

TiPSE

The **T**erritorial **D**imension of **P**overty and **S**ocial **E**xclusion in Europe

Applied Research 2013/1/24

Assessment of the Final Report

Gianmichele PANARELLI

Sounding Board Expert

November 2014



Assessment of Final Report (TiPSE)

Standard contractual demands for the Final Report

The **Final Report** is divided in three Parts (A: Executive Summary; B: Main Report; C: Scientific Report). Part C is made of 11 annexes.

The report contains: main results, trends, impacts and options for policy development, key analysis, diagnosis and findings, as well as the most relevant indicators and maps.

The report is included in the fifty pages required.

The **Executive summary** is included in the ten pages required and it is divided in five parts: “Key Empirical Findings”; “Concepts and Policy Approaches”; “Patterns of Poverty”; “Patterns of Social Exclusion”; “Monitoring and Policy Implications”.

The **Scientific report**, including the Literature and methodology/theory used (Annex 1: Review of Concepts of Poverty and Social Exclusion), explores – particularly in its Part 1 and Part 2 – the academic debates around the concepts of poverty, of social exclusion and of a combined ‘poverty and social exclusion’ concept. Part 2 then considers the conceptualisations of the territorial nature of poverty/social exclusion from an academic viewpoint. Bibliographies of reference are in the References chapter (pag. 36-44) of Annex 1.

The indicators used are listed in the Annex 1, chapter 4 (Implication for Indicators); they are presented and grouped in four domains, related to “earning a living”, “access to basic services”, “social environment”, and “political participation”. Poverty and Social Exclusion indicators disseminated by Eurostat, are in the Annex 11, chapter 4.

Annex 2 contains the TiPSE database and – particularly – in the table 4 (Calculation of TiPSE indicators) are presented the: indicator, numerator, denominator.

In the Annex 5 we have Data availability and choice of methodology.

Annex 3 (Case Study Guideline) and Annex 4 (Comparative Analysis Case Studies) show in detail the results of the implemented case studies. In chapter 4 of Annex 3 is illustrated the Structure Case Study Report.

Annex 5 and 6 contain, respectively, the "Implementation of Poverty Mapping" and the "Development and Mapping of Social Exclusion Indicators", representing the maps produced in support of results.

Annex 7 reports the Commentary on Poverty Maps and Analysis.

Annex 8 reports instead the “Analysis of Conceptual Implications of Social Exclusion Maps”.

A roadmap for policy implementation is given in the Annex 10 (Implications for Policy). "Recommendations by target institutions" are listed – particularly at page 36-40 – and divided in: All Policy and Data Arenas at all Scales; European Parliament and Committees; European Commission and its Institutions; Other European Organisations; Member States.

Detailed recommendations for future monitoring of poverty and social exclusion are presented in Annex 11.

Gianmichele Panarelli

Sounding board expert, nov.'14



EUROPEAN UNION

Part-financed by the European Regional Development Fund
INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

Judgement of the scientific quality

The complexity of the topic, the difficulty in obtaining current data and the particular historical moment (the economic and financial crisis of 2008 is still having a great impact in some European countries such as Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain) is strongly committed to the group of work in the elaboration of data collected and in the definition of the indicators to be used.

The methodology developed by the TPG has been applied in a consistent manner and the chains of reasoning are logic throughout the report. The report is clear on the data that was used as well as on the indicators and the typology developed.

The methodology adopted, strictly scientific, after a survey about Key Empirical Finding and the illustration of Concepts and Policy Approaches, Patterns of Poverty and Patterns of Social Exclusion (generally speaking) seeks to contextualize the individual contexts, concepts and indicators.

The Scientific Report is clear and the development of indicators is described, as well as their mapping; the typology work gives a comprehensive account of the case study work. The provided informations is very rich.

The models are mapped (Mapping patterns of income poverty and Mapping Patterns of Social Exclusion).

The scientific report (made up of altogether eleven annexes) presents very thoroughly the methodological approach developed and applied throughout the project.

On the basis of the review of the academic and policy literature, the availability of data, and the specific frameworks of the project, we have identified different domains and a number of indicators (in FR and in Annex 7, pag.13 and Annex 6 Development and Mapping of Social Exclusion Indicators).

Also the concepts used are sufficiently described in the main report and presented in greater detail in the scientific report.

The project has been confronted with a number of challenges regarding data availability. Annex 4 has an anomaly in the page numbering (changed from 57 to 60).

The project is coherent with the general objectives of applied research projects under Priority 1 (Applied research on territorial development, competitiveness and cohesion), in fact, it achieves the goal of studying European trends, perspectives and policy impacts related to Poverty and social exclusion, including Cross-thematic and thematic analysis (defining territorial potentials and challenges), as well as studies of territorial trends and the related prospective studies.

