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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research report summarises the main findings of the work conducted under WP2 “Spatial dimension of solidarity: from local to transnational acts & practices” of the Horizon 2020 project SOLIDUS, *Solidarity in European Societies: Empowerment, Social Justice and Citizenship*.

This document thus includes: 1) a conceptual discussion that examines the impact of socio-spatial dimension on practices and acts of solidarity as well as evaluates the geographical scale of policy interventions conducted in the different countries participating in the project; 2) a cross-country analysis that identifies the relevant drivers and barriers in relation with practices and acts of solidarity between different areas and territories; and 3) policy recommendations regarding future interventions for the promotion of successful acts of solidarity.
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1. Introduction

The recent economic and fiscal crises as well as post-crisis policies of austerity have increased socio-economic inequality and spatial differences between and within the EU member states. Even those societies that have not been subjected to an explicit austerity agenda have been shaped by media debates on questions of redistribution and a new politics of core and periphery.

A crisis of youth unemployment was evident in many nations, cultural and religious differences became more evident, Islamaphobia was the regrettable result of despicable acts of terrorism in France, Spain and the UK, and since 2013, the ‘migration crisis’ has seen large-scale movement between nation states, including into Hungary and Germany, with different policy responses. New social and political movements at different spatial scales have been the outcome of the changing socio-economic and political environment, as well as, in many countries, widening of inequalities at different spatial scales. In the UK, for example, London is both the richest and the most unequal city. Spatial differences are also widening between the north and south of the country and between regions. In addition in a referendum in 2016, the UK population narrowly voted to leave the European Union which has had a significant impact on the political climate more generally, as well as on attitudes to the EU and a belief in cross-European solidarity.

Despite this relatively adverse climate, there have been numerous examples of solidarity responses ranging from the institutional to communal and inter-personal actions, operating on the basis of principles of both redistribution and recognition. While all policies and practises inevitably have a spatial basis and spatial effects, they vary in scale from the transnational (policies and movements to reduce inequalities within the European movements), to national policies (state welfare and social policies are the key example, some of which have an explicitly spatial intention, such as subsidies to poorer parts of a nation (both regions and often inner cities), and others which are based on client groups or a particular policy aim but nevertheless have a spatial impact) and local scale policies and practices. Here movements based on communal or interpersonal connections (by or on behalf of particular groups) and political solidarities are significant, ranging from housing provision for specific groups, language classes for new in-migrants, health or child clinics, and inter alia, specifically-place based campaigns to challenge the location of, for example, migrant camps or polluting industries or activities.

In this sense, one of the main contributions of SOLIDUS has been to analyse the spatial dimension of solidarity, particularly through Work package 2 (WP2), “Spatial dimension of solidarity: from local to transnational acts & practices”. In this regard, the main aim of WP2 has been to identify the policies and practices of solidarity both bottom-up (institutionalized) and top-down (from civil society) that have been successful in enhancing solidarity in addition to reducing spatial inequalities in five
policy areas: employment, housing, education, health and civic engagement. To achieve this purpose, WP2 has considered some specific objectives, which were set out at the start of the programme. They are as follows:

1. Evaluate the impact of socio-spatial dimensions on practices and acts of solidarity
2. Examine the spatial dimension of inequality and injustice: how socio-economic divisions are widening/tightening solidarity at the local, regional and national level
3. Evaluate the geographical scale of policy interventions: to identify where policy interventions have been most successful, focusing on the spatial dimension and their acceptance at transnational level
4. Identify relevant drivers and barriers in relation to practices and acts of solidarity between different areas and territories, especially the role of fiscal\(^1\) and social policies
5. Analyse attitudes of European citizens toward transnational fiscal solidarity: to what extent and under which circumstances European citizens of different Eurozone countries (included in the project) support this new mode of transnational redistribution
6. Make policy recommendations regarding interventions

All spatially based policies and practices of solidarity also address and enhance or alleviate substantive social divisions of class, gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, etc. They are based on mechanisms of belonging and exclusion, as participants in and the beneficiaries of (sometimes but not necessarily the same social group) a movement or a campaign based on solidarity notions are identified. It is clear that solidarity as an aim is a mechanism that recognises difference as well as similarity, and as such is an exclusionary as well as an inclusionary practice; perhaps especially in circumstances where resources are tight and so constrain the possibilities of redistribution.

This Research Report includes a summary of the discussion on the spatial dimensions of solidarity as well as an overview to the comparative description of the policy developments in several European countries facing the consequences of the economic crisis (chapter 2). An extended version of these outcomes could be found in the Concept paper for research and policy analysis of the spatial dimension of Solidarity (deliverable 2.1 of WP2), which complements to and could not be separated of the present Research Report. Chapter 3 of this report summarises the

\(^1\)The work on fiscal policy was undertaken by German scholars, led by Prof. Dr Holger Lengfeld, as a separate part of the work for WP2
main findings in relation with the relevant drivers and barriers present in the successful acts of solidarity analysed between different areas and territories. These main findings have been obtained after conducting a cross-country analysis of the 64 case studies and 12 focus groups developed in all countries of the SOLIDUS Consortium (Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, The Netherlands and the UK). Finally, chapter 4 compiles conclusions and above all the policy recommendations regarding future interventions for the promotion of successful acts of solidarity.
2. Conceptual notions of spatial difference: a short review

The remarks that follow address some specific issues about the effects of space and scale. It is based on a critical reading of the Anglophone geographical literature on the spatial dimensions of solidarity. Besides, an in-depth review of scholarly work on the spatial dimensions of solidarity could be found in the Concept paper for research and policy analysis of the spatial dimension of Solidarity (deliverable 2.1 of WP2). The consortium’s overall approach to solidarity, justice and empowerment is specified in the work undertaken for work package 1 and the review that follows here should be read in conjunction with the WP1 paper.

The focus is on the conceptualisation of solidarity in debates among academic geographers writing in key journals and in well-regarded books, as well as on the ways in which drivers and barriers to solidarity and the achievement of social and/or political impacts have been examined. Perhaps unsurprisingly academic geographers have been less interested in the measurable impact of solidarity than conceptual debates, although they have addressed this issue at times, and have been active in exploring the spatial politics of solidarity. Moreover, research in human geography has been concerned primarily with local articulations of international solidarity rather than with solidarity at a national scale, and with solidarity practices by non-state actors rather than with public policy that aims to promote solidarity. In particular, these debates have focused on the emancipatory potential of solidarity as well as highlighting its topological nature. Right wing movements based on solidarity between people organising to exclude ‘the other’ have seldom been the focus of attention and are ignored here, as they tend to exacerbate rather than ameliorate social inequalities.

Geographers have been working on the question of solidarity for around two decades. As Schuermans, Spijkers and Loopmans (2013) have argued, the emphasis in this literature has been on the loyalties between underprivileged groups, solidarity within autonomous groups, global justice networks, labour geography, and international worker solidarity, as well as research that is conducted in collaboration with solidarity campaigns. Here the work of Jane Wills and others (Wills and Linneker 2014) in the UK on the implications of the living wage campaign is a good example (and one which was the basis of one of our case studies, with comparable cases in Germany, Ireland and The Netherlands). Debates about solidarity between the powerful, through for example professional associations, have not been the focus of a great deal of research by geographers, despite their significance as mechanisms of exclusion. In studies of women’s exclusion from positions of power, the practices of the powerful have been a focus, in for example McDowell’s (1997) work on investment banking. In the consortium’s approach, however, the aim is to understand the reduction of socio-spatial differences.
Schuermans, Spijkers and Loopmans (2013) suggest that solidarity has not been a key geographical concept and that it is closely related to other debates, such as those on care and responsibility (Conradson, 2003; Massey, 2004). Nevertheless, there is a sizeable body of work around the concept of solidarity, which can be divided into two.

The first set of studies, published between the mid-1990s and the early 2000s, had as its focus the relationship between global capital and international labour solidarity. Studies looked, for example, at worker solidarity in a West Virginia mining company (Herod, 1995), US/Guatemalan worker solidarity (Johns, 1998), the strategies of South African organised labour in response to public–private partnerships in municipal infrastructures (Barchiesi, 2001), the framework of the North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation (NAALC) (Compa, 2002) and the British and Norwegian trade union movements (Cumbers, 2004).

More recently, geographers have branched out and examined a whole range of processes through the lens of solidarity, including a re-examination of the civil rights movement in the United States, specifically the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955-6 (Alderman, Kingsbury & Dwyer, 2012), the non-stop picket at the South African embassy in London during the late 1980s (Brown & Yaffe, 2014), climate justice and global justice networks (Chatterton, Featherstone & Routledge, 2013; Cumbers, Routledge & Nativel, 2008; Cumbers & Routledge, 2013), activism around migrants and refugees near the Calais Eurostar terminal (Millner, 2011), the campaign to close the School of the Americas, an US army institution known to have been involved in the training of Latin American military personnel (Sundberg, 2007), attempts to boycott the commodification of the Fair Trade movement (Wilson & Curnow, 2012) as well as the effects of borders on trade union policies in Luxembourg (Thomas, 2013). Whilst some of these studies have addressed historical processes, the majority has looked at recent and ongoing solidarity campaigns. All of them understand solidarity as a grassroots political struggle, rather than as something that is articulated by states or by economic actors. Perhaps unsurprisingly, most of this analysis has been from a left of centre perspective, drawing on arguments in feminism and environmentalism.

2.1. Conceptualisations of solidarity

Andrew Herod has been an influential scholar in work by geographers. Based on a study of worker solidarity in a West Virginia mining company, Herod defined solidarity as ‘a practice fundamentally concerned with overcoming geographic barriers to unified action by workers’ (Herod, 1995). Another early study, that by Johns (1998) examining a U.S./Guatemala Labor Education Project (US/GLEP), established a twofold definition of solidarity – the first a limited accommodationist
solidarity, which ‘accommodates’ capital by privileging spatial over class interest, and a more effective transformative solidarity, which does not distinguish between workers on the core and periphery of the global economy and thereby works as an obstacle to capital flight/capital seesaw. Johns further distinguishes between four different levels of solidarisation of the working class, from national and fully accommodationist to international and transformative. Although we do not explicitly draw on these classifications of solidarity, they are a useful device when considering the long term effects of different practices. As well as considering the barriers to greater cooperation across space.

Doreen Massey, who has been a pivotal thinker in human geography, argued that solidarity ‘may involve working to change particular, presently unequal, connections; it may mean challenging the territories of the powerful; or it may mean questioning the whole current form of globalisation’ (Massey, 2008: 313). Highlighting the relationship between territory and flow, Massey argues that solidarity expresses the fundamental desire to see a globalised world organised differently. ‘Whatever the particular issue’, she continues, solidarity campaigns ‘raise questions about what alternative architectures might be aimed for’ (ibid). Whilst she does not discuss solidarity explicitly, in a previous argument about responsibility, she makes an important addition about the territorial nature of western forms of responsibility, descending from the family outwards to the nation and beyond, like a set of ‘Russian dolls’ (Massey, 2004: 9). This is perhaps less a point about geographical scale as one about the possibility of different referents or recipients of solidarity, as she does not hold to a hierarchical notion of spatial division but rather a set of connections across different scales that coincide in a place (see her argument about a global sense of place (Massey 1992) in which she defines a locality as a set of intersections of socio-spatial process across multiple scales).

Millner (2011) in her study of the no border movement and its activities in the ‘Calais jungle’, makes a distinction between hospitality, a logic in which refugees are invited into the sanctuary of the territorial nation, and solidarity, a more radical political logic that operates across borders and which does not accept the distinction between economic and forced migration.

David Featherstone (2012), in an influential book Solidarity: hidden histories and geographies of internationalism offers perhaps the most comprehensive geographical study of solidarity as well as the most concerted effort to conceptualise the spatial referents of the concept. Analysing and defining the concept of solidarity through three historical types of struggles - anti-colonial, anti-Cold War and anti-neoliberal - he highlights the spatially stretched relations of solidarity. Featherstone (p.5) defines solidarity firstly as ‘a transformative relation’. Rather than being about likeness or similarity, he argues, it is about relations between places, activists and
social groups. Secondly, he holds, it is ‘forged from below’, by marginalized and subaltern groups. Thirdly, it is marked by the ‘refusal of political activity to stay neatly contained within the nation-state’ (ibid). Fourthly, he argues that ‘solidarities are constructed through uneven power relations and geographies’ and, finally, that solidarity is ‘inventive’; it constructs new political relations (p.6).

In conceptualising solidarity in this way, Featherstone critiques Durkheim’s theory of mechanical and organic society for resting on an overly static notion of solidarity. It is ‘an automatic outcome of social position’, which he sees as inhibiting an understanding of how solidarity is constructed (p.19-20). He then goes on to criticise Rorty’s critique of Durkheim as producing an overly static view of solidarity for obscuring the creative practices of solidarity and for being itself locked into a ‘reductive binary of similarity and dissimilarity’ (p.23). Featherstone makes a pledge for a place-based study of solidarity (p.31). He wants us to think of internationalism as more than just the connection between social groups in nation-states but to acknowledge the messier interrelationships that challenge the idea of a bounded nation-state (p.45). These are challenging concepts and claims and may be difficult to operationalise fully, as our case studies illustrate. Nevertheless, his ideas are provocative but inevitably the smaller scale, local movements that are the majority of our case studies, fail to meet claims about international solidarity. The methodological challenge of identifying and studying multifaceted global movements is immense.

2.2. The spatial dimensions of solidarity

In examining the politics of solidarity in a wide range of studies, geographers have approached the question of space in various ways. It is important to note here that geographers generally have an understanding of space that is more than just a grid on which different inequalities can be observed or mapped. Space, to return to the arguments of Doreen Massey introduced already, ‘is not a “flat” surface in that sense because the social relations which create it are themselves dynamic by their very nature [...]’ Moreover, and again as a result of the fact that it is conceptualized as created out of social relations, space is by its very nature full of power and symbolism, a complex web of relations of domination and subordination, of solidarity and cooperation’ (Massey, 1992: 81). Space, in other words, is constantly produced by interactions at different scales. And yet, as Cumbers, Routledge & Natviel (2008) have emphasised the power relations within which solidarity campaigns operate are often hierarchical.

Chatterton, Featherstone & Routledge (2013) have been interested in the kind of material and political spaces in which solidarity movements are shaped, such as camps and streets. Brown and Yaffe (2014), too, examine solidarity as a reciprocal
relation through the case of the non-stop picket at the South African embassy in London during the late 1980s. Their work highlights the performative, micropolitical and multidirectional dimensions of successful acts of solidarity. They argue that in order to succeed, the group had to perform a more general anti-racist struggle in Britain (this is the performative dimension). They also draw attention to the everyday sites in which solidarity is practiced (micro-political dimension) and look at the way in which different social movements help one other (multidirectional dimension). It is the second of these that highlights the centrality of socio-material spaces to the success of particular solidarity initiatives. In the case studies that the Consortium undertook (see section 3 below) a wide range of physical spaces are examined, form local food banks, theatre productions, clinics and schools, among many others.

In conclusion it is clear that the spatial dimensions of solidarity do not map easily onto distinct spatial scales – the local, regional, national, etc. – but instead draw on and construct sets of interconnected socio-spatial relations across different scales. Even the most local of actions typically affect and reflect national or even international systems of regulation, power and control. International migration is an obvious example here, when local solidarity initiatives such as Friendly Villagers (Venligboerne), Refugees Welcome to Norway, Migszol Szeged or Proactiva Open Arms are the reactions to international events such as economic crises of war, national systems of regulation and local political responses. It is also clear that however humane the local responses are, hierarchies and power relations at play at a local level have an impact on the success and longevity of solidarity actions. Furthermore the success or the failure of solidarity campaigns, be they grassroots movements or changes in public policy, is difficult to determine in their immediate aftermath. Often, it becomes clear only much later whether a particular ‘success’ was durable or not, which is an important reminder of the fragility of solidarity victories in an increasingly uneven and unequal world.

2.3. Some contextual features of the countries studies

Conceptual debates about the nature of space, place and locality and the impact of geographical divisions on living standards, opportunities and lifestyle are reflected in different ways in local, regional, national and international policies to reduce the impact of uneven geographical patterns of resources and opportunities, as well as geographical concentrations of ‘deprivation’, often measured though locally-based socio-economic and demographic indicators (the percentage of low income households for example, or ethnic origins (often seen as a surrogate indicator of deprivation). Pragmatic policy decisions have relatively little connection to theoretical debates about the complex, interconnected notion of space, although there is acceptance of ideas about scale and connections across national boundaries,
in for example, EU regional policies that address inequalities across national boundaries.

