PUBLIC POLICIES FOR ROMA
Mariea Ionescu, Simona Maria Stănescu
2014
Assessment report of national programs financed by European Union for Roma inclusion
The volume was elaborated within the project „Efficient programs for the active integration/inclusion of the Roma people in South-Eastern Europe”. Priority axis: „The development of the transnational synergies for supporting the sustainable growth areas, financed by the European Commission through the transnational program South-East Europe

The authors thank for comments on previous versions to:
Nora TELLER, Hungarian Maltese Charity Service, Hungary
Laszló Maltai MORAVCSIK, Hungarian Maltese Charity Service, Hungary
The thematic experts from PAIRS countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Italy, Republic of Serbia, and Hungary

The content of this report does not necessarily represent the official position of the Hungarian Maltese Charity Service and of the National Agency for Roma, Romanian Government.
PUBLIC POLICIES FOR ROMA
Coordonator al colecției
ȘTIINTE PSIHO-SOCIALE: Mihaela Tomiță

Copyright © 2014, Editura Pro Universitaria

Toate drepturile asupra prezentei ediții aparțin Editurii Pro Universitaria

Nicio parte din acest volum nu poate fi copiată fără acordul scris al Editurii Pro Universitaria

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României
IONESCU, MARIEA

Public policies for Roma / Mariea Ionescu, Simona

Maria Stănescu. - București : Pro Universitaria, 2014
Bibliogr.
ISBN 978-606-26-0022-8

I. Stănescu, Simona Maria

323.1(=214.58)(498)
36(=214.58)(498)
ABOUT AUTHORS

Mariea IONESCU is a law graduate and holds a PhD in Sociology, is a civil servant currently holding the position of advisor in the National Agency for Roma. She has extensive experience in public administration, the management of institutions and non-governmental organizations, community development, project management, human rights, national and European public policies.

From 1992 to 2000 she worked for various non-governmental organizations as a human rights activist. She is a founding member of “Împreună” Agency for Community Development. She contributed to the development of Government Decision 137/2000 on the prevention and sanctioning of all forms of discrimination, later enacted in Law 48/2002. As an expert mandated by the Roma community, she helped draft the Government Strategy for improving the condition of the Roma, enforced as Government Decision 430/2001, and has made a valuable contribution to the development of public policies aimed at the Roma in Romania.

Mariea was the coordinator of the Office for Roma Victims of Deportation to Transnistria and consultant of the Association for the Defense of Human Rights (APADO) Braşov. She is currently a board member of various associations and foundations, such as Soros Foundation Romania and ACCEPT. Other organisations that she has worked with include: the Ecumenical Association of Churches in Romania– AIDRom, RROMANI CRISS Roma Center for Social Intervention and Studies, Aven Amentza, the Roma Party, the Roma Ethnic Community of Romania, Save the Children, CRCR, the Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center in Cluj-Napoca, European Roma Rights Center – Budapest, Co-Operating Dutch Funds – The Netherlands, Spolu International – The Netherlands etc.

Between 2001 and 2005, as a civil servant with the National Office for the Roma, she acted as head of the Project Implementation Unit in charge of the implementation of programs targeting the Roma; in this capacity she
monitored and assessed the provision of technical assistance. She was appointed president of the newly-established National Agency for the Roma, and she held this office (the equivalent of a secretary of state) from 2005 to 2007.

Mariea has authored and coordinated a significant number of books, studies and articles on community development processes, social development, Roma access to the labour market and Roma inclusion. She was a member of teams working on various research reports on the condition of the Roma in Romania, relations between the Roma and public authorities and institutions, relations between the Roma and the police, instances of violence between the Roma and the majority population, and the situation of women.

Her distinguished service was recognised by the National Agency for the Roma (2007), “Împreună” Agency (2011), the Roma Civil Alliance of Romania (2005). In 2005, VIP magazine awarded her a special prize for “Sangre Ardiente”, a cultural event created by Liza Panait and directed by Beatrice Rancea. In 2007 she received a prize from VIP and Amfiteatru magazines for fighting discrimination. In 2010 she was awarded a diploma of excellence by Catalactica Association for Social and Economic Development and Promotion.

Simona Maria STĂNESCU is a senior researcher within the Research Institute for Quality of Life, Romanian Academy. Simona is a sociologist and attended courses at Master and PhD level in Sweden and Denmark. Simona holds a PhD in sociology from the Faculty of Sociology and Social Assistance, Bucharest University, Romania with a thesis focusing on current challenges of the welfare state.

Simona is the chief editor of Social Innovation on-line Journal (http://www.inovatiasociala.ro) coordinated by the Research Institute for Quality of Life.

Simona coordinated national and international interdisciplinary research teams. Her main research interests include: welfare state, institution building in the social field, social policy, human rights, vulnerable groups, accession process to the European Union, and social economy.
Selected coordinated books: Romanian’s Accession to the European Union: impact on the Romanian Welfare State (coordinator 2004); Encyclopedia of Social Development (co-coordinator 2007); Social Inclusion Policies during the Economic Crisis Period (co-coordinator 2010); Research Report on Social Economy in Romania from a Comparative European Perspective (coordinator 2010); Legal and Equal on Labour Market for Roma Communities: a Diagnosis of Factors Influencing Employment of the Roma Population in Romania (co-coordinator 2010); Solidarity, a new source of economic power: best practices in social economy (co-coordinator 2011); Profit for People – opening report within the project The Model of Social Economy in Romania (coordinator 2012); An Inclusive Labour Market in Rural Areas: Poverty, Social Exclusion and Labour Opportunities Among Youth Living in Rural Areas (co-coordinator 2012); A Guide on Setting Up Social Enterprises for Roma People (coordinator 2013); Recommendations Report for Social Economy: Romania 2013 (coordinator 2013), Welfare state between survival, reform and European accession (2013), and Demand and Supply of Social Economy - Two Development Regions of Romania (co-coordinator 2013).
## TABLE OF CONTENT

ABOUT AUTHORS ........................................................................................................... 5  
LIST OF FIGURES AND GRAPHS ................................................................................... 12  
LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................................. 13  
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ............................................................................................. 14  

**Part I. EVALUATION REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMS**  
FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION FOR THE ROMA INCLUSION IN ROMANIA  
Mariea Ionescu .............................................................................................................. 15  

INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................. 17  
  The objective of the analysis ......................................................................................... 17  
  The research methodology ......................................................................................... 17  
  The Roma situation in Romania ................................................................................. 21  

**CHAPTER I. PUBLIC POLICIES FOR THE ROMA MINORITY IN ROMANIA** ................................................................................................................................. 25  
  1.1. National policies for the Roma minority. Focused approach ............ 25  
  1.2. National policies for the Roma minority. Integrated approach ..... 31  
  1.3. Financial sources allocated to the public policies for the Roma people ............................................................................................................................... 41  

**CHAPTER II. STAKEHOLDERS INTEREST FOR INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION** ................................................................................................................................. 51  
  2.1. The implementation, cooperation and assessment mechanisms for the inclusion policies of Roma minority in Romania ........................................ 51  
  2.2. The role of the non-governmental organizations ............................................... 53  

**CHAPTER III. WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE? CHALLENGES** ......................... 55
## CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1. Public policies intended for the Roma people ........................................ 58
- 4.2. The financing given to the public policies for the Roma people... 59
- 4.3. The Social Inclusion Program................................................................. 60
- 4.4. The sustainability of the financed programs and projects ............. 61

## CHAPTER V. RECOMMENDATIONS ..................................................... 63

- 5.1. The setting up of internal and external cooperation networks ..... 63
- 5.2. Explicit approach ............................................................................... 63
- 5.3. Europe 2020 Strategy ........................................................................ 64
- 5.4. European Social Funds co-financed programs .................................. 64
- 5.5. The explicit allocation of the funds intended for the Roma minority inclusion ................................................................. 64

## REFERENCES .............................................................................................. 65

## ANEXES ...................................................................................................... 70

- Annex 1. Estimations of the number of Roma in Romania .................. 70
- Annex 2. The age pyramid at the Roma population ......................... 71
- Annex 3. Distribution of the Roma people per residence areas ......... 72
- Annex 4. The mechanism of institutional cooperation for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Roma inclusion policies in Romania .................................................. 75

### Part II. JOINT REPORT ON FUNDING PROGRAMMES FOR ROMA MINORITY SUCCESSES / FAILURES: ALBANIA, BULGARIA, ITALY, HUNGARY, ROMANIA AND SERBIA Simona Maria Stănescu .............. 77

## INTRODUCTION .......................................................................................... 79

## CHAPTER I. ROMA MINORITY IN ANALYSED COUNTRIES .......... 80

- 1.1. Recognition of Roma as a minority ................................................... 80
- 1.2. How many Roma? ............................................................................. 81
1.3. Experiencing discrimination as Roma minority................................. 84
1.4. Other common challenges ................................................................. 85

CHAPTER II. REGULATIONS WITH IMPACT ON ACTIVE INTEGRATION/
INCLUSION OF ROMA MINORITY .......................................................... 87
2.1. International regulations .................................................................... 87
2.2. Institutional framework ...................................................................... 91
2.3. Weaknesses and strengths ................................................................. 95

CHAPTER III. FUNDING PROGRAMMES FOR ACTIVE INCLUSION
OF ROMA MINORITY ............................................................................ 97
3.1. Education: key elements and identified gaps .................................. 98
3.2. Employment: key elements and identified gaps ............................... 100
3.3. Health: key elements and identified gaps ....................................... 102
3.4. Housing: key elements and identified gaps ..................................... 103
3.5. Structural requirements and funding: key elements and identified
gaps ........................................................................................................ 105

CHAPTER IV. LESSONS LEARNED FROM SOUTH EAST EUROPEAN
ANALYSED COUNTRIES ....................................................................... 106
4.1. Successes and failures: Albania ....................................................... 106
4.2. Successes and failures: Bulgaria ....................................................... 107
4.3. Successes and failures: Hungary ...................................................... 107
4.4. Successes and failures: Italy ............................................................. 108
4.5. Successes and failures: Romania ...................................................... 109
4.6. Successes and failures: Serbia ........................................................ 110

CHAPTER V. STREAMLINING FUTURE PROGRAMS ................................. 112
REFERENCES ......................................................................................... 114
LIST OF FIGURES AND GRAPHS

Figure 1. National and European policies including Roma minority. Approaches, periods ............................................................... 26

Graph 1. Total amounts allocated to the public policies for the Roma people ..................................................................................... 42

Graph 2. Main areas financed during the years 1997-2012 ..............42

Graph 3. The source of the investments allocated to the public policies for the Roma (Euro), period 1997-2012 ................................. 43


Graph 5. PHARE grants. Period 1998-2006 ............................................ 45

Graph 6. Grants. ESF/POS/D Romania .................................................... 46
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The design of the social inclusion program ........................................ 48
Table 2. Roma minority in figures ...................................................................... 81
Table 3. Top three discrimination areas in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania ................................................................................. 84
Table 4. United Nations’ Bills and Conventions ................................................. 88
Table 5. National Roma Inclusion Strategies in analysed countries ................. 91
Table 6. Overview of main national stakeholders responsible for implementation of Roma National Strategy ............................................................... 92
Table 7. Public administration involved in Roma Integration/Inclusion programmes ......................................................................................... 93
Table 8. International funds for the Roma inclusion ......................................... 97
Table 9. European Union’ funds for Roma inclusion ........................................ 98
Table 10. Comparative approach on education: key elements ......................... 99
Table 11. Comparative approach on education: identified gaps ....................... 99
Table 12. Comparative approach on employment: key elements ................... 100
Table 13. Comparative approach on employment: identified gaps ................. 101
Table 14. Comparative approach on health: key elements ............................... 102
Table 15. Comparative approach on health: identified gaps ............................ 103
Table 16. Comparative approach on housing: key elements ......................... 104
Table 17. Comparative approach on housing: identified gaps ....................... 104
Table 18. Comparative approach on structural requirements and funding: key elements ....................................................................................... 105
Table 19. Comparative approach on structural requirements and funding: identified gaps ................................................................................ 105
## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>National Agency for the Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL</td>
<td>Public Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD</td>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>European Social Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTLR</td>
<td>Working group of public policies for the Roma people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>Government Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIG</td>
<td>Minimum Income Guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRIS</td>
<td>National Roma Inclusion Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIRS</td>
<td>Effective Programmes for the active integration / inclusion of the Roma in the South East Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIB</td>
<td>Gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS/DRU</td>
<td>The Sector Operational Program for the Development of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPL</td>
<td>Census of Population and Habitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Serbia (Republic of Serbia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I. EVALUATION REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION FOR THE ROMA INCLUSION IN ROMANIA

Mariea Ionescu
INTRODUCTION

The evaluation report of the national programs and of the financings for the Roma inclusion in Romania intended for the integration/inclusion of the Roma minority is an objective within the project “Efficient programs for the active integration/inclusion of the Roma people in South-Eastern Europe”. The priority axis: the development of the trans-national synergies for supporting the areas of sustainable growth, financed by the European Commission (CE) through the program of trans-national cooperation South-Eastern Europe, implemented in 18 partners from eight countries: Albania (AL), Bulgaria (BG), Italy (IT), Romania (RO), Hungary (HU), Ukraine, Slovakia, Serbia, Slovenia. The partners in Romania are the National Agency for the Roma (ANR) and the Agency for Community Development “Together”.

The objective of the analysis

The objective of the analysis is to identify and analyze the successes and the failures of the public policies from the partner countries, in order to identify the strength and the weaknesses, to analyze the financing frameworks of the projects intended for the social inclusion of the Roma people, and also to formulate recommendations for the social players interested at European and national level with the purpose of improving the financial programs and the national strategies.

The research methodology

The proposed methodology was based on the use of two main research methods.

For part I. The analysis of some official documents those are relevant from the perspective of the research theme. Alongside the data held by the ANR, including administrative and archive data that were turned to good account in this report and that contributed to reduce the costs intended for the project’s research, some additional data was collected. This means
public policies with an impact on the Roma minority from Romania, European and national strategies, primary and secondary legislative acts, programmatic documents enacted at national level, international and national specialized articles, other analysis, studies and research reports. The secondary analysis of some official statistic data or of some data that come from various researches carried out on the implementation of some projects within the Roma communities.

The second part of the report is based on desk research of national information provided by PAIRS reports. Complementarily international comparative reports were used as well as national public reports as well as secondary analysis of international data bases:

- 2009 European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (EU-MIDIS) carried out by European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights;
- 2011 Roma and non-Roma population survey\(^1\) carried out by European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);
- 2011 Regional Roma survey\(^2\) carried out by UNDP, World Bank, European Commission.

A preliminary validation of the research findings occurred during the PAIRS workshop held in Sofia mid June 2013.

**Research methods**

For part 1. After the phases of documenting and collecting the information, in order to structure the report, we have used social indicators that have had an influence on the inclusion process of the Roma minority. Starting from the assumption that the state intervention that has own mechanisms and resources, through timely planned projects, can determine the integration/socio-economical and cultural inclusion\(^3\) of the Roma

---

\(^1\) Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, and Spain

\(^2\) Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, and The former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia

\(^3\) The European Commission defines social inclusion as a process that is used to ensure that the persons who are facing the risk of poverty and exclusion acquire the necessary
people, we have selected and included in this analysis two types of organizations: institutions of the public administration at central level and non-governmental organizations that have developed or that offer support to the implementation of some projects within the Roma communities. We have identified the public policies at national level: strategies, programs, projects, the chosen approach (targeting versus mainstreaming), the type of processes (participative versus traditional) used to apply these, the cooperation mechanisms set up, including the financial mechanisms⁴.

As social documents we have researched and processed the following:
- official documents drafted by the Government,
- documents from the ANR archive⁵,
- documents from the web-sites of some public institutions,
- reports of some technical assistance projects (AT) that have supported the implementation of the programs that the ANR and the Ministry of National Education (MEN) benefited from,
- relevant previous researches.

The content analysis includes an evaluation of the results of applying public policies and their allocated funds. The processing of information and the explaining of the centralized and analyzed data has resulted into this report.

