



## Getting involved with the NAPs/inclusion: A toolkit for EFSC Member Organisations

### 1. Background: the Lisbon Strategy and the Social Agenda

The National Action Plans on Social Inclusion are policy plans meant to contribute, in the social area, to the objectives of the Lisbon strategy for Growth, Competitiveness and Job Creation, adopted in 2000, and aiming at making the European Union “*the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion*”. It is articulated as follows:



In 2005, the Strategy has been revised and has set itself the following objectives, strengthening the “growth and jobs component and relatively watering down the social cohesion element:

- Boost knowledge and innovation
- Make Europe a more attractive place to invest and work
- Create more and better jobs

In 2008, the Social Agenda of the Lisbon Strategy has undergone a revision, which is summarized in a number of documents contained in the “**Renewed Social Agenda Package**”: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=547>

The renewed social agenda aims to create more opportunities for EU citizens, improve access to quality services and demonstrate solidarity with those who are affected negatively by change. It brings together a range of EU policies in order to support action in seven priority areas:

1. Children and youth – tomorrow's Europe
2. Investing in people: more and better jobs, new skills
3. Mobility
4. Longer and healthier lives
5. Combating poverty and social exclusion
6. Fighting discrimination and promoting gender equality
7. Opportunities, access and solidarity on the global scene

Coming in 2010 to its completion, the consultation on the post-2010 Social Agenda has now started. Social NGOs aim in this context to give a new momentum to the social cohesion element.

In order to achieve the social objectives of the Lisbon Strategy, the principal policy coordination tool is the Open Method of Co-ordination on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (Social OMC)

## 2. The Open Method of Coordination in the field of Social Policy

The Social OMC is method of voluntary policy cooperation among EU Member States based on peer pressure, regular reporting, and mutual learning.

The following are the key elements of its functioning:

- a. Political agreement on **common objectives**
- b. Definition and construction of **common indicators**
- c. Translating the EU objectives into national/regional policies (**National Reports** on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion)
- d. Common analysis and assessment of the National Reports : **Joint Reports**
- e. **PROGRESS**: financial support to promote policy cooperation, good governance and transnational exchange of learning and good practice.

### a. The common objectives for social inclusion

In the field of social inclusion, the OMC aims at making a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty and social exclusion by ensuring:

- Access for all to the resources, rights and services needed for participation in society, preventing and addressing exclusion, and fighting all forms of discrimination leading to exclusion;
- The active social inclusion of all, both by promoting participation in the labour market and by fighting poverty and exclusion;
- That social inclusion policies are well-coordinated and involve all levels of government and relevant actors, including people experiencing poverty, that they are efficient and effective and mainstreamed into all relevant public policies, including economic, budgetary, education and training policies and structural fund (notably ESF) programmes.

The **main themes** in the EU social inclusion process are the following, in some cases addressed through focus thematic years (such as in the case of child poverty):

- **Active inclusion** (Adequate Income support, Inclusive labour markets, Access to quality services)
- **Child poverty** (2007 Report on child poverty and well-being)
- **Housing exclusion and homelessness** (2009)
- **Social aspects of migration and social inclusion of ethnic minorities** (2010)
- **Other more specific themes** (Financial inclusion, Rural poverty, Extreme poverty)

- **Cross-cutting themes** (poverty and health, pension adequacy, social services).

### **b. Common indicators**

In June 2006, the Social Protection Committee adopted a set of common indicators for the social protection and social inclusion process.

It consists of a portfolio of

- 14 overarching indicators (+11 context indicators) meant to reflect the newly adopted overarching objectives (a) "social cohesion" and (b) "interaction with the Lisbon strategy growth and jobs objectives";
- and of three strand portfolios for social inclusion, pensions, and health and long-term care.