One of the key findings of the project is certainly that the key EU 2020 indicator for measuring poverty (i.e. the ARoP rate) is not a “failsafe” indicator of subjectively experienced poverty, since basic living costs also vary considerably between different areas, often exacerbating both urban and rural income disparities.



The literature used is rich and varied and belonging to different currents of thought, though they're not always easy to read, in their distribution within the different annexes. Inside the Interim Report assessment (SB expert Panarelli G. - July 2012) some interesting ESPON projects (probably useful to TiPSE) were reported (DEMIFER¹, EDORA², FOCl³ and ReRisk⁴), with the recommendation to further investigate them. The last one of those projects appeared particularly crucial in tying the energy theme to the new poverty, already defined as 'fuel poverty'.

The Response on Draft Final Report (Version 7 July 2014) on page 8 (2.3) says: *...the Inception Report, for instance, also mentioned the Typology Compilation, BEST METROPOLISES and ITAN as projects that TiPSE has either made use of or had the intention to do so. These projects don't appear anymore in the Draft Final Report. By the same token, the CU response to the Inception Report recommended also looking into TRACC FOC, ReRisk... The Final Report should clearly state if these projects had been used in any way in the framework of TiPSE and if so how, respectively if not, why not.* The answers to these questions are not very clear.

The report is generally well elaborated, focusing on the right level of detail and providing more than sufficient and relevant information.

The territorial phenomena are described at macro, meso and micro level, where possible.

The Final Report should work as a stand-alone document, including all the relevant informations needed (avoiding the reader to search for data and references in different attachments). Considering the complexity of the research (in terms of number of documents, data, graphics and attachments), it would have been useful to have a summary table of the preparation and/or the submission of a summary sheet project addressed to a larger target group not fully confident with the exact details of the project set-up.

¹ **DEMIFER, Demographic and Migratory Flows Affecting European Regions and Cities - Policy brief "Demographic Diversity of the European Territory" September 2011 and Policy brief "Impact of migration on Population change" September 2011**

² **EDORA, European Development Opportunities in Rural Areas.**

³ **FOCl, Future Orientation for Cities.** Chap. 4 - Cities and social cohesion. Executive summary version 15/12/2010. *Social polarisation in cities is increasing and above a certain threshold of wealth, the latter is not linked to social cohesion indicators.*

⁴ **ReRisk, Regions at Risk of Energy Poverty Effects.** Rising energy prices on regional competitiveness



Judgement of the usefulness for policy development

The policy recommendations presented in Chapter 6 of the FR (Implications of These findings for EU Cohesion policy, and policy for MS, page 45) are very well explained in Annex 10 (Implication for Policy). The levels involved are related to the different spatial and organizational scales, also according to the fundamental role played by the component "space".

Particularly, (pag 36-40 of Annex 10) there are cited the "Recommendations, listed by target institutions", divided in: All Policy and Data Arenas at all Scales; European Parliament and Committees; European Commission and its Institutions; Other European Organisations; Member States.

Detailed recommendations for future monitoring of poverty and social exclusion are presented in Annex 11.

Probably, the impact of recent economic crisis should have had a different weight, to be considered in the elaboration of policy recommendations. Nevertheless, it is also true that the effects of the crisis are still ongoing and the statistics are not currently relevant, nor complete.

The project takes into account the Territorial Agenda 2020 and ESIF 2014-2020.

Annex 10 is essential for the development policy, in fact re-examines the research conclusions and policy recommendations of the earlier individual annexes and discusses them in the context of the existing policy and of the institutional frameworks at EU, national and subnational level, to derive the key implications for policy from the TIPSE project.

Annex is divided in two sections:

- **Section 1 (Policy Analysis)** analyses the policy and institutional context in which TIPSE's policy recommendations will be made;

Section 1 provides the current policy context for section 2 which will address the implications for policy of the TIPSE research. The analysis relies heavily on the four domains of poverty and social exclusion (P&SE) used in the TIPSE research:

- Earning a living.
- Access to Basic Services.
- Social Environment.
- Political Participation.

- **Section 2 (Implications of TIPSE Findings for Policy)** discusses the main implications for policy from the TIPSE project and outlines a set of recommendations targeted at appropriate institutions.

This section starts by examining the implications for policy of TIPSE's conceptualisation of P&SE. It goes on to examine the broad geographic patterns that emerge from the data analysis and the implications for policy of these. It discusses these in terms of the scale of analysis, by regional classifications and in terms of the economic crisis. It then examines what the project explains about how issues of P&SE are addressed. At each of these stages it provides specific policy recommendations; these are also brought together in the final section and targeted at various institutions at European and MS level.



