



WILCO

Welfare innovations
at the local level
in favour of cohesion

COMPARATIVE REPORT

**APPROACHES AND INSTRUMENTS IN LOCAL WELFARE SYSTEMS:
INNOVATION, ADOPTION AND ADAPTATION**

Adalbert Evers & Benjamin Ewert,
Giessen University

CONTENTS

Approaches and instruments in local welfare systems: innovation, adoption and adaptation	1
Recurrent patterns of approaches and instruments in local social innovations - on methods and outcomes of a study in the framework of the WILCO project ...	1
1. CONCEPTS AND METHODS.....	1
1.1. The understanding of social innovations	1
1.2. Methods to sort out local examples of innovations.....	2
1.3. Mapping the context of selected innovations.....	3
1.4. Guidelines for ways of presenting and analysing the innovations.....	4
2. FINDINGS ON RECURRENT APPROACHES AND INSTRUMENTS	6
2.1. Innovation in services and their ways to address users	8
2.2. Innovations in regulations and rights.....	9
1.1 Innovations in governance	11
2.4. Innovations in modes of working and financing.....	12
2.5. Innovations concerning the entity of (local) welfare systems	14
Innovative approaches and instruments in the fields of urban revitalization, childcare and work integration	18
References	21

RECURRENT PATTERNS OF APPROACHES AND INSTRUMENTS IN LOCAL SOCIAL INNOVATIONS - ON METHODS AND OUTCOMES OF A STUDY IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE WILCO PROJECT

The main objective of this work package was to describe instruments and approaches that are used to fight against social inequality and stimulate social cohesion, and to assess the impact they have in local welfare systems. Therefore the tasks convened upon in WP V were:

- to identify a number of cases of innovation in each of the cities to be studied and to describe their characteristics in a way that was conducive to find out recurrent patterns of approaches and instruments used
- to identify such recurrent approaches and instruments used in the innovative cases
- to point at those linkages between innovations and the local context that play a key role in the ways these innovations as projects and processes developed.

What are innovative approaches and instruments in local welfare systems? Are there post-conventional service patterns and path-breaking social offers emerging in times of austerity? Or does the latter prevent the former by definition? What differentiates a social innovation in, say, Milan to one in, say, Birmingham? And which local conditions and support do they require in order to unfold and blossom? What else do we know about ways and processes to adopt and adapt good ideas in practice? These and other questions stood at the beginning of our inquiry for social innovations in 20 European cities in ten countries. In its part I our work package report starts with some general remarks concerning our research goals and the ways to achieve them. It is concerning the intellectual basis and practical guidelines, as they have been developed in order to find out and analyse innovations in the twenty cities that have been studied. More than 80 innovations have been analysed alongside a consented scheme. Four general aspects will be addressed, before in the second part of this report, a structured overview on recurrent patterns of approaches and instruments will be presented. Our initial considerations concerning social innovations and ways to look at them have led to a consented set of agreements concerning:

1. The understanding of social innovations
2. Methods to sort out local examples of social innovation
3. Ways of mapping the context of selected innovations
4. Guidelines for ways of presenting and analysing the innovations.

This has led to the results presented in part two of this work package report: Findings on recurrent approaches and instruments.

1. CONCEPTS AND METHODS

1.1. The understanding of social innovations

If one studies the present literature on conceptualizing and defining social innovations (SIs) one comes to the clue, that SIs are basically not the property of a specific social and political orientation. In some attempts for definition, it is claimed that they have to stand for "improvement" (Phills 2008) and a better answer to basic needs, and for more satisfying social relations (Moulaert 2010), and their initiators will obviously claim this and assorted

"good things". While most analyses try to derive from the "social" in social innovations a widely consented positive meaning (see BEPA 2010 and Mulgan 2006) their values, actions and outcomes will in fact always be a contested issue. Innovations are different from given widespread practices by definition. They may become a mainstream practice over time but this is not already so at the outset. They can be linked with a diversity of goals and take different meanings over time, depending from the wider political concept and institutional system wherein they become embedded (see e.g. Osborne and Brown 2011). Therefore, the (technically) same innovative instrument (e.g. case management) can work and be judged differently in different places and circumstances. The field of SIs and the attempts at defining them are open-ended. In the WILCO project we have defined social innovations, likewise products and processes, as:

- Ideas, turned into practical approaches;
- New in the context where they appear;
- Attracting hopes for better coping strategies and solutions
- Marked by a high degree of risk and uncertainty a.m. due to the specific context they meet.

According to this working definition, social innovations are, in a significant way, new and disruptive towards the routines and structures prevailing in a given (welfare) system or local setting. Whether or not they can be seen as "better" (more effective / social / democratic) is a question of its own that can only be answered in retrospective.

Following these criteria there is still a broad field left for studying and selecting SIs. Our selection has picked up out of the broader stream of SIs - ranging from NPM-inspired concepts of public service reform to cultural alternative projects - that kind of innovations, in which ideas of bettering the conditions of local citizens (and especially of those threatened by various dimensions of exclusion) have been claimed to be central not only by the initiators but as well by the local key persons and actors that were interviewed.

As it turned out, the majority of such SIs are new service arrangements, making a difference in terms of organisational structures, processes and types of service offers; however, there are also innovations in terms of new interventions (new financial arrangements, tax/transfer measures, etc.). And our search for innovation in local welfare systems also concerns economic (e.g. funding arrangements) and political dimensions (e.g. new arrangements in decision-making and participation).

1.2. Methods to sort out local examples of innovations

From our definition followed, that an innovation is innovative in its specific context. So, what matters is whether it is regarded as new in a particular city. It does not have to be path breaking on a European or global scale. For example, family centres are well known in the UK and an integral part of many other local welfare systems across Europe; however, in other places, e.g. Berlin, family-minded service hubs, addressing children and their parents, are new. Since we looked as well at the dynamics of social innovations, we selected only those that have overcome the very inception stage. According to this criterion, every selected innovation should have existed for at least one year (since March 2011) in order to be scrutinized. This minimum period of existence was not agreed upon to filter unsuccessful innovations but to work with a sample of halfway realized cases providing enough material for our analysis. Thus, the SIs we looked at are about ideas or approaches that have been implemented in practice to some degree; therefore, each innovation picked up by our teams entails a practical "project" that has been realised. As it turned out, this "project" can be an organisation or an organisational subunit with new

services that clearly differs from what existed so far in the field, but it can also be a measure/intervention such as a new transfer, tax or resource arrangement.

However, as the compiled examples show, local social innovations can also take other forms. Innovations always have a background of orientating streams of values and thinking as well as associated practices that back and inspire them. Sometimes this takes the form of a clear-cut movement (e.g. to establish local foundations with social aims). Innovations may be represented by a local network rather than a single organisational unit; or they may show up as an experimental model and unit to be found in plural forms in the local setting (e.g. new family centres). Therefore, speaking about SIs can mean to refer to a large project, but also to a cluster of small, similar projects. In such a case, it was the task to describe the whole cluster and zoom in on one or two of the small cases, to get a sense of the micro-dynamics. In case the innovation is part of a government program meant to promote, finance and regulate an innovative approach, only those innovations from wider national programs that can be seen as "local" - in the sense that there is a considerable degree of freedom to shape them in the local context - were picked up. Finally, since social innovations generally include both bottom-up and top-down elements, we chose projects with variations in the mix (i.e. both innovations that are more citizen-driven as well as others with a stronger government involvement, etc.) in order to get a good sense of the different dynamics.