The use of commonly agreed indicators to monitor progress towards commonly agreed objective is an essential component of the OMC policy coordination process. In this context, indicators have been agreed using a consensual approach and using a set of criteria which include comparability based on sound EU harmonised data, policy responsiveness, clear normative interpretation, focus on outcomes, etc.

The ISG also agreed on a new typology of indicators which distinguish between those that can directly be used for benchmarking, and those that can only be used to monitor progress within a single country.

As for poverty, the following indicators have been agreed upon. As shown in the table below, the breakdown per age group allows adapting them specifically to child poverty:

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Breakdowns</b>
EU: At-risk-of poverty rate + illustrative threshold values	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below 60% of the national equivalised median income. Equivalised median income is defined as the household's total disposable income divided by its "equivalent size", to take account of the size and composition of the household, and is attributed to each household member. Equalization is made on the basis of the OECD modified scale. Complemented by the value of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold (60% median national equivalised income) in PPS for two illustrative households: a single-person household and a household consisting of two adults and two children.	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Persistent at-risk of poverty rate	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold in the current year and in at least two of the preceding three years.	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Relative median poverty risk gap	Difference between the median equivalised income of persons aged 0+ below the at-risk-of poverty threshold and the threshold itself, expressed as a percentage of the at-risk-of poverty threshold.	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Long term unemployment rate	Total long-term unemployed population ( $\geq 12$ months' unemployment; ILO definition) as a proportion of total active population aged 15 years or more.	Gender
EU: Population living in jobless households	Proportion of people living in jobless households, expressed as a share of all people in the same age group. This indicator should be analysed in the light of context indicator N°8: jobless households by main household types	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender

	Source: LFS	
EU: Early school leavers not in education or training	Share of persons aged 18 to 24 who have only lower secondary education (their highest level of education or training attained is 0, 1 or 2 according to the 1997 International Standard Classification of Education – ISCED 97) and have not received education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey.	Gender
EU: Poverty risk by household type	Poverty risk for the total population aged 0+ in the following household types: Households with no dependent children: - Single person, under 65 years old - Single person, 65 years and over - Single women - Single men - Two adults, at least one person 65 years and over - Two adults, both under 65 years - Other households Households with dependent children: - Single parent, 1 or more dependent children - Two adults, one dependent child - Two adults, two dependent children - Two adults, three or more dependent children - Three or more adults with dependent children	
EU: Poverty risk by the work intensity of households	Poverty risk for the total population aged 0+ in different work intensity categories and broad household types. The work intensity of the household refers to the number of months that all working age household members have been working during the income reference year as a proportion of the total number of months that could theoretically be worked within the household. Individuals are classified into work intensity categories that range from WI=0 (jobless household) to WI=1 (full work intensity).	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Poverty risk by most frequent activity status	Poverty risk for the adult population (aged 18 years and over) in the following most frequent activity status groups: employment (singling out wage and salary employment); unemployment; retirement; other inactivity. The most frequent activity status is defined as the status that individuals declare to have occupied for more than half the number of months in the calendar year for which information on occupational status is available.	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Poverty risk by accommodation tenure status	Poverty risk for the total population aged 0+ in the following accommodation tenure categories: - Owner-occupied or rent free - Rented	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below 40%, 50% and 70% of the national equivalised median income.	Age groups: 0-17; 18-64; 65+, gender
EU: Persons with low educational attainment	Share of the adult population (aged 25 years and over) whose highest level of education or training is ISCED 0, 1 or 2.	Age groups 25-34; 35-54; 55-64; 65+; 25-64, gender
Low reading literacy performance of pupils	Share of 15 years old pupils who are at level 1 or below of the PISA combined reading literacy scale	Gender

For more information,

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=756&langId=en>.

**c. The National Strategic Reports for Social Protection and Social Inclusion and the National Action Plans for Social Inclusion (NAPs/incl)**

The National Action Plans for Social Inclusion are the part of the National Strategic Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (NSR SPSI) which focuses on social inclusion measures.

