

***Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:***  
**- A PLANET Position Paper -**



**Proposal for inclusion in the National Partnership Agreement from the Area based Partnership companies.**

It is proposed that the forthcoming agreement should include a specific and detailed reference to the provision of a dedicated new programme targeted at significantly reducing poverty and social exclusion in areas of concentrated disadvantage.

This proposed programme will include a range of actions aimed at improving levels of education and training; community economic activity; environmental improvements; sports and leisure facilities; tackling health inequalities and increased participation.

The initiative will be built on the achievements and relationships developed in the two previous Local Development Programmes, it will focus specifically on those disadvantaged rural and urban communities that have endured, sometimes for generations, the most substantial, cumulative and sustained disadvantage in this country, and also at those areas at risk of becoming the new disadvantaged areas.

**The over-riding objective in undertaking this approach is to seek to abolish the main Designated Disadvantaged areas over a fifteen year period to the year 2020, by bringing them up to an agreed percentage of national averages for key social indicators.**

In order to achieve this PLANET proposes a unified programme, which incorporates RAPID and other such interagency initiatives, to be run through the Area Based Partnerships; though clearly it will also require new forms of Public Service innovation working in parallel.

The area Based Partnerships were established initially in 1991 to focus on twelve long term unemployment “blackspots”. This initiative was an outcome of the National Partnership Agreement, the Programme for Economic and Social Progress (PESP). The approach was considered very successful and expanded to a further twenty six designated areas of disadvantage to tackle high levels of poverty and social exclusion. Subsequent national partnership agreements further enhanced this local partnership approach and the Programme for Prosperity and Fairness (PPF Framework III) set out a comprehensive range of measures in relation to addressing poverty and social exclusion, including actions to combat urban disadvantage and rural poverty. In particular this agreement included a measure entitled “Targeted Investments in disadvantaged areas”

This PLANET proposal aims to build on the foundations established from this previously agreed approach, in order to fully realise the potential for significant improvement and identifiable change in the selected areas over a realistic and realisable timeframe.

*Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:*  
**- A PLANET Position Paper -**

**PARTNERSHIPS POST 2006:**  
***A BLUEPRINT FOR THE THIRD GENERATION OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT***

---

**A PLANET Position Paper**

***Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:***  
**- A PLANET Position Paper - -**

## **1 OVERVIEW**

This year, 2006, sees the end of the current National Development Plan, and the accelerated development of major new plans and targets for Ireland (and the EU) for the period 2007 to 2013. It also heralds the end of 15 years of Local Development in Ireland, from the Area Partnerships' focus on 12 unemployment blackspots of 1991, to the LDSIP focus on Social Inclusion in 38 areas in recent years. PLANET – the Network of the 38 Area Partnerships, has prepared the following paper as its contribution to the setting of National Socio-Economic Priorities for the period 2007 – 2013.

Firstly, there has been significant progress. Haase and Pratschke reviewing changes in Social Indicators from the census figures, 1991 to 2002, commented that there has been real growth across the country; this suggests area based strategies can work. But they also comment that many areas experience continuing deprivation and that there is “overall stability (of) the spatial pattern of relative affluence and disadvantage”. Despite the successes, and lessons learned, area based poverty and social exclusion still exists; many of the worst Designated Disadvantaged Areas still lag far behind Irish society, in spite of the Celtic Tiger and years of sustained growth.

PLANET believes the financial and organisational resources of the Irish nation are now such that we can realistically aim to eliminate the problem of Disadvantaged Areas in the medium term. PLANET now calls on the Government and Social Partners:

**To abolish the main Designated Disadvantaged Areas by 2020, by bringing them up to an agreed percentage of national averages for key Social Indicators.**

Building on the achievements and relationships developed in the two previous Local Development programmes, it should focus specifically on those disadvantaged rural and urban communities which have endured, (sometimes for generations), the most substantial, cumulative and sustained disadvantage in this country; and also those areas at risk of becoming the new disadvantage areas.

PLANET, recognises the value of the Local Development sector in general, including Territorial Employment Pacts, but calls **for a section of the new National Development Plan to be devoted to a new results-oriented Third Generation Local Development Programme (TGLDP) to include a specific and dedicated programme with the specific aim of eliminating the most serious Area Based Disadvantage by targeting areas of concentrated disadvantage (PTCD).** It will be open to Partnership companies operating in, or partially in, Designated Disadvantaged Areas (DDAs) to apply for funding and backing under this programme, which will have a major focus on new forms of Public Service innovation.