Within the twelve nation states in the SOLIDUS Consortium there is clearly a huge variation in the geographical size of the country, in the population size and composition, in its political orientation, in degree of oppositional movements, and in the extent of regional inequalities in the provision of and access to employment, education, health care, decent housing and civic engagement (the five substantive areas which are the basis of the SOLIDUS programme). This is reflected in, for example, EU regional policy in which some nations benefit to a greater extent than others from fiscal support to parts of their country deemed to be deprived, and in the extent to which national governments have an explicit regional policy. National systems of regulation, economic policy and welfare systems also vary considerably, as the useful conceptual distinction of three worlds of welfare capitalism, elaborated by the social theorist, Gosta Esping Andersen (1990), makes clear. While his analysis did not include countries formerly part of the Soviet bloc, his focus on economic and political ideologies, family structures, religious beliefs and public participation through civil society organisations remains a useful approach, as a basis for comparison of recent trends and responses to crisis across the 12 states participating in the SOLIDUS programme.

Based on Esping Andersen’s approach on welfare states, we have clustered in five kinds of welfare state models the type of policies derived of the analysis on the spatial dimension of solidarity in Europe developed after systematize the main outcomes obtained in the National Background Papers: Nordic or social democratic model (including Denmark, Netherlands and Norway), Continental or conservative model (Germany), Anglo-Saxon or liberal model (Ireland and UK), Mediterranean (Cyprus, Greece, Spain and Portugal) and Central-European including post-communist countries (Hungary and Slovakia).

All these countries have been affected by the financial crisis in 2008 because of the implementation of neoliberal policies based on austerity. However, differences are found between countries, especially taking into account that their trajectories in the welfare provision are different and still have influence on their characteristic policy traits. Furthermore, even in the most social democratic of states (the Nordic countries in the main) there has been a shift towards a neo-liberal, individualistic ‘work-fare model’ of public policy provision, in which support is no longer a right but has to be earned through participation in the labour force for all able-bodied individuals. In general, in almost all the participating states, governments have been

---

2 Each of the twelve SOLIDUS participants has written a National Background Paper (NBPs) and guide to the different levels of government (typically national, regional and local) at which different policies are administered. Full versions of the NBPs are included within the deliverable 2.1 Concept paper for research and policy analysis of the spatial dimension of Solidarity, available on the SOLIDUS website (http://solidush2020.eu/outcomes/).
reducing welfare spending, expecting both the market and civil society through third sector organisations and communal efforts to step in to meet many needs previously accepted as state responsibilities.

A real test for solidarity actions across the 12 nations is their response to ‘crisis’, not only the financial crisis, but the on-going refugee ‘crisis’ in the context of reduced welfare benefits in general but for refugees and immigrants in particular. In many of the 12 countries, there is evidence of hardening attitudes to in-migration, at worse as borders are closed, at best where migrants are still accepted, in the evident growth of polarization between citizens and refugees and immigrants with respect to entitlements to social services and citizenship rights. This is a clear example of the need to respond to events that have widespread effects across national borders and raises important questions about the extent to which solidarity responses at the grassroots level are able to influence policy responses in a field that depends on notions of solidarity in an ‘imagined community’ that extends beyond national boundaries.

Here we provide a brief note about the extent to which each of the 12 nations has an explicit policy framework to address spatial differences (i.e. a form of policy to address geographical inequalities across rather than within spatially-defined areas of governance – typically termed regional policy, whether implemented at within a state or, as in the case of the EU, across national boundaries), while insisting, as we noted in the introduction, that all policies have spatial effects. Thus a wide range of locally-based policies to address the needs of specific groups or types of provision are as spatial in their impact as policies that are designated as geographical in their focus and aim, as the NBPs illustrate in detail.

2.4. Main results of the comparative policy analysis on the spatial dimension of solidarity in Europe, grounded on WP2 Background National

In this section we discuss the spatial inequalities found within the different territories analysed. These results are obtained after conducting a comparative policy analysis of the NBP. In order to facilitate their exposition, we have grouped these results using the above-mentioned approach of European welfare state models: Nordic or social democratic model (Denmark, Netherlands and Norway), Continental or conservative model (Germany), Anglo-Saxon or liberal model (Ireland and UK), Mediterranean (Cyprus, Greece, Spain and Portugal) and Central-European including post-communist countries (Hungary and Slovakia). Within each sub-section, it is provided with a general overview plus a policy analysis per country.

As mentioned, an extended version of the comparative policy analysis developed could be found in the Concept paper for research and policy analysis of the spatial


2.4.1. The Nordic countries model

The Nordic countries model predominantly deploys decentralised policies. Exceptionally, Norway has gone through centralisation processes in health giving rise to spatial inequalities, and in employment due to labour and welfare reforms. Despite the states portray general strategies to be extended and provide funding for social investment, regions and local authorities are the ones which have the expertise on specific social problems, thus they have a say in implementing a diverse range of initiatives. This decentralisation trend may be perceived as an empowerment process whose beneficiaries are the regional and local authorities or may be related to “outsourcing” of the state’s traditional action areas toward the former public entities. Along these lines, the decentralisation of the employment system in Netherlands entailed a shift from a national equal distribution of welfare to the support of the strong regions of the country, which clearly indicates a worsening in life conditions, being these aligned with the rise in unemployment rates and self-employed people.

Despite being traditionally countries loyal to social-democratic policies, financial crisis in 2008 hit them, resulting in the implementation of privatization processes and liberal recipes which interrupted the health of their welfare states. This new scenario leads to the reduction of the universal, public and access-equality social services dominating in prior times, especially in the areas of health, employment and housing.

Still, Nordic countries are characterised by deploying vertical strategies to a greater extent that the remainder countries in Europe, which reflects a high level of redistribution of public resources at a spatial level in order to beneficiate the lowest resourceful citizens. Redistribution is made mainly through taxation. For example, in Denmark, vertical solidarity can be brought about by the state or the local government despite the current trend to cut welfare benefits. Likewise, the Netherlands follow three principles to tackle inequalities among citizens: work-based employment-related benefits, citizen-based benefits and citizen-based social assistance (for citizens detached from labour market). Additionally, Norway has a solidary wage policy and financial redistribution mechanisms among policies.
**Denmark**

Denmark, with a population of 5.6 million people, has a political system divided in three spatial levels: the national parliament, regional governments and local government. The Danish State administration and democracy has traditionally been built on the principles of decentralised local governance, with maximum autonomy for the municipal and regional bodies, which addresses geographical inequality within rather than between municipalities and regions.

There are some mechanisms for alleviating regional inequality, for example through the 2014-2020 Rural Development Programme, largely funded by the European Commission Structural Fund, co-financed by the Danish government. The aim is to increase sustainable and organic farming, to introduce new forms of training and the creation of new jobs in rural areas.

**Norway**

As Europe's second largest exporter of oil and gas, Norway had no great recession after the financial crisis in 2007-2008. However, the decreasing oil prices during the last few years had led to new debates about the costs and financial sustainability of the Norwegian welfare state.

However, there remains strong support for the belief that all citizens should have equal living conditions and welfare services independent of where they live in the country. This consensus is combined with a broad public support to a generous and universal social welfare state. In line with the Nordic Model, the welfare state services are designed to equalise the life chances of citizens by ensuring free access to education, promoting participation in paid work and by offering a comprehensive system of social protection.

In Norway, there are three administrative levels: municipalities (kommune), counties (fylkeskommune) and the state. The 431 municipalities and 19 counties are juxtaposed and thus not in a hierarchical relationship. At all three levels, the political leaders are democratically elected. Over time, there have been several changes in the division of responsibilities between the administrative levels. Since the beginning of the 1990s, the counties have reduced responsibilities, while the state has established new regional entities covering larger areas than the counties. The present right-wing coalition government aims to merge several municipals, with the argument that many small municipals (with around 500 inhabitants) are not able to fulfil their responsibilities. In June 2015, the government gained support in the National Parliament to start this process (Stortinget 2015).

Norway's geography, topography and demography are crucial to an understanding of the country's spatial inequality. Norwegian territory extends about 1,748 km from the North to the South, and it is the farthest north of any European country.
Only two per cent of the territory is built area (including roads). Three per cent is agricultural land and 24 per cent is productive forest. Mountains, glaciers, moors, waters and rivers cover nearly 70% of the country. The hundreds of deep fjords that cut into the coastline make it problematic to establish infrastructure and to travel across the country. Moreover, five of the 19 counties are very sparsely populated areas with less than 8 inhabitants per km² (Finnmark, Troms, Nordland, Hedmark, Oppland). The average for the whole country is 16.2 inhabitants per km².

In order to assess the regional differences in a systematic manner, Norwegian authorities developed a periphery index based on a weighting of four major socioeconomic factors: geography (40%), demography (30%), labour market (20%) and income (10%). This index is used to distinguish degrees of periphery challenges in the regions, where the northernmost part of the country is ranked highest (most deprived/peripheral). The main differences, however, are between the densely populated areas around Oslo and on the west coast, largely connected to the oil industry, and the rest of the country. Various tax, welfare and employment policies aim to reduce spatial inequalities.

**The Netherlands**

In studies of comparative welfare states in the 1990s, The Netherlands was identified as a hybrid welfare state at the crossroads of a social-democratic and a conservative corporatist welfare state. Here there are clear parallels with Germany. At that time, social-democratic principles guided the redistribution of income, social security and taxation, and conservative corporatist principles regulated family life. Corporatism also shaped social services such as education, home care, health care and youth care. In an effort to define the cultural and institutional shifts that have occurred in the Dutch welfare state since the 1980s, various scholars have suggested that there has been a shift from a conservative/communitarian to a liberal/amoral welfare state, in which (religious) moral standards about care and support have vanished while individualistic (liberal) values have become dominant.

The Netherlands are governed by a coalition-government, which usually entails a combination with at least one of the major political parties; the Liberal Party [VVD], the Labour Party [PvdA] and the Christian-Democratic Party [CDA]. The Netherlands consist of twelve provinces, which are sub-divided into municipalities (403 in total). A special place is taken by ‘the Randstad’, an agglomeration of the four major cities in the Netherlands: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. Through the first decades of the 21st century, the Netherlands have implemented social policy reforms by decentralizing care and welfare.

Social inequalities between high and low income earners and between dual earner and single earner households have increases since the fiscal crisis, although income inequality is less marked in The Netherlands than in comparable advanced
industrial nations, including the United Kingdom. Spatial inequalities include those between high and low income groups within cities, often including an ethnic divide between local areas. The Netherlands is a small country, but nevertheless some regional differences exist with regard to poverty, health and religious matters. The most basic economic divide (based on gross domestic product) is between the Randstad (high) and the rest of the country (lower), with the exception of the province of Groningen which – due to natural gas resources – is a relatively rich province. Regional differences became more pronounced with the financial crisis, which hit harder in industrial areas such as the Rijnmond-region, than in service economy areas such as the Utrecht-region. In general, 9.3% of Dutch households live in poverty but regional differences range between 3.0% and 17.2%. One fourth of the poor households live in one of the four cities of the Randstad, most notably Rotterdam and Amsterdam. After these Randstad-cities, poor households are mostly found in the North-East (Groningen) and the South-East of the Netherlands (Limburg). National and local authorities are responsible for different areas of social policy.

2.4.2. The Continental model

This model is decentralised through federal states, which may allow it to be flexible enough to react quickly to provide efficient social protection adapted to demand. The case of Germany is akin to the one of the Nordic countries, even though some differences are found. For example, this model puts significant emphasis on not leaving citizens alone facing the vicissitudes of the labour market, thus both vertical and horizontal solidarity are relevant characteristic traits that make this model prominent.

Germany

Like most sizeable industrial nations, Germany is divided into several tiers of administration, from the national to the local. The main geographical inequality since reunification in 1990 is the division between the former East and West Germany. Below the national level (Bundesebene), the broadest regional allocation is the differentiation between the 16 federal states (Bundesländer), which include 13 territorial states (Flächenländer) and 3 city-states (Stadtstaaten - Bremen, Hamburg and Berlin). This division of federal states corresponds to the European NUTS-2 classification. Below that, the bigger and more populated federal states are divided into administrative regions (Regierungs-bezirke) or statistical areas (Statistische Regionen).

Although not an official administrative division, the differentiation between “old” federal states (Bayern, Baden-Württemberg, Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen,
Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Saarland and Schleswig-Holstein) and “new” federal states (Berlin, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt and Thuringen), or West and East Germany, is central for understanding geographical inequality in Germany. The five Eastern federal states, constituting the former German Democratic Republic (Deutsche Demokratische Republik, DDR), joined the German Federal Republic during German reunification in 1990. Although an adjustment of living conditions was planned in the aftermath of the reunification, there are still huge differences between the new and old federal states in several areas of social and economic life.

Besides this cleavage, there are also disparities between the northern and southern federal states. GDP per capita is nearly twice as high in Hamburg as it is in Thuringen; there are five times as many recipients of social security benefits in Hamburg, Sachsen-Anhalt or Mecklenburg-Vorpommern than in Baden-Württemberg; and unemployment rates, risk of poverty and school dropout rates differ widely between states. Germany’s financial redistribution system, the Federal Financial Adjustment, the Solidarity Pact and the Solidarity Supplement are the central redistribution mechanisms aiming to lower financial inequalities between the federal states and communes. There are also key non-financial redistributive mechanisms embedded in social policy more generally. These are described in detail in the NBP.

2.4.3. The Mediterranean model

The Mediterranean model embraces countries with a weak welfare state. Accordingly, in most of them care relies on families, in view of the scarce help in well-being provided by the states and the insufficient volunteer work or citizens’ involvement in social problems. This model maybe centralised or decentralized depending on the type of policy. For instance, in Spain, while health and education are decentralised, employment and housing are strongly centralized. Health is also decentralized in Cyprus, while education is highly bureaucratised and centralized in Greece. Contrary to the Nordic countries, centralisation may entail lack of flexibility and thus inefficiency when applying measures addressed to citizens.

The austerity measures adopted as a result of the 2008 financial crisis had major effects on the well-being of these countries, if compared with other European countries. First, they are below the average of EU and OECD countries in many features related to the different public policies, as explained below. Although some claim to have had universal and public policies (the case of Spain) or being in the way to attaining them (the case of Cyprus and Greece), they are currently far from them or clearly not universal any more.
Austerity measures greatly limited the ability of the government to tackle social problems among vulnerable groups, thus public policies cannot overcome inequalities inherent to the system. An illustration of that is the failure of Greece when trying to address inequalities and the commodification of welfare provision, given that formal social solidarity is very weak as well as the means to change the policies behind. In light of a situation of scarce influential vertical solidarity strategies of redistribution of resources, in these countries solidarity actions come to be responsibility of third sector organisations and social movements, largely.

**Cyprus**

As a small island, currently politically divided, it is hard to argue that there is an explicitly regional policy to address geographical differences. The main issue is reunification of the island.

The Republic of Cyprus (RoC) was granted independence from British colonial rule in 1960. Since the 1974 Turkish invasion, the northern areas of Cyprus have been occupied by the Turkish army and the island has been divided in two by the UN-controlled buffer zone. The northern part of the island was self-declared as the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), recognized only by Turkey. In 2004 the Republic of Cyprus joined the European Union (EU) but the *acquis communautaire* has been suspended for the northern occupied areas.

A few days prior to EU accession (May 1, 2004) the UN-sponsored Annan Plan proposed a resolution to through the formation of a federal republic that would unify the island. The majority of Turkish Cypriots voted to accept the Annan plan but it was rejected by Greek Cypriots in a referendum held simultaneously on both sides of the border. Talks for a solution to the ‘Cyprus Problem’ are continuing. The Republic of Cyprus is internationally recognized as the government in the southern part of the island. The work of the Consortium focuses only on the area under the control of the Republic of Cyprus.

Cyprus has six districts: Nicosia (the capital), Limassol, Paphos, Larnaca, Famagusta, and Kyrenia. Kyrenia and parts of Nicosia and Famagusta are currently occupied by the Turkish Army. The districts of Cyprus follow national policies, although they have municipalities that provide services at regional level.

Various forms of EU aid were made available to different parts of the island, for example to support the development of Turkish Cypriots in the north. At the national level, the main explicitly geographically based policy was through the introduction of Zones of Educational Priority (ZEPs) in 2001. ZEPs were established to include schools with a large percentage of minority pupils. As the Cyprus NBP shows, the focus of most policy innovation is the national level.

**Greece**
Greece became the ‘chief scapegoat’ among the overwhelmingly crisis-hit European Union (EU) member-states. The devastating retrenchment reform imposed on Greece highlights a sharp contradiction between the policy choices made by the EU in response to the Greek economic crisis and the values embraced by ‘Social Europe’ – and social solidarity indeed. These choices reinforced recession, strengthening social inequality at the national level and reflect an anti-solidarity concept at the international level despite the EU's committed to the principle of solidarity which is regarded as vital to the notion of a social Europe, embedded in the European Charter of Fundamental Rights.

