

SOCIAL ECONOMY IN GIURGIU COUNTY

*Filip ALEXANDRESCU**

Abstract: The article presents the main forms of social economy in Giurgiu County, their social impact and the prospects of the social economy in this county. The offer of social economy, in the narrow meaning of the term, is limited strictly to the cooperative sector: craftsmen cooperatives and consumption cooperatives. The mutual aid units on the pensioners are another form of social organisations which are much more inclusive regarding the disfavoured groups. There is local demand for the social enterprises, particularly in the rural area which is confronted with the lack of jobs and of local services, accessible and personalised. A large void in the social economy offer is due to the poor development of the non-governmental organisations in Giurgiu County. The seven associations and foundations that were identified provide services of social work which are badly needed, but no other non-governmental organisation has been established with the purpose to join social protection with the economic activity. The causes of this state of underdevelopment are multiple, but they are certainly connected to the low level of economic development of the county.

Keywords: social economy, unemployment, disfavoured social group, Roma, European funds, social assistance.

Brief profile of Giurgiu County

Giurgiu is a county from South-Muntenia Region, with a population of 284,501 (1 July 2006), of which 31% lives in Giurgiu Municipality and in the towns of Bolintin Vale and Mihăilești (Statistical Yearbook 2007). In terms of GDP per capita, Giurgiu is one of the poorest 5 counties in Romania, both in 2005, and in 2008¹. Between 2000 and

* He is researcher at the Institute for Research on Quality of Life, email: filip.alexand@gmail.com

¹ <http://khris.ro/index.php/10/2009/cum-se-manifesta-criza-economica-la-nivelul-judetelor/>.

2006 the proportion of Giurgiu County GDP within the GDP of South-Muntenia Region oscillated between 5.9 and 7.6% and displayed a decreasing trend after 2004¹.

According to the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture Giurgiu (CCI), the main economic branch in Giurgiu County is the agriculture (and, associated to it, the food industry). According to the data of the Directorate of Statistics, in 2007, 53% of the occupied population worked in agriculture, game and forestry. This branch of the economy is much smaller than it was before 1990. CCI president speaks about the disappearance of many units of agricultural production (farms of dairy cows, sheep, greenhouses, canned food factory). For instance, currently there is just one Romanian-Dutch farm at Naipu and several other smaller ones (20-30 cattle). Regarding the factories, currently there is a factory of meat products, one of wheat flour and a small oil producing factory. However, none of them is owned by cooperatives. Actually, according to CCI president, the cooperatives don't play an important role in the economy of the county, neither in agriculture, nor in other fields.

This situation is in contrast with the period before 1990, when the cooperatives had an intense economic activity and earned substantial incomes. CCI president mentions the powerful food trade with Bulgaria. Furthermore, the cooperatives had workshops (tailoring, hairdressing, etc.) supplying services that were important to the inhabitants of Giurgiu County. Compared to the period before 1990, the activity of the cooperatives decreased by more than 90%, according to CCI president estimates.

The general situation of the people in social risk seeking jobs in Giurgiu County is described, at a first level, by the number and rate of the unemployment. At the end of October 2009, the number of the unemployed in the county was 6,421 people (of which 3,580 receiving unemployment benefit, and 2841 with no benefit), and the unemployment rate, slightly lower than the national average, was 7%. Unfortunately, AJOFM Giurgiu didn't supply the requested data, which would have offered a more detailed image on the situation of the people running social risks.

Support programs for the disfavoured groups (focusing on women and on the Roma population)

The main suppliers of social services in Giurgiu County are both private and public institutions. The public institutions are the General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection (DGASPC) Giurgiu (with 20 territorial centres), the social assistance compartments of three local councils (communes of Bucşani, Gogoşari

¹ Database: INS Tempo-online. (<https://statistici.insse.ro/shop/index.jsp?page=tempo3&lang=ro&ind=CON103CC>).

and Mogoșești) and Giurgiu penitentiary, which provides psycho-social assistance and education. Of these institutions supplying social assistance, only the latter one delivers activities that might fit to a broader definition of the social economy. More precisely, equipment for furniture production was bought within a project with PHARE funds. The inmates are working in the penitentiary, they benefit of training courses through AJOFM, and their products are sold (DeC, DGASPC Giurgiu). Also, the inmates from Giurgiu penitentiary painted icons which were sold and the money was used to paint part of the chapel from the penitentiary. DGASPC has several protected centres where people with various disabilities are involved in productive activities, but these units are seen as belonging strictly to the occupational therapy, with no implications for the social economy (DaC, DGASPC). Except for these special situations, the social economy activities are absent among the public suppliers of social services.

