Aldona Wiktorska-Święcka
University of Wroclaw, Poland

CO-CREATION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN POLAND IN STATU NASCENDI. A CASE STUDY ON SENIOR CO-HOUSING POLICY AT THE URBAN LEVEL

Author

Aldona Wiktorska-Święcka, Ph.D, Prof. of University of Wrocław, political scientist, economist, Germanist. Main fi elds of interests: public governance and public policy (dynamic approach upon globalization and Europeanisation); territorial governance (regional, urban, metropolitan governance); sectoral governance (social policy, educational policy, cultural policy, labour market policy, civic-public partnership, public-private partnership, cross-sectoral partnerships); innovation in management and governance (social responsibility of an organization, diversity management, corporate citizenship, social innovation, social investment); normative assumptions of management and governance: democratization, ethics in management, quality in management, good governance, values and compliance, democratic organizational culture, civil society, participatory governance, social and human capital, leadership).

ORCID no. 0000–0002–4240–7023
e-mail: aldona.wiktorska-swiecka@uwr.edu.pl

Abstract

The paper impacts the current debate on governance system in Poland upon Europeanisation in terms of co-creation of public services at urban and regional level. In this context, it can be a part of a discussion on challenges related to cities' and regions' transition from industrial economy, society, city and government, to creative and knowledge-based ones. Due to its dynamic and vibrant character, the item can be also implemented into the debate on social and economic strengths in order to solving urgent problems in cities and city-regions linking to innovation in governance.

Its clue is the concept of co-creation, which occupies an important space in the current study of European integration. However, the starting point for the considerations contained in the paper is the observation, that while it is commonly accepted that the co-creation of services with citizens and other non-governmental actors seems to be the most effective action to answer to the need for new social innovations and the growing demand for personalised services, the research agenda linked to this has investigated this aspect regarding Eastern and Central Europe not in an enough extensive way. In this regards, the paper can contribute to the field.

The aim of the paper is to present the results of the general review of key sources concerning existing knowledge in the field of co-creation in Poland, both in domestic science and institutional practice. In the paper author confronted the EU concepts of co-creation of public services, whereby the basis of this approach was the participation of stakeholders in the decision-making processes as a crucial element of co-governance. In the paper a local case study will be discussed on the basis of social housing policy in Wrocław, the 4th biggest city in Poland.

The proposed paper is a part of the international research performed upon the project "Co-Creation of Public Innovation in Europe" (acronym "CoSIE") financed upon Horizon 2020.

Keywords: Co-creation, local governance, Poland, housing policy, senioral housing, Wrocław

Introduction

In recent decades, social challenges have become increasingly complex and interdependent due to robust transformations of socio-economic and cultural patterns, like, among others, digitalization, interconnectedness and political landscape changes. One of key trends is the megatrend on the aging society and the resulting challenges for sustainable development (Adamczyk 2009). All of the mentioned changes significantly affect arrangements of public administration (Bason 2010). However, processes of establishing new social policies and services that satisfy previously unobserved citizens' needs are a challenge both at the legal and administrative level due to socio-cultural and political environments. One can observe that public social and welfare systems are facing the growing demand for personalized services because of the destandardization of individual needs and the dramatic differentiation of societal risks (*European Social Network* 2015). Related to this, it seems to be necessary to abandon traditional sectoral manners and call for more collaborative responses which answers citizens' expectations for effective, citizen-centric approaches (ibidem). Nowadays, the quality and performance of a public service process is shaped primarily by the expectations of the citizens their active or passive role in the service delivery and their subsequent experience of the process.

Because the transformations of socio-economic and cultural patterns have affected Western European countries earlier than Poland, Western European countries have already developed a number of different arrangements and approaches on how to cope with challenges of transforming world (Adamczyk 2009). One arrangement is the concept of co-creation, which has emerged due to the coincidence of several developments globally and in Europe.

Co-creation is often seen as producing better quality, customer-oriented and less costly public services (Osborne et al. 2016). In this sense, co-creation has received positive attention for being able to enhance the orientation on citizens in public services, to promote the role of citizens in poor social status and to encourage the actions of a civil society (*European Commission* 2013). The concept of co-creation currently occupies an important space in the European debate on public services. Particularly, in recent years, it has been embraced as a new reform strategy for the public sector, given the social challenges and budget austerity which governments face (ibidem). Thus, since local governments are responsible for providing the majority of public services, it is crucial to undertake analyses related to this issue.

This paper tackles this as an up-to-date issue1. It is a part of the international research performed upon the project named "Co-Creation of Public Innovation in Europe" (Co-SIE) and is financed by Horizon 2020. The CoSIE project develops the co-creation process in the field of public services and aims at creating service innovations by applying and testing a collaborative and user-oriented co-creation process. It builds on the idea that public sector innovations – whether ICT-related or not – can best be achieved by creating collaborative partnerships between service providers (i.e. public sector agencies, third sector organizations, private companies) and service users (i.e. citizens). The goal of CoSIE is

to contribute to democratic dimensions and social inclusion through co-creating public services by engaging diverse citizen groups and stakeholders in varied public services.

The starting point for the idea elaborated in this paper is the observation that the co-creation of services with different stakeholders seems to be the most effective action to answer to the need for new social innovations and the growing demand for personalized services (Arundel et al. 2015). However, this requires specific arrangements and environments. Meanwhile, although issues related to this statement are already a topic of deep and on-going Western European research (Voorberg et al. 2013; Voorberg et al. 2015), the research agenda linked to the concept of co-creation of public services has investigated this approach in relation to Eastern and Central Europe, but not thoroughly. In this context, the aim of this paper is to present the results of the general review of key sources concerning existing knowledge in the field of co-creation in Poland. This paper looks into the scientific state of the art and the institutional practice which directly refer to the idea of co-creation understood as an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process (Prahalad, Ramaswamy 2004). In a more detailed way, this paper focuses on senior and housing policy as selected examples of public sectoral policies at the local level.

However, the analyzed concept can be assumed in a more specific terms as the joint provision of public services by the public administration and citizens (end-users of services) in a non-commercial manner and on a partner basis. In contrast to other forms of public service systems, co-creation puts more emphasis on solidarity and activation of citizens (supporting public value), which distinguishes it in particular to a market model focused on maximizing the efficiency and quality of services provided. In this sense, the concept of co-creation as such doesn't prove transparent demarcation lines from other citizens' participation oriented concepts. It might be implied by other approaches that refer to direct or indirect participation of citizens, end-users and/or other stakeholders in creating public services. Moreover, co-creation is a more specific approach than the concept of participation, which could also consider the passive citizens' involvement (Wiktorska-Święcka, Kozak 2014). Nevertheless, in the literature regarding active citizen involvement, one can also find the term "co-production" (Brandsen, Pestoff 2006). There are also other concepts such as public participation, collaborative governance or community involvement which seem to be closely-related with the concept of co-creation (Verschuere et al. 2012).

Thus, while concentrating on an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process, a local case study of senior co-housing policy in Wrocław, the fourth largest city in Poland, will be discussed.

This paper draws from relevant scientific and institutional sources on this matter. Key knowledge bases were searched (Cambridge Humanities & Social Sciences Journals, EB-SCO, CEEOL, Google Scholar, Journal Citation Reports, JSTOR, SCOPUS, Science Direct, Web of Science, Wiley Online Library and repositories from Polish university libraries), and focused on data on concepts and domestic institutional practices of co-creation. Whereas:
- scientific papers in Polish and English and developed by Polish researchers;
- monographs and collective works;
- authored and co-authored scientific chapters in monographs and collective studies;
- expert opinions and scientific studies; and

- research projects on co-creation in Poland with their products were also reviewed, with concentration on economic studies (mainly marketing and management studies), law and administration and political studies. Moreover, the author focused on institutional documents relating to the political and administrative dimension. In this regard, the author reviewed documents developed by:
- government administration level (ministries) and
- regional and local levels of administration of the government of Lower Silesia and the municipality of Wrocław.

