

France 2006

Social Inclusion

cross cutting policy tools –

“Document de politique

transversale (DPT)”

Minutes

Peer Review Meeting
Paris, 29-30 June 2006



On behalf of
European Commission
DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities



Peer Review: Social Inclusion cross cutting policy tools – “Document de politique transversale (DPT)” Paris, 29-30 June 2006

The two-day meeting examined the Social Inclusion cross cutting policy tools - “Document de politique transversale (DPT)”, arising from the French government's framework laws on combating social exclusion. Dating back to July 1998 the essential policy changes were a progression from taking account of monetary poverty to the notion of social exclusion, a more complex, multidimensional and long-term phenomenon; a progression from assistance and emergency measures to prevention and social inclusion and a progression from specific procedures for promoting universal access to embracing the notion of universal rights.

Day 1

Opening Statements

Jean-Jacques Tregcoat, director general of social action, Ministry of employment, social cohesion and housing welcomed the delegates from Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom to Paris and introduced his team led for the review by Catherine Lesterpt, head of the mission at the office for prevention policies, inclusion and access to rights - the chair of the two day session. The meeting was held in the Salle Ramoff, named after André Ramoff, the director of social action from 1974 to 1981. Mr Tregcoat indicated the scope of the French policies and methods being used to tackle social exclusion and poverty at national and local level which would be outlined in the presentations during the following two days.

He emphasised both the national and international relevance of the policies and programmes in France which has a long standing policy on social inclusion. In terms of the underlying principles, the framework law on combating exclusion of 29 July 1998 gave concrete form to significant policy changes - the progressions from monetary policy to the broader concept of social exclusion; from assistance and emergency measures to prevention and social inclusion and from specific procedures to the notion of universal rights. He indicated the development of the French approach within the context of the definition of social inclusion given by the European Commission for implementation of the Lisbon strategy within which, since 2001, the French policy to combat social vulnerability and exclusion has operated: "social inclusion is a process that guarantees that persons vulnerable to poverty and exclusion are given the possibilities and the resources needed to participate fully in economic, social and cultural life, and to enjoy a lifestyle and well-being that would be considered normal for the society in which they live. Social inclusion guarantees better participation in the decision-making processes that affect their lives and improved access to their basic rights."

Mr Tregcoat said that the Peer Review organised by France would allow these tools to be enhanced - whether they concerned institutional or methodological instruments. He indicated that this was an ongoing, active process in France with wide ranging consequences - particularly in relation to financial provisions. France has broken with the tradition of expenditure oriented budgets by drawing up a Programme budget based on a three tier structure: **missions** correspond to the state's major public policies. Each mission

comprises a set of **programmes** to which appropriations are allocated and broken down into sub-programmes (**actions**) that together constitute the operational means of implementing the programme.

Hugues Feltesse (DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, European Commission) thanked Mr Tregcoat and the Ministry's Directorate general for social action (DGAS) for hosting the Peer Review. He said that the importance of inclusive societies was recognized nationally and internationally throughout Europe and was highlighted at the highest level in the European Union on a continual basis and during meetings - such as the Heads of State and Government meeting at Hampton Court Palace, England in October 2005. Mr Feltesse looked forward to a practical series of presentations, analysis and discussions looking for indications of how to take the process of social inclusion forward.

Introduction to the coordination tools and to partnership in France

Claire Descreux, deputy director of the insertion policy and the fight against exclusion (DGAS), Bernard Seillier, senator and president of the National council for the fight against poverty and social exclusion (CNLE) and François Carayon, deputy director budget direction gave a presentation of the national tools:

- national conference for the fight against exclusion
- interministerial committee for the fight against exclusion
- national observatory for poverty and social exclusion

and local tools:

- inter-organisational delegations
- pivotal commissions
- territorial charters

together with an overall description of the national and local partnership based strategy. The host country report, Social Inclusion cross cutting policy tools - "Document de politique transversale (DPT)" describes the social inclusion policies and the finance bill for 2006 with its list of programmes contributing to the cross-functional policy. It provides the reference points for the presentations and following discussion.

The presentation began with an outline of the French approach to social inclusion with focus on:

- global and individual care in situations of social exclusion
- a commitment to effective access to all rights
- emergency aid and support for sustainable (re-)integration
- mobilisation of society as a whole.