The private suppliers of social services in Giurgiu County include four associations and three foundations (some also have branches in the territory) which supply services for children or adult people in difficulty (for instance, for the people or families with HIV/AIDS problems or for the women/children confronted with situations of abuse). All the private organisations are specialised in social assistance, but none of them has economic activities producing income. From this point of view, the non-governmental sector is completely absent from the social economy offer of Giurgiu County.

Through a project of the National Agency for the Roma, centres of social economy have been established in every region of development, as of January 2009. For the South-Muntenia Region, this centre is located in Călărași, and the coordinator is from Giurgiu. Although the main target-group consists of the Roma people, the activity of the centre is not limited to this group (IR, DAS Giurgiu town hall). One of the identified problems, to which the centre for social economy is to find a solution, is the access of Roma women to the labour market.

On the basis of the few data supplied by AJOFM Giurgiu, the employment activity focuses mainly on the commercial companies. On the other hand, according to one AJOFM representative, the cooperatives are not among the main employers of the people seeking a job. AJOFM cooperates with some NGOs, but not for the jobs that the latter might offer. These NGOs just gather information about the people running social risks and seeking a job.

Profile of the social economy offer in Giurgiu County

The offer of social economy, in the narrow meaning of the term, is limited strictly to the cooperative sector. In Giurgiu County there are craftsmen cooperatives and consumption cooperatives. According to BNR (National Bank of Romania) registry of

the credit institutions, in Giurgiu there are no credit cooperatives. In the past there have been credit cooperatives, but they are no longer operating at this time. For instance, in Vedea commune there has been such cooperative until few years ago, but it closed down. The subsequent discussion will focus on the craftsmen and consumption cooperatives from Giurgiu County.

Crafts en cooperatives

All three craftsmen cooperative societies (SCM) from the county („Dunărea”, „Munca” and „Sârghița”) are located in Giurgiu Municipality and they are UCECOM members. There is no county SCM association of union, the three cooperatives being affiliated directly to UCECOM. SCM „Munca” and „Dunărea” are small cooperatives (with 20 and 32 members, respectively), while SCM „Sârghița” has 85 members.

The field of activity of SCM „Dunărea” Giurgiu is the manufacture of garments and the supply of garments services (for women and men, and lingerie). SCM „Sârghița” delivers personal services of hairdressing, hair stylist, manicure, and pedicure and also runs a windows workshop (thermal pane windows). Both SCM units lost part of their membership from 1990 until now and decreased from 585 members to 85, while „Dunărea” from 465 to 32 de members.

Asked how they evaluate the general economic situation of the cooperatives, the leaders of „Dunărea” and „Sârghița” spoke of “survival”. This term characterizes their economic strategy, a conservative strategy: both SCMs aim to survive economically because they are not interested to take credits and they try not to make debts. The future seems bleak, both representatives of the craftsmen cooperatives speaking of a continuous decline over the next years (“When you will be of my age, the cooperatives will be just memory”, president of „Sârghița”). This pessimistic image is stressed by the description of the “lost glory” of the cooperatives before 1990, when they were strong (as membership), influential (by the many contracts they had) and wealthy (by the areas they owned). For instance, the president of „Sârghița” remembers that before 1990, their cooperative also had mass production, cooperating with „Tractorul” Brașov, manufacturing gaskets for „Roman”, seals for „Dacia Pitești” etc.

The president of „Dunărea” said that the present situation is very poor because there is no market for the products. Given the invasion of cheap, poor quality Turkish clothing, the people don't order their clothes at the cooperatives, where the prices are higher (hand-work etc.). A possible cause of the decline also was the closedown of „Dunăreana” garment factory and of the garments high school which it had established. The apprentices for SCM „Dunărea” were recruited from the graduates of this high school, but lately, nobody was interested to become an apprentice in

tailoring. So, on the long-term, the cooperative membership can only decrease because the working force cannot be refreshed.