These documents were:
- political acts (White Papers, political programs);
- legal acts (laws, ordinances, regulations, resolutions); and
- operational acts (strategies and programs).

The special attention was given to the local level due to formal competences which communities ("gminy") and counties ("powiaty") play in the welfare policy of Poland. The temporary limit was 2014. The rationale for its adoption was:
- a decade of Poland's presence in the EU (the assumption is that the influence of top-down Europeanization is already visible in the institutional and socio-cultural dimension); and
- the beginning of the new programming period (the assumption is that Poland already has experience in programming policies in line with EU expectations after the first period of full participation in the EU in 2007–2013 and integrates current cohesion policy recommendations into domestic institutional arrangements at all public governance levels).

The concept of co-creation of public services in Poland in light of the current scientific debate

The idea of co-creation refers to the voluntary or involuntary involvement of public service users in any of the design, management, delivery and/or evaluation stages of public services (Osborne et al. 2016). To make co-creation a reality, a specific governance model is required. It should concern the strengthening of position and increasing the capacity of social institutions, improvement of mutual relations between various social entities, improvement of skills, competences, social capital among actors of social life involved in the development and implementation of social and economic programs and strategies (Kelly et al. 2002). Co-creation moves the balance of power. Government, traditionally in a role of inviting the public in for comments on pre-determined programs, functions in a more iterative decision making process. Part of this hierarchy-flattening involves a significant degree of trust and transparency between citizens and government officials. The growing role of citizens in the exercise of power and public governance (empowerment) and their direct involvement in public services (co-creation) brings, however, tensions between the individualization of needs and the maintenance and strengthening of social cohesion. This requires the use of various non-standard arrangements (conditions of institutionalization) which, on the one hand, respond to the expectations and needs of residents

and potential users at the same time (Gerometta et al. 2005). Thus, specific institutional governance settings, like the compatibility of public organizations to citizen participation, attitude of public officials to citizen participation, risk-averse administrative culture and clear incentives for co-creation, are required. However, particularly at the local level, the emergence, development and firm establishment of co-creation of public services constitute a political process whose outcome is highly dependent on both a decisive set of environmental factors, including coalition building, and specific constellations of actors (Kazepov 2005).

From this point of view, co-creation of public services as such is highly embedded in the environment. But the capacity of local milieu differs, and all differences are related to, among others, strategies and dynamics linked to government decisions and lobbies in the economic and social spheres. Thus, when considering issues related to co-creation of public services at the local level, it is required to embed the analyses into local context with its specifics.

Currently, the issue of the functioning of the public services system in Poland is not one of the most important topics in the country's domestic public debate. In a more specific framework, in the scientific discourse, this is not an issue that is very often discussed. This concept (in the Polish literature on the subject the term "co-design": "współtworzenie" functions alternately with English language terms "co-production": "koprodukcja" and "co-creation": "ko-kreacja", "współtworzenie") is undertaken mainly in the debate within economic sciences, especially in the field of management sciences. First of all, this trend, which started after 2004, along with Poland's accession to the European Union, is associated with the study of the changing roles of individual actors operating in the market and in the public space. In this context, considerations are mainly taken into account in the area of marketing (Matusek 2015). Also, issues related to the current state of international debate are discussed (Awdziej et al. 2016).

An important variable in the Polish debate is the perception of "co-creation" as an element of generating the value of an organization. Thus, Polish authors stress the normative dimension of the discussed approach and enter their considerations into the area of social responsibility (Bąkowska-Morawska 2015). One can also observe a slow retreat from the pro-neoliberal social model and a critical reflection on the marketing of services and its effects (ibidem). In the economic literature, issues related to broadly understood theories of social development are taken up, e.g. the concept of social capital as one of key assumptions for co-creation (Austen 2016). Current trends in social studies, like innovations, whose source can be the end-users of services (Kobylińska 2015; Stobiecka 2016), are discussed, too.

So far, however, this point of view not in the mainstream of the domestic scientific debate. Additionally, an important aspect is the idea of an active market where one considers co-creating values as a form of an organization's development strategy. In this sense, authors of research about this topic essentially refer to the development of ICT, which influenced the redefinition of stakeholders' roles and values. They note that the center of gravity has been shifted from the package of products and services offered to the recipient to a continuous process of value creation, taking into account consumer experience and the logic and ability to distinguish values from products and other resources. At the same time, they emphasize that the key factor of success in implementing the co-creation approach is the direct interaction between service stakeholders (Matusek 2015). Thus, this approach of

co-creation as an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process should be considered as the dominant one from the perspective of this paper.

However, not only economic sciences are engaged in the debate on co-creation so far. Other scientific disciplines increasingly discuss co-creation-related issues, i.e. a specific area within the framework of the debate is the co-creation of public services. Aspects related to this have been elaborated, among others, within law and administration and social sciences, mainly the political science. On the basis of a general literature review, the thesis can be formulated that Polish researchers only begin the debate on this approach, while on the one hand bringing the general assumptions of co-creation that are already present in the international discourse (Kaźmierczak 2014), and on the other associating co-creation with the problem of modifying ways of public governance matters in Poland (Sześciło 2015c, 2015d). In particular, they focus on issues related to the relationship of co-creation of public services and social economy (Sześciło 2015a, 2015b). Nevertheless, when focusing on new institutional arrangements and their tools, in the considerations published after 2014, many threads and challenges of and for domestic public governance are formulated (Sześciło 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2015d). The authors of the sources identified in this paper stress numerous deficits, which limit the implementation of the concept of co-creation in Poland (Trutkowski 2016). However, in the scientific literature on the co-creation of public services in Poland, there are more and more studies resulting from the implementation of international projects, mainly financed by European Union funds or related financial mechanisms (Kaźmierczak 2014; Trutkowski 2016) and ordered by the government administration affecting national institutional arrangements as well as by local self-governments (Bartoszewicz et al. 2014).

In detailed terms, the co-creation issues raised in the above-mentioned scientific sources review, concern:

- terminological and definitional issues (Awdziej et al. 2016);
- a non-commercial model for governing public services at the local level, built on a civic commitment and responsibility for the common good (Sześciło 2015d);
- trust as a key factor for determining the co-creation of value in transactions concluded in a traditional manner and via the Internet (Austen 2016);
- involving citizens in the co-design and co-implementation of policies as an innovation (Bartoszewicz et al. 2014);
- the requirement of a specific level of social, intellectual, but also financial and material capital in the process of co-creating services (Sześciło 2015b); and the
- participation, involvement of private and public resources and the lack of focus on the participants' profits as key elements of co-creation (Sześciło 2015c).

In this context, one can state that the current scientific debate doesn't elaborate the idea of co-creation from the perspective of an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process only. This is one of several possible approaches that are not frequently discussed. However, against the background of the relatively poor achievements in this context, one can observe a relatively active exchange of views about one of key components of co-creation: participation. However, the Polish literature doesn't consider at this stage the concept of "participation" as a part of the co-creation approach. It is worth noting that participation in the context of public governance has not been yet connected with the change of standards in the provision of public services. It does not see a deep sense of co-production in it, which means that it grants citizens an objective role in the processes of

organizing public life. Nor is it associated with the process of moving from "public service FOR the public" to "public service BY the public" (Boviard, Löffler 2012), which is crucial from the perspective of the concept of co-creation in the adopted analytical framework as an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process. Both, "participation" and "co-creation" of public services don't see each other and are not associated as interdependent. It is neither related with the real civic agency, the bottom-up political impact nor empowerment. It is usually enforced by regulations or by striving to legitimize a positive, democratic image of power. Nevertheless, it is worth emphasizing that one can still find individual statements in the current Polish literature on the subject that consider co-creation as an attractive paradigm from the perspective of end-users' involvement in the process of the public service production (Sześciło 2015a). In this sense, it has been considered as the "third way" in its delivery (Sześciło 2015b). However, the co-creation approach has been not seen to be the panacea for all public sector problems, but rather as a very beneficial tool in long-term relations between professional service providers and service users or other members of the community (Podgórniak-Krzykacz 2015).