There is little exploration of the institutional obstacles that may act as a brake on the recommendations identified.

The issues addressed in the research, the variety of data and the diversity of contexts in which it has been worked imposed the need for a scientific rigorous "language", able to avoid confusion (in fact it took a lot of efforts to re-determine terms and concepts): the only way – at least in the initial phase of the work – to save from interpretation mistakes. Naturally, if the scientific language, on the one hand, has made possible the completion of the work, on the other hand, it has required one (or more) "simplifications" able to reach the different stakeholders involved in the processes, identified by the research.

"The language used is at times a bit too academic and not always too easy to take in. For instance the names given to the different types of welfare regimes mentioned on p. ii of the Executive Summary and p. 6 of the Main Report are not very tangible. It will not be immediately clear to everyone what "universalistic" or "corporatist-statist" countries are, nor will the other categories be. Therefore, it would be extremely helpful to briefly explain the distinctive features of each type also in the Main Report".

There's yet another risk in the use of these terms: i.e. the definition of "familism" (tendency to treat the family, with its system of kinship, with its tradition, its social position, and especially with the internal bond of solidarity among its members, predominantly on the rights of the individual and the interests of the general public) belongs to the vocabulary of sociology and even if it seems appropriate for the detected geographic segments, it leaves unexplored the connections with its sociological reasons.

To complete the reading it is necessary to use Annex 10 (Appendix 1 to 5) where are well illustrated the various Welfare Regime: the 'Familial'⁵, pag. 43; the 'Individual'⁶, pag. 67; the 'Society-based'⁷, pag. 79; the 'State-based'⁸, pag. 88; the 'Transitional'⁹, pag. 101.)

The whole reading of the document is sometimes difficult to be understood from a non-specialists audience; moreover, the large amount of data and images (maps) addressed to different target groups discourage the reading for anyone who comes close to the report, simply intrigued by the title of the research.

It would have been helpful to present a summary sheet with the key concepts (definitions of Poverty and Social Exclusion criteria of geographical subdivision/welfare systems, the indicators used and the main recommendations) and with few pictures in summary (e.g. Map 1: "Welfare Regimes and Poverty-Social Exclusion Clusters", pag. iii). The one which, during the presentation of the project (Project Proposal, Application Form, Part B, pag. 48) was announced as:

⁵ **Familial**, Mediterranean, or Southern Model (Greece, Portugal, Italy, Spain, Cyprus)

⁶ **Individual, Liberal**, or "Anglo Saxon" (UK and Ireland).

⁷ **Society-based**, Universalistic, Nordic, or Social Democratic Model (Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway).

⁸ **State-based**, or Corporatist-Statist, (Germany, Austria, France and Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Switzerland).

⁹ **Transitional, or Post-Socialist**, (the former socialist New Member States of Central and Eastern Europe).



Practitioner Guide

The main objective of the Practitioner Guide is to communicate ESPON TIPSE's results in a clear and relevant manner that will be of use to policymakers, practitioners and stakeholders at different spatial scales in Europe. This should be achieved through cooperation with the Stakeholder Advisory Group, which will help ensure that the guide is oriented towards the needs of its intended audience. The guide should be organised as a text that can quickly and easily be referred to.

Even the announced publications (always in the Project Proposal, Application Form, Part B, p. 49) could have had – from time to time – an appropriate language (simplified if necessary), according to the relevant public and in order to give maximum diffusion (thus allowing a transversal utilization of the studies between the various scientific and disciplinary fields) to the great efforts made by the working group in these recent years.

Publications

To communicate ESPON TIPSE findings, promote the project's profile and foster awareness on the Territorial Dimensions of Poverty and Social Exclusion, the TPG will develop a number of policy-relevant articles for journals, newsletters, bulletins and popular media. In doing so, several institutional newsletters and bulletins can be used to reach a broad audience. Peer-reviewed articles produced within a special conference session and/or be submitted to relevant academic journals such as:

- *International Planning Studies*
- *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*
- *European Planning Studies*
- *Progress in Planning*
- *Planning, Practice and Research*
- *disP – The Planning Review*



Advice for next steps

As mentioned in the previous section, the activities for the dissemination and capitalization are very important, even with appropriate languages, in order to achieve maximum dissemination of the achieved results.

In these terms, the publications play a key role, in addition to specialized websites (besides the ESPON's) and to the participation in international conferences.

Moreover, it would be useful to consolidate the working group through further work programs (in the first months of 2015, for example, it will start the new URBACT¹ program, as well as others projects). This would allow to continue working without wasting the knowledge acquired.