At national level the DGAS is tasked with facilitation and inter-ministerial coordination of policies and regulations to combat exclusion, with mobilizing actors and promoting partnership and interministerial facilitation and coordination.

The bodies involved include:

The inter-ministerial committee to combat exclusion (CILE)

This was set up in 1992 with powers extended by the law of 1998 and plays the role of adviser and initiator. It is essentially a body for exchanges and dialogue which organises coordination between public authorities, NGOs and experts. It mobilizes local networks of associations, social organisations, the local networks of CNLE members for decentralized initiations and proposes measures to improve the fight against poverty and social exclusion. It also helps and advises the government:

- the Prime Minister can consult the CNLE on proposed laws or regulations and action programmes for social inclusion
- it can be asked for advice by members of the Government when projects are related to their jurisdiction.

The national monitoring centre for poverty and social exclusion (ONPES)

This was set up by the framework law on combating social exclusion in 1998. It is responsible for collating, analysing and disseminating information and data relating to situations of social precariousness, poverty and social exclusion as well as policies within the field. It carries out studies and reviews in association with the CNLE and every two years draws up a report synthesizing all its studies.

The inter-ministerial committee to combat exclusion (CILE)

Established following the law of 29 July 1998 it is chaired by the Prime Minister and made up of the ministries concerned whose jurisdictions are concerned. It defines and coordinates government policy on preventing and combating social exclusion and monitors its application.

The CILE's first meeting in July 2004 established a series of coordination and monitoring measures:

- mobilisation of society as a whole - creation of a house for social cohesion
- tool selection - to include:
 - periodic meetings
 - national conference
 - creation of the cross-functional policy document (DPT)
 - signature of territorial charters to be signed between state and local actors.

The CILE's second meeting in May 2006 made a pledge to reduce poverty:

- definition of targets to reduce poverty by improving knowledge and evaluation of policies
- association of individuals and actors with the policies which concern them:
 - via national conference preceding by local, institutional conferences
 - setting up of departmental social cohesion commissions
 - support for involvement initiatives.

The CILE permanent committee for the fight against exclusion involves:

- a permanent committee representing all administrative sectors which:
 - meets every three months (chaired by DGAS)
 - prepares tasks for CILE
 - supervises decisions and their implementation.

The departmental commissions for social cohesion were set up in 2006:

- they established bodies for coordination to ensure coherent policy on social inclusion and equal opportunities
- chaired by the préfet and made up of state and local authority services, social partners, social organisations, NGOs and service users.

The toolkit

The national conference for preventing and combating social exclusion and local meetings

This was organised for the first time in July 2004 and after five local meetings a second, national meeting was held in April 2006. It was prepared by the CNLE and DGAS and proposed priorities for action to the government.

Participatory evaluation: local forums

The objective here was to take into account local actors' expertise to measure the impact of policies and action programmes. The method used was to:

- bring together a small group of beneficiaries and professionals
- work in separate units and then in plenary sessions
- active and open techniques within a structured framework
- analysis of contents of verbal contributions in an evaluation report.

The key points included the benefits of:

- bringing together a diverse contributors around a question relevant to governance
- listening to the genuine concerns of service users and professionals
- working on people's perceptions of each other
- assessing the level and quality of local partnership
- promoting concrete proposals.

Regional charters for social cohesion

These were established in 2004 to enable definition of a joint regional strategy to determine the needs of a territory and the policies required together with local implementation of social cohesion policies and the pooling of resources between partners.

A localized social database

This collects, within one central tool, social data on the population and situations of precariousness and exclusion. It highlights national and local indicators and enables comparisons between territories and monitoring over time. It fosters exchanges between partners.

18 Regional social observation platforms

Objectives:

- to share social, demographic and economic data between local partners
- to feed evaluation work and take part in the public decision making process

Outcome:

- gathering and pooling of statistical data
- joint analysis of data
- production of information tools
- shared enquiries and studies
- formalisation of recommendations
- dissemination of results.

The organic law relative to the finance law (LOLF)

A new architecture for the state budget

This was approved by parliament in 2001 and implemented in 2006 and established a three tier system:

- missions: for ministerial or inter-ministerial policy
- programmes: for the pooling of resources by one ministry in order to implement a strategy
- actions: identification of resources and modes of action for a programme.

The social inclusion, cross-functional policy document

A strategic and budgetary tool of the ministerial policy

This was set up by the CILE in 2004 and involved:

- scope: European social inclusion strategy involving all relevant ministries with 27 programmes and 83 objectives
- estimated inter-ministerial resources: 50 billion euros in 2005.