They are based on three-year cycles (2006-2008, 2008-2010, etc) and are structured on the basis a **Guidance Note** developed by the Commission in consultation with the key stakeholders. In 2008 EFSC has been consulted on the elaboration of the Guidance Note. The Guidance Note insists very much on stakeholder involvement in the preparation and through all stages of policy cycle, and on ensuring continuity with previous years' strategies.

The NSR SPSI are normally submitted in the second half of the year (September-October) and are articulated as follows:

Part 1	Common Overview and summary messages	max 10 pages
Part 2	National Action Plan on Social Inclusion (NAP-Inclusion), including succinct Progress Report	max 20 pages
Part 3	National Strategy Report for Pensions, including succinct Progress Report	max 20 pages
Part 4	National Strategy Report for Healthcare and Long-term Care, including succinct Progress Report	max 15 pages

The National Action Plans for Social Inclusion thus correspond to Part 2 of the NSR SPSI.

The European Commission has a role to play in inviting Member States to focus on the results and objectives of the previous rounds or on objectives of specific concerns. For example, in 2008 Member States were again invited to focus on 3 to 4 priorities with a view to making a decisive **impact on eradication of poverty**, and were reminded that **child poverty and active inclusion** emerged as priorities in previous rounds.

However, Member States remain free to determine their **own priorities on the basis of evaluation of progress and challenges** that were identified.

The Complete list of the NSR SPSI for each round is available on the commission's website:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?type=3&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=nsr+spsi&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en>

**d. Joint Reports**

The Joint Reports are developed and adopted yearly by the Council of the EU. The Joint Reports assess progress made in the implementation of the OMC, set

key priorities and identify good practice and innovative approaches of common interest to the Member States. In correspondence with the years of submission of the NSR SPSI, a supporting document is added to the Joint Report, which analyses and addresses the NSR SPSI on a country by country basis.

The Complete list of the joint reports can be found here: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=757&langId=en>

#### **e. PROGRESS**

The financial instrument for promoting policy cooperation, good governance and transnational exchange of learning and good practice is the PROGRESS programme.

Its overall goal is *“To financially support the implementation of the EU-objectives in the employment and social affairs area, as set out in the Social Agenda, and thereby contribute to the achievement of the Lisbon Strategy goals in these fields”*. PROGRESS is thus fundamentally a policy implementation measure.

Its general objectives are the following:

- To improve the knowledge and understanding of the situations prevailing in the MS;
- To support the development of statistical tools, methods and common indicators;
- To support and monitor the implementation of policy objectives and Community law in the Member States, and assess their effectiveness and their impact;
- To promote networking/mutual learning, identification and dissemination of good practice and innovative approaches at EU level;
- To enhance the awareness of stakeholders and general public about the EU policies + objectives;
- To boost the capacity of key EU networks to promote, support and further develop EU policies and objectives;
- To promote gender mainstreaming into all sections and activities of PROGRESS

The programme is articulated around five policy areas: **Employment, Social inclusion and social protection, Working conditions, Anti-discrimination, and Gender equality.**

It supports three types of activities:

- 1. Analytical activities** (data/statistics; common indicators; studies; impact assessments);
- 2. Mutual learning, Awareness & Dissemination** (best practices & peer review; media campaigns and events);

**3. Support to main actors** (support to key EU networks; working groups; training seminars; experts' networks; EU level observatories)

For more information, please refer to the European Commission's dedicated website, <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=327&langId=en>, or to the presentations given by [Luca Pirozzi](#) and [Kerstin Weerts](#) at EFSC Focal Officers' Training in June 2008.