For our selection criteria the political and economic dimensions of innovations and the new institutions they bring about were also important. There are innovations that focus on developing new forms of interest representation (as exemplified by the new local NGOs and lobbies featured in the cases of innovations we received); and there are innovations where the focus is on innovative ways of creating financial funds. These dimensions were central for the choice of examples of local innovations, especially for those that are about new service patterns: In these cases, the ways in which these innovations deal with power, authority and money are sketched.

As a mandatory requirement, in each city at least three and at most six innovations had to be featured and analysed by each team. The actual number of cases chosen in a city depended largely on the complexity of the respective cases. In fact, the more complex the innovations featured in the report, the smaller the number of innovations studied has been. By "complex", we refer here for example to innovations represented by a network or a program entailing diverse further micro-innovations (like e.g. many new approaches in neighbourhood and housing renewal).

Each team had to cover all the three policy fields (child care, employment and housing) and target groups (single mothers, youngsters and migrants) that we had agreed upon earlier when it came to make out of the criterion of exclusion/cohesion a practical and operational issue. For purpose of comparison, every innovation had to cover a specific field. However, we realised that in practice innovations crosscut fields and address several groups at once. Therefore, as a general guideline, it was agreed to make sure that all fields and groups are at least somehow covered in the selection of innovations. Finally, each team enjoyed freedom in making additional choices; this meant e.g. that those innovations held as central by local politicians, professionals and change agents interviewed must not necessarily be the obvious choice of the WILCO researchers. Sometimes, the local partners pointed at more projects they saw as new, important and socially useful than it was possible to take up. In it's portrayal of an innovation, each team was requested to give the reasons why the respective cases were chosen.

1.3. Mapping the context of selected innovations

Social innovations are rarely micro-events standing alone; much more frequently, they are associated with running streams of ideas and concepts. Consequently, each WILCO team was requested to write a few pages at the beginning of each city report to point at background streams of cultural, public and/or professional debates and streams of (re)orientation that are animating the respective innovation(s) in the three fields and/or in relation with the three target groups.

Since the changing structures and notions of the national welfare system and those of (each city's) local system, together with the values that guide them had already been part of the work accomplished in the WILCO work package 3 and were simultaneously studied in work package 4, it was recommended to look in WP V complementary at streams of thinking and movements that are important incentives for and orientate the respective local innovations (like e.g. new ways of dealing with issues of participation and civic engagement, the debate on new types of neighbourhood revitalisation concepts and what they mean for the modernisation of housing stocks; or new concepts that enable services to reach out to migrant communities).

1.4. Guidelines for ways of presenting and analysing the innovations

Each feature of an innovation ought to begin with a comprehensive description of what the selected example is all about, and of what is seen as the outstanding "innovative" trait in this particular case (against the given local and general background in the field). The description and analysis then were to focus on what is remarkable with respect to the selected case in terms of the approaches and instruments it has created and is operating with.

It was a key task of our analysis to deal with the question of what can be generalized from these innovations, their approaches and the tools and instruments developed by them - not only in the special local system within which an innovation is taking place, but as well on the level of an international European debate on local welfare systems, their institutions, rules, services, modes of governance and kinds of welfare mixes. Obviously, this task called for a fairly high degree of "abstractification".

In terms of drawing conclusions for local welfare systems at large, several kinds of impacts can be envisaged in general, ranging from simply giving room for or basically accepting a similar project/concept in a different setting (e.g. getting towards a similar lobby organisation for migrants elsewhere - upscaling and diffusion) up to questions concerning the degree to which an innovation represents kind of messages about an emerging new service and welfare logic that calls for changing the local welfare system to a larger extent (e.g. allowing for bundling contributions from different realms and sources in a personalised way for individual users - innovations as part of a comprehensive reform process) (BEPA 2010, 33). Taking all this into account, a central challenge was to obtain both, a very concrete and sensitive picture of the individual innovation, and an intelligible way to draw "messages" out of it that are interesting also for colleagues that work on the issue in other countries and settings. Thus, it was seen as important to keep an eye on discourses that inspire and legitimise SIs, seeing, whether an innovation was inspired by examples from other regions or countries.

Moreover, it was suggested to analyse, discuss and portray each innovation with respect to the same basic points of interest. Given the enormous diversity of social innovations, we suggested only three "analysis grids", which all teams should use when observing the selected innovations. Hence, the portray of each case of innovation is organised along three basic themes:

- a) Conceptions and ways of addressing users
- b) Internal organization and modes of working
- c) Interaction with the local welfare system.

(a) Conceptions of and ways of addressing users

The focus here is on the kind of idea to be found about the users, groups concerned, etc. To what degree does one find here innovation in terms of (i) different conceptions of users, (ii) different types of services and (iii) different ways to provide a service (e.g. through an empowering approach, relying on users' potentials rather than focusing mostly on their deficiencies)? Examples should include a.o.:

- New ways of bridging the gap between the administrative world and "real life", or between the social/public realm and the personal/private one;
- Pedagogical interventions operating partly with gratifications, sanctions or dialogues, etc.;
- Various capacity-building and empowering approaches and their respective instruments;
- Co-productive approaches that build on resources of the addressees;
- "Family-minded" approaches, that take into account the immediate setting of addressees/users;
- Personalisation of transfers and services and
- Contractual relationships instead of rights.

(b) Internal organisation and modes of working

This part of the analysis is about questions that concern the organisational form chosen and the working culture to be found in innovative settings; the working culture may e.g. be innovative by the remarkable degree it is e.g. diverging from the working conditions and culture and the style of management found in local public administrations; new kinds of working units, marked by team work, flexible working contracts etc. may mirror mainly the precarious status of innovative organisations; but it may entail as well elements for an innovative definition of what "public organisations" should look like and how they should organise themselves. Selected innovations in the working culture concern a.o.:

- The organisation of the work by team work / team-building;
- The impact of social entrepreneurs and of modes of post-bureaucratic management ("fluid" and "entrepreneurial" forms);
- Working contracts that are outcome-/project-based;
- Working by time-limited "projects" and their sequences;
- Making publicity strategies and social marketing part of their agenda.

As our choice of examples demonstrates, various "hybrid" organisational forms of social innovations exist (e.g. "agencification", entrepreneurial and community-based styles of operation in third sector organisations and in public organisations opening up to the third sector and community life; role of social enterprises, foundations, etc. as organisational forms).

(c) Interaction with the local welfare system

Quite often, new innovative instruments or services are not just an "app", but have repercussions on the context and on the level of the political and administrative system; they entail a chance and challenge for the governance system as a whole, which has to react in one or another way (this is e.g. what happens when a neighbourhood revitalisation scheme entails the establishment of a round table). An innovation at one point of a system

may then alter the relationships between actors and organisations in local welfare and urban development, the underlying values (see work package 4 of the WILCO project), modes of decision-making and participation as well as acknowledging or setting up new modes of funding and financing. Given these interactions and modes of interplay, we specifically looked at:

- Innovative ways of institutionalising organisations/"project units" (e.g. on a multi-stakeholder basis);
- Accepting, acknowledging or even promoting new rules for funding and financing;
- Solutions that aim to meet the peculiarities of various groups by allowing for diversity - going beyond standard solutions with respect to the content of the services provided;
- Ways of governing "by projects" rather than only administrating open-ended tasks within a fixed framework of public administrative bodies;
- Creating a diversity of public-private partnerships of bodies and organisations within (local) society and business;
- Operating through inter-sectorial networks that are (semi-) formalised;
- Upgrading of a diversity of forms of deliberation (forums of participation), going beyond decision-making through elected officials and corporatist, "behind-closed-door" arrangements.