On the other hand, both „Sârghița”, and „Dunărea” managed to avoid the fast dissolution after 1990, which affected other cooperatives (mainly the consumption cooperatives – *authors note*). The president of „Sârghița” said that „Sârghița” didn’t sell its patrimony and this is one of the reasons it managed to stay alive, which is maybe true for SCM „Dunărea” too. Furthermore, only those craftsmen cooperatives which adapted to the shrinkage of the productive sector and to the expansion of the service sector after 1990, managed to survive.

The development perspectives of the two cooperatives are very limited even from the point of view of the foreign funds. Their presidents said that they didn’t take credits (for instance, from the county fund which guarantees the credits taken by the SMEs). The access to credits presumes eligibility criteria which they don’t meet (they must provide co-financing). Also, although the presidents of both SCM know of the European funds in support of the social economy, they didn’t apply for them.

The relation of each SCM from Giurgiu with UCECOM is satisfactory. „Dunărea” uses the advisory services of UCECOM, but just for guidance, not for guidance and control. From this point of view, the collaboration is good. „Sârghița” too has a good collaboration with UCECOM, which the president sees as their “enclave” which provides some kind of mutual help (between the individual SCMs), however, increasingly less lately. The president of „Sârghița” said that in the old times there was a close collaboration, but now the situation is quite the opposite: “if one cooperative doesn’t have work, how can it give (work) to another one?”

In terms of the logistic resources for the cooperatives, other than those supplied by UCECOM, the president of the Chamber of Commerce (CCI) Giurgiu admits that they don’t supply services to the cooperatives. Sometimes they send requests for offer, but CCI president thinks that they are no longer able to respond as they should because they lost the material basis (areas etc.) which they had before 1989.

None of the craftsmen cooperatives has branches in the county, although „Sârghița” used to have branches in all the counties of Romania. SCM „Dunărea” has 9 working points, all in Giurgiu Municipality. Each working point includes a reception centre where the persons in charge work and a workshop where the workers work.

Consumption cooperatives (CPADM)

The consumption cooperatives are organised at the county level; individual cooperatives exist in Giurgiu Municipality and in Vedea and Bolintin communes, under the denomination of Cooperatives of Production, Purchase and Sales of Goods (CPADM). We will subsequently discuss the situation of the consumption

cooperative from Vedeia. Before 1990, this cooperative had 19 shops (4 in Slobozia, 4 in Malu, 6 in Vedeia, 1 in Cetățuia and 4 in Găujani). Presently, it only has two, in Vedeia. In parallel with this decrease of activity, CPADM Vedeia developed a parasitic relationship with the commune to which it belongs.

According to the mayor of Vedeia, the buildings where this cooperative works have been built with the collective effort of the community, to which the town hall, the former CAP and IAS and the villagers contributed with physical work. After 1990, the competition and the free market have eroded the economic basis of these associations pushing them to bankruptcy. Officially, SPADM Vedeia has 40 members, and as employees it has one accountant, a president and three sales persons. The future is uncertain, though, because this consumption cooperative has large debts to the state and to the town hall, some overdue for several years. On the other hand, the ownership papers for the building are lost and some people managed to own to CPADM built areas. By renting, these beneficiaries make income by using some goods which, at origin, were public goods, belonging to the community of Vedeia.

The mayor of Vedeia says that he tried to cut short these actions, but he had no success so far. His interest, which he stated in a determined manner, is to make a project by which the built areas owned by CPADM are to be turned into a commercial complex (hairdresser, shoemaker, etc.) and which to make money – from productive activities – for the community. For instance, as the mayor explained, some company might want to start a tailoring shop with 20 jobs, for the beginning. Then, in one year or so, the enterprise would develop and create more jobs. It is interesting that the mayor speaks more of a “firm” than of a cooperative, which to conduct economic activities to the benefit of the community. This undifferentiated perception regarding the form of organisation of the local economic revival (social enterprise or private firm) will be discussed at length in the next section.

Perception of the social economy

Two of DGASPC representatives have heard of the social economy, as specific term (one at a master in public administration and the other one at a master in social assistance, Bucharest University). One of them defined the social economy/enterprise as a “centre for reintegration through occupational therapy, some beneficiaries of the unit work and finished product result, which are then sold”. However, after detailed questions, both DGASPC representatives said that in Giurgiu County there are no such centres.