The structure of the report

For part 1. The analysis is structured on four chapters which correspond to the documents specific for the PAIRS project. In chapter I were identified the public policies and the relevant stakeholders that have as objective the opportunities and resources to fully participate in the economical, social and cultural life and enjoy a life and a welfare standard considered to be normal in the society they live in. It also ensures an increased participation of these people in the decision making process of those decisions that affect their life, such as their access to the fundamental rights. Source: The European Commission, Joint report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion, 2003.

⁴ We have included in the analysis only the programs that were carried out based on the signing of some financing Memorandums, Agreements or loans between the Romanian Government and various stakeholders.

⁵ Documents drafted by the ANR in the pre-accession and post-accession period of Romania in the EU, financial archive.
integration/inclusion of the Roma minority during the reference period and the financial opportunities used at national level by the identified stakeholders (including the ANR). According to the Set-up Decision nr.1703/2006, ANR has the function to represent the interests of the Roma people at national level. In chapter II were identified the stakeholders of the coordination, implementation and monitoring mechanisms for the Roma people public policies. In chapter III were assessed the results of the opportunities used by the identified stakeholders and the lessons learned that have the purpose to prepare the drafting process for the national public policies and European regulations for the period 2014-2020. Chapter IV contains the conclusions and the general recommendations.

For Part II. The complementary report is structured in five chapters. The first chapter addresses the issues of Roma recognition as a minority in analysed countries. The second chapter focuses on public policies: institutional framework and Roma minority related regulations. The third chapter overviews (inter)national funding programmes for Roma implemented in each PAIRS country. The chapter identifies key elements and gaps for education, employment, health, housing, and structural requirements. Chapter four emphasizes learned lessons in terms of successes and failures in PAIRS project countries. The final chapter proposes recommendations in line of streamline future programs.

The limits of the research

The analysis and the research of the Roma situation in Romania have aroused an increased interest in the last years. Due to this reason, the multitude of studies, research, international and national reports regarding the Roma people from Romania but also the various research methodologies that were used creates difficulties when it comes to exactly establishing and accurately reproducing the socio-economical analysis indicators of these. For drafting this research report, ANR has used mainly official data from the National Institute of Statistics (INS) and from the Ministries in the field (MEC and MMPSF) that have own data bases organized also on ethnical criteria.

6 The analysis starts with the year 1997, the year when the Department for the Protection of the National Minorities was set up in Romania and continues until the year 2009, the year when the last pre-accession program was finished and continues with the application of the post-accession programs.(2009-2011)
For the estimative research of the funds allocated to the Roma minority through the financial instruments after the integration, the ESF/POS/DRU, some significant disagreements were observed between the researchers of the same reality: the number of projects that have as target group the Roma people and the amounts of money allocated for the projects of the ESF/POS/DRU Funds intended for the vulnerable groups (mainstreaming), doubled by the limited access to the documents of the contracted projects makes the research process difficult and limited.

In this case, ANR has researched the data base published by the MMFPS on the web-site www.fseromania.ro regarding the projects financed from the POS/DRU. The report published in 2010 by Sorin Cace (ICCV) that uses as indicators the Roma people as the main target group, the data base of the Agency Together and the list of the Technical Work Group for the Roma people (GTLR)\(^7\) formed within the ANR that uses the same indicator.

The difficulty to estimate the amount of money intended for the projects of promoting the Roma social inclusion is due to the way in which the Roma people are mentioned as a target group, in some cases being explicitly mentioned, in other cases being included in the vulnerable groups category but without being quantified.

In what regards the assessment of impact of projects financed by POSDRU on Roma communities, we estimate that real difficulties in identifying the target groups involve an extended research time.

The Roma situation in Romania\(^8\)

The number of Roma people in Romania

The concerns to find out how many Roma persons are there in Romania or in Europe have been and shall be a research objective for many

\(^7\)GTLR was set up at the initiative of ANR, with the support of the experts from the General Directorate for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (DGOASI) within the European Commission, within the Monitoring Committee of POSDRU in order to ease and support the access of the Roma people to the operations financed during the period 2007 – 2013. Source: www.anr.gov.ro

\(^8\) The data regarding the socio-demographic structure of the Roma population comes especially from the National Census of the Population and of the Habitation from 2002 and 2012.
researchers. Starting with the year 1993, there were several researches carried out at national level. Depending on the applied methodology, the results regarding the estimation of the number of Roma persons are different. Nevertheless, it is recognized that, except the data which comes from the RPL in the years 1992, 2002 and 2011, where it is believed that the number of self-identified Roma people is under-estimated, there are few studies that offer an estimation based on a clear methodology. The reports of Romanian institutions are still using in the year 2013 the data from RPL of the year 2002.

The leader of the Roma minority organization represented in the Romanian Parliament estimated that the number of the Roma persons in Romania is between 2.5 and 3 million people. In his opinion, these people do not want to declare their identity, because of the sad inheritance transmitted to the future Roma generations by the Roma people deported in Transnistria, these events still being alive in the collective memory of the Roma population. On the other hand, the presidential report from 2009, shows that even the “Identity of Roma person/gipsy continues to be a stigma.” The field experience of the ANR has showed that recognizing the ethnical appurtenance is not perceived as a source of benefits but rather represents another barrier in the socio-economical and educational inclusion.

The preliminary results of the population and habitation census (RPL) in Romania, carried out in 2011 shows that the number of those who declared to be Roma people was 619 thousand people (3.2%). In terms of territory, the distribution of the Roma population is not uniform, with percentages that vary between 1.1% in the county of Botoșani and 8.8% in the county of Mureș. According to the CE note from 2011, the Council of Europe has

---

9 Zamfir, Cătălin, Zamfir, Elena, 1993, „The gypsies between ignorance and concern”, Bucharest, Editura Alternative;
11 The deportation of the Roma in Transnistria was done based on a census dated 25th of May 1943, which classified the Roma proposed to be deported in two large categories: “nomads” Roma (coppersmiths, spoon makers) and 2. “stable” Roma who did not have living means or precise occupations or who did jail time. Source: Sandu, The history and the traditions of the Roma minority, Editura Sigma, Bucharest, 2005.
13 COM (2011) 173- A EU framework for the national Roma integration strategies until 2020,
estimated an average number of Roma people in Romania of 1,850,000 persons, respectively 8,32% of the total population. This reference number is mentioned in the programmatic documents including the ones that refer to the programming of the 2014 – 2020 funds.

**The structure and the homogeneity of the Roma community from Romania**

*The structure of the Roma communities in Romania per genders*

The 2002 census of the population and of housing (for 535,140 people, meaning 2,46% of the population) establishes that the number of the Roma men between 15-64 years old represent a percentage of 60,3% of the total Roma population of male gender, and the number of the women of same age, represents 60,1%.

*The structure of the Roma community in Romani per age*

In comparison with the majority population, where there is an ageing trend\(^\text{14}\), the Roma people under the age of 20 years old represent 47,33% of the total Roma population. The Roma persons of over 30 years old represent 66,8% of the population. The Roma persons of and over 50 years old represent 10,8% of the population and the share of the aged/dependent population is only 3,3%. **In conclusion, the Roma population is young.**

*The territory distribution of Roma by the residence environments: urban/rural*

a). From the administrative point of view, Romania is divided in eight development regions. Of these, six\(^\text{15}\) “cover the almost the entire country, except the area of Bucharest-Ilfov” are on the list of the poorest 20 regions in Europe\(^\text{16}\). From the point of view of the gross domestic product (GDP), the EUROSTAT report published in 2011 offers the following information: the

---

\(^{14}\) Socio-Economical analysis for the European Funds Programming 2014-2020, MMPSF, 2013

\(^{15}\) Region of North East, Region of South West / Oltenia, Region of South East, Region South Muntenia, Region North West, Region Centre.

development region North East has a share of 29%, the GDP of the
development region South West/Oltenia has a share of 36%, the GDP of the
development region South Muntenia has a share of 39%, the GDP of the
development region North West has a share of 41% and the GDP of the
development region Center has a share of 45%.\footnote{Doctoral thesis of Ph.D. arh. Lorin Constantin Nicolae, Bucharest, 2013, University of Architecture and Urbanism “Ion Mincu” – Bucharest., pag.41.}

b). The temporary data of the 2011 Census shows that at national level, 37% of the Roma people live in the urban area and 63% in the rural area. Although it is difficult to analyze with high accuracy the presence of the Roma people per development regions, the RPL data from 2011 shows the following:

- a great share of Roma in four development regions, more precisely:
  - Development Region Center: Covasna county (86,2%).
  - Development Region South Muntenia: Argeș county, (84,2%), Dâmbovița county (85,0%),
  - Development Region North West: Satu-Mare county (76,8%), Bistrița-Năsăud county (78,5%), Bihor county (79,4%), Sălaj county (80,0%),
  - Development Region South East: Vrancea county (75,9%), Galați county (79,8%),

- the smallest share of the Roma was recorded in the other four development regions:
  - Development Region North East: Botoșani county (39,9%), Vaslui county (40,9%),
  - Development Region South East: Tulcea county (23,7%), Constanța county (37,1%),
  - Development Region West: Hunedoara county (17,9%),
  - Development Region West South West Oltenia: Vâlcea county (38,9%), Gorj county (42,7%).

For more details please see Annex 2. The distribution in the territory of the Roma people according to the residence criteria: urban/rural
CHAPTER I. PUBLIC POLICIES FOR THE ROMA MINORITY IN ROMANIA

Since 1993, based on the Copenhagen criteria, Romania has started the preparations to join NATO and the EU. That socio-political context has allowed the politics of the Government to be reoriented towards various categories of population that were severely affected by the transition from the planned economy to the market economy, for example the Roma minority.

Mainly influenced by the evolution of the Romanian and international political scene, the method of approaching the Roma minority was put into legislative and institutional practice and meant the enacting of some solutions, such as: the set up of some institutions to represent the Roma minority and to observe their rights, the drafting of some public policies explicitly for the Roma or implicitly for the vulnerable groups, attracting and managing funds from the European Commission, World Bank, BIRD and other international organizations.

1.1. National policies for the Roma minority. Focused approach

In the period 2001-2011 several public policies were drafted, where the Roma represented the target group (targeting). (ex. The national strategies for the Roma from the year 2001 and 2011, the Inclusion Decade), or a vulnerable group (mainstreaming), (i.e. PNAInc, JIM, PNDR 2007 – 2013 and PNDR 2013 – 2020 whose results represent the fundament of the Europa 2020 Strategy).
Figure 1. National and European policies including Roma minority. Approaches, periods

Source: Ionescu, ANR, 2013

The public policies drafted in the period 2001-2011\(^{18}\) either focused (*targeting*) or integrating (*mainstreaming*), have as common elements the objectives\(^{19}\), the action fields\(^{20}\), the deadlines for implementing the strategies and the measure plans\(^{21}\) (PGM).

**Approaches in the public policies for the Roma people in Romania**

The focused (*targeting* and the integrating (*mainstreaming*) approach are two terms regarded as being in opposition, insufficiently discussed/analyzed both in the EU space and also in Romania but they can clarify the costs of the socio-economical Roma inclusion.


\(^{19}\) Improvement of the situation / living conditions (The Strategy of the Government 2001, PNAinc), the implementation of the Government strategy from 2011(JIM), promotion of social inclusion (the Decade), the Roma minority inclusion (strategy 2011).

\(^{20}\) Education, health, vocational training and employment, habitation and infrastructure, accompanied by measures to fight discrimination, poverty and the promotion of gender equality in all the intervention fields, the formation of human resources.

\(^{21}\) The strategies are adopted on long term (10 years), accompanied by general measure plans (PGM) on short term, respectively the government period (4 years).
The focused approach *(targeting)* regards the Roma as a target-group, who, based on the identified needs, gets financial allocations, based on some strategies, programs, action plans, projects, measures.

**The process of consultation in the focused approach *(targeting)***

Unlike the mainstreaming policies, in Romania, the consultation and the policy making process of *Targeting type*, was done together with Roma and non-Roma specialists from some specialized institutions and organizations, including the ANR and has as base an official consultation process. The efficiency, the effectiveness and the impact on the focused target group of the policies and of the allocated finances can be easily measured.

**Examples of focused policies**


*The impact of the Roma inclusion decade 2005 – 2015 in Romania*

The Government of Romania has entitled ANR as the national coordinator of the Decade, Romania being the first of the 9 members of the Decade that has provided the Presidency of the decade during the period 1\textsuperscript{st} of July 2005 - 1\textsuperscript{st} of July 2006. From this position, ANR has suggested to debate several problems specific for the public policies for the Roma people. One of these aspects relates to harmonization of domestic and international public policies.

In terms of the harmonization of the internal and international public policies, during the preparation period before joining the EU of the current state members, the same as the members of the Decade, the Governments have drafted national strategies or measure plans for the integration or, depending on the case, the improvement of the Roma situation from the respective countries. For example, in 2006, Romania was implementing four public policies with two types of approaches:

• PNAInc, enacted by the Government in 2002 *mainstreaming* approach),
• JIM, (*mainstreaming* approach) commitment from the Government in 2005
• The Inclusion Decade, (*targeting* approach) a new initiative, whose preparations have started in the year 2004.

In order to prepare the action plans of the Inclusion Decade, the ANR, as a specialized institution has analyzed the public policies referring to the Roma from Romania enacted by the Romanian Government. The objective was to identify the common points, the relation between the various social players and their mechanisms of involvement in the implementation, the tools and the cooperation opportunities between the CE and the 9 countries participating in the Decade. Following the analysis, it has been observed the complementarily of various measures and the need to harmonize them. The solution was to include the action plans of the Inclusion Decade in the Government Strategy (modified in the year 2006). Their financing was possible through the state budget allocated annually to the ANR.

Another achievement within the Decade is the fact that the Romanian Parliament enacted of the Law nr. 216/2006 to ratify the Agreement between the Romanian Government and BIRD regarding the formation and the administration of the Fiduciary Fund to support the Decade. Last but not least, and also for the preparation of the Decade’s implementation in Romani, in the year 2005, the World Bank and the Romanian Government represented by the ANR have carried out a research at national level in order to test the main needs of the Roma communities. The innovative methodology used by the research has made it possible to estimate the...

---

Public policies for Roma

number of Roma people from Romania and has formed the base of the interventions within the social inclusion program (SIP) loan from the BIRD given to the Government.

The impact of the Roma strategy enacted by the Romanian Government in 2001

In 2009, a team of Roma and non-Roma researchers has carried out an evaluation of the Government strategy from 2001. The SWOT analysis has emphasized the following strengths: the creation of a Roma elite hired on important positions both at central and also at county or local level (Preoteasa, Cace, Duminică, 2009, p. 78), insitutional palyers (the networks BJR, BR, ELR, MECT) and the mechanism to implement the strategy at central, county and local level. Among the succes factor are mentioned: the Roma experts, the staff and the employees with attributions for the Roma problems, the real knowledge of the community priorities and the adjustment of the interventions to their specific needs, an easier access to the funds for improving the Roma situation, the diversity of the interventions that allowed the coverage of several fields with deficits for the Roma communities (Preoteasa, Cace, Duminică, 2009, p. 55). The insuccess factors refer both to the lack of the budget intended for the implementation of the strategy and also to the univolvement of some social capable players, closed attitude of the APL for the Roma projects, the lack of Roma human resources that are motivated and responsible at the level of the deconcentrated institutions and last but not least, the weak representation of the civil society and of the Roma policies in the territory (Preoteasa, Cace, Duminică, 2009, p. 56).

Another report from 2009 referring to the impact of the 2001 Government strategy implementation, mentions that these “have recorded modest results and they existed due to the external pressure rather than to the understanding of the seriousness of the situation and to the public’s interest to improve the Roma situation. The fact that some national policies

---

26 Preoteasa, Ana Maria, Cace Sorin, Duminică Gelu (2009), The national strategy to improve the Roma situation – The voice of the communities, Bucharest, Editura Expert.
27 Preda Marian (coordinator), (2009) Risk and social inequities in Romania - drafted by the Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Social and Demographic Risks (CPARSD) under the supervision of the Presidential Administration.
had a positive impact on the life expectancy of the Roma persons who are living in risk conditions shows that social inclusion is rather possible (page 59)”. Being publicly undertaken by the Presidential Institution, the report of the Presidential Commission represents a document on the bases of which the Roma minority problems were defined and the main priorities were formulated in order to elaborate the national inclusion strategy of the Romanian citizens that are part of the Roma minority for the period 2012 – 2020.