As well as widening economic inequalities, social policies fail to tackle inequalities and to challenge market outcomes. Most policy operates at the national scale – local and regional policies remain weak and the residual Greek welfare state tends to promote the interests of ‘insiders’, rather than new arrivals. The country has, however, been severely tested by the arrival of significant numbers of asylum seekers and the reluctance of many member states to accept an EU-wide distribution of migrants.

Compared to most European countries, regional disparities in Greece, as exemplified by variations in income from region to region, are less pronounced. Yet, Greece is regarded as suffering from relative underdevelopment, both at national and regional levels. The extensive underground economy, the rather large, inefficient and highly centralized public administration, in conjunction with significantly high structural unemployment and low degrees of industrialization are among the factors that impact adversely on the growth potentials of the most underdeveloped and poor regions of the country.

**Spain**

Spain is a parliamentary monarchy, constituted in a social and democratic state of law, which became one of the EU member states in 1986. With a current population of 46.5 million inhabitants, it is the 7th most populated country of the EU. It is also one of the most regionally diverse countries with strong regional political representation.

At the end of Franco's dictatorship, the Constitution in 1978 established 17 autonomous communities. In 1995, two autonomous city regions (Ceuta and Melilla) were also established. Spain is not a homogeneous country, as there are linguistic, historical and cultural differences across the regions. The decentralization process started in 1978 evolved in an asymmetric way across the territory but also over time. The three 'historical nationalities' (Catalonia, the Basque Country and Galicia) acceded to autonomy almost immediately, through a fast and simplified process. The Autonomous communities correspond to the European NUTS-2 classification, and each one is subdivided in provinces (with a total of 50 provinces).
The latter have their own parliaments and governmental institutions, and own competencies to legislate and to make policies in a wide range of areas.

Spain has a marked pattern of regional and local inequalities, including rural-urban differences and, at a larger scale, between the north and south of the country. Overall, the population of medium sized towns in the southern half of the peninsula are the most likely to be at risk of poverty. Rates of 30% of inhabitants ranked as poor are not uncommon. During and after the fiscal crisis, austerity policies have had a severe impact on many areas of Spain. Welfare budgets have been cut, unemployment, especially among young people, rose and the real estate bubble burst, with a variable impact across the country. Along with the austerity policies, a series of social services saw their prices raised and a number of taxes were increased. With these measures, the central Government sought to re-balance the national economy and stop the worsening of the economic indicators. In 2015 the economic situation of Spain apparently hit bottom and indicators such as the unemployment rate seem to have been stabilized. However, the economic stabilization of the country has been achieved at considerable social cost.

The main fiscal redistribution mechanism is the Inter-territorial Compensation Fund (FCI). Autonomous regions and cities are beneficiaries of this FCI when their GDP per capita is less than 100% of the national average. The current beneficiary communities are Andalusia, Galicia, Castile and Leon, Extremadura, Castile-La Mancha, Valencia Community, Canary Islands, Principality of Asturias, Murcia Region, Cantabria and the autonomous cities of Ceuta and Melilla. Other nationally administrated funds to combat regional inequality include the Guarantee Fund of Essential Public Services, the Global Sufficiency Fund, the Competitive Fund and the Cooperation Fund.

2.4.4. The Anglo-Saxon model

Ireland and the UK vary in centralized or decentralized models in different arenas. While Ireland has a highly centralised health system, as a result of the recent crisis, the UK has a decentralised orientation, giving stronger role to local players. Otherwise, the model of UK in education is centralised. Centralisation of health in Ireland led to even closing down local hospitals, a process that was accompanied by other cutbacks policies and welfare reforms giving rise to inequalities in the access to services.

While Ireland was strongly affected by the crisis, retrenchments were not so alarming as in the Mediterranean countries. Some data about Ireland shows that, for example, it invests greatly in education (it is mainly state funded through taxes), holds lower unemployment rates (9.3% in October 2015), its employment rate has
been rising in recent years, the salaries of teachers are higher than those of Mediterranean countries and its educational participation (46% in 2014 according to OECD) is above the average of the EU and OECD. Also, social protection in Ireland (16.4% of GDP in 2012 according to Eurostat) is not among the lowest in Europe, since it position 12th out of 19 EU member states (2014). Thereby, regardless of inequalities, social protection plays a more central role than in Mediterranean countries, although its welfare structure is less-well-resourced than other European countries, including the UK.

In the case of Ireland, redistribution mechanisms of wealth are carried out thanks to taxation, according to a very complex and centralised system of tax reliefs. These mechanisms are a form of solidarity, since the amount of income received from the Central Government (60% of local authorities’ revenues) varies among cities and city councils. However, for the UK, solidarity policies are rhetorical and that regional redistribution is just a recommendation. Furthermore, due to the austerity programme, initiatives to reduce spatial inequalities are scarce and, due to centralisation of the funding system, local authorities do not have the autonomy enough to apply effective strategies of growth.

**Ireland**

Ireland has a population of 4.6 million (CSO April 2015). Of this, approximately 1.3 million people reside in Dublin, the capital city, (CSO April 2015 Population estimates). Ireland is a parliamentary democracy. It gained independence from the United Kingdom in 1922 when it became the Irish Free State and has been a Republic since 1949.

National government comprises the Oireachtas (Parliament) and the President. The Oireachtas comprises two houses; the Dáil (lower house) and the Seanad (upper house). Local government comprise county and city councils: there are 26 County Councils, 3 City Councils, and 2 City and County Councils. There are also 95 municipal districts and 3 regional assemblies. Municipal districts and regional assemblies were established in 2014. Municipal districts operate at a sub-county level and exercise certain functions within a district that are reserved from the overall local authority. Regional assemblies have a general purpose of co-ordinating, promoting or supporting strategic planning and sustainable development, and promoting effectiveness in local government and public services.

Public policy decision-making is highly centralised in Ireland and, as such, local authorities (city and county councils) do not have extensive control over budgets or policy decisions (Quin 2003). Decisions concerning health, education and social welfare are made by national, rather than local government. The powers of local authorities have diminished over time, as health care, education, agriculture, transport and housing were centralised over the course of the 20th century.
Income inequality between different parts of Ireland is noticeable. There are regional disparities in unemployment, with rates higher in parts of the North West and in deprived urban areas in major cities. During the austerity period enforced by successive governments since the financial crises, economic inequalities have grown. Young people have been particularly affected. Among the original EU15, Ireland had the largest number of young people under 18 at a high risk of poverty; it also had the 4th highest percentage in the EU (18.4%), of young people aged 15 to 24 years not in education, employment or training. Yet funding for youth work services supported by the Department of Children and Youth Affairs, was cut by almost 30 per cent over the austerity period from €73.1m to €51.4m.

**The United Kingdom**

Like Spain the UK is a country with marked political devolution, with regional parliaments in Scotland and Wales, as well as in Northern Ireland (although currently (in mid-2017) disbanded). Each administrative area has responsibility for different parts of economic and welfare policy.

There are three levels of explicitly policies to address geographical differences in the UK: regional policy to address the North-South divide, urban policy to address inequalities within cities, and planning policy that focuses in the main on local land-use and development control issues (within a strategic planning framework). The seven years since the origins of the crisis have seen four Governments in power – Labour until 2010, a Conservative-Liberal Democrat Government between 2010 and 2015 and Conservative Government, with a small majority (12 seats) between May 2015 and May 2017, and currently a minority Conservative Government. As in other nations, a rightward shift from a welfare to a workfare state under neo-liberal assumptions of individual responsibility has reduced the reach of welfare policies.

Since the fiscal crisis, the implementation of an austerity programme and significant cuts in spending has acted as a severe constraint on initiatives to reduce spatial inequalities. In addition, neoliberal Conservative governments prefer private investment and lighter-touch state regulation than previous governments, abolishing many of the previous mechanisms of spatial redistribution.

The key spatial divide in the UK, recognised for decades across almost the entire twentieth century has been the distinction between the north and the south, approximately distinguished by a line drawn from the Bristol Channel in the west to the Humber in the east. On a wide range of indicators, albeit with internal differentiation, the north fared worse than the south. Indicators include economic prosperity, GDP, income per head, rates of unemployment, child mortality rates, eligibility for free school meals, participation in higher education, unemployment, various indicators of health including obesity and type-2 diabetes, and longevity rates. Long-standing regional investment agencies were abolished and replaced in
2010 by a regional growth fund, local enterprise partnerships and city deals with a greater emphasis than in previous eras on state and private sector initiatives. The election of city mayors, and their responsibility for a range of previously nationally or regionally-based policies is an attempt to increase opportunities and living standards in some of Britain’s major cities. The notion of a ‘northern power house’, for example, introduced by a former Chancellor of the Exchequer, George Osborne, is an effort to counter the economic dominance of Greater London. The most deprived areas in the UK also benefit from a range of EU policies and subsidies. The impact of the decision to withdraw from the EU will have an adverse, although yet unknown effect on declining former industrial areas and on rural parts of the UK.

As elsewhere, all economic and social policies implemented at different levels of local and national government have a spatial effect, depending in the policy areas and the intended recipients of the benefits. There is, however, a general consensus in the UK that decades of spatially-based policies have been relatively unsuccessful, and that ‘people, not places’ should be the main focus of Government policy.

2.4.5. The post-communist model

The countries here analysed –Hungary and Slovakia– have characteristics similar to the Mediterranean countries in that the crisis led to adopt austerity measures which translated into declining investments in social protection and serious consequences for citizens. However, these countries differ in that they had traditionally less developed welfare states and impelled policies that had been initially forged in other political environment (communism), which went from collective solutions to individual plans. Besides, as mentioned below, some policies are similar to those rooted in the liberal model, thus the one presented here present a mixture of traits belonging to different welfare state models.

In relation to the degree of centralisation, we see that in Slovakia employment and civic engagement initiatives are deployed in a decentralized manner (encompassing regional and local governments), and so are educational policies (delegated to municipalities), although the State portrays the strategical content. Furthermore, there exist policies and actions oriented to reduce spatial inequalities, although state transfers and grants were reduced after the crisis. At a national level, these policies and actions consist on two kinds of packages of benefits: tax benefits for some employers (decreasing social contributions for low income groups), benefits for parents with child care’ needs, and funds for state-owned hospitals.

Hungary

Hungary is a small country of 10 million, including a significant Roma minority. Officially recognized minorities have certain rights of self-government and receive
state support to help preserve languages and traditions. In recent years, the number of immigrants increased, until the borders between Hungary, Serbia and Croatia were closed in 2015 in response to the perceived crisis of in-migration.

Investment and development is heavily concentrated in the capital, the western border regions and pockets around the Lake Balaton in the centre of the country. Although Hungary suffered during the 2008 financial crisis, partly from an over reliance of selling state bonds to cover budget shortfalls, since then economic growth rates have returned and at over 3%, the country now has one of the highest levels of growth in the European Union. However, the distribution of wealth and opportunity is heavily skewed in favour of the capital and towards certain historically wealthier regions. Despite the significant efforts of the post war socialists to redistribute wealth to the more deprived parts of the country, there remains a problem of lower levels of development in peripheral regions.

One of the important political developments in the 1990s was the move to decentralize decision making and develop local institutions, at various levels, including regional, county and village level. The aim was that these would be able to assume control over public services that previously had been the responsibility of higher level institutions. However, one recurring theme in the regional development literature has been how this initial surge for local autonomy was followed by a deep disillusionment as restrictions imposed by low revenues began to be felt. Although there had been state policy to support the most backward areas, as they were known, since 1986, much of the impetus for the development of a new institutional structure and new policy instruments came through the European Union.

On joining the EU in January 2004, the regional programs were planned and managed centrally because the European Commission judged that regional institutional capacities were inadequate. Despite vast efforts to create new regional governance, the decentralised institutions have been largely a failure.

**Slovakia**

Slovakia, as an independent sovereign state, was established on 1 January 1993 as the result of the uncontested division of the former Czechoslovakia into two independent states – the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. It has been a member of the European Union since 2004. The Slovak Constitution was ratified on 1 September 1992, and became effective on 1 January 1993. It was modified in September 1998, to allow for the direct election of the President, and later amended in February 2001 to allow Slovakia to apply for NATO and EU membership.

Two tiers of self-government exist in Slovakia: municipalities («obce») and self-governing regions («samospravne kraje»). Cities («mesta») are municipalities that are declared as «cities» by the National Council of the Slovak Republic. Self-
governing regions are NUTS III and not NUTS II level, mainly because of political factors behind the decision how to organise regional level.

The territory of the Slovak Republic is highly fragmented in terms of the number of municipalities (the number of municipalities has been equal to the number of either local self-government units or local authorities). Nowadays, there are 2,890 municipalities in Slovakia. The average municipality population size in Slovakia is only 1,870 inhabitants and the average Slovak municipality has approximately 17 km². Only two cities, the capital city Bratislava and Košice have a population size over 100,000 inhabitants (approx. 430,000 in Bratislava and 250,000 in Košice).

Municipalities obtained self-government status again through the Municipal Act (1990), and a prime function of local self-government became the execution of public affairs administration to such an extent that had not belonged to the state administration. The system of national committees was abolished, and the local self-governments became the fully-fledged decision makers of policy-making at the local level. The municipalities in Slovakia carry out, to a relatively large extent, internal and delegated responsibilities. During the decentralisation programme implemented in 2002-2004 regional self-government was established. There are eight regional self-governments in the country.

The most significant regional difference in Slovakia is between what is referred to as the problem macro-region of southern and eastern Slovakia and advanced regions in the northern and western parts of the country. The differences in economic development, income and living standards between these two regions have increased since membership of the EU, although within the most developed areas there has been a slight decrease in inequality. Despite a national strategy to promote regional development, regional authorities have no specific plans to reduce spatial inequality, although all policies to address social inequalities in, for example, health, housing or employment opportunities, as well as policies to aid specific under-privileged groups, have spatial effects.

Before presenting case studies of solidarity actions in each of the five policy areas (see chapter 3), we draw out a small number of comparative points to sum up this section. Definitive conclusions are difficult as the 12 countries differ in numerous degrees. They might perhaps be classified as falling into one of four categories or types of economic-welfare states:

- Denmark, Norway and The Netherlands represent the most social democratic of the 12 nations, still with reasonably comprehensive welfare provision for most citizens.
- Germany and the UK the old large industrial nations, with significant regional inequalities that now have modern high tech and financial sectors (although Brexit will be a challenge to the UK) and neo-liberal ‘workfare’ state. Ireland
is difficult to categorise and perhaps fits somewhere between the Germany/UK and the Mediterranean group. However, based on Esping Andersen's threefold classification, Ireland is generally classified as closest to the liberal Anglo-American welfare model.

- Greece, Cyprus, Portugal and to some extent Spain are southern peripheral EU members, still with significant agricultural sectors and high youth unemployment.
- Slovakia and Hungary are members of the 2004 EU accession states from the former eastern bloc, with more authoritarian governments than the other 10 SOLIDUS participants.

The extent to which the fiscal crisis and national and EU-wide austerity policies have had an impact on each of the 12 countries varies, with Norway the most resilient, at least until oil prices dropped. The large-scale movement of people – the second ‘crisis’ to influence inequality, living standards and notions of solidarity and civic engagement – has also had an uneven impact across the EU. Greece has been the most severely affected by both crises, whereas Hungary has reacted with the most undemocratic response. Germany was initially generous in offering asylum to migrants, whereas the UK has been noticeably ungenerous. These differences emerge in more detail in the case studies analysis that follows in chapter 3 of this report.
3. Successful acts of solidarity in European territories.

This chapter contains the main findings of the cross-country comparative analysis developed in the framework of WP2 of the SOLIDUS project. The aim of this analysis is to study solidarity actions in different contexts that are contributing to overcoming inequality successfully, with a special focus on spatial and geographical dimensions. WP2 involved 64 case studies carried out in 12 countries (Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, The Netherlands and the UK) in five policies areas (civic engagement, education, employment, housing and health). We have selected cases that provide evidence of some social impact (Flecha, Soler & Sordé, 2015), that is, that they have been successful in improving the lives of citizens in the areas of employment, housing, health, education or civic participation.