Cross cutting objectives

Six objectives were outlined with high aims for the public social inclusion policies and requiring a joint, inter-ministerial effort:

- to enhance social cohesion by reducing poverty
- to reduce child poverty
- to promote the integration of young people
- to reduce the number of illiterate people
- to eradicate unworthy housing
- to promote mobilisation of actors.

Objectives contributing to cross cutting policy

A total of 77 objectives and indicators within ministerial programmes contributing to social inclusion were set around common National Action Plan (NAP) objectives to:

- promote employment integration and access for all to resources, rights, goods and services
- to act in favour of the most vulnerable
- to mobilize all actors.

Catherine Lesterpt, head of the prevention policies, inclusion and access to rights office within the Ministry of employment, gave a short description of the policy measures presented as a good practice and of the policy reform. She emphasised that the coordination and development of policies within the domain of the fight against exclusion in France takes place within the context of decentralisation which places the department as the authority with general competence in terms of social action but where also other territorial administrative levels such as the region and the commune also have responsibilities - where the state holds important powers such as employment, housing, health and integration of foreigners into France.

She stressed the importance of the state engaging actively in terms of exercising its responsibility through various ministerial means as well as at a national and local level - citing the CILE, LOLF and the DPT in particular. Pointing out that from 2006, after interministerial preparatory work with exchange of views between services, the main lines of the state's financial role in terms of the fight against exclusion, together with the appropriate objectives, indicators and coordination had been developed and would be followed by a number of ministries. At the local level, the préfet, representing the state within the department assures the coordination of the inclusion policies by means of the territorial charters (see day 2, p 11) created within the social cohesion plan.

In terms of good practice and policy reform relevant for other countries, Ms Lesterpt suggested that the improvement of coordination at national level between the different state actors was a significant point. Within a single document - the DPT - the state's entire financial effort, its objectives and priorities - with indicators - would be presented. The innovation in European terms is that the DPT indicates the coordination required within social inclusion policies by the EU and contributes examples of good practice towards all six of the priority areas - policies and actions in deprived areas; active inclusion policies for the people furthest from the labour market; comprehensive policies and actions to prevent and alleviate child poverty and to break intergenerational inheritance of poverty; integrated and comprehensive strategies to prevent and tackle homelessness; policies and actions addressing inequities in access to care and in health outcomes between socio-economic groups and comprehensive policies concerning minimum income of pensioners.

Comments from delegates

In response, delegates from the participating countries made a series of comments:

UK representatives Chris Burston from the government Department for work and pensions and Katherine Duffy from the de Montfort University Business School noted some of the similarities between the situations in Britain and in France. The UK's approach to tackling poverty was summarized as 'work for those who can, support for those who cannot' within a wide ranging and multi-faceted strategy. The division of responsibility between national and local government was broadly similar with an ongoing search for new ways of decentralising power and decision making. A Social Exclusion Minister and a Cabinet Committee on Social Exclusion were recently appointed. The national action plan (NAP) and open method of coordination (MOC) are seen as offering new ways of approaching strategic problems in social inclusion. They pointed out a number of differences - a number of Departments in the UK have responsibility for social protection and social inclusion strategy; progress in the UK has been through engaging with civil society with flexibility in existing mechanisms and budgets.

Possibilities for the transfer of the policy included:

- establishing a stakeholder group for the NAP (learning from the CNLE)
- the feasibility of a national monitoring centre or observatory
- the use of indicators in the field of social inclusion (the use of tools to support coordination and partnership)
- understanding the French strategy in context of historical developments
- discussion issues such as governance, partnership and engagement with civil society.

They also summarized their questions in relation to the French experience in terms of the role of the DPT social inclusion document, the relationship between national and local structures, budgets and how the views of people experiencing poverty are reflected in developing policies.

Elena Palola of Stakes (National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health) and Klaus Halla from the Ministry of social affairs and health presented the statements and comments from Finland. Their focus was on the issue of coordination and partnership. They explained that in Finland the starting point for fighting poverty and marginalisation was universal service and support systems with the municipality playing a key role. One third of the compulsory welfare budget is state funded with the remainder coming from the municipalities and client fees (10 per cent). They saw the French framework on coordination and partnership in the area of social inclusion policies as ambitious and a genuine attempt to make a change. They saw a comparison in the broad based participation, cross sectorality, large strategic objectives and development plans together with the importance of multi-dimensional information on social inclusion as a basis for the plans. Their main questions concerned the local forums in France, the regional charters and pooling of resources - and their combined influence on action at national level. How are the budgets linked to policy tools?