Up-to-date information about the funding opportunities under PROGRESS can be checked here:

- Calls for proposals:  
<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=630&langId=en>
- Calls for tender:  
<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=625&langId=en>

### **3. Child poverty and the Social OMC**

#### **1. The legal base and the prioritization of child poverty in the Social OMC**

The Social OMC prioritization of child poverty was, until December 2009, based on the (rather limited) EC Legal base to work on child poverty:

- Articles 13 (non-discrimination), 136 and 137 EC (combating social exclusion);
- Charter of Fundamental Rights Art. 24

This legal base has been significantly reinforced since 1<sup>st</sup> of December 2009, with the entry into force of the Lisbon treaty, which includes child protection among the objectives of the European Union (Art.2.3 and 2.5). The fight against trafficking in human beings, especially women and children (Art. 63a2d), and the setting of minimum rules concerning the definition of criminal offences and sanctions in areas of particularly serious crime with a cross border dimension, including sexual exploitation of women and children (art. 69 B) will be included among the areas of legislation of the European Parliament and the Council.

Notwithstanding the limited legal base, the prioritization of child poverty has so far gained increasing attention at the policy level:

- The **National Strategy Reports 2006** identified child poverty as an important challenge for many EU countries;
- The **European Councils of 2005, 2006, 2007** reaffirmed the EU Political commitment to focus on target groups such as children and giving all of them equal opportunities; in particular, in the 2007 Spring Council, Member States were asked “to take necessary measures to rapidly and significantly reduce child poverty, giving all children equal opportunities, regardless of their social background”;
- **2007 was set as a thematic year on child poverty;**
- The Social Protection Committee issued, as a result of the thematic year, a Report on Child Poverty and Well-Being (adopted in 2008)
- Member States have reported specifically on their strategies to fight child poverty;
- A Peer Review of the Social Protection Committee was devoted to child poverty;
- Child poverty was recommended as a priority in the 2008 National Strategy Reports; and resulted as a key priority in 24 Countries;
- Many Member States have set quantified targets in relation to child poverty;
- In the **European Council in spring 2009**, it was affirmed that Member States would aim in particular at pursuing poverty reduction and social cohesion, through reinforced comprehensive strategies to combat and prevent poverty and social exclusion of children, including strengthened provision of accessible and affordable quality child care”.

## 2. Main achievements of the Social OMC in the fight against child poverty

According to the assessment of the OMC held in 2008, the following main achievements in the fight against child poverty have been attained:

- Child poverty has gained **importance in national agendas** and is now present in most national strategies. For some countries the issue as such had never been on the policy agenda. This also applies to enlargement and neighborhood countries.
- **Common indicators have been made available** and further work is being done (notably on material deprivation and on child well being). The target-setting approach has gained relevance (see above).
- Mutual learning through peer reviews has taken place (e.g.: in the areas of pre-school education) and there is broader understanding of the **multidimensional nature of the issue.**
- **Stakeholders involvement in policy making has improved**, although in uneven manner across MS.

More information about the Social OMC and child poverty can be found here: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=751&langId=en> , or by checking [Marie-Anne Paraskevas](#) presentation at EFSC November 2009 workshop on the NAPs.

#### **4. EFSC Member Organisations' involvement in the NAPs/incl**

EFSC is committed to play a role in the process of elaboration of the NAPs/incl in order to maximize the impact of policies aimed at fighting child poverty for the situation of the most marginalized children and street children in particular. For this reason, since 2008, EFSC has organized a number of workshops, seminars and trainings aiming at improving its Member Organisations' acquaintance with the NAPs. Beginning of 2008, the results of a comprehensive **assessment report**, which analysed the extent by which street children have been addressed in the NAPs and the extent of the involvement of EFSC Members in the elaboration process, have been made public.

##### **a. EFSC 2008-2010 Assessment report**

#### **I. The extent by which street children are addressed in the 2008-2010 round of NAPs**

**Mieke Schuurman**, independent consultant on children's rights issues, is the author of the first part of EFSC Assessment Report on the NAPs 2008-2010, analyzing the extent by which street children are addressed therein. Although street children *per se* are hardly mentioned in the NAPs, most Member States have measures addressing related categories, such as homelessness, education and school drop-out, violence, abuse and exploitation of children, the integration of Roma children and families, migrants and refugees, access to healthcare, child poverty and social exclusion are addressed. The need for measures addressing child beggars seems to be growing in most Member States, although only Romania and Finland have introduced it explicitly in the 2008-2010 round of NAPs.

