FROM PRE-ACCESSION TO ACCESSION

Thematic Evaluation

Review of the European Union Phare Assistance to Roma Minorities

Phare Support Allocated in 1999-2002 and Implemented until November 2003

EMS

Review of the European Union Phare Assistance to Roma Minorities

Interim Evaluation of Phare Support Allocated in 1999-2002 and Implemented until November 2003

Thematic Evaluation Report

December 2004

European Commission Directorate-General Enlargement
Directorate E – Evaluation Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Scope and Objectives

The aim of the review is **to summarise the achievements of Phare Roma programmes** in the five countries where integration of Roma minorities was specified as an Accession Partnership priority (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia) **and to consider to what extent they have contributed to a wider social inclusion agenda.** The period covered by the review is October 2001 to July 2003, over which time a total of 26 programmes, amounting to some M€95.77 of assistance (M€64.54 from Phare plus M€31.23 of national co-financing) were specifically targeted at Roma minorities.

The Commission was particularly interested to focus on 'lessons learned and good practice' and the Report is geared to that end. It is therefore not the intention of the report to go into detail about the level of social and economic exclusion being experienced by many Roma communities. The fact that large numbers of Roma are affected by poverty and unemployment, and that they exist in poor living conditions, has been confirmed in recent research. By placing this review in the context of the wider social inclusion agenda, it is acknowledged that this is the most critical policy field that can improve the quality of life and living standards of Roma minorities.

Context

1.   The Report starts by acknowledging the extreme sensitivity and difficulty of achieving Roma integration, given that the roots of the problems faced by the Roma, and by the societies within which they live, go back many centuries and involve widely held and deeply entrenched attitudes and emotions. Given that background, it is a remarkable and praise-worthy achievement that Phare has nevertheless been able successfully to exploit opportunities for promoting integrationist projects for the Roma, which have contributed significantly to opening up a civil dialogue; and which have achieved some initial results and set an agenda for the future which, less than ten years ago, would not have been conceivable. The opportunities offered to member states by the Structural Funds, and the powerful pressures for reform inherent in the anti-discrimination directives, have both begun to be recognised and to exert further incentive to address Roma affairs.

Analysis of Key Evaluation Findings

Relevance of programme purpose and design to the needs of the sector

The Phare Roma minorities programmes are in line with the *Accession Partnership* agreements and they take account of the findings in EU Regular Reports. Transposition of the anti-discrimination legislation has been an outcome of the accession process which should go a long way to supporting the fight against discrimination, provided the law goes hand and hand with efforts to improve people's understanding of the factors leading to discriminatory behaviour. The legislation however cannot on its own tackle the poverty and social exclusion experienced by many Roma communities, as it needs to be embedded in wider social inclusion policies that take account of the socio-economic factors that lead to exclusion. Most Phare programmes were developed as socio-economic interventions designed to deal with some aspects of the social exclusion experienced by many Roma minority populations.

Although the Phare Roma programmes reviewed have a social inclusion dimension, at the time of their programming and implementation, there were no active national social inclusion strategies to underpin Phare involvement. At the time of this review, the Joint Inclusion Memoranda were being completed. Consequently, Phare resource allocations were generally targeted on the most visible and acknowledged problems.

The largest share of resources, some 60%, was spent on education related and infrastructure development activities, with the remainder used to support a collection of other relatively small scale, but none the less important, activities. In many instances, project design has been overly ambitious, taking insufficient account of what could realistically be achieved within the life of a Phare programme. The design and objectives of recent programmes are becoming better focused, notably in Romania.

How efficiently have programmes been managed and implemented ?

In many cases, countries delegated the management of Phare projects to their new Roma offices and implementation of these complex socio-economic development type projects proved to be a challenge. Inexperience of Phare procedures and also of the broader principles of development have affected implementation.   Staff shortages, staff changes and poor administrative and absorption capacity affect the various managing institutions.

Project implementation was made more difficult because of insufficient preparatory work to build trust and partnerships between stakeholders; stimulate local ownership, and build capacity to participate in planning and project implementation. Where multi-faceted projects were designed, implementation difficulties were compounded. The problems that arose in Phare management were not significantly different to those facing other Phare programmes, and early administrative and procedural delays reduced the time available for implementation, and made completion of the projects difficult to achieve within the available timescales. Some projects promoted a 'bottom-up' and participatory approach. Although this proved difficult to achieve through Phare, it is an approach based on good practice. In grant-funded projects, the capacity of many NGOs to meet grant application procedures was low.

The main effects and outputs stemming from the programmes

The absence, in any of the five countries, of a clear policy framework for social inclusion of Roma means that many Phare programmes were considered to fall outside the mainstream functions of Government ministries. Evidence shows that when the programmes fall clearly within the responsibilities of one Ministry, there is a much stronger commitment to systemic change, and projects are regarded as a mechanism that will test and inform future policies and implementation methodologies.

In all five countries, some form of National Office for Roma affairs, has been established and is responsible for inter-ministerial coordination and for ensuring that Roma issues are taken into account in the policies of each Ministry. This is a very positive development. However, their status and capacity is not adequate to manage effectively such a significant influencing agenda.

Implementation challenged inexperienced staff, but the value added from this has been learning by doing, not only about Phare procedures but also about the diversity and complexity of development type issues. Phare has had a positive effect in terms of providing 'learning by doing' experiences, as it has introduced a large number or organisations into the complex arena

of social inclusion and has provided practical hands-on experience of project management and implementation.

Phare tried to emulate complex socio-economic development schemes, but for many reasons, including the short term nature of Phare and inexperience and lack of preparedness of the sector, the final outcomes of many projects fell short of these high expectations.

The wider impact of the Phare Roma minorities programmes

Phare and the EU accession process was a significant lever to increase awareness and to highlight the importance of Government intervention to address the problem of Roma social exclusion. Each of the five countries has adopted some form of document or strategy that outlines the Government's commitment to integration of Roma. This is a significant step forward. But still there are no Government led strategies that clearly define exactly what social inclusion (integration) of Roma means or how this will be achieved.

It is widely acknowledged that Phare has stimulated discussion and opened the door for more open dialogue on Roma minorities. Phare programmes helped to highlight the magnitude, severity and complexity of the problems but, thus far, greater national commitment is needed to determine why current systems are failing Roma. Although programmes revealed the need for sizeable changes, commitment to systemic change and mainstreaming is generally weak.

Phare acted as an introduction to the complex arena of social inclusion for many organisations and served to demonstrate that this is a long term and complex process. Phare also exposed a lack of capacity and professional experience within the current systems. In a few instances the results of Phare projects have directly influenced Government policies, for example, the new Education Legislation in Hungary that outlaws segregated practices in schools.

Sustainability of programmes and their results

There is widespread agreement that the issues affecting Roma minorities should be considered within a much broader agenda. At the same time there are fears that, in a wider strategic context, discrimination will be exercised, and Roma will be overlooked in favour of other disadvantaged groups within the majority population or other minority populations. There also seems to be a lack of clarity about the term 'social inclusion'. There was certainly no clear understanding of how a social inclusion strategy would guarantee a position of priority for Roma in the future.

Many Phare projects have been short-term, one-off interventions. In a few instances, primarily in the education sector, interventions started through Phare have been absorbed into mainstream funding. Some sustainability can be foreseen in the learning and increased awareness that has occurred at policy and operational levels and in the partnerships that have been established as an outcome of project implementation. More importantly, sustainability is likely to be enhanced by the fact that Roma issues are eligible for structural fund support in member states, and this has been taken into account in programming preparatory activities for the funds in candidate countries.

But those who are more aware and better informed because of Phare are small in numbers and mainly contained in specific areas in the public institutions. Though growing, this is not yet a group with sufficient status, influence and access to power to engender change on the scale required.

Key Evaluation Questions

The following five questions were identified for answer during the course of the review:
- What type of support has been applied under Phare?
- Do Roma programmes reflect the wider social inclusion agenda?
- Has Phare influenced change in policy and project implementation?
- How successful has Phare been in promoting learning by doing in this sector?
- What conclusions can be drawn and what lessons can be learned for developing an integrated approach to Roma minorities?

What type of support has been applied under Phare?

During this review, the 26 Roma programmes were broadly categorised by the type of activity covered in each programme. This exercise revealed that the resources were spread across 12 different topic areas and that the bulk of the resources was targeted towards education related and infrastructure development activities. The remainder was used to support a collection of other relatively small scale, but none the less important, activities.

Education

Funding (Phare plus national co-financing) for Roma minorities' programmes in the education sector amounted to M€ 32.2, within which some M€ 10.6 was allocated for the supply of educational related equipment and for works projects to upgrade and refurbish educational premises. Much work has been done in the education sector with Phare assistance and most countries have made some efforts to introduce an element of multi-cultural education into the curricula. There are some examples of good practice, particularly a project in Romania that has a firm objective to introduce multi-cultural teaching practices.

Overall, greater emphasis needs to be given to building a lifelong learning approach to ensure that the education systems offer accessible and inclusive learning opportunities for people of all ages. Responsibility for change in education lies very firmly in the hands of Governments, and without a strong commitment to bring about systemic change, there is a limit to what assistance programmes like Phare can achieve.

Improving Roma Living Conditions

One large, M€16.7 project accounted for nearly two thirds of the expenditure on infrastructure development programmes, which together attracted some M€26.2 of total (Phare plus national co-financing) funds (27% of the total resources). The programmes were primarily developed as a means of improving the living conditions within detached Roma settlements. Infrastructure development projects, in the main, followed a 'top-down' interventionist approach. This resulted in isolated interventions without sufficient local participation or a clear long-term vision of how area regeneration would continue or be resourced in future. Without such a strategic context, there is a risk that, while such interventions make slum conditions a bit more habitable, they do little to bring the goal of Roma integration any closer.

The review shows that infrastructure projects should not come first, but should be an extension of development work to stimulate local involvement and generate a local capacity to react and absorb the resources available. Good practise is a 'bottom-up' approach that combines infrastructure development with community planning. This concentrates different activities on

defined geographic areas and involves building and working in partnerships with local Roma and non-Roma communities, NGOs, and public institutions. This is a solid approach that mirrors those applied in Member States to tackle the multi-dimensional problems of social exclusion.

Employment and labour market re-integration

Unemployment, and particularly long-term unemployment, is one of the root causes of poverty and social exclusion. Given the scale of unemployment in Roma communities, it is surprising that only 9% of Phare assistance for Roma minorities was spent on tackling unemployment. Not enough emphasis or investment has gone to tackling unemployment and labour market re-integration for unemployed Roma. The labour market reintegration projects that were delivered were not based on an informed understanding of the patterns of unemployment or the barriers that exclude Roma people from the labour market.

