Good practices in citizens' organizations – governments relations.
A research on 10 European countries.
Paper presented by Giovanni Moro[*]

DRAFT VERSION

Content

1. Introduction
2. The research on Good Practices
3. Conclusive remarks
4. References
Annex: list of gathered Good Practices

1. Introduction[**]

A new agenda

Pretty all over the world, relations between citizens' organizations and public administrations seem to be increasingly considered of the utmost importance. They are of special relevance, according to the statements of political leaders and public officials, in order to fill two relevant gaps of governments that hinder their ability to fulfill their tasks:

- a gap of resources, skills and know-how;
- a gap of trust and legitimacy.

This attitude is not only declared, but also practiced in several policy fields, ranging from welfare to the environment, from consumer protection to education. It covers various aspects of public policy making and has different degrees of formalization (from Constitutions to laws, from regulations to policy documents, up to compacts between governments and umbrella bodies of voluntary or community sectors). It can be focused either on specific fields

("vertical"), or on the general matter of relations between governments and citizens' groups, voluntary organizations, community movements etc. ("horizontal", Kendall 2005).

In the European Union environment this attitude of governments towards citizens' organizations is diffused as well. It can be possible to identify a general European policy strategy and style (intended as a set of cognitive and operational patterns leading policy making) of public institutions interacting with citizens' organizations, and also an agenda of concerning elements according to the citizens' organizations' point of view, including the political attitude towards civic activism, the legislation, the consultation procedures, the implementation process, the culture of public officials, the financial matters, the checks and assessments of citizens' organizations (ACN 2004). The European Union situation, therefore, can be considered as a relevant field of observation and research on this matter.

Empirical and conceptual problems

Precisely the EU situation enables us to shed light to problems related to uncertainties existing on this matter. For example, Article 47° of the project of European Constitution, while stating the "Principle of participatory democracy", mentions that institutions shall give the "citizens and representative associations" the opportunity to participate with their opinions in all areas of the Union action, without defining the ways in which this participation should be carried out. Also in the article 72°, when defining the right of freedom of association as a Fundamental Right in all levels (political, trade union and civic matters), the legislator recognized the political parties and trade unions as emanations of the first two levels but did not specify the expression of "civic matters". It can be added that key-concepts as "partnership" are very diffused, but rarely used with the same meaning.

On the other hand, there is a lack of an adequate common base of information on citizens' organizations operating in the territory of the European Union. This deficit includes not only quantitative and qualitative data on the existing organizations, but also information on the work they carry out, the critical situations they must address, the cultural and social context in which they live, the political, legal and institutional environment they are embodied in. Of course, both official data and empirical researches do exist at national level; at cross-national level (for example, researches comparing two or three countries, or regarding sub-regional areas such as the Scandinavian or Baltic countries); with reference to single categories of citizens' organizations (such as social enterprises or consumer associations); with reference to wider areas of civil society organizations (including, for example, religious institutions or private universities). Nevertheless, the available documentation does not allow us to make a general picture of the attitudes and operational patterns of public institutions interacting with

citizens' organizations in Europe (Moro 2005a). This empirical deficit affects the system of relations between citizens' organizations and governments, which is the focus of this paper, as well.

The problem we have to face, therefore, can be defined in this way: governments do relate with citizens' organizations and vice versa, but on one side the various forms of these relations are not clearly and commonly defined, and on the other side there is scant information on how these relations take place in the territory of the European Union. Being this problem widespread, a focus on the European Union itself can be worthwhile in order to better picture the situation.

The research program on civic activism in Europe

Since 2001, ACN (the European network of national-based citizens' organizations promoted by the Italian movement Cittadinanzattiva[***]) and FONDACA have carried out, either autonomously or jointly, theoretical and empirical research and action on the topic of civic activism in Europe.

Among the main issues dealt with, there can be mentioned the following:
- the definition of the nature and content of European citizenship (Moro 2001);
- the practice of the principle of "horizontal subsidiarity" in the European environment (ACN 2003);
- the European policy style regarding identity and role of citizens' organizations (ACN 2004);
- the issue of "representativeness" of citizens' organizations as interlocutors of national and European institutions (extended to Latin America) (ACN 2005b);
- the partnerships between citizens' organizations and their public and private stakeholders (ACN-FONDACA 2006b);
- the issue of patients' rights in Europe and the role of citizens' organizations as "civic auditors" of the implementation of these rights (ACN 2002, 2005a);
- the "political" rights of Autonomous citizens' organizations (ACN-FONDACA 2006a);
- the role of national umbrella organizations as actors of the communication processes between the EU and European citizens (ongoing).

The focus of this research program is on European citizenship, in a double sense. The first is that citizenship of the European Union contains a paradigm of activism in public life on a daily basis that is uncommon in traditional,

---

[***] See the internet sites www.activecitizenship.net and www.cittadinanzattiva.it.

national-based, citizenship. The second is that the definition and practice of a role of policy making actors by citizens' organizations is an indicator of citizenship-building in the European Union.

Definitions

For the sake of clarity, I mean for *civic organization* (or ACOs, autonomous citizens' organizations; active citizenship, or civic activism, organization) every organization – whatever its scope, size, juridical status, motivation, membership, field of action – which is self-created and self-managed by citizens. This definition includes voluntary organizations, advocacy movements, advice services, social enterprises, grassroots and community organizations, self-help groups, international cooperation associations and so on. A civic organization is set up mainly on a voluntary basis. It is active in the area of public policies and aims at protecting citizens' rights and/or taking care for common goods. It does not seek profit and acts in the general interest. This concept is narrower than the one *of civil society*, since it involves only those organizations engaged in public interest activities; and, differently from the one of *third sector*, it encompasses both advocacy and service organizations, as well as activities hat go beyond the welfare system. I do not use expressions as *"NGO"* or *"NPO"* because of their residual and negative ("non-something") character (cf. Moro 1998; 2005b).