Finally, in a conclusion, the portray of each selected innovation should give information on the following points:

- Has the innovation grown and stabilised?
- Has there been more acceptance and support in political and financial terms compared to the beginnings and mid-term situation?
- Has there been diffusion in terms of learning processes in the political and administrative system? For example, has the system taken over instruments and practices from the innovation?

Beside the use and review of documents and programs (see above), interviews were a key source for analysing social innovations. The number of interviews carried was obviously linked to the number of innovations chosen. However, the minimum number of interviews carried out for each city report was nine. For a very small-scale single innovation, at least two interviews (one with a key-promoter, the other one with an experienced user) had to be carried out; for a complex innovation, which clusters several different sub-parts, more interviews (also with partners in the local welfare department and/or the department for urban planning) had to be undertaken. Therewith, we followed the procedure of data collection that has been promised in the initial work package description.

2. FINDINGS ON RECURRENT APPROACHES AND INSTRUMENTS

When it came to look at the rich number and diversity of cases of innovations, discussing analysing and finally presenting them, four issues called quite soon for joint decisions among the research teams.

The first one is concerning the meaning of "different", "new" and "innovative" in relation to what is already there in terms of institutions, practices and modes of thinking of what had been called by the EU institutions launching this piece of research as "welfare systems". While the research in the WILCO project has devoted some time on describing

different national paths and histories of institution-building both with respect to welfare systems and the role of municipalities and cities in governance, its main aim has been to look at *common international trends* that get visible despite different national trajectories. This orientation was useful since our task has been to look first of all to innovations as developments that represent a break with traditions, rather than looking at levels of diffusion of innovations dependent from the degree given national traditions, regimes or trends act in support or as a barrier to innovations. Furthermore the point of view from which we have looked at innovation are not concerning the difference they make to a special type of welfare regime (“liberal”, “conservative” or “social democratic”) and its form of governance (such as e.g. “corporatist”) but it was concerning *differences towards shared patterns of welfare and governance in the European region*. Three elements can be seen as widely shared across “regimes”.

First of all there are the commonalities of postwar-welfarism as described by Wagner (1994) like standardisation and the search for large scale uniform regulations in welfare institutions going along with a minor role of participative elements and civil society in welfare systems and democratic decision making. Secondly there has been the influence of new public management and respective managerial concepts across borders with their practices of economisation and rationalisation of welfare agencies and concepts of governance that were taken from the business sector. On the other hand all countries in den European region have in on or another form gone through phases, where cultural and social movements have revitalized elements of self-organizing, new social solidarities, reaching from the social movements of the early seventies and the democratic revolutions in Middle-Europe over to the new waves of movements linked with the issues of growth, the environment sustainability and participation. It is against a background shaped cross-nationally by the major influence of these three factors that the social innovations make a difference altogether. The descriptions of the teams show this quite clearly.

The second point relates to a difference between our choice of innovations and what is looked at in the mainstream literature. The latter usually looks at social innovations with a focus on social *service* innovations. What was brought from the first city surveys to the international meetings of the WILCO teams showed however quite soon, that innovations touch on more than “services” and ways of organising their provision. *Changes in rules and regulations* (e.g. concerning the access to financial benefits) *and in governance* (forms of democracy and decision making on priorities in welfare and cohesion politics) are likewise important fields for social innovations that should not be neglected. This widening of areas and types of innovations includes as well developments that make a difference when it comes to conventional *forms and modes of working and financing*. All this should be kept in mind when looking at the classification system by which we have arranged our findings on recurrent patterns among the innovations.

The third point is concerning the different degrees and stages concerning impact and diffusion of SIs that we found. Some SIs represent approaches that - while being like all others new in the immediate context where they appear - basically *represent an already quite developed international trend*, having popped up in many sites and cities across Europe. This holds true especially for the following three innovations.

- Social enterprises that work in the field of occupational and social integration as “*work integration enterprises*”; one could almost develop a kind of prototype out of the variants of work integration enterprises to be met from Plock to Barcelona and from Stockholm to Varazdin
- Participative and community-oriented forms of *revitalising housing estates and urban neighbourhoods*, here once again examples reach across countries and cities

- *Family support services and centres* of various kinds are as well quite common, to be found in contexts as different as Italy, England or Germany; despite differences their common innovative core is to direct offers of support to the whole family system instead of focussing just on child-care services.

The fourth and final point is concerning our ratio of ordering findings on recurrent approaches and instruments of the social innovations we looked at. When looking the classification system used one should keep in mind that it mirrors the central task and mandate that has been given to the WILCO research: to look at the impact of SIs on local “welfare systems”. It is therefore that we have not used other possible ways to arrange our findings e.g. alongside separate policy fields, grouping findings on innovations as they prevail in the field of housing and neighbourhood development, occupational and social integration and family and child care related services.

Instead we opted for five fields and dimensions of welfare systems wherein to group what we see as the most important recurrent approaches and instruments of social innovations

1. Innovations in services and their ways to address users
2. Innovations in regulations and rights
3. Innovations in governance
4. Innovations in modes of working and financing
5. Innovations concerning the entity of (local) welfare systems.

These five dimensions hopefully allow integrating our findings into current debates as they can be found in the community of researchers on welfare and social policy but as well among researchers on urbanism and local policy. We assume that all who work in these fields are familiar with the aforementioned key points that we have chosen

2.1. Innovation in services and their ways to address users

The majority of the social innovations that were recommended to the national teams by local interview partners as important and promising and finally chosen as cases to be described, have been service-innovations. Since personal social services are by definition a special form of social relationship between people this is not a surprise. Moreover services are more accessible to small-scale innovations and respective social entrepreneurs, groups and change agents than e.g. lots of high-tech products. Service innovations can be small scale and do not need big start-up investments. There have been five characteristics that mark the differences between the service-innovations collected in the WILCO project and services or service systems as they have built up alongside post-war welfare traditions and the more recent managerial culture of public and private services. They play a role not only in the special field of social inclusion and integration policies but very much so in the field of personal social services at large.

Investing in capabilities rather than spotting deficits

This hallmark can be found basically in most of the SIs. The services are not so much about giving or granting or filling gaps than about a kind of relationship that aims at reducing the initial dependency of the users by opening up chances or strengthening capabilities. In various ways this element can be linked with the activation rhetoric, as it is known from public welfare debates. Different activation discourses will give services innovations that want to strengthen capabilities different meanings. A telling example in this respect is e.g. the project “Her second chance” from Varaždin (Croatia), aiming at supporting women and mothers in special difficulties in acquiring competences and self-esteem on a way that

might lead back to paid work. The “Primano”-programme from Bern (Switzerland) is likewise a project for young mothers, aiming at breaking the intergenerational transmission of poverty (see at the end of the work package report the tableau with a selection of SIs out of the full number of cases that illustrate best the points we make).