More generally, preventive measures that may indirectly impact on the situation of street children include: social benefits, family policies and employment measures – but to measure the impact of these measures on children it would be necessary to improve the availability of data about the income distribution within families.

As recommendations for the next round of NAPs, she proposes EFSC Members to concentrate on the following areas:

1. Lobbying towards further prioritizing the policy areas with a direct or indirect impact on the living situation of street children
2. Support the governments in the collection of data and the development of specific indicators, by supporting the governments and NAPs authorities in the selection of those indicators which would be needed to analyse the situation of street children.

In her [report](#), a detailed analysis of the policy measures of relevance for street children is carried out on a country-by-country basis.

## **2. EFSC Member Organisations' involvement in the NAPs**

**EFSC also carried out** a second part of the **NAPs assessment report** which analyses **the extent to what EFSC member organisations have been consulted** by the national authorities in the development process of the NAPs (2008-10), based on the Members' own feedbacks on the issue. The [report](#) contains the collection of members' feedbacks and some key conclusions of recommendations.

In short, it can be said that most member organisations maintain regular contacts with their national and local authorities and are regularly consulted in policy development in the child rights field (in particular Instituto de Apoio à Criança, Silesian Diakonie, Tallinn Centre for Children at Risk, Istituto Don Calabria, Ejjew Gandhi Children's Homes). However, on the whole, a more comprehensive consultation by the NAPs-relevant authorities with EFSC member organisations can be expected and more advocacy work is required to achieve a full prioritisation of the street children issue.

The limited consultation with smaller and locally active NGOs, as well as the late transmission of the Commission's financing, which has shortened the time available for the implementation of the NAPs-related activities at EFSC, are linked to a limited prioritisation of street children in the NAPs.

Something which could facilitate our MO's involvement in the NAPs would be the fine-tuning of the NAPs at local level, or "LAPs", which would ease the involvement of often locally rather than nationally active MOs.

## **3. EFSC questionnaire on MO's involvement in the NAPs**

During 2008, EFSC held a workshop with some of its Member Organisations in order to identify key lessons learned and good practices in order to improve its Members' involvement in the elaboration and implementation phases of the NAPs. In this framework, a questionnaire was submitted to its Members, which also involved an analysis of their own assessments about the contents of the NAPs and the extent of their involvement.

The results of the questionnaires confirm the results of the consultation which led to the first assessment report on the 2008-2010 NAPs round. Those organizations which have been more directly involved with the NAPs report also a higher satisfaction about the contents of the NAPs themselves. There is a clear differentiation among those MOs who managed to get involved with the NAPs in terms of the funding which is made available to them: those who got involved have answered positively to the question whether the NAPs have influenced the funding of their organizations; those who didn't, have answered negatively. Similarly, those who got involved with the NAPs report that their activities have been influenced by the NAPs, while those who did not get involved report no influence of the NAPs on their activities. **This demonstrates the appropriateness of investing time and resources in getting involved with the NAPs**, provided that it turns out to be an effective investment.

These results do not only apply to those MOs who have been directly involved, but also to those who have been indirectly consulted as part of bigger networks they are member of at national level.

On average, the working areas of EFSC member organizations have been addressed through the NAPs and, although street children are not explicitly addressed in the NAPs, our member organization consider that children at risk are at least partially addressed as a target groups in the NAPs.

On the other hand, EFSC Member organizations are on average not fully satisfied with the way the 2008-2010 NAPs address the social problems they are working on, they are not satisfied about the way the NAPs address the root causes of the social problems they work on, nor consider that they introduce significant innovations compared to the past. Although they consider that the NAPs do target child poverty and social exclusion, they are not satisfied about the way the extreme forms of child poverty are addressed in the NAPs, nor about the implementation of the NAPs about children and risk and street children.