The effects of the pre-joining programs on the 2001 strategy

Among the Romanian institutions that signed the 2001 national strategy, only two, (ANR and MEN) have brought to fruition the opportunities of using the pre-accession funds intended for the Roma minority, of a total value of 71,850,000 €.

Results

Alongside the component of forming human resources included in each program, approximately 1000 person that have a connection with the implementation of public policies for the Roma (public servants, public authorities, Roma and non-Roma employees, professors, etc.), the grant components have financed approximately 450 projects, of small and medium size in the fields of: education, health, vocational training and employment, income generating activities, infrastructure. The Roma population was issued 16.102 identity cards, 12.611 birth certificates and 4.701 title deeds for the houses and the lands. There was a national research regarding the inclusion and the exclusion of the Roma and an awareness and information campaign for reducing the discrimination of the persons that belong to the Roma minority. There were drafted 170 county plans for the local development. The MEN structures, county and locals were endowed with machineries, equipment’s and furniture. There were created educational training materials necessaries for the good deployment of a quality educational process.

28 Rughiniș, Cosima and Fleck Gabor, (2008). Come closer, the inclusion and the exclusion of the Roma in the today Romanian society, Bucharest, Published by the National Agency for the Roma.
1.2. National policies for the Roma minority. Integrated approach

The integrating (unfocused/mainstreaming) approach in social policies means to adopt some common strategies, programs, projects and measures intended for the social disadvantaged/vulnerable categories of which the Roma are part of\textsuperscript{29}. Examples of integrating policies in Romania: PNAInc, JIM, PNDR 2007/2013.

For the consultation and drafting process of these policies, were involved specialists from research institutes or European institutions and World Bank specialists. The consultation process, official or unofficial was limited to the participation of the ANR as an institution that represent the Roma at central level and a specialized governmental organization of the Roma people.

Sector policies addressed to Roma minority in Romania

The Roma minority from Romania is the most exposed to the risks of social exclusion, is discriminated and has an unequal access to education, to the labor market, to decent housing conditions, to social and health services (Zamfir, Zamfir 1993, Zamfir, Preda, (coord.) 2002, Fleck, and Rughiniş, 2008, ICCV, 2010, FRA, UNDP and CE 2012, World Bank and CE, 2012).

1.2.1. Education

a). Statistical data

In Romania, during the period of economical decline, the most affected category of population was the children from the rural areas, especially the Roma children. The rate of kindergarten enrollment of the Roma children is 40% smaller than the rate of the majority population\textsuperscript{30}. 44% of Roma

\textsuperscript{29} The vulnerable groups are defined in the JIM: pre-school children, students with a risk of early school dropout and their parents, persons that have dropout of school before obtaining the basic skills and knowledge necessary to be integrated on the labor market, persons who live in isolated communities, community assistants, social workers, family mediators, imprisoned persons, youngsters who leave the institutionalized system of child protection, staff of the central and local authorities, unemployed people, Roma who work traditional occupations, Roma young adults and women, etc.

children aged between 7-11 years present a risk of school dropout\textsuperscript{31}. In 2012, approximately 400,000 Roma children from primary school were not going to school on a regular basis\textsuperscript{32}. Over 75\% of Roma children do not graduate from gymnasium\textsuperscript{33}. Two of ten Roma children do not go to school, and the most frequently reason invoked by the parents is related to the lack of financial resources\textsuperscript{34}. One of six Roma parents explains the weak participation of the children in schools through ethncial discrimination.\textsuperscript{35}

The schools do not have efficient strategies to prevent the dropout phenomenon, they take action only when it is already too late and also, in the moment when the share of Roma children in schools is growing there is the occurrence of a segregation phenomenon at the class level, accompanied by a decrease in the quality of education and of the material endowments of the respective institution.\textsuperscript{36} The Roma girls are facing highly disproportionate risks of school dropout or of leaving the school early.

At the level of the adult population, a percentage of 23-25\% of the Roma people have not graduated any school and declare they do not know how to write or read,\textsuperscript{37} 26\% have graduated the first four classes and 34\% only the gymnasium. Only 17\% of the people are going to a professional school, a high-school or are getting superior education. 9\% of the Roma people are high-school graduates 2\% university graduates (Duminică, Ivasiuc, 2010).

A study carried out in 2009\textsuperscript{38}, showed that the schools were the Roma children are generally having access are far from being schools for everybody. In order to remedy the situation, the increase of the quality of the educational act in the schools where the Roma children go and to create a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[31] UNICEF Romania, Country programme action plan 2013/2017, pag.3.
\item[32] UNESCO, National Institute of Statistics, 2010
\item[33] idem
\item[34] Cace, S., Preoteasa, A. M., Tomescu, C. and Stănescu, S.M. (coord.) (2010) Legal and equal on the labor market for the Roma communities. A diagnose of the factors that influence the employment level of the Roma population in Romania, Bucharest, Editura Expert, 2010
\item[37] ICCV/SOROS project POSDRU, 2010.
\item[38] Community Development Agency “Together”, Bucharest, 2009
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
really inclusive environment, it is mandatory to adopt some strategic, urgent and profound measure. The conclusions of the study were strengthened by the Decade Watch Study\textsuperscript{39} that shows the fact that, in the context of improving the access to education and the quality of the educational act, the education system continues to be inequitable.

The added value of the study is showing the significant incidence from the statistic point of view of two of the most frequently invoked reasons by the non-Roma population to explain the school dropout phenomenon within the Roma population. Therefore, the study shows the impossibility to prove the stereotype according to which the Roma people leave school because of early marriage: only 4\% of the ones that left the school did so because of marriage, which means that the early marriage phenomenon is less found in the Roma population than it is affirmed by the public opinion. In a similar way, the study invalidates the stereotype according to which the Roma parents are not sending the children to school: only 9\% of the Roma parents are showing a lack of interest with regards to the education of their children, which practically means no contact of the parents with the school, a lack of direct encouragement to make the children study well and negative attitude towards education in general. 90\% of the Roma parents are showing positive attitudes towards education, are maintaining contact with the teachers and are encouraging the children to obtain good results at school.

In conclusion\textsuperscript{40}, correlating the data, although the Roma parents have a positive attitude towards the education of their children, almost half of the Roma people have not even finished the compulsory education because the school does not have efficient strategies for preventing and fighting school dropout. As a consequence, almost half of the Roma people are not eligible for the professional qualification courses that could offer them an officially recognized diploma after graduation. The lack or the low level of education, the inadequacy of the Romanian school for the current demands of the labor market, the difficult economical situation of the Roma people, together with the discrimination based on ethnic reasons and the lack of opportunities in the rural areas are leading to very high delays regarding the inclusion of the Roma...
young Roma people on the labor market and their possibility of obtaining a well paid job.

b). Policies of the Ministry of National Education (MEN)

In 2011 Roma inclusion strategy, MEN has identified a set of 11 measures that refer to including the preschool and the school aged children in some form of education, reducing the absenteeism in the pre-university education, at the same time with the measures that ensure the quality of the education with an emphasize on the management of the inclusive education. The disaggregation, non-discrimination, the continuation of the affirmative measures and the monitoring of the educational system structures would respond to the indicator of the 2020 Strategy that has as objective to include until the year 2020 all the children in the education system. Alongside the measures from the 2011 Roma strategy, other measures to promote the participation of the children in schools, applied according to the Law of education, are as follows:

- Summer camps for the children aged between 3-6 years old;
- „The second chance” for those who exceeded the school age;
- „School after school” for the pupils included in the primary education;
- „Functional teaching”;
- „Bagel and milk” for preschool and school children;
- Scholarships for high school students;
- Affirmative measures for high school and university students;
- The network of inspectors, professor and teachers for the Romani language and the history of the Roma people;
- Summer schools for the Romani language;
- School contests for the Romani language;
- Distance learning– CREDIS41;
- The school mediator
- The school counselor and assistant
- Scholarships for the Roma students (in general)

41 Department of Distance Learning within the University of Bucharest.
1.2.2. Employment

a). Statistical data

The Roma people from Romania have a reduced participation on the official labor market, but have a high participation on the unofficial labor market, without social security mechanisms. The INS data from 2002 are showing that the employment rate was 36%, while other 36% were looking for a job and 28% were inactive (in comparison with an employment rate of 58%, and an unemployment rate of 7.7%, at national level). Regarding the situation of the unemployed people and of the people looking for a job, the share of Roma unemployed people is 21%.

According to RPL 2002, only one of 10 Roma persons has worked permanently in the last two years. 52% state that they have not found any jobs during this time. Among the Roma women, the participation in the labor market is extremely low, only 27% are carrying out economical activities and 36% say they are looking for a job. Plus, most Roma women have, while they are very young, a large number of children that they must take care of.

As employed persons, the Roma work on their own, only 10-15% of them are wage workers. Of these, most of them have no formal qualification, they either carry out activities that do not require a qualification, for example cleaning lady, janitor, garbage man or park worker. Per total, of the employed population, the young Roma of 15 years and over, 38% work as unqualified workers, 32% hold qualified jobs (workers, salespersons), 9% work in agriculture and 13% have traditional Roma jobs. The economical activities that the young Roma carry out are mostly temporarily, seasonal or occasional, fact that indicates a massive underemployment at the level of this population category.

---

43 The comparative analysis data report from the Inclusion Barometer, drafted by the Community Development Agency “Together”, 2010.
44 The socio-economical analysis of the Roma people from Romania, ASIS, 2013
45 ICCV (2010). A research carried out in July 2010. Project POSDRU.
b). Policies of the Ministry of Labor, Family, Social Protection and Elderly

Part of the Roma inclusion strategy from 2011, the MMFPSPV has enacted 22 measures.

- Active measures, according to Law nr. 76/2002 regarding the insurance system for unemployment and the incentives for employment, updated (information, counseling, qualification courses);
- Measures in the field of social economy (the law project on social economy is in the process of being approved) for developing of businesses, setting up SME, schemes for micro-grants and activities that produce income, apprenticeships and tutorships, job opportunities for women based on flexicurity, including partnerships between the MMFPSPV through its local structures and the relevant players on the labor market.

Other enacted measures:
- The stock of jobs for Roma;
- The employment caravan for Roma persons.

1.2.3. Health services

a). Statistical data

According to the data collected within the EU, in the year 2010, the life expectancy for the Roma was ten years smaller than of the population as a whole, while the infantile death rate was two times to six times higher\textsuperscript{46}. The delay between the Roma persons and the non-Roma persons regarding the health level can also be explained through the barriers regarding the access to the medical services (the distance to the nearest medical office, an indicator that can be applied in the rural areas and the discrimination of the medical staff towards the Roma).

According to the Decade Watch Report carried out in the year 2010\textsuperscript{47}, within the Roma communities there are still numerous problems: (1) a lack

\textsuperscript{46} Dezideriu, Gergely 2011, *The right to health and the principle of non-discrimination, The ethics and the non-discrimination of the vulnerable groups in the health system*, published by the Association for Development and Social Inclusion.

of adequate information regarding the usefulness of vaccination and the conditions in which this gets done. Almost half (46%) of the Roma minors, although they are exempted by law from the payment of the health insurances, have not received all the compulsory vaccines, subsidized through the National Program for Immunization. (2) a reduced frequency of dental visits. Almost half (46%) of the adults have never benefited from dental services. (3) a reduced share of women that get mammography tests and tests for detecting cervical cancer. 89,4% of the Roma women over 15 years old have never got a mammography and the same number applies for the Babeş-Papanicolau test for detecting cervical cancer. (4) a difficult access to the medical services because of the costs.

The authors of the Decade Watch study believe that the lack of financial resources hinders the Roma to access a system where exists a habit of offering unofficial payments in exchange of services. Another study 48 carried out in the year 2010 shows that “the main reasons for which the Roma have not enrolled to a family physician are the missing health insurance – for four out of the ten respondents (38%), the lack of money- for two out of ten respondents (20%) and the lack of a work place – for one out of ten respondents (9,8%)” (SASTIPEN, 2010, p. 39).

With regards to the perception of the Roma people on the health system, according to the Decade Watch study, 60% of them believe that the health system is bad and very bad, and 20,8% consider it to be unsatisfactory. Although the Roma population continues to have a modest health condition and an unequal access to the health service, according to the ICCV study from 2010, 90% of them have a family physician, and over half of them believe they have a good and very good health condition, and 40,2% consider it bad and very bad (ICCV, 2010, p. 60). The ICCV study is made complete with the Sastipen study that records the fact that the persons enrolled to a family physician are over 50 years old, which suggests the access to the primary medical services of the beneficiaries of VMG and unemployment pay, retired people, children but also women that have their bread winner insured (p. 38).

48The report „Access of the Roma to the public health services”, carried out by the Centre of the Roma for Health Policies– SASTIPEN, Bucharest, 2010.
The problems related to health hold the third place in the absolute hierarchy of the problems that the Roma are struggling with. Of the diseases that the Roma are having, the most frequent are the circulatory system problems (14%), followed by the respiratory problems (8.7%) and the diseases of the bone joint system (7.2%) (SASTIPEN, 2010, 34).

Regarding to the relation of the Roma people with the public institutions, the Roma believe they are discriminated in their relation with the city hall, (47%), the hospitals, the medical offices (46%), the schools (42%), institutions where they believe they are treated worse than the Romanian people.

In conclusion, the financial poverty is combined with the reduced access to the health services and results into a lower life expectancy than the one recorded at the level of the general population, and also a higher occurrence of poverty related disease. Correlated, half of the Roma population do not have access or have not heard of the medical mediation services and state that they have felt discriminated by the doctor/hospital.

b.) Measures taken by the Ministry of Health

In the Roma inclusion strategy from the year 2011, MS has 9 measures, all suggested to be implemented under the national campaign format: Campaigns for the evaluation of the Roma persons’ health condition, for sanitary education regarding TBC, HIV/SIDA, BTS, for education regarding healthy food and the vaccination of children according to the National Plan for Immunization. All campaigns must correspond to the indicator of the Europe 2020 Strategy for reducing the death rate until the year 2020.

Other measures

The sanitary mediator, an initiative that, in the context of Law nr. 435/2006 regarding the administrative decentralization has passed to the coordination of the local authorities (the mayors), and due to this fact, according to the ANR estimations, the number of the sanitary mediators has considerably diminished, from 800 in the year 2002, to 450 in 2011.
1.2.4. Housing

a). Statistical data

The data supplied by the INS and also by a series of independent studies is showing that a great part of the Roma population lives in miserable housing conditions, fact that influences also the other fields, especially education and health. A study carried out in 2010 by Eurostat which correlates income with social inclusion and the living conditions in the EU member states, shows that of all the state members Romania has the most alarming situation regarding habitation (EUROSTAT, 2010, p. 84). In 2006, the Roma had a habitation density of 5.7 persons/house and a housing area of 12.6 m². In 2011, the housing area was 13.5 m². A research made in 2010 has established the habitation as being extremely poor or locative extreme poverty. Referring to the particular situation of the Roma, the authors observe that the marginalization resulted from poverty is doubled by racism, which makes the Roma housings isolated, satellites, peripheral, englobed but not integrated. The discrimination related to habitation generates residential segregation, unfit living conditions, exposure to environmental risks and forced eviction (Berescu, Celac, 2006).

Another study made in 2010 shows that the “Roma are living mostly in the peripheral areas of the localities (83%), in compact communities (77%). 40% of them own a house and a quarter live in their parents houses. The house owned by the individual or by his family is more spread in the rural areas. A large part of the houses owned by the Roma from the rural areas are build from panel stake and adobe and are not connected to the utilities (water, sewage system, gas). 13% of the Roma do not have electricity, in comparison with the average of 2%, at national level and the infrastructure

50 Dan, Adrian-Nicolae, The habitation exclusion of the Roma population, Social Assistance Magazine, No. 3-4, 2009
53 Cace, Preoteasa, Tomescu, Stănescu (coord.) 2010, Legal and equal on the labor market for the Roma communities,”, financed by the FSE/POSDRU, Bucharest,
of the Roma homogenous communities is often impossible to use or is missing completely. In the urban areas, 14.2% have houses rented from the state and 1.2% live in social houses. Three quarters of the Roma are using a contracted house (66% legal valid contract and 4% have an expired contract). Almost a third (30%) does not have any kind of contract for the house they live in. The lack of the title deeds for the new generations leads, on long term, to social exclusion, blocking the access to the social assistance, medical assistance services or education, and, in general, to all the citizen rights”54.