In my approach, moreover, *public policies* are the proper arena of citizens' organizations, where they act both in the definition (including agenda setting, planning and decision), implementation and evaluation phases. The field of public policy is different and partially autonomous from the one of politics, and participation in policy making has presently a weak link with political participation through parties and elections. As a research tool, this concept is useful in avoiding a common misunderstanding, which would see civic participation only in the phase of decision-making (as in the idea of "civil dialogue") and, at the same time, underestimates the meaning of civic projects funded by the public institutions. We assume that participating in policy making means not only discussing laws and programs, but also acting in the implementation and evaluation of policies.

2. The research on good practices

The European Charter of Active Citizenship project

The content of this paper comes from a project aimed at defining concrete rights and responsibilities of autonomous citizens' organizations in the EU, overcoming uncertainties and filling normative gaps, that was carried out in 2005-2006 with the support of the EC DGEAC. It brought to the definition of a European Charter of Active Citizenship, presented and discussed in Vienna in May 2006 (ACN-FONDACA 2006a).

The Charter was based on a research implying:
• a research on the official documents of the European institutions, civic organizations' papers and official documents and existent studies and researches on civic participation, active citizenship, civil dialogue and participatory democracy and also in other charters and conventions at local, national and international level dealing directly or indirectly with the theme of citizens' participation in the policy-making – 136 pertinent documents (61 from NGOs, 19 from scientific community, 46 from the EU, 10 charters and conventions) were identified and analyzed;
• the analysis of 50 Good Practices on Civic Participation collected by the partner organizations in Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Turkey[****].

A working document aimed at summarizing the main results of the research was set up. It identified information regarding:
- Names, concepts, themes;
- Roles and functions;
- Mechanisms, procedures and tools;
- Current situation (positive and negative aspects);
- Proposals.

Then a draft of the Charter was set up, reviewed in a partners' meeting, redraft and presented and discussed in a conference, held in Vienna in May 2006. After the Vienna conference the final version of the Charter was set up.

As a relevant part of this project, each of the 10 partner organizations were asked to collect 5 examples of Good Practices of Civic Participation. Good practices were used as a point of reference for the definition of the Charter and they are now – divided into the rights of the Charter – an annex of this document.

[****] Beside Cittadinanzattiva for Italy, the other national organizations involved in the project were The World of NGOs, Austria; Consumers Defence Association of the Czech Republic, Czech Republic; Sozialburo Main-Taunus, Germany; Ghaqda-tal-Konsumatori, Malta; Association of Polish Consumers, Poland; Animar, Portugal; Romanian Association for Consumer Protection, Romania; Legal Information Centre for NGOs, Slovenia; Helsinki Citizens Assembly, Turkey

Conceptual structure

By *Good Practice of Civic Participation* it was meant "a successful initiative that has been implemented regarding the participation of citizens' organizations in public policies".

The GP could be of three types: dialogue, collaboration and partnership.

Dialogue refers to the situations in which public institutions firstly, listen to citizens and / or citizens' organizations "inputs" (information, requests, points-of-view, etc.); secondly, give them a feedback and thirdly, take it into account. The inputs from civic organizations may be requested by public institutions, that is the case of public consultations; or civic organizations may ask to be heard by public institutions like in the case of a petition to a change a law.

Collaboration refers to the situations in which public institutions and civic organizations have convergent objectives. These convergent objectives may be reached through:

- The support given by public institutions to civic organizations and vice-versa. By support we mean not only financial resources but also formal support, voluntary engagement, facilitation of administrative procedures, etc.;
- The coordination between the different initiatives of both public institutions and civic organizations.

Partnership refers to the situations in which civic organizations and public institutions share objectives, resources, responsibilities and risks.

The GP can be started either by a public institution, or by a citizens' organization, or by both.

The GP may occur during the three main phases of the policy-making: definition, implementation and evaluation. This gives place to the following matrix including on one side the three kinds of relation and on the other side the three policy phases:

Forms / Phases	Dialogue	Collaboration	Partnership
Definition			
Implementation			
Evaluation			

Source: Active Citizenship Network and FONDACA, 2006

Consequently, on the base of this conceptual structure, nine possible forms of relation between public institutions and citizens' organizations could be identified:

- Dialogue in definition;
- Dialogue in implementation;
- Dialogue in evaluation;
- Collaboration in definition;
- Collaboration in implementation;
- Collaboration in evaluation;
- Partnership in definition;
- Partnership in implementation;
- Partnership in evaluation.

We can consider these forms as basic, since a practice of civic participation could (or would) embody more than one form and phase.

Finally, good practices were selected through four evaluation criteria:

- *Reproducibility* (the possibility to transfer and implement the identified practices in situations and places different from the ones where they were observed);
- *Innovativeness* (the capacity to produce new solutions with respect to the consolidated praxis);
- *Added value* (the capacity of the identified practices to produce a major impact on the reality compared to the results that would have been obtained with the isolated initiative of public institutions or civic organizations), and
- *Appropriateness* (a practice enabling an efficient and effective management of an issue).

The good practices

Gathered good practices in the ten countries are the following.