The other respondents also understand the concept according to the institutional culture to which they belong. For instance, for the president of SCM „Dunărea” it is obvious that their activity belongs to the social economy, because their members have a job and are not in poverty or don’t have to go “in the street to steal or to rob

people". With this meaning, the social economy looks rather like a precarious and dissolving refuge struggling against unemployment. For the president of SCM „Dunărea” the process of dissolution is somehow unavoidable because nobody is interested any more to practice the petty professions. “What parent gives his child to become a tailor? Everybody wants to be somebody, right? Cooperation was a system of refuge of the people who didn’t learn.” This conclusion is significant for the observation that social economy tends to be seen as a bar to hang to not to fall, rather than a lever helping you to rise economically.

The president of CCI Giurgiu told us that the social economy “must be an economy which develops for the population, for the social part, for the development of people’s welfare”. The respondent displays a tendency to understand by it some social assistance (in different forms), rather than an economic activity with a social purpose. When he speaks of the economic activities from the county, he seems to favour the individual initiative and the competition. About the old cooperatives who managed to survive, he says that they are particular entities and that it all depends on the “particular manner of organisation”. Thus, CCI president notices a paradox: the cooperatives decayed after 1990, although they “could develop very well after 1990 because nobody stopped them. They had the entire material basis, which could be put to work. At that time, nobody had own specialised shops.” The cause for this state of the things is pursuing the individual interest, so that the cooperatives that survived tried to get as much as possible from the goods of the old cooperatives and make a profit from selling them. Although he didn’t say it explicitly, CCI president hints towards a rather high lack of confidence in the cooperatives. Furthermore, he sees the cooperatives as being in competition with the individual initiatives and doesn’t give those many odds to win.

Although he doesn’t seem familiarised with the term, the mayor of Vedea commune looks very interested to develop the local industry by small workshops (during the interview he mentioned hairdresser, tailoring, shoemaker, wood processing, ironsmith etc.). It is interesting that the mayor presents this initiative before being asked about cooperatives, suggesting a personal concern for the revival of the local economy. The workshops he mentioned might be developed in built areas owned by the town hall. Their advantage is that they make money for the local budget and create jobs. For instance, he tells us how he used the local workforce to repair the commune school, spending just 6,000 lei, instead of 60-70,000, as he figured it must have cost using external workforce. Asked whether these centres should be developed by the cooperatives, or by individual investors, the mayor responded that he has no preference, “important is, that who has the initiative.” Asked in detail, the mayor supports the idea of the cooperatives as possible operators of these workshops, adding that the cooperatives might have lower prices and better quality. However, speaking of the present situation, the mayor of Vedea criticised the

consumption cooperative (Consumcoop), which developed a parasitic relationship with the rest of the community (see above).

Although he didn't link explicitly the initiative of the "small workshops" of the integration of the disadvantaged groups, the mayor and a former local counsellor (former teacher and one of the prominent representatives of the commune) seem to be outstandingly progressive in the matter of the minorities. Speaking of the efficient integration of the Roma, they propose to encourage them to settle among the Romanian ethnics. They both said that they have heard no Romanian complaining that Roma people moved in close to them.

Generally, for the mayor and for the former counsellor from Vedeia, the inter human relations from Vedeia improved compared to the situation after 1990, when there have been many conflicts when the land was returned to the people. There seems to be now willingness among the villagers to help their families and to help each other. Furthermore, it seems there is emulation with positive effects among the commune villagers regarding the improvement of their socioeconomic status.

Reverting to the local premises for the development of a social economy, it is self evident the fact that in Vedeia there is no agricultural cooperative, just four agricultural societies and an individual one. The memory of the former CAP is not uniformly positive, and probably this is one of the reasons why the villagers preferred agricultural societies rather than agricultural cooperatives. If the mayor will succeed to develop the commercial centre he wants, it would probably be a private individual initiative, rather than a cooperative one. Of the six projects which the mayor promoted recently¹, none is intended to encourage the social enterprises. The obstacles in the way of social economy initiatives seem to be rather complex.