Michaela Moser of ASB and Hannes Spreitzer for the Federal Ministry of social security, generations and consumer protection spoke for the Austrian delegation. Ms Moser said the main focus of Austrian policy to combat social exclusion is based on a social market economy policy pursued by the Federal government. The policy aims, by means of full employment, to provide a sufficient standard of living and secure income - with inclusion in the system of social welfare benefits for those who need support. Ms Moser said that the CNLE as well as the national and regional conferences on poverty in France seem to open the path for new forms of governance. Her main questions concerned the CNLE (composition, structure and methods), how the different structures work together; evaluation; the involvement of people experiencing poverty within national and local structures and the state budget.

Toula Kouloumou from the Ministry of labour and social insurance and Elias Mallis from the Ministry of finance (Division of economic research and EU affairs) presented the comments and statements from Cyprus. As a new member state with a small population and land area, Cyprus is in the process of adjusting and assimilating various measures to become a fully participating member of projects, programmes and structures across the European Union. Ms Kouloumou stressed the importance of participation of all stakeholders in combating social exclusion. She noted the legal and institutional framework which provided a solid base for coordinating action against social exclusion in France and saw the DPT as an innovative policy tool offering an alternative means for government departments responsible for the state budget which also promoted inter departmental and ministerial cooperation. The national and

regional conferences seemed to be a good tool for sharing information and increasing awareness on social exclusion. Their questions in terms of transferability to Cyprus concerned the regulatory framework and the issue of citizens' rights, the DPT and design of the institutional framework. They wanted to know more about the French experience in terms of selection of individuals within socially vulnerable groups and financial efficiency; the lessons learned from the efforts made since the first inter-ministerial meeting; inclusion of the most vulnerable in the process and the role of the DPT in coordination and partnership at the local level.

Brigitte Weinandy from the Ministry of the family and integration (Division 'National service for social action') and Frederic Berger from CEPS/INSTEAD international studies network spoke for Luxembourg. They noted the move throughout Europe following implementation of the Lisbon strategy towards more integrated inclusion policies cutting across the different socio-economic areas. In Luxembourg social inclusion policy is based on combining income support with personalised and comprehensive counselling including individualised activation paths. Despite the differences in size and population, there were similarities in the structures and organisation of social inclusion policies in France and Luxembourg - the National service for social action (SNAS) in Luxembourg being largely similar to the French DGAS and the higher council for social action in Luxembourg being largely similar to the French CNLE. However Luxembourg does not have the French institutions or tools at local levels because of the size of the country. Nor is there a similar organisation to the French ONPES for studying poverty and social exclusion. They were particularly interested in the DPT and the BDSL and the possibility of transferring the concept of both to Luxembourg. Questions concerned the participation of the different actors in the French policy process and the legitimacy of partners involved in the implementation of the policies.

Joan Williams from the Department of education and science and Kevin P O'Kelly from the Combat Poverty Agency presented the Irish participants' comments. In Ireland there is a centralised political and administrative structure with ministries responsible for key objectives, outputs and strategies. There is a move towards decentralisation of social policies and a greater involvement for local government in delivery and implementation of national policies for social inclusion - but it is a process which is just beginning. Ireland has no specific legislation to underpin national political consensus to build an inclusive society such as France's laws of 1998 or 2005. Particular interest in Ireland for the CNLE, ONPES and DPT social inclusion document - particularly in relation to the budgetary implications - were expressed.

Issues relating to the theme of cross cutting policy tools and partnership

Hugo Swinnen from the Verwey-Jonker Institute in Utrecht made a presentation on the DPT and on questions and issues raised by participants in response.

He focused on three aspects:

- government
- governance
- the process of policy development.

His presentation ranged over the issues and discussion at a European level before looking at the French example, particularly as it related to the six aims for the transversality within social inclusion policy:

- reinforcing social cohesion by reducing poverty
- reducing child poverty
- promoting youth integration into society
- reducing illiteracy
- eradicating inadequate housing
- promoting mobilisation of institutional actors towards social inclusion.