Country	Title
Austria	1.Participating in Dialogue
	2. Information about domestic violence
	3. Regional telephone hotline for victims of trafficking in human beings
	4. Making women's history visible
	5. Online shopping needs trust
Czech Republic	1. Partner advice offices in the municipalities
	2. Information campaign on financial investments
	3. Stickers "No advertising"
	4. Green procurement
	5. Competition of websites accessibility
Germany	1. Patients´ organizations participating in the decision-making process on the treatments and the medicine covered by public health insurance
	2. Social Monitoring

	3. Prevention of violence against women
	4. Cheap living space for financially vulnerable persons
	5. Social Community
Italy	1. Civic Audit
	2. The postal offices and the citizens' rights
	3. Management Group "Piazza Ragazzi"
	4. Call Center 060606 - City of Rome
	5. Reform of the 118th article of the Italian Constitution.
Malta	1. Itemized billing in telephony
	2. Developing policy and legislation to defend the rights of those suffering from family violence
	3. Providing a home and education to young economic immigrants
	4. The introduction of facilitators to children with special needs
	5. Making People with severe special needs employable
Poland	1. Cooperation with local consumer advocates
	2. "European day without a car" campaign
	3. Participation of NGO's representatives in the work of Steering Committees
	4. Gdynia's Centre of Non-Governmental Organisations (GCOP)
	5. "Otulina Drahimska"
Portugal	1. Definition of an adequate Law for Water Amusement Parks
	2. Arbitrage Centres on Consumer Disputes (ACCD)
	3. Training of health professionals in the area of diabetes
	4. Writing the Fundamental Rights of the European Union in the walls of the cities
	5. Itinerant pre-school education
Romania	1. Consumer Credit Law
	2. TeleCottage - Heart of the comunity
	3. National Committee on the Elimination of Deficiencies through Iodine
	4. Monthly fare for gas consumption
	5. Education for Health
Slovenia	1. What's the matter, girl?
	2. Youth Council Act
	3. Action "For youth without drugs"
	4. Supplementary Health Insurance
	5. Public Involvement in the Decision Making about Low and Medium Level Radioactive Waste Disposal
Turkey	1. Collaboration of Social actors for the Protection of Human Rights
	2. The Civic Involvement Projects
	3. Supporting Health Promotion for Adolescents
	4. Establishing and Holding Day Care Centers
	5. The Consumer Council

Source: Active Citizenship Network and FONDACA, 2006

The 50 BP may be consulted in the online database on the already mentioned ACN website and a summary of the good practices can be found in the Annex of this paper.

Fields of good practices

As for their fields of operation, good practices can be grouped in the following seven main areas.

Good practices by policy field	Total (a.v)	%
Consumer Policy	14	28,0
Education	8	16,0

Health policy	5	10,0
Environmental policy	2	4,0
Civic orgs' rights & participation	6	12,0
Social Policy	12	24,0
Urban development/renewal	3	6,0
Total	**50**	**100,0**

Source: Active Citizenship Network and FONDACA, 2006

It can be noticed that gathered good practices go well beyond the field of welfare services, where citizens' organizations are supposed to have their main (or exclusive) field of operation.

Who started the good practices

The analysis of gathered good practices shows that the most part of them have been started by public institutions (56%), while a minority by citizens' organizations (38%). Just a very little part of them (6%) have been started by both actors.

Good practices by who initiated it	Total (a.v.)	Total %
Only public institution	28	56,0
Only civic organisation	19	38,0
Public institution + civic organisation	3	6,0
Total	50	100,0

Source: Active Citizenship Network and FONDACA, 2006

On this regard it must be noticed that the high number of experiences started by public institutions can be explained with the fact that we have dealt with successful experiences. In other words, the prevailing institutional origin of good practices would mean that are more likely to be successful in case they are initiated by public institutions.

On the other side, it can be pointed out that the very small number of good practices initiated by the two parts together, compared with the high number of practices that have taken the form of a partnership, suggests an existing problem of unbalanced relations. We will come back to this point later.

The forms and policy phases of the good practices

Let us now consider the good practices with regard both to the form of relation and the policy phase in which they have been carried out. The

general results are summarized in the following table. Of course, a single experience could be carried out in more than one policy phase.

Good practices by type and policy phase	Dialogue	Collaboration	Partnership	Total (a.v.)	Total %
Definition	6	6	3	15	30
Implementation	4	13	20	37	74
Evaluation	4	4	3	11	22
Total (a.v.)	14	23	26	63	
Total %	28	46	52		

Source: Active Citizenship Network and FONDACA, 2006

30% of good practices regard the definition of policies, 74% the implementation and 22% the evaluation. As for the form of the relation, good practices regard dialogue in 28% of cases, collaboration in 46% and partnership in 52%.

It can be noticed that, on one side, the most recurrent policy phase is implementation; and on the other side that the most practiced form of relation is implementation. This is a non-obvious result, since it is common wisdom that dialogue in definition of policies (i.e., consultation) is the most diffused occasion of relation between public administrations and citizens' organizations. Dialogue in definition of policies has received, on the contrary, less than one fourth of mentions.

Moreover, this table tells us that rarely a project/activity is jointly planned and decided by the two actors; that only in 13 cases out of 50 an activity of one actor is someway supported by the other one; that usually evaluation is not a relation matter.

In general, it can be noticed that a correlation between the low level of practices regarding the definition of policies and the low level of practices regarding dialogue seems to exist. On the other side, it is worth noticing the relation between the high level of practices regarding implementation and the high number of practices involving partnership.

The low number of practices regarding evaluation would be related to the well-known general phenomenon of relative scant attention of public administrations (and citizens' organizations too) towards evaluation of policies.

In order to have a more analytical view of the relationship between the forms of relation and policy phases, let's check the cases in which one relation covers more than one policy phase. Results are summarized in the following table.

Good practices by type and policy phase	Dialogue	Collaboration	Partnership	Total (a.v.)	Total %
Only definition	4	2	0	6	12,0
Only implementation	2	10	17	29	58,0
Only evaluation	3	1	2	6	12,0
Definition-implementation	1	1	2	4	8,0
Definition-evaluation	0	1	0	1	2,0
Definition-implementation-evaluation	1	2	1	4	8,0
Total (a.v.)	11	17	22	50	
Total %	22,0	34,0	44,0		100,0

Source: Active Citizenship Network and FONDACA, 2006

It can be noticed that the good practices regard less the whole policy making cycle, and mainly one or at least two of the phases. Good practices including all the phases are indeed only 8%. 18% regard more than one phase. 82% of practices have been developed in one phase only.

The single phase more practiced is implementation (58%) and the single form more practiced is partnership (44%). The least ones are respectively definition and evaluation (12%) and dialogue (22%).