Impact/results of the social economy

The direct employees of the craftsmen cooperative societies are also the main beneficiaries. However, there are no more than 140 such cooperative members in the entire county. Before 1990 and probably immediately after 1990, „Sârghița” Giurgiu had 20 workers with disabilities (3.5% of the 585 members), including unsighted and persons with locomotive or hearing deficiencies. They were mainly producing brooms, brushes and baskets and seemingly they had some tax deductions. After 1990, these deductions were cancelled and given the massive

¹ These are: an environmental project for the park near the town hall, expansion of the water supply and a water treatment plant, a type-1 arena (for 500 people) with foreign funds (European funds), endowment of the house of culture, closed garbage platforms – tender to pick up the garbage from each house, and improvement of the road infrastructure for the secondary roads.

reduction of the membership, the participation of the people with disabilities decreased to zero¹.

From the point of view of the socioeconomically disfavoured groups (people with low education/skills), the craftsmen cooperatives, as productive units using people skilled in various professions, was not in a favourable position to employ them.

The indirect benefits of the cooperatives for the broader community are rather low. On the side of the consumers, the temporary president of SCM „Dunărea” considers that their activity has indirect benefits for those inhabitants of Giurgiu who prefer ordered clothing. On the other hand, both „Dunărea”, and „Sârghița” do not organise social, cultural or educational activities.

Social impact of the pensioner houses of mutual aid (CARP) ■■■

Although they are not in agreement with a stricter definition of the social economy², the pensioner houses of mutual aid are more inclusive for the disfavoured groups. For instance, CARP Giurgiu has a significantly higher membership than the craftsmen cooperatives (14,000). Each year about 2,000 pensioners join in. In order to facilitate and increase the access of the pensioners, CARP accepts as members people who still have up to five years to retirement. CARP Giurgiu also functions as county association of the CARP units, because it has members throughout the county (for instance, in Vedea commune there are several hundred members of Giurgiu CARP). Furthermore, this CARP has branches in Bolintin Vale and Ulmi.

In terms of the social protection of the disfavoured groups, CARP seems to be in a much better position to provide help than the cooperatives. For instance, CARP Giurgiu provides occasional aids, of 100-150 lei, function of the degree of sickness or of the social state of the pensioner in need. The decision is taken by CARP counsellors who make an inquest according to which the council of administration approves the financial aid. The aid is larger for incurable diseases. Also the loans up to 300 lei, most often demanded by the pensioners on low pensions, are free of interest.

The Giurgiu County Pensioners Union (with 5,000 members) also provides a function of social protection of the elder. The donations and sponsorships obtained by the union (most times from the local and county council and from the prefecture) are offered to the poorest pensioners under the form of food aid. Additionally, by an intense lobby they succeeded to obtain free public transportation for the pensioners of Giurgiu town.

¹ The information is not sure, because we didn't ask whether they still have members with disabilities, but it is very probable.

² Particularly because it has no income-providing activities outside the interests to the loans and because the decision-making process is not democratic.

From the standpoint of the social economy, CARP Giurgiu had an attempt to organise a business from selling coffins, but because of the poor quality of the products (which they were buying from a producer) they lost money and gave up. The president of CARP Giurgiu considers that it is difficult to organise income-making activities (a hairdressing shop, for instance) because there will be problems of control of the employees of the enterprise etc. They also intended to start a "health shop" but, according to CARP president, "it is no longer necessary because they all have family doctor."

Even though he sees difficulties in the development of some social economy organisations within the CARP, the president said that many pensioners, particularly former craftsmen, do private work to earn additional money. There is, thus potential for economic activities, but at this time, these opportunities are used rather individually than within a cooperative framework.

Forms of support for the social economy organisations

The cooperation of the social economy entity (the cooperatives particularly) with the local or county authorities seems to be very low in Giurgiu County. Actually, the only relation with the local institutions which the presidents of „Dunărea” and „Sârghița” mentioned is their quality of clients of these SCMs. For „Dunărea”, the interaction was positive, meaning that they had orders for garments, thus contracts and income. On the other hand, the president of „Sârghița” said that the local authorities of Giurgiu, when they needed a thermal pan window to be installed, they asked the private companies, not the cooperative. He added: "they support is null, not to say more."