Co-creation *in actu*: current Polish institutional practice at the local level

Since the local government is responsible for providing the majority of public services, it seems also to be crucial to undertake analyses of forms of co-creation of public services at the local level. Polish self-government is based on the decentralization principle. It means that all public duties that are not provided by the governmental public entities can be delivered by the local government units. As a result, local governments command a wide license to organize public services in their own way. However, due to the lack of financial and logistical resources they are not able to properly perform. The low efficiency of the local government apparatus (Sześciło 2015a; 2015c) directs citizens towards their attempts to solve problems in public service delivery (Hausner, Jessop, Mazur 2016; Mazur 2015). This could contribute to the development of co-creation of public services as an alternative approach to the classical model of public administration (Sześciło 2015b). However, although in the institutional practice in Poland in the last few years since 2014, there has been a partial remodeling of the existing method of public administration, but it is limited mainly to formal changes necessary for functioning in inter- and supra-national organizations. On the one hand, this should be connected with the direct impact of formal top-down Europeanization, but on the other hand with the greater awareness of citizens, their experiences acquired from Western European countries and their active attempts to make impact on decision-making processes. Based on the latter, currently the public governance standards, mainly at the local level, consider various mechanisms stimulate the participation of citizens in exercising power and influencing decisions. Among the tools of participation that have become popular in recent years in Poland include:
- establishing formal working teams, e.g.: steering groups in the preparation of strategic documents, such as development strategies or local development programs, groups involved in monitoring the implementation of strategies and programs and public benefit activity councils whose main role is issuing opinions on legal acts;
- the establishment of social dialogue committees in order to solve a specific problem, appointing housing councils, youth city councils and senior councils, – all bodies composed of people from end-users groups;

- the appointment and functioning of proxies dealing with a specific group or social problem, e.g. the Plenipotentiary for National Minorities or the Plenipotentiary for Students;
- organizing social research or street debates, during which residents can comment on, for example, the importance of opening hours of kindergartens;
- providing websites with an online forum for social consultations; actions involving residents in the process of planning, implementing and monitoring public policies, gathering their opinions, remarks, observations and proposals; and
- using the tool called participatory budget, i.e. gathering projects from the residents concerning investment proposals and the selection of these proposals (by voting) which will be implemented in the nearest future from local government funds.

However, all the above-mentioned activities don't making it into the mainstream of institutional arrangements and are rather a part of the reactive participation model. They rely on taking back actions by civic circles in response to specific acts of public decision-making centers (for example, through institutionalized activities such as undertaking procedures for lobbying activities or through non-institutionalized ones by initiating various forms of direct action). At the same time, one can observe an increasing awareness of the discrepancy between the existing practices and the model of desired active participation, which results from the greater subjectivity and increased expectations of the citizen in modern society and, consequently, pressure to control the activities of the public administration (Bartoszewicz et al. 2014). This is an expression of the growing need for civic subjectivity, among others growing out of suspicion of the efficiency and effectiveness of the state. In this case, forms of participation are the answer to the existence of specific social needs, specific interests and aspirations of individuals and collectives, and they can be an element of co-creation (ibidem). Participation understood in this way may be equated with a certain ideal in which one sees the "third way" of a welfare state, where the state's responsibility for public affairs is limited and the need to share this responsibility with citizens and their organizations is increasingly recognized (Sześciło 2015c). In this approach, it can be assumed that co-creation means the joint provision of public services by the public administration and citizens (who are also end-users of services) in a non-commercial manner and on a partner basis. In contrast to other forms of public service systems, co-creation places more emphasis on solidarity and activation of citizens (supporting public value), which distinguishes it in particular to a market model focused on maximizing the efficiency and quality of services provided (Sześciło 2015b).

The hitherto practice of participation in Poland is criticized in the context of social and ethical consequences. The growing group of skeptics of participation see that the institutionalization of participatory practices (their instrumentalization, professionalization and bureaucratization) can lead to a crises of citizenship, and hence the opposite effects than intended (Wiktorska-Święcka, Kozak 2014). The currently dominating model of participation is associated with unpaid work, which largely comprises the exoneration of officials and politicians, and with social emphasis on participation in certain previously created institutional forms: the recommendation of participation in public life, inviting citizens to participation and instruction on how to implement it.

The above method of institutionalizing participation in Poland verifies the optimistic assumptions that it may be a leavening of the concept of co-creation of services and its implementation into the practice of public governance. According to the assumptions of

the co-creation concept, participation is an indispensable element of partnership cooperation between the public sector and citizens in the process of providing public services (Pestoff 2012). Only then it contributes to the increase in the final value of these services in a manner disproportionate to the size of the contribution of both parties. This is especially important for communities with limited resources, because it increases their productivity and allows them to achieve greater dynamics of development at the same expenditure. Beneficial effects are also brought by the direct involvement of citizens in the process of producing public services because it implies the creation of public value (*Together for Better Public Services* 2011). It is a significant measure of the quality and effectiveness of actions taken by public administration, as it requires government involvement with legitimacy to act on behalf of citizens, not only from cyclical elections, but also from consultations between stakeholders.

Thus, co-creation practices, understood as the "innovative approaches to providing services based on a partnership formed by governments with citizens, service users and civil society organizations" (*Together for Better Public Services* 2011), seem to not be widely used so far. However, several years after Poland's accession to the European Union, the first empirical findings regarding the practice of co-creation of public services at the local level have appeared. In this respect, two categories of services are distinguished: of a universal nature (e.g. in the field of public transport, garbage collection and rest and in the field of recreation, which provides parks, squares, playgrounds), and selective ones, that is, those services which satisfy someone's specific needs, important for an individual's life situation (life phase) or individual preferences (e.g. services provided by public nurseries, kindergartens, schools, cultural centers and libraries, social welfare centers and sports and recreation centers) (Kaźmierczak 2012).

When examining the practice of co-creating public services at the local level, Kaźmierczak (2012) searched for the answer to the question about the dominant model of citizens in this process. He referred to one of the most cited approaches in Western European literature: the concept formulated by Pestoff, who, among others, formulated conditions for the institutionalization of public services and the role of their beneficiaries. However, one has to consider, that Kaźmierczak refers to no general dominant co-creation model adopted in the Western European research but rather to one among many other models in literature, which indicates how co-creation may be facilitated under certain conditions. From this perspective, the author delivers both the theoretical argument about conditions for co-creation in the domestic environment and a source of an original theoretical argument **(Table 1).**

Table 1. The conditions for the institutionalization of public services and the role of their beneficiaries

	Institutional conditions do not facilitate co-creation	**Institutional conditions facilitate co-creation**
Great importance attributed to public service	Active consumer	Active co-creator
Small importance attributed to public service	Passive consumer	Participant *ad hoc*

Source: Pestoff 2012.

The study of Kaźmierczak shows that collected empirical data supports Pestoff's perspective: the involvement (also no involvement or spontaneous involvement) of end-users into delivery of co-created public services is related both to conditions for the institutionalization of public services and individual needs and motivations.

Table 2. Residents of communes declaring to perform particular roles towards communal service institutions by type of services

Selected public services at the local level	The role of end-user					
	informed	engaged	engaged (protest)	consulting	co-planning	planning
	No co-creation	Co-creation				
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local public transport	26,1	4,4	0,6	1,0	0,0	0,0
Garbage collection	15,8	4,4	1,2	14,8	2,7	1,2
Parks, squares, playgrounds	9,7	4,0	4,0	5,7	2,5	3,0
Health center, clinic	31,7	9,3	2,6	4,0	0,9	0,5
Public school	40,4	17,3	4,3	20,0	10,3	2,9
Public kindergarten or nursery	43,1	22,0	6,6	27,5	22,0	5,6
Cultural center / public library	44,1	13,1	2,6	5,6	7,5	4,5
Social welfare center / social welfare institution	67,4	25,1	21,8	20,5	3,5	2,9
Center of sport and recreation	61,8	19,0	0,0	18,3	13,3	7,1

Source: Kaźmierczak 2012.