There is a huge diversity among the case studies analysed (in terms of the areas they concern, the population they address, the nature of the organization, etc.) but all of them have also elements in common that have been found to be crucial to contribute to achieve social improvements. To select them, the SOLIDUS research team did an initial exploratory review of 138 solidarity initiatives in the five policy areas of SOLIDUS within the 12 European countries involved. On that basis, research team selected the 64 most successful cases in their corresponding policy area. Each case study contains 4 in-depth interviews with end-users (2), staff and volunteers (2). Total amount of 340 interviews have been registered. In addition, one focus group with end-users, staff, policy makers and other stakeholders have been conducted in each country, summing up 12 focus groups. These 64 case studies accomplish with seven categories defined as crucial elements for ensuring social impact, which became the categories of analysis of our case studies. These seven categories were democracy, plurality, transparency, recognition, social and political impact and scalability.

Democracy

The participation of all members of an organization in governance and decision-making processes is considered as organizational democracy (Cloke and Goldsmith, 2002; Manville and Oberm 2003). Democracy is a relevant variable because it influences in economic development and social improvements. Besides, some scholars from different disciplines have remarked that democracy protects the rights and freedoms of citizens (Sen, 2000). Thus, citizens can express their voice (Hirschman, 1970), increasing the successful of their organizations, governments and States.

See annex 1 for a brief description of the case studies developed
Pluralism / Diversity

Diversity and pluralism in our societies is continuously growing, which means that cultural, ideological, religious, and other identity diversities are more and more frequent in a real heterogeneous society (Touraine, 2007). In terms of members’ composition of an organization, this diversity is considered as a competitive advantage. Actually, diversity together with democratic decision-making processes enriches the organization, accumulating more social capital and, consequently, more effective and successful actions (Putnam, 1993). Thus, diversity is a source of wealth. Further, some scholars have noted that plurality should be recognised and promoted (Fraser, 2008). In this sense, pluralism encouraged the ability to open up new realities and understand, in more deeply, the reality of our citizens. As a consequence, it allows citizens to intervene in the reality more consciously and successfully.

Transparency / Accountability

Transparency and accountability is now a citizen’s claim as a result of public's lost confidence in the institutions, also affecting to NGOs and other third sector organizations. In this regard, the transparency of NGOs has acquired a prominent role in recent years, especially after the economic crisis and specifically for NGOs which are working for reducing inequalities and to respond to social needs (García-Mainar & Marcuello, 2007; Baur & Schmitz, 2012). As a result, society is interested in the fate of funding and actions that these organizations carry out (Brown and Kalegaonkar 2002; Lee, 2004; Salim Sadruddin and Zakus, 2011). Because these entities are mainly financed through contributions to donations from individuals, these were the most interested in the functioning of the sector (Burger & Owens, 2010; Gugerty, 2010; Taylor & Doerfel, 2011). So transparency acts as a mechanism of institutional legitimacy, increasing the trust of donors and thus the possibility to continue doing their work.

Recognition

The social recognition of an NGO, such as having received an award or prize, allows obtaining greater social visibility and provides powerful incentives to continue their work, being able to generate a remarkable political impact.

Social and Political impact

In the case of NGOs, institutional legitimacy is not the only necessary legitimacy. However, demonstrating the achievements is the first step to show the legitimacy as an organization, resulting in the performance legitimacy (Lister, 2003). This legitimacy is actually demanded not only from institutions but also by citizens (Flecha, Soler, & Sordé, 2015). Therefore, social organizations and initiatives are increasingly required to demonstrate that they are improving the lives of the
vulnerable groups they serve. Accordingly, social impact is understood as “the social improvements achieved as a consequence of implementing a particular project or action” (SIOR, 2016) and political impact as the institutional repercussions of this project or action.

**Scalability**

In order to address the spatial dimension, we will look at the scope of the organization analysed, as well as the reach of the solidarity action. Many organizations start local, through a targeted community based action, and later grow to different territories. Others start big, across territories and contexts, often as an institutional initiative. The relationship between success (in terms of social improvements of peoples’ lives) and scalability has also been addressed.

Furthermore, in all of the cases we have analysed the spatial dimension of this impact. Most of the case studies selected contribute to reducing inequality in terms of intra-urban divisions, helping to reduce the gap between the richest and the poorest zones within the city through opening up opportunities to disadvantaged populations and vulnerable groups. Some cases began locally, mainly in cities, but rapidly increased and extended their scope to other territories, including rural areas (city-countryside). Other cases started through the actions of a group of citizens who were in contact with European or international initiatives and decided to implement them in their territory. Finally, there are also examples of citizens’ initiatives: people who decided to extend their solidarity with citizens who lived in other territories and were in risk situations (this is the case of refugee welcome initiatives) (core-peripheries).

A general reflection emerging from the analysis is that where welfare states do not reach due to budget cuts or other factors, citizens are getting organized and promoting solidarity in many cases in order to ensure the well-being of all people, especially those that are in most vulnerable situations. Most of these solidarity actions starts as non-profit citizen-based actions that later may receive some help from public funding. However, it is important to emphasise that solidarity actions need to be economically sustainable in order to carry out their aims and tasks and that in many cases such actions cannot work without the financial support of public institutions. Further, there are some local, regional and national policies that are supporting these initiatives, sometimes by even changing their own priorities.

We present the results under three main headings:

1) Drivers and barriers to solidarity actions with social impact
2) Reducing inequality and social exclusion through solidarity acts with social impact
3) Solidarity acts among citizens from different European and non-European countries that ensure transnational solidarity and European citizenship
3.1. Drivers and barriers to solidarity actions with social impact

Drivers and barriers have been analysed in relation to the seven categories above defined: democracy, plurality, transparency, recognition, social and political impact and scalability. In this regard, our research design was a purposeful sampling framework for qualitative data collection. In our case, the aim of this sampling was to select cases of organizations or practices based on solidarity that have had a demonstrable social impact. In addition, two other categories have emerged through developing the overall comparative analysis: dialogic interactions and meaning creation to overcome disenchantment. The findings demonstrate that those solidarity actions that are achieving the most significant social impact accomplish these seven categories and become more sustainable over time. On the contrary, those with less social impact have shown some barriers in some of these components.

In this section, we have compiled the main results according to the following structure:

a) Drivers for ensuring solidarity actions with social impact.

b) Barriers to the promotion of solidarity actions with social impact.

c) New categories: Dialogic interactions as a driver and disenchantment as a barrier to solidarity actions.

3.1.1. Drivers for ensuring solidarity actions with social impact

Drivers of democracy are mainly focused on the creation of egalitarian dialogue spaces with end-users. In this sense, there are different types of ways in which this egalitarian dialogue is being carried out. There are solidarity actions that are led by end-users themselves. Other solidarity actions are mainly institutions led by a management board but who one that has established a dialogue with and including the opinion of end-users in their development. There are other solidarity actions developed on the basis of the respect towards end-users that both staff and volunteers share and are in agreement with this principle. Further, those solidarity actions where end-users are able to participate in the decision-making spaces not only become more affordable for their needs but also end-user empowered. This is the case of RIO, an association composed by former substance abusers in Norway, where end-users became the managers of the initiative:

*RIO is a democratic organisation. Everyone takes part in decisions. We have regular meetings among employees and among employees and volunteers.*

In addition, this type of space based on egalitarian dialogue promotes friendship, a strong solidarity and well-being among volunteers, end-users and people involved in the initiative. For instance, in the case study of Friendly Villagers in Denmark,
spaces have been created where refugees and citizens are building social relationships:

*It was really something that made a difference. To feel that nobody wants to communicate with you in this country, and now you feel that you have a social life and can have so many friends who care (refugee).*

**Drivers of pluralism** focused on those inclusive spaces where people with diverse profiles work together to achieve a common goal. Diversity is measured in terms of age, religion beliefs, cultural and professional background, educational level and socio-economic origin. Another common point of fostering more pluralist initiatives is that they engage people with very different political opinions and this facilitates the creation of public spaces where people are able to discuss in a friendly and respectful way because all of them are duly respected. The initiative of *The Trussell Trust*, a charity Christian foodbank initiative to address poverty in UK, is an example of this pluralism among volunteers and users and the creation of these deliberation spaces:

*There is an interesting story to be told about the geography or voluntarism. In some areas, where there is high unemployment and deprivation, such as the valleys in South Wales the volunteers come from a different social background than the volunteers in Exeter. In Exeter, older, retired more women than men, middle class, very few had been users but elsewhere volunteers had been users of the food bank. In terms of politics of the volunteers there is a melting pot, card carrying Conservatives and socialists; religiously you have militant atheists to born again and devout Christians, a really interesting melting pot. How do people put aside ideological issues to work together in spaces of welfare? The conversations people have together about politics and issues are really interesting because in the academic literature so often food banks, hostels, spaces of care, people talk of them as proxies for something else – food banks as proxy for food deserts or poverty and very few people try to discover what is actually going on inside these spaces. These are spaces of deliberation and so people's ethics and politics are being negotiated, talked about and discussed.*

**Drivers of transparency** centred on showing the financial situation as well as the activities carried out by the solidarity actions. As most of the solidarity actions have confirmed, transparency in the sense of accountability is a legal requirement in their countries, so its accomplishment is compulsory for them. However solidarity actions also perceive its completion as a moral obligation towards society too; i.e. there is a desired requirement to fulfil in order to be transparent with the work done in their institutions. Transparency is also a basic issue as a trust criterion for citizens. Considering the social context where corruption is seen as one of the problematic facts denounced by citizens around Europe, transparency is needed as evidence to gain their confidence towards the acts they are developing as solidarity action. This transparency is achieved through different strategies, for instance, there are institutions that elaborate annual reports, while others opt for publishing the
information on their website; yet others communicate this information in their regular meetings. For instance, in the case of Timon, a housing organization for children and youth in The Netherlands, transparency is achieved by making the annual available for anyone:

In their annual reports, which are published on their website, Timon gives a detailed overview of their funding, how it is spend, and also details the role of partner organizations such as social housing corporations. Transparency also is an important issue in the way Timon’s projects are organized. For instance, volunteers do not get paid for what they do, and this is known to the young people involved so that they understand that the adults are there because they want to be, not because they receive any money for it.

Drivers of recognition show the trust of communities in the results achieved by the solidarity action, since they are developing actions in fields that sometimes public authorities are not able to do due to different reasons. In this regard, almost all the analysed solidarity actions have been recognized somehow through awards obtained from public administrations or private foundations. Traditional media and social media also play an important role in their recognition because they catch the attention of citizens in the work they done. As a consequence, there is a twofold effect: this recognition reaffirms their presence in the field in which they are working, on the one hand, and consolidates the task they are carrying out, on the other, converting them in actors of reference within their own communities; which generates even more recognition. This is the case of the PAH, a mortgage victim platform in Spain:

In 2013 they received recognition at international level when they got the Citizen of the European Parliament Award, showing the illegality of several clauses of the Spanish mortgage law including the subsequent alterations to the sentence of the European Justice Court.

Drivers of social and political impact evidence the specific attainments of each solidarity action that we have analysed. It is important to emphasize that those case studies which make available specific results on how their action impacts on improving end-users lives achieve more attention for and from the community. In this regard, it is based on both quantitative and qualitative evidence that illustrates those achievements of their actions. Quantitative evidence envisions impact in a robust way, whilst qualitative evidence allows a deeper understanding of the impact on individual lives. Examples of the quantitative and qualitative evidence will be provided in the section below. In the case of political impact, the Irish case study of housing shows the need for building partnerships with policy makers in order to assess social and management issues:

Focus Ireland have worked to assist policymakers in identifying the kinds of emergency accommodation that are suitable for families suddenly experiencing homelessness; in
how to deal with emotional and psychological impact that homelessness has on children; in facilitating a child’s school commitments; in updating legislation to assist children, families and caseworkers; and in prioritising allocations of social houses to those who are homeless.

**Drivers of scalability** are an assessment of the potential for growth of the solidarity action, that is, how most of the successful solidarity actions have been scaled-up from a local dimension to national implementation in a short time. Further, there are some case studies that began by addressing city-divisions, but due to their impact are now being extended to rural areas. Finally, there are also four case studies that are contributing to the extension of solidarity between countries in transnational solidarity acts in terms of citizens’ networking and which are introduced in a section below.

Scalability is achieved because, based on initial successes, wider recognition results in an increase in the demand for their activity, and so the initiative searches for ways to extend their solidarity action without losing their particular way of working. For instance, in the case of the *Scottish Unemployed Workers Network*:

*The network is based in Dundee where most of the activities are undertaken. As stated by some of the respondents, some activities for the networks were undertaken in Paisley, Govan and Glasgow, mainly when one of the founders was based in those cities for work. The network also engaged in actions in Arbroath and tried to organise some activities in Perth. AS SUWN3 explained, the SUWN is trying “to spread the method of work rather than the organisation”, suggesting to other groups in other cities how to act and organise. Some of the respondents stated that they have been approached by groups in other countries, such as Austria, Germany, Greece, and Canada.*

**3.1.2. Barriers found to the promotion of solidarity acts with social impact**

The barriers discussed in this section are those elements that prevent the accomplishment of some of the criteria defined as drivers of actions of solidarity. We use the same classification of barriers as the one of drivers.

**Barriers to democracy** identified focused on the relation established with end-users. In some cases this relation is considered “paternalistic” because the targeted group in the assessment of the project was not included in an egalitarian way, or their opinions have no impact on the important decisions made. This is the case of the *Awakenings Foundation* from Hungary which has identified the attitude of not considering the experiences and knowledge of the patients as the main barrier to constructing a more solidarity-based community psychiatry:

*In Hungary every professional is paternalistic, so the kind of freedom that lets the people decides themselves – this is quite a new culture. For example, when social*
workers and psychologists come out from university, they see themselves as experts. They are making decisions instead of others, and bring this culture, something that we in turn try to change to the opposite side, and this is the most difficult situation to change.

*Barriers to pluralism* centred on not reflecting the pluralism of the solidarity action in the composition of the management board. We argue that the composition of volunteers and/or staff should be diverse and plural but this is not reflected in some of the managerial bodies, which tend to be composed mainly of people with higher educational levels, more men than women, or with a low representation of cultural minorities. For instance, one of the examples provided is extracted from the case study of health from Ireland:

> Nevertheless, most individuals working on the National Management Council are men - 11 men, with 2 women - making the managerial-level highly gender imbalanced, as well as ethnically (white) homogenous.

*Barriers to transparency:* there exists a consensus that transparency is necessary but the bureaucratic process that implies filling some forms and documentation is an obstacle for having updated the information. People involved in the solidarity initiatives claim for more transparency, and in all the cases analysed, this information is available in one or other way. However it has to be emphasized that, when barriers to transparency arose, the consequences may lead to disagreement and even disenchantment, as shown by this example from Greece:

> The issue of financial transparency has created much friction and has divided the people in charge of the Social Solidarity Clinic in Corinth. Up until today, the clinic has not provided detailed information on its financial situation, a practice that a section of the volunteers disagrees with.

*Barriers to recognition:* despite the recognition of communities and support for recognition by municipalities and other public authorities or private foundations, the common barriers detected on here are related to how some case studies lost financial support due to economic crisis and so endangering solidarity actions in practice. A second barrier to recognition is the existence of legal barriers that makes difficult their solidarity action overall when moving to the transnational level. In these cases, the solidarity initiative should address legal contradictions where a common framework is the most needed. This is particularly significant is the cases of help for refugees and medical care. These cases demonstrate the need for better coordination and cooperation between countries in order to meet the basic needs of people at risk, as shown in the case study of health from Germany:

> One of the stakeholders stressed that the law must be adapted to the current situation, with problems within the European Union, e.g. in Greece, which could be tackled by reforming some legislative features, and simply because of the difficulty of giving help in Germany. “And that’s the Problem: How can you bring the people around to it and
make it clear to them: ‘You’ve got to rethink. We are living in a time where we can help ourselves, but where we also have to create the legal foundations for it.’

**Barriers to social and political impact:** In the case of social impact, the barrier found is the lack of specific quantitative and/or qualitative evidence that reflects the social impact that case studies indict might be achievable. On the one hand, it could be that most solidarity initiatives with social impact do not collect data on their own social impact. On the other hand, there is also the case that public institutions do not ask or collect information about organizations’ social impacts. Despite being one situation or another, there is a strong recommendation to share the relevance for collecting specific quantitative and qualitative evidences of their social impact. The reality is that most of these initiatives are doing an excellent job in terms of reducing inequality in different fields and promoting solidarity among citizens but need to pay greater attention to the collection and systematization of data in order to make their impact more visible. Also there is the task of researchers to push in this direction through their research work. At this regard, it is fostered to promote the expertise and support of researchers to support in the task of measuring the social and political impact of solidarity actions, becoming potential partners and establishing partnership alliances.