Preference for open approaches avoiding targeting with stigmatizing effects

Most of the present occupational and social integration programmes and schemes one can find in workfare policies operate by a strict approach of targeting that clearly indicates who is “in” and “out” and detailed rules for stages of foreseen integration proceedings, preconditions and admission to them, entailing much danger of stigmatization. In contrast to that, many of the innovations that deal with topics of occupational and social integration operate with kind of looser and more open approaches not defining admission to an offer top down and not prescribing in detail how a re-integration process and its stages should be processed. While personal help and advice play an important role, the whole approach is fewer directives. Among the many examples (see tableau) the “Filur” project from Stockholm (Sweden) operates with much more elements of choice for the young unemployed people it addresses than other schemes in Sweden or elsewhere in the EU. A likewise experience is represented by the Family Office in Münster (Germany) offering its support in a kind of way that is basically open for all, even though some families will need and use it much more than others

Concern with bridging the gaps between professional services and people’s life worlds

Cultural and ethnic diversity, overlapping with poverty, has increased in times of migration, unemployment and harsher inequalities. This makes it increasingly difficult for services and professionals to reach the groups that might need their help, be it that the respective offers are unknown, hard to understand or not taken up due to lacking trust. Therefore bridging gaps between professional services and people’s life-worlds has become an increasing challenge. Among the innovations of our sample that touch on this problem one can mention here e.g. the “Neighbourhood mothers” from Berlin (Germany), women that are on the one hand networked with and trusted in their community of migrants but who likewise are experienced in making contacts with administrations and the services and entitlements that they offer.

Service-offers that connect otherwise often separated forms of support and access, allowing for personalized bundles of support

While public administrations and welfare bureaucracies have in the course of their development differentiated and specialized, with separated agencies offering different particular but as well partial solutions, following their own logics, the complex needs of customers cannot be met adequately. Getting together a bundle of support measures that fit is mostly complicated and discouraging. Therefore among the selection of innovations service offers that allow to connect otherwise often separated forms of support and channels of access play an important role. There are various schemes that operate with personal advisers, care- and case-managers and various forms of “one-stop-entry-points”. A good example is given e. g. by offices in Nantes (France) that offer joint assessment of families’ needs when it comes to link access to jobs and day care, something that is especially important for single-parent families; likewise intermediary organizations such as the Foundation for development beyond borders in Warsaw (Poland) have achieved to make very different offers work for migrants from other East-European countries, that reach from language courses over to advice and support in juridical matters.

2.2. Innovations in regulations and rights

Creating flexible forms of ad hoc support

Changed and less continuous biographies of working and living and more complicated zones of transition between those life situations and stages, traditional services and transfers were built for, are increasing. This might mean being out of school but not yet in a job, on a track back to work but without access to a flat. Often this coincides with acute problems that call for immediate and time-limited help, different to the lengthy ex-ante negotiation and decision-making on long-term provisions, such as pension-arrangements. Innovative ways of offering an often provisional “quick fix” can well be the critical missing link when it comes to upheld a living and working arrangement that secures staying “in the game” and not to fall out. Quite a number of the WILCO innovations are about establishing such kind of short-term time-limited ad hoc support. A telling example is e.g. the “Welfare Foundation Ambrosiano” in Milano (Italy) that has the mission to support individuals and families disregarding of their previous and/or current type of working contract and place of origin who are in conditions of temporary need for various reasons (job loss, illness...); another similar example is the targeted discretionary housing payment scheme from Birmingham (UK), addressing people on their way from welfare to work by time limited payments that ease the costs of transition, helping e.g. towards rent arrears. A third example is given by a SI in Geneva (Switzerland), the Unit of Temporary Housing, where flats in a building are reserved for young people in special difficulties. What is specific is that residents may be supported by a team employed by the municipality, comprising a building manager and nurses. This service takes into account risk biographies and how in life accidents issues of health, employment, family status and housing situation overlap.

Developing offers that meet newly emerging risks, beyond fixed social and participation rights and entitlements

Much of what has been presented above is about so far unknown gaps, a feature that some call “new risks”, not foreseen in the manual of standard risks that made up for the social service offers and transfer-systems of post-war-welfare-states. Many of the innovative offers and measures that develop here are not very stable in terms of institutionalization and legal status; this makes a difference to the core area of public welfare institutions in health, education or pension schemes. New disperse offers form a kind of settlement, that may either be the forerunner of later more stable rights or just a shaky substitute for social rights and entitlements that have been or get shortened. Among the broad variety of innovations that represent offers related to new risks - be it services, cash or various other forms of time limited support - are e.g. programs such as the public rental housing program in Zagreb (Croatia), giving better access to housing for a kind of group in need that had not been known or - more accurately - “publicly acknowledged” before: young families that are just on the way to start into working life but have already to bear the manifold responsibilities and burdens of parenthood.

Working by kind of “social contracts” with individuals and groups

By tradition, most public welfare offers and services have the status of rights that are unconditional insofar they require usually only a set of material preconditions to be fulfilled in order to have access to support in a defined situation of need. A new tendency in welfare arrangements, namely in the field of “workfare”, differs from that insofar here, the clients enter a kind of contractual relationship where the preconditions needed for support are concerning the future behaviour of the client(s). They have to be ready to contract in for a number of duties to take over in exchange for what they get from society. Mostly this is about proving the readiness to increase one's employability by taking part in training measures etc. These types of contractual relationships (different from traditional rights) are about defined responsibilities the clients take exclusively for themselves (or sometimes their next of kin).

Among our set of innovations there have been other types of contracts. These are kind of micro-social-contracts that define the claim to give something back for what one gets from society in a broader way: people get access to some goods and services once they oblige themselves to do something for others: in form of volunteer work, defined tasks of personal support for people in need in the community etc. An example for such practices of a different more socially defined kind of working with contracts is given by “Time for Roof”, an inter-generational home-share service in Nantes, offering cheap lodging for students that enter an inter-generational co-habitation arrangement. In a similar way in a program called “Fare e habitare” (Doing and living), a social housing agency in Brescia (Italy) has developed special offers for young people, where they as dwellers pay very little rents, presupposed that they engage themselves by civic activities - be they cultural, social (in the field of integration of migrants) or pro-environmental (e.g. doing urban gardening).

1.1 Innovations in governance

The cases of SIs that have been studied all represent a combination of new “products” and new “processes” The latter term refers to both - the internal organisation of decision-making and ways of interacting with the environment - the public, various stakeholders, social partners and political and administrative authorities. Hence most SIs that aim at developing new kinds of services have as well a governance dimension. However for some innovations, influencing and changing the system of governance has been found as being their core issue.