All that seems meaning that, at least in the studied sample, public institutions and autonomous citizens' organizations relate in a quite fragmented way; that the actors tend more to concretely cooperate than to dialogue; that the two actors are pushed to cooperate to reach objectives that no one of them could achieve by alone.

These data seem confirming an ambivalent result of previous researches (especially ACN 2004): civic organizations are more and more involved in the policy making process, but not yet overcoming an unbalanced situation. In particular, they tend to be considered as operational agencies of public administrations. Of course, this growing role in the implementation of policies testifies confirms the current deficit of operational abilities of governments, and at the same time the growing constructive (also in critical terms) role of civic organizations.

Strengths and weaknesses

The assessment of strengths and weaknesses of good practices on the citizens' organizations' side confirms this interpretation in light and shade.

The strength points regard each of actors and their relations.

As for the roles and responsibilities of public institutions the following elements were mentioned:

- Public institutions had a subsidiary role in what regards the action of civic organisations;
- Public institutions overcame their self-referential model;
- Simplification of public services;
- The procedures used in the BP were integrated in the working standards of the public institutions;
- Financial support given by the public institutions.

As for the roles and responsibilities of civic organisations, on the other side, two main points were mentioned:

- Civic organisations have shown relevant organizational and coordination skills;
- Civic organisations set up evaluation instruments.

As for the relationship between public institutions and citizens' organizations three relevant elements emerged:

- Joint creation of *ad hoc* structures and instruments;
- Adoption of new laws or directives; changes in laws at national or European level;
- Establishment of formal agreements: official documents where the roles of both parts and guidelines were set forward.

The critical points that were mentioned regard on one side the relationship between public institutions and autonomous citizens' organizations and on the other side specific obstacles faced by organized citizens.

As for the first point, the following negative phenomena regarding the relation between public institutions and citizens' organizations were noticed:

- Resistance and distrust of the public institutions towards civic organisations;
- Difficulty on setting a true partnership (imbalanced share of roles and responsibilities);
- Existence of discretional norms;
- Lack of contracts or formal procedures;
- Restraints due to bureaucratic procedures;
- Public institutions' slow capacity of response to civic organisations;
- Time constraints (e.g., in consultation processes).

As for the obstacles faced by ACOs there were mentioned:

- Difficulty on finding human resources;
- Lack of funds.

3. Conclusive remarks

From the research and the analysis of the 50 good practices there can be drawn conclusions regarding two topics: on one side on information emerging from the good practices, and on the other side on the value of the conceptual framework used in the research.

On good practices

As for the analysis of good practices, it can be concluded that, despite policy documents coming from public institutions, scholars and citizens' organizations themselves seem to give priority to dialogue in the definition of policies, in practice what is more carried out is partnership in implementation of them. In other words, it should be concluded that, while dialogue in definition of policies is something more declared than practiced, partnership in implementation is something scarcely declared but practiced to a large extent. It could lead to the conclusion that, since we are dealing only with good practices, when the citizens-institutions relations go well, the main outcome is that they work together, rather than discuss.

Partnership in implementation, however, seems to be in some extent an ambiguous phenomenon. On one side, indeed, it is linked to the recognition of the necessity of the contribution of citizens' organizations in policy making, being partnerships forms of relation that imply that no one of the involved actors could achieve the same result by alone. On the other side, the fact that partnerships are mostly not included in a general cooperation along the whole policy making cycle, could mean that citizens' organizations are considered more as technical agencies of the public administrations rather than policy actors on an equal basis. This impression is confirmed by a number of other researches, both at European and ad national level (see, for example, Morris 1999).

On the conceptual framework

As for the value of the conceptual framework set up and used in the research, some elements can be pointed out. The first is that this framework can be useful in order to avoid confusions and overlapping between different forms of relation between public institutions and citizens' organizations. Secondly, the matching between forms of relations and policy making phases can considerably increase information and avoid reductive approaches to this very important topic. Thirdly, it is a framework that leaves apart juridical definitions that often correspond more to politicians' and public officials' views rather than reality and that, in any case, are usually based on national legislations and administrative traditions rather on reality. Fourthly, it can

help to avoid to exchange the part with the whole, for example reducing citizens' organizations engagement in public policies to the consultation on laws of general or specific scope, or to the delivering of services. Fifthly, it can be worthwhile in dealing with citizens' organizations as a relevant actor of policy making, avoiding both over- and underestimation.