In terms of political impact, barriers found suggest how important it is that policy makers pay attention to those initiatives that are achieving impact, as well as find mechanisms to support and extend their practices instead of putting up obstacles, because at the same time these initiatives help them to achieve their policy goals, generating a win-win situation. For instance in Denmark one user from The Headspace, an advocacy organisation for mental health issues, claims that public spending should be addressed to the implementation of those initiatives that are obtaining successful results among youngsters of all ages, as well as policies to reduce the number of young admissions to psychiatric hospitals:

*Another general political barrier is reduced public spending. “I think it’s important that Headspace is here, for those who are not totally out there. At the same time, now it gets really political - as the government wants fewer admissions to psychiatric wards among young people they want to make cutbacks on initiatives like Headspace. It doesn’t make sense when there’s a young person who might just have a heart ache age 14, but at 20 she might have been hospitalized three times at the psychiatric ward (Interview user).*

**Barriers to scalability:** There are two findings to consider as obstacles to overcome. One is that initiatives that do not promote a constant recruitment and replacement of their members are at more risk of disappearing or limiting their solidarity action to a particular territory. Then, there is a need to involve a wide range of people constantly in order to avoid feeling that the solidarity action depends on specific people. The other finding is that there are people who are not ready to cooperate
and work with volunteer sector but involved in the solidarity action, making difficult the implementation and normal development of the solidarity action and limiting the efforts through the real objectives. Despite this, all case studies demonstrated that there are mechanisms to follow in overcoming this barrier. This situation is well-reflected in the interview to the leader of *KREM* in Norway:

Our main strategy is to change structures. We aim to change how the inclusion is organised. If our work leads to structural changes, we have succeeded. There are of course barriers regarding our economy, but this can also lead to more focused work. The voluntary sector is also a barrier because several people perceive us as a challenge to their tasks. An important barrier is that many people are not prepared to cooperate.

3.1.3. New categories: Dialogic interactions as drivers of solidarity actions and disenchantment as a barrier to action

**Dialogic interactions as drivers of solidarity actions**

There are two, not initially foreseen, common findings of our analysis. On the one hand, there is the common element of dialogic interactions as driver of solidarity. On the other hand, there is the barrier of disenchantment.

Almost all the solidarity actions analysed have a common element that acts as a merging piece and which is in the basis of the initiatives: daily conversations among volunteers, workers and end-users collected become an example of dialogic interactions (DI, hereinafter). These types of interactions (DI) are based on communicative acts, where sincerity and consensus are free from coercion. People involved in the conversations express mutual respect, increasing the sense of solidarity and engagement as a consequence. There are different examples on the case studies analysed. Here we include a small number to illustrate this finding.

One example is the interactions among volunteers and kids at the *Homework Cafés* in Denmark. Considering the words of the researchers and interviewed: “*Homework Cafés creates an atmosphere free from coercion and power relations*” and “*Volunteers don’t have any power coercion over the kids, they don’t have to do anything else that make sure that it’s nice and comfortable for everyone*”. These kinds of interactions are dialogic ones, and as we note in the social impact evidence, many of the children and young involved in this initiative get higher grades at school and are more self-confident.

A second example is the case study of *Europa Donna Cyprus* which shows how people who get involved in this space do not leave it because they feel really helpful and supportive. This is an example of how dialogic interactions increase trust and confidence: “*Whoever comes here, never leaves. It is the approach of the personnel here and the board they are all bounded as a team. They help, they support*”.

Dialogic interactions also include non-verbal communication related to the expression of users’ eyes where trust and complicity arose, as illustrated in this quotation from the case study of *HeadSpace* in Denmark, an advocacy organization in mental health addressed to youngsters:

*The fact that it is volunteers working there (along some staff, including from the municipality) increases trust, a feeling that they might be experienced some similar problems in their lives, which gives Headspace a certain lifeworld-based legitimacy in the eyes of users.*

This type of interaction makes a strong relationship among end-users, professionals, and politicians. It is a way to increase the social inclusion, for instance, of the former substance abusers as the leader of RIO, an abusers’ interest organisation in Norway, explains in his interview:

*RIO establishes crucial bonds of solidarity among former substance abusers, professionals, bureaucrats and politicians. It is a widespread myth that we are excluded from society. This is not the case. We withdraw ourselves from society. We need to find a way back into society and live together with other people. In most cases, we are welcomed back and included when we try to return. We must develop by interaction with others. Most of us are happy when we manage a normal life.*

Finally, this type of interaction promotes an atmosphere of friendship and well-being because end-users feel that they are treated as equal human beings, which it is a crucial point for including in the initiatives focused on making solidarity stronger among citizens. For instance, in Hungary “*MigSzol Szeged itself became a community of friends or at least citizens*”. In Scotland there is similar reflection:

*What people needed was encouragement, friendship and to be treated as normal human beings [...] And just as importantly because we were not experts, we worked in partnership, in equality, with asylum seekers themselves because in many different ways they were far more knowledgeable than we were.*

As the quote continues, interactions focused on an egalitarian dialogue serve to promote a common feeling and pursuit based on solidarity:

*We are on the same side as the people that we are supporting, so we're not looking down and saying: 'I'm here to help you'. We're saying: ‘We're standing with you and we're with you and we're here and we'll do what you need and we're available 24 hours a day'. It's not like when you're going to a big charity and they're behind a big desk and they're giving you charity, it's very different than that. It's much more solidarity.*

**Disenchantment as barrier**

The second non-foreseen finding systematised through the comparative analysis conducted is that disenchantment is considered a barrier for solidarity. One of the situations in which solidarity actions are at risk of disappearance is that people
involved lose enthusiasm for the initiative. An example here is the Social Solidarity Clinic in Corinth (EL), where volunteers who were involved at the beginning of the project decided to leave it after the leftist government assumed the responsibility, because they believe that it was not necessary to continue:

*After three years of operations, the Social Solidarity Clinic in Corinth has lost its initial enthusiasm and dynamic. Many volunteers who had participated at the beginning of the venture have since left. Many of the people involved in the clinic expected that, with the political changes at the central level and the rise to power of a leftist government, vulnerable groups would regain their access to state health structures.*

As a consequence, meaning creation to overcome disenchantment is more than needed in these solidarity actions. Meaning creation s based on the involvement and inclusion of people who want to take an active part in the solidarity action, is demonstrated in the following quotation from the case study of Cyprus Stop Trafficking, an humanitarian organization that provides support and assistance to victims of trafficking:

*Whoever wants to really work and be involved in the organization’s activities with the one or the other way; if she or he thinks they are a member of the team we think they are a member of the team too.*

Dialogic interactions foster a commitment that may generate a commitment not only with the solidarity action but with the community they respond to, as summarized in the Danish case study of The Skovsgård Model:

*The people who work here have a very strong commitment to keeping a strong connection to the community. I think in that respect of this project differs a lot from others in Denmark. People feel that they are part of this community.*

Disenchantment becomes, then, a new line of research to explore further, and suggests the need for new research on disenchantment and other forms of barriers to acts of solidarity and how drivers help to overcome them.

### 3.2. Reducing inequality and social exclusion through solidarity acts with social impact

One of the criteria for the selection of the case studies was to provide quantitative or qualitative evidence that their actions have improved the living conditions of end-users or have other forms of social impact. Social impact is measured in relation to an official target, for instance, the targets of the EU2020 strategy (creation of employment, decreasing early school leaving, reduction of poverty, etc.) or UN sustainable development goals (poverty, health, gender equality or economic growth, among others). In the following section we provide examples of the social...
impacts of the case studies in order to illustrate their contribution to the achievement of societal aims in the five different policy areas.

**Civic Engagement**

The civic engagement initiatives included in the programme of research are very diverse but a number focused on how civil society organizes solidarity action to welcome and support refugees. These initiatives are crucial in a time where refugees in Europe are experiencing extreme living conditions and are fighting for survival. In this regard, and taking into account the quantitative evidence found, about 184.000 refugees have been supported through the different solidarity actions analysed in the different European countries. They are an example of how citizenry is responding to people without territory suffering from injustice, extending their solidarity and increasing the sense of humanity.

We have also analysed cases of citizen campaigns denouncing corruption, taking a stand on nuclear energy weapons or struggling against water charges. Finally, food banks and social groceries emerged from civic engagement initiatives to provide this basic need to people and families with no resources. The numbers of people benefiting from these initiatives is astonishing: from 2.500 in Portugal to 1.5 million in Germany over a period of a year. All these initiatives are also an example of how solidarity is contributing to overcome spatial divisions of inequality as they address geographical differences at different scale. In the tables below, we summarise the evidence of social impact found from the solidarity actions achieved through civic engagement in the different countries:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Civic Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CY</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: According the Head of the Unit, since 2006 they have assisted over 4,000 refugees through support in their asylum needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DK</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Inclusion of refugees in society - More than 80 Friendly Villagers groups across Denmark have established informal spaces of relationships and exchange where refugees and non-refugees meet as equals, and not as helpers and those receiving charity, promoting friendship to achieve a better social inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DE</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: 1.5 million people are regularly supported with groceries. Of these, about 23% are children and teenagers, 53% adults and 24% retirees. Most of the adults are either migrants, or dependent on welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EL</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: The municipality of Athens was the first municipality to establish a social grocery. Based on data of the Municipality of Athens, the social grocery of the municipality supported 400 households per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HU</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: The emergence action of MigSzol Szeged provided humanitarian assistance to around 30,000 refugees in 2015 according to the group's own estimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IE</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management with a campaign against water charges which has achieved the temporary suspension of water charges in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NL</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: ‘Opzoomer Mee’ nowadays facilitates over 100,000 inhabitants of about 2000 streets (a third of all streets) in Rotterdam who participate in street and neighbourhood initiatives. (...) In this context ‘Opzoomermen’ is the quiet force, working at the street-level, and able to mobilize people quickly, it has a low budget, and hardly any administrative overhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: RWTN is an umbrella organization with 18 regional groups and 53 local groups working to help refugees with housing, food and money. In Oslo, during five weeks in Autumn 2015, voluntary people worked 13,404 hours; they served around 7,000 meals and gave out around 4,500 jackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCT</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Inclusion of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers through a volunteer action addressed to cover their various needs such as shelter, food, clothes or simply advice in Glasgow and also support anyone detained in any UK Detention Centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SK</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: 11 specific corruption cases based on complaints from citizens were resolved within the activities of the association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: NGO Proactiva Open Arms helped get safely to the coast to 143,358 people, 10,273 of whom sailed in boats adrift, 475 had fallen into the water and were trapped in 9,067 cliffs (April 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development through a campaign against the renewal of Britain's independent nuclear deterrent (Trident) as part of its aim of unilateral nuclear disarmament in the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: It started with a cell of 50 beneficiaries, with a number around 1,000 meals distributed per month and grown to numbers that reached 25 ReFood centres, more than 4,000 volunteers, 2,500 beneficiaries and 46,000 meals per month, 5 or 6 days a week. Between 2011 and 2014 the ReFood movement rescued and brought to individuals and families over than 300,000 meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative improvement: fight against poverty and the inclusion of migrant communities through a community kitchen project that is fighting the situations of marginalization, unemployment and conflicts of diverse nature (including drug trafficking) in the neighbourhood of Mouraria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative improvement: BdT is a work/family reconciliation strategy, supporting the family and the balance between professional and family life by offering practical solutions to organize daily life. It also plays an important role strengthening social support networks, reducing loneliness and promoting a sense of community and neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Education**

Case studies of actions in the field of education focused mostly on obtaining and improving academic achievements and qualifications, in regular schools or through support programmes. Most of them are focused on children and youth, but some also include work with adults with few or low level qualification. These solidarity actions are dedicated to reducing the achievement gap between children from affluent families and those from deprived areas, low income families or belonging to vulnerable groups. In addition, we have analysed a range of cases of educational campaigns that are increasing social awareness of the refugee situation, family planning, financial family education and LGBT+ rights in schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Improvement of health sexuality education through the introduction of sex education as part of the Health Education curriculum and responsible for writing up a booklet about sex education in agreement with the Ministry of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Increase of school-level attainment. Homework Cafés was designed with the objective that 95% of young people, especially ethnic minorities, should successfully complete high school with a degree. Regular evaluations of the project, both by the Ministry and the NGOs running it, always showed positive impact on youth’s performance in school and aspects of social development. Youth’s testimonies confirm that after their involvement in this space, they get higher grades, are better prepared and have more confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: More than 100 sponsorships refugees that attend the night school have successfully come to pass so far, with yet more offered and waiting in the works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Increase the number of young with socio economic difficulties to do exams for obtaining certificates (e.g. foreign languages) due to the covering of their expenses by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Increase of school-level attainment of Roma people. Study Halls allow to Roma Children being in a safer and positive environment to reinforce their study and motivation to learn and being success on the school subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Increase of school-level achievement. For instance, comparing results from 2007 to 2010, approximately 65% of schools demonstrated an increase in average reading scores at second, third and sixth class levels (Smyth et al., 2015: 27) (...) Similar results are reported for Math, with pupil scores improving significantly in 2013 compared to 2010, with higher increases again coming from the most disadvantaged students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Increase of the social awareness of being inclusive with refugees addressed to overall citizens in order to promote an openness attitude trough the Campaign “Stay Human” that specifically target the Dutch and their role in the integration process, and which are often very successful. Many other organizations, such as football clubs and market- based companies, are now included in the Stay Human Campaign too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Since 2012, around 100 women have participated in courses to prepare for the workplace, and around half of them are employed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Increase of social awareness of having an inclusive LGBT+ education that overcome social exclusion of LGBT+ young students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: The School of Financial Family has achieved that 3,615 participants can plan personal and family finances better, reflecting on and looking for ways to increase their income, as well as how to save on costs by thorough planning and accounting. At the same time, they gain an overview on other important issues affecting families such as loans and consumer right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Increase of academic achievements of students after implementing SEAs. Data provided show how prior to introduce SEAs, only 17% of students pass the basic competence test of reading and writing; while once SEAs were implemented, school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
achieved that 85% of their students pass it with success. The percentage of students from different countries was of 48% at this school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Educational access to higher education for refugees. Oxford Student Refugee Campaign is trying to help the eight potential students whose higher education career was interrupted due to conflict war and are now enrolled in Oxford this year 2017/2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Qualitative improvement: fight against poverty and the inclusion of migrant communities through a community kitchen project that is fighting the situations of marginalization, Unemployment, educating about ways of preparing quality foods, promoting knowledge of the world's cuisines and conflicts of diverse nature (including drug trafficking) in the neighbourhood of Mouraria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment**

The Case studies of employment are diverse. Some of them are solidarity actions focused on finding jobs for unemployed people, and others are dedicated on acquiring the necessary skills to find a job. Moreover, there are also campaigns to promote awareness in relation to the right to a living wage. The case studies focused on increasing the number of people with jobs obviously have a social impact in terms of reducing the percentage of unemployed people. For instance, 60 people with special needs have been employed through the solidarity action compiled by Denmark; or 40 temporary jobs were created through the solidarity action described by Slovakia. In Spain, the establishment of a cooperative group based on inter-cooperative cooperation has contributed to reduce the unemployment rate for people older than 45 years in the region, five times lower than the Spanish average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Increase of quality of live conditions of trafficking victims through their recruitment in a safer place where basic needs are covered but also live and job skills for social reintegration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Employment achievement - More than 60 people with special needs together with a number of social pedagogues and other professions like a chef, a merchant, and a carpenter and supported by local volunteers have started a collectively owned hotel, opened a grocery store, and are running a campsite and a café in an area where most shops closed many years ago and only very few industries remained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative evidences: Introduction of the minimum wage - As the minimum wage of €8.50 per hour was higher than many incomes of low wage employment groups; about 3.7 million people receive a higher salary today. Amongst the prime beneficiaries from the law are unskilled workers, part-time employees, employees in small companies, people in the service industries and agency workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: There are not evidences how this initiative has increased employment achievements, but 400 members of Time Bank in Greece are actively engage in the exchange of activities developing strong networks of solidarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Small Basket Shopping community has reinforced the security of the farmers' jobs due to success of demand. In 2014 the Association had only 30 customers, in 2015 this rose to 320 and in March 2016 the number was 500. Especially the introduction of a web-shop increased the number of members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Living Wage initiative has fixed this wage in €11.50 per hour. It has reached an official political commitment by a large majority of elected officials within the national parliament and local authorities as well as social awareness of the need to include it in the policies this initiative. However, there is not still a law passed by the parliament to implement it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverable 2.2 Research Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Basic Income Association has fixed it in €1500, per person and month (60% of the median income) for Netherlands. It is highly debated in the media and has promoted some social awareness. However it is not still implemented anywhere in the Netherlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Qualitative evidences: KREM increases the skills and competences for social inclusion putting together in same level users who are suffering some kind of social exclusion with researchers, public servants and private business in order to listening contributions of users on how to improve their situations. Users of KREM have learnt to see possibilities and not only problems as well as be problem solving oriented, to set goals and seek concrete solutions. KREM has identified new methods and practices in which the users of diverging services apply their experience and competences to promote their social entrepreneurship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Increase of work rights awareness that decrease sanctions among people unemployed. “In the recent years there was an increase in sanctions in Dundee; however, “between January 2015 and March/April 2015 there was a 40% drop in sanctions in Dundee” and the SUWN can “claim credit for that. Because people were more confident of what their rights are”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: 40 temporary jobs were created in six local businesses. By means of this temporary subsidized employment, a group of long-term unemployed gained real work experience, new job skills, and strengthened their self-esteem, confidence and social ties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Quantitative evidences: Increase employment achievement for those most vulnerable people. Oñati’s unemployment rate of 2014 for people older than 45 years (6,71%), long term unemployment (2,74%) or people among 16-64 years old (6,54%) is lower compared to the region, province and autonomous community rates. Moreover, the unemployment rate for people older than 45 years in this region is around five times less than the Spanish rate (32,9%). Further, the Mondragón Corporation creates job in all the autonomous communities of Spain, and with significant numbers in Catalonia (6387), Galicia (4252) and Navarra (4104), as well as in the international level (11312 workers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: UK Living Wage Foundation has fixed two rates: London rate is calculated at £9.40 an hour (reflecting the higher living cost in the capital) and the UK fixed at £8.25 an hour. There are evidences of how this initiative achieves social awareness of the need for having a Living Wage due to their impact in increasing low wages. However it is not still implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health