The results of empirical research (**Table 2**) prove that the use of public services of a general nature does not motivate co-creation at the local level. This is not the case for services falling into the category of selective services, which means that citizens are more willing to engage in co-creating services when it is personally more important. Nevertheless, one should mention the services which are of a small importance attributed to the public service (engaged, engaged in protest actions or consulted) and contribute to *ad-hoc* participation (public kindergarten or nursery, social welfare center orinstitution).

Kaźmierczak (2012) also notices that, apart from variables characterizing the community and institutional conditions and the meanings attributed to the service individually, the characteristics of individuals also influence the undertaking of co-production practices. This profile consists of the following features: high social position; high level of social capital and support; positive assessment of the communal self-government; readiness to fulfill chosen functions in self-government bodies; conviction about the influence of resi-

dents on its activities and that the inhabitants themselves are able to organize themselves to solve their own problems; regular participation in religious practices; and a positive emotional attitude to their own community. Making a link with the approach of Pestoff, Kaźmierczak (2012) proves a small importance attributed to the public service based on a passive attitude (being informed). This doesn't directly support co-creation and is the most selected end-user's role.

Also among institutional conditions which facilitate co-creation, one should mention those which are of a small importance attributed to the public service (engaged, engaged in protest actions or consulted) and contribute to *ad-hoc* participation. This is still a minority when one considers institutional conditions which facilitate co-creation of a great importance attributed to the public service (co-planning, planning). In this sense, end-users as active co-creators are still not a dominant model. Moreover, one can rather observe an individual co-creation, which concerns a one-to-one relationship between the user and the provider than group co-creation, which means that a group of users is co-designing and co-delivering public services. The collective co-production, where the population served is encouraged to participate in value co-creation in order to improve the ability of the public sector organizations to effectively meet users' explicit needs, has been not proved so far.

Summing up the current practice of co-creating public services in Poland, it can be considered that it still oscillates from the traditional model of bureaucracy. Openness to public participation by public authorities is relatively small. It boils down to informing and educating with the preservation of the imbalance of entities. In principle, the ability to influence citizens on decisions is limited. Listening to them is treated as participation. The residents themselves join the process more willingly if they see the opportunity in the action to guarantee the satisfaction of their individual needs. So far, there are still no practical examples indicating the partnership of various entities in the co-creation of public services. In this context, the claim that political co-creation debate mirrors a traditional bureaucratic approach to service delivery needs more empirical support. Moreover, the analysis of current domestic institutional arrangements do not necessarily reflect the lack of co-creation in institutional practices. Concepts differ from their practical implementation, and the authors, mentioned by Gawłowski (2018) also refer to some participatory practices introduced in Polish context. However, they do not reflect the conceptual assumptions of co-creation as an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process. To do so, as pointed out by Podgórniak-Krzykacz (2015), the following issues will be of key importance: a) involvement and trust between inhabitants and local administration, b) the attitude of officials who may be open to new initiatives and actions of the inhabitants or to treat them problematically, c) the tradition of co-operation between partners and d) organizational and managerial factors related to the decentralization of tasks to the level of auxiliary units, organizational and substantive support for the submitted initiatives and the reduction of administrative barriers.

The housing policy in Poland with particular emphasis on elderly people and the concept of co-creation

The aging population is the subject of research by many demographers and economists in Poland and abroad. However, while observing these tendencies, one can state relatively poor achievements referring to housing issues for elderly people. Additionally, one wonders the general lack of literature on the domestic housing policy, especially in the context of seniors. The assessment of the objectives, tools, effectiveness and efficiency of domestic housing programs related to housing policy in Poland developed after 2014 is based on the assumption that the housing situation of Poles is one of the most difficult in Europe (Bielak-Zasadzka, Kucharczyk-Brus 2017). While the number of documents and studies on the importance of housing for the development of the country and the very importance of homestead for the well-being of every human being is quite impressive, the empirical dimension of housing policy leaves much to be desired (Muzioł-Węcławowicz 2015). Additionally, it has been shown that the housing issues of seniors have rarely been the subject of comprehensive research in Poland, unlike in the US, which have much greater achievements in research on the housing needs of the elderly population that can be described as pioneering solutions for residential development for seniors (Groeger 2016, cit. for: Pytel 2014). In Poland, the first research on the housing policy issues of elderly people was only carried out at the turn of the 21st century. There are comprehensive discussions on the topic, whereas several researchers explain the basic terminology and indicate the factors that influence the aging process, based on many examples from Poland as well as other countries (Groeger, Szczerek 2016).

An inseparable element of academic statements related to housing issues is a reference to contemporary demographic trends, a more or less deepened analysis of an aging society not only in the perspective of Poland, but on a global scale as well. Demographic forecasts indicate that the number of senior households will grow rapidly. The real estate market conditions and changing demographic situations in Poland are also being analyzed, with a focus on housing policy in Poland and a particular emphasis on elderly people (Kłusek 2016). Current housing opportunities for seniors (excluding private real estate, independent households and households shared with children) can be classified under three types: institutional, social, market-oriented housing (Jancz 2016). In the public, social and free market sectors there are various arrangements and models as well as a wide range of functional and architectural housing and seniors products. Three basic groups of "senioral-residential products" have been distinguished: "independent" apartments, "services" for mature seniors that offer support, such household help and immediate health care, and "care" dwellings. Attention is being paid to the role of the public sector, whereas concepts of protected and assisted housing for elderly people, provided by local governments, are being evaluated (Giezek, Iwański 2017).

Meanwhile, senior housing is in Poland a new sector that raises the topic for discussion, especially in the context of conditions for the development of construction, its form, legal regulations, financing and locations of such facilities (ibidem). Senior housing is the idea of independent housing for seniors with servicing, or access to care services (Brzeski et al. 2015). This type of residential building is also technically adapted for living by elderly people. In this context, attention is also paid to various arrangements: traditional apartments, dedicated services, co-housing flats and protected flats, all showing that local government

plays a key role in this respect (Błędowski et al. 2017; Gradzik 2017). One should also mentioned that senior housing has great development potential but still requires early support of the public sector (Brzeski et al. 2014). It is assumed that the task of the government and local governments is to play a greater role in creating conditions for securing seniors' housing, matching existing resources to seniors needs and introducing innovative solutions that would allow them to live in dignified housing conditions (Kłobukowska 2014). The subject of housing is supplemented by the diagnosis of its present situation in Warsaw and Połaniec (Baran 2016), Warsaw's Bielany (Boruta 2017), Tychy (Rojek-Adamek 2016), Szczecin (Gieze, Iwański 2017) and Poznań (Jancz 2016).

From this perspective, it should be noted that, in the design of multi-family residential buildings as a part of senior housing, the possibility of creating small integrated groups of inhabitants – an important factor affecting social integration – is still underestimated. Institutional arrangements implemented by now are rather conductive to disintegration. Thus, one recommends to create buildings that integrate elderly people with other age groups, instead of establishing housing arrangements which are exclusively designed for the elderly. It is estimated that only 1% of seniors would like to live in such compounds (Baran 2016). On the basis of demographic analyzes, researchers emphasize that institutions dealing with the supply of flats in the investment process should take into account the housing needs of the elderly (Bielak-Zasadzka 2016). It is worth noting that the potential possibilities of applying solutions in the field of gerontechnology in housing for seniors are also considered. The basic assumptions of the "silver economy" as well as approximate basic functionalities and the possibility of using products in the field of gerontechnology in housing is discussed (Boruta 2017). A general characteristic of the "silver economy" concept in the context of the implementation of the active aging policy is presented (Klimczuk 2016).