Mr Swinnen then turned his attention to the challenges being faced in France to implement the policies and structures. For him, the most difficult question in the immediate future is the systematic development and involvement at a local and national level of the actors and organisations. In terms of methodology he recommended exchange within France and at a European level and in terms of preconditions he remarked that the French model of administrative policy since the 1980s associated with reducing concentration on the prefectures towards decentralisation based on general councils, then regional councils may appear complicated. However it was a work in progress which required not just an infrastructure but good will in favour of collaboration at a local level in order to achieve results.

Mr Swinnen also drew attention to the distinction between representation and participation within democratic structures. He said it was important to understand that within the practice of good governance and participatory democracy, representation should not always be judged according to the same type of criteria as for representative democracy.

Workshop discussions

During the afternoon of the first day the group broke into three workshops to discuss the following topics:

Workshop 1

Institutional Organisation of social inclusion policy

Coordinated and integrated steering tools at national and local level

Micheline Gustin from the office for inclusion policies and the fight against exclusions at DGAS led this discussion based on the French and British experiences. Ms Gustin introduced the discussion by explaining the work of the mainstreaming institutional tools - CILE, CNLE and departmental commissions for social cohesion and their involvement in:

- reinforcing the mainstreaming policy aiming at integrating social inclusion issues to all public policies and all private and social organisations and their actions
- coordination at national and local level with contribution to an integrated approach to social inclusion problems
- involvement of these organisations in the definition of social inclusion policies and strategies at a local and national level
- a budgetary document such as the DPT and its role as a mainstreaming tool.

Chris Burston from the UK's Department for Work and Pensions explained the work of the social exclusion unit set up in 1997.

Workshop 2

The policy cycle: conception, development, implementation, impact and efficiency evaluation, possible adjustments. Diagnosis, follow up and evaluation tools in defining a global and integrated political strategy

Catherine Lesterpt, head of the DGAS office for policy on prevention, inclusion and access to rights, led the discussion on the role of social observation platforms in diagnosis, follow up and evaluation tools within the DPT and in evaluation initiatives. She outlined the role of monitoring and evaluation partners in political decision making and looked at the dangers and opportunities it presented. How can the beneficiary's opinion be taken into account in such a framework?

The discussion also focused on the concept of rights in social inclusion. How could this be implemented. There were no immediate answers and a culture of change, engagement and partnership at local level to introduce the subject within a long term strategy was understood.

Workshop 3

This group looked at the challenges inherent in implementing social inclusion policies:

- which tools could be used to implement centralised policies at a local level
- how to ensure equity relating to national social inclusion policies in all regions
- how to coordinate actions between local decision makers and between local and national decision makers
- how to involve local actors in building up a national social inclusion policy.

The resulting discussing made it clear that there were also cultural issues to be taken into account; that the process of decentralisation was just beginning and that local coordination and responsibility issues needed to be addressed in a positive and consultative manner.

Kevin O'Kelly gave an overview of the work carried out with local groups in Ireland and indicated the approach taken was one which allowed all issues to be discussed and to involve as many social partners and NGOs as possible - both as service providers and as actors for social change.

The plenary discussion following the workshops raised a further series of comments and contributions:

Katherine Duffy from the UK highlighted the group based approach and the need for voices from within the communities to be heard plus the need for attention to the financial and budget assessment issues. Joan Williams from Ireland noted that a lot of the issues dealt with by the French family affairs department would come under the Education Department in Ireland; this raised a number of points about which aspects of state provision - such as housing - were most key to social inclusion policies. Members of the French team including Antoine Saint-Denis, head of the European and international affairs office at DGAS said there was a need for more work to convince the various actors they could achieve more together than they could alone. While there were 16 networks with another ten being developed the idea of pooling with other services was often not particularly welcome. With twenty charters signed at regional level and twenty more in the pipeline, the strategy was to reach agreement between different players to consult and then agree to pool resources at a later date. Mr Saint-Denis said there were a series of issues to be discussed and that France was at the beginning of a process of change. Citizens in France have a strong identity with the state but the question of who responds to social needs is a complex one. There were issues of responsibility, coordination and partnership to be discussed and the process of change would probably

take a decade. Bernard Seillier, Senator and President of the National council for policies to fight against poverty and social exclusion said that the challenge was more human than political and that a debate on finance for social needs was necessary.