Fostering units and types of organization that operate in more embedded and networked ways

Stating that the traditional service organizations and systems are very much focused on their respective special tasks, functioning like “silos”, has become nearly a stereotype. The low degree of cooperation and sharing holds as true as for those parts of the service-landscape that have been shaped by managerial reforms. These kinds of reforms fostered a concentration of single organizations on their respective core-tasks and a more competitive rather than cooperative orientation. In contrast to that social innovations are characterized by bringing together what is usually separated, be it ideas, concerns or practices. Since the SIs that we studied have a highly local character they are much more embedded than organizations that act as part of a hierarchical system be it in business or centralized welfare administrations. Furthermore the complex goals of many SIs correlate with networked ways of action. A good example for unconventional forms of networking are for instance the Neighbourhood Stores for Education, Research, and Talent Development in Amsterdam (Netherlands), where teacher and students from the university cooperate with activists in a community development programme that links governmental, non-profit and business organizations. This kind of trilateral cooperation can be found in many of the SIs that operate in the field of programmes for restoring housing estates and revitalizing urban neighbourhoods. A good example is given by the Neighbourhood Management Project in Berlin-Kreuzberg that links not only community groups and local business but as well various departments of the public welfare system reaching from the urban planning over to the school department.

Giving new concerns and groups a voice in the public domain

Innovation means as well, to address issues, concerns and related forms of self-organizing in a way that is more up to date with changing challenges and pressures. Conventional orders of presenting and organizing concerns often do not work anymore. Looking back to the history of conflict-articulation and -management in welfare states, this means e.g. that the various special needs of groups can mostly not get anymore assembled under the

roof of an overarching “workers movement” and its organization clusters. But one can observe as well changes in *new* social movements such as the environmental and feminist movements when it comes to themes and self-definitions of today. Impressive examples in our sample come here e.g. from movements and initiatives in post-socialist countries concerning the needs of women and mothers, speaking for themselves and their families. Both the MaMa Foundation in Warsaw and the RODA initiative (Zagreb) have overcome the traditional restricted focus on getting the same role as men in a male-shaped labour market; they include and highlight other concerns that had before been seen as mere private issues, scandalizing local environments and systems that before and after socialist times showed little interest in the manifold challenges of care and the difficulties to get to new ways of working and family life that give caring tasks an upgrade in public and policy agendas. The ways movements such as MaMa Foundation and RODA combine self-organizing, protest, campaigning and the upbuilding of own service and self-help organizations is an innovative contribution in the field of gender and family issues.

Organizing more intense forms of public debate and opinion-building around prior challenges in cohesion policies

In contrast to those agencies and service providers that work much on rather routinized issues, innovative organizations are by their very nature forced to create publicity to advertise and convince. The unconventional way they define their own needs and concerns and seek to act upon them calls for a strong orientation to the outside. However quite often “publicity” is hard to reach and moreover opinion building is difficult when it is left to the usual interplay of a single group or initiative with professional opinion builders and politicians. Some of the innovations we selected have been eager with finding new forms of organizing debates, deliberation processes and publicity in order to establish finally a new consensus on priorities and agendas. Among such examples there are e.g. two especially impressive ones. First of all there has been the Maggio 12 Initiative in Milano that aimed at bringing together concerned citizens, experts, politicians, professionals and administrators in an organized deliberation process on a new agenda for dealing with children and childhood. Similarly the city council of Bern acted in an innovative and courageous way when it invited experts and professionals to develop a process that led to widely consented guidelines on how the city should deal with migrants and the tasks of their integration into city life.

Building issue related coalitions and partnerships

Networking can have various meanings. Often the focus is on day-to-day relationships between various organizations and agencies. A more demanding kind of networking is represented by coalitions, partnerships, and alliances, as more intense and dense forms of interaction that are often concerned with raising or upgrading an issue. Establishing such kind of actorship that is at once unified and plural can be seen as an important innovative element in policy making and participating in governance. A telling example is a SI from Plock (Poland), the Foundation Grant Fund for Plock, a joint initiative of the municipality and two local firms. It is tried to combine the potential of the public and private sector in support of projects that serve the local community. Besides examples from the field of urban, housing and neighbourhood revitalization, an SI already mentioned such as the Foundation Ambrosiano in Milano gives good example; one could point here as well once again at SIs like the MaMa Foundation (Warsaw) or RODA (Zagreb) that depend much from building such alliances.

2.4. Innovations in modes of working and financing

When taking up this issue it is important to point at the fact that innovations take shape under given, often-adverse circumstances. While this for it is banal it represents quite a

challenge when it comes to disentangle what is “innovative” about a project and development and what is just an effect of the deconstruction of or regression in existing welfare models and regulations. When innovation means to deal differently with a given challenge or pressure this must often entail a way to accept and live with worsening material conditions. This tends to increase the anyway huge imbalance between ambitions on the one and conditions and means on the other hand. Therefore innovative elements like flexible teamwork are hard to disentangle from the mere reflex to conditions where it is impossible to offer some basic degree of job security. And likewise an innovative way of working in a multi-stakeholder perspective can entail as well to accept as a fact a chronically underfunded local public sector, making it difficult to differentiate between a perspective of winning additional societal support and using local partners as a spare wheel.

Flexicurity in working contracts; levels of institutionalization and security below traditional standards

Throughout, the descriptions of the modes of working in SIs show working arrangements that could be assembled under the label of flexicurity, i.e. a mix of elements that are about balancing constant changes in tasks, positions and time arrangements of the workers and a degree of minimal reliability in working conditions. People working in projects and earning their money there may enjoy an atmosphere of creativity and trust-based relationships that allow for many of the various co-operators to “plug in” just for a while and to accept short term contracts, being sure that there is a possibility for a new contract once circumstances allow. However, all these mixes between some attractive and other more frightening elements in the modes of working, between gains and sacrifices, are far from being chosen or much to be shaped by those who work there. The SI “Kreuzberg Acts” describes some of these recurrent dilemmas. Lok.a.Motion, a social enterprise organisation that is counselling local business and start ups interweaving this with community development presents a sharp contrast to public administrations where the size of staff is stable and jobs are socially protected. Having very few permanent staff provides Lok.a.Motion with sufficient leeway to decide whether a certain project actually suits to their key professional principles. The flip side of the agency’s flexibility is that Lok.a.Motion is not a good employer in traditional terms by benefiting from a satellite system of unsecured co-operators around its small core of constant jobholders.

Different working collectives - professional teams and voluntary commitments as part of the projects and approaches

It has already been mentioned that the kind of arrangements for cooperation in SIs are much more diversified than in the public or business sector, including not only various forms of casual paid cooperation but as well many forms of voluntary and civic contributions, reaching from short term activism over to regular unpaid volunteering with a long-term perspective, from “hands on” volunteer work over to constant inputs by civic engagement in a board. Therefore from what is reported on the various SIs one gets the impression that here working fields are taking shape that are innovative in two respects. First of all they are innovative since they balance of very different arrangements for networking paid work, volunteering and civic engagement. And secondly it is at least remarkably new to see, how much the demarcation lines between those who operate inside and those that get addressed as co-producers are often blurring. This can be illustrated by much of the examples of innovations in housing and neighbourhood revitalization. Another illustrative example standing for similar others is an initiative like “Bimbo chiama bimbo” (Child calls Child) (Brescia); here, voluntary commitment and community work is both in quantitative and qualitative terms more important than the contribution of paid staff; a similarly illustrative case for the strong role of users as co-

producers, volunteers and participants is given by the description of the SI “Ilot Stephenson - Co-production of housing in a major urban renewal district in Lille” (France).