Thus, a comprehensive study regarding the prospects for the development of senior housing in Poland points out key challenges and contradictions in the subject of seniors accommodation. The attention is drawn to the growing role and scope of senior housing on a global scale as well as in Poland. In this context, the housing support instruments that are used in EU countries are enumerated (Groeger 2016). The importance of social housing in selected EU countries (taking into account and securing the needs of seniors, including dependent persons) is indicated. When choosing a form of housing, financial resources play a decisive role, which are considerably limited in the case of a typical Polish pensioner. Another important fact is the relatively lean offer of the forms of housing addressed to seniors and the low number of such offerings on the market. It is caused by economic reasons and the lack of a modern standard that takes into account, along with the regulations and standards, a full range of needs and expectations of seniors in relation to the living environment (Pytel 2014). The conclusion is that substandard solutions offered by some institutional branches should be changed and adapted to European standards as soon as possible (Bielak-Zasadzka 2016). To sum up, after evaluating the most discussed arguments on the institutional conditions in domestic practice, one can observe that the topic related to the idea of co-creation of senior (social) housing, is not present in the mainstream of the housing policy debate in Poland so far.

Co-creation of public services at the urban level in the context of the senior housing policy in Wrocław

Wrocław, one of the oldest and biggest cities in Poland, is the capital of Lower Silesia, a region in the western part of the country, bordering Germany and the Czech Republic. It is an important cultural centre, a religious centre of many confessions, a city of universities, cultural institutions, including museums and theaters, as well as cultural events. It is also a major centre of economic development. The city occupies an important place in recent Polish history, too: it is associated of the Orange Alternative movement, which contributed to the change of the political system in Poland. Wrocław is the place where the activities of the Solidarity movement began, which influenced the democratization of Poland and Europe. The city is proud of its multiculturalism, but has to demonstrate it in the everyday life. Although, in recent years, Wrocław has seen a very rapid economic growth, today it faces many challenges, including dealing with the impact of rapid but unsustainable progress.

Relating to this, when constructing the analytical framework, the focus is on institutional documents which refer to the housing policy at the urban level in Wrocław, senioral policy and other key documents on local development (horizontal and sectoral strategies). On the basis of a brief review of institutional practice in Wrocław, the author decided to verify the extent to which there are present issues of a) co-creation of public services, b) senior policy including housing and c) local housing policy that takes into account the needs of seniors. In order to explore the issues, a report was used developed by the Ombudsman as part of the work of the European Commission for the Elderly. This report, created in 2017, presents key areas of the system of support for seniors in their residential environment. The importance of shaping a habitable environment that is friendly for the elderly has been here emphasized. Selected international documents in which this idea is reflected (among others, in UN Resolution 46/91, which defines the Principles of Action for the Elderly, and the revised European Social Charter of 1996, where the Council of Europe emphasizes the need to provide housing adapted to the needs and health conditions of elderly people or to ensure adequate adaptation of housing) and recommendations for the support for elderly people are also presented (Szatur-Jaworska et al. 2017).

In the report "System wsparcia osób starszych w środowisku zamieszkania. Propozycja modelu oraz wyniki badania antydyskryminacyjnego" ("Support system for older people in the living environment. Model proposal and results of anti-discrimination research"), the authors created an integrated system of activities that should be undertaken at the local level in order to holistically and optimally guarantee the possibility of securing the housing needs of older residents in such a way as to guarantee the highest quality of life and not to secure – as it is understood in institutional practice in the Polish support system – the social minimum. The highest quality of life for seniors according to the authors of this report consists of:
- health;
- social care;
- security in the residential environment;
- education;
- housing (Szatur-Jaworska, Błędowski 2017).

The report doesn't refer directly to the concept of co-creation. It supports, however, innovative arrangements, like partnerships within housing activities, considered as an active involvement of end-users in various stages of the production process (ibidem). From this point of view, this approach is very close to the adopted analytical framework and can be supportive when evaluating co-creation of public services at the urban level in the context of the senior housing policy in Wrocław. Referring to this, several research questions were raised. One focused here on variables able to describe the essence of the participation of end-users (co-creation) and the political context (urban governance).

The essence of the participation of end-users' related questions considered the following aspects:

- Are there, if any, objectives of co-creation with citizens? If yes, what are they and what are the relevant types of co-creation in the public sector? (This variable should measure assumptions and goals as well as groups of existing approaches relating to the concept of co-creation at the urban level in the context of senior housing policy.)
- What should be the outcomes of co-creation processes with citizens? (This variable should measure results of co-creation of public services at the urban level.)

The political context-related questions consider the following aspects:

- What are the urban policies and social investments tools offered by the local government? (This variable will measure whether the local government of Wrocław is proactive in recognizing senior housing and co-creation problems.)
- What is the orientation towards individual responsibility and empowerment? (This variable should indicate how local policies adapt to differences in the population through measures to individualize services, and how far social policies diverge from old schemes of resource scattering.)
- What is the attitude towards socially innovative arrangements with particular attention given to end-user orientation considering senior housing and co-creation? (This variable should measure openness of the local government of Wrocław towards new arrangements which consider individual responsiveness in the process of public service delivery.)
- What is co-decision logics of local welfare-state institutions (participation in networks of stakeholders)? (This variable should measure the co-operation with urban stakeholders in the production of senior housing policy and co-creation of senior housing.)
- What is the pro-active approach towards involvement of end-users in the production of senior housing policy and co-creation of senior housing?

While trying to answer the questions above, this author made use of the institutional method, which enabled critical analysis of acquired source materials, supported by the analysis of the current literature of the subject. The local policies for the elderly were explored both from the co-creation perspective and areas of support. The results of the above areas review in key development documents of Wrocław are presented in the **Table 3.**

Table 3. Overview of key development documents of Wrocław in the context of co-creating public services for senior housing

Areas of support for the elderly	Development policies of Wrocław	
	Housing policy	Policy for the elderly
Economic security	No data (ND)	Wrocław 2030 Strategy
Health	ND	Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018
Social care	ND	Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018
Security in the residential environment	ND	Wrocław 2030 Strategy Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018 Wrocław Mobility Policy
Leisure	ND	Wrocław 2030 Strategy Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018
Education	Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018	Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018
Housing	Wrocław 2030 Strategy Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018	Wrocław 2030 Strategy Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018

Source: Based on: Wrocław 2030 Strategy Principles of socio-economic policy for 2018 [Założenia polityki społeczno-gospodarczej na 2018 rok] (http://wrosystem.um.wroc.pl/beta_4/webdisk/192216/0934ru07z.pdf), Wrocław Mobility Policy [Wrocławska Polityka Mobilności] (http://bip.um.wroc.pl/artykul/631/22375/wroclawska-polityka-mobilnosci), Wrocław Education Strategy [Wrocławska Strategia Edukacyjna] (http://wrosystem.um.wroc.pl/beta_4/webdisk/179742/0271ru07.pdf) (Accessed: January 23, 2019).

Generally, one can observe that the concept of co-creation refers only to a few selected aspects of public services at the urban level. The housing policy seems to not be a priority for the local administration. Also, when one considers senior housing policy, one should emphasize the lack of its co-creative element.

