



Sweden 2004

Matti Heikkilä

National Expert

**Local development
agreements as a tool
to stop segregation
in vulnerable
metropolitan areas**

Comment Paper, Finland





Part 1.

Spatial social segregation in big cities is so far a problem in Finland in a much smaller extent than e.g. in Sweden. This is due to two things – proportion of immigrants having their background outside Europe is still small (Russians being the biggest minority) and the dominant mode of public housing policy has been “social mixing”. But the problem is also here – especially in the Helsinki metropolitan region.

Hence the Swedish policy described in the paper is relevant also in Finland.

Part 2.

Transferability. Basically the Swedish policies and measures can be adapted also in Finland. We have same kind of legislation, administrative structures and welfare (state) culture.

Part 3.

3.1. I was personally a member of the European Foundation (Dublin) study group in the 1990s when we focused on “local partnerships” as a tool to fight social exclusion (referred in the Lukkarinen ´s paper on pp.17-18. One of the lessons from that project was that local partnerships could only in a very limited amount mobilise also social partners and entrepreneurs (firms) in countries having rather centralised and public welfare system, like in Scandinavia. The situation was quite different in e.g. Mediterranean countries.

3.2. The evaluation results available from the Swedish local agreements –policy are convincing. The 3-4 macro indicators used to assess the effectiveness are adequate.

3.3. The paper is for obvious reasons rather abstract and the reader is not able to see the actual content and variance of local projects and activities.

3.4. The role and meaning of the management by objectives remains somewhat unclear in this context.