Strong mission profile and a professionalism that combines formerly fragmented knowledge

When going through the list of innovations in our pool it is interesting to see throughout the concern with finding catchy labels for the respective initiative and project. Where traditional organizations often presuppose that their business is basically known and established, SIs have to take care to make their missions’ profile as clear as possible and well known; advertising oneself in the various (social) media is a core task of many of the innovations. The various forms of cooperation between concerned citizens, volunteers and professionals within and at the fringes of the project entail as well special processes of social learning on all sides.

The kind of professional to be found in many of the innovative projects and initiatives has to manage tasks that often escape traditional professions and the divisions of labour they imply; professionals in the innovations have to learn to dialogue with addressees, co-citizens and volunteers; they are sometimes simultaneously specialists, entrepreneurs and managers. This kind of re-professionalization processes may e.g. concern architects that work simultaneously as community organizers and mediators. The SI example of supporting housing self renovation in Lille “Companion Builders” (Les compagnons bâtisseurs) managing, training and supervising the implementation of a self-renovation process in a region where such practices have been like elsewhere marginal and unprofessional gives a good example. Likewise the “Primano” initiative in Bern, a pre-school education program targeting disadvantaged children and their families in selected districts, is another telling example. This can be complemented by the example of the Neighbourhood Mothers (Berlin) that points at the enormous difficulties when it comes to succeed in giving room for new types of professional work in the established classification systems of acknowledged licensed professions.

Short term and time-limited funding, combining resources from different stakeholders

Many if not most of the SIs we dealt with are based on a multiplicity of resources and their combination; the mix may vary and often state-financing may be the most important component; but mostly there is a degree of (financial) co-responsibility of other organizations from the civil society or the business sector; furthermore the funding arrangements are very often precarious and limited in time. Here once again innovative elements mix with hardships one would like to lower or avoid. The strengthening of social innovation and the accompanying of welfare down building are often hard to disentangle. Interesting examples of the possibilities opened up and the restrictions that are found are given e.g. by the SI “Job explorers” in Berlin that matches a. o. money from the chamber of industry and commerce and the local labour market office for programs that build bridges between schools and local employers. The work corporations from Nijmegen (Netherlands) are another example about the “art” of mixing own income from service activities and funding from various local and other sources.

2.5. Innovations concerning the entity of (local) welfare systems

The WILCO project has operated with the task of looking at the possible contributions of SIs for changes and developments in local *welfare systems*. We have understood that consciously this label addresses more than just the local *welfare-state* institutions. Speaking about a welfare system usually means to include besides the local welfare state/the municipality the welfare related roles and responsibilities from the third sector,

the market sector and the community and family sphere. The cases of social innovations we have looked at testify the mutual relations that exist between all of these four components of a (local) welfare system.

Reaching out to all sectors of local welfare systems; a lesser state focus

Even though the impact of state funding and backing for the SIs that we studied varies very much, one can make the general statement that they are concerned with establishing relations to all of the sectors. Once again, one can argue that most SIs would like to see more state and municipal support but suspect as well that they would reject to get incorporated into the public sector. Therefore it can be argued that the SIs can be caught best by concepts of welfare that are based on a consciously worked out mix and pluralism of resources and responsibilities. Needless to say that the share of state-public welfare contributions from various kind of third sector organisations reaching from associations to social enterprises, from NGOs to community networks and finally the level of corporate social responsibility is a very conflictual matter - not only of ideas but as well of power.

Aiming at less standardized, more diverse and localized welfare arrangements

A second conclusion concerning the understanding of the welfare system as a whole can be related to the basic fact that innovation gets difficult if not impossible wherever a right to act, organise and provide differently is negated; this can be the case both in big private business organisations steered centrally and in respective market sectors controlled by their oligopolies. But it can as well be the case in much of the public sector when e.g. the school or health system is by tradition or by recent managerial reforms (see the managerial reforms in labour market services) organized in a very centralist, highly standardized way. Therefore those who want to give social innovations a more important role will have allow for degrees of decentralisation, diversity, difference and moreover possibilities for unconventional merges between what is usually separated. This holds true both with respect to more time-limited experiments with pilot-schemes and a basic readiness for mainstreaming what has developed outside or at the margins of the respective system of provision and decision-making. Moreover, supporting innovation means to go for arrangements that allow for a new balance between equal standards to be guaranteed and a diversity of localized arrangements, that reach to the same level as elsewhere when doing differently. Good examples for the tasks and problems in interweaving and balancing concerns with equality and diversity can be found e.g. in the example of striving for the right to get the status of a municipality which is allowed to work out own options for occupational integration strategies (“Optionskommune” Münster). Concerns with and conflicts around the aim of allowing more variety of service provision can be illustrated as well by the SI “Casas Amigas” (Friendly Homes) in Pamplona (Spain) aiming at upgrading the status of in-house child care as part of the possible choice of child care services.

Upgrading the community component in mixed welfare systems (families, support networks etc.)

In various ways the SIs that have been assembled in the WILCO project are about upgrading the community-component in mixed and plural welfare systems. This shows first of all by innovations that are about services that rather seek to strengthen and support the role of families in caring and taking responsibilities than merely to substitute a loss in their capabilities and resources by professional child minding. Secondly community activation and participation is upgraded throughout in the innovative concepts for modernising housing estates and revitalizing urban areas. Given the fact that quite often the community-sphere is subsumed under a “third sector” of voluntary associations in society, excluding family relationships and rather informal neighbourhood--communities from such a view, it is all the more important to see how innovative forms and functions of community are a dimension of many social innovations. Good examples for the intertwining

of the public and community sphere and their sharing of responsibilities for care are given by the example of the Neighbourhood Cafes in Lille which open up tasks and concerns with family life to the community; others are the Neighbourhood companies where a housing corporation in Amsterdam decided to support community organizing in their housing areas under reconstruction. Obviously, once again it may be argued that it is unavoidable to highlight the community component of welfare systems when the focus of the project as a whole is on local levels and welfare systems. Yet on the other hand it should certainly be noted, that many SIs are in a way challenging an understanding of welfare, wherein community is seen as a rather parochial element to be substituted stepwise by more state-public, professionalized and completely freely chosen “voluntary” elements.

Integrating economic and social logics (entrepreneurial action, developmental welfare)

Differently to the aforementioned point the integration of social and economic logics is a much better established concern in the debates on the profile of future welfare systems. On the one hand there is the lively public debate about the creeping economisation of all spheres and an increasingly productivist attitude, that measures all social actions and relations first of all with respect to their measurable economic effects. On the other hand there is as well the debate about the welfare state as a “social investment state” modernizing public welfare by an approach that argues with the positive economic by-effects of raising social expenses on education, family support, occupational and social integration. Especially those SIs that e.g. in urban revitalization try to interweave active participation of people as co-producers and co-decision makers with public and private investments can be seen in such a social investment perspective of societal development. Furthermore the various SIs that operate as (work integration) social enterprises point at the wider tendency of acknowledging the social embeddedness of economic and entrepreneurial action and the possibilities of combining both in a renewed understanding of welfare in an “activating social investment” perspective (Evers and Guillemard 2012).