Thus, as a next step, to evaluate the social senior housing policy at the urban level, we confronted the senior policy model developed by the Polish Ombudsman with the local practice in Wrocław. This model was based on Western European experience and previous institutional practice and was adopted into the domestic debate due to the lack of integrated approach toward senior policy in Poland. For analytical reasons, this author checked the presence of this senior policy model in the key strategy "Wrocław Strategy 2013". Results are presented in **Tables 4–10:**

Tables 4–10. Areas of support for the elderly in the current development strategy of Wrocław 'Wrocław Strategy 2030'

Detailed goals of social support in the area of economic security:
- protection and improvement of the financial situation of the elderly,
- promoting and supporting economic activity of seniors and their economic independence;

Table 4. Social support in the area of **ECONOMIC SAFETY**

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities / strategic documents	Human resources
Priority 4. Creative and innovative economy related to science: Prosperous city – Leveling the chances on the labor market (sustainable employment). City that unites – Using innovations in shaping the city's spatial structure. Supporting green economy and models of shared economy (p. 23).	**Employment**	Sharing economy and the promotion of sustainable employment.	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
No data (ND)	**Income**	ND	ND	ND
Priority 4. Creative and innovative economy related to science: Prosperous city – Leveling the chances on the labor market (sustainable employment). City that unites – Using innovations in shaping the city's spatial structure. Supporting green economy and models of shared economy (p. 23).	**Information and support activities**	Sharing economy and the promotion of sustainable employment.	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities

Detailed objectives of social support in the area of health:
- promotion of healthy aging;
- counteracting premature aging;
- counteracting or delaying the occurrence of dependence;
- actions for the functioning in the current living environment of the elderly;

Table 5. Social support in the area of **HEALTH**

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
Priority 5. Healthy and active residents: Support actions aimed at extending the life of Wrocław residents in good health.	**Prevention and health promotion**	No specification in 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy' beyond the indication in Priority 5 to support actions aimed at extending the life of Wrocław residents in good health.	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
ND	**Medical and social support for people with cognitive impairment**	No data (ND)	ND	ND
ND	Geriatric and **rehabilitation** care	ND	ND	ND

Detailed objectives of social support in the area of care:
- supporting the elderly at their place of residence,
- optimal selection of type and mode of care for the needs of the elderly,
- supporting informal carers of the elderly;

Table 6. Social support in the area of **CARE**

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
ND	**Organization of daily forms of care**	No data (ND)	ND	ND
ND	**Care services**	ND	ND	ND
ND	**Support for family (and other informal) carers**	ND	ND	ND
ND	**Leisure bank – a volunteer center**	ND	ND	ND
ND	**Provision of rehabilitation and medical equipment**	ND	ND	ND
Priority 3. Entrepreneurship – City that unites – Implementation of social clauses in the work commissioned by Wrocław City Hall. Support for the development of clusters (p. 42) **Priority 7. Governance:** Prosperous city – Implementation of special instruments for managing the areas and topics selected for economic reasons (examples: economic dimension of revitalization, local clusters, routes and shopping squares).	**Cluster of services for the elderly**	Social clauses in public procurement, support for local clusters	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław Strategy 2030'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities

Detailed objectives of social support in the area of safety in the place of residence:
- improvement of the safety level of elderly people in their living environment;
- shaping the habits and behaviours of the elderly favouring their personal safety;

Table 7. Social support in the area of **SECURITY IN THE PLACE OF RESIDENCE**

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
Priority 5. Healthy and active residents Smart city – Making life in the city easier for people with disabilities […] Removing architectural barriers for people with limited mobility (p. 44).	**An integrated system of supporting the safety of the elderly**	Removal of barriers (including the architectural ones), universal design. (The Municipality of Wrocław has undergone the monitoring of the observance of provisions of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the report will be prepared in autumn 2018)	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
Priority 2. Quality of the environment and urban space. City that unites – Increasing security in public areas. Creating local public spaces (squares) Develop circular economy Applying the principles of the so-called universal design in public spaces. **Taking care of the availability of public spaces for everyone** **- especially for the elderly,** people with disabilities, and children. Promoting and supporting space sharing. Promoting and supporting the lifestyle without car ownership, including housing zones without cars (car-sharing only). Increasing security of public areas. **Offering a variety of residential styles (p. 41).**	**Prevention of adverse phenomena through appropriate shaping of public space**	Circular economy, sharing, e.g. car-sharing, space sharing, offering various styles of residence	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
Priority 1. Mobility. City that unites – Eliminating the transport exclusion of peripheral settlements. Treating public transport as mobile public space. Consulting transport solutions with residents. Creating, promoting and supporting shared zones. Developing shared transport systems. (p.39) **Priority 2. Quality of the environment and urban space.** City that unites – Increasing security of public areas (p. 41)	**Safe transport**	Shared transport services, co-creation of transport service	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
ND	**Stimulation and inclusion of the elderly in activities for the safety in local communities**	ND	ND	ND
ND	**Information and support activities**	ND	ND	ND

Detailed goals of social support in the field of leisure:
- maintaining or triggering the activity of the elderly,
- counteracting the social alienation of elder residents,
- making use of the elderly human and social capital.

Table 8. Social support in the area of **LEISURE**

Policy area	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
Priority 6. Open city: Smart city – Increasing the access to public services and raising their standards. Comprehensive inclusion into the city life of the excluded people. Adjusting urban policies to demographic changes.	**Cultural activities**	No specification	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities

Policy area	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
Priority 6. Open city: Smart city – Increasing the access to public services and raising their standards. Comprehensive inclusion into the city life of the excluded people. Adjusting urban policies to demographic changes. **Priority 7. Governance** Increasing the residents' share in city management, including through the development and implementation of the Wrocław participation strategy (p. 46).	**Social activities**	No specification	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
Priority 5. Healthy and active residents Smart city – Making life in the city easier for people with disabilities. Creating the zones of active leisure – especially those helping to shape the ecological and health awareness. (p.44) **Priority 6. Open city:** Smart city – Increasing the access to public services and raising their standards. Comprehensive inclusion into the city life of the excluded people. Adjusting urban policies to demographic changes (p.45).	**Tourist and recreational activities**	No specification	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
Priority 5. Healthy and active residents Smart city – Making life in the city easier for people with disabilities. Creating the zones of active leisure – especially those helping to shape the ecological and health awareness. (p.44) **Priority 6. Open city:** Smart city – Increasing the access to public services and raising their standards. Comprehensive inclusion into the city life of the excluded people. Adjusting urban policies to demographic changes (p.45).	**Physical activities**	No specification	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities

Detailed goals in the area of education:

- providing all intellectually fit elderly people – regardless of their state of physical health and level of education – the opportunity of participating in education;
- maintaining existing competences and supporting the new ones, both in the area of so-called hard and soft skills;
- supporting lifelong learning.

Table 9. Social support in the area of **EDUCATION**

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
People capable to function independently (needing less support)				
ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
People incapable to function independently (needing more support)				
ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

Detailed goals in the area of housing:

- adaptation of housing conditions to the diverse needs of elderly people, enabling them to stay in their own habitat as long as possible;
- providing modern technologies to facilitate independent living and supporting the informal carers.

Table 10. Social support in the area of **HOUSING**

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
Priority 6. Open city: Smart city – Increasing the access to public services and raising their standards. Comprehensive inclusion into the city life of the excluded people. Adjusting urban policies to demographic changes. Supporting the development of the rental market, including Economic Social Housing construction. [...] A city that unites – Developing and implementing a housing policy that promotes forms of financing, organizing and investing in the area of housing other than real estate development. Supporting the creation of safe housing spaces, without fencing them. **Supporting investments that make life easier for the elderly** (p.45).	**Traditional homes of the elderly**	Economic Social Housing (TBS) / housing development for rental / development of urban housing policy	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities

Policy aims	Area	Instruments (services, ways of acting)	Responsible entities	Human resources
ND	**Serviced housing**	ND	ND	ND
Priority 6. Open city: Smart city – Increasing the access to public services and raising their standards. Comprehensive inclusion into the city life of the excluded people. Adjusting urban policies to demographic changes. Supporting the development of the rental market, including Economic Social Housing construction. [...] A city that unites – Developing and implementing a housing policy that promotes forms of financing, organizing and investing in the area of housing other than real estate development. Supporting the creation of safe housing spaces, without fencing them. **Supporting investments that make life easier for the elderly.** (p.45)	**Co-housing**	Economic Social Housing / housing development for rental / development of urban housing policy	Municipality of Wrocław: 'Wrocław 2030 Strategy'	The strategy does not indicate the implementers / coordinators of activities
ND	**Protected housing**	ND	ND	ND
ND	**Spatial information system**	ND	ND	ND
ND	**Innovative information and technology solutions**	ND	ND	ND

Source: Own elaboration based on (https://www.wroclaw.pl/rozmawia/strategia/Strategia_2030_2str.pdf) (Accessed: January 23, 2019).