4. References

- ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP NETWORK (2002), *European Charter of Patients' Rights*, presented in Brussels on 15 November 2002, paper.
- ACN (ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP NETWORK) (2003) *Rethinking the Principle of Subsidiarity, final report*, paper.
- ID. (2004), *Public Institutions Interacting with Citizens' Organizations. A Survey on Public Policies Regarding Civic Activism in Europe*, paper.
- ID. (2005a), *Citizens' Report on the Implementation of the European Charter of Patients' Rights. Working paper February 2005*, edited by A. Lamanna, G. Moro and M. Ross, paper.
- ID. (2005b), *Participation in Policy Making: Criteria for the Involvement of Civic NGOs*, paper.
- ACN, FONDACA (2006a), "European Charter of Active Citizenship", paper.
- ID. (2006b), "Not Alone. A research on partnerships between private companies and citizens' organizations in Europe", paper.
- ANDERSEN S. S., ELIASSEN K. A. (eds) (1996), *The European Union: How Democratic Is It?*, SAGE Publications, London.
- ARMSTRONG, Kenneth (2001), "The Commission White Paper and European Governance", paper
- ID. (2002), "Civil Society and the White Paper – bridging or jumping the gaps?", New York University / Jean Monnet Program
- BAUBOCK R. (n.d.), *Citizenship and National Identities in the European Union*, paper.
- BELLAMY R., WARLEIGH A. (eds) (2001), *Citizenship and Governance in the European Union*, Continuum, London and New York.
- BELLAMY R., CASTIGLIONE D. (1998), *Between Cosmopolis and Community: Three Models of Rights and Democracy within the European Union*, in ARCHIBUGI D., HELD D., KOHLER M. (1998), pp. 152-178.
- BIGNAMI F. (2003), "Three Generations of Participation Rights in European Administrative Proceedings", New York University / Jean Monnet Program
- CESV (2002), "Dalla Consultazione alla Partecipazione. Il ruolo delle ONG nella costruzione della cittadinanza europea", paper
- CHRYSSOCHOOU D.; LAVDAS K. (2003), "Public Spheres and Civic Competence in the European polity: a case of liberal republicanism?", ECPR, 2003
- CITTADINANZATTIVA (2000), *Vademecum on the Access to European Institutions and Justice System. Norms, Principles, Bodies and Procedures,* paper.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2000), *The Commission and non-governmental organizations: building a stronger partnership,* discussion paper presented by President Prodi and Vice-President Kinnock, COM(2000)11 final.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2001), *European Citizenship: Beyond Borders, Across Identities,* proceedings of the Dialogue Workshop promoted by DG Research, Brussels, 23-24 April 2001.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2001), *European Governance. A White Paper,* COM(2001)428 final.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2005a), *Youth Program,*
- http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/index_en.html
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2005b), *On-line consultation on the future program for Active European Citizenship 2007-2013. Presentation and analysis of the results*, DG Education and culture, paper.
- FOLLESDAL A. (2001), *Constructing A European Civic Society - Participation and Belonging in a Multi-Level Europe,* Arena
- HABERMAS J. (2001), *L'inclusione dell'altro. Studi di teoria politica, Feltrinelli, Milano.*
- HAJER M.; WAGENAAR H. (2003), "Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network society", Cambridge University
- HARLOW C. (1999), "Citizen Access to Political Power in the European Union", European University Institute, Working Paper RSC No 99/2
- INSAUSTI M. (2003), "Civil Society and Participation: The Challenges of Trade Policy", IABD

- JOHNSON C., OSBORNE S. P. (n.d.), "Local Strategic Partnerships, neigborhood renewal and the limits of co-governance", paper.
- JOLY P.-B. (2005), "Debates and participatory processes: lessons from the European experience Forum Science in Society"
- JOSEPH ROWNTREE FOUNDATION (1996), Community Involvement in Estate Regeneration Partnerships, Housing Research, February 1996, www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/h167.asp.
- ID. (1999), "Developing 'local compacts' between local government and the voluntary sector", February 1999 – Ref. 239, www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/socialpolicy/239.asp.
- ID. (2000), "Urban Regeneration through Partnership: A Critical Appraisal", May 2000 – Ref. 560, www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/560.asp.
- JUDGE A. (2003), "Practicalities of Participatory Democracy with International Institutions", Union of International Associations
- KENDALL J. (2001), "The Third Sector and the Development of European public policy: framework for analysis", LSE
- ID. (2005), "Third Sector European Policy: organizations between market and state, the policy process and the EU", LSE
- KOLYBASHKINA N. (n.d.), "Reaching the Equilibrium? State – Third Sector partnership in social service provision: a case study analysis of current policies in England and Ukraine", paper.
- KUMAR L. (n.d.), "Shifting Relationships Between the State and Nonprofit Sector. Role of Contracts under the New Governance Paradigm", paper.
- LOMBARDO E. (n.d.), "The participation of Civil Society in the debate on the future of Europe", Universidad de Zaragoza
- MAGNETTE P. (2001), "European Governance and Civic Participation: Can the European Union be politicised?", New York University / Jean Monnet Program, Working Paper No. 6
- MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR AND KINGDOM RELATIONS, THE NETHERLANDS (n.d.), *Citizen Participation: a Source of Inspiration to the European Union?*, paper.
- MORO G. (1998), *Manuale di cittadinanza attiva*, Carocci, Roma.
- ID. (2001), "The 'Lab' of European Citizenship. Democratic deficit, governance approach and non-standard citizenship", paper presented at the IIS Conference, Krakow, July.
- ID. (2005a) "European Institutions Interacting with Citizens' Organizations - Some findings of a survey on public policies on "civic" NGOs in Europe", paper presented at the ISTR-EMES conference, Paris.
- ID. (2005b), *Azione civica. Conoscere e gestire le organizzazioni di cittadinanza attiva*, Carocci, Roma.
- MORRIS D. (1999), "Charities and the Contract Culture: Partners or Contractors? Law and Practice in Conflict", The University of Liverpool Charity Law Unit, paper.
- NCVO (National Council of Voluntary Organizations) (2005), Briefing on Strengthening Partnerships: Next Steps for Compact, www.ncvo-vol.org.uk.
- NENTWICH M. (1996), "Opportunity structures for Citizens' Participation: the Case of the EU", Austrian Academy of Sciences
- PHILLIPS S. D. (2004), "The Myths of Horizontal Governance: Is the Third Sector Really a Partner?", paper.
- SALAMON L. (1995), Partners in public services. Government-Nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- ID. (2002), The Tools of Government. A Guide to the New Governance, Oxford Un. Press, Oxford.
- SAURA J. (2004), "Participation of Civil Society in the decision-making process at the local level", ALDA
- SCHMITTER P. C., TRECHSEL A. H. (eds) (2004), *The future of democracy in Europe. Trends, analyses and reforms*, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg.
- ZIMMER A.; SITTERMANN B., *Brussels Civil Society*, Institut fur Politikwissenschaft