Overall, little effort has been made to ensure that wider Phare European Social Fund type projects are successfully inclusive for Roma. Although such projects provided an opportunity, in advance of access to the Structural Funds, to develop and test the effectiveness of active labour market measures and to ensure that they reach unemployed Roma, this has been utilised in only a few instances. The exception is Hungary where in recent European Social Fund type projects, Roma are named as a priority group with dedicated resources and an implementation approach to better orient the project towards unemployed Roma.

The social economy and intermediate labour market training and employment projects should be recognised as a means of generating and improving employment opportunities for unemployed Roma.

Support to Non-Governmental Organisations

Of the total allocation, M€5.6 was spent to support NGOs, the bulk of which went to grant schemes in two Civil Society Development Programmes, in the Czech Republic and Romania. Overall, some 360 projects have been funded through NGO managed grant schemes and such projects supported a vast range of different services such as educational support; street children projects; legal advice and counselling; leisure time activities; labour market re-integration; health services; cultural exchange information, and advice and research.

The fact that in both the Czech Republic and Romania the programmes have been managed by an NGO has proved to be successful in allowing experience to grow, establishing successful working relationships and a flow of information between those driving the policies at national level and locally based organisations. But many projects have been small scale, short term and often not sustainable as they depend on a long term funding commitment that is not readily available. While such projects can improve the quality of life and widen the range of services available, the impacts of such measures are not in themselves enough without much higher mainstream support and long term commitment.

NGOs have been champions of the Roma cause by maintaining a level of pressure and by stimulating activities at local level. Such organisations can operate as effective partners and can be drivers of change, making sure that pro-Roma policies are translated into reality on the ground but, on their own, they have neither the power nor the resources necessary to stimulate change of the magnitude required. The scale of the task is beyond the capacity of these

relatively small organisations which, although operationally effective, cannot be a substitute for larger interventions and Government driven policy change

Other activity areas

The other Roma related activities that received funding have included: Media and public awareness campaigns (5.8%); Administration (3.6%); Legislation and strategy development (3.3%); Institutional training (2.4%); Health (0.9%) and Health information (0.3%); Business Development (0.2%) and Research (0.1%). The activities that have been undertaken in these areas are worthwhile but, in most cases, the projects have been relatively small and have been smaller components within larger projects.

A specific example relates to health. Given that poor health is connected with poverty and social exclusion, and is generally regarded as a critical factor in social inclusion policies and given also that the life expectancy difference between Roma and non-Roma is estimated to be 12 years less for men and 8 years for women, health is an area that has not been given the significance it deserves in Roma programmes.

Do Phare programmes reflect the wider social inclusion agenda?

Social exclusion and inclusion are multidimensional concepts and income, employment, education, housing and health are critical factors. While the Phare Roma programmes met the criteria and brought crucial financial support to the sector, the scale of financial allocations and weaknesses in project implementation meant that Phare programmes could have only a limited wider impact, though their contribution to the increased attention paid by policy makers to the importance of addressing Roma issues should not be underestimated.

Some Phare programmes tried to encompass a multi-dimensional concept by including a range of different activities into one single project, but the outcomes fell short of what was anticipated. Tackling social inclusion is about bringing together the expertise and the resources of the different ministries, and organisations, to simultaneously concentrate on either one area or one target group, while ensuring that overall control for any given intervention is clearly allocated to one body.

How successful has Phare been in influencing change in the policy arena?

As an outcome of EU pressure the Roma question has moved to a position of higher priority, but at the same time it has also become much more a political and partisan issue. Pressure on the countries to make the right decisions is immense, and in some cases the capacity of those responsible for driving the process does not reflect the scale of the task. The political and operational environment surrounding the policies for Roma Integration remains fragile.

There is no well-informed, clear vision or goal to define exactly what Roma inclusion means and how this will be achieved. Although Phare helped focus the attention of policy makers and practitioners on the relevance of interventions in this area, this awareness has not sufficiently been used constructively to inform future policies and measures.

Very little is being invested by governments to assemble the necessary knowledge and comprehensive understanding of the scale and complexity of the problems. As a result, policies and policy measures are not being developed which accurately reflect the circumstances. At

political level, there is no across-the-board Government and ministerial commitment to social inclusion, and so far no developed strategic framework to drive the progression forward.

How successful has Phare been in promoting learning by doing in this sector?

The greatest benefit of Phare has been perceived in terms of the capacity building and learning on the job that has taken place across Government ministries, NGOs and other organisations involved in projects. The value added has been a cadre of young, qualified professionals functioning within this complex policy area. The numbers, however, are not sufficient, and certainly not enough of them are Roma; and their level of development expertise does not match the enormity or complexity of the task. Nevertheless, the practical experience that has been gained should not be underestimated, and should be effectively channelled and further developed to better underpin operational practices for the future.

Less positive factors in terms of learning by doing are that Phare has not been effectively used to build sustainable development partnerships, and for those countries acceding in 2004 this is an opportunity that has not been used constructively in advance of access to the Structural Funds. Widespread partnership working at local authority level has been missing, despite the local connections between Roma communities and municipalities.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Social Inclusion of Roma must be underpinned by strong Government commitment that is translated into an integrated, multi-agency approach where Roma social inclusion is regarded as a mainstream issue. This requires partnership working across all Government ministries and all strands of the public and NGO sectors; with other donors; and with Roma and non-Roma communities. This is not a blueprint for guaranteed success, but a long process of sustainable development is the only realistic way forward. Without across-the-board commitment to bring about systemic change to overcome the barriers that exclude Roma from mainstream society, the goal of social inclusion of Roma will remain a distant vision.

The following key points have been extracted from the 25 recommendations and 11 examples of key lessons learned and good practice drawn from the findings of this review.

	Recommendations	**Key Lessons Learned**
Education	Governments must lead in ensuring that social inclusion policies for Roma are translated into practice. Social inclusion must be underpinned by serious commitment to bring about systemic change, particularly in the education sector.	Education projects cannot, on their own, integrate Roma into the mainstream education system unless they are underpinned by a strong and long-term Government commitment to systemic change and education reform.
Unemployment	More should be spent to tackle Roma unemployment. Government active labour market policies and ESF should include Roma as a priority group, and the measures should be oriented to overcome the barriers that exclude Roma from the labour market.	Not enough is being done to tackle long-term unemployment that is endemic in many Roma communities
Infrastructure Development	Interventions that relate to infrastructure upgrading should be closely scrutinised to ensure that they are an extension of previous community planning and development activities, before Phare or other funds are committed.	Top-down interventions, related to upgrading of infrastructure, do not bring the goal of social inclusion of Roma any closer unless they are part of a comprehensive regeneration strategy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

Acquis	Acquis Communautaire
ALM	Active Labour Market
AMOS	Assistance and Monitoring System
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
Cofin	Co-financing
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
DfID	Department for International Development (UK)
DG	Directorate General at Commission Services Headquarters
ECD	European Commission Delegation
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
GP	General (medical) Practice
IA	Implementing Agency for Phare
IE	Interim Evaluation
ILO	International Labour Office
JIM	Joint Memorandum for Social Inclusion
HRDOP	Human Resource Development Operational Plan
MoE	Ministry of Education – Hungary
MoEL	Ministry of Employment and Labour - Hungary
MoER	Ministry of the Education and Research - Romania
MoLSAF	Ministry of Labour Social Affairs and Family – Slovakia
MS	Member States
NCECDI	National Council for Ethnic and Demographic Issues
NDP	National Development Plans
NGO	Non Government Organisation(s)
NLO	National Labour Office - Slovakia
NROS	Civil Society Development Foundation – Czech Republic
ONEM	Office for National and Ethnic Minorities
PAA	Pre-Accession Adviser
RCRC	Resource Centre for Roma Community – Romania
ROP	Regional Operational Plan
SPO	Senior Programming Officer
TA	Technical Assistance
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
SF	Structural Funds

PREFACE

This review of Phare Assistance to Roma Minorities covers the five countries: Bulgaria; Czech Republic; Hungary; Romania; and Slovak Republic where integration of Roma minorities was a priority in the *Accession Partnership* agreements.

The Review of Phare Assistance to Roma Minorities was prepared by EMS consortium[1] during the period from September 2003 to January 2004 and reviewed in autumn 2004 by the former lead partner in that consortium, ECOTEC. The evidence for this review is predominately empirical, drawn from an extensive number of interviews (97 in total) and discussions with those involved in the management and implementation of Phare programmes, past and present. The review team would like to thank everyone who gave up their valuable working time to contribute to this review.

Information is also based on Interim Evaluations (IE), carried out in each country by the EMS Consortium between August 2001 and July 2003, and covers Phare assistance under the 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 programmes. Findings are also based on an analysis of the Financing Memoranda, formal programme documentation, and other relevant published material.

The report is intended to provide management information for the benefit of the Commission Services across several Directorates General dealing with Roma and with minority issues in particular and social inclusion issues in general. In addition, the report targets national administrations in the five countries included in the review, as well as other countries with a sizeable Roma population. It is not the intension of the report to provide any form of blueprint or solution for social inclusion of Roma minorities, but rather to focus on examples and to draw on the lessons learned from past experience, which form the basis for Recommendations.

---

[1] The authors of this Thematic Review of Phare Assistance to Roma Minorities are Ann Hyde, assisted by Short Term Technical Specialist Will Guy. The Report was reviewed by Klaas-Jan Reincke and Richard Thomas.

MAIN REPORT

1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background and Context

2.   The European Council meeting in Copenhagen in 1993 formulated political, economic and acquis-related criteria to be met by countries applying for membership of the European Union. The Political Criteria state that membership requires that the candidate country has achieved "stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities." At its meeting in Luxembourg in December 1997, the European Council decided that Accession Partnerships would be the key feature of the enhanced pre-accession strategy. The Accession Partnerships of 1999 specified integration of Roma as a priority for Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia. By 2001, reference to the Roma minorities in the Accession Partnership documents, for the same five countries[2], referred to:

> '*fighting against discrimination (including within the public administration), fostering employment opportunities, increasing access to education, improving housing conditions; and providing adequate financial support'.*
>
> *EU: Accession Partnership 1999*

3.   The sensitivity and difficulties which existed and which remain in the way of achieving this integration are very considerable. This is not surprising, given that the roots of the problems faced by the Roma, and by the societies within which they live, go back many centuries and involve very deep-seated and firmly-held attitudes and emotions. It is neither appropriate nor relevant in a report of this technical nature to go into that background further than to acknowledge its importance. However, despite that background, the overriding political imperative for accession, coupled with the pressures implicit in the Copenhagen criteria and applied during negotiations, have enabled much to be achieved. A civil dialogue has been opened; the Commission has grasped available opportunities to use Phare for launching integrationist projects for the Roma; some initial results have been achieved, and an agenda for the future has been set which, less than ten years ago, would not have been conceivable. This is a remarkable and positive achievement. The opportunities offered to member states by the Structural Funds, and the powerful pressures for reform inherent in the anti-discrimination directives, have both begun to be recognised and to exert further incentive to address Roma affairs.