The health solidarity actions studied are contributing to improve health and well-being of citizens and reduce inequality in terms of access to health. Additionally, we found that the volunteers involved have also benefitted from helping others. Further, in some cases, once patients are recovered, they engage in other initiatives such as getting a job, becoming volunteers or enrolling in training courses. The latter happens especially in programmes related to addressing mental health issues or addiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Qualitative evidences: Improvement on the prevention and treatment of breast cancer in Cyprus. Impact of women’s health is huge in terms of surveillance and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Qualitative evidences: Health improvement of young with mental health issues, after being involved in Head Space they feel in safer space, treated with respect and they recovered, some of them get jobs, become volunteers for helping other young and come back to training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: More than 34 tons of medicaments have delivered to communities without basic health care in Germany (ex. Homeless, refugees) but also to other European and non-European countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Health improvement of citizens without insurance in Corinth through promotion of informal solidarity among citizens involved in Social Solidarity Clinic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HU</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Health improvement of mental health of patients through a treatment based on respect and equality where patients are “experts of experience”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IE</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Health improvement of elderly people who are alone through the support of volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NL</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Health improvement of elderly people and well-being of volunteers and receivers of help due a balance relationship based on informal solidarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Re-start has had 42 participants since 2012, of these participants, 38 persons manage their lives without drugs, and 29 former participants have a job or go to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCT</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Improvement of mental health of participants once they are involved in the project, some users decide to involve in other activities such as going to college or obtaining some job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SK</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Mobile trainers are improving the health conditions of children with hearing difficulties and the well-being of the whole family because they teach how to communicate better with their children and this has a direct impact to improve the family communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: REDER has achieved that 90% of cases received (about 2,000) could be solved, facilitating health care attention to those people who were in vulnerable situations such as immigrants with legal documents ensuring the human right of health service in Spain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: health improvement and covering the basic need of food at the same time that promoting the feeling to be valuable of their users. In addition, some of the volunteers engaged in this initiative who were unemployed, recover the sense to be fruitful, and some of them have also achieved jobs in UK after being involved in this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: improvement of the elderly people's health conditions who have received the support of volunteers as well as increase of the medical knowledge and training of volunteers (future doctors).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

Case studies of actions in the field of housing focus on different kind of solidarity actions. Many of the cases included are to help homeless people from diverse communities in terms of age, social exclusion (trafficking victims, unemployed, vulnerable young, etc.) origin and nationality. Other are campaigns to stop evictions and protect people facing economic injustices, as well as pressing for the adoption of protective measures towards the citizens. Two cases that were included are, however, different: an initiative in Norway led by people with disabilities for managing a living independence with personal assistance project, which has employed 6,000 assistants to cover the needs of the members involved. The other one, in Slovakia, is a project in which students of Architecture work together with Roma families to help them build their own homes. All the case studies are contributing to the reduction of internal divisions within cities in terms for ensuring the dignity of occupants of these different forms of housing in diverse ways.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: 150 trafficking victims have achieved to live in flats protected and supported by volunteers 24/7 until they can become financial independent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Housing for people with special needs - The foundation owns three houses in Skovsgård and the original Købmandsgården, offering accommodation to 19 disabled employees in independent housing communities. Other special term employees are either living by themselves or with their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Housing assistance to homeless – The initiative has facilitated shelters for 700 women and 100 children (1994-2009) that allowed having a safer place to live while women found other resources for living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Housing assistance for vulnerable collectives - 'Housing and Reintegration' Programme is achieving that people with economic difficulties find solution for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Housing assistance for vulnerable collectives - AVM’s various methods have been successful at raising the issue, changing the talk towards problems of housing poverty rather than homelessness, and introducing terms such as 'affected by housing instability' rather than homeless. AVM promotes the Street Lawyers program: this is a group of volunteer lawyers that provides legal advice on issues to help people in risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: The social pressure that exercises this initiative has achieved to ensure housing for vulnerable groups or families in risk for being homeless. Examples: 50% of all social housing allocations should go to homeless, provision of 117 new homes for families on the social housing waiting list in Finglas and Beaumont, and achievement that 40 families that were notified for evictions were stop due social pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Housing services to young adults (18-23 years) who due to their age are no longer eligible for youth care, but who are also not fully prepared to live independently. Timon offers them a place in a living arrangement and helps them, via professionals and via volunteers, to get their independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Uloba is changing both how persons with disabilities perceive themselves and how the wider society perceives persons with disabilities. Uloba allows its disabled members to empower themselves by becoming managers of their own personal assistance scheme. Uloba is an employer for its members’ 6,000 assistants. On 17 June 2014 the Norwegian Parliament decided personal assistance is individual right thanks to Uloba claims: Since 1 January 2015, 14,500 disabled persons in need of at least 25 hours of assistance a week have been granted the right to personal assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Qualitative evidence: Improvement of the housing conditions of tenants. They do a campaign that successfully achieves more rights for tenants through Scottish Parliament that help thousands of people for ensuring a better rent house conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: 8 Roma families built their own house together with the collaboration of students of Architecture and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Since the creation of the PAH, 2,045 evictions have been avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative evidence: Since its inception, Depaul UK has made a difference to over 80,000 young people. Nowadays Depaul has grown from a small London-based charity to an international NGO (Depaul International) now working in six countries and helping over 13,000 disadvantaged and marginalised people a year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Solidarity acts among citizens from different European and non-European countries to ensure transnational solidarity and enhance European citizenship.

A number of the case studies demand particular attention due to their contribution to transnational solidarity. We have selected four cases that are from different countries: PROACTIVA OPEN ARMS (Spain), Europa Donna Cyprus (Cyprus), Medical Aid (Germany) and Refugees Welcome (Norway) These initiatives demonstrate the reality of European citizenship where people from different countries are collaborating to aid people from diverse origins.

**PRO ACTIVA OPEN ARMS (Spain)**

This initiative was created because his founder, Oscar Camps, after finishing the summer period and his work as lifeguard saw the horror of lives lost on the Greek coasts. He thought that he would be necessary as life guard to help saving lives and then he decided to promote this initiative. Nowadays volunteer team’s come from different European and non-European Countries (from Northern Europe, Latin America, Palestine, etc.) to help save lives. They reinforce the idea of transnational solidarity despite the origins of the volunteers; what it really matters is that everybody is able to collaborate and volunteer for helping lives of other citizens:

> Accidentally we are from here [Spain] but we worked to not pigeonhole us, because above all is the solidarity that we are all equal, it does not matter the colour, race, whether you’re male or female.

Also is remarkable that this NGO contributes to save lives and to put on the agenda that European institutions need to cooperate and provide solutions for helping citizens who are in danger, and also those NGO that are working every day for solving an urgency situation:

> NGO Proactiva Open Arms helped get safely to the coast to 143,358 people, 10,273 of whom sailed in boats adrift, 475 had fallen into the water and were trapped in 9.067 cliffs. (...)However, they had the help of civic society, with Greek and Turkish fishermen, who moved to the area to rescue more refugees and bring them to shore. Later on the coast Proactiva Open Arms was helped by other non-governmental organizations (doctors, nurses, etc.) that provide floor care resuscitation.

This NGO is evidence that is possible to construct strong networks of solidarity among citizens from different countries for the purpose of helping people in risk, especially refugees fleeing conflicts war and so creating a sense of sense of European citizenship where solidarity is the common value.
**EUROPA DONA CYPRUS**

Europa Dona Cyprus is an initiative that belongs to a European Coalition focused on a network of solidarity among European women who have suffered breast cancer. This initiative is an example of how European initiatives from civil society promote interchanges among citizens from different countries to help each other achieve common goals in a European and at the national level. This coalition focused on improving breast cancer education, providing appropriate screening and optimal treatment, as well as more funding for breast cancer research. Thus, solidarity among women from different European countries has had a real impact on lives of many women in Europe. One of the specific cases is the Europa Dona Cyprus that being in contact with the coalition stronger their voice in order to press politics from Cyprus for adopting control population and prevention programs:

*The fact that we participate in actions that take place on a European level; that we take part in European conferences made our voices stronger ... to be able to have consultations with politician's members of national parliament to justify our demands for the rights of every woman...*  

*The fact that we are members of a European coalition the fact that we take part in European conferences has strengthened our voice.*

In addition, women from this initiative value the relevance of directives of European Parliament adopted related to breast cancer. They assume that approving this type of directives is crucial also for pressing national parliaments to adopt these measures:

*The 2 directives by the European Parliament the directive of 2003 and 2006 were a sharp weapon in our hands when demanding the opening of breast centre and population control.*

**MEDICAL AID FOR PEOPLE IN NEED (Germany)**

Medical Aid for People in Need is a Germany-based foundation born to help people deprived of healthcare around the world. This initiative distributes medication and medical equipment needed in those communities that need to their health assistance. They are helping now refugees in Germany and other people without health insurance, but their spatial range is diverse, they helped to Afghanistan, Argentina, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Eritrea, Lithuania, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, Tibet and the Ukraine. This foundation creates solidarity networks in those countries and territories that delivers this type of medical help and promotes that those communities can health assistance despite the difficulties. This type of initiative often found legal obstacles for delivering medication and they must solve in order to arrive to those people in need. For this reason, one of the claims
extracted to this case study is the recommendation of improving the legal coordination among countries, even in Europe for reaching those citizens that are waiting this health assistance:

    And that's the Problem: How can you bring the people around to it and make it clear to them: 'You've got to rethink. We are living in a time where we can help ourselves, but where we also have to create the legal foundations for it.'

REFUGEES WELCOME

This initiative has a special value for exemplifying how the citizenship could promote solidarity networks to overcome barriers introduced by the governments in order to save lives. This initiative supports the inclusion of refugees and asylum-seekers in many different countries and there are several case studies in SOLIDUS which analyse the social and political impact of the national/local network. Here we present the case of Refugees Welcome in Norway. On the basis of this case study we are able to show how citizens in Norway mobilized in order to help refugees from other countries facing hard situations. For instance, the Government closed internet connections to avoid communications and stop the mobilization, but instead of giving up, citizens continued to help refugees, searching for solutions to provide support despite the difficulties.

    When the government tried to close the borders with Russia to prevent refugees from coming to Norway, we mobilised all the resources we had. We used our network and helped refugees in the north. At that time, we had communication with several refugees over the internet, and then suddenly public servants closed the refugees' access to internet. It was unbelievable. This is Norway. The government followed a strategy of exhaustion. We used our network, and mobilised people who could help the refugees.

These four case studies provide an example of how citizens from different countries in Europe have created solidarity actions that reinforce the sense of European citizenship through promoting transnational solidarity. There are more examples of this type of solidarity, but also public administrations need to learn how these citizens’ networks are working to avoid obstacles and official barriers and to achieve specific results to improve people’s lives. One of the ways is to build strong connections between civil society and policy makers/politicians from different political views to ensure the common pursuit of well-being for all European citizens, including refugees.
4. Conclusions and recommendations

Throughout this document, several contributions from the case studies carried out as part of WP2 of the SOLIDUS programme have been highlighted. Firstly, a conceptual survey and summary has been carried out in order to understand the question of space when conceptualising solidarity at difference scales, including the global. We then provided an overview on the policy framework policy to understand the extent to which each of the 12 states participating in the SOLIDUS programme addresses spatial differences. Finally, this report has presented the main findings of the analysis of the 64 case studies identified as successful acts of solidarity in the European territories.

Based on this work, the SOLIDUS Consortium is able to elaborate a set of conclusions and policy recommendations to promote successful acts and initiatives of solidarity in Europe.

Related to the conclusions, it has been stated that even in the most social democratic of states (the Nordic countries in the main) there has been a shift towards a neo-liberal, individualistic ‘work-fare model’ of public policy provision, in which support is no longer a right but has to be earned through participation in the labour force for all able-bodied individuals. In general, in almost all the participating states, governments have been reducing welfare spending, expecting both the market and civil society meet many needs previously accepted as state responsibilities. Consequently, where welfare states do not or no longer reach, citizens are getting organized and promoting solidarity in order to ensure the well-being of all people, especially those that are in most vulnerable situations. But the analysis also has evidenced that the support of the stat in rolling out local groups and organizations across the national landscape is important.

A second general point outlined is the existence of similar spatial inequalities between regions, in particular between urban and rural areas, between the capital city and smaller cities and towns and then between neighbourhoods in cities.

The analysis of drivers and barriers clearly defines seven categories found in all actions of solidarity that achieve social impact. These seven categories are: “democracy” (the participation of all members of an organization in governance and decision-making processes); “pluralism / diversity” (in terms of members’ composition of an organization); “transparency /accountability” (society is interested in the fate of funding and actions that this organization carries out); “recognition” (social recognition of the indicatives by the civil society and other social spheres); dialogic interactions; sustained meaning creation and “scalability” (the potential for growth of the organization). The analysis also evidences that those solidarity actions which are achieving a greater social impact accomplish these seven categories and become more sustainable in time. On the contrary, those
solidarity actions which arose less social impact have shown some barriers in some of these categories.

A fourth conclusion focuses on the importance of interpersonal relations between providers and users to foster solidarity. We have provided with numerous examples that shown how personal connections helped establish solidarity and so working at a local level seemed most significant. In this regard, mention how the use of media, particularly social media has an impact in increasing the spatial connections within solidarity actions, allowing the scalability of these social actions. As a consequence, there are many solidarity actions which have enlarge in the territory, building a network of solidarity which also crosses boundaries to other countries and even achieves a transnational solidarity.

On the other hand, and after systematise the contributions arisen from the cross-country analysis of case studies and later discussion in focus group, we have defined eight policy recommendations to promote successful acts and initiatives of solidarity in Europe, as follows:

1. **Public institutions should support those successful acts of solidarity that are promoting solidarity in Europe and reducing social and spatial inequalities, which could involve also to reduce financial barriers**

   The increasing emphasis by many national governments on individualization rather than policies of social protection and social solidarity makes the achievement of solidarity more difficult. However, the support of the estates in rolling out successful acts of solidarity across the national landscape is important. Furthermore, public institutions should moderate financial barriers of those successful acts of solidarity that are promoting solidarity in Europe and decreasing the social and spatial inequalities.

   Finally, this support should not to diminish the independency of the solidarity action. As it has been argued, the worst thing that can happen to a solidarity project is if governments take over and citizens lose their agency and ‘authority’ over the project.

2. **Public institutions should improve infrastructure and connection between urban and rural and between centre and peripheral regions in each country to reduce social and spatial inequalities**

   As it has been shown, there are increasing spatial differences within each country. We have been provided with examples of how inequalities are growing between urban and rural spaces and, particularly between centre and peripheral regions. However, we have also analysed some case studies that gave examples from the peripheral areas and/or rural areas that are overcoming such situations. In this
regard, it appears the need to improve the existing connections and infrastructures within each country to reduce spatial inequalities.

3. Public institutions should fund regionally-based agencies to reduce social and spatial inequalities

Related to the prior recommendation, a solution debated has been funding regionally-based agencies to reduce social and spatial inequalities. Allocated in a regional level, both within the European perspective as the national one, such regional agencies could better know and answer to the political needs and demands of both organizations and citizens.