Day 2

Following an introduction to the day from the chair, Catherine Lesterpt, representatives from Havre on the west coast of France made a presentation on the implementation of partnership tools at a local level focussing on housing issues. Agathe Cahierre, first adjointe to the Mayor and Jean-Luc Briere, director of the department for sanitary and social affaires for the department of Seine-Maritime introduced the discussion. The area includes the the port city of Le Havre and the city of Rouen. With a total of 1.23 million inhabitants and 37 communes it is a urban environment with unemployment standing at 10.6% against a national average of 9.5%. Mr Briere outlined the various state actors involved in the provision of housing and their roles together with the economic and social background to the region. He outlined the roles of the various parties involved in the social inclusion policies and the extent of their work so far.

Ms Cahierre emphasised that the charter signed by the communes had made it clear that success at this level depended on making it possible for organisations and state entities to work together, rather than to replace any of the bodies involved. By focussing on the subject of housing and the various issues - particularly in relation to youth - that this raised the charter had been successful in drawing together the major players locally in relation to the social inclusion policies.

The presentation brought a series of questions from the floor: Hugues Feltesse asked what they considered was the key point in achieving the coordination. Mr Briere replied that it was a combination of the charter and developing a sense of partnership. Hugo Swinnen said it was one thing to deal with complexities but was it possible to simplify the problem by creating leadership in partnerships. Ms Cahierre replied that when leadership had been given to one association it had not worked out well. There were complexities around questions of competence. Kevin O'Kelly asked about provision for youth training and social care and Ms Cahierre replied that these were considered to be key issues as many young people were living in an area where they had no family roots - no grandparents to give them additional support for example.

A wider discussion developed around general issues of coordination and Ms Zimmerman gave an overview of the difficulties - in terms of local political and social interests - which needed to be overcome in the future. At the beginning of a process of change in provision of social services and in funding social care there were bound to be difficulties which would take time to explain and resolve before the process could be taken forward. Mireille Gauzere, head of service at DGAS said there was hope in the future to extend departmental coordination within France and coordination at a European level.

Fintan Farrell, stakeholder representative from the EAPN, asked what the current situation for regional coordination was and Ms Zimmerman replied that currently five regions which had been approached - Bordeaux, Normandie, Bretagne, Calons, Rhone-Alpes and Champagnendaine - had been approached with a view to increasing coordination but while matters had developed well over the last two years it was important to avoid making promises which could not be kept. A long term process of change had been started and further rounds of discussions, consultation and technical consultation - such as that scheduled at the Ministry of employment in Paris on 18 September - would be needed to take the process forward.

Round table discussion

Participants were then given an opportunity to comment on the main points and issues they had been able to consider over the two days of the Peer Review particularly in terms of the transferability of the tools presented. All participants thanked the organisers for providing a fascinating insight into social engineering within the French state and society:

Katherine Duffy said she had been impressed by the totality of the instruments provided by the French state and the synergies. She had found the Havre case study particularly interesting and suggested that tracing an individual case from both sides - that of the individual service user and from all levels of the state - would be an interesting means of understanding the system better.

Chris Burston complimented the organisers and said he found the DPT to be an effective way of bringing in people across government.

Klaus Halla said he found the Peer Review a good opportunity to consider the ways to tackle poverty and social exclusion. He asked a rhetorical question - are some measures more effective than others? Softer measures such as recommendations, partnership and cross cutting tools appeared to have greater potential. He suggested a strengthening of the links between monitoring and implementation. Finland, he said, was full of evaluation reports which no one read. He said that his experience from Finland showed there was a need to strengthen cooperation and concentrate on the implementation, also stressing the concept of good governance. The common objective in all countries was to improve the situation, but the weak point is the implementation of decisions.

Elena Palola said that her comments echoed much of what Katherine Duffy had said. Finland had many projects and evaluations but lacked perhaps a coherent structure which could be seen in more simplified terms. She said there was a need to find new structures which would involve people and bring together the different players and beneficiaries. A quintessential question "how do you select a representative of the poor"?

Hannes Spreitzer said he had been much impressed by the organization of the French system and the contributions during the two days from his French colleagues whose knowledge and commitment to their work had made a mark on him.

Michaela Moser said that she was leaving Paris with a much improved analysis of how to use the structures available to organisations, actors and associations in Austria. She felt that the need to simplify structures was important as well as the use of NGOs within the whole policy process for social inclusion together with recognition of the contributions from the various actors at every level.