Integrating welfare and urban politics

This final point is about the limits of a concept that articulates problems of social cohesion in society and its cities mainly with respect to welfare policies. Even if one acknowledges the need to integrate concerns with social and economic policies in an investment perspective and even if one includes the welfare functions and effects of market, third sector and community actors in a mixed welfare approach, this enlarged welfare concept cannot frame all the fields that count for the development of social innovations and likewise social inclusion. First of all policy fields that are usually excluded from the welfare system such as environmental policies or cultural activities are important stages for socially innovative developments. The two examples of innovations linked with the urban gardening movement, the “Gardens of Life” from Varaždin and the “Prinzessinnengärten” from Berlin point at the role of environmental politics.

Furthermore there is the important policy field of spatial planning and development - be it on the level of neighbourhood's cities or regions. The very fact that many of the innovations collected and presented by the WILCO-project look for better social cohesion and inclusion by interweaving social welfare and urban / spatial planning can hardly be overlooked. The innovations consist in establishing an essential link between urban transformation and social intervention, something completely new in local planning and based on merging knowledge and professionals from diverse fields (architects, economists, educators and social workers). A good example is the Omradesprogrammet which aims at lifting several districts in Malmö (Sweden) by the cooperation of “resource groups” such as for city development, the elderly, young people, culture and recreation and last not least labour market and economic growth. Thereby the program is both about the problem-oriented cooperation of departments of social and economic planning and about the

intertwining of spatial with social planning areas. Not by accident our collection of social innovations, deemed as important and promising by local experts, is in large parts located at the intersection of welfare and urban development.

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES AND INSTRUMENTS IN THE FIELDS OF URBAN REVITALIZATION, CHILDCARE AND WORK INTEGRATION

Dimensions of innovation

I. Service innovations

- **Investing in capabilities rather than spotting deficits**

The Second Chance School of Nantes (France), Her second chance (Varaždin/Croatia), The Future Melting Pot (Birmingham/UK), work corporations (Nijmegen/Netherlands), neighbourhood companies (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Neighbourhood or Constituency Employment and Skills Plans (Birmingham/UK), Young people with a future (Barcelona/Spain), Become your own boss in Poland (Warsaw/Poland), Yalla Trappan (Malmö/Sweden), Filur project (Stockholm/Sweden), Project for young mothers (Bern/Switzerland)

- **Preference for open approaches avoiding targeting with stigmatizing effects**

Early Childhood centres (Lille/France), Primano (Berne/Switzerland), Yalla Trappan (Malmö/Sweden), Bimbo chiama Bimbo (Brescia/Italy), Neighbourhood or Constituency Employment and Skills Plans (Birmingham/UK), Coompanion Inkubatorn (Malmö/Sweden), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden), Family Office (Münster/Germany)

- **Concern with bridging the gaps between professional services and people's life worlds**

Early Childhood centres (Lille/France), Primano (Berne/Switzerland), neighbourhood mothers (Berlin/Germany), Joint assessment of families' needs and changes in childcare provision for single-parent families (Nantes/France), Neighbourhood Mothers Catering (Amsterdam/Netherlands), SIROCCO (Nijmegen/Netherlands), Young people with a future (Barcelona/Spain), Casas Amiga's (Pamplona/Spain), Plock Council of Seniors (Plock/Poland)

- **Service-offers that connect otherwise often separated forms of support and access**

Housing advice surgeries (Medway/UK), Service point for families (Münster/Germany), Neighbourhood companies (Amsterdam/Netherlands), UNA CASA IN PIU' ("ONE HOUSE MORE") (Brescia/Italy), "FARE E ABITARE" ("DOING AND LIVING") (Brescia/Italy), Joint assessment of families' needs and changes in childcare provision for single-parent families (Nantes/France), Foundation for Development Beyond Borders /Warsaw/Poland), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden), Family Office (Münster/Germany)

II. Innovations in regulations and rights

- **Creating flexible forms of ad hoc support**

Milan Welfare Foundation (Milan/Italy), targeted discretionary housing payments (Birmingham/UK), Unit for Temporary Housing (Geneva), "Time for Roof" (Nantes/France), Social integration housing (Pamplona (Spain), Become your own boss in Poland (Warsaw/Poland)

- **Developing offers beyond fixed social and participation rights and entitlements**

MAMBA (Münster/Germany), Unit for Temporary Housing (Geneva), Milan Welfare Foundation (Milan/Italy), targeted discretionary housing payments (Birmingham/UK), UNA CASA IN PIU' ("ONE HOUSE MORE") (Brescia/Italy), "FARE E ABITARE" ("DOING AND LIVING") (Brescia/Italy), "Time for Roof" (Nantes/France), Gardens of Life (Varaždin/Croatia), public rental housing program (Zagreb/Croatia), Social integration housing (Pamplona (Spain), Casas Amiga's (Pamplona/Spain), THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION (Plock/Poland), City Social Housing Societies (Plock/Poland), Foundation for Development Beyond Borders /Warsaw/Poland), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden), Family Office (Münster/Germany)

- **Working by kind of "social contracts" with individuals and groups**

Ilot Stephenson (Lille/France), Support for housing self-renovation (Lille/France), "Time for Roof" (Nantes/France), A FUTURE FOR EVERYBODY (Nijmegen/Netherlands), Public works (Varaždin/Croatia), Gardens of Life (Varaždin/Croatia), Neighbourhood children's services (Pamplona/Spain), Coompanion Inkubatorn (Malmö/Sweden), Filur project

<i>(Stockholm/Sweden), Prevention visits (Münster/Germany)</i>
III. Innovations in governance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fostering units and types of organisation, that operate in more embedded and networked ways <i>Citizen Agreement for an inclusive city (Barcelona/Spain), Neighbourhood Stores for Education, Research, and Talent Development (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Birmingham Municipal Housing Trust (Birmingham/UK), Neighbourhood or Constituency Employment and Skills Plans (Birmingham/UK), Young people with a future (Barcelona/Spain), Neighbourhood children's services (Pamplona/Spain), THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION (Plock/Poland), City Social Housing Societies (Plock/Poland), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden), Family Office (Münster/Germany)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizing more intense forms of public debate and opinion-building around prior challenges in cohesion policies <i>Maggio 12 (Milan/Italy), Citizen Agreement for an inclusive city (Barcelona/Spain), La Mina" Transformation Plan (Barcelona/Spain), Plock Council of Seniors (Plock/Poland), Team for Solving Social Problems in the field of Housing, Reprivatization, Homelessness and Social Exclusion (Warsaw/Poland), Integration guidelines (Bern/Switzerland), Optionskommune (Münster/Germany), Hafenforum (Münster/Germany)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Giving new concerns and groups a voice in the public domain <i>MaMa Foundation (Warsaw/Poland), Association for Legal Intervention (Warsaw/Poland), RODA (Zagreb/Croatia), RODA (Zagreb/Croatia), Plock Council of Seniors (Plock/Poland), THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION (Plock/Poland), Foundation for Development Beyond Borders (Warsaw/Poland), Integration guidelines (Bern/Switzerland)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building issue related coalitions, partnerships and networks <i>MAMBA (Münster/Germany), Citizen Agreement for an inclusive city (Barcelona/Spain), Association for Legal Intervention (Warsaw/Poland), "Fondazione Housing Sociale (Milan/Italy), Public works (Varaždin/Croatia), RODA (Zagreb/Croatia), Birmingham Municipal Housing Trust (Birmingham/UK), La Mina" Transformation Plan (Barcelona/Spain), Young people with a future (Barcelona/Spain), Grant Fund for Plock (Plock/Poland), Foundation for Development Beyond Borders (Warsaw/Poland), Team for Solving Social Problems in the field of Housing, Reprivatization, Homelessness and Social Exclusion (Warsaw/Poland), Miljardprogrammet (Stockholm/Sweden), Optionskommune (Münster/Germany), Osthuesheide (Münster/Germany), Hafenforum (Münster/Germany)</i>
IV. Innovations in working and financing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexicurity in working contracts; levels of institutionalizing and security below traditional standards <i>Employment Insertion Service (Brescia/Italy), Yalla Trappan (Malmö/Sweden), Kreuzberg acts (Berlin/Germany)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different working collectives - professional teams and voluntary commitments as part of the projects and approaches <i>VIA DEL CARMINE 15 (Brescia/Italy), Ilot Stephenson (Lille/France), Support for housing self-renovation (Lille/France), Områdesprogrammet (Malmö/Sweden), Miljardprogrammet (Stockholm/Sweden), Osthuesheide (Münster/Germany)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong mission profile and a changing professionalism that combines formerly fragmented knowledge <i>MAMBA (Münster/Germany), Fryshuset - Children to lone Mothers (Stockholm/Sweden), Joint assessment of families' needs and changes in childcare provision for single-parent families (Nantes/France), Områdesprogrammet (Malmö/Sweden), Coompanion Inkubatorn (Malmö/Sweden), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden), Primano (Berne/Switzerland), Prevention visits (Münster/Germany), Family Office (Münster/Germany), Neighbourhood mothers (Berlin/Germany)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short term and time-limited funding, combining resources from different