The segregation and the ghettoizing tendency are expressed more and more in the last years, and the discrimination risk, in the case of the homogenous Roma communities, is very high.

With regards to the poor communities, a study55 carried out 2009-2010 has indicated the following:

- access to utilities: 15% of the houses are not connected to the electricity network; 96% do not have hot water; 93% of the houses are not connected to the gas network; only 2% of the houses have central heating systems; only 7% are connected to the sewage system; 56% of the houses do not have a refrigerator and 52% do not have a gas cooker;
- 61% of the communities are formed from poor quality houses;
- overpopulation: a Roma family gathers in average 6 members and has, in average, 2 rooms;
- the situation of the houses: 27% of the analyzed houses have debts for the utility payments; 25% of the houses do not have a kitchen; 79% do not have a bathroom or a toilet;
- infrastructure: in 23% of the communities the access is difficult or becomes impossible after rain or snow; in 9% of the communities the access of the ambulance or of the fire brigade car is not possible; in 28% of the communities there is partial street lighting; 51% of the analyzed communities do not have access to a certified source of drinking water.

54 Idem, 2010, p.65
55 Study carried out by the Community Development Agency “Together” on a sample of 88 communities in 24 counties.
In conclusion, the polarization of the living conditions has increased, and the most disadvantaged are the Roma people.

b). Measures taken by the Ministry of Rural Development, Transportation and Administration

In the Roma inclusion strategy from the year 2011, MDRTA has 3 measures that refer to the Roma inclusion and to poverty fighting, to the development of house and infrastructure building programs, based on Law no. 292/2011.

Regarding social assistance, Law nr. 152/1998 regarding the criteria for offering social houses, the Law of the House no. 114/1996, republished.

Other measures.

• the Pilot program „Social houses for the Roma communities”, which has as indicator a number of 300 social houses build in the eight development regions of Romania.

Although, according to the Government Decision no. 1237/2008 regarding the approval of the pilot-program, it was proposed to be implemented by the National Agency for Houses (ANL) in the year 2013 but has not begun yet.

1.3. Financial sources allocated to the public policies for the Roma people

Both the Romanian institutions and the civil Romanian society including the Roma minority recognize the importance of the investments in the human capital: education under all its forms, formation (including vocation training) and employment are the priority areas for the Roma inclusion. The main stakeholders involved during the period 1997-2011 in the drafting of the documents specific for the European projects according to the needs identified in their areas of activity and that included the Roma are: the Ministry of National Education (MECT), the Ministry of Labor, Family, Social Protection and Elderly (MMPSF), the Government of Romania / the National Agency for Roma (ANR), the Romanian Fund for Social Development
(FRDS). The total amount of money allocated to the public policies inventoried through the stakeholders identified above is of \(313,465,635\) €.

**Graph 1. Total amounts allocated to the public policies for the Roma people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public policy for Roma /Amount (313,465,634.74 Euro) allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014- 2020 RDNP/mainstreaming approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2020 strategy/mainstreaming approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2013 RDNP/mainstreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2015/Decade/targeting approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM/mainstreaming approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNAlnc/mainstreaming approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2010 Strategy /targeting approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139,966,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96,741,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ionescu, M. NAR, 2013

The main fields approached by the financed projects (approximately 500) in the analyzed period (1997-2011) are: infrastructure, vocational training followed by the income generating activities (AGV), health, education and employment.

**Graph 2. Main areas financed during the years 1997-2012**

Source: Ionescu, NAR 2013
Note that the analysis included in graph 2 emphasized the objectives included in the programs financed by the EC, according to the national strategies of the MECT, MMPSF and ANR and co-financed from the state budget.

Type of financings:
The financings assigned to the public policies for the Roma people in Romania come from the national contributions and from various international financers.

**Graph 3. The source of the investments allocated to the public policies for the Roma (Euro), period 1997-2012**

![Graph showing the source of investments](source.png)

Source: Ionescu, NAR 2013

Financial sources . National contributions

With a total value of **43,416,614 €**, the national contributions represent a share of 13% of the total amount of money allocated to the public policies for the Roma people in Romania. The amounts were mainly allocated as co-financings to the EU programs (a share of 72%) and the Government’s loan from the BIRD (a share of 27%). A small part was allocated during the period before the pre-accession funds (Raxi, Counterparty) and, starting with the year 2005 the Inclusion Decade (a share of 1%), through the state budget, for the financing of some Sector projects, according to the strategy of the Government and the Inclusion Decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade (Euro)</th>
<th>Total national contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing post accession (Euro)</td>
<td>16,872,974.90 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing pre accession (Euro)</td>
<td>14,430,000 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofinanțare BIRD (Euro)</td>
<td>11,800,000 27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ionescu, ANR 2013

Financial sources attracted from various external stakeholders

With a total value of 241, 151,496.74 €, the financings attracted represent a share of 87% and come from the EU grants (pre-accession and post-accession funds) and from the Government’s loan from the BIRD through the World Bank.

The pre-accession grants (PHARE)

With a total value of 71,850,000 €, the pre-accession grants PHARE allocated to Romania were directed (targeting) to the implementation of the strategy for improving the Roma situation through the PHARE projects: 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2004 and the multiannual PHARE Program 2004/2006, implemented by the MECT and the ANR.
Post-accession grants. The European Social Fund

The National Development Plan of Romania (PNDR) 2007-2013. Integrating policy

As we showed, the target groups are defined in the JIM as categories of vulnerable persons, excluded, marginalized and living in marginalized, disadvantaged communities: imprisoned person, person with disabilities, youngsters who leave the institutionalized system of children protection, unemployed persons, Roma who work traditional occupations, Roma young adults and women, etc. As a consequence, in most of the financing projects, the target group refers to the measures intended to the categories of vulnerable groups and only some projects the target group explicitly specifies the Roma as the main target group or the number of Roma who shall benefit from the measures suggested by the project.

Until the end of the year 2012, the view regarding the Roma minority inclusion in the PNDR is limited to the Social European Fund, the Operational Program for the Development of the Human Resources (ESF/POS/DRU). With all the difficulties encountered during the analysis of the results, in the research carried out by the ANR, the Roma have come under the category main target group, in 63 projects, strategic and grants (30 in the field of employment, 20 in the field of education and 13 in the field of social economy). The projects were implemented during the period 2009 – 2012, by the following stakeholders: 3 Limited Liability Companies,
23 public institutions and 37 NGOs. Regarding the evaluation of the impact of the projects financed from the ESF/POS/DRU on the Roma minority, the difficulties concerning the real and accurate identification of the target group requires a long research time. The making of such an evaluation shall substantiate the decision regarding the ensemble of activities that respond to the needs of the Roma community and that can be implemented through various financial complementary sources (local, central, European public funds).

The efficiency and the effectiveness of the integrating policies application is difficult to quantify. The yearly implementation report of the POSDRU,\(^5^6\) confirms the ineffectiveness of the integrating approach, because of the fact that the objective linked to the participation in the qualification and requalification courses was achieved only in proportion of 5.5% during the period 2008-2011. In comparison with the target set (28,000 persons), only 1,542 Roma persons participated at the trainings.

The estimated value of the contracted projects through the ESF/POS/DRU for the period 2008-2011 is 140,522,735.99 €, a share of 43%, of which: the EU contribution has a value of 169,301,496.74 €, meaning a share of 52% and the national contribution, which included also the contribution of the beneficiaries has a value of 16,872,974 €, meaning a share of 48%.

Graph 6. Grants. ESF/POS/D Romania

Source: Ionescu, NAR, 2013

---

\(^{56}\) Annual implementation report, the Romanian Government, the Ministry of Labor, Family and Social Protection, the Management Authority for the Sector Operational Program for the Development of Human Resources (2011).
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Major intervention fields from the ESF /POS/DRU

- DMI 2.2: Prevention and correction of the early school dropout,
- DMI 5.1: Development and implementation of the active employment measures,
- DMI 5.2: Promoting the long-term sustainability of the rural areas with regards to the development of human resources and employment,
- DMI 6.1: Development of social economy,
- DMI 6.2: Improving the access and the participation of the vulnerable groups on the labor market,
- DMI 6.3: Promotion of equal opportunities on the labor market,
- DMI 6.4: Trans-national initiatives for an inclusive labor market.

Reimbursable found. The Social Inclusion Program (SIP)\(^{57}\)

In 2005, based on the Common Memorandum of Social Inclusion (JIM), Romania has signed the Agreement between the Romanian Government and the European Commission regarding the implementation in the next five years of some measures intended for the inclusions of the most disadvantaged population categories, among which there are also the Roma. In 2006, the Romanian Government has signed together with the BIRD the Loan Agreement for the amount of 59 million € with the purpose of implementing in Romania a program for the social inclusion of some disadvantaged population categories. The target groups that the program is intended for are: the children that come from disadvantaged groups, including the Roma, persons with disabilities, youngsters exposed to risks and victims of domestic violence, including the Roma and the communities in which they live in. The approached fields were: early education, social assistance services, small infrastructure and community services projects, in the poor habitation areas, including the ones inhabited by the Roma, the setting up of a monitoring organism for social inclusion.

\(^{57}\) The legal base of this program is the Memorandum for contracting a loan from BIRD, signed on the 4\(^{th}\) of July 2006, with a value of 59 millions de dollars (47,2 mil. EURO) for the exclusive financing of the project regarding the social inclusion of the vulnerable groups and of the disadvantaged communities (SIP), ratified by the Parliament through Law nr.40/2007.
### Table 1. The design of the social inclusion program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financed field</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
<th>Amount from BIRD (€)</th>
<th>National contribution (€)</th>
<th>TOTAL (€)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority interventions (PIP).</strong> Small infrastructure projects and for community services, in the poor habitation areas, inhabited mainly by the Roma.</td>
<td>FRDS</td>
<td>11,700,000</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td>15,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive early education.</strong> Access to pre-school education of the children with the ages between 3 and 6 years old, including the children that belong to disadvantaged groups, such as the Roma minority.</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>6,100,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social assistance services:</strong> Rehabilitation of buildings and/or constructions, training, care facilities, services, etc. for the persons with disabilities, youngsters exposed to risks and the victims of domestic violence.</td>
<td>MMFPSPV</td>
<td>28,600,000</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>35,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting up a monitoring organism for the social inclusion</strong> of the Roma people, at the same time with the strengthening of the capacity to benefit from the post-accession funds.</td>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>0,800,000</td>
<td>0,200,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL €</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,200,000</td>
<td>11,800,000</td>
<td>59,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the ANR Archive. Subsidiary loan agreement between the MFP, MMSSF and ANR, ratified by Law nr. 40 from 2007 regarding Aide Memoire, Social Inclusion Project (SIP), 13th-17th of April, 2009.

The vision of the Social Inclusion Program (SIP) of the World Bank is an example of successful practice in the approach "mainstreaming is necessary targeting is obligatory", a slogan that refers to the approach
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proposed for the Decade of Inclusion, reviewed along the way through the European platform for the Roma social inclusion. SIP is for the vulnerable categories, including the Roma and the disadvantaged communities where they live. SIP includes 4 components and 4 objectives specific to the area of activity of each partner that signed the Agreement: MMFPSPV, MECT, FRDS and ANR.

With regards to the objective of reducing poverty and promoting the social inclusion of the Roma as provided in the SIP, according to the official documents, this will be achieved using the priority interventions component, (PIP) managed by a non-governmental organization with a demonstrated expertise (FRDS) and the early education component (PETI), managed by the MECT.

**Results**

**Results PIP** (implemented by FRDS)

- The partial results, until the month of May 2010 (the program was extended, is in the process of implementations) of the PIP component within the SIP show the following:
- 128 local communities, mainly inhabited by Roma people have been supported by promoting the community to initiate local projects,
- 260 people (in average 3 representatives per each local community) trained in the project management area,

---

58 The European platform was launched in April 2009 by the European Commission and is conceived as a cooperation framework consolidated, on a volunteer basis, between the relevant players, respectively between the member states, the European institutions and the representative of the Roma, in order to exchange good practices in the area of social inclusion.

59 The PIP component is intended for the communities mainly inhabited by the Roma (approximately 1000) of which 81 are in the rural areas. The value of the PIP project managed by the FRDS is 15.4 million Euro. (table nr.1).

60 The early education component (PETI), managed by the MEN has the objective to support the inclusion of the Roma children among the habitual policies and the programs of the MECT by carrying out some interventions during the first years of childhood, useful for the development of the child and for his preparation for school. The value of the PETI project managed by the MECT is 7.5 million Euro.

61 Component of the Social Inclusion Program (SIP)

106 integrated projects approved and contracted in the area of small infrastructure works and social services – design, works, and goods:

98 projects in ongoing implementation, in 62 locations, submitted by the city halls from 15 counties, in partnership with the representatives of the Roma communities and the NGOs, of which eight were finalized.

**PETI Results (implemented by MEN)**

- The construction and the endowment with furniture of 20 new buildings, in the areas where there is a high percentage of Roma minority children with ages between 0-6 years old.
- The restoration and the endowment with furniture of other approximately 50 existing buildings.
- The curriculum for the early education of the child from 3 to 6-7 years old was reviewed, having in view all the areas of his development: cognitive, language and communication, socio-emotional and physical, an education focused on the child.
- Program focused on the child where the educators promote the learning process in a way that has in view the global development of the children, their individual needs and interests, different teaching methods.

---

63Source: Presentation MECT- UMPIP, 2011.
CHAPTER II. STAKEHOLDERS INTEREST FOR INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

A study from the year 2006\textsuperscript{64} shows that at the level of the majority population’s perception, \textit{the responsibility for the Roma inclusion}, belongs to the \textbf{Roma} minority: National Agency for Roma, as a specialized institution of the Government, the Parliament, including the organizations that represents the Roma people in the Romanian Parliament, the Roma non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the Roma people themselves.\textsuperscript{65}.

But, \textbf{The European Commission}\textsuperscript{66}, considers that the main responsibility for the social and economical inclusion of the Roma people belongs to the \textbf{public authorities}, specifying that, the Roma inclusion “\textit{is a dual process that implies a change in the mentality of the majority but also in the mentality of the Roma people, a challenge for which firm actions are required, deployed within an active dialogue with the Roma minority, both at national level and also at EU level}”. As a consequence, the implementation, cooperation, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the inclusion policies of the Roma people from Romania were conceived in such a way that they clarify this dilemma of responsibility. For more details please see annex 3 The implementation mechanism.

2.1. The implementation, cooperation and assessment mechanisms for the inclusion policies of Roma minority in Romania

The mechanism is explicitly established only in the governmental strategies from 2001 and 2011 and provides mixed structures (public

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Study regarding the political participation of the Roma people in Romania- comparative results Roma / non-Roma, CURS, August 2006, available on the web site www.ndi.org.}

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{The Barometer of the Roma Inclusion, 2007, Bucharest, published by the Foundation for an Open Society, chapter written by the author Ovidiu Voicu – State of mind, institutions, political options of the Roma people from Romania.}

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{The Communication of the European Commission from 2011 “A framework for the Roma national integration strategies until the year 2020”}. 
Mariea Ionescu, Simona Maria Stănescu

authorities and NGOs) organized on horizontal and on vertical, the attributions of each mixed institutional structure (GLI, CMR, BR, BJR, ELR, ONG etc) and the role of the partners.

The structures of the mechanism are formed through legislative instruments specific for the level of the administrative institutional level: Decisions of the Prime Minister, Orders of the relevant Ministries and/or of the state secretaries/other presidents, Decisions of the Local Councils. In the case of Romania, the mechanism has the following detailed structure.

At central level, the mechanism includes a working group on Roma public policies and the Ministry commissions. The working group for the Roma public polices (called hereinafter the inter-Ministry work group- GLI), formed by the Decision of the Prime Minister (the Government’s strategy from 2011), attached to its Cabinet, of which also ANR is part of. The GLI has the coordination role of the Roma policies. The Ministry commissions for the Roma people (CMR) are formed within the Ministry that signed the strategy, through the orders of the relevant Ministries, which have an implementation and a monitoring role of the measures intended for the Roma people included in the specific area of activity: education, health, habitation, etc. The ANR has delegated a specialist in each CMR.