Within the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds programme for the 2014-2020 period, LEPs must ensure that at least 20% of the European Social Fund (ESF) element (roughly 10% of the total indicative LEP area allocation) will be invested in activities which address social exclusion and combat poverty.

The Thematic Objective 9: "Social inclusion"², contains important indications in this direction.

The Europe 2020³ Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth sets targets on poverty reduction by aiming to lift at least 20 million people out of the risk of poverty.

The EU target will not be reached based on current national targets. These add up to around 12 million people. If spill-over effects of strategies, focusing on combating child poverty or reducing long-term unemployment, are taken into account, this number can be increased by 25%.

However, this would still fall short by at least 5 million or 25% of the EU headline target.

For the research, as well as for partnership programs, the Horizon 2020 program is of fundamental importance, which could be directly used by research structures, particularly within the *Europe in a changing world - Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies*⁴.

Reducing inequalities and social exclusion in Europe (80 million people at risk of poverty, 14 million young people not in education, employment or training...), overcoming the economic and financial crisis and tackling unemployment (12% in EU and above 20% of youth unemployment in 2012), are crucial challenges for the future of Europe.

¹ URBACT III programme is organised around four main objectives: Capacity for Policy Delivery; Policy Design; Policy Implementation; Building and Sharing Knowledge. Therefore, we propose to concentrate the programme resources for exchange and learning on issues relating to the different thematic objectives including : Thematic Objective 9: **Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty**.

² Legal texts, Guidance on European Structural and Investment Funds 2014-2020,

http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/2014/guidance_social_inclusion.pdf

³ <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/>

⁴ <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/europe-changing-world-inclusive-innovative-and-reflective-societies>



At the same time, there is great potential for Europe through the provided opportunities, for example, by new forms of innovation and by the engagement of citizens.

Supporting inclusive, innovative and reflective societies is a prerequisite for a sustainable European integration.

EU research and innovation will address social exclusion, discriminations and various forms of inequalities. It will explore new forms of innovation and it will strengthen the evidence base for the Innovation Union, the European Research Area and other relevant EU policies.

The basic studies developed with TiPSE certainly represent a good starting point for further research and investigation.



Conclusion

The overall objective stated at the start of the project – "The urgent need for a better understanding of the territorial characteristics of poverty and social exclusion in Europe" – has been achieved.

The primary - or central - aim of the project was a regional database (NUTS 3 and LAU 1) with associated maps of poverty and with social exclusion indicators.

The database and maps will allow the project team to fulfil a number of further objectives. These are of no less importance, indeed their outputs are often of more immediate utility to policy makers, but are contingent upon the fulfilment of the central aim described above. (Establishing the macro and micro-scale patterns of poverty and social exclusion across the ESPON space; Understanding recent trends; Assessing the reliability and policy relevance of commonly used indicators, and consider potential improvements to the EU 2020 poverty reduction targets; Deriving from this evidence-base recommendations for a 'place-based' package of interventions within the EU social policy OMC).

The overall aim and the further objectives have been designed to address all the 'key policy questions' and 'research issues' of the Specification.

The complexity of the issue and the operational difficulties encountered have partially influenced the final output of the job that has a good fit of the case studies in the contexts of reference (10 in total). The selected indicators have allowed a comparison between the different conditions, according with the limits set out by the structural differences between the various countries.

TiPSE Project, in the light of the above, is certainly an important advancement in the scientific framework.

In particular, the highlighting of the direct relationship between Poverty, Social Exclusion and Space (pag. 41-48 of the FR) has made possible the identification of the actions and the recommendations to be taken.

Finally, it is of fundamental importance (at such an important time of economic crisis and of revision of the policies at the European level) to continue the work initiated by the project TiPSE, not only through the dissemination of data and monitoring of actions in the field, but also with more specific insights on the issues of income (poverty) and social exclusion (or inclusion) – intended as the difficulty for the most vulnerable social groups to access basic services such as health, school, housing.

The use of EU funds is determined by the 11 thematic Objectives defined by the European Commission, in line with the Europe 2020 Strategy targeting at smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. From these eleven thematic, "*Promoting Social Inclusion and Combating Poverty*" is the field of action in which it will be possible to test the effects (and determine any corrective) generated by the TiPSE project.





ESPON 2013

**Sounding Board Expert's Assessment
of the Final Report of the Applied Research Project**

"TiPSE"

**The Territorial Dimension of Poverty
and Social Exclusion in Europe**

Standard Contractual Demands
(max 1 page)
Scientific Quality
(max 3 pages)
Usefulness for policy development
(max 3 pages)
Advice for next steps
(max 2 pages)
Conclusion
(max 1 page)

