliament for the Dublin constituency. He has been active in European politics for many years and has held various positions such as Vice Chairman of the Regional Affairs Committee of the Parliament. He is a Member of the Employment and Social Affairs, the Foreign Affairs and the Petitions Committees in the European Parliament, as well as the Tobin Tax intergroup, and the Full Employment Association. He is Chair of the PES Working-Group on Public Services. He is also a Member of the Spinnelli Group which consists of Socialist Group Members promoting new forms of governance for the European Union based on the idea of a Federation of Nation States.

In Irish politics, he was leader of Democratic Left and then president of the Labour Party. He served as Minister for Social Welfare in the 'Rainbow' Government (Fine Gael/ Labour/Democratic Left) from 1994 to 1997, initiating a wide range of reforms, including the introduction of the country's first National Anti-Poverty Strategy. He also established the Commission of the Family and the National Pension Policy Initiative.

Workshop Presenters

Dr. Gerry Mulligan

Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Northern Ireland

Gerry Mulligan is the Head of Equality and Social Need Division. This is part of the Equality Directorate in the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister. He has responsibility for the Northern Ireland Executive's strategy for tackling poverty and social exclusion. This includes strategies to prevent exclusion on the basis of disability, age and race and to promote gender equality. He is responsible for the implementation of the statutory duties under equality provisions of the Northern Ireland (1998) Act, and compliance with human rights legislation and conventions.

Prior to taking on these policy responsibilities, he held a number of posts in the Northern Ireland public service. These include head of corporate services in the Statistics and Research Agency; head of Research and Statistics in the Northern Ireland Department of the Environment and in the Northern Ireland Office.

Stephen Donnelly

Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Northern Ireland

Stephen Donnelly is head of the Equality Research Branch where he has responsibility for three research programmes within the Department: equality, community relations and cross-departmental social research. He was formerly head of the Criminal Justice branch of the Statistics and Research Agency. He is a founding member of the Northern Ireland branch of the British Criminology Society. He also has experience of developing research, statistics and forecasting systems for the Social Security Agency. Following

devolution he established the Northern Ireland Assembly Research and Library Service and worked to provide the various Assembly Committees, Members of the Assembly and the Assembly Commission with a research and information service.

Dr Síle O'Connor

University of Ulster, Northern Ireland

Síle O'Connor is the Professor of Social Policy at the University of Ulster. Her particular interest and expertise is in the areas of comparative social policy research in OECD countries, EU social policy, cross-border studies, social inequality and citizenship and governance. She has been the Director of the National Economic and Social Council where *inter alia* she was responsible for the review of poverty proofing.

Pierre Larcher

Director of Health, Jeopardy and Networking Systems, Directorate General for Social Action, France

Pierre Larcher is a medical doctor and a specialist in public health. The following is a resume of his responsibilities: Research on the health of families experiencing poverty in Metz and Nancy from 1973 to 1983. General Medical Practitioner from 1977 to 1982. Director of the Regional Observatory of Health in Orléans from 1984 to 1989. Diplomat in Algeria (responsible for social and health co-operation) then in El Salvador (European programme on health in Central America) from 1989 to 1994. Responsible for the evaluation of public health and then for Health Networks at the Directorate General for Health from 1995 to 2000. In charge of the Mission for Health and Jeopardy and Networks at the Directorate Generale for Social Action since 2000.

Appendix 2 – Seminar Delegates

EAPN

Mr. Brian Carty	EAPN Ireland
Mr. Robin Hahn	EAPN Ireland
Mr. Fintan Farrell	Director of EAPN
Ms. Alexandra McMahon	EAPN Ireland
Mr. Fernando Pincheiro	EAPN Portugal
Mr. Antoine Sondag	EAPN France
Ms. Francis Dowds	EAPN Northern Ireland

France

Ms. Michele Chaussumier	Director, Department of Health and Social Affairs, Mayenne
Dr. Jacques Hassin	Advisor on Homeless, to the Minister of Social Affairs
Dr. Pierre Larcher	Official Representative with responsibility for Health, Jeopardy and Networking Systems, General Directorate for Social Action
Prof. Michel Legros	National School of Public Health and board member of the Observatory of Poverty and Social Exclusion
Dr. Pierre Micheletti	Town Doctor of Grenoble