On the basis of the analyses of the collected data one can state as follows:
- there is no integrated approach to address the needs of seniors at the urban level in the context of Wrocław's development strategy;
- the system offered is related to passive social policy model;
- it doesn't consider co-creation as a new paradigm of service delivery at the urban level;
- considering the elderly people approach, there is a social integration formula, which is related to leisure;
- the housing of seniors is not a priority of the senior oriented actions performed by the Municipality of Wrocław;
- if there are some housing-related actions mentioned, they don't match the model developed by the Polish Ombudsman in general and are limited to support offered to alone and social excluded seniors;

- only four aspects related to seniors are being mentioned in Wrocław's development strategy. However, they are rather general;
- in different departments and at different levels of the management structure of the Municipality of Wrocław, there are individuals or small units in charge to coordinate separate aspect which can be associated with the senior policy. However, they often don't see each other and don't cooperate and the integrated policy has been not coordinated at the decision-maker's level so far.

Conclusion

There are several ways to define the co-creation of public services. Overall, one can distinguish four different approaches to this concept. According to them, one can mention: a) co-commissioning or involving citizens in service reviews and planning; b) co-design, which offers a structured approach to harnessing the best ideas from the people who will ultimately use and deliver the service; c) co-delivery, where the citizens and the public sector work together to deliver services and improve outcomes; and d) co-assessment, which involves citizens working with the professionals and managers to provide feedback on services and support received (Boviard, Löffler 2016).

A brief review of the scientific literature and institutional practice shows that the concept of co-creation of public services in Poland in this broad meaning has been not the paradigm in the public governance yet. A relatively small number of studies published after 2014 indicates a recent growing debate in this area. Also, the institutional practice in the field of co-creation remains at the initial stage of development. Moreover, there are only a few examples of institutional arrangements in such a specialized area as senior social housing policy at the local level. On the one hand, this is connected with the lack of a common understanding of what co-creation means, how senior, housing and/or senior housing policies should be defined, and on the other one to the traditional bureaucracy model, which does not stimulate the integration of specific needs of older citizens with housing issues. Admittedly, normative positions on new opportunities in the modernization of the public sector appear more and more often in Polish scientific literature, and co-creation sees an attractive alternative to activities undertaken only within the market and the state (Sześciło 2015b). Hence, one argues that the issue of co-creation of public services has to be analyzed against the background of their specific contexts. With other words, co-creation of public services at the urban level is the outcome of a political process and as such a reflection of city-specific (welfare) cultures and local governance arrangements. However, urban governance arrangements are not simply a set of rules imposed by local politicians and government officials; instead, they are the outcome of complex coalition-building processes through which core values are framed, and in which multiple stakeholders are involved. That is the reason, why in the paper the urban level governance arrangements in Wrocław related to the concept of co-creation of senior housing policy were considered in a detailed way. And if the findings of the analyses present a gap between the concept of co-creation and the current institutional arrangements, one hopes that these city-specific settings create both opportunity structures and constraints for new ideas and concepts which develop into locally embedded innovations.

References

Adamczyk D. (2009), *Starzenie się społeczeństwa polskiego wyzwaniem dla zrównoważonego rozwoju.* [in:] Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej, No, 106, 105–113.

Arundel A., Casali L., Hollanders H. (2015), *How European public sector agencies innovate: The use of bottom-up, policy-dependent and knowledge-scanning innovation methods.* [in:] Research Policy, No. 44, 1271–1282.

Austen A. (2016), *Kapitał społeczny w procesie współtworzenia usług publicznych.* [in:] Zarządzanie i Finanse, Journal of Management and Finance, 14, No. 3/1, 223–238.

Awdziej M., Krzyżanowska M., Tkaczyk J. (2016), *Przegląd koncepcji współtworzenia wartości.* [in:] Handel Wewnętrzny, 3/362, 16–26.

Bąkowska-Morawska U. (2015), *Analiza doboru partnerów w kreowaniu usług poprzez wykorzystanie map grup strategicznych.* [in:] Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu. Research Papers of Wrocław University of Economics, No. 375, 114–126.

Baran A. (2016), *Budownictwo senioralne – nowe wyzwanie w rozwoju mieszkalnictwa.* [in:] *Rozwój budownictwa mieszkaniowego i usług społecznych w nowym Studium uwarunkowań i kierunków zagospodarowania przestrzennego.* Towarzystwo Urbanistów Polskich. Warszawa, 74–87.

Bartoszewicz A., Herbst J., Ostrowski Ł., Starzyk K., Wygnański J.J. (2014), *Od diagnozy do strategii.* Urząd miasta stołecznego Warszawy i Pracownia Badań i Innowacji Społecznych "Stocznia". Warszawa.

Bason C. (2010), *Leading public sector innovation.* Policy Press, Bristol.

Bielak-Zasadzka M., Kucharczyk-Brus B. (2017*), Obraz zasobu mieszkalnego w Polsce i relacje demograficzne.* [in:] Polityka Senioralna, No. 3, 71–78.

Błędowski P., Szatur-Jaworska B., Szweda-Lewandowska Z., Zrałek M. (2017), *Wsparcie społeczne w wybranych obszarach* (the part of the chapter: *Modele wsparcia społecznego osób starszych w środowisku zamieszkania*). [in:] Szatur-Jaworska B., Błędowski P. (eds.), *System wsparcia osób starszych w środowisku zamieszkania. Propozycja modelu oraz wyniki badania antydyskryminacyjnego.* Biuro Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich, Warszawa, 13–14.

Boruta M. (2017), *Gerontechnologia jako narzędzie w procesie zaspokajania potrzeb mieszkaniowych seniorów.* [in:] Progress in Economic Sciences, No. 4, 25–36.

Boviard T., Löffler E. (2012), *From Engagement to Co-Production. How Users and Communities Contribute to Public Service.* [in:] Pestoff V., Brandsen T., Verschuere B. (eds.) *New Public Governance, the Third Sector and Co-Production*, Routledge.

Boviard T., Löffler E. (eds.) (2016), *Public Management and Governance.* Routledge, New York.

Brandsen T., Pestoff V. (2006), *Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services.* [in:] Public Management Review, 8(4), 493–501.

Brzeski W., Kirejczyk K., Kozłowski E. (2014), *Perspektywy rozwoju budownictwa senioralnego w Polsce Obecne i przyszłe problemy związane z zapewnieniem lepszych mieszkań dla polskich seniorów.* REAS. Warszawa.

European Commission (2013), *Evidence on Demographic and Social Trends, Social Policies' Contribution to Inclusion, Employment and the Economy.* SWD, 38 final.

European Social Network (2015), *Public social services in crisis: challenges and responses From 2008–2014: a response from ESN members.* available at: http://www.esn-eu.org/userfiles/Documents/2015/2015_Public_Social_Services_in_Crisis_report_-_FINAL.pdf (23.01.2019).

Gawłowski R. (2018), *Co-Production of Public Services in Terms of the Polish Experience.* [in:] Polish Political Science Yearbook, No. 47(1), 110–120, DOI: dx.doi.org/10.15804/ppsy2018108.

Gerometta J., Häussermann H., Longo G. (2005), *Social innovation and civil society in urban governance: Strategies for an inclusive city.* [in:] Urban Studies, 42(11), 2007–2021.

Giezek M., Iwański R. (2017), *Mieszkania chronione i wspomagane* dla osób starszych w ujęciu społeczno-ekonomicznym. [in:] Handel Wewnętrzny, I, No. 4(369), 287–296.

Gradzik B. (2017), *Mieszkalnictwo senioralne a możliwości finansowe seniora.* [in:] Społeczeństwo i Ekonomia, No. 2(8), 71–82.