4.   Notably, the five candidate countries concerned[3] have adopted government plans or programmes to protect and promote integration of Roma minorities and tackle racism, although as yet implementation and funding of these programmes generally remain at a low level. The EU has been providing support and financing projects for the integration of Roma minorities channelled mainly through the national Phare programmes. Having acknowledged the unique nature of Roma issues in the accession process and the constraints faced by those programming Phare initiatives, hereafter in the report the normal evaluation methodology will necessarily be applied to the analysis of Phare programmes related to the Roma.

---

[2] Annex 1 provides an extract of the priorities identified in the Accession Partnership documents.
[3] Three of which; the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary acceded on 1 May 2004, after the cut-off date of this report.

5.   Placing this review in the context of the wider social inclusion agenda acknowledges that this agenda is the most critical policy field that can improve the quality of life and living standards of Roma minorities. In October 2000 at the Lisbon and Santa Maria da Feira European Councils a set of appropriate objectives, for the fight against poverty and social exclusion, were adopted, and were subsequently endorsed by the Nice European Council in December 2000. In November 2002 the Social Protection Committee concluded that there was no need to make major changes to the objectives as they had proved to be balanced, robust and viable.[4] They recognised that:

> *'Poverty and social exclusion take complex and multi-dimensional forms which require the mobilisation of a wide range of policies under that overall strategy. Alongside employment policy, social protection has a pre-eminent role to play, while the importance of other factors such as housing, education, health, information and communications, mobility, security and justice, leisure and culture should also be acknowledged'*

1.2   Objectives of the Thematic Review

6.   The aim of the review is **to summarise the achievements of Phare Roma programmes** in the five countries where integration of Roma minorities was specified as an Accession Partnership priority **and to consider to what extent they have contributed to a wider social inclusion agenda.**

7.   The Commission was particularly interested to focus on 'lessons learned and good practice' and the Report is geared to that end. It is therefore not the intention of the report to further detail the level of social and economic exclusion being experienced by many Roma communities. It would have been ideal to represent the levels of social and economic exclusion being experienced by Roma communities in statistical terms. However the necessary data sets providing consistent, reliable and robust demographic and statistical information are not available across all five of the countries included in the review. The fact that large numbers of Roma are affected by poverty, unemployment, poor levels of education and that they exist in poor living conditions has been well represented by some recent population surveys[5] and this evidence has been accepted as providing the necessary backdrop for this review.

> Increasingly severe poverty among Roma in Central and Eastern Europe has been one of the most striking developments in the region since the transition from socialism began in 1989. While Roma have historically been among the poorest people in Europe, the extent of the collapse of their living conditions in the former socialist countries is unprecedented. While most Roma had jobs during the socialist era, formal unemployment and poverty among Roma communities is now widespread. The problem is a critical one. ….Policies to address Roma poverty therefore need to be an integral components of countries' economic and social development strategies
>
> (World Bank 2003)

---

[4] Annex 2 contains an extract of the agreed *Objectives in the Fight Against Poverty and Social Exclusion* issued by the Committee in November 2002.

[5] World Bank: Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle (2003) Avoiding the Dependency Trap : UNDP (2002)

1.3   Key Evaluation Questions

8.   At the outset of the review the following five specific questions were identified, which the Report seeks to answer:

- What type of support has been applied under Phare for Roma Minorities?
- Do Roma programmes reflect the wider social inclusion agenda?
- Has Phare influenced change in policy and project implementation?
- How successful has Phare been in promoting learning by doing in this sector?
- What conclusions and lessons can be learned for developing an integrated approach to Roma minorities

1.4   The Methodology

9.   The period covered by the review is primarily from October 2001 to July 2003. In practice, this means that the Phare programmes for 1999 – 2002 constitute the main evaluation cluster, but lessons are also drawn from earlier, 1998 programmes. The evidence for this review is predominately empirical, drawn from an extensive number of interviews and discussions with those involved in the management and implementation of Phare projects, past and present. Of the total of 97 interviews, 45 (46%) were carried out at grass root level with people directly involved in projects. (This included three focus group discussions involving Roma and non-Roma participants); 32 (33%) with government ministries, and 20 (21%) from European Commission Delegations (ECDs), Implementing Agencies (IAs) and other donors.

10.   Information is also based on Interim Evaluations (IE), carried out in each country by the EMS Consortium between August 2001 and July 2003. Findings are also based on analysis of the Financing Memoranda, formal programme documentation, and other relevant published material.

11.   The first part of this review involved a stocktaking exercise to identify Roma related programmes in the five target countries. The stocktaking exercise revealed that a total of 26 programmes, amounting to some M€96 of assistance specifically targeted at Roma minorities, were prepared during the period 1998-2002[6]. The average share of co-finance amounted to 33%, leaving almost M€64.54 of Phare assistance for these programmes.

12.   Of the total assistance, the largest share was in Hungary (28%) and the smallest in the Czech Republic (8%). Table 1 provides a breakdown of the total assistance by country and value (M€).

---

[6] Some 9% to address unemployment through human resource development activities such as employment and training and vocational education; 8% to community development type initiatives; 7% to provide assistance with administration, legislation and strategy development; 6% to support local projects and the NGO sector through grant schemes; 6% to public awareness and media campaigns; and the remaining 3% to improve the provision of health services and health information; to provide anti-discrimination and multi-cultural awareness training in public sector institutions; to stimulate business development; and for research .

Country	Number of projects	Value of Phare	Total project Value	Value of Co-finance	Co-finance %	Share of total assistance %	Average project size
Bulgaria	5	9.375	12.014	2.639	22%	14%	2.4
Czech Rep	6	5.000	7.500	2.5	33%	8%	1.3
Hungary	6	17.500	30.730	13.23	42%	28%	5.2
Romania	4	16.000	18.930	2.93	15%	25%	4.7
Slovakia	5	16.660	26.594	9.934	37%	26%	5.3
TOTAL	**26**	**64.535**	**95.768**	**31.233**	**32%**	**100%**	**3.7**

Table 1Source : project fiches [7]

13.   The first Roma programmes were in the Czech Republic and Romania in 1998, in advance of the 1999 Accession Partnership agreements. In 1999, Phare National Programmes in four of the five countries, except Romania, included Roma related programmes. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the programmes by country, year and value (M€).

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		TOTAL	
Country	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value
Bulgaria			1	0.500			3	5.484	1	6.030	5	**12.014**
Czech Rep	1	0.900	1	0.800	3	5.050			1	0.750	6	**7.500**
Hungary			1	9.600	2	6.350	1	10.000	2	4.780	6	**30.730**
Romania	1	2.000			1	1.000	1	8.330	1	7.600	4	**18.930**
Slovakia			1	2.300	1	4.109	2	19.075	1	1.110	5	**26.594**
TOTAL	**2**	**2.900**	**4**	**13.200**	**7**	**16.509**	**7**	**42.889**	**6**	**20.270**	**26**	**95.768**

Table 2 : source: project fiches

14.   During the evidence gathering stages of this report, a broad framework was used to steer the interview questions and also to ensure that the same sample of questions was asked of each participant. A copy is attached at annex 8. Individual interviews were not conducted on a straight question and answer basis but more as discussions, including two focus groups, from which relevant information was extracted. During the course of interviews, despite attempts to confine discussions specifically to the Phare projects, they often steered towards a broader explanation of the magnitude and complexity of the problems the projects were trying to address. A large number of the individuals interviewed are highly committed to 'making a difference'. Most expressed frustration about the difficulties they had encountered, for a range of different reasons. One person likened their job to "pushing a large ball up a hill, but with their hands tied behind their back".

---

[7] The table show the variance in the levels of finance for each country. It may be an indication of the level of political commitment. It was impossible to reach a judgement and to determine how the decisions were made in relation to the amount dedicated from the national programmes for Roma related activities .

2.   ANALYSIS OF KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS

15.   This Chapter provides an overall analysis of the Phare assistance on the basis of the five evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The main focus of this review is on 'lessons learned and good practice' which are addressed in chapter 3 in the context of the Key Evaluation Questions.

2.1   Relevance of programme purpose and design to the needs of the sector

16.   The Phare Roma minorities programmes are in line with the *Accession Partnership* agreements in the five countries in relation to the political criteria of the *acquis*, and they also take account of findings in EU Regular Reports, such as "concerning the Roma community, little has been done to remedy problems of social discrimination or to take concrete action to improve very poor living conditions[8]".

17.   When the anti-discrimination legislation is in place, fully EU compliant in all five countries, and supported by an Equality Body, this should go a long way to supporting the fight against discrimination provided the law is imposed and translated into practice. But anti-discrimination legislation on its own will not tackle the root causes of social exclusion, as discrimination is only one contributing factor. It needs to be a component part of social inclusion policies that take account of the socio-economic factors that combine together to lead to exclusion. In recognition of this the Phare programmes were not specifically tied to the legislative requirements, but were developed more as socio-economic interventions targeted at the Roma minority populations.

18.   The early Phare projects drew attention to the extent of Roma exclusion and demonstrated the importance of government intervention to address the problem. At that time, Roma were seldom featured in government policies and, as a result, the Phare initiatives were perceived to be separate and additional to mainstream functions of the various ministries. In subsequent years all five countries have adopted some form of document or strategy[9] that outlines the government's commitment to integration of Roma. While this is a significant step forward, there is still a need to define in more detail, what social inclusion (integration) of Roma means or how this will be achieved[10].