At local level (regional, county and local) the mechanism is formed at the level of the prefecture through the Decision of the Prefect and at the level of the City Halls through the HC and includes: representatives of the decentralized institutions and of the deconcentrated services, including NGOs, organized as a mixed work group (GLM). The main task of the regional, county and local structures is to sign strategic partnerships with various social players (stakeholders). The role of these mixed local structures (GLM) is to implement and monitor at local level the public policies drafted by the Government, including the Roma strategy. The connection between the regional and county level is done through the 7 Regional Offices of the ANR that cooperate with the County Offices for the Roma (BJR) and the GLM organized at the level of the prefecture.

67 The partnerships for the implementation of the public policies are institutional and organizational constructions at central, regional and local level of the public Authorities with: the network of the County Offices for the Roma, the Network of Local Experts within the City Halls, the Network of the Sanitary Mediators, the MECT Network, the NGO’s Networks, the Community Centers Network.
2.2. The role of the non-governmental organizations

According to the mechanism structure, the NGOs are partners in the consultation process for drafting public policies, especially at central level and they assess in a critical manner their implementation phase. At local level, the NGOs are dialogue and cooperation partners and participate in the work reunions of the mixed work groups (GLM) attached to the prefectures and city halls.

As mentioned above, achieving a collective welfare is possible through the state intervention, which has own mechanisms and resources with planned processes but also through the NGOs, drove mainly by their ideals, activism and actions, but through spontaneous processes. Recognizing their importance, since the beginning of the 1990s, they were actively involved to carry out some social interventions and to promote the rights of the Roma minority. The lack of a national fund addressed to these, determined them to reach external financers in order to approach punctual problems – short term interventions – the global problem remaining mostly unresolved. Furthermore, together with the request to implement the post-accession program, the proposed management blocked a great part of the NGOs` vigilance. Concerned to respond to the bureaucracy management of these funds, their attention was no longer focused on the way in which the disadvantaged people were spending the money or on the impact of the funds allocated to the Roma minority as a target group from their projects but on the implementation of the contracted projects according to the administrative procedures.

In December 2011, the “Strategy of the Romanian Government for the inclusion of the Romanian citizens that belong to the Roma minority for the period 2011-2020” was approved by a Government Decision. Currently, the strategy is being reviewed based on the observations formulated by the European Commission and on the ex-ante conditionalities that prepare the 2014-2020 programming. As in the period when the Governmental strategy from 2001 was drafted, the NGOs of the Roma have understood the importance of the context and of their role. Invited to be members in the

---

68 In agreement with the request of the European Commission from April 2011. An EU framework for the national strategies for the Roma integration until 2020.
Consultative Committee of the ANR, officially, they form a sub-commission of the Consultative Committee, organized per specialized commissions specific for the action fields of the strategy. The first reunions established their working manner and the objectives to be achieved.

Their contributions subscribe both to the review of the Sector action plans of the Strategy, according to their field experience and also to substantiate the priorities of the future European Funds 2014-2020. Likewise, they will be the base of the consultations and of the negotiations with the other social players included in the consultation process (the academic environment and the non-Roma NGOs that have experience both in drafting public policies for the Roma people but especially in implementing them, the associations of the public authorities and last but not least the Ministries responsible for the Roma inclusion through the commitments undertaken by the enactment of the Roma Government strategy and also by the Partnership between the Government and the European Commission for the 2014/2020 programming.

The consultation process is organized by the ANR and is estimated to be continued until June 2013. During the same period, the Soros Foundation for the Development of the Civil Society and the Resources Center for the Roma Communities are making an alternative report for the European Commission regarding the implementation phase of the Inclusion Decade and of the national strategies in the member states. Another research will be realized by World Bank to fundament the revision of the 2011 Strategy and fundament programming period 2014-2020.
CHAPTER III. WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE?

CHALLENGES

The new government formed after the elections at the end of 2012, has included in the Governmental Program 2013-2016 a few key measures that diminish the negative socio-economical indicators. It is intended to reduce poverty and to eliminate the families` dependency on the social security aid by developing opportunities, respectively national programs to be carried out at national, regional and local level, adapted to the needs of the families in risk situations. Also, it is recognized the need to coordinate the social inclusion mechanism set up at national level for the period 2007/2013 on Sector fields. Education is a priority in the government program and this means a package of integrated measures in the field of education and health simultaneously with offering support for the children and their families.

The Government’s report launched in 2010 on ESF allocated to Romania in the period 2007/2013 showed an absorption share of 10% of the 19 million allocated to Romania for the period 2007/2013. The Ministry of the European Funds set up in 2013 established an 80% target of fund absorption until the end of the year 2015. Currently, Romania, like the other EU members, is developing the Accession Partnership that provides, alongside the socio-economical analysis, also the financial framework for the period 2014-2020.

The socio-economical analysis carried out by the MMFPSPV has identified as vulnerable groups, the same categories defined in the JIM where the Roma people are also included, in an implicit and an explicit way: pre-school children, students with a risk of early school dropout and their parents, persons that have dropout of school before obtaining the basic skills and knowledge necessary to be integrated on the labor market, persons who live in isolated communities, community assistants, social workers, family mediators, imprisoned persons, youngsters who leave the institutionalized system of child protection, staff of the central and local
authorities, unemployed people, Roma people who work traditional occupations, Roma young adults and women, etc.

The programming process of the new funds has at base the Sector national strategies (including the Roma Strategy from 2001), is based on the lessons learned from the programming experience from 2007-2013 and also on the inputs of the technical assistance teams but also of the various social national and international players, but also on the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

Treating the Roma minority as being a social problem is a unilateral orientation, in opposition with the position of the Roma minority representatives and reflects the lack of dialogue and of a common strategic vision. The social problem was defined as being a deficiency that affects a great number of persons for which there is the need to do something, that require a collective social action and that is part of the public agenda

The socio-economical exclusion of the Roma minority has several dimensions, it affects the Roma as persons and the communities in which they live in, blocking community initiatives, projects and programs by not redistributing the incomes, not allocating or depending on the case, insufficiently and inadequately allocating the financial resources, the human and the social capital. The effects are complex and they become bigger and visible in the quality and the level of education, life expectancy, access of the young adults (women and men) on the labor market, etc.

The socio-economical and cultural inclusion of the Roma people was one of the political criteria for the accession of Romania, is part of the political agenda of each governmental party and has represented the negotiation or commitment object of the Government at external level. The collective social action is still a desideratum and represents only one subject of the frequent reports drafted by the Roma or non-Roma non-governmental organizations, which, even if they accurately reflect the situation of the Roma people, they cannot also, influence its improvement.

Despite all these, it is expected that the Roma civil society to have learned from the experience of the European funds implementation in the pre-accession and post-accession period and to get involved more in

---

69 Mărginean, Ioan, *The design of sociological research*, Iaşi, 2000, p 103, Polirom Publishing House, Iaşi
monitoring and evaluating the national strategy for the Roma people and of the funds allocated for its implementation. Of course, it necessary to re-activate their activism and militancy, but these values can serve as the base of the public-private partnerships with the social players from the cooperation, monitoring and evaluation mechanism, at central, regional and local level, exactly to influence the social action. It is expected that the NGOs and the networks they set up at regional and local level shall be consolidated so that they become partners in the implementation of their own projects and the rest of their time could be spend on vigilance actions.
CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS

4.1. Public policies intended for the Roma people

In the domestic and external public speech, the politicians, the technicians and the experts justify the necessity to know the dimensions of the Roma people in Romania and the way in which they are distributed in the territory. One of the frequently used reasons is: “in order to support the necessary of adequate projects and to estimate the costs of the public policies”, according to the situation or to the priority problems, identified for these. The speech is theoretical and continues with the approach type, an expected one, from “bottom to up”, “at the base”, with the necessity of the Roma participation in all the decision making processes during the entire implementation cycle of a policy strategy, program, project, etc.). The vision is lost, and this vision should be “for the Roma but with Roma people”, evaluating the potential for action of these and it should not be exclusively “for the Roma people” as passive beneficiaries.

As seen before, during the analyzed period, the draft of the public policies for the Roma people has represented a relative priority for the experts and the researchers, connected to the socio-political context, and that, each government has undertaken by enacting documents. Once more, the vision of the experts did not have in view the financial prognosis, the analysis of the context and the economical impact of these policies. The solution was to use external sources, mainly from the EC and to apply intervention programs, on short term to ease the effects and also on short term, determined by the historical exclusion of the Roma people, the global problem remaining in most part unresolved. The draft of public policies with impact on the Roma situation was rather a reactive process towards the visible adverse and often pressing social effects (lack of documents, migration, and school dropout) than part of a strategic vision.

The solutions that were approached have created greater expectations from the majority population that often relate to the Roma minority through
the amounts of money allocated for their inclusion and the affirmative measures. The results of applying such programs are qualified as being unsatisfactory not only at the level of the majority but also at the level of the Roma elite. For example, the MMFPSV report from 2013 confirms the weak results and identifies the factors that have influenced them. “On the labor market the projects implemented in the last years were rather inefficient. On one hand, only approximately half of the Roma persons of 16 years old and over have graduated the compulsory education cycle that provides them the eligibility for the professional qualification programs. On the other hand, in the case of many Roma families, the head of the family is the person that could participate in the qualification courses, the same person who brings an income into the family, reason why he renounces or refuses to participate in the courses”.

4.2. The financing given to the public policies for the Roma people

If the drafting of the public policies for the Roma people has as moment zero, the criteria from the Copenhagen and the objective to fight some phenomenon and unspecific form of democracy, the allocation of some funds in order to improve the situation/integrate/ economical, social and cultural inclusion of the Roma people has as moment zero the preparation period of Romania to join the united Europe.

The targeting approach in the PHARE programs proposed to the EC by the Romanian institutions had a greater addressability and allowed the monitoring and the impact evaluation of the financed projects.

The pre-accession funds (PHARE) have allocated for the improvement of the Roma situation an ensemble of directed measures (targeting) towards five large activity areas provided in the national strategic document: education, health, vocational training and employment (income generating activities), habitation and small infrastructure. The funds were managed by the public institutions through some mixed teams of technical assistance (national and international) formed by experts, specialists and NGOs belonging to the Roma minority, a mechanism that involved the members of the Roma community, has influenced both the capacity to absorb the funds and their efficiency and effectiveness but mostly has created models of good
practice. The teams of technical assistance and the NGO Roma specialists have supervised the implementation and monitoring process of the projects, fact that has determined chances of greater success than the mainstreaming approach from the post-accession funds.

For the large financial components of the PHARE grant schemes (between 50 thousand and 200 thousand €/project) the eligible applicants were exclusively the local public authorities, in partnership with the NGOs and/or the local initiative groups. Those projects were mainly focused on the field of infrastructure works (country roads and bridges) and in very few cases on habitation, but they respond more to the needs and to the local public agenda than to the real need of the Roma people from the community.

The smaller financial components, between 10 thousand and 50 thousand €/project, have addressed to the non-governmental organizations, in partnership with the APL and/or the local initiative groups and responded to the basic, individual needs of the Roma minority community members: education, health, vocational training and employment (AGV). The added value from the NGOs interventions is the transformation, at the end of the project, of the local initiative groups into self-supporting non-governmental organizations, fact that has not represented a priority for the APL.

4.3. The Social Inclusion Program

The scientific approach of the social inclusion program is an example of good practice, but its implementation still represents an objective to be analyzed.

The strategy of the priority intervention program (PIP) in the Roma communities has as base a survey carried out in 848 communities in the year 2005. Regarding the awareness of the needs, the author of the study shows that of the 5 layers (problems) identified by the members of the local communities, the quality of the roads is on level four. But, in the perception of the local elite, including the Roma elite, the most intense level in the hierarchy of the problems within the communities inhabited by the Roma people with serious problems was identified as being the problem of infrastructure. (Sandu, 2005).
As a consequence, like in the case of the other funds, grants, also the philosophy of the PIP component of the SIP program was directed towards infrastructure works and social services applied in the disadvantaged communities, including in the ones mainly inhabited by the Roma people, with the difference that they are based more on the perception of the needs identified by the local elites (mayors, public servant, local leaders including the Roma leaders) rather than on the needs/problems identified to be priorities by the members of the Roma communities.

4.4. The sustainability of the financed programs and projects

A characteristic of the investment schemes (grants) is the lack of sustainability.

As a principle, sustainability is an obligation for each applicant, either an APL or an NGO, and is correlated with the principles of developing the local community and the sustainable development. Through the PHARE programs, the number of the NGOs increased because the methodology provided the formation of local initiative groups as a partnership structure for the implementation of projects, structure that, at the end of the project, is transformed into an NGO, a solution for ensuring the sustainability of the projects (in some cases they have succeeded).

In the case of the NGOs, the sustainability of some infrastructure type projects is impossible to ensure because there are no maintenance costs. Unlike these, the APLs can ensure the sustainability of the infrastructure type projects through their own budget. As a consequence, the transfer to the APLs based on a public-private partnership could represent a solution to ensure the sustainability of the works carried out in the communities.

In the case of the income generating activities, the predecessors of social economy (included in the major intervention fields within the post-accession funds), the sustainability is difficult to be ensured because there is yet no social economy law in Romania and also because there is no public fund available to support these types of activities. Even if the NGOs, more than the APLs, have supported the local initiative groups to implement income generating activities type projects, they were also not able to ensure the sustainability of these projects. On one hand because there is no fund
intended for raising the capacity of the NGOs or for putting into practice the needs identified in their activities. On the other hand, the income generating activities are activities with an economical character that suppose, according to the legislation, the reinvestment of the profit obtained from the sales of products in social type activities (education, health, formation, etc.) carried out by the NGOs, and this is hard to achieve.

The APLs, more than the NGOs can easier ensure their continuity, through the redistribution of the collected taxations and local taxes, or through the state budget project. The interest of the APLs to carry out income generating activities type of activities would allow an increase of the possibilities to collect the taxations and the taxes at local level, fact can promote the local development. When this type of projects are perceived by the APL only as promoters of the welfare of only a small group of people, bringing individual benefits only for the Roma people, than the preference for large infrastructure projects is justified. But the impact on the community development with direct effect in the local tax collection process is forgotten. An economical activity carried out locally brings first of all money at local level.

Other positive aspects for the community are: the opportunity to create new jobs, the use of local resources, and the response given to some urgent community needs.

Last but not least, the infrastructure projects, in most cases intended for the rehabilitation of the communal and county roads can have a correspondent with the socio-economical problems of the Roma people if they would be involved in some income generating activities or if they were the entrepreneurs of some social enterprises whose goods or services are difficultly delivered due to the missing infrastructure.

Another indicator that could justify the impact of the preponderant allocation of finances to the infrastructure projects should make the connection with the socio-economical problems of the Roma people and could materialize by using within the project, during its progress, the Roma human resources, qualified and unqualified, the inclusion share on the labor market and employment in general being a fundamental problem of the Roma minority.
CHAPTER V. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. The setting up of internal and external cooperation networks

The lack of consultations with the Roma and the non-Roma experts and specialists, with the academic environment but especially with the members of the Roma community in the drafting of the public national and European policies is determinant also for the lack of vision regarding the Roma minority inclusion, the assignment of the intervention priorities and the allocation of funds. During the pre-accession period, the lack of vision was replaced with short term interventions, mainly in the rural areas and that responded more to the public agenda of the APLs. This fact is also reflected nowadays, both in the assignment of priorities and also in the allocation of the pre-accession funds, in the identification of the practical, pragmatic ways to apply the social inclusion concept but especially the approach type. In the context of prioritizing the future interventions, an indicator could be represented by the large share of the Roma people on regions, counties, especially of those who live in the rural areas.

5.2. Explicit approach

The mainstreaming type approach must be an exception. As long as, within the universal mechanisms for distributing the opportunities and the resources, the mainstreaming method does not distinguish the institutions of economical power from the social ones, this approach may exacerbate the inequities. As it was observed in the case of the post-accession programs of mainstreaming type, the suggested management increased the Romanian bureaucracy, has deepened the advantages and has created opportunities only for those who already had them. Even more, the mainstreaming method used in the allocation of the post-accession funds, where the Roma people are defined as being part of the vulnerable/disadvantaged groups creates
difficulties both in the identification of the real impact of the projects on the target group and also in the measuring of the progress.