We call on the Government and Social Partners to adopt this as a priority Aim for the New Millennium.

**Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:  
- A PLANET Position Paper - -**

**1.2 OUTCOMES: focus on results**

The eradication of seriously disadvantaged areas will be achieved, not by breaking up or depopulating these communities, but by planning and investing in integrated measures to turn them into surviving and indeed thriving communities. But what does this mean in practice? How will we recognise a successful outcome?

**The success of this dedicated programme will be measured by the areas' progress in moving from the margins of Irish society to within striking distance of national averages on terms of a battery of key social and economic indicators.**

**Baseline data on 10-12 agreed key Social Indicators** will be gathered for each agreed area so that we are clear on what we call success. Housing, Employment, Education, Health, Safety/Public Order, Built Environment, Income, Enterprise, Minority Rights, Citizen Participation/Social Capital, Culture, Sport and Leisure, etc. are possible examples. Key Socio Economic Indicators of area sustainability will need to be finalised by agreement, and thereafter, for a complete Programme, appropriate targets set in respect of each of them.

A key difference between the LDSIP and the proposed TGLDP will be the **additional focus on area targets rather than targets for individual projects or indeed Target Groups** such as Travellers, Long Term Unemployed, ex Prisoners etc. Thus a target may be a planned reduction of early school leaving *for the area*, rather than a class in one school, or an individual family, as these area targets tell us how the general area is moving. (Individual problems may continue to affect given individuals or families, and they will be entitled to services as before. **But the criteria for success in this programme will lie in breaking the above average concentrations of poverty, ill health etc. in any one area.**)

But we will also expect residents to have higher order outcomes like hope, pride and confidence in their future; other outcomes such as participation in political life, health, public order/safety, cultural activity and wealth generation will also be indicative of a healthy and sustainable community.

**1.3 SUB PROGRAMMES: urban and rural**

Reflecting the different nature of disadvantage, the TGLDP needs sufficient flexibility to respond to local needs and opportunities. Two major Sub Programmes are envisaged as part of the Programme Targeting Concentrated Disadvantage (PTCD), viz., Urban and Rural.

**A. URBAN: Its key Aim is to abolish all major deprived urban areas by 2020  
Dublin:**

This will run in disadvantaged neighbourhoods and areas displaying cumulative disadvantage based on the Deprivation Index, e.g. high unemployment, welfare dependency, crime, low education and training levels, poor social and physical infrastructure.

Some pockets not in current Partnership areas may be managed by a neighbouring Partnership.

***Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:***  
**- A PLANET Position Paper - -**

**Provincial Urban:**

This will run in those cities and towns outside Dublin offering many of the same clusters of problems. Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford are clearly sizable urban centres, but in some smaller towns the dispersed spatial pattern of housing estates (where some clusters may even be outside the Town's boundary) may obscure the fact that there are disadvantage estates and neighbourhoods with essentially the same urban problems of cumulative social disadvantage, rather than the rural issues of demographic decline referred to below.

**B. RURAL:**

**The key aim will be to ensure the sustainability and renewal of rural communities, addressing the demographic decline and its consequences – loss of employment and services, collapse of growing communities etc.** It is essential that the major investment necessary in the key areas outlined below is made so that there is a reversal of rural decline and depopulation and that sufficient industry and services are present in rural locations as is the case in most major developed countries.

**1.4 LOCATION: which communities?**

Haase and Pratschke's work on Spatial distribution of poverty comments that in broad terms the maps for Ireland as a whole are very similar between census periods, which clearly indicates that the designation of areas to be targeted via area based initiatives does not need to be reviewed in a major way in the short to medium term.

They point out that "the most deprived areas, in 2002, were as follows:

**Dublin:** Coolock, Darndale, Ballymun, Finglas, Cabra, Ballyfermot, Inchicore, Cherry Orchard, Clondalkin, Blanchardstown, Crumlin, Walkinstown, Tallaght, and parts of Dublin's Inner City.

**Other Urban Locations:** parts of Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford cities, as well as parts of the towns of Dundalk, Drogheda and Wexford.

**Rural locations:** most of Donegal and Mayo, large parts of West and East Galway, significant parts of Leitrim, Cavan, Monaghan, Longford and Roscommon, North and West Kerry and Wexford."