---

[8] 2003 Regular Report on Bulgaria's progress towards accession, EU. Though after the cut-off date of this report, the 2004 Regular Reports for Bulgaria summarises: "Efforts have been made in the past years to develop a framework to tackle the problems faced by minorities, but the situation on the ground has not evolved much. Sustained efforts including allocation of appropriate financial resources will be necessary to effectively implement the intentions and to combat in particular anti-Roma prejudice." For Romania, there is a somewhat more positive assessment, "The Roma Strategy, which is explicitly aimed at addressing discrimination, is being implemented but de facto discrimination against the Roma minority remains widespread. The support for an inclusive approach to education is a positive development. The same encouraging trend has been noted in health care and employment."

[9] Framework Programme for Equal Integration of Roma into the Bulgarian Society (The Framework Programme) 1999 and Action Plan for Implementation of the Strategy September 2003: The Roma Integration Policy Concept – Czech Republic last updated - March 2003: the medium term package of measures aiming to improve the living conditions and social situation of Roma, accepted by the Hungarian Government in 1997 – and amended in 1999: The Strategy for Improving the Situation of the Roma (April 2001); and Basic Thesis of Government Policy Concept for Integration of Roma – Approved by Government of the Slovak Republic April 2003.

[10] At a World Bank and Soros Foundation Conference in July 2003, the Prime Minister of Hungary made strong commitment to Roma inclusion. A significant outcome of this conference was that representatives from all five countries included in this review committed themselves to Roma inclusion and to supporting implementation of a strategy. Preparation of the strategy for 'A Decade of Roma Inclusion', which will be a multi-country document covng nine countries, is currently in progress.

Resource allocations

19.   In terms of allocation of Phare resources, there were two areas which predominated; education related activities and infrastructure development[11], which together attracted more than 60% of the total Phare assistance to Roma minorities. The remainder was used to support a collection of other activities (Footnote 9) all of which are relevant to the needs of the sector and in their own way, towards a wider goal of social inclusion (integration) of Roma. There is however, no strong underpinning evidence to support how resource allocations were prioritised, apart from an immediate and visible response to external pressure. In each of the five counties there is insufficient demographic information to quantify the extent of the social and economic problems that face residents of Roma communities.

20.   Too much was invested in infrastructure, to the detriment of other high priority areas such as, employment where less than 10% of all resources was spent on initiatives to address long-term unemployment that is endemic in Roma communities, and only 3% on health related initiatives despite the fact that poor health and reduced life expectancy are serious side effects of poverty and social exclusion. It is acknowledged, however, that infrastructure projects provide some, generally short term, employment opportunities.

Project design

21.   In many instances project design has been overly ambitious and did not take account of what can realistically be achieved within a Phare project life cycle. Too many different activities were all scheduled to happen at the same time. Design did not take sufficient account of the readiness, or the capacity, of the sector to absorb and respond to the new monies available. This applies in Government institutions responsible for Phare project management, and also across the broad range of organisations that needed to contribute to successful implementation.

22.   Investment in infrastructure development projects within Roma communities, which were probably a response to external pressure to improve the living conditions of Roma, in many instances adopted a very top-down interventionist approach. This resulted in isolated interventions without sufficient local participation nor a clear long-term vision of how area regeneration would continue or be resourced in future. There is a risk that, while such interventions make slum conditions a bit more habitable for a few families, they do not address the goal of Roma integration. Although it may be perceived as of less immediate practical benefit, it could have been better to invest more in a widespread community planning exercise, and less on immediate infrastructure interventions. At least at this stage there would be a better understanding about the extent of the problems and a clearer picture of local priorities and local needs, as a basis for future decisions and resource allocations.

23.   Phare Roma projects to tackle unemployment have been sub-components of larger projects and they have relied too heavily on traditional implementation methodologies. Projects do not include anti-discrimination measures to guarantee that they are sufficiently inclusive to allow for participation of unemployed Roma. The exception is Hungary, where Roma are named as a priority group, with a dedicated allocation of resources, and an

---

[11] The predominant weighting of infrastructure is a consequence of the fact that one very large project – the largest single project in the sector – was for infrastructure development in Slovakia (M€16.7, of which M€8.3 was from Phare and M€ 8.4 was from co-financing).

implementation approach that recognises the need for an alternative approach to reach unemployed Roma. This is an example of good practice.

24.   Although Phare Roma programmes have a social inclusion dimension, at the time of this review there was no overarching, cross sectoral and multi agency strategy to underpin Phare involvement. In this respect, responsibility for change lies very firmly in the hands of Government, and without strong commitment to bring about systemic change and provide significant resources, assistance programmes like Phare can only secure marginal improvements in relation to overall needs.

2.2   How efficiently have programmes been managed and implemented

Project management

25.   The cross sectoral design of some projects meant that they did not fit logically within the competences of any one ministry. Management of Phare projects was delegated to the newly established Roma offices and implementation of complex socio-economic development projects severely challenged these organisations. Inexperience, of both Phare procedures and the broader principles of development, has affected implementation. Staff shortages, staff changes and poor administrative and absorption capacity affects the various managing institutions. The field of development is complex, but this job has been left to relatively young, inexperienced public servants, who have neither the specialist knowledge nor the breadth of experience to manage such a broad and complex portfolio.

26.   In terms of the management of Phare, the problems that have emerged are not significantly different to those that occurred in many other Phare programmes; delays due to fiche modifications; insufficient numbers of quality tender or grant applications; the application approval process; and late contracting. In many cases, the initial administrative and procedural delays reduced the time available for implementation, which made fulfilment of the objectives difficult, if not impossible, within available timescales. The practice of designing multi-faced projects that amalgamate a range of different activities, all scheduled to run concurrently, also compounded implementation difficulties.

Project implementation

27.   A recurring problem in infrastructure projects, has been land ownership and obtaining building permits. In education projects, the time available for implementation tends to be limited to the school year, but co-ordinating activities within this narrow time frame proved challenging for the managing institutions.

28.   Some projects adopted a bottom-up and participatory approach, based on a model of good practice. But this proved almost impossible to translate into reality, within the limitations of Phare. The complex tender procedures effectively excluded local companies, as they did not have the know-how, or language skills, to comply with tender application requirements. Project implementation was made even more difficult because of the lack of preparatory work to build trust and partnerships between all stakeholders; stimulate local ownership, and build capacity to participate in planning and project implementation. In early grant funded projects, the capacity of Roma NGOs to meet grant application procedures was a problem. Although there were sufficient numbers of applications, the quality made it difficult to approve a sufficient number of quality applications.

2.3   The main effects and outputs stemming from the programmes

Strategic policy

29.   The cross sectoral design of some programmes meant that, in many cases they did not fit logically within the competences of any one Ministry. Evidence shows that when the programmes fall clearly within the parameters of responsibility in one Ministry, (MoE and MoEL in Hungary and MoER in Romania) and management is contained within that ministry, there is a much stronger correlation between the programme and the overall policies of the Ministry. In these cases, there is a much stronger commitment to systemic change, and projects are regarded as a mechanism that will test and inform future policies and implementation methodologies.

Learning by doing

30.   Implementation severely challenged inexperienced staff, but the value added from this has been learning by doing, not only about Phare procedures, but also about the diversity and complexity of development. It is in this area of learning by doing that Phare has had the greatest effect. Across all levels, most saw the benefits stemming from Phare in terms of capacity building, since it both stimulated and prepared for participation in future EU projects. Although this is a positive outcome, the largest share of organisations are in the NGO sector, and therefore do not have sufficient status, or access to power to influence government policy on the scale required. It may not be clearly recognised, at this time, but Phare has be given credit for introducing a range of different organisations into the complex arena of social inclusion.

Project results

31.   The effects of infrastructure projects to improve the living conditions of Roma are, by nature, confined to specific geographical areas. What has been done through Phare will only make a dent in a much bigger problem. For example, in Slovakia 30 settlements out of 620 have been targeted to receive assistance through infrastructure projects to improve housing and sanitation conditions.

32.   Much work has been done in the education sector with Phare assistance and most countries have made efforts, some more than others, to introduce an element of multi-cultural education into the curricula. There are examples of good practice: training and involving Roma assistants in the classroom is an intervention that is now used in all five countries; schemes to promote maternal (parental) involvement in the education of their children; pre-school education to prepare children for school: extra curricular activities that combine learning with leisure; and the use of school and Roma inspectors to create links between the education authorities and Roma communities. Phare in Hungary clearly demonstrated how little is gained by projects alone, to tackle the endemic problem of segregation in education, unless there is government commitment to systemic change in education practices. Overall greater emphasis needs to be given to building a lifelong learning approach to ensure that the education systems offer accessible and inclusive learning opportunities for people of all ages. To be appropriate, learning opportunities need to extend beyond the parameters of 'traditional' education into building community based education opportunities that are more relevant and more inclusive to encourage adults into education by promoting learning in areas such as active citizenship, human rights education and community development practices.

33.   Not enough emphasis has been placed on tackling long-term unemployment within the Roma communities, for which only 9% of Phare was allocated. It is therefore difficult to see any significant results from the relatively small number of projects, but there are a few examples: training of Roma counsellors to facilitate and stimulate Roma involvement in employment projects, and training opportunities that formalise work skills and past employment experience. The exception is Hungary where Roma are named as a priority group in a recent ESF type project, with dedicated resources and an implementation approach that recognises that projects need to be oriented towards Roma to be inclusive. This is an example of good practice. Although Phare provided an opportunity, in advance of SF and ESF, to develop and test the effectiveness of Active Labour Market (ALM) measures, to ensure that they reach unemployed Roma, this has been utilised in only a few, Roma specific projects. Overall little effort has been given to ensure that wider ESF type projects are successfully inclusive for Roma.

34.   In terms of institution building, twinning and technical assistance have generally been applied effectively to assist with strategy development, and to expose countries to the institutional structures and practices that are applied in similar circumstances in member states. Phare tried to emulate complex socio-economic development schemes, but for various reasons: the short term nature of Phare; inexperience or lack of preparedness of the sector, the final outcomes of many projects fell short of their high expectation.

2.4   The wider impact of the Phare Roma minorities programmes

35.   Phare is only one instrument that has funded projects with an overall objective of social inclusion (integration) of Roma.   Government programmes, international civil society organisations and bi-lateral assistance programmes have also been active in this field. The biggest impact stemming from Phare projects for Roma minorities is that, more than any other assistance programme, Phare is widely acknowledged as the lever of change that has stimulated discussion and opened the door for more frank dialogue with a wider, civil society constituency. The need to fulfil the Copenhagen political criteria in relation to Roma has been exposed during the negotiations and this has had the decisive effect of getting governments to start to adopt an appropriate legislative framework and, in at least some cases, to set targets and provide resources.