The questionnaires report a good deal of satisfaction among Member Organisations about the coherence among the NAPs and the National policies, and they seem to perceive an important added value in the EU level requirements on the social policies in their countries.

On average, our member organizations, except those who have been formally consulted, report having had relatively few contacts with the NAPs authorities before the 2008-2010 round of the NAPs. More contacts were had with other sectors of the ministries in the same period, which is reflected in relatively better scores in the area of the involvement in the implementation phase. In the case of our Bulgarian Member organization, even if the information about the preparation of the new round of NAPs was given prior to the adoption, no formal consultation was held. The information about who was the authority in charge of the NAPs was clear only in the cases of those organizations who were formally consulted.

#### **b. Good practices from Member Organisations' involvement in the NAPs**

The above-mentioned workshop and questionnaire also yielded interesting results in terms of the key lessons learned and good practices to improve i Members' involvement in the elaboration and implementation phases of the NAPs.

#### **1. EFSC workshop on fostering member organisations' involvement in the NAPs**

As a result of the workshop, a joint call could be identified about the importance that Member States to develop **more effective consultation mechanisms, and**

**NAPs that are coherent and integrated in wider, longer-term strategies, developed in a bottom-up fashion starting from the local level.**

In our members' experience, **projects** are effective in indirectly raising awareness on some key issues and to thereby sustain their inclusion in the NAPs.

**Network building**, especially at the local level, was identified as one of the key ways to gain more strength as NGOs and to better address the upcoming new challenges. Political will, not least at European level, and an appropriate communication strategy by the civil society towards policy-makers, are key elements to making the NAPs more effective for the social inclusion of the most vulnerable groups; building inter-institutional networks can be crucial to mobilizing political will. In methodological terms, a **decentralized advocacy action** of each member towards its own government with shared messages may be useful for mobilizing awareness at national level.

It was highlighted that NGOs should always adopt a proactive **approach towards their governments as well as adequate communication strategies towards them**, and that in spite of an often lacking consultative approach of the Governments, NGOs should become themselves more "attractive" and **support Governments with data collection and information**.

## **2. Good practices and lessons learned from the questionnaires on the involvement in the NAPs**

Among the positive aspects of the cooperation of EFSC Member Organisations with national, regional or local authorities that were signaled by EFSC MOs for having relevance in view of improving MO's involvement in the NAPs, most of the interviewed countries reported positive examples of **public-private partnerships in specific projects, standard setting and networking for social inclusion**. The importance of high quality standards in NGOs work was also highlighted.

As for the positive aspects of the cooperation of EFSC Member Organisation with national, regional or local authorities, which may be of relevance for improving the protection policies for marginalised children and street children, many respondents restated the importance of public-private partnership, but also underlined the importance of **securing adequate funding, training, preventive action and information dissemination activities**.

Finally, among the lessons learned in the experience of the relations with the authorities, NGOs highlighted the importance of **being consequent in the advocacy action and in encouraging the governmental own action to expand social policy**. The importance of **articulation of the methods, flexibility, mediation and negotiation** was also highlighted by many of the respondents.

### **c. Key advocacy messages**

In consideration of the support given by EFSC Member Organisations to a decentralised and co-ordinated action to be driven, at European level, by EFSC, in close co-operation with the European Union, which is also considered to be an important action in promoting the improvement of social policies for the most excluded groups of children, EFSC proposed to its Member Organisations a number of measures, asking them to rank them in terms of their usefulness for their action and of the extent by which they are addressed by the authorities in the current round of NAPs.

These measures are meant to constitute the backbone of EFSC Members joint advocacy action at the national level, to be complemented by EFSC own action at European level.

The **urgency of such an advocacy action** is proved by the distance between our members' ranking of the importance of such actions and the extent by which these actions are concretely addressed, which is on average less than satisfactory.