Although Law no. 1/2005 (art. 106) stipulates the support of the public authorities for the cooperatives (facilitate the access of the cooperatives to the counselling services), this support didn't materialize for the three SCMs from Giurgiu County. The situation is much more surprising as the same law recognises as important the "improvement of the economic performance [of the cooperatives] and of the capacity to create jobs and generate incomes" (art. 106).

Social economy legislation

The effects of Law no. 1/2005 seem to have been insignificant for the two craftsmen cooperatives, „Dunărea” and „Sârghița”, meaning that nothing changed compared to the previous legislation. The president of „Sârghița” speaks in negative terms about the large expenditure by the "tenth of millions" which the smallest SCM had to pay during the process of registration with the Commerce Registry, according to the new law (1/2005).

On the other hand, from the formulation of Law no. 1/2005, it is obvious that the Romanian state only assumes a reactive role in relation with the cooperatives: “The Romanian state supports the development of the cooperative societies, irrespective of the level and form, and of the associative forms, to which it guarantees the autonomy, independence and a *treatment which is no less favourable than the treatment of other economic agents*” (Law no. 1/2005, art. 195, our highlighting).

Perspectives of the social economy

There seem to be potential demand for the social economy organisations in Giurgiu County, but it is improbable that the offer will appear spontaneously. Those doing the small crafts (mostly are pensioners) would probably benefit from a cooperative form of organisation, which to protect them and which to increase their opportunities to conduct income-generating activities. On the long-term, within the context of the drastic decrease of the demand for small crafts, these cooperatives seem not to have a future. The only activities for which there will still be long-term demand are the delivery of personal services (hairdresser, hair stylist etc.). At the same time, these social enterprises will have to cope with the competition of the private firms.

Demand for social enterprises exist both at the local level in the rural areas which are confronted with the lack of jobs and with the lack of local services, accessible or “personalized”. In this case, like in the case of the delivery of services, it is not clear whether and to what extent the cooperatives will prove to be more viable than the commercial societies.

In a very limited measure, there actually is potential offer of social economy (outside the offer of the current cooperatives). The occupational therapy activities organised by DGASPC might be transformed into productive activities. Unfortunately, the idea of a “third sector” (between the public and the private sectors) doesn’t seem to be familiar within the institutional environment from Giurgiu County.

A large gap in the offer of social economy is given by the lack of the NGO sector in Giurgiu County. The seven associations and foundations run a very necessary social assistance activity but, unfortunately, no NGO has been established with the purpose to join social protection with the economic activity. The causes of this state of underdevelopment are multiple, but they are certainly related to the low level of economic development of Giurgiu County.

As a preliminary conclusion, the only institutions which are able to initiate forms of social economy are the local authorities and the private firms. The first ones might be able to draw foreign funds for the development of small cooperatives in the rural localities. The private companies, on the other hand, might be encouraged to develop their CSR projects towards the support for productive activities having a component of redistribution of the obtained income.

Appendix 1
Data regarding the field research

Period	4 – 6 and 12 November 2009 [phone interview]
Locations	Giurgiu County (Giurgiu Municipality and Vedea commune)
Interviewed institutions (through their representatives):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chamber of Commerce and Industry Giurgiu, <i>president</i> – General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection Giurgiu, <i>economic director and two DGASPC employees</i> – National Agency for Employment Giurgiu, <i>officer from communication department</i> [very limited information] – Directorate for Social Assistance, Giurgiu town hall, <i>officer from the department of strategy and public relations</i> – Craftsmen Cooperative Society "Dunărea", <i>temporary president</i> – Craftsmen Cooperative Society „Sârquința”, <i>president</i> – CARP – Pensioner House of Mutual Aid Giurgiu, <i>president</i> – Pensioner Union, <i>president</i> – Town hall of Vedea commune, <i>the mayor and a former local counsellor</i>

Appendix 2

List of the public and private suppliers of social services in Giurgiu County

(Data source: http://sas.mmssf.ro/servicii_furnizori.php?judet=giurgiu)

Public suppliers:

1. General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection

Specialised service, at county level, running the following units:

- Family-type house "Mihaela" (mental handicap, psychic handicap, neuromotor handicap, abandonment, family problems), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type house "Andrei" (mental handicap, psychic handicap, neuromotor handicap, abandonment, family problems), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type house "Ioana" (mental handicap, psychic handicap, neuromotor handicap, abandonment, family problems), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Centre for Neuropsychological Recovery and Rehabilitation - Cărpenișu (mental handicap, psychic handicap), Găiseni commune, Giurgiu County.
- Complex of Social Services - Bolintin Vale, Centre for Care and Assistance (mental handicap, psychic handicap), Bolintin Vale, Giurgiu County.
- Complex of Social Services - Bolintin Vale, Centre for Neuropsychological Recovery and Rehabilitation (mental handicap, psychic handicap) Bolintin Vale, Giurgiu County.
- Home for the Elder - Mironești (old age, neglect, and family problems), Goștinari commune, Giurgiu County.
- Family-type house "Casa mea" (family problems, abandonment), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Residential-type care services (separation from parents, family problems, abuse (violence) and neglect, psychic handicap, neuromotor handicap), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type care services (risk of separation from parents, separation from parents, family problems, handicap, abandonment, abuse (violence) and neglect), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Compartment for the complex evaluation of the handicapped children (handicap, HIV/AIDS), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Compartment for the evaluation of children committing offences, but who cannot be penal liable, Giurgiu Municipality.

- Family-type house "Casa albastră" (family problems, abandonment), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type house "Gabriela" (mental handicap, psychic handicap, family problems, abandonment), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type house "Elena" (mental handicap, psychic handicap, family problems, abandonment), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Day care centre "Soarele" (family problems, risk of separation from parents), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Day care centre "Luceafărul" (family problems, risk of separation from parents), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Centre for Recovery and Discontinuation (handicap, neuromotor handicap), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type house "Sfântul Ioan" (family problems, abandonment), Giurgiu Municipality.
- Family-type house "Casa noastră" (family problems, abandonment), Giurgiu Municipality.

2. Centre for Medical-Social Assistance Mogoșești

- Unit for medical-social assistance (for old people or for the adults having a chronic disease, abandoned, in social isolation or having other difficult situations), Adunații Copăceni commune, Giurgiu County

3. Local Council – Gogoșari commune

- Compartment for social assistance (family problems, poverty, social emergency, risk of separation from the parents, other difficult situations), Gogoșari commune, Giurgiu County.

4. Giurgiu penitentiary

- Service of psycho-social assistance and education (for the delinquents), Giurgiu Municipality.

5. Local Council – Bucșani commune

- Compartment for social assistance (family problems, poverty, social emergency, risk of separation from the parents, other difficult situations), Bucșani commune, Giurgiu County.

Private suppliers:

6. Association „Letca Nouă” (association)

“Grădina Maicii Domnului” shelter:

- Centre for emergency reception for situation of family violence, Letca Nouă commune, Giurgiu County.
 - Maternal centre, Letca Nouă commune, Giurgiu County.
 - Centre with family module, Letca Nouă commune, Giurgiu County.
 - Protected house (for the homeless), Letca Nouă commune, Giurgiu County.
7. „Use Your Chance” (association)
- Family-type centre (care, education, socialization and emotional support for the independent life of the children, including those with mild disabilities, in the family-type house „Speranța”), Giurgiu Municipality.
8. Association „Licurici” (association)
- Social assistance for the children and young people infected with HIV/AIDS, living with their families, Giurgiu Municipality.
9. „Viața și Speranța 2003” (association)
- Voluntary activities of social assistance for the children and young people infected with HIV/AIDS, living with their families, Giurgiu Municipality.
10. „Bambini in Emergenza” (foundation)
- "Andreia" house (HIV/SIDA, risk of separation from the parents), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.
 - "Lorenzo" house (HIV/SIDA), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.
 - "Carol" house (HIV/SIDA, risk of separation from the parents), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.
 - "Sfântul Francisc" house (HIV/SIDA), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.
 - Centre for emergency reception „Îngerul păzitor" house (repatriation), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.
 - Social apartment (HIV/SIDA), Giurgiu Municipality.
 - Family-type assistance and care with AMP - "Sfânta Clara" house (abandoned children), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.
11. „Bethel” (foundation):
- Family-type centre (difficult situations in the family, abandonment, other difficult situations), Giurgiu Municipality.
12. „Sfânta Maria” (foundation)
- Family-type centre (HIV/SIDA, abandonment), Singureni commune, Giurgiu County.