36.   In consequence, Phare was enabled to assist some countries to comply with the political criteria of the *acquis* with the development of human rights and anti discrimination legislation. This is a step forward that will go some way to support the fight against discrimination, provided it is enforced and translated into practice.

37.   During the accession process, in all five countries, some form of National Office for Roma affairs,[12] was established and charged with responsibility for inter-ministerial coordination to ensure that Roma issues are taken into account in the policies of each Ministry. The fact that these offices now exist should be acknowledged as a positive development, if not directly stemming from Phare, but from the EU accession process. Their status and capacity, in terms of experience and staff numbers is, in most cases, not adequate to influence effectively the policies of individual ministries. This said, these offices are in their early years and as yet have not had sufficient time to become securely embedded into the institutional structures of Government.

---

[12] the National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues (NCEDI) in Bulgaria, Council for Roma Community Affairs, in the Office Of the Government, Czech Republic; Office for Roma Affairs in the Prime Ministers' Office in Hungary; National Roma Office in Romania; and the Section of Human Rights and Minorities in the Slovak Republic Government Office. `

38.   The Phare programmes served to highlight the magnitude, severity and complexity of the problems that have to be overcome for Roma inclusion (integration) to be a realistic and achievable goal. On an operational level, it also exposed a lack of capacity and professional inexperience in the current systems to deal with such a complex range of issues.

39.   A shortcoming, that has inevitably frustrated the opportunities for Phare to adopt either a comprehensive or a strategically conceived approach to Phare programmes for Roma minorities, is the lack of a framework of coherent Government strategies for Roma inclusion. Nevertheless, the results of some Phare projects have influenced the polices of government, for example recruitment of Roma classroom assistants in all five countries and the new Education Legislation in Hungary outlawing segregated education practices. Thus far there is no across-the-board commitment to determine why current systems are failing Roma. Although projects revealed the need for change on a much bigger scale, the commitment for systemic change and mainstreaming is generally weak. Regular Reports have acknowledged that the main reason that all had put some sort of Roma strategy in place, included in CSFs, was pressure from the EU.

2.5   Sustainability of programmes and their results

40.   The accession process and Phare raised the issue of Roma minorities to a higher priority. Phare programmes were targeted directly to address some of the socio-economic problems within Roma communities and provided a dedicated allocation of resources. In some instances this helped to improve understanding and increase awareness of the extent of the problems. Where sustainability can be foreseen is in the transfer of know-how that has occurred at policy and operational levels and in the partnerships that have been established as an outcome of project implementation. Provided this experience is utilised effectively, and channelled in the right direction, it has the potential to provide a foundation for more appropriate polices and more realistic measures in the future.

41.   There was widespread agreement that the issues affecting Roma minorities should be considered within a much broader agenda, as this would enable a more coherent and strategic approach. However, there were fears that this would suppress the momentum that is beginning to grow and put at risk the dedicated resources that have so far been available. Many people expressed concerns that in the context of a wider social inclusion strategy, discrimination would be exercised and Roma would be overlooked in favour of other disadvantaged groups within the majority population or other minority populations.

42.   Although Phare Roma projects have contributed to learning by doing across the sector and have had a direct impact on the quality of life for some Roma families or communities, overall the projects have been short term ones that ended on completion or, in some cases, continued with the assistance of other donor funding. Only in a few instances, primarily in the education sector, have interventions that started through Phare been absorbed into Government or local authority mainstream funding. Long-term sustainability depends on close correlation between the project and the policies of Government and, as has been clearly demonstrated, this relationship between project and policy has only been established in a small number of Phare projects for Roma minorities.

43.   The goal of Social Inclusion of Roma must be underpinned by strong Government commitment that is translated into an integrated, multi agency approach where Roma social inclusion is regarded as a mainstream issue. This requires partnership working across all Government ministries; all strands of the public and NGO sectors, with Roma and non-Roma communities and also with other donors active in this field of development. This is not a blueprint for guaranteed success, and it may sound idealistic. But a long process of sustainable development is the only realistic pathway forward. Without across the board commitment to bring about systemic change to overcome the barriers that exclude Roma from mainstream society, the goal of social inclusion of Roma will remain a distant vision.

3.   KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

44.   This part of the report seeks to address four of the five questions that were identified at the outset of the review. This chapter of the report has been subdivided under four separate headings, which reflect the review questions:

- What type of support has been applied under Phare?
- Do Roma programmes reflect the wider social inclusion agenda?
- Has Phare influenced change in policy and project implementation?
- How successful has Phare been in promoting learning by doing in this sector?

Conclusions and lessons which can be learned for developing an integrated approach to Roma minorities follow in Chapters 3 and 4.

3.1   What type of support has been applied under Phare?

45.   During the early stocktaking stage of this review, the 26 Roma programmes were broadly categorised by the type of activity covered by the primary, 2^{ary}, 3^{ary} and 4^{ary} components in each programme. To make this possible, the project fiches were examined in detail and each sub component was allocated to a generic heading that broadly describes the purpose of the activity. Table 3 provides a breakdown by type, size and share of finance.

46.   The following section of the report has been divided into sub sections covering the activities that have received the bulk of Phare resources. Within that, the intention is not to provide a detailed account of how the money has been spent, but rather an overview that highlights examples of lessons learned and good practice. Where possible, it will also make comparisons between the approaches that have been applied across the different countries.

	Primary Component		2^{ary} Component		3^{ary} Component		4^{ary13} Component		Total	
Type of Assistance	M€ Size	Share	M€ Size	Share	M€ Size	Share	M€ Size	Share	M€ Total	Share
Administration, legislation and strategy development	3.150	4.4%	2.250	14.1%	0.600	11.2%	0.650	28.9%	6.650	6.9%
Business Development	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	0.220	4.1%	0.000	0.0%	0.220	0.2%
Community Development type Initiatives	5.800	8.0%	0.625	3.9%	0.819	15.2%	0.100	4.5%	7.344	7.7%
Education	14.070	19.5%	7.547	47.2%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	21.617	22.6%
Education Infrastructure and Equipment	8.386	11.6%	2.200	13.8%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	10.586	11.0%
Health and health information	0.817	1.1%	0.283	1.8%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	1.100	1.1%
Human Resource Development –employment and training initiatives	5.059	7.0%	0.830	5.2%	2.400	44.6%	0.200	8.9%	8.489	8.9%
Infrastructure	26.195	36.3%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	26.195	27.4%
Institutional Training	0.000	0.0%	1.350	8.4%	0.650	12.1%	0.346	15.4%	2.346	2.4%
Media and Public Awareness campaigns	3.930	5.4%	0.000	0.0%	0.641	11.9%	0.950	42.3%	5.521	5.8%
Research	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	0.050	0.9%	0.000	0.0%	0.050	0.1%
Support to NGO/ CSOs	4.750	6.6%	0.900	5.6%	0.000	0.0%	0.000	0.0%	5.650	5.9%
TOTAL	72.157	100.0%	15.985	100.0%	5.380	100.0%	2.246	100.0%	95.768	100.0%

Table 3- Source: project fiches

---

[13] The table is not a prioritisation of the project elements. Most of the programmes covered more than one area of activity. Therefore the components indicate how resources were allocated across all the programmes. Primary does not mean more important but it does represent where the countries decided that the bulk of the activity should occur.

The Education Sector

> Lacking access to education is not just a cause of exclusion but even more so an outcome of the way the educational systems work, of the lack of awareness of differences among the groups (both by majorities and minorities) and of low levels of aspirations or distinct cultural patterns. All these causalities form a system leading to exclusion and addressing just one of its elements is usually insufficient.
>
> UNDP - Avoiding the Dependency Trap (2002)

47.   The bulk of funding for Roma minorities spent in the education sector (almost M€22 - 22.6% of the total funding) was applied to education activities (as distinct from equipment and infrastructure). It is the second highest of the primary components, attracting some M€14 and almost 20% of all the funding. In addition to the education activities, some M€10.6 was also allocated for the supply of educational related equipment and for works projects to upgrade and refurbish educational premises.

48.   There have been education related projects in all five countries. A common theme has been the training of Roma teaching assistants, to provide additional support for Roma children in the classroom. This approach was cited as an example of good practice in both the World Bank (2003) and UNDP (2002) reports. However, the IE in Bulgaria revealed that although Roma classroom assistants had been trained and qualified, their entry in the education system was delayed for almost a year, as they could not be absorbed into the education system until the start of the next school year. In Slovakia, teacher training places for working with Roma are heavily oversubscribed, as they provide good quality, well paid jobs that are attractive to educated Roma women. Overall, the concept of training Roma assistants is founded on good practice but the effects as yet tend to be limited to individual schools, or even classrooms. Although such projects produce very positive and direct results, their coverage is not yet extensive enough to have a significant impact on the education system as a whole.

The grant scheme approach in Hungary

49.   The largest education programme was in Hungary. It started as a M€9.6 programme, with M€7.4 for education related activities and M€2.2 for education infrastructure projects. The total was subsequently increased to M€12.7 in May 2001[14]. This programme was not solely for Roma as it provided for the Social Integration of Disadvantaged Youth; but the emphasis was very strongly directed towards Roma minorities. The aim was to increase school enrolment and improve school success at primary, secondary and higher education levels, to be achieved through individual school projects, funded by a grant scheme, and complemented by investment to improve school infrastructure.

50.   The Hungary programme was implemented as a grant scheme, funding a large number of projects in schools, kindergartens and trade schools (207 projects in total) across the whole country. The education institutions developed their own projects, to meet the criteria of the call for proposals, and were then responsible for implementation of the project. The MoE, at national level, was responsible for management of the Phare grant scheme, but its involvement with individual projects was very limited. The fact that the project was implemented as an open competition resulted in many different approaches being applied across a large number of different educational institutions.

---

[14] M€1.9 of Phare funds from the 1999 National Phare Programme, and M€1.02 co-financing.

51.   Towards the end of the implementation period, the MoE Phare Office commissioned an impact study[15], to "analyse how successful are the subsidised institutions in the training of the disadvantaged and of the Roma pupils". The final report has been produced, and translated into English.[16] The report produced some quite shocking findings and was highly critical of the performance of the schools and of the use made of the monies provided by Phare. The report states that "the main lesson of the study is that the support provided by Phare has catalysed any change only very rarely". Also that "schools used the extra resources to finance their old and fixed practices".