Among the key issues to be addressed by the NAPs, according to EFSC Member Organisation, the most important support measures for their own activities are **financial support to outreach activities and to integrated intervention teams (medical, social, psychological)**.

**Awareness-raising on children's rights and financial support to lone-parent families** were also considered as measures of crucial importance for NGO's work.

In addition, **income support for numerous families, financial support to second-chance education and non-formal education, governmental support to data collection, child participation in the definition of policies and network building** were ranked highest in the MO's selection.

Of these, only two of the 23 proposed measures were addressed sufficiently in the NAPs: the network building among actors at local level and the financial support to day care centres. While income support measures, second chance education, informal education and awareness raising on children's rights are considered being basically satisfied in a number of countries (with Eastern European countries performing relatively worse), all other measures are considered to be inadequately addressed in the NAPs. **There is therefore a clear case for promoting the inclusion of these measures in a stronger way in the NAPs.**

Many member organizations shared the call for the **need of professional training for social workers** and for **preventive action involving families**.

Another issue that emerged to be a significant challenge to the social inclusion action of our member organizations was **the mobility of separated children from Romania and Bulgaria to other Member States, and the increased migration of refugees and asylum seekers**. These are posing unprecedented

challenges to our MOs and the need to be supported in facing these new challenges was one shared claim among them. In order to correctly approach the Roma issue, networking and cooperation will be strengthened with expert organizations in the field, particularly the European Roma Information Office.

#### **4. What comes next?**

**EFSC recommends that its members take early action and contacts with the relevant authorities in charge of the elaboration of the NAPs.** For getting involved in the elaboration of the 2010-2012 action plans, it is important that contacts are taken from early 2010 on.

**Useful contacts should be taken with the authorities in charge of the elaboration as well as with the relevant member of the [Social Protection Committee](#).**

Based on a thorough consultation with its Member Organisations, a document based on the above identification of key advocacy messages will be prepared by EFSC, also in consideration of the 2010 European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion.

**The member organizations will be asked to translate it into their languages and to be disseminated at national level, as a support document to their action.**

In order to better adapt their action to the national context, we recommend that Members get well acquainted with the 2008-2010 round of NAPs and that they identify key EU priorities and adapt them to the national context.

2010 provides a unique opportunity to boost action in the field of social inclusion of migrant and minority children, as 2010 will be a thematic year on Social aspects of migration and social inclusion of ethnic minorities.

**Let us work together to build a socially inclusive society for all children!**

#### **European Federation for Street Children (EFSC)**

15, Route d'Esch

L-1470 Luxembourg

Tel +352 27 44 51

Fax +352 27 44 51 70

E-mail [info@efsc-eu.org](mailto:info@efsc-eu.org)

[www.efsc-eu.org](http://www.efsc-eu.org)



*EFSC is supported by the European Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity (2007-2013) PROGRESS. This programme is managed by the Directorate-General for Employment, social affairs and equal opportunities of the European Commission. It was established to financially support the implementation of the objectives of the European Union in the employment and social affairs area, as set out in the Social Agenda, and thereby contribute to the achievement of the Lisbon Strategy goals in these fields.*

*The seven-year Programme targets all stakeholders who can help shape the development of appropriate and effective employment and social legislation and policies, across the EU-27, EFTA-EEA and EU candidate and pre-candidate countries. PROGRESS mission is to strengthen the EU contribution in support of Member States' commitment. PROGRESS will be instrumental in:*

- *providing analysis and policy advice on PROGRESS policy areas;*
- *monitoring and reporting on the implementation of EU legislation and policies in PROGRESS policy areas;*
- *promoting policy transfer, learning and support among Member States on EU objectives and priorities;*
- *and relaying the views of the stakeholders and society at large*

*For more information see: <http://ec.europa.eu/progress>*

*The information contained in this publication does not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission.*