Elias Mallis said that both for himself as an individual and as a member of the Cyprus government the Peer Review had been interesting. He said he had learned that the French system was based on a holistic approach based on the French philosophy of the role of the state in society - expressed with the DPT social inclusion. He said he felt both his own country and France shared common challenges and had the basic tools to meet concrete objectives and to register indicators (the data necessary to monitor the processes). Cyprus was in a traditional period he said with new procedures for the state budget in the medium term which presented challenges to ensure sound social public finances and fiscal responsibility.

Toula Kouloumou said that this was the beginning of an inquiry on how to better manage coordination of actors within the social inclusion process. The seminar had been rich in content she said and an interesting learning process. France and Cyprus, she suggested, were in their different ways at transitional stages and there was clearly an intention to implement similar policies in both countries.

Brigitte Weinandy and Frederic Berger said they would take home the same message to implement coordination and partnership for social inclusion policies wherever possible.

Joan Williams said that her opinions reflected those expressed by the Austrian participants and that there were certain issues which could be appreciated from the unique situation of France. The word 'complexity' had been used frequently but she reflected that in time the issues become simplified as they become part of daily life. Each process must include the concept of social cohesion she said.

Kevin O'Kelly too was impressed by the holistic approach adopted in France including the state budget. He said that in the transition to decentralisation there were a number of effects including the challenge of changing attitudes and changing minds. The presentation on the Havre showed how the political and administrative roles can work well at a local level.

Fintan Farrell said he had been particularly interested in the cross cutting and financial aspects of the French policy. Social and economic policies need to be linked for a programme to effectively eradicate poverty he said and that there was now pressure on member states to deliver results for social inclusion policies.

Michel Legros said there were different challenges facing national and local actors in the process towards implementing social inclusion policies. Questions of how best to go forward and improve the situation were complex and would take time to resolve. Within terms of partnerships he suggested the emphasis should be on management.

Patrick Boulte, EAPN had appreciated the opportunity to listen and to give context to his own questions on the subject.

Marie Pierre Hamel had attended as part of her ongoing research into the effectiveness of MOC for the CEVIPOF research centre and looked forward to adding the Peer Review to her studies.

Lessons learned and transferability of the tools presented

After lunch Hugo Swinnen gave a presentation with his impressions of the lessons learned and the transferability of the tools presented. He repeated his concerns about the issues of government and governance in relation to social inclusion policies and the need to take into account dynamics and structure, transparency as opposed to clarity in decision making, and the pace of the changes being considered. He outlined what he said were key elements in leadership - an open, soft method of guidance especially when dealing with individuals and associations who did not hold power. He said that it was important to involve and value all the various actors and the roles they played - either as users/clients of services provided by the state agencies or as social actors for change where different social situations and indicators were important. In his opinion individuals always brought their own personal situations to meetings - especially if they were not given the space to speak within a family context. In conclusion he said that the way is the means and that the essential considerations were to distinguish between

government and governance and the interests and different roles of actors, stakeholders and service users.

Conclusion

Jean-Jacques Tregoeat being absent from the Peer Review to attend discussions for the state budget, Mireille Gauzere presented closing remarks on his behalf. She said that much had been learned from both the written and verbal presentations which would have found favour with French philosophers and writers. She hoped that what had been learned during the two days in France would have resonance in participants' own countries. She stressed the importance of evaluation and the fact that the way is the aim (le chemin est le but). In this context it is important to appreciate governance.

Refining complex institutions for social policy aims was a challenge for partners and the bureaucracy which also demanded the participation of users of the social support services.

Hugues Feltesse said that the Peer Review had not been a philosophical discussion but one of practical possibilities. The use of MOC had the benefit of bringing new elements together. He said it was important to clarify responsibility in each link of the chain of decision making. Within a multidimensional approach - such as expressed by the case study of the Havre - it was important to stress coherence and interdependence. This had to be seen from the vertical, horizontal and European perspectives where there were common objectives in terms of social inclusion. The need for action did not prevent a focus on the questions of costs and capacity he said. The approach was to experiment as well as develop solutions to poverty and social exclusion. He saw the benefits of taking one case and seeing it from the perspective of the individual service user and the service provider; it is a two Way Street so it is important to see what happens he said. There was a need to develop confidence in the process of change towards European wide social inclusion he said so that the strategy developed in Lisbon could be fully implemented in due course of time with full regard for fiscal and social responsibility.