52.   The impact study paints a very vivid picture of the situation in schools, the levels and shapes of segregation and the attitudes of teachers and parents. The report quotes the many reasons why the schools themselves considered the projects to be successful, but does not draw specific conclusions about the overall quality of the Phare projects. The report focuses on whether the projects themselves had a positive impact on segregation in the schools, but in most cases they were considered to at best have maintained the status quo or at worst generated separate classes or

> Integrated education is a major objective but it cannot be enforced in a top-down manner and /or if basic necessary preconditions are missing. Integration in education requires the removal of the existing systemic barriers.
>   UNDP: Avoiding the Dependency Trap (2002)

activities that further compounded the problems of segregation. The report concluded that "In spite of the support provided ... the situation within the schools did not improve, the multi-million forints subsidy was not able to change the situation". To presuppose that Phare projects could significantly alter or bring about systemic change in segregation practices is somewhat short sighted. In the words of a government official "in hindsight, the project tried to encompass all segments of education from the kindergarten through higher education. It tried to grasp and attain too much within a short period of time. The call for proposal suggested a kind of paternalistic view towards Roma. The project did not count with the hidden pattern of prejudice that is pervasive in the majority society, also to be found in teachers and social workers".

53.   However through this negative experience, useful lessons have been learned. A view expressed by a senior official, was that "without the Phare programme, the impact study would not have taken place and we would not have such a clear picture about the extent or the various forms of segregation practices in schools". The information stemming from the study provides evidence that has led to Government legislation from 1 September 2003, which outlaws segregated education practices in Hungary.

An alternative approach in Romania

54.   In direct comparison to the Hungarian programme "Social Integration of Disadvantaged Youth", is another currently being implemented in Romania "Access to Education for Disadvantaged groups". This project is being driven by the Ministry of Education and Research (MoER). The long-term aim is for systemic change in the education methods applied in Romania. Planning and development of the concept has been ongoing for a number of years, and was tested, initially through implementation of a smaller pilot version led and funded by the MoER. In Romania the MoER has a clear vision of what they are trying to achieve, ie to introduce multicultural education practices. The MoER are committed to monitoring the results of the project closely, and future interventions will be adapted to take

---

[15] For more information about the report contact the Fundmanaging Directory of the Ministry of Education (Previously the Phare Office in the Ministry of Education), H-1146 Budapest, Ajtosi Durer sor 19-21. Phone +36 1 344 0337 : www.prof.iif.hu/phare

[16] The MoE Phare Office intended to distribute the report at the closing conference for the Phare project. This did not happen, as there is ongoing discussion about the content and distribution of this report.

account of the lessons learned. Although this appears to be a more top-down approach, participation and consultation are at the core of this project, facilitated by the school and Roma inspectors, which gives the project a bottom-up style of implementation and participation across all levels ie, to the MoER from the Regional Authorities from the School and Roma Inspectors from the teaching staff in schools and Roma families. The project in Hungary was a grant scheme, which provided additional funding for schools, but was not based on a clear education policy and there was no close correlation between the overall policy and implemented projects. The MoE in Hungary demonstrated good practice by evaluating the impact of the education projects, but this was done too late to allow for intervention to change the direction of the projects, and too late to alter the final outcome. The Romania project is in its very early stage, so long term success and sustainability will depend heavily on strong Government commitment to systemic change.

Learning from Education projects in Hungary and Romania

The evaluation of the projects in Hungary and Romania provides some useful key findings and valuable examples of good practice.

The Access to Education for Disadvantaged groups project in Romania shows that:	The Disadvantaged Youth Programme in Hungary clearly shows that:
• A top-down approach can be good practice when it is closely tied to a clear Government policy direction.	• Monitoring the results of funded projects should be an ongoing process, to ensure that they are moving in the right direction.
• Success depends on a bottom-up style of implementation, which is based on participation and consultation across all levels.	• If only the final results are evaluated, it does not allow for corrective actions during the life of the project and it is too late to change the final outcome.
• Using project implementation as a means of testing the relevance of the methodologies and the effectiveness of the intervention is good practice.	• Using the results of the impact study in Hungary to inform and influence a future Government policy is good practice

---

55.   The Romania "Access to Education" project, where school and Roma inspectors are crucial, is also an interesting observation for Hungary, where the idea of school inspectors was considered and rejected. The view in Romania is that both the school inspectors and Roma inspectors will play a critical role in ensuring change in future education practices, and that they provide a crucial link between the Education authorities, at a national level, and the teaching staff in schools.

Achievements in other countries

56.   Education programmes have also been delivered in Bulgaria, Czech Republic and Slovakia. In Slovakia four of the five Roma programmes include education related activities either as the primary or second component, with a total allocation of almost M€7.0. There is however a difference in the Slovakia programmes, compared to the others, in that a higher proportion (M€5 over 70%) of the budget is devoted to the purchase and supply of equipment for educational establishments.

57.   Good practices in Slovakia have included parental involvement in kindergartens, through a 'mother and child' scheme with the support of Roma assistant teachers, a whole day care system including preparatory classes and attempted reintegration of children from special schools for those with learning disabilities into mainstream primary schools. Although Roma are a very high priority within such projects, the broader target group is frequently described as children from a socially disadvantaged environment. This last activity is linked to a fundamental redesign of the diagnostic system to make it non-discriminatory and culture free.

Testing of this new scheme has been reported as producing encouraging results. Further integration is to be achieved by establishing new classes, supplied with specialised teaching equipment, for those formerly in special schools or in designated primary schools where Roma are most numerous. To be truly inclusive, this action needs to be part of a longer-term vision to remove the need for these new and separate classes.

58.   In all countries some steps have been taken to introduce an element of multiculturalism in the education curricula and to provide teacher training places for working with Roma children. But the rigidity of the education systems has been seen as a significant part of the problem, failing others from disadvantaged backgrounds as well as Roma. Roma projects have been welcomed as they provide an opportunity to make the system more flexible. But projects alone are unlikely to have a significant impact on education systems where segregated and outdated education practices still exist; a point that is demonstrated in the impact study undertaken in Hungary. Lessons can be drawn from this study for other countries, as it is a significant step towards understanding the reality of the situation and how the system is failing children from Roma and other disadvantaged backgrounds. In all countries, responsibility for change in education lies very firmly in the hands of Governments, and without a strong commitment to bring about systemic change, assistance programmes like Phare can only have a localised effect.

Improving Roma Living Conditions

59.   This sub section covers both infrastructure, and community development initiatives. Although some programmes were largely dedicated to infrastructure development, others have combined infrastructure with community development.

60.   A notable feature of the situation of Roma in the five countries is the large number of people living in what are often referred to as settlements. These are either located at some distance from the majority population or on the outskirts of villages or towns, forming a distinct quarter. Even in urban areas Roma tend to live within concentrated pockets of the cities. Infrastructure programmes were primarily

> **O**rganisations working to improve the living conditions for vulnerable communities should involve members of those communities in the designs and implementation process. Roma participation is key to the success of programmes. People should be seen as active participants not as passive 'target groups' of intervention.
>
> UNDP: Avoiding the dependency trap (2002)

developed as a means of improving the living conditions within those settlements. Infrastructure development attracted some M€26.2 (some 27%) of the total resources, but the majority of this was for one large project (see box overleaf and footnote 11 on page 6 above).

Improving Living Conditions - The top-down approach

A negative feature of some infrastructure projects is the '**top down**' approach that has been adopted. The infrastructure development activities were direct and, in most instances, one-off interventions that did not actively involve local communities or take account of their views or priorities in the decision making process in advance of the project. There are examples of such projects in both Bulgaria and Slovakia, and the following paragraphs highlight some of the difficulties that have been encountered in these projects.

Bulgaria

The Integration of Roma Minority programme (BG-9907) in Bulgaria included a project to build 11 houses for Roma families. The project was considered to be a pilot, to build a particular model of house suitable for Roma families, and to test whether relocation, out of Roma settlements, into such houses could be successfully achieved. This approach was extremely short sighted and took no account of the social dynamics of relocating a small number of families. The project may have been a reaction to the Commission's demands "to improve the living conditions of Roma" which were translated literally as a need to invest in housing. The final outcome is that, as yet, no Roma families have been found to occupy the houses.

Lessons about top-down approaches to housing relocation can be drawn from the 1950 – 60s in Britain, when local authorities built peripheral housing estates on the outskirts of the cities to accommodate the 'overspill' populations from sub-standard inner city housing. Poverty and social exclusion are now characteristics of many of these estates and they are designated 'social inclusion partnership' areas or 'city challenge zones'.

Slovakia

In Slovakia, where the conditions in the most segregated of Roma settlements resemble shantytowns, a quite atypically large (M€ 15.3) Phare Roma programme 'Infrastructure Support for Roma Settlement' (SR-0103.02) was developed to improve basic infrastructure: drinking water supply, sewerage and road communications in 30, out of a total of 620, Roma settlements.

For a variety of reasons the projects in this programme have suffered some of the most protracted delays, which stem partly from the inherent complexities of the tasks, but also from organisational deficiencies. For example, insufficient staff in the IA to deal with the highly complex nature of the project components and no clear divisions of responsibility between the Roma Office and the Implementing Agency.

The Implementing Agency also seems to have little empathy for the social impacts of the projects, and as a result their focus was to achieve the technical requirements taking little account of the communities affected by those changes.

Common Problems

The Slovakia projects experienced difficulties related to land ownership and obtaining building permits. Similarly in Bulgaria, one of the major obstacles to regeneration of the Roma settlements is that many settlements are not considered legal or legitimate as they fall outside the boundaries of local towns and villages and no cadastre maps exist for town planning purposes. On the other hand, it was also suggested, that this can be used to stall development. However, when there is willingness and flexibility on the part of the mayor and local authority, this obstacle can be set aside allowing work to progress either without or in advance of fully approved planning maps.

A fundamental issue is whether projects aimed at improving the living conditions in detached Roma settlements, only serve to maintain the status quo or whether they promote social inclusion. World Bank research in Slovakia (World Bank 2002) found, unsurprisingly, that social integration of Roma, including employment rates, increases as the distance between Roma housing and the majority population decreases. The Monitoring and Evaluation report (R/SR/JHA/01041) on Phare Roma Programmes in Slovakia anticipated this finding, suggesting that to improve infrastructure in remote settlements, while making segregated slums a little more habitable for a few families, does little towards bringing the goal of Roma integration any nearer.