ANNEX: LIST OF GATHERED GOOD PRACTICES

1. Austria

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1.Participating in Dialogue	-Public Institution(s): Austrian Federal Ministry Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture (BMBWK) - Civic Organization(s): The World of NGOs	Education	Dialogue	Definition	Reaching citizens through civic organisations with the initiative of the 'European Year of Citizenship Through Education'
2. Information about domestic violence	Public Institution(s): The Austrian Federal Ministry for Health and Women (bmgf) Civic Organization(s): Autonomous women organisations in Austria Other Subjects involved: Departments for Women Affairs in the respective State Governments	Health	Collaboration	Implementation	Providing information on support and help structures for the citizens anonymously in matters of domestic violence.
3. Regional telephone hotline for victims of trafficking in human beings	Public Institution(s): The Women's Department of the Provincial State Government of Carinthia Civic Organization(s): ASPIS Research, consultation and support for traumatized persons Other Subjects involved: University of Klagenfurt, department of psychology	Social Services	Collaboration	Implementation	Helping victims of trafficking in human beings in the federal state of Carinthia in the South of Austria.
4. Making women's history visible	Public Institution(s): The Women's Department of the Provincial State Government of Lower Austria Civic Organization(s): Suedwind, an Austrian development NGO	Culture	Partnership	Implementation	Making women's history visible in Lower Austria in the historical jubilees year
5. Online shopping needs trust	Public Institution(s): Austrian Federal Ministry for Social Security, Generations and Consumers Civic Organization(s): VKI Verein für Konsumenteninformation Other Subjects involved: ÖIAT Österreichisches Institut für angewandte Telekommunikation	Consumers	Partnership	Implementation	Supporting consumers towards increasing problems with online shopping

2. Czech Republic

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Partner advice offices in the municipalities	Public Institution(s): municipalities Civic Organization(s): Consumer Defence Association of the Czech Republic (SOS)	consumer protection	Partnership	Implementation	Increasing the possibility of consumers to consult their consumer problem.

2. Information campaign on financial investments	Public Institution(s): The Czech Securities Commission Civic Organization(s): Consumer Defence Association of the Czech Republic (SOS)	financial services	Partnership	Definition/Imple mentation	To inform small current and potential investors on available possibilities, related risks and their rights.
3. Stickers "No advertising"	Public Institution(s): Czech Post Civic Organization(s): Consumer Defence Association of the Czech Republic (SOS) Other Subjects involved: Czech Telecommunication Office	Consumer protection	Partnership	Definition/Imple mentation	Enabling consumers to make use of their right to refuse advertising in their post-boxes
4. Green procurement	Public Institution(s): Office of the ombudsman Civic Organization(s): Czech Eco-Counselling Network (STEP)	environment	Partnership	Definition/Imple mentation	Implement green procurement in governmental offices.
5. Competition of websites accessibility	Public Institution(s): municipalities Civic Organization(s): Czech Blind United Other Subjects involved: Minister of Interior, civic association Golden Heraldry	public health	Collaboration	Implementation	To make websites of municipalities accessible for blind people

3. Germany

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Patients´ organizations participating in the decision-making process on the treatments and the medicine covered by public health insurance	Public Institution(s): Common Committee of representatives from the doctors, the dentists, the hospitals, the public-health insurance Civic Organization(s): German Disability Council and German Group of consumer protection	public health	Dialogue	Implementation	- To increase the transparency, cooperation and participation of patients in the process of decision-making and defining quality standards.
2. Social Monitoring	Public Institution(s): The Chancellor, Secretaries of State for social and economic affairs, Civic Organization(s): Charitable organizations, leader organisation in 2004 and 2005: Caritas	Social Policy	Dialogue	Evaluation	To increase the political awareness on the consequences of the new Social Laws. To give voice to financially vulnerable social groups.
3. Prevention of violence against women	Public Institution(s): Police Civic Organization(s): Women help Women association Other Subjects involved: county government	Social / Health policy	Partnership	Implementation	Proactive prevention of violence against women.

4. Cheap living space for financially vulnerable persons	<u>Public Institution(s)</u>: Social Services Department <u>Civic Organization(s)</u>: Ecumenical housing association <u>Other Subjects involved</u>: house-building companies, private house or flat owners	Social policy	Partnership	Implementation	To help financially vulnerable people finding cheap living space in this region. Prevention of homelessness
5. Social Community	<u>Public Institution(s)</u>: Town-Mayor and parliament <u>Civic Organization(s)</u>: Caritas <u>Other Subjects involved</u>: The local housing company, the mayor	Urban development	Collaboration	Implementation	To improve social and urban development and Integration. Living together as good as possible, solving social problems. Integration of migrants.

4. Italy

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Civic Audit	<u>Public Institution(s)</u>: Local Health Agencies <u>Civic Organization(s)</u>: Cittadinanzattiva <u>Other Subjects involved</u>: Astrazeneca	Health	Partnership	Evaluation	To evaluate the quality of the health agencies performance from the citizens' point of view.
2. The postal offices and the citizens' rights	**Public Institution(s):** National Post Service **Civic Organization(s):** Cittadinanzattiva, specifically the network of Citizens' Advocates **Other Subjects involved:** Other consumers' organisations and associations of disabled	Consumers' Rights Protection	Collaboration	Evaluation	To increase the quality of the Post offices' services and infrastructures.
3. Management Group "Piazza Ragazzi"	<u>Public Institution(s)</u>: Terza Età Sicura' Department of the City of Genoa <u>Civic Organization(s)</u>: Association "Tutti in Ciassa", created by citizens interested in the management of the public space at issue but as a consequence of the Municipality initiative. <u>Other Subjects involved</u>: Trade Unions of Retired People of Genoa and the Association of Retired People, professors and other professionals such as sociologists and experts on the active citizenship.	Urban renewal	Collaboration	Implementation	The project of "Piazza Ragazzi" is part of a larger plan started in 2001 by the City of Genoa to assure the senior citizens' enduring residence in the historical city centre. Moreover is part of the European Community Initiative Urban 2 – "Genova – Centro Storico" in the framework of the project "Genoa European Capital of Culture".
4. Call Center 060606 - City of Rome	<u>Public Institution(s)</u>: City of Rome: "Ufficio Semplificazione e diritti dei cittadini" Department of the Public Administration "Cantieri". <u>Civic Organization(s)</u>: Cittadinanzattiva (Citizens' Advocates Network) <u>Other Subjects involved</u>:	Consumers	Collaboration	Evaluation	To simplify and facilitate the contact between citizens and the Administration of the City of Rome through the analysis and the control of the activities developed by the Public Administration