The State may continue to offer programmes for marginalized people throughout the state, and Partnerships may conceivably be asked to deliver Programmes for marginalized groups or families in nearby areas that are not Designated Disadvantaged, **but PLANET seeks a unified programme incorporating Partnerships and RAPID with the a specific budget and mandate to tackle the problems of concentrated and overlapping disadvantage in key neighbourhoods and communities.**

**Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:  
- A PLANET Position Paper - -**

**1.4 CORE PROGRAMME: investing in 6 measures**

The Programme will require “Investment”, both in terms of money and political leadership. Areas will need some new money, but also better use of current resources; experience has shown this will mean **a series of measures to “join up” planning and delivery of different state services; and more specifically to refocus them on outcomes rather than activity, and on area outcomes specifically.** This has excellent potential as an SMI Demonstration Project.

The following 6 Measures are proposed as indicative types of eligible actions on the basis that healthy communities will demonstrate vitality in these areas.

**INVESTING IN TRAINING AND PEOPLE DEVELOPMENT**

■ Disadvantaged areas experience low levels of education and training which contribute to unemployment or depopulation as people leave in search of jobs. Developing education, training, skills and work for those who need it is critical both in terms of self-fulfilment and income.

**INVESTING IN CIVIC PARTICIPATION AND VOLUNTARY EFFORT**

■ Active citizenship, where there is strong engagement between citizens, communities, policy making and the state, leads to strong deep democracy. It involves, but goes beyond voting in local and national elections; it also includes service and supports through voluntary activity, which builds social capital and helps tackle social inequality.

**INVESTMENT IN PLACES**

■ Many deprived areas have poor physical environments and are weak in leisure, housing and other facilities. The built environment impacts significantly on the health, social and economic life of individuals and communities.

**INVESTMENT IN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ACTIVITY**

■ Entrepreneurship and community enterprise can provide jobs and income, as well as providing much needed services in the community.

**INVESTMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH**

■ People living in disadvantaged communities are particularly at risk of ill health; they often experience higher levels of age dependency with consequent demands on health services for young and old. Mental health, smoking and substance abuse affect individuals, families and communities alike, sometimes with knock on effects for crime and quality of life.

**INVESTMENT IN EQUALITY**

■ Older people, travellers, ethnic minorities, substance abusers etc. are often on the margins of even disadvantaged communities. Multiple disadvantage requires extensive and sustained efforts and attention.

***Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:***  
**- A PLANET Position Paper - -**

### **1.5 BASIC PRINCIPLES**

It will be based on similar principles to the original Area Partnerships:

- Clarity of purpose and the sense of national unity
- Focus on areas of deprivation and poverty
- A partnership approach
- Bottom up identification of need
- Development of innovative and cross cutting solutions.

However it also **addresses challenges** that were not successfully met:

- “Bending the spend”, or reprioritising the existing budgets of the public service towards their areas;
- Mainstreaming of successful initiatives;
- Decentralising of responsibility and authority to nearer the target areas;
- Finding structured ways to integrate the planning and implementation of mainstream public services with the multiple needs of marginalized areas

Lastly, it will **reposition** Partnerships to work in the different scenario that exists in 2006, and to handle the new, emerging and changing needs of Ireland over the next 15 years; it specifically acknowledges the Local Development environment is more complex and crowded, and suggests a division of roles and responsibilities which will bring coherence and order to that scene.

**Partnerships Post 2006: Third Generation Local Development:  
- A PLANET Position Paper -**

## Appendix 2 Population Statistics in Disadvantaged Urban & Rural Areas in Ireland

### Rapid Areas – Strand I

Dublin South West Inner City Canals	4265
Dublin South Inner City	3896
Dublin Northwest Inner City	4524
Dublin Northeast Inner City	12544
Dublin Southeast Inner City	4740
Dublin Northside	7095
Dublin Finglas	20637
Dublin Ballymun	19492
South Dublin – Killinarden	4710
South Dublin – Fettercairn	6515
South Dublin – Jobstown	9908
South Dublin – Clondalkin	13894
Blanchardstown	12000 (E)
Dunlaoghaire Rathdown	6008
Bray	7000 (E)
Dundalk	4062
Cork – Knocknaheeny/Churchfield	5977
Cork – Fairhill/Gurranebraher	15412
Cork – Blackpool/The Glen/Mayfield	12222
Cork – Togher Mahon	11759
Limerick Northside	13000
Limerick – South City	11000
Limerick – Kings Island/Bishops Place	6000
Waterford	8206

Statistics sourced from the following:

Central Statistics Office

POBAL  
RAPID Area Co-Ordinators

### Rapid Areas – Strand II

Athlone	7479
Athy	6058
Ballinasloe	5977
Carlow	6053
Carrick on Suir	5543
Cavan	3497
Clonmel	3320
Ennis	2500 (E)
Galway	8000 (E)
Kilkenny	8594
Longford	6899
Mallow	7109
Navan	3415
New Ross	4812
Sligo	3000
Tipperary	4560
Tralee	3000 (E)
Tuam	3089
Wexford	9443
Youghal	6203

### Urban Area not classed as Rapid Area

Ballyfermot	20699
-------------	-------

(E ): Estimate

Statistics sourced from the following:

Central Statistics Office  
POBAL  
RAPID Area Co-Ordinators

### Clar Areas

Cavan	29435
Clare	35655
Cork	35137
Donegal	33103
Galway	27311
Kerry	30309
Leitrim	25815
Limerick	373
Longford	9409
Louth	8080
Mayo	54264
Meath	343
Monaghan	7149
Roscommon	28270
Sligo	23649
Tipp North	4235
Tipp South	764
Waterford	5148

Statistics sourced from the following:

Dept Comm.Rural & Gaeltacht Affairs

# Appendix 1

## **A NEW COMPACT WITH PUBLIC SECTOR.**

High-level agreement needs to be reached on the principles for the interaction of the State services with the new Initiative. Key areas are as follows:

**A. Funding:** Agreement needs to be sought on items such as the following.

*Ring fenced Public Body budgets:* a proportion of the state agency/government department budget that can only be spent by agreement with the partners in the Initiative.

*Public Body Allocation:* each state agency and government department would be required to state what funds were being spent in those individual areas within their jurisdiction which are DDAs. All budgets will have Local Development Sections.

*Innovation Budget:* seed money outside the State Agency budget for projects.

*Staff secondment funds:* allocation of funds to replace staff working full or part time on DDA work.

*Planning and Evaluation:* a budget will be needed specifically to monitor progress, and assist Departments in the extra planning work involved.

**B. Decentralisation: A New Charter is needed to address the decentralisation of responsibility for budgets and operations to officials close to those areas that are included in the programme, and to bring about a focus on results.**

These would cover:

*Authority:* giving enhanced authority levels to staff in DDAs for budgets, planning and cross agency relationships; and decentralisation of the appropriate staff to take that responsibility.

*Support:* these staff have to be rewarded for success, incentivised to take the jobs by bonuses and options for advancement; they also need access to appropriate levels in their parent organisations for guidance and support.

*Structures:* a new form of structured relationship is called for which brings together on an ongoing basis key staff from Partnership and state organisations. To work this requires more than just putting people in a room; they will need team building, skills in cooperation and problem solving; in some cases exposure to best international practice

## **A PLANNING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

A critical concept in abolishing DDAs is that most Government Departments and Agencies need to be involved; mainstream budgets will be used, and there will be widespread use of targets and outcome planning, (rather than inputs) for these areas.

This will require that all agencies use comparable planning areas (DDAs) in compiling their budgets and implementing their plans; and that mechanisms are found for committing to shared targets in these areas.

This will take time, but it is arguably easier to pilot real SMI in a select number of areas than across the full gamut of government nationally. It is suggested the following will help.

**Baseline data on 10-12 agreed key Social Indicators** will be gathered for each agreed area so that we are clear on what we call success. Housing, Employment, Education, Health, Safety/Public Order, Built Environment, Income, Enterprise, Minority Rights, Citizen Participation/Social Capital, Culture, Sport and Leisure, etc. are possible examples.

**Targets, within multi annual plans, will be set for these Indicators**, within a relative percentage of national averages, which we will regard as indicating that the areas are not disadvantaged.

**Performance** will be monitored for each agreed indicator target (or clusters thereof) throughout the programme to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of strategies.

#### **NATIONAL SUPPORTS**

Realistically local Partnerships do not have the ability to access or influence senior Civil Servants on an ongoing basis; their concerns and/or area focus will not be shared equally in many cases, and therefore the target of abolishing DDAs has to become National Policy, but backed by political support and workable changes in structures. The following area suggested.

**Dept. Finance/CRAGA Budgets;** Finance and the relevant Department overseeing the DDA programme will need an overseeing role so that departmental annual budgets cannot get passed without clear statements (i.e. budgets and targets) about those DDAs in their remit.

**NDP Sub Committee** to review progress, possibly with external evaluations on progress towards the main aims from a body such as NESF.

**Political Structures:** Social Inclusion Cabinet Sub Committee to help eliminate blockages.

**Strategic Management Initiative:** Make it an SMI demonstration project and harness the insights of senior civil servants on how to get deliver cross cutting actions!