61.   There are undoubtedly situations, relating to infrastructure installation or renewal, when direct public intervention is very necessary. The biggest problem with the top down approach, is - what happens next? Of course there is a need to improve living conditions, but this should not be done as one-off isolated interventions without a long-term plan and clear vision of how the area regeneration (improvement) process will continue and how it will be resourced in the future. When infrastructure development has a direct impact on the daily lives and living

---

conditions of individuals, at the very minimum there should be a community consultation exercise or, even better, active participation in the community planning and decision making process in advance of the project.

The bottom-up approach

62.   An alternative approach to direct intervention is to use a more bottom-up approach to combine infrastructure development with community planning. There are two projects that have tried to follow this direction. The "Roma Social Integration Programme (2000)" within Hungary (2000), which experienced implementation difficulties, and the more recent "Support to the National Strategy to Improve Roma conditions" within Romania (2002).

63.   The 2000 Roma Social Integration Programme in Hungary was intended to stimulate a bottom-up approach and contains all the elements of good practice, as it fits the same profile of many participatory community development type projects supported by the SF and ERDF in MS. But in practice implementation proved harder than originally anticipated.

64.   Essentially, the Social Integration Programme in Hungary had too many different activities all scheduled to happen within a very short time frame: setting up local partnerships; infrastructure investment for electricity, drinking water, sewage and road systems, and anti-discrimination training, to name a few. It anticipated that local consortia would provide an analysis of the local situation and development plans, but this did not emerge in the 'bottom-up' fashion intended. It also envisaged that local companies, and also local people, would be involved in the small works projects. However the complex tender procedures removed the opportunity out of the hands of local companies, as they did not have the know-how to apply. The project assumed a level of community participation, partnership and local capacity that was not readily available. It was also short-term, offering no guarantee of follow up or long term commitment to build on the development work it started.

65.   The 2002 "Support to the National Strategy to Improve Roma conditions" programme in Romania resembles the Hungarian approach as it combines local works projects with community planning and development. More preparatory work was done in advance of this programme, and it has taken account of the capacity of local communities and organisations to implement complex and multifaceted projects. The project will be managed by the Resource Centre for Roma Communities (RCRC), an NGO that has experience of managing Phare and a long history of establishing partnerships with Roma communities and the public authorities. Community development planning is an ongoing activity at the RCRC, where they employ experienced practitioners, some of whom are Roma, and have been working with local communities, involving local people and organisations to build community action plans. This programme has the potential to provide funding that will allow these communities to fulfil their action plans and to turn ideas into real projects. Collectively these factors should facilitate less problematic implementation than in Hungary. The programme is in the earliest stages of development and should be watched with interest as a potential lesson in good practice.

66.   There is evidence of good practice in another project that has been operating since 1997, that has a strong community development dimension, "The Drom Project" in Brno, Czech Republic. Although the project received Phare funding for several small-scale project initiatives, the project is essentially a housing partnership supported by the Local Authority. The Director is himself a Roma and has built up co-operation with local communities over a number of years. The project has undertaken substantial refurbishment (M€5) of a run-down

inner city apartment complex, in an area with a high number of Roma residents. It now provides high quality affordable accommodation for 50 Roma families.

67.   The majority of residents in the Brno housing complex have low income and are dependent on social assistance. To reduce the risk of eviction due to rent arrears, provision is made for the housing costs to be deducted from social assistance benefit. More than just a housing management role, the project team involves residents in the decision making process and provides information and advisory services to ensure that residents are kept fully informed and supported in their dealings with the public authorities.

68.   Because of their relationship with residents, the project team can prompt early intervention to tackle debt-related housing problems which can lead to eviction. The project also operates a 'social trading' scheme where different skills and services are traded between community members on a no cost basis[17]. This project shows that innovative developments can be made to provide good quality affordable housing for Roma families.

69.   In the opinion of the project Director, the key to success is both "the active involvement of residents in the management and administration as well as financial support and commitment from the local authorities". There are many similar examples in Member States, where Community Housing Associations are involved in management, refurbishment and service provision to provide affordable social housing. This example should be looked upon as a model of good practice relevant in all five countries.

Combining infrastructure and community development is good practice	
• The concept of combining a range of different activities; concentrating on defined geographic areas; involving the local community; building partnerships between local Roma communities, NGOs, and public institutions, is a solid approach that mirrors those applied in Member States to tackle the multi-dimensional problems of social exclusion[18]. • Infrastructure projects should not start the community planning and development cycle, but should be used as an extension of preparatory work that has stimulated local involvement and generated a level of local capacity and local planning that is ready to react and absorb the resources available.	• The integrated community development approach has been long recognised as good practice in EU MS – The URBAN I and II programmes. Funded through the European Regional Development Fund they have achieved economic and social regeneration of areas that face quite severe deprivation and specific challenges. For example, average unemployment and crime rates in URBAN II areas are both around twice the EU average. • A particular feature of the URBAN initiative is the high degree of involvement at local level. The measures set out in each programme were selected and implemented through a broad partnership involving all the parties concerned and offer examples of good practice for urban located Roma communities[19].

70.   The concept of combining a range of different activities; concentrating on defined geographic areas; involving the local community; building partnerships between local Roma communities, NGOs, and public institutions is a solid approach that mirrors those applied in

---

[17] See http://www.spolu.nl/geinthuisv.html - for information abut the DROM project, and
http://www.ecobusinesslinks.com/local_currencies.htm about Hours and Lets community trading schemes.

[18] An area based approach has been adopted in the UK to tackle social and economic exclusion. For more information see web site http://www.rcu.gov.uk/ and http://www.rcu.gov.uk/abi/default.asp for information about the types of initiatives that have been applied.

[19] http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/themes/urban_en.htm provides information about the EU Urban Programmes.

Member States to tackle the multi-dimensional problems of social exclusion[20]. Infrastructure projects should not start the community planning and development cycle, but should be used as an extension of preparatory work that has stimulated local involvement and generated a level of local capacity and local planning that is ready to react and absorb the resources available.

71.   The integrated community development approach has been long recognised as good practice in EU MS. The URBAN I and II programmes, funded through the European Regional Development Fund have achieved economic and social regeneration of areas that face quite severe deprivation and specific challenges. For example, average unemployment and crime rates in URBAN II areas are both around twice the EU average. A particular feature of the URBAN initiative is the high degree of involvement at local level. The measures set out in each programme were selected and implemented through a broad partnership involving all the parties concerned and offer examples of good practice for urban located Roma communities[21].

Employment and labour market re-integration

72.   Employment, or rather unemployment, and particularly long-term unemployment, is generally regarded as being one of the root causes of poverty and social exclusion. According to the UNDP Report "employment and labour income problems are usually ranked highest among the problems seriously affecting Roma households". In all five countries this view was strongly expressed by the Roma people, who contributed to the review.

73.   The fate of Roma throughout Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) following the ending of Communist rule is well known and has been extensively documented in recent reports[22] (Czech Government 1997, World Bank 2003, UNDP 2002). Many Roma lost their previous jobs due to the restructuring of industries and the privatisation of agricultural land or its restitution to former owners. Whereas the previous command economies needed the unskilled labour that Roma could provide, the emerging market economies have far less need of such workers.

74.   The levels of unemployment amongst Roma populations are significantly higher than in other strands of the population [23]. It is well documented [24] that many barriers exclude Roma individuals from the labour market and also that the opportunity for employment for Roma has diminished significantly over the last decade. Discrimination also plays its part, since Roma are victims of a relaxation of legal restrictions on employers and were commonly among the first to be dismissed. In both the Czech Republic and Slovakia official lists of available jobs [in municipal labour offices] often ... note that – "the particular employer does not accept Roma" (Czech Government 1997). Likewise sociological research in Hungary revealed that in seeking employment, Roma with equal qualifications to non-Roma applicants were liable to suffer discrimination[25].

---

[20] An area based approach has been adopted in the UK to tackle social and economic exclusion. For more information see web site http://www.rcu.gov.uk/   and http://www.rcu.gov.uk/abi/default.asp for information about the types of initiatives that have been applied.

[21] http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/themes/urban_en.htm provides information about the EU Urban Programmes.

[22] Czech Government 1997, van der Stoel 2000, Ringold 2000, Ladányi and Szelényi 2002, World Bank 2003, UNDP 2002, Ringold *et al*. 2003)

[23] The UNDP report shows that the share of respondents who perceive themselves as unemployed stands at: 80% in Bulgaria; over 40% in the Czech Republic; almost 60% in Hungary; about 75% in Romania, and about 85% in Slovakia. UNDP Survey - Avoiding the Dependency Trap : December 2002 - Page 33.

[24] The World Bank Report – Breaking the Poverty Cycle – June 2003: UNDP Survey - Avoiding the Dependency Trap : December 2002 :

[25] Lemon 1996: 28–30; Weinerová 1994 - Czech Government 1997: 18, Tritt 1992: 76-90 - Ladányi and Szelényi 2002

75.   Given the scale of the problem, it is surprising that only 9% of Phare assistance for Roma minorities was spent on tackling unemployment. Of the total amount, 65% - some M€ 8.4, is attributable to two programmes in Hungary "Employability and long-term employment of multiple disadvantaged groups - Roma Specific component (2000)", and "Promoting Social Integration of disadvantaged groups with particular emphasis on the Roma Minority (2001)".

Employment initiatives for unemployed Roma

76.   Although there have been some employment and training initiatives funded by Phare, the level of resources applied are not commensurate with the scale of the problem. Direct support to long term employment is a critical missing link in Roma integration policies. Overall, the activities have been piecemeal and have relied on long-established practices such as vocational education and training, supported short-term employment, and public work projects with little attempt to ensure that the methodologies meet the needs of the target group.

77.   The strategy of putting some emphasis on Roma vocational training as a means of securing sustainable employment for Roma is questionable. The UNDP (2002) report found that such qualifications did not lead to higher employment as they tend to be job specific and tied to jobs that are not readily available in the current labour market. Greater flexibility and opportunity, in terms of entry qualifications, for a wider range of better quality jobs, can be gained through secondary education. Some serious doubts were also expressed about the effectiveness of relatively short periods of counselling and training in the areas of high unemployment where most Roma live (UNDP 2002). A perceived means of reducing unemployment, at least as a short-term measure, in both Bulgaria and Slovakia has been enrolling registered unemployed, including Roma, on public works schemes. However the problem is that most public works schemes require basic unskilled manual labour, which tends to be short term, low paid and does not deal with the root problems, or overcome the barriers that exclude many Roma from sustainable employment.