	Formez (Training and studies Center), trade unions, consumers and citizens organisations, schools and religious associations.				
5. Reform of the 118th article of the Italian Constitution.	Public Institution(s): Parliament Civic Organization(s): MFD (Movimento Federativo Democratico, divenuto poi Cittadinanzattiva), Forum del 3° Settore, FGCI, Legambiente. Other Subjects involved: Comittee "Quelli del 118" (composed by civic organisations, experts and individuals) ; Astrid; the Regions' and Provinces' governments and the municipalities.	Citizens' Rights	Dialogue	Definition	To introduce the principle of circular subsidiarity in the Italian Constitution that recognizes that citizens should have an active role in the protection of common goods and in the safeguarding of rights.

5. Malta

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Itemized billing in telephony	Public Institution(s): Malta Communications Authority Civic Organization(s): Ghaqda tal-Konsumaturi	Consumers	Partnership	Implementation	To introduce itemized billing in telephone
2. Developing policy and legislation to defend the rights of those suffering from family violence	Public Institution(s): Ministry for the Family and Social Solidarity Civic Organization(s): National Council of Women	Social	Dialogue	Definition	To ensure that the perpetrator leaves the house and not the victim. To ensure that family violence could be reported by outsiders to the family.
3. Providing a home and education to young economic immigrants	Public Institution(s): Ministry for Social Policy Civic Organization(s): Jesuit's Refugee Service Other Subjects involved: Ministry of the Interior, Attorney General's Office	Immigration / Social	Partnership	Implementation	To release from detention young economic immigrants who landed in Malta unaccompanied. To provide an educational opportunity to improve their future.
4. The introduction of facilitators to children with special needs	Public Institution(s): Ministry of Education Civic Organization(s): Eden Foundation Other Subjects involved: Ministry for the Family and Social Solidarity	Education	Collaboration	Implementation	To give educational support to children with special needs
5. Making People with severe special needs employable	Public Institution(s): Employment and Training Corporation Civic Organization(s): Eden Foundation	Employment / Social	Partnership	Implementation	To teach basic skills to people with severe special needs and make them employable thus reducing their economic dependence.

6. Poland

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Cooperation with local consumer advocates	Public Institution(s): Office for Competition and Consumer Protection Civic Organization(s): Association of Polish Consumers Other Subjects involved: Over 360 local consumer advocates	Consumer policy	Collaboration	Implementation	Strengthening the position of local consumer advocates and their ability to help consumers at the local level, by, creating network of contacts, providing them with legal advice and news from the consumer protection field, sharing experience
2. "European day without a car" campaign	Public Institution(s): Ministry of Environment, local authorities Civic Organization(s): Institute of Civil Affairs,"The Citizen" Association, Green Federation – Krakow Group Other Subjects involved: Schools, private entrepreneurs, local media and police	Environmental policy	Partnership	Implementation	The campaign's objective was to encourage pro-ecological behaviour patterns and to promote environmental friendly city transport.
3. Participation of NGO's representatives in the work of Steering Committees	Public Institution(s): Ministry of Environment Civic Organization(s): Non-governmental Ecological Organizations	Environmental policy	Dialogue	Definition Implementation Evaluation	Strengthening the consultation process between the Ministry and NGOs
4. Gdynia's Centre of Non-Governmental Organisations (GCOP)	Public Institution(s): The Office of The President of Gdynia Civic Organization(s): Local NGO's	General cooperation at national level	Collaboration	Implementation Evaluation	Strengthening the role and activity of local NGOs
5. "Otulina Drahimska"	Public Institution(s): Local government of Czaplinek Civic Organization(s): Regional Historic Society, "Szczecin EXPO" - Society for Supporting the Development of Western Pomerania Other Subjects involved: Teachers, students	Promotion of the region, tourism	Partnership	Definition Implementation Evaluation	The objective of the project is to promote the Drawskie Lake District as a tourist attraction, to create the regional brand and to develop citizens' historical and social awareness.

7. Portugal

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Definition of an adequate Law for Water	Public Institution(s): Portuguese (national) government - National Institute for the Consumers Protection / State	Consumer Policy	Dialogue	Definition	To fit / change the Law in order to guarantee the safety of the Water Amusement Parks in Portugal

Amusement Parks	Office of Consumers Protection / Presidency of the Cabinet Civic Organization(s): DECO PROTESTE				
2. Arbitrage Centres on Consumer Disputes (ACCD)	Public Institution(s): The central and the municipal governments Civic Organization(s): DECO PROTESTE Other Subjects involved: The Union of Merchant Associations of Lisbon District (Region scale)	Consumer Policy	Partnership	Implementation	To provide easy access to justice by consumers facing disputes with merchants / retailers.
3. Training of health professionals in the area of diabetes	Public Institution(s): Ministry of Health (Directorate-General of Health) Civic Organization(s): Association for the Protection of the Diabetics in Portugal (APDP)	Health	Partnership	Implementation	To complement private and public efforts following the needs (of information / education / training) of the National Programme for the Control of Diabetes (1997; - to improve the quality of life of diabetics and their families.
4. Writing the Fundamental Rights of the European Union in the walls of the cities	Public Institution(s): Jacques Delors European Information Centre (JDEIC); municipalities (several); public schools Civic Organization(s): The Inscrire Association; 'animar' (Portuguese Association for Local Development) and at least six animar members (territorial development associations); Local Cultural Associations	Human / Citizen Rights	Partnership	Implementation	To write the fundamental rights of the European Union in public spaces of different cities (Charter of the Fundamental Rights).
5. Itinerant pre-school education	Public Institution(s): The regional services of the Ministry of the Education (in the Algarve region) Civic Organization(s): The RADIAL team / IN LOCO Association Other Subjects involved: Two municipal governments	Education	Collaboration	Definition Implementation Evaluation	To create methodological and structural alternatives to the systems of usual kindergarten for rural isolated families or those living in small rural centres.