Groeger L., (2016), *Programy wspierania budownictwa mieszkaniowego w Polsce i ich wpływ na rynek nieruchomości mieszkaniowych.* [in:] Masierek E. (ed.), *Uwarunkowania polityki mieszkaniowej w Polsce i na Ukrainie. The determinants of housing policy in Poland and Ukraine,* "Space – Society – Economy", 18, Institute of the Built Environment and Spatial Policy. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. Łódź, 131–146.

Groeger L., Szczerek A. (2016), *Mieszkalnictwo ludzi starych. Housing of the old people.* [in:] Janiszewska A. (ed.), *Jakość życia ludzi starych – wybrane problemy.* "Space – Society – Economy", 14, Department of Population and Services Studies. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź, 187–211.

Hausner J., Jessop B., Mazur S. (2016), *Governance. Wybór tekstów klasycznych.* Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.

Jancz A. (2016), *Potrzeby mieszkaniowe osób starszych i ich opinie na temat budownictwa senioralnego.* [in:] Studia i Prace WNEiZ US, No. 44/2, 305–316.

Kazepov Y. (2005), *Cities of Europe: Changing contexts, local arrangements and the challenge to urban cohesion.* [in:] Kazepov Y. (ed.), *Cities of Europe. Changing contexts, local arrangements and the challenge to urban cohesion.* Blackwell, Oxford, 3–42.

Kaźmierczak T. (2012), *Udział mieszkańców w zarządzaniu gminnymi usługami publicznymi.* [in:] Olech A. (ed.) *Dyktat czy uczestnictwo? Diagnoza partycypacji społecznej w Polsce.* Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Warszawa.

Kaźmierczak T. (2014), *Koprodukcja usług publicznych (koncepcja, badania, rola w świadczeniu usług adresowanych do osób wykluczonych społecznie, warunki upowszechnienia).* Expertise prepared within the Project "EAPN Poland – we create common Social Europe" co-financed by Switzerland within the Swiss Programme, implemented in 2013–2014.

Kelly G., Mulgan, G., Muers S. (2002), *Creating Public Value: An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform.* Discussion paper prepared by the Cabinet Office Strategy Unit, United Kingdom.

Klimczuk A. (2016), *Modele "srebrnej gospodarki" w Unii Europejskiej w ujęciu porównawczym. Próba wprowadzenia do dyskusji.* [in:] Problemy Zarządzania, 14, No. 2 (59), 41–59.

Kłobukowska J. (2014), *Polityka mieszkaniowa wobec starzenia się społeczeństw – podstawowe wyzwania.* ŚN–WOREJ, No. 89, 35–40.

Kłusek M. (2016), *Directions of development of the real estate market in the context of demographic changes in Poland.* [in:] World Scientific News, No. 51, 26–35.

Kobylińska U. (2015), *Innowacje w administracji publicznej w Polsce na poziomie samorządu lokalnego.* [in:] Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Research Papers of Wrocław University of Economics, No. 402, 142–151.

Matusek M. (2015), *Współtworzenie wartości z klientem – systematyczny przegląd literatury.* [in:] Zarządzanie organizacjami, No. 10, 5–11.

Mazur S. (2015), *Współzarządzanie publiczne.* Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.

Muzioł-Węcławowicz A. (2015), *Problemy mieszkaniowe Polaków a polska polityka mieszkaniowa.* [in:] Salamon M., Muzioł-Węcławowicz A. (eds.), *Mieszkalnictwo w Polsce. Analiza wybranych obszarów polityki mieszkaniowej.* Habitat for Humanity Poland, Warszawa, 13–90.

Osborne S.P, Radnor Z., Strokosch K. (2016), *Co-production and the co-creation of value in public services: a suitable case for treatment?* [in:] Public Management Review, No. 18(5), 639–653.

Pestoff V. (2012), *Co-Production and the Third Sector Social Services in Europe. Some Crucial Conceptual Issues.* [in:] Pestoff V., Brandsen T., Verschuere B. (eds.) *New Public Governance, the Third Sector and Co-Production,* Routledge.

Podgórniak-Krzykacz A. (2015). *Co-production for local public services – a case study of the cooperative Hallendad Norten-Hardenberg.* [in:] Zarządzanie Publiczne, No. 2(30), 165–178.

Prahalad C. K., Ramaswamy V. (2000), *Co-opting customer competence.* [in:] Harvard Business Review, 78(1), 79–90.

Pytel S. (2014), *Osiedla mieszkaniowe dla seniorów w przestrzeni miast. Housing estate for senior citizen in the urban space.* [in:] Prace Komisji Krajobrazu Kulturowego, No. 25, 155–165.

Rojek-Adamek P. (2016), *Miasta i społeczności przyjazne seniorom – działania lokalne w międzynarodowej skali.* [in:] Herudzińska M. H., Błaszczak I. (eds.), *Znane i nieznane oblicza starości jako obszar wyzwań dla społeczeństw XXI wieku. Known and unknown faces of the old age as an area of challenges for twenty-first century societies.* Wydawnictwo SGGW, Warszawa, 202–215.

Stobiecka J. (2016), *Współtworzenie wartości w usługach publicznych z perspektywy logiki dominacji usługowej.* [in:] Studia i Prace Wydziału Nauk Ekonomicznych i Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, No. 44/2, 294–303.

Szatur-Jaworska B., Zrałek M. (2017), *Założenia aksjologiczne modelu wsparcia środowiskowego osób starszych – przegląd dokumentów międzynarodowych* (the part of the chapter: *Modele wsparcia społecznego osób starszych w środowisku zamieszkania*). [in:] Szatur-Jaworska B., Błędowski P. (eds.), *System wsparcia osób starszych w środowisku zamieszkania. Propozycja modelu oraz wyniki badania antydyskryminacyjnego.* Biuro Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich, Warszawa, 14–21.

Sześciło D. (2015a), *Koprodukcja a ekonomia społeczna. Alternatywa rozłączna czy komplementarność?* [in:] Ekonomia Społeczna, No. 1, 79–87.

Sześciło D. (2015b), *Samoobsługowe państwo dobrobytu. Czy obywatelska koprodukcja uratuje państwo dobrobytu?* Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar. Warszawa.

Sześciło D. (2015c), *Współzarządzanie a usługi publiczne.* [in:] Mazur S. (ed.), *Współzarządzanie publiczne*, Warszawa, 285–302.

Sześciło D. (2015d), *Współzarządzanie jako koprodukcja usług publicznych.* [in:] Zarządzanie Publiczne, No. 1(31), 13–21.

Together for Better Public Services: Partnering with Citizens and Civil Society (2011), OECD, Paris.

Trutkowski C. (ed.) (2016), *Realizacja usług publicznych w jednostkach samorządu terytorialnego – ograniczenia, możliwości,* rekomendacje. Fundacja Rozwoju Demokracji Lokalnej. Warszawa.

Verschuere B., Brandsen T., Pestoff, V. (2012), *Co-production: The state of the art in research and the future agenda.* [in:] VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, No. 23, 1083–1101.

Voorberg W., Bekkers V., Tummers L. (2013), *Co-creation and Co-production in Social Innovation: A Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda*. Proceedings of the EGPA Conference.

Voorberg W.H., Bekkers V.J.J.M., Tummers L.G. (2015), *A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey.* [in:] Public Management Review, 17(9), 1333–1357.

Wiktorska-Święcka A., Kozak K. (2014), *Partycypacja publiczna w zarządzaniu rozwojem lokalnym.* Oficyna Wydawnicza ATUT, Wrocław.

Internet sources:

http://bip.um.wroc.pl/artykul/631/22375/wroclawska-polityka-mobilnosci   (Accessed: January 23, 2019).

http://wrosystem.um.wroc.pl/beta_4/webdisk/179742/0271ru07.pdf (Accessed: January 23, 2019).

http://wrosystem.um.wroc.pl/beta_4/webdisk/192216/0934ru07z.pdf (Accessed: January 23, 2019).

https://www.wroclaw.pl/rozmawia/strategia/Strategia_2030_2str.pdf (Accessed: January 23, 2019).