<p>stakeholders</p> <p><i>work corporations (Nijmegen/Netherlands), targeted discretionary housing payments (Birmingham/UK), Milan Welfare Foundation (Milan/Italy), “Fondazione Housing Sociale (Milan/Italy), Grant Fund for Plock (Plock/Poland), Områdesprogrammet (Malmö/Sweden), Coompanion Inkubatorn (Malmö/Sweden), Jobexplorer (Berlin/Germany), Filur project (Stockholm/Sweden), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden), Kreuzberg acts (Berlin/Germany)</i></p>
<p>V. Innovations in welfare-systems</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaching out to all sectors of local welfare systems; lesser state focus <i>Birmingham Municipal Housing Trust (Birmingham/UK), Grant Fund for Plock (Plock/Poland)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aiming at less standardized, more diverse and localized welfare arrangements <i>Community Centres (Medway/UK), neighbourhood mothers (Berlin/Germany), VIA DEL CARMINE 15 (Brescia/Italy), “Time for Roof” (Nantes/France), SIROCCO (Nijmegen/Netherlands), Neighbourhood children's services (Pamplona/Spain), Casas amigas (Pamplona/Spain), Fryshuset (Stockholm/Sweden)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrading the community component in mixed welfare systems (families, support networks etc.) <i>Neighbourhood companies (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Early Childhood centres (Lille/France), Primano (Berne/Switzerland), Community Centres (Medway/UK), Princess Gardens (Berlin/Germany), Neighborhood Stores for Education, Research, and Talent Development (Amsterdam/Netherlands), A FUTURE FOR EVERYBODY (Nijmegen/Netherlands), SIROCCO (Nijmegen/Netherlands), La Mina” Transformation Plan (Barcelona/Spain), Neighbourhood children's services (Pamplona/Spain), THE RUSSIAN COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION (Plock/Poland)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrating economic and social logics (entrepreneurial action, developmental welfare) <i>Neighbourhood Management (Berlin/Germany), work corporations (Nijmegen/Netherlands), Yalla Trappan (Malmö/Sweden), The Future Melting Pot (Birmingham/UK), neighbourhood companies (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Neighborhood Mothers Catering (Amsterdam/Netherlands), A FUTURE FOR EVERYBODY (Nijmegen/Netherlands), RODA (Zagreb/Croatia), Youth Employment and Enterprise Rehearsal project (Birmingham/UK), Become your own boss in Poland (Warsaw/Poland), Coompanion Inkubatorn (Malmö/Sweden), Kreuzberg acts (Berlin/Germany)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrating welfare and urban politics <i>Neighbourhood companies (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Community centres (Medway/UK), Neighbourhood Management (Berlin/Germany), Princess Gardens (Berlin/Germany), Early childhood centres (Lille/France), Ilot Stephenson (Lille/France), Support for housing self-renovation (Lille/France), Neighborhood Stores for Education, Research, and Talent Development (Amsterdam/Netherlands), A FUTURE FOR EVERYBODY (Nijmegen/Netherlands), SIROCCO (Nijmegen/Netherlands), Gardens of Life (Varazdin/Croatia), La Mina” Transformation Plan (Barcelona/Spain), Social integration housing (Pamplona/Spain), City Social Housing Societies (Plock/Poland), Grant Fund for Plock (Plock/Poland), Områdesprogrammet (Malmö/Sweden), Miljardprogrammet (Stockholm/Sweden), Osthuesheide (Münster/Germany)</i>

REFERENCES

- Bureau of European Policy Advisers (BEPA) (2010): *Empowering people, driving change. Social Innovation in The European Union*, available via http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/pdf/publications_pdf/social_innovation.pdf
- Cels, S./De Jong, J./Nauta, F. (2012): *Agents of Change. Strategy and Tactics for Social Innovation*, Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Evers, A./Guillemard, A. M. (2012): *Social Policy and Citizenship*, New York: Oxford University Press
- INNOSEV (2012): *Innovative practices In Europe: INNOSEV Project Selection of Innovative Practices*, available via http://www.innosev.eu/sites/default/files/WP3%20Report_Innovative%20practices%20INNOSEV_0.pdf
- Moulaert, F. (2010): *Social Innovation and Community Development. Concepts, Theories and Challenges*. In Moulaert, F./Martinelli, F./Swygedouw, E./González, S. (Eds.) *Can neighbourhoods save the city?*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 4-16
- Mulgan, G. (2006): *The Process of Social Innovation*, *Innovations* 1 (2) pp. 145-162
- Osborne, St. P./Brown, L. (2011): Innovation, public policy and public services delivery in the UK: The word that would be king?, *Public Administration* 89 (4), pp. 1335-1350
- Phills, J. (2008): Rediscovering social innovation, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6(4), pp. 36-43
- Wagner, P. (1994): *A Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline*, London: Routledge

The main results from the WILCO Project take the form of:

- Various types of publications: research reports, working papers, policy briefs, position papers, grassroots events reports, and summary of findings.
- Two edited volumes on social innovation: > “Social vulnerability in European cities” (2014) > “Social Innovations in the urban context” (2015)
- An e-book “Social Innovations for social cohesion 77 cases 20 European cities” (ISBN: 978-2-930773-00-1. Available in PDF, eReader and ePub)
- A documentary divided in three individual video pieces was produced at the end of the Project:
 - Social vulnerability in European cities.
 - Social Innovations across Europe.
 - Governance of innovation across European cities.

All the results are available on the WILCO Project website
www.wilcoproject.eu