4. Public institutions should look in detail at the different ways public policies affect regions, especially the dominant focus on the capital city in each country.

Sometimes it may happen that public institutions have a dominant focus on the capital city of each country, so that generates the definition of policies not considering the total necessities of the complete population. In this regard, it is asked to analyse the social effects of a policy before establishing it, especially taking care of how they can affect the different regions and what could be the consequences of its implementation.

5. Public institutions should identify and recognize those actions of solidarity that are achieving the greatest social impact

The success of solidarity action should be demonstrated with evidence, proving the impact of these acts in relation to reducing inequalities in Europe and promoting solidarity. Public institutions should consider the categories of the successful acts of solidarity that are making a difference in relation to reducing social exclusion and promoting solidarity in Europe in order to map what initiatives have the most beneficial and widest ranging social impact in the European Union and within individual member countries. There are many solidarity actions in Europe. However not all of them are really achieving the objective of the social impact defined as improving the life conditions of European citizens. In this regard, the establishment of categories to identify the extent and value of the social impact of solidarity actions could support the task of defining them as successful acts of solidarity with social impact.

The identification of successful acts of solidarity with social impact would support the task of public sector institutions in deciding where to dedicate political efforts in the promotion of solidarity.
In order to achieve this, it is suggested that there are two important developments:

51. **Support solidarity organizations and other initiatives to show their social impact:** many solidarity organizations and initiatives do not have enough resources to systematize their social impact. In order to highlight and to increase solidarity in Europe, public institutions should support these organizations and initiatives in this task. In this context, attention was drawn to the role of and cooperation with academia in the task of support to solidarity organizations and initiatives to highlight social impact as well as evaluation.

52. **Recognition of social impact as an indicator of quality for political assessment:** It has been suggested to consider as indicator of quality the social and political impact achieved by actions of solidarity. If doing so, public administrations and institutions could refer and use it when looking for assessment in some particular topics and/or targets. For instance, in the case that a public body needs of assessment on how to provide Roma people with the successful educational policies, they can consider the actions of solidarity that are achieving the best educational results to assess them in this task.

On the other hand, it has mentioned that some solidarity actions with social impact are not necessarily preferred over other initiatives when it comes to the distribution of public funds or contracts. That situation could be improved/solved if it is considered the social impact as an indicator.

6. **Public administrations should promote mechanisms and channels of participation between successful acts of solidarity and political administrations**

Where civil society through third sector organisations and communal efforts is now addressing many needs previously accepted as state responsibilities, there is a need to guarantee the establishment of fluent communication as well as facilitate ways for civil initiatives to become participants in the political sphere. The promotion of greater dialogue between political institutions/administrations and citizenship is necessary, even though nowadays it quite difficult in many of the EU countries. Mechanisms should be found to enable people to meet policy-makers to communicate their demands, as well as to work in partnership together in ways which may be of benefit to everyone.
A fourth recommendation is related to the question of stability in the policies that are applied by public administrations in order to answer public demands. In this regard, it is important not to change laws and or legislation concerning the regulation of a particular policy area or how to address a target group, especially if it is achieving their aims with measurable social impact.

Question remains of the coherence of policies between what is necessary and what is legislated. Analysis and debate have shown the inconsistency in what needs to be done and what legislation permit. This should be adjusted and aligned.

A considerable barrier detected is the existence of a lack of monitoring and evaluation of existing policies, which is a demand of civil society and citizenship. It is difficult, for example, to find concrete information about the impact of policies on websites or in other public reports. It is necessary to evaluate policies in order to know if they are achieving better living conditions for citizens in order to improve their impact.
5. References


## Annex 1 – List of case studies

### Table 1. Case studies on Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Europe region</th>
<th>Spatial dimension</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Poverty and/or Social exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Future Worlds Centre</td>
<td>Humanitarian Affairs Unit</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City Divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Friendly Villagers (Venligboerne)</td>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Local Regional National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Federal Association of German Tafel</td>
<td>Parent organisation of German foodbanks</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social Grocery in the Municipality of Agia Varvara</td>
<td>Social grocery</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Migszol Szeged</td>
<td>Migrants / refugees</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Irish Water resistance campaign</td>
<td>Resistance campaign for the abolition of water taxes</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Opzoomer Mee</td>
<td>street and neighbourhood initiatives</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Refugees Welcome to Norway</td>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Unity Centre</td>
<td>Asylum seekers and other migrants in Scotland</td>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Local Regional</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Against Corruption</td>
<td>non-profit civic association Against Corruption</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Proactiva Open Arms</td>
<td>NGO Refugees</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>Core-periphery</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CND</td>
<td>Campaign for nuclear disarmament</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>National Regional Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ReFOOD</td>
<td>Meal collecting from restaurants</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Banco de tempo</td>
<td>Time bank</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Briefly the case studies on Civic Engagement are:

**Future Worlds Centre (FWC)** is a non-profit, non-governmental independent organization based in Nicosia, Cyprus. It is active in programs with future orientation in areas related to positive social change and social entrepreneurship. FWC has four Units working under different thematic areas, which includes the analysed Humanitarian Affairs Unit, working on strengthening asylum system in the republic of Cyprus and support refugees and asylum seekers.

**Friendly Villagers (Venligboerne)** is a platform of support to refugees entirely run by volunteers across Denmark. Very grassroots and decentralized in their organizational structure, groups share certain rules that stem from their value: meeting people in friendliness and trying to make their lives in Denmark as meaningful as possible; avoiding the mistakes of past integration policy; setting a counter-example to the currently dominating anti-refugee public discourse. The other important founding principle is that refugees and non-refugees meet as equals, and not as helpers and those receiving charity. Groups differ in size and rage of activities, depending on local context and people involved.

**Federal Association of German Tafel.** The Bundesverband Deutsche Tafel (Federal Association of German Tafel) is the parent organisation of German foodbanks. The Tafel is a classic bottom-up initiative that has shown unprecedented growth in its effort to combat both the problem of food waste as well as social issues like hunger and poverty.

**Social Grocery in the Municipality of Agia Varvara (Athens, Greece).** Social groceries have been founded as a means to reduce the impact of extreme material deprivation, within the broader framework of the establishment of social networks to combat poverty, aiming at relieving and supporting destitute families and offering them, on a monthly basis, the most basic necessities, especially in the case analysed, the Municipality of Agia Varvara, which is a suburban municipality in Western Athens with residents from many and different vulnerable groups.

**Migszol Szeged** (Hungary). For those refugees who crossed into Hungary from Serbia before the border closed in September 2015, the first place that refugees reached was the county of Csongrád and its administrative centre, Szeged. Measures to help the arrivals were largely coordinated by a non-governmental and non-registered organization called MigSzol Szeged.

**Irish Water resistance campaign.** In late-2013, individuals around the country began to mobilise relatively independent campaigns of resistance centred on local community groups opposed to Irish government plans of establishing a national water utility company – Irish Water – and introducing service charges for the population.

**Opzoomer Mee** facilitates over 100,000 inhabitants of about 2000 streets (a third of all streets) in Rotterdam (Netherlands) who participate in street and neighbourhood initiatives. Current activities focus on ‘lief and leed’ (love and sorrow) that aims to prevent loneliness, on informal language education, and on street-cleaning.

**Refugees Welcome to Norway (RWTN)** was created in August 2015, first through concrete actions to help refugees, then as a Facebook page and later as a broader network.
The initiative was taken with the aim of organising individual, organisational and private efforts to help newly arrived asylum seekers. RWTN provides basic needs (food, clothes, housing, money etc.) to asylum seekers.

The Unity Centre is a collective based in Glasgow (Scotland) that "gives practical support and solidarity to all asylum seekers and other migrants in Scotland" and "also support anyone detained in any UK Detention Centres". More in detail, the UC volunteers try and address the various needs of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, such as shelter, food, clothes or simply advice. To do so, the UC volunteers make referral to food banks or to night shelters, give vouchers to be used in charity shops, or book a first appointment to "trusted immigration lawyers", according to the need of the people.

Against Corruption is a non-profit civic association aimed on addressing the problem of corruption on the part of the state in Slovakia. In response to the problem of corruption, the civic association Against Corruption has implemented its activities to involve members of the public in the fight against corruption in order to increase the transparency in the management of public funds and the effectiveness of the control mechanisms in public administration.

Proactiva Open Arms is a Spanish NGO created to do lifeguard first in Lesbos (Greece) and later on in the central Mediterranean in order to saving refugees. Proactiva Open Arms have not stopped to rescue refugees since September of 2015 until now.

Campaign for nuclear disarmament (CND) is an organisation that advocates unilateral nuclear disarmament in the United Kingdom but also campaigns against weapons of mass destruction and nuclear power more generally. In recent years, it has fought against the renewal of Britain’s independent nuclear deterrent (Trident).

ReFOOD is a local community solidarity movement in Portugal with the mission of eliminating food waste and end hunger, involving the full community in the common cause. It emerged in the year of 2011 with three objectives: (1) avoiding food waist, (2) ending hunger situations in Portuguese communities, and (3) avoiding social segregation.

Cozinha popular da Mouraria (CPM) is a social, civic and cultural initiative launched by the Portuguese photographer Adriana Freire, who within a kitchen offers the possibility to prepare and share a meal. CPM falls within the scope of activity of ACPM - Associação Cozinha Popular which is a non-profit association formed in 2011 as a social responsibility initiative that aims to involve the neighbourhood of Mouraria.

Banco de tempo (BdT) is a system of organization of solidarity exchanges promoting the encounter and the offer of services by its members. At Banco de Tempo, one exchanges time for time; all hours have the same value and those participating commit to give and receive time. In Portugal, BdT plays an important role strengthening social support networks, reducing loneliness and promoting a sense of community and neighbourhood.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Europe region</th>
<th>Spatial dimension</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Poverty and/or Social exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cyprus Family Planning Association</td>
<td>Sexuality, sexual and reproductive health and rights</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Red Cross Youth Homework Cafes</td>
<td>Homework Cafes</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Refugee Council Leipzig</td>
<td>Educational program</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Solidarity Schools: The Case of the 'Mesopotamia' Solidarity School in Moschato</td>
<td>Time Bank / Solidarity services school</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tanoda/Study Hall’ Movement</td>
<td>Extra-curricular afternoon school</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions City-countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DEIS: Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools programme</td>
<td>State-directed scheme to tackle educational disadvantage and inequality at both primary and secondary schools</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-countryside</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dutch Council for Refugees</td>
<td>Educational programs</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional National</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Equality, Inclusion and Networking</td>
<td>Multicultural voluntary organisation for women: courses in Norwegian language</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time for Inclusive Education</td>
<td>LGBTI+ inclusive education</td>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School of Family Finance</td>
<td>financial literacy</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>City-countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Briefly the case studies on education are:

**Cyprus Family Planning Association (CFPA)** works on sexuality, sexual and reproductive health and rights. CFPA designs and implements educational activities for young people. The organization activities are run by young volunteers, as the main aim is to inform and support, empower and inform young people about their rights. In addition, the CFPA runs a free helpline who offer information on sexuality issues. Finally, it carries out research programs throughout the entire territory of Cyprus.

**Red Cross Youth Homework Cafes** runs around 70 Homework Cafés (Lektiecafeer) mostly in urban areas across the country of Denmark to support youth with their education. They are targeted at high school students (2nd to 10th grade students in Folkeskolen/Basic School) with a special focus on ethnic minorities to prevent drop out of school.

**Refugee Council Leipzig (Flüchtlingsrat Leipzig)** is a grassroots organisation based in the German city of Leipzig that has assisted refugees for more than 25 years, both with immediate aid and long-term support. Numerous volunteers are teaching German to both adults and children and assisting students of all ages with their schoolwork and extracurricular education.

**Solidarity Schools**: The Case of the 'Mesopotamia' Solidarity School in Moschato. 'Mesopotamia' is a solidarity organization without an institutional status, which started operating in 2003. Initially, it was an initiative by activists from Moschato (southern Attica, Greece) with roots in the ecology movement as well as in the reformist and radical left movements. The Solidarity School organizes: educational services, crammer school courses, as well as foreign language courses (English, German and Italian), seminars and educational courses for any age and any other activity that aims at personal and social development.

**“Tanoda/Study Hall” Movement** is an organization which provides professional help for so-called 'tanodas', a term in Hungarian is associated with the words 'study', ‘take care of’ and ‘kindergarten’ and in practice is an extra-curricular afternoon school addressed mainly to Roma children, who represent around 10% of the school-aged population in Hungary.
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Delivering Equality of Opportunity in Schools programme (DEIS) is a state-directed scheme to tackle educational disadvantage and inequality at both primary (ages 4-12) and secondary (ages 12-18) schools within Ireland. The DEIS programme attempted to function in a highly targeted manner, first providing a standardised system for identifying levels of disadvantage, and then offering an 'integrated' School Support Programme (SSP).

Dutch Council for Refugees (DCR) is the largest organization in the Netherlands regarding the support for refugees. Their strongest feature is the fact that they are involved with the asylum seekers and refugees from the start (arrival in the Netherlands) until their final integration in Dutch society. Another strong feature is the activation and support of volunteers through professional assistance. DCR combines support and services with a more critical stance and lobby activities regarding policy decisions for this group of people.

Equality, Inclusion and Networking (LIN) is a multicultural voluntary organisation for women, which has around 1,050 members. LIN works to encourage minority women to learn the Norwegian language; to participate in society; to improve their knowledge about Norwegian society; to improve the dialogue between parents, children and families; and to build bridges between minorities and the wider society. The aim of the organisation is to be a meeting place for women, give these women independence and recognition, and offer a way into Norwegian society.

Time for Inclusive Education (TIE) campaign aims to ensure that all schools in Scotland are offering an LGBTI+ inclusive education with the introduction of a diverse and fully inclusive education programme that addresses, acknowledges and highlights such matters relating to the LGBTI+ community in a positive and progressive manner and in order to prevent homo/transphobia during school.

School of Family Finance promotes financial education to change the habits regarding home management. In order to do so, the programme involves parents as important adults in children's lives. The Children of Slovakia Foundation (CSF) is in charge of the programme, and looks for ways to bring education to the communities with the support of the third sector.

Schools as Learning Communities project is based upon a group of successful educational actions addressed to achieve social and educational transformation of children. They are mostly kinder garden and primary education centres, although there are secondary education centres and adult education centres too. 209 school centres in Spain and over 200 in Latin America have transformed socio-educational centres and their environments aiming for the achievement of a quality education for all, guaranteeing efficiency and equity.

Refugees welcome is a non-governmental community group founded in December 2015 to channel the pro-refugee political energy in the UK that has swept through Europe in the wake of the Syrian refugee crisis. Refugees Welcome works with Citizens UK and includes 40 leaders from different religious and societal groups on its board to support refugees in the British communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Europe region$^6$</th>
<th>Spatial dimension</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Poverty and/or Social exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freedom Dolls Initiative (FDI)</strong></td>
<td>Programs to victims of Human trafficking and abuse</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Skovsgård Model</strong></td>
<td>People with mental disabilities</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationwide minimum wage in Germany</strong></td>
<td>Law minimum wage</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-countryside</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Banks (Athens)</strong></td>
<td>Exchange of services and knowledge among citizens</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Basket Shopping Community</strong></td>
<td>Local food markets</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Wage initiative</strong></td>
<td>Alliance to promote the concept of a living wage within Ireland</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Income Association</strong></td>
<td>Implementing basic income on a large scale in the Netherlands</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>National International</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative and Diverse Workplace</strong></td>
<td>Creating work solutions to social exclusion</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Scottish Unemployed Workers Network</strong></td>
<td>Advocacy activists campaign against the very deliberate demonization of the unemployed</td>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Banská Bystrica (BB) project to reduce the number</strong></td>
<td>Temporary supported employment</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 2.2 Research Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of long-term unemployed citizens</td>
<td>Work cooperative</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>Core-periphery</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mondragon Corporation</td>
<td>Employers who choose to pay the Living Wage on a voluntary basis</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 UK Living Wage Foundation</td>
<td>Promotes responsible tourism engaging tourists in social projects and the homeless to work as guides</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description of the case studies on Employment**

**Freedom Dolls Initiative (FDI)** is a voluntary Non-Profit Organisation that offers help, assistance and rehabilitation programmes to victims of human trafficking and abuse in Cyprus. The organization has been successful in helping trafficking victims find employment opportunities. One way of doing this was to train the victims to make dolls and live off the profits of selling them.