8. Romania

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Consumer Credit Law	Public Institution(s): National Authority for Consumer Protection Civic Organization(s): Romanian Association for Consumer Protection	Consumer Policy	Dialogue	Evaluation	The consultation of NACP with APC Romania in the definition and elaboration of the Consumer Credit Law, in order to implement the EU Directive on Consumer Credit
2. TeleCottage - Heart of the comunity	Public Institution(s): Local Governments Civic Organization(s): CREST Resource Center	Governance	Partnership	Implementation	The development (economical, social and cultural) of the rural communities by the establishment of the TeleCottages - local resource centers that can offer services in the following fields: infrastructure,

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
					human resources, economy, tourism, community development, cross-border cooperation, culture, civil sector, environment.
3. National Committee on the Elimination of Deficiencies through Iodine	Public Institution(s): Bucharest Public Health Institute (Ministry of Health) Civic Organization(s): Romanian Association for Consumer Protection	Public Health	Collaboration	Implementation	Establishment of a National Committee on the Elimination of Deficiencies through Iodine.
4. Monthly fare for gas consumption	Public Institution(s): National Authority for Natural Gas Regulation Civic Organization(s): Romanian Association for Consumer Protection	Energy Policy	Dialogue	Evaluation	In 2005, based on the intention of the private Gas companies from Romania to introduce a monthly fare for gas using, the National Authority for Gas Regulation initiated a dialogue on the implementation of the legal regulation for this monthly fare and new contracts on gas distribution.
5. Education for Health	Public Institution(s): Ministry of Education Civic Organization(s): Romanian Association for Consumer Protection	Education, Health	Partnership	Evaluation	1. To have a more efficient involvement of APC Romania in its initiative and collaboration with the Ministry of Education in introducing consumers' education in the school curriculum, by having more efficient training instruments and a stronger impact on the teachers' level.

9. Slovenia

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. What's the matter, girl?	Public Institution(s): Government's Office for Equal Opportunities, Parliament's Commission for the policy of equal opportunities Civic Organization(s): Society SOS telephone for women and children - victims of violence, Society for non-violent communication, Feministic informational-cultural centre	Equal opportunities for men and women	Partnership	Implementation	To inform the public of extensiveness and different types of violence against women;
2. Youth Council Act	Public Institution(s): Slovenian Office for Youth, National Assembly, Ministry for Education and Sports Civic Organization(s): Slovenian Youth Council	Youth	Collaboration	Definition	To pass a new law on Youth council, which would serve as a legal basis for establishing youth councils in Slovenia.

3. Action "For youth without drugs"	Public Institution(s): Permanent Commission for preventive work of Police Directorate Nova Gorica, Outpatient's clinic for addictions Nova Gorica, Centre for Social Work Nova Gorica, local governments Civic Organization(s): Institute Karitas-Pelikan, Society of friends of youth Nova Gorica, Club of students of Gorica Other Subjects involved: Public institute for sports Nova Gorica	Health care (help to drug addicts)	Partnership	Implementation	To collect financial resources for the renovation of the house facade of the Meeting Community
4. Supplementary Health Insurance	Public Institution(s): Ministry of Health, Agency for insurance supervision Civic Organization(s): Association of Consumers Slovenia	Consumers' protection	Dialogue	Definition Implementation	To draw the attention of public to the breach of the Consumers Protection by insurance company Vzajemna
5. Public Involvement in the Decision Making about Low and Medium Level Radioactive Waste Disposal	Public Institution(s): Agency for RadWaste Management Civic Organization(s): Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe	environment	Partnership	Implementation	Involvement of the public in the decision making process; preparation of recommendations for public involvement in the decision making; to inform the public about their legal rights to participate in environmental decision making; to offer them the possibility for discussion with an independent legal expert and Agency for RadWaste Management

10. Turkey

Title	Actors	Policy Field	Type	Policy phase	Description
1. Collaboration of Social actors for the Protection of Human Rights	Public Institution(s): Istanbul Kadikoy Municipality Civic Organization(s): Foundation for the Support of Women's Work ; Istanbul Bracnh of the Federation of the Handicapped	Education	Collaboration	Definition	The project aims to inform, bring together, and facilitate exchange of experience among different social sectors in Turkey, through seminars, conferences and workshops on the significant issues regarding human rights.
2. The Civic Involvement Projects	Public Institution(s): Social Services and Child Care Institution Civic Organization(s): The Civic Involvement Projects (CIP) under Sabanci University	Education	Collaboration	Implementation	Civic Involvement Projects (CIP), is a program for Participatory Democracy, and is designed to give the university students an understanding that every individual not only can, but also has

					the responsibility to contribute positively to society.
3. Supporting Health Promotion for Adolescents	Public Institution(s): The Ministry of National Education Civic Organization(s): Human Resource Development Foundation (HRDF); Departments of Education of universities in the three major cities of Istanbul, Izmir and Bursa;	Health	Collaboration	Implementation	To provide accurate information and responsible behaviour training in sexual and reproductive health to adolescents.
4. Establishing and Holding Day Care Centers	Public Institution(s): Social Services and Child Care Institution (SHCEK is a public organisation under the government) Civic Organization(s): Foundation for the Support of Women's Work (FSWW)	Education	Partnership	Implementation	Developing of alternative ways to expand early childcare and education services to low-income communities, through the leadership and advocacy role of grassroots women with support of the governmental organization (SHCEK) and sometimes municipalities.
5. The Consumer Council	Public Institution(s): The Ministry of Industry and Commerce and other ministries related to the issue. Civic Organization(s): Consumer rights advocate organizations	Consumer rights	Dialogue	Implementation	Investigating consumers' problems and to solve the problems using universal consumers' rights.