5.3. Europe 2020 Strategy

In the context where the state members are concerned to reach the objectives they have commonly agreed to undertake through the Europe 2020 Strategy, its implementation mechanisms should combine the experience of the state members with the flexibility of the European policies, including those financial ones, the innovation regarding the mechanisms created at national level or the creation of new ones, so that the set of suggested priorities ensures also the participation and the awareness raising of the Roma people.

5.4. European Social Funds co-financed programs

Although, until the year 2012, the vision regarding the Roma inclusion is financially limited by the ESF, it must be extended in order to be included also in other programs such as: the National Program of Rural Development (PNDR), the Regional Operational Program (POR), The Development Fund for Agriculture (FADR), the Cohesion Fund and the Trans-border Cooperation Programs, etc.

5.5. The explicit allocation of the funds intended for the Roma minority inclusion

If, for the measures to improve the situation of the Roma people and the objective to fight poverty and to promote social inclusion, the total volume of funds was mostly attracted from the European Commission and from the BERD through the World Bank, the intervention mechanisms and the financial levers of the state were more difficult to call up. Starting from the assumption that the main responsibility for the social and economical inclusion of the Roma people belongs to the public authorities, “that have own mechanisms and resources, for which is required firm actions, carried out within an active dialogue with the Roma minority, both at national level and at the EU level”. The national strategies for the Roma inclusion until the year 2020 shall have the expected impact abiding the principle of the funds additionally.
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# ANEXES

## Annex 1. Estimations of the number of Roma in Romania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source/ Organization</th>
<th>No. estimated</th>
<th>Share in the majority population</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>ICCV Study</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>Hetero identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>INS Census</td>
<td>535.140</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>Self-identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UNDP Study (2003 published in 2006)</td>
<td>Minimum 1.8 million, Maximum 2.8 million</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>World Bank Study</td>
<td>Minimum version of 730.174 de persons, average version of 851.048 de persons, maximum version of 970.000 de persons.</td>
<td>Self-identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>European Commission, based on the data from the European Council (COM (2011) 173.)</td>
<td>Average version: 1.850.000 persons</td>
<td>8.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>INS Census</td>
<td>619 000</td>
<td>(3.2%)</td>
<td>Self-identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ionescu, NAR, 2013
### Annex 2. The age pyramid at the Roma population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Roma people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>12.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 years</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69 years</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74 years</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Institute of Statistics Data, Census of population and housing, 2002
Annex 3. Distribution of the Roma people per residence areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Region</th>
<th>Counties part of the region</th>
<th>Preliminary estimations according to the 2011 Census</th>
<th>Great share of the Roma people in the counties</th>
<th>Small share of the Roma people in the counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 1. North-East</strong></td>
<td>Iasi, Bacau, Suceava, Piatra Neamt, Botosani, Vaslui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Botoșani (39,9%), Vaslui (40,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 2. South-East</strong></td>
<td>Braila, Buzau, Constanta, Galati, Tulcea, Vrancea</td>
<td>Galați (79,8%), Vrancea (75,9%).</td>
<td>Constanța (37,1%), Tulcea (23,7%),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>11.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 3. Bucharest - Ilfov</strong></td>
<td>Bucharest, Romanian capital and Ilfov county,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public policies for Roma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Region</th>
<th>Counties part of the region</th>
<th>Preliminary estimations according to the 2011 Census</th>
<th>Great share of the Roma people in the counties</th>
<th>Small share of the Roma people in the counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 4. West</strong></td>
<td>4 counties: Arad, Caraș-Severin, Hunedoara, Timiș.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hunedoara (17.9%),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 5. South-West Oltenia</strong></td>
<td>5 counties: Dolj, Olt, Vâlcea, Mehedinți și Gorj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vâlcea (38.9%), Gorj (42.7%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 6. South Muntenia</strong></td>
<td>Is formed of 7 counties: Argeș, Prahova, Dâmbovița, Teleorman, Giurgiu, Ialomița, Călărași,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Argeș (84.2%), Dâmbovița (85.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>19.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Region</td>
<td>Counties part of the region</td>
<td>Preliminary estimations according to the 2011 Census</td>
<td>Great share of the Roma people in the counties</td>
<td>Small share of the Roma people in the counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 7. North-West</strong></td>
<td>Is formed of 6 counties: Bihor, Bistrița Năsăud, Cluj, Maramureș, Satu Mare, Sălaj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maramureș (39.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 8. Centre</strong></td>
<td>5 counties: Alba, Brașov, Covasna, Harghita, Mureș, Sibiu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Covasna (86.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total population of the region</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total Roma population</td>
<td>18.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compilation of the ANR using the data of the 2011 Census.
Annex 4. The mechanism of institutional cooperation for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Roma inclusion policies in Romania

The mechanism of institutional cooperation for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Roma inclusion policies in Romania involves various bodies and structures, including the Parliament, the National Agency for the Roma (ANR), and regional authorities. The chart illustrates the coordination roles and responsibilities of these entities:

- **Parliament**: Legislative and control role of the Government's activity.
- **Parliament Subcommission for the Roma**: Consultative role for the ANR, executive role in the relationship with the Parliament, control role in the relationship with the Government.
- **Work Group for Public Policies (Government)**: Coordination role.
- **Ministry Commissions for the Roma (CMR)**: Implementation role: MECT, MS, MMSSF, MAI, MDRT, etc.
- **National Agency for the Roma**: Consultative committee, coordination role.

### ANR Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANR Partners</th>
<th>ANR Attributions</th>
<th>Regional offices of the ANR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Central public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regional public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **ANR Attributions**
  - Draft of public policies
  - Monitoring of public policies
  - Evaluation of public policies
  - Partnerships
  - Relationship with the NGOs
  - Youth, women, children
  - Training

- **Regional offices**
  - Region 1 North East
  - Region 2 West
  - Region 3 North West
  - Region 4 Center
  - Region 5 South East
  - Region 6 South Muntenia
  - Region 7 Bucharest Ilfov
  - Region 8 South West Oltenia

Source: National Agency for Roma, 2013
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Part II. JOINT REPORT ON FUNDING PROGRAMMES FOR ROMA MINORITY SUCCESSES / FAILURES: ALBANIA, BULGARIA, ITALY, HUNGARY, ROMANIA AND SERBIA

Simona Maria Stănescu
INTRODUCTION

The comparative research report is elaborated within the *Project for the Active Integration/Inclusion of Roma in South East Europe (PAIRS)* framework. The analysed South East European countries are: Albania (AL), Bulgaria (BG), Hungary (HU), Italy (IT), Romania (RO), and Serbia (RS).

Research report analyses successes and failures of EU/national/regional funding programmes for Roma inclusion towards identification of successes and failures. In terms of sustainability, a next step would be to prospect transfer ways between countries in terms of exchanging relevant experience from a country to another one taking into account national context and relevant previous experiences. Exchange of international best practices among PAIRS project countries will support recommendations for policy decision makers towards streamlining future programmes. Nevertheless, members of the international team are aware about opportunities and constrains of this mutual learning exercise in finding common bridges suitable to different national contexts.
CHAPTER I. ROMA MINORITY
IN ANALYSED COUNTRIES

1.1. Recognition of Roma as a minority

Roma population represents the biggest European minority. As mentioned in one of the EU programmatic documents, „Roma – Europe’s largest minority of about 10 to 12 million people – are very often the victims of racism, discrimination and social exclusion and live in deep poverty lacking access to healthcare and decent housing” (European Commission, 2012b:2).

A significant proportion of the European Roma population lives in PAIRS’ countries. From the historical point of view, Roma minority has been present for centuries in all analysed countries.

Roma are recognized as an ethnic minority (Albania, Romania, Serbia), and a linguistic minority (Albania). The Act establishing their recognition as national minority by the Italian government is undergoing institutional evaluation. Roma in Albania are considered a cultural group and public policy approaches them from an ethnic-linguistic perspective. Bulgarian Constitution does not define the Roma minority as an ethnic or cultural one but they are often perceived as an ethnic minority. Since 2013 Roma in Hungary are considered as national minority but they used to be seen an ethnic minority. Roma minority is not approached from a perspective of historical legitimacy in any of the six South East European PAIRS countries.

Analysis of public policies reflects a common trend in recognition of Roma minorities but differences are to be noticed from the classification criteria as minority point of view. Roma are considered as ethnic, linguistic or cultural minority. Perspectives on Roma minority influences the perception of Roma at national level with impact on adopted public policies, supported measures and allocation of financial resources.

Analysis of Roma minority within PAIRS countries supports the mechanism of assisted resilience at both individual level as psychological
resilience in the sense of “capacity to overcome difficult periods” (Ionescu, 2013) and at the level of societal resilience as “its capacity to engage in positive relationships and to endure and recover from life stressors and social isolation” (Tomita 2013).

1.2. How many Roma?

According to statistics of the Council of Europe, Roma and Travellers Division, 15 out of 27 EU member states did not include Roma in their official censuses conducted in 2001 (Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary) or in 2002 (Romania, Serbia). The same applies to 10 out of 22 analysed Non-EU member states. National minimum and maximum estimations of Roma minority were available for 2001 and 2002 except for some countries (Malta, Andorra, Iceland, and Monaco).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of population Estimate in the document</th>
<th>Council of Europe estimations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>325 343</td>
<td>750 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>750 000</td>
<td>700 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>130 000 - 150 000</td>
<td>140 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>730 000 - 970 000</td>
<td>1 850 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comparative data shows a larger number of estimated Roma than the official statistics. According to Council of Europe’s official data (2001 and 2002 census in comparison with the total number of population in 2009), Roma represented 5% in Bulgaria, 2.4% in Romania, 1.9% in Hungary, 1.4% in Serbia, and 0.03% in Albania. According to alternative national estimations, Roma represented 11.2% in Romania, 11% in Bulgaria, 10.9%
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in Serbia, 4.1% in Albania, and 0.2% in Italy. Maximum estimations of Roma population size were 118 times higher than the official ones were noticed in Albania, seven times higher in Serbia, three times higher in Hungary, and four times higher in Romania. The Bulgarian maximum alternative estimation was two times higher than the official one.

PAIRS’ reports emphasize a “real” unofficial value estimated to be twice higher than the ones reported in Bulgaria and Hungary, three times higher in Romania and Serbia, and 14 times higher in Albania. The largest difference is noticed in Albania: the estimation of the real number of Roma varies between 16,000 and 120,000. In Serbia, Roma officially represent 2.1% of the total population while the alternative estimations are higher (Housing Center, 2013:5).

PAIRS national reports supports the idea of a larger Roma population in the analysed six South East European PAIRS’ countries than the official figures.

In terms of geographical disparities, Roma communities are very diverse across and within the analysed countries. Compared to other member states, Roma communities in Bulgaria and Romania are more isolated which “appear to shelter its members from discrimination and victimisation, whereas Roma in other Member States are more exposed though their regular contacts with mainstream society and services (EU-MIDIS, 2009a:12). This partially explains the high rates of not reporting discrimination in Bulgaria (92%) and Romania (81%) (EU-MIDIS, 2009a:6).

A common problem in the analysed six South East European PAIRS’ countries is the difficulty to know estimate the exact number of Roma as shown by the differences between the official (latest 2011 national census) and unofficial alternative figures provided especially by international organizations, research institutes and NGOs. Alternative studies focus on estimation of Roma’s size estimate higher percentages of Roma minority.

72 108 Roma communities in AL. Main tribes are the Kabuzis or Karbuxhinj (51% of Roma living in Albania), the Meckars or Meçkarë, (32% of Albanian Roma), the Cergars (subdivided in Shkodrani and Besaqe), the Kurtofs and the Bamilles.

The overview of main causes of statistical differences could guide us towards the identification of possible ways to reduce this gap in future censuses by harmonising the various sources of data.

One cause relates to the relatively recent inclusion of the Roma national, cultural or linguistic identity questions in the censuses’ methodology. 2011 census in Italy does not include the ethnic criteria. In the case of Italy, “quantitative data about the presence of Roma in Italy is not definitive or univocal: a vacuum of knowledge is partly due to the impossibility to perform censuses based on ethnicity, and partly to the reluctance to declare a highly stigmatized identity”\(^\text{74}\). This hinders for instance a more targeted allocation of resources to improve the situation of the Roma.

A further cause may be the low level of self-identification of Roma in censuses (and surveys in general). Roma rather tend to declare themselves as members of the majority population. Furthermore, in some PAIRS’ countries Roma may prefer to declare themselves as members of other ethnic minorities: for example in Bulgaria as Turkish and Walachians due to potential more positive public perceptions associated with these other minorities. In Albania, Roma are associated with Egyptians. In Serbian statistics ethnicity is recognised “as a personal preference” with focus rather on “ethnic commitment” than “ethnicity” situation which “causes many problems in the use of available data“ (Knežević, 2013:45).

Other causes for low self identification as Roma minority relate to strong discrimination faced by Roma, being stigmatized, and for example the fear to lose social or/and professional position. In the case of Roma in Romania, there is to be noticed a “sad inheritance transmitted to the future Roma generations by the Roma people deported in Transnistria” (Ionescu, 2013:7).

In terms of Roma living abroad, some small percentages of Roma live in neighbouring countries: Romanian Roma in Bulgaria and Hungary, and Hungarian Roma in Romania and Slovakia. Half of the Roma living in Italy are mostly from the “former Republic of Yugoslavia and Romania, with minor groups from Bulgaria and Poland” (Mariotti, 2013:5-6). In the case of Bulgarian Roma, Greece is preferred as first country of migration (Baev, Lomeili, 2013:24).

\(^\text{74}\) NRIS for Italy apud in Mariotti 2013, Italy – country report, Effective Programes for the active integration / inclusion of the Roma in the South East Europe (PAIRS), p. 3
1.3. Experiencing discrimination as Roma minority

According to EU-MIDIS 2008 data from 27 member states, every second Roma “was discriminated against at least once in previous 12 months” (EU-MIDIS, 2009a:3). A sample survey in seven member states\(^{75}\) emphasised that discrimination in private services is the most common area of discrimination followed by discrimination when looking for work or at work.

79% of investigated Roma did not report discrimination mainly because
- “nothing would happen/change by reporting” (78%);
- “didn’t know how to get about reporting/where to report” (52%);
- “too trivial/not worth reporting it – it’s normal, it happens all the time” (44%);
- concerned about negative consequences/contrary to my interest (39%) (EU-MIDIS, 2009a:6).

Table 3. Top three discrimination areas in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discrimination areas</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>First area</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>In private services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Second area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>When looking for work or at work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>By healthcare personnel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>By social service personnel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When looking for work or at work</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EU-MIDIS, 2009:5

Taking a closer look at Table above main sources of discrimination are faced by Roma minority in analyzed seven countries in private services, and when looking for a job or at work.

\(^{75}\)BG, Czech Republic, Greece, HU, Poland, RO, Slovakia

\(^{76}\)Same value registered as By social service personnel
1.4. Other common challenges

Despite international and national efforts towards improving the living conditions of the Roma, they continue to face various forms of discrimination and higher risks of social exclusion.

Compared to the general population, the average age of Roma is lower, and they continue to have higher birth rates in Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, and Romania. At the same time, Roma’s life expectancy is ten years lower than European’s average. According to PAIRS’s national reports, Roma fertility decreased during last years even if the official statistic information is not available.

In the analysed South East European countries one could identify common socio-economic characteristics in terms of economic development trends, forms of poverty, and types of social problems. With one exception (Italy), these countries shared a common political history: all post-communist regimes have faced the challenges of the transition from a planned economy to a market-oriented one. Moreover, Serbia was hit by the Balkan war, which heavily impacted the country’s population and economy, too.

The specificity of Roma population is based on the traditional Roma cultural model combined with the cultural model of the country where they live. A comparative research report on Roma living in Bulgaria, Italy, Romania and Spain identified as common elements: low educational level, precarious jobs (unstable and low payment) and low quality housing (Preoteasa, 2012:6).