**The Skovsgård Model** consists of several independent social enterprises and a foundation cooperating in a network, all following the same principle, working mainly with people with mental disabilities in a rural municipality in Northern Jutland, Denmark. They employ more than 60 people with special needs in a collectively owned hotel, opened a grocery store, and are running a campsite and a café. Many of their “employees on special terms” live locally in houses owned by the oldest initiative, Købmandsgården.

**Nationwide minimum wage in Germany.** The introduction of a nationwide minimum wage of the Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (GDB; German Federation of Trade Unions) in Germany has been a topic of debate for several years. The minimum wage should help secure the employees of inappropriate wages (“wage dumping”) and stop the competition amongst companies to decrease wages; relieve the social system by decreasing the number of working poor receiving top-up benefits (“Aufstocker”); secure the tenure of employees; reduce income inequality; and increase the purchasing power among the population.

**Time Banks: The Case of the Time Bank of Athens.** The rationale behind the operations of a time bank is that each service (and good) is equal to a specific amount of time. In a similar vein, a time-based currency is an alternative currency or exchange system where the unit of account is the person-hour or some other time unit. The members of a time bank exchange goods and services on the basis of the aforementioned rules.
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Small Basket Shopping Community (SBSC) was created in 2011 by a local civil society entrepreneur. SBSC is a shopping community located in the northern Hungarian border town of Esztergom, focused on reviving local food traditions, and supporting rural, local or regional employment. They insist on direct contact between the producer and buyer.

Living Wage initiative. At the beginning of 2013, several left-leaning groups from civil society came together in a loose alliance to promote the concept of a living wage within Ireland. The initiative was designed to promote “a wage which makes possible a minimum acceptable standard of living [that is] evidence based and grounded in social consensus”. Based on a calculation by the ‘Living Wage Technical Group’ – composed of several individuals from the organisations involved – this wage was calculated to be €11.50 per hour.

Basic Income Association The approach of the unconditional Basic income Association is that a real basic income has four characteristics: it is universal, individual, unconditional, and sufficient enough to allow for a decent living and participation in society. Every person (regardless of age, gender, ethnic background, etc.) should have right to a basic income. Such an income will be paid per individual, (not per household) and does not hold the obligation to work or to find work. For the Netherlands this means that a Basic income would be around €1500.

Creative and Diverse Workplace (KREM) is a bridge-building organisation in Norway for users who are long-term recipients of social assistance, and persons who have experienced or been engaged in crime, substance abuse, mental illness and unemployment. KREM aims to develop new ways and possibilities for participation in labour and school activities. KREM stresses equal partnerships between individuals, systems, the public and private sectors, as essential in developing new, effective social services based on users’ needs, competencies and resources. KREM recruits most of its staff and interns from outside the work force.

The Scottish Unemployed Workers Network (SUWN) was established in Scotland in 2011 as an organisation by and for unemployed people. At the very beginning, the aim of the network was to “campaign against the very deliberate demonization of the unemployed”. Overtime, the mission of the SUWN has become much broader and coupled campaigning with the advocacy activity. In this sense, the SUWN has a two-fold objective. On the one hand, a practical, bottom-up assistance to unemployed benefits claimants. On the other, SUWN activists campaign for welfare reforms.

City of Banská Bystrica (BB) project to reduce the number of long-term unemployed citizens. The city of Banská Bystrica (BB, SK) implemented a project to reduce the number of long-term unemployed citizens. In cooperation with the Regional Development Agency in Banská Bystrica, the Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, the Education Centre for NGOs, local employers, and with the support of the European Social Fund they have created a new system for tackling the problem of the long-term unemployed. The result was a form of temporary supported employment through interim labour. 40 people were employed in six local companies and organizations for 14 months.

Mondragon Corporation is the first business group in the Basque Country and one of the main groups in Spain with economic activity in the industry, finances, distribution and knowledge sectors. This group is composed of 103 cooperatives, some of them with subsidiaries and offices in 41 countries and sales in more than 150 countries.
UK Living Wage Foundation is an administrative body that promotes the concept and adoption of Living Wage, encouraging and accrediting employers who choose to pay the Living Wage on a voluntary basis. The voluntary hourly rate is set independently and updated annually according to the basic cost of living in the UK. There are two rates, one is for London, reflecting the higher living cost in the capital, and one is for the UK. The London rate is calculated by Greater London Authority and currently (Spring 2016) stands at £9.40 an hour for those aged 25 and over. The UK rate (excluding London) is calculated by the Centre for Research in Social Policy at Loughborough University and is currently £8.25 an hour. There are now 2559 living wage employers accredited by the Foundation, including KPMG, Nationwide, Burberry, National Grid, Oliver Bonas, several universities and both Houses of Parliament.

Impact Trip promotes responsible travel experiences in Portugal by allowing the traveler to dedicate part of the travelling time volunteering at a local social project. They also engage in Hills of Hope which aims at transforming ex-homeless people into tour guides. It allows employability, literacy and the training of former homeless people, allowing them to share stories of their lives and allowing tourists to know places that otherwise would not be discovered.
Table 4. Case studies on Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Europe region</th>
<th>Spatial dimension</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Poverty and/or Social exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europa Donna Cyprus</td>
<td>Breast Cancer Women network</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-Countryside // City divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Social Network – Headspace</td>
<td>advocacy organisation - Mentally vulnerable youth</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Local, regional, national</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City Divisions</td>
<td>Top-Down/Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Aid for People in Need</td>
<td>Foundation that distributes medication to people in Need</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>National, International</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>Core periphery City divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Clinics: The Case of the Social Solidarity Clinic in Corinth</td>
<td>Civil Non-Profit Association</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Local, National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City Divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awakenings Foundation</td>
<td>Foundation addressed to mental health</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City Divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent de Paul charity</td>
<td>Voluntary charity organisation</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City Divisions / City Countryside/</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Help</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City Countryside</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO – Abusers’ Interest Organisation</td>
<td>Association funded by former drug abusers</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City countryside/City Divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Nemo</td>
<td>Charity organization</td>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City Divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile trainers</td>
<td>Pontis Foundation.</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>City Countryside</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDER</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Regional, National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City countryside/City Divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trussell Trust</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Regional, National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-Divisions / City Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saúde porta a porta</td>
<td>Project Students Association of NOVA Medical School</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City-divisions</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Briefly the case studies on Health are:

**Europa Donna Cyprus** founded in 2000 as part of the Europa Donna European Breast Cancer Coalition that aims to create awareness for breast cancer and support women. There are 47 country members in the coalition.

**The Social Network** works is an advocacy organisation with several projects in the field of prevention, working towards more acceptance and awareness of mental illness and vulnerability. They are particularly dedicated to help young people. One of their youth prevention projects is Headspace, providing ad-hoc and sustainable support to vulnerable youth with the help of trained volunteers, providing a bridge between young people and institutions if necessary in Denmark.

**Medical Aid for People in Need** is a project that collects, sorts and distributes medication among people in need all around the world. The project itself can be seen as a successful example of a solidary project in the field of health with a worldwide focus. The spatial scope is of importance, since it started on an international base with a focus on countries with special distresses like wars or natural disasters before expanding to regional projects in its country of origin, Germany.

**Solidarity Clinics.** Social health services have become an almost standard form of solidarity action during the crisis and a mean of social pressure for political action towards widening the protection of the unemployed and the uninsured. Evidence from three major social clinics all over the country highlights an increasing need for free medical and pharmaceutical treatment. The case study selected for this research is the Social Solidarity Clinic in Corinth (Greece).

**The Center is called Ébredések Alapítvány which translates as Awakenings Foundation.** It was founded in 1991 with the goal of promoting community-based mental health practice, to reduce social stigma surrounding mental illness, and provide practical support for patients and their families, through day care support, employment training, and other social and rehabilitation therapies. (Hungary)

**Saint Vincent de Paul (SVP)** is the largest voluntary charity organisation in Ireland as well as the oldest, its establishment dating back to 1844. Rooted in Catholic/Christian principles and ethos, the organisation has long provided charitable relief within Ireland alongside efforts to fight social exclusion and deprivation.

**WeHelp** was developed – originally with 3 partners; Rabo Bank Foundation, PGGM (pension fund for workers in the field of Care and Social Work) and CZ (health care insurance company) - with the idea in mind that Dutch society is ‘in transition’, meaning that it is in the process of shifting from a society based on a formal sense of solidarity to a society based on an informal sense of solidarity. WeHelp Cooperation was founded in 2012. In 2014, over 15.000 people use the WeHelp Cooperation, and over 17.000 requests for help were placed on the wehelpen-website. In total there are 27.000 people who have registered at WeHelp either to ask for help and support or to give care and support. (Netherlands)
RIO was established in 1996 by former substance abusers. They wanted to influence the Norwegian drug policy and work for better treatment of substance abusers. Their vision was a society where everyone gets an organised way out of drug-related problems. Today, RIO is a nationwide user organisation. Its mission is to exert influence so drug addicts and alcoholics can get adapted back into the community through diverse treatment options and an individually facilitated integration process. All RIOs representatives are former addicts who in various ways have come out of their addiction. Consequently, RIO has organised representatives who have experience of public institutions as former addicts. (Norway)

Theatre Nemo is a charity established in 1998 in Glasgow. Theatre Nemo was founded by Isabel McCue and her son Hugh after her elder son, who suffered from schizophrenia and was hospitalised, took his own life. This tragic event prompted Isabel and Hugh to set up an organisation to support people affected by mental health issues by engaging them in arts projects, music and drama activities. In particular, Theatre Nemo was created to address the lack of similar services: as TN1 argues, there was a "dire situation in terms of what was there for people" affected by mental health issues. As a result, Theatre Nemo provides "a space for people to come together in an inclusive environment" (TN2). Underpinning the work of Theatre Nemo is "an interest in people that have been pushed aside a lot in communities or societies or kind of left behind because of different needs" as well as the idea that activities such as "music and drummer are for everyone, not for people that can afford" (TN2). (Scotland)

Mobile trainers. The aim of the project is to help families with children suffering from hearing problems to support integration of such children into the “normal” community. Qualified trainers visit families for free and try to help as much as possible. This initiative was started in 2012. The main actors are Pontis and Telekom fund. The program is an expression of solidarity by the organisers with the target group. (Slovakia).

REDER.The Network for Denouncing and Resisting the Royal Decree-Law 16/2012. REDER (Red de Denuncia y Resistencia al RDL 16/2012) was created in 2014 with the commitment to defend universal access to healthcare and to the denouncing of its infringement. REDER is a network of collectives, movements, organisations and individuals. Nowadays, REDER has 300 members. REDER emerged as a response to the austerity measures introduced in the Spanish healthcare system, particularly those that changed healthcare entitlements.

The Trussell Trust (the TT) is a UK-based Christian charity established in 1997 to address 'hidden hunger' and poverty in the UK. The initiative was launched by a British couple in the context of their work on international feeding projects in Bulgaria and in response to a local incident of hunger that they encountered in one of the more affluent cities in the UK. In practice, the TT provides a ready available foodbank model for community activists. The Trust opened its first foodbank in Salisbury in 2000. In 2004, it launched the UK Foodbank Network that operates as social franchise. The Trust collaborates with churches and communities nation-wide, helping them to set up and run their own foodbanks.
Saúde Porta-a-Porta (SPAP) (Door to Door Health) is a volunteer project by medical university students developed by the Students Association of NOVA Medical School (AEFCM) an Academic unit of Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (PT).
### Table 5. Cases studies on Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Europe region(^a)</th>
<th>Spatial dimension</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Poverty and/or Social exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>CST - Cyprus Stop Trafficking</strong></td>
<td>Humanitarian organization that provides support and assistance to victims of trafficking</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City divisions City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>The Skovsgård Model</strong></td>
<td>People with mental disabilities</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City- rural</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Shelter for homeless women in Leipzig</strong></td>
<td>Shelter for homeless women in Leipzig</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City divisions City-Countryside</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>The Case of the 'Housing and Reintegration' Programme - The Praksis</strong></td>
<td>Initiatives against Homelessness</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Local National</td>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>City divisions City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>AWM - The City is for All</strong></td>
<td>Advocacy organization promoting real participation of affected by homelessness.</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Local National</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City – divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>The Irish housing crisis</strong></td>
<td>solidarity acts from government, NGO's and academia &amp; Policy response</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Local Regional National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City – divisions</td>
<td>Top-down Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Timon</strong></td>
<td>Welfare organization for children and youth</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Local Regional</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>City divisions City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>ULOBA - Independent Living in Norway</strong></td>
<td>disabled persons</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Local Regional National</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City-Countryside</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Living rent campaign</strong></td>
<td>Campaign in response to the situation of the private</td>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>City – divisions</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Briefly the case studies on Housing are:

**Cyprus Stop Trafficking (CST)** is a humanitarian organization that provides support and assistance to victims of trafficking. The association offers financial support, housing, protection, information, and education to the victims, with the help and support of volunteers. CST rents flats where survivors of trafficking are hosted for as long as they need. A number of volunteers are available 24/7 to help survivors of trafficking with day-to-day tasks. They also offer guidance for other different services.

**The Skovsgård Model** consists of several independent social enterprises and a foundation cooperating in a network, all following the same principle, working mainly with people with mental disabilities in a rural municipality in Northern Jutland, Denmark. They employ more than 60 people with special needs in a collectively owned hotel, opened a grocery store, and are running a campsite and a café. Many of their “employees on special terms” live locally in houses owned by the oldest initiative, Købmandsgården.

**Shelter for homeless women in Leipzig** is an interesting example of housing support from a range of social actors that can be found all over Germany. The shelter for homeless women offers refuge for women over 18 who have, against their will, become homeless. The shelter is not a long-term solution but a form of crisis intervention. They supply with basic necessities, including clothing, hygiene products and access to sanitary facilities, food and a place to sleep and offer them personal support. Further they also assist in applying for a postal address, social security payments, settling into a new home, and, if needed, medical support or the referral to other specialists.

**Hospitality and Solidarity Centre of the Municipality of Athens (KYADA)** aims addressing the housing problems of the homeless individuals in the city of Athens (Greece). Moreover, KYADA offers programmes that address the food and health needs of the homeless, and promote their social (re)integration. KYADA’s two shelters have the ability to provide short-term hospitality services to 180 people over the age of 18. The services provided are free of charge.

**The City is for All (AWM)** is a highly structured though legally informal organization that has, made a not insignificant contribution to the debate around housing as well as offering
an important alternative approach to supporting affected citizens in Hungary. AVM was created in 2009 and views itself as a 'homeless rights advocacy group'; i.e. an advocacy organization that would have genuine and real participation of those affected by homelessness.

**The Irish housing crisis** focuses on identifying key issues related to the different criteria for assessing solidarity. It is paid attention to the role of the state in conducting housing policy, as well as highlighting a series of small solidarity acts that were brought up in the course of interviews with a variety of actors from government, NGO's and academia.

**Timon** is a large care- and welfare organization for children and youth in which care professionals and volunteers work together to offer help to young people, most specifically in all kinds of housing initiatives. Timon particularly targets young adults (18-23 years), who due to their age are no longer eligible for youth care, but who are also not fully prepared to live independently. Timon offers them a place in a living arrangement and helps them, via professionals and via volunteers, to get their independence (Netherlands).

**Independent Living in Norway (ULOBA).** By giving disabled people assistance - as a tool to participate in society - their aim was to break down barriers in society. The main barriers were the discrimination against disabled persons, and their view was that disabled persons were discriminated against simply by the fact that society is organised around people who are not disabled. The organisation is run in line with the principles of the international Independent Living Movement: empowerment, full citizenship and human rights.

**Living rent campaign (LRC)** is a campaigning group of private tenants established in 2014 in Edinburgh (Scotland). The aim of the LRC is to "give tenants a stronger voice in the creation of housing policy", demanding affordable housing and rent control for private market tenants. Additionally, the LRC seeks to redress the "power imbalance" between landlords and tenants, giving the latter more power and security and "ideally some more power to bargain over rent levels".

**Kojatice.** Social housing in Kojatice is the fulfilment of a mission of a Slovak citizen association People in Need dealing with social cohesion, humanitarian aid and human rights protection. One of its programmes focuses on housing for people dependent on social assistance. Some of the volunteers in this organisation study architecture and they came up with the idea of building social houses for marginalized groups of citizens.

**Mortgage Victim Platform (PAH)** was created in 2009 in Barcelona, and it was registered as an association in 2011. This movement was created as a result of the recession that appeared in 2008. PAH is a network that is working across Spain, mainly using the social nets, to promote activism and citizens' solidarity to stop home evictions, as well as providing legal support to the families at risk of social exclusion.

**Depaul UK and Nightstop** is a nationwide youth homelessness charity established in April 1989 as a direct response to an increased number of homeless young people in central London (UK). Depaul UK works to ensure that everyone has a place to call home and a stake in their community.