Ireland

Ms. Anne Bride	Combat Poverty Agency
Mr. Pádraig Carmody	Combat Poverty Agency
Mr. Joe Cullen	Department of Finance
Ms. Angie Daly	Combat Poverty Agency
Mr. Prionsias De Rossa	Member of European Parliament
Ms. Lynda Fox	Dun Laoghaire / Rathdown County Council
Ms. Elaine Houlihan	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Helen Johnston	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Fidelma Joyce	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Camille Loftus	Equality for Women Measure
Mr. Gerry Mangan	Director of the Office for Social Inclusion, Ireland
Ms. Rose McGrath	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Maria Minguella	Cork City Council
Ms. Ann Moore	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Tracey O'Brien	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Marie O'Neill	Office of Social Inclusion, Ireland
Mr. Eoin Ó Seaghda	Office of Social Inclusion, Ireland
Mr. Seán Regan	Community Workers Co-op
Ms. Liz Sullivan	Combat Poverty Agency
Mr. Gerard Walker	National Economic and Social Forum
Mr Jim Walsh	Combat Poverty Agency
Ms. Barbara Walshe	Combat Poverty Agency

Northern Ireland

Mr. Stephen Donnelly	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister
Ms. Harriet Ferguson	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister
Mr. Paddy Hillyard	University of Ulster
Mr. Michael Mulholland	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister
Mr. Gerry Mulligan	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister
Ms. Síle O'Connor	University of Ulster

Portugal

Ms. Helena Areias	Social Worker, Zone Co-ordinator in the Braga Social Security Institute
Mr. Joao Paulo Fernandes	Social Worker, Social Action Department in Povoado Lanhoso Municipality
Ms. Alda Gonclaves	Institute of Solidarity and Social Security
Ms. Gisela Matos	Institute of Solidarity and Social Security
Ms. Andreia Soares	Social Worker, Social Action Department in Amares Municipality

European Foundation for the Improvement of Working and Living Conditions

Mr. Raymond-Pierre Bodin Director

APPENDIX 3: CONTACT DETAILS: PARTNERS & COMMISSION

Jurisdiction	Organisation	Address	Tel/Fax/Email
Europe	European Commission	Employment and Social Affairs DG, B-1049, Brussels, Belgium.	Tel: +32 2 296 02 31 Fax: +32 2 299 05 09
Europe	European Anti-Poverty Network	rue du Congres 37 41 Boite 2 B 1000 Brussels Belgium	Tel: + 32 2 230 4455 Fax: + 32 2 230 9733 Email: fintan.farrell@eapn.skyne.t.be
Portugal	Research Dept. Instituto de Solidariedade e Seguranca Social	Calçada Eng. Miguel Pais, 32 1249-119 Lisboa Portugal	Tel: + 351 21 318 490063 Fax:+ 351 21 318 490055 Email: Gisela.M.Matos@seg-social.pt
France	Ecole Nationale de la Sante Publique	Avenue du Professeur Leon Bernard CS 74312 35043 Rennes Cedex, France	Tel: + 33 2 99 022846 Mobile: +33 6 80 24 40 31 Fax: + 33 2 99 022623 Email: Mlegros@ensp.fr
Northern Ireland	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister	21 Castle Buildings Stormont Estate Belfast Northern Ireland	Tel: +44 28 90 522 048 Fax: +44 28 90 523328 Email: Gerry.mulligan@ofmdfm.gov.uk
Ireland	National Office for Social Inclusion Department of Social and Family Affairs	Aras Mhic Diarmada, Store St, Dublin 1 Ireland	Tel: + 353 1 7043031 Fax: + 353 1 7043032 Email: ecoin.oseaghda@welfare.ie
Gerard Walker	National Economic and Social Forum	16 Parnell Square (East) Dublin 1 Ireland	Tel: + 353 1 81 463 63 Fax: + 353 1 814 63 01 Email: Gerard@nesf.ie
Jim Walsh	Combat Poverty Agency	Bridgewater House Conyngham Road Islandbridge Dublin 8 Ireland	Tel: + 353 1 602 66 13 Email: info@cpa.ie