The analysed South East European countries are hit by increasing unemployment rates, mostly due to the economic crisis. Poor Roma are especially hit by unemployment and insecure position on the labour market, because many times it is only the informal sector which employs them. This, however, causes the lack of long term perspective on receiving a regular income, insurance or pension. The lack of security and formal employment may push especially older people to severe poverty.

In many European countries Roma continue to earn income from traditional occupations. Most common traditional occupations mentioned in PAIRS national reports are: craftwork, horse trading, and small trade. Beyond
these professions, the construction industry and branches of agriculture also employ Roma in a partially formal manner. Informal jobs often perceived as survival jobs comprise casual daily jobs, collection of scrap metal, small trade of used clothes, waste collection, and begging. Newly informal jobs are often dangerous, imply hard work, and provide a low income level.

In all PAIRS countries Roma have lower level of education compared to the general population, which is explained by the fact that in some countries they face language barriers when entering school. Besides, many times early childbearing causes early drop outs for young mothers. Their exclusion from the labour market is exacerbated by the fact that in most countries there is no formal recognition of informally gained vocational skills and knowledge.

In all PAIRS countries a large share of Roma live in precarious housing conditions, many times in segregated areas with lower levels of service delivery.

Many Roma face difficulties in accessing health services, which impacts life expectancy and quality of life in general (for example due to the lack of documents or social security arrangements).

In all above fields Roma face discrimination.

Despite recent registration campaigns for Roma people carried out in some of the PAIRS analysed countries, lack of official documents continues to be a barrier for Roma inclusion (i.g.. Romania, Serbia, Albania). Official invisibility of some Roma people blocks their access to formal labour market, insurance system, housing, health and education.
CHAPTER II. REGULATIONS WITH IMPACT ON ACTIVE INTEGRATION/INCLUSION OF ROMA MINORITY

The chapter overviews international regulations and national legal and institutional frameworks focus on improving the quality of life for Roma.

2.1. International regulations

Recent measures addressing Roma’s problems are included in several international regulations starting with Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood” Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, art 1.

This international commitment reflects the vision: “if the non-discrimination provisions were effectively implemented, special provisions for the rights of minorities would not be necessary” (Holmström et al, 2001:344). Obvious necessary follow up steps were done for protection of persons belonging to minorities by prohibition of discrimination, and implementation of special rights.

“In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion, or to use their own language” International Convenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1976, art. 27.

The period of time allocated to transform a UN Bill into a UN Convention is an indicator of UN’s member states attention and commitment to protect vulnerable groups. Four years were needed to regulate women’s access to political rights; 12 years for regulations of non-discrimination of women; 30 years for protection of children, and 35 for protection of people with disability (Stanescu, 2013:65-6). The most recent Bill was adopted in 1992
and it is focus in elderly. One could ask how many years would be needed in order to make UN member states aware on this topic and adopt a consequent UN Convention. Measures included in mentioned UN Bills and Conventions impact on Roma’s minority.

**Table 4. United Nations’ Bills and Conventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>UN Bill</th>
<th>UN Convention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Woman – political rights</td>
<td>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
<td>1952 Convention of the Political Rights of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Women – violence</td>
<td>Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Person with disabilities</td>
<td>Bill of Rights for Persons with Mental Retard</td>
<td>2006 Convention on the Rights for the Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Person with disabilities</td>
<td>Bill of Rights for Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Elderly</td>
<td>Proclamation regarding Ageing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stănescu, 2013: 65-66
The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965), mentions ethnicity in defining racial discrimination as “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedom in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life” (art. 1)\textsuperscript{77}.

The only UN instrument focusing on the rights of minorities is the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities (1992). The document “balances between the right of persons belonging to minorities to maintain and develop their own identity and characteristics and the corresponding obligations of States, ultimately safeguards the territorial integrity and political independence as a whole” (Holmström \textit{et al}, 2001:347-8).

Other relevant documents for Roma inclusion are:

- The Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015,
- The European Platform for Roma Inclusion (European Roma Platform),

The Decade can be considered as “an unprecedented political commitment by European governments to eliminate discrimination against Roma and close the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society”\textsuperscript{78}. The Platform was created “to help coordinate and develop policies for Roma integration and stimulate exchanges among EU Member States, international organisations and Roma civil society. It aims to make existing policy processes more coherent and facilitate synergies”\textsuperscript{79} In line with EU’s concern for improving Roma condition, EU member states were invited to submit National Roma Inclusion Strategies or alternative social

\textsuperscript{77} http://www.anr.gov.ro/docs/legislatie/internationalea/Conventia_internationalea_privind_eliminarea_tuturor_formelor_de_discriminare_rasiala.pdf
\textsuperscript{78} http://www.romadecade.org/about-the-decade-decade-in-brief#
inclusion measures by 2011 (European Commission, 2012:4)\textsuperscript{80}. Malta was the only exception due to small number of Roma population.\textsuperscript{81}

In line with the Decade process and the EU framework for National Roma Inclusion Strategies, National Action Plans were elaborated which had to be coordinated with other national level strategic documents for Roma integration. Still, the lack or limited proper financing source allocated for the implementation of National Roma Inclusion Strategies Action Plans in PAIRS countries represents a major challenge to effective work for Roma inclusion. Within this context, action plans become more declarative frameworks than efficient tools with measurable objectives.

Before the Decade and the National Roma Inclusion Strategies process, some PAIRS countries have already developed Roma specific inclusion policies. The analysed six South East European countries could be classified into two categories: the ones which adopted specific measures from the early 2000s, and those who followed only in the past few years. National Strategies addressing Roma issues were adopted in 2000 in Bulgaria and Hungary, 2001 in Romani and in 2003 in Albania. Similar national Strategies were adopted late 2000 as follows: in 2009 in Serbia, and in 2012 in Italia. Hungarian National Strategy is not focus exclusively on Roma minority but also on non-Roma citizens.

A key point in these coordinated national measures was the recommendation of European Commission addressed towards member states to submit National Roma Inclusion Strategies (2011) followed by the follow up measures (European Commission, 2012).

As strong points in addressing Roma issues by national policies in analysed PAIRS countries, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania implement second consolidated versions of National Strategies for Roma.

\textsuperscript{80} The analysis of EU’current tendencies are relevant for RS as candidate country and AL as potential one
\textsuperscript{81} *** 2012, Comunicarea Comisiei către Parlamentul European, Consiliu, Comitetul Economic şi Social şi Comitetul Regiunilor Strategiile naţionale de integrare a romilor: o prima etapă în punerea în aplicare a cadrului UE, (Communication of Commission to European Parliament, Council, Economic and Social Comittee and Regional Comittee National Strategies for Roma inclusion: a first step in implementing UE framework), p. 4
Table 5. National Roma Inclusion Strategies in analysed countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name of strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BG</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>National Roma Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HU</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>National Roma Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RO</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>National Strategy to Improving Roma Situation (revised in 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RS</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>National Strategy for improvement of position of Roma in Republic of Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IT</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>National Strategy for the social inclusion of Roma, Sinti and Traveller communities 2012-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAIRS national reports

2.2. Institutional framework

Openness of the public institutions towards NGOs in last constantly increased. Public and private stakeholders have been constantly collaborating over the last years to promote the protection of human rights for Roma in the analysed countries. A common trend was that it was first non-profit and international stakeholders who launched measures of policy development, and the public bodies then became partners in tackling Roma issues at national level. Beyond harmonization of common approaches in terms of Roma policies (EU accession, Decade, Roma Platform), the international commitments also play a role in channeling financial opportunities into Roma inclusion. Still, the level of the problems would require additional resources, and implemented activities’ impacts are seldom the object of national evaluation and monitoring procedures. In line with latest developments, National Focal Points are given responsibilities to actively monitor the process of Roma inclusion/integration in every country. They collaborate with national stakeholders responsible for implementing national strategies for Roma inclusion and action plans. In Hungary the national contact point coincides with the national stakeholder.
In Albania, the Technical Secretariat for Roma “is still lacking capacity in terms of coordination, data collection and analysis, planning, reporting, monitoring and documenting actions” (PAIRSa, 2013: 25).

Table 6. Overview of main national stakeholders responsible for implementation of Roma National Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National stakeholder</th>
<th>Year of establishment</th>
<th>Subordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>The Technical Secretariat for Roma</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Directorate of Crosscutting Strategies in Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Commission for Roma Integration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Council of Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>State Secretariat for Social Inclusion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ministry of Public Administration and Justice&lt;sup&gt;83&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>National Office Against Racial Discrimination</td>
<td>2003&lt;sup&gt;84&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The Council of Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>National Agency for Roma</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>General Secretary of the Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAIRSa, 2013: 26, Mariotti 2013:2; national PAIRS report

Roma issues are dealt with in a complementary approach by various ministries with specific responsibilities in the field.

<sup>82</sup> initially under the State Social Service office  
<sup>83</sup> http://romagov.kormany.hu/download/5/58/200000/Strategy%20-%20HU%20-%20EN.PDF  
<sup>84</sup> http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/good_practices/1-specialised%20bodies/sb_italy_EN.asp
**Table 7. Public administration involved in Roma Integration/Inclusion programmes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>RS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ministry of Economy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Other institutions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAIRSa, 2013: 26; Housing Center, 2013: 15, 17, 19; Mariotti 2013: 2;

85 Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities in Albania
86 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy in Bulgaria
87 Ministry of Social Policy in Italy
88 Ministry of Labor, Family, Social Protection, and Elderly in Romania
89 Ministry of Labor and Social Policy in Serbia
90 Ministry of Education and Science in Albania
91 Ministry of Education, Youth and Science in Bulgaria
92 Ministry of Education and Research in Italy
93 Ministry of National Education in Romania
94 Ministry of National Economy in Hungary
95 Ministry of Economic Development in Italy
96 Ministry of Economy and Regional Development in Serbia
97 Ministry of Home Affairs in Bulgaria
98 Ministry of Interior in Italy
99 Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Telecommunication in Albania
100 Ministry of Tourism, Culture, Youth and Sports in Albania
101 Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism in Romania
102 Ministry of European Integration, State Committee for Minorities, The Office of Ombudsman (since 2000), The Commissioner for Protection from Discrimination (since 2010) in Albania
103 Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works, Ministry of Culture, Commission for Protection from Discrimination in Bulgaria
104 Ministry of National Development, Ministry of Public Administration and Justice, Ministry of National Resources, Ministry of Rural Development, the President of the Central Statistical Office and the representative of the Prime Minister’s Office are members of the Committee.
105 Ministry of Cooperation, Ministry of Justice in Italy
106 The Romanian Fund for Social Development in Romania
107 Ministry of Human and Minority Rights and the National Council of the Roma National Minority in Serbia
In Hungary the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Social Inclusion and Roma Affairs is responsible for national coordination and the State Secretary for Social Inclusion is involved as chair.

The institutional collaboration at regional and local level in Albania is facilitated by mainstream structures active in each of the 12 regions and subordinated to Regional Councils. The 12 Regional Committees on Social Services are assisted by Technical Groups on Roma issues „composed of public experts at regional level from the Prefectures, Regional Directorates of Police, Public Health, Education, State Social Service, Employment Office, representatives of Roma associations” (PAIRSa, 2013: 27). The institutional collaboration in Albania confronts the insufficient capacity to operationally implement the Roma Decade National Action Plan (PAIRSa, 2013: 25).

In Italy, the institutional network at regional level responsible for collecting specific data, management of funds for migrants working in close collaboration with local authorities represents a positive experience to be followed. The National Strategy for Roma Inclusion calls all 20 Italian regions to set up the so-called “Regional Roundtable for Roma”. So far only six out of 20 have done so.

The Romanian participative process of public consultation in elaborating 2001 and 2011 Roma National Strategies represents a best practice in terms of collaboration with relevant private and public stakeholders.

From the institutional point of view, specific roles of public and private stakeholders in collaborating to support the improvement of Roma situation is still at a mainly declarative stage with no clear share o responsibilities agreed. International donors and NGOs are involved in lobbying common efforts towards Roma and implementation of various projects dedicated to Roma communities. Identification and allocation of financial resources for Roma remains a sensitive subject.

At national level, responsibilities for implementing Roma inclusion public policies is given to specialized public institutions among which some are confronted with a high risk of institutional “failures” due to collaboration mechanisms between ministries within the context of limited allocated financial resources for Roma. Besides, opposite effects are noticed in Roma communities as individual survival strategies to problems remaining
unsolved by responsible institutions (i.g. illegal migration, dependency of social benefits especially minimum income guarantee national scheme). Empowerment of public policies capacity to promptly tackle this sort of problems is highly depending on design of central-local public administration cooperation, decentralized available resources, local governance design, involvement of community leaders, and public support and trust towards public institutions.

In respect with NGOs active in Roma social inclusion issues further steps are to be done in developing their collaboration and coverage at regional and local level as well as their capacity to attract funds and implement complementary projects towards empowering Roma communities.

2.3. Weaknesses and strengths

In terms of strong points, Albanian Roma National Strategy was “welcomed by Roma NGOs and praised by international experts for its comprehensiveness and, particularly, its sensitivity to youth and gender issues” (Abdikeeva, 2005:5). As weak points, some major issues have to be noted:

- omission of specific anti-discrimination and community empowerment measures,
- lack of a human rights approach,
- some proposals and objectives formulated in a troubling manner,
- lack of further policy development,
- lack of mainstreaming the Roma within national development strategy
- insufficient references to the role of Roma
- allocated budget, references to donors (Abdikeeva, 2005:5; PAIRS, 2013a)

Similarly, the Bulgarian National Strategy “reflects a political support. It defines proper strategic approach and directions for actions. It further develops the strengths of previous Roma integration documents”. At the same time, it does not propose any changes to the institutional arrangements
of Roma integration and to the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that proved their inefficiency during the previous years.\textsuperscript{108}

Five out of the six analysed South East European countries are part of Decade of Roma inclusion 2005-2015: Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia, and Hungary\textsuperscript{109}. As this political commitment is internationally open and supported by other countries, Italy is welcome to join.

In 2011/12, based on the EU Framework for Roma Inclusion, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Romania adopted National Strategies focusing on the social inclusion of Roma. For Bulgaria, Hungary and Romani this represented a follow up public policy exercise for the ones adopted in early 2000s. Besides, the Romanian National Strategy benefitted to a mid-term review (2006). In the further PAIRS countries, among specific negotiations to adopt Copenhagen criteria within the process of accession to EU, other international organisations, agencies and donors (World Bank, Council of Europe, Open Society Institute, Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, United Nations Development Programme) played a speed-up role within the process of supporting the development of national level Roma Strategies.

As strong points, all analysed countries have positive experience in collaboration between private and public stakeholders. In terms of best practices, a National Agency for Roma functions in Romania with branches in the eight development regions of the country. Involvement of Romanian National Agency for Roma as partner in PAIRS project supports the dissemination of best practices to other South East European countries.

In terms of common points, the analysed PAIRS countries present a similar trend in elaborating public policies focus on Roma based on identification of needs for Roma communities. The Roma population still constitutes the most vulnerable minority group in all states facing widespread poverty, social and economic marginalisation and frequent forms of discrimination, particularly regarding access to education, social protection, health services, employment and adequate housing.

\textsuperscript{108} *** 2013, Bulgaria – country report, Project for the active integration / inclusion of Roma in the South East Europe (PAIRS)

\textsuperscript{109} Other countries that joined the Decade are: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Macedonia, Montenegro, Slovakia and Spain http://www.romadecade.org/about-the-decade-decade-in-brief
CHAPTER III. FUNDING PROGRAMMES FOR ACTIVE INCLUSION OF ROMA MINORITY

Analysis included within this chapter is based on funds for Roma inclusion measures come from international resources, EU funds, national, regional and local funds. As PAIRS comprises member states, candidate countries, and potential candidate countries, we differentiate between non-EU funds and EU funds as a special financing source.

As no comparable amounts for funding spent for Roma inclusion/integration were provided in PAIRS reports, we focus the research on their presence as financial mechanisms in tackling Roma exclusion.

As international funds, UN was the main donor in the South East analysed area, except Italy. Among UN funds, the most present was United Nations Development Programs (UNDP). From a comparative perspective, Romania benefited from financial support of all analysed UN available funds for Roma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. International funds for the Roma inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International donors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. United Nations Development Programmes (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural (UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (BIRD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Open Society Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Roma Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAIRS national reports
From the EU perspective, three institutions were involved in financing Roma inclusion programs in PAIRS countries: Council of Europe, European Commission and European Agency for Reconstruction.

Table 9. European Union’ funds for Roma inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International donors</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>RS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Council of Europe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. European Commission</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structural funds: European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. European Agency for Reconstruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PAIRS national reports

Other national funds used for Roma inclusion programs mentioned in PAIRS reports were national (Serbia and Albania) and regional (IT). Funds from local level were mentioned in Albania: funds from Local Government Units.

3.1. Education: key elements and identified gaps

In term of key elements in promoting social inclusion of Roma minority through education, one could identify two sets of measures. The first is directly addressed to Roma pupils in terms of assuring school meals or keeping them enrolled in various school related activities including after school activities. Incentives (i.g. scholarships) to improve participation of Roma in higher education were implemented in PAIRS countries. The second set of elements refers to teachers on one hand and parents on the other hand. Various activities carried out in PAIRS’s countries (cooperation between educational institutions, extra-school services and Roma communities and families, network of school inspectors belonging to the Roma community) were focus on raising awareness about their support and contribution to children education.

One element insufficiently emphasized in analyzed PAIRS reports is related to policy maker level and national perspective supporting Roma
adult education. Even if school dropout is correctly identified as a common problem which needs to be addressed, adopted measures proactively approach children in school or at school ages. Sustainable long term effects depend on reactive measures of bringing back to school at school age or not graduated adults. Children which drop out school have better chances to go back to school if his/her family trusts that this would offer him/her a better future. Besides, the possibility of young mother to finalize at least the compulsory education level increases their chances to find a formal job or a better paid job.

Table 10. Comparative approach on education: key elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key elements in education</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School meals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>After school activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training of teachers on multiculturalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Romani language teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Measures to step up parental involvement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Second chance schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mediators</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dedicated places in high schools and universities for Roma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School dropout measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:1; Hungary, 2011:1; Italy, 2012:1; Romania, 2011:1

Table 11. Comparative approach on education: identified gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identified gaps in education</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Segregation in primary and secondary education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attention should be paid to higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitoring and data collecting systems focus on Roma children</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Precise quantitative targets and identification of the necessary resources</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The strategy does not cover completion of primary school by all Roma children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The integration into the labour market of the trained school mediators should be supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:1; Hungary, 2011:1; Italy, 2012:1; Romania, 2011:1
3.2. Employment: key elements and identified gaps

Main income sources of the Roma minority living in BG and RO were: child allowance, occasional jobs, salaries (twice higher in BG), pensions (almost three times higher in BG), invalidity pensions (twice higher in BG), and minimum income guarantee (three times higher in RO) (Preoteasa, 2012:12).

Table 12. Comparative approach on employment: key elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements in employment</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training courses for the unemployed, for labour office staff on the Roma, on entrepreneurship and management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subsidised employment for vulnerable groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Appointment of Roma representatives in the employment agencies in regions with predominant Roma population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A very clear vision on raising employment in a systematic way, based on 3 pillars: integration into open and legal labour market; through active labour market policies; social economy; and public employment schemes for the most disadvantaged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Specific attention to job creation in rural areas, mainly in the agricultural sector.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-discriminatory access to training courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop the micro-credit actions through the use of ESF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitor the situation of the undeclared work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reinforce the efficiency of the local Public Employment Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Promotion of the self-employment and entrepreneurship initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Support the transition from school to work helping directly Roma families, promote active labour policies to include Roma women in the labour market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Target to increase the number of Roma employees by 60,000, and the number of Roma female employees by 25,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Stimulating agricultural activities and traditional crafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Providing incentives to SMEs: infrastructure investments, loans, Roma employment subsidies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:1; Hungary, 2011:1; Italy, 2012:1; Romania, 2011:1
## Table 13. Comparative approach on employment: identified gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified gaps in employment</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A better addressability of rural Roma specific problems</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Possibilities of job creation in rural areas in sectors other than agriculture could also be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The problems of rural areas and disadvantaged micro-regions and segregated neighbourhoods should be addressed specifically.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effectiveness of public works programmes to provide (re)qualification and lead to sustainable employment should be examined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clear share of tasks and responsibilities among service providers and targeted services for Roma jobseekers via the public employment service could improve results.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appropriate funding (both national and EU) should be indicated.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. More focus on reintegration to the open labour market, developing more concrete measures in the area of social economy, self-employment /microfinance and vocational training would be needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More attention is needed to the reduction of unemployment, in particular in the case of women and youth, as well as to increasing the skills of the Roma population and to promoting transition from undeclared to regular and from short to long-term employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The proposed measures are lacking precise quantitative targets and quantification of necessary resources. The lack of figures and indicators will make it difficult to monitor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The target is not commensurate with the size of unemployment.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Potential of social economy entities should also be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:1; Hungary, 2011:1; Italy, 2012:1; Romania, 2011:1
### 3.3. Health: key elements and identified gaps

**Table 14. Comparative approach on health: key elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements in health</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inclusion of qualified Roma in social services and medical programmes.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion of health mediators</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promotion of mobile health units</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family planning support, monitoring of women</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reinforcement of existing projects aimed to monitor the health situation of Roma.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Acknowledgement of the need to target Roma women and children specifically.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Immunisation campaigns, vaccination campaigns for Roma children and families</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Information campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Health education campaigns in the field of prevention of tuberculosis in Roma communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Measures to tackle unhealthy lifestyles.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Training programmes for healthcare and social service workforce</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Strong analytical part in the area of health.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Active involvement of civil society and Roma representative foreseen in implementation of the strategy.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Focus on geographically deprived areas (micro-regions) covering also non-Roma population living under the similar conditions as Roma.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Identification of key challenges (e.g. lack of medical staff in rural areas, and lack of health insurance among Roma).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Target of increased access of Roma to public healthcare services and specific target on increasing the number of Roma health mediators.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:1; Hungary, 2011:1; Italy, 2012:2; Romania, 2011:1
Table 15. Comparative approach on health: identified gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified gaps in health</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The lack of health insurance coverage is a key problem for a large percentage of the Roma population</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of preventive services including immunisation, creating healthy living conditions via an integrated approach including social assistance.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Systems to monitor health needs and health outcomes of Roma.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Registration with public authorities is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Measurable targets and more specific measures to tackle problems identified (timeline for implementation, the budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:1; Hungary, 2011:1; Italy, 2012:2; Romania, 2011:1

3.4. Housing: key elements and identified gaps

A comparative report on Roma living in Bulgaria, Italia, Romania and Spain identified the following main types of housing: as owners (85.9% in Bulgaria and 81.5% in Romania), in Roma camps (27.3%). Analysis of types of dwellings inhabited by Roma migrants in Italy shows that 49% of Bulgarian Roma use shanty towns, caves and similar, compared to 42.3% Romanian Roma. The second possibility is apartment in a building with less than 10 dwellings: 12.7% Bulgarian Roma, compared to 7.5% RO Roma. Public policy in Italy is focus on isolated spaced for nomad Roma despite the fact that they are sedentary. In terms of primary facility in houses, access to electricity is the main asset of Roma houses (94% in Italy, 92% in Bulgaria, 90% in Romania). Quality of houses is worse in Romania: 36% have access to running water compared to 68% in Bulgaria and 91% in Italy. Only 24% of Roma houses in Romania are connected to the sewer system (including septic tank) compared to 78% in Bulgaria and 90% in Italy (Preoteasa, 2012:14-7).
Table 16. Comparative approach on housing: key elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements in housing</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social housing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understanding of the existing problems, willingness to solve them and interest for Roma inclusion from local authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A complex programme is in place for those living in segregated environment, conceived within an integrated approach.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promote micro-credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The financial framework presented is based on EU structural funds and resources provided at national, regional and local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clear and strong position against the “system of camps” (recognised as an unsuitable arrangement in terms of desegregation and social exclusion).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Regional development infrastructure project for 10 000 km of local and regional roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:2; Hungary, 2011:2; Italy, 2012:2; Romania, 2011:2

Table 17. Comparative approach on housing: identified gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified gaps in housing</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Desegregation in housing should be addressed along with desegregation in education and labour market integration.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More attention to be paid to social housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Measures better addressed towards identified situations. The quantification of financial resources is difficult to determine as there are no quantitative targets for future actions.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of areas with extremely poor communities and defining targeted measures to address the specificities of the situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:2; Hungary, 2011:2; Italy, 2012:2; Romania, 2011:2
### 3.5. Structural requirements and funding:
key elements and identified gaps

#### Table 18. Comparative approach on structural requirements and funding:
key elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements in structural requirements and funding</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The strategy acknowledges the key role of municipalities in the implementation: municipalities will have to adopt annual action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Further consultation with respective bodies implementing the Action Plan is foreseen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The consultation and dialogue with NGOs on the preparation of the strategy was of high quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Specific attention is paid to the situation of children as well as to raising awareness on discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. EU resources planned measures targeting disadvantaged people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The strategy shows efforts to solve the legal status of Roma from the Balkans and to recognise Roma, Sinti and Caminanti as ethnic minorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Limited dialogue with the local and regional authorities during the preparation of the Strategy and Action Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reference to European funding, as far as agriculture and rural development is concerned, without mentioning any amount.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:2; Hungary, 2011:2; Italy, 2012:2; Romania, 2011:2

#### Table 19. Comparative approach on structural requirements and funding:
identified gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified gaps in structural requirements and funding</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A territorial approach to Roma integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate funding for local authorities needs to be ensured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A significant improvement of the absorption capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The strategy does not make reference to any potential contribution of the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification of EU and national funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Identification of quantitative targets, indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The strategy does not reflect an integrated approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Involvement of the regional and local authorities and of Roma NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Effective coordination of implementation must be ensured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bulgaria, 2012:2; Hungary, 2011:2; Italy, 2012:2; Romania, 2011:2
CHAPTER IV. LESSONS LEARNED FROM SOUTH EAST EUROPEAN ANALYSED COUNTRIES

Based on national reports submitted by PAIRS National thematic experts successes and failures were identified for each of the analysed country. According to PAIRS national reports, best practices were identified in the field of employment, education, housing, and health. Other best practices elements were mentioned in the field of institutional and legislative frameworks.

When considering the transfer of a best practice from a country to another one should take into account the identification of common elements, and comparatively explore risks, opportunities and challenges that arise due to adaptation process to a different national context.

4.1. Successes and failures: Albania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSCE 3.3. mil € project for Western Balkans including AL</td>
<td>Limited financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Secretariat for Roma a monitoring and reporting system</td>
<td>Implementation, monitoring and reporting mechanism at central and local level government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Secretariat for Roma lacks capacity in terms of coordination, data collection and analysis, planning, reporting, monitoring and documenting actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.2. Successes and failures: Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roma culture subject in schools optionally for Roma or non Roma pupils (books and interactive discs available since 2002)</td>
<td>Slow improvement of Roma education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective in preventing early school drop-out: parent clubs, teacher trainings and forming a school parliament with the participation of students only</td>
<td>Segregated secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRIS expresses political will and defines proper strategic approach and directions for action.</td>
<td>NRIS does not propose change in the Roma integration institutional infrastructure as well as in the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that proved their inefficiency during the previous years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRIS continues and further develops the strengths of the previous Roma integration documents adopted by three Bulgarian governments.</td>
<td>Financial resources allocated to implement National Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4.3. Successes and failures: Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban rehabilitation to tackle segregation processes</td>
<td>Explicitly contradictory interventions have been launched and they will not support the goals of NSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No long term approach of NSRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of funding and institutional or regulatory discontinuity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 4.4. Successes and failures: Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social cooperatives</strong> able to offer jobs, regularize undeclared and illegal work situations, support a decent standard of living (much less after the economic crisis strike).</td>
<td>Weak link between national Roma policies &amp; EU framework in terms of policies and funding for social inclusion as no part of Decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Social Fund (regions of Calabria, Campania, Puglia, Sicily)</td>
<td>Insufficient capacity of funds absorptions by at local government level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Regional Development Fund</td>
<td>The NRIS is still far from sufficient implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Programme Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows</td>
<td>Housing solutions are still inadequate in most regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roma targeting tends to be still exclusive**
### 4.5. Successes and failures: Romania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional development</td>
<td>Initiatives from the local authorities are not yet sufficiently evidence based and lack in monitoring of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interministerial control room to guide the integration / inclusion process over time</td>
<td>Widespread use of discriminatory language towards roma by Media and Politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Office against racial discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successes</td>
<td>Failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School mediators in schools with high percent of Roma children.</td>
<td>Ineffectiveness of the integrating approach in ESF projects (low level of trained Roma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma health mediators in localities with more than 500 people belonging to Roma minority</td>
<td>The lack of a national funds allocated to NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School after school programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second chance programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of inspectors, professors for Romani language and history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative measures. High school and university places for Roma students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of several stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional framework at national, regional, county and local level</td>
<td>Bureaucratic management of post-accession programs partially blocked a NGOs` vigilance in monitoring impact on Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treating of Roma minority as a social problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.6. Successes and failures: Serbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impact of Roma measures in employment and education</td>
<td>Insufficient allocated funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According with 2007 assessment report</td>
<td>• to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• best impact of employment programs</td>
<td>• to monitor follow up successful projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• second best impact in education</td>
<td>Comprehensive and holistic policy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 - Roma coordinators</td>
<td>Disaggregated data on Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma assistants</td>
<td>Efficient monitoring structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish legal and strategic frameworks</td>
<td>Gender perspective in adopted policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roma non-participation in policy process of elaboration,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public policies for Roma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successes</th>
<th>Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized structures for coordination and monitoring</td>
<td>Implementation, monitor and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003 Social Innovation Fund</strong></td>
<td>Roma not included as measurable beneficiaries of mainstreaming policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated national funds</td>
<td>Since 2012 lack of political support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2008 Roma coordinators in 20 local self-governments</td>
<td>Institutional coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2008 eight municipalities – planning documentation for ten Roma settlements</td>
<td>Capacity building on monitor and evaluation of policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roma health mediators</td>
<td>Housing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affirmative employment measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Roma Inclusion in Vojvodina region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V. STREAMLINING FUTURE PROGRAMS

The report focused on identification of best practices in terms of funding programmes addressing Roma issues implemented with EU/regional/national funds and the framing national policies in the PAIRS countries.

Analyzed South-East European countries confront various gaps in addressing social inclusion of Roma:

- lack of measures to address specific social problems faced by vulnerable Roma despite common measures adopted by each country in the field of employment, education, housing, and health,
- rigid institutional systems which should be adjusted,
- insufficient correlation between various stakeholders which could support the improvement of Roma living conditions,
- insufficient cultural knowledge about approaching and answering the Roma communities’ social problems,
- differences between public mentality and stereotypes in comparison with public policy measures and potential support of the general population in adopting them.
- insufficient financial resources allocated for the implementation of National Strategies for Roma Inclusion, including National Actions Plans
- no real coordination of available resources despite political commitment
- low capacity to access private funds from donors
- no reliable data sources on Roma population (both size and general characteristics and the impact of programs)
- two sides communication gaps
- in Roma communities about their rights and duties as citizens
- population: information and awareness public campaigns about Roma
- gap of Roma participation to decision making process
Key conditions for further measures to improve Roma situation include:

- long term commitment,
- long-term and accountable financial responsibilities for political engagements focusing on Roma inclusion,
- decentralized financial support mechanism (local governments),
- publicly available information about and for social inclusion of Roma,
- efficient cooperation mechanism between relevant stakeholders,
- sustainable intra-national and inter-national mechanisms of bottom-up and top down interchange of policies and good practices on Roma inclusion.

Our recommendations for South-East European countries included in PAIRS project are:

- a better coordination between mainstream and targeting approach of Roma inclusion
- improved institutional coordination at horizontal level between responsible stakeholders and at vertical level between central and local levels
- better overview and coordination of allocated human and financial resources from national and international funds and donors
- improvement of evaluation, monitoring and reporting mechanisms
- increasing the trust of Roma in public institutions
- empowerment of Roma communities in general (in other words, nothing should be done for Roma without Roma).
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