78.   Additional Phare funded ESF type employment and labour market reintegration projects were prepared during the time period covered by this review. These projects have not been examined in detail, but an attempt was made to try to establish to what extent the funded projects are attracting Roma individuals as a priority client group. There have been very few ESF type projects that have specifically targeted unemployed Roma as a priority group, with the exception of Hungary. Quantifying Roma participation levels in past Phare projects, and in current ESF type projects, is complicated by the Minority Legislation that prohibits information being collected on the basis of ethnicity. From discussion with ESF implementing agencies, indications are that the numbers are relatively low.[26]

79.   The UNDP (2002) report saw participation in public works schemes as a viable strategy for unemployed Roma, provided a training element is included. Recent thinking in Hungary, Slovakia and Romania is moving towards the perception that the social economy (such as NGO-type activities and social care initiatives) should be treated as a legitimate sector to generate employment. This matches thinking in Member States where it is now recognised and documented[27] that the social economy (which should encompass social care, education, health and research sectors) has the potential to be an effective provider of employment, particularly in areas of high unemployment. Also that it can be a training ground and effective bridge

---

[26] Annex 5 contains additional information about Roma participation in labour market projects on a country be country basis.

[27] See *Valuing the Social Economy: the Social Economy and Economic Inclusion in Lowland Scotland ; Community Enterprise in Strathclyde (Macgregor et al 2002)* also see http://www.objective3.org/equal/site.php?pageid=10 for information about Strengthening the Social Economy Partnership that has been establish under Objective 3 in Scotland.

between unemployment and the labour market. Supported employment projects, with a social economy organisation as the provider of employment and intermediate labour market training[28] and employment projects which combine public benefit employment with training and personal development, are two such examples.

80.   If the social economy is to be stimulated to become the provider of employment, such activities need extensive financial support and recognition that this sector is not about volunteering but about real jobs providing very necessary services in society. Moreover, for active labour market policies to reach long-term unemployed and socially excluded people they must be oriented (and specifically designed and costed) to target this particular segment of the labour market.

Roma as a Priority in Labour Market Reintegration Projects in Hungary

The MoEL in Hungary is trying to ensure that measures are better oriented to reach excluded and vulnerable segments of the labour market, including Roma, through a more inclusive, participatory and supportive approach. The lessons learned from the 2000 project have been influential in shaping a similar but larger grant scheme in Phare 2002 where:

- local partnerships are being established between a range of local actors, such as local organisations including Roma organisations, the Roma Self Governments, local authorities, labour offices, training providers etc;
- local partnerships, through time and with experience, have the potential to evolve into sustainable development partnerships;
- the scope of employment has been expanded to include the social sector and NGO activities, in an attempt to utilise and stimulate opportunities in the social economy;
- the MoEL recognises that new and alternative methods have to be applied and tested to continually refine and improve project orientation towards the most vulnerable in society, and
- the MoEL is committed to measure success, on the basis of those who are successfully moved from unemployment into long-term sustainable employment in either the traditional or social economies.

---

81.   It is not enough to develop generic employment and labour market reintegration type projects and assume that they will reach the most vulnerable, particularly Roma who live in marginalized communities in areas with very limited potential for economic growth. Within the ranks of the unemployed there are groups that are generally regarded as hard to employ. These include people with low education levels, no or low qualifications, outdated skills, and members of racial minorities. There is clear evidence that ALM measures to reintegrate hard to employ people can be successful[29] but this means a different approach which tends to be more labour intensive and more expensive to deliver than standard projects for the less hard to employ.

82.   This review found that significant areas of unemployment, labour market reintegration and human resource development within the Roma minorities have yet to be comprehensively addressed. It would appear that more account could be taken of the patterns of unemployment and the complexity of the barriers, including the different configurations of discrimination, which exclude Roma people from the labour market and also from participation in ALM

---

[28] Based on a model of intermediate labour market training projects developed by the Wise Group in Glasgow in 1975, which have been successfully getting unemployed people back into sustainable employment through projects that combine an innovative mix of training, personal development and paid work experience tailored to the individual circumstances of their temporary employees. Some 65% of Wise Group employees go onto full time permanent work. Web reference: www.thewisegroup.co.uk

[29] Publication by the Policy Studies Institute (UK) – Does Active Labour Market Policy Reduce Unemployment? 1992 http://www.psi.org.uk/publications/publication.asp?publication_id=172

projects[30]. Too often anti-discrimination efforts are missing in ALM policies, to guarantee that measures are designed and oriented towards the needs of unemployed Roma. The Comprehensive Monitoring Report on Preparation for Membership (EU November 2003) quite rightly point out "that ESF assistance could be a useful tool to help better address the situation of Roma Populations". However unless future ALM policies are created that take full account of the dynamics of the labour market, understand the barriers that further disadvantage and exclude Roma individuals not only from the labour market, but also from employment and training projects, there is a significant risk that the active labour measures will by-pass and fail to reach this socially excluded, and often marginalized, element of the population.[31]

Administration, legislation and strategy development

83.   Administration, legislation and strategy development are activities that have received assistance through Phare programmes in the shape of twinning and technical assistance, but overall the amount of resources applied has been comparatively small (M€6.6 and 6.9% of all Phare Roma projects).

84.   In Romania, technical assistance supported the development of the Roma Strategy. Strategy development was a participatory process that involved Roma people, and activists in the NGO sector. Creation of the strategy is generally acknowledged as a significant step forward, but overall implementation has been constrained by a lack of resources. Many of the people responsible for the original strategy development remain actively involved in the sector today and are participants contributing to the development of the strategy "A Decade of Roma Inclusion" currently being driven by the World Bank and Open Society Institute.

85.   Good results have been realised in some twinning projects. Twinning has assisted, or is currently assisting countries to gain a broader, wider European perspective on the issues of Roma affairs. Twinning helps to inform countries about the institutional structures that have been set in place to support anti-discrimination legislation and also to provide a wider exposure to the types of policies and interventions that have been applied in Member States. An experienced Pre Accession Adviser (PAA) can make a significant contribution to improving the level of understanding within public administration. Study visits can provide a valuable insight into how things are being done in Member States. For example, the Czech Republic study visits were to: the anti discrimination and equality body in Ireland to see how fieldwork was being delivered; to Spain to see the policy frameworks that had been created, and to the UK to see the institutional structures from an operational perspective.

Support to NGOs

86.   In the Phare programme for Roma minorities, M€5.6 was spent (5.9% of the total) on supporting NGOs, the largest components of which were grant schemes in two Civil Society Development Programmes in the Czech Republic (CZ-9806 and CZ-0002-01) and two in Romania (RO-9803 and RO-0004.02.02). The earlier grant schemes were drafted in 1997 at a time when little was being done to address the problems faced by Roma communities. The grant schemes provided significant leverage to involve Roma organisations in delivering services at a community level and in advocacy work on behalf of and in partnership with Roma

---

[30] Information emerged during the course of this review that suggest that there are a number of factors which make the dynamics of the labour market, and the patterns of unemployed for Roma different to traditional and accepted factors. See Annex 3 and 4 provide more detailed information.

[31] See Institute for Employment research : http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/research/ulmd.php

individuals. Although relatively small grant schemes (M€ 0.9 each), at the time they constituted the largest fund available that specifically targeted Roma.

87.   In both countries the programmes have been managed by an NGO (NROS in the Czech Republic and the RCRC in Romania). Both organisations have been successful in establishing links with smaller Roma NGOs, and with Roma activists at community level. The approach has been similar in both countries: in the Czech Republic a sub-project was created to employ a group of educated Roma assistants (AMOS), although all of them may not have been Roma people, to provide supervision and real time monitoring of project performance. In Romania, educated Roma individuals are employed by the RCRC to support projects throughout implementation. In both countries this was a deliberate response to engender trust between the local projects and the funding organisation. The importance of building trust should not be underestimated as it serves to overcome the barriers and reservations that can emanate from both sides: on the Roma side, entrenched suspicion of any form of interference or intervention from non-Roma and on the side of the funders, concerns about the managerial capacity of the new applicants to implement real projects and their ability to comply with the administrative guidelines.

88.   Involving an NGO intermediary has proved to be successful in both countries and continuity has allowed experience to grow; successful working relationships to be established, and a flow of information between those driving the policies at National level and locally based organisations. Both NROS and the RCRC have been champions of the Roma cause by maintaining a level of pressure and by stimulating activities at local level. However, the scale of the task is far beyond the competence of these relatively small organisations, which, although operationally effective, cannot be a substitute for larger interventions and policy change. Such organisations can operate as effective partners and can be drivers of change, making sure that pro-Roma policies are translated into reality on the ground but, on their own, they have neither the power nor the resources necessary to stimulate change of the magnitude required.

89.   Similarly at local level, the funded projects are making a difference by offering services to communities that would not otherwise be available. Overall some 360 projects have been funded through NGO managed grant schemes: some 300 in the Czech Republic and 65 in Romania. These projects support a vast range of different services such as educational support, street children projects, legal advice and counselling, leisure time activities, labour market re-integration, health services, cultural exchange information and advice and research. Many are relatively small scale, short term and often not sustainable as they depend on long term funding commitment that is not readily available. While such projects can improve the quality of life and widen the range of services available, the impacts of such measures are not in themselves enough without much higher mainstream support and a long term commitment.

90.   NGOs are successfully managing to stimulate local partnership working, and these projects guarantee Roma participation either at applicant or beneficiary level, as the application process requires that the project involves a Roma NGO either as the main applicant or as a member of the consortium, or that the services are directly targeted to Roma communities. A component of many funded projects has been the multi-agency approach that brings together mainstream organisations, (such as local municipalities, health service professionals, labour offices, police, teachers and employers) together with an NGO to deliver the project. The mainstream agencies contribute the human resources and the professional expertise, as part of their mainstream functions, and the NGO takes responsibility for project management, co-ordination and administration. Such projects can have a significant impact at local level and

demonstrate how partnership working can be cost effective; a good example is the "Together for the community" project in Alba County, Romania where a whole range of professionals in policing, education, health, land registration etc are involved in training Roma community leaders.

91.   Both NROS and the RCRC are examples of how effective partnerships can bring together and facilitate better cooperation, and joint implementation, between the NGO sector and mainstream organisations. It clearly demonstrates the important role that civil society organisations, with know how and grass root knowledge, have in translating policy measures into operational realities at community level. The UK reles heavily on organisations with functions similar to these intermediary NGOs to manage and coordinate multi-agency partnership bodies that have been specifically set up to tackle social exclusion and disadvantage through community development initiatives across urban and rural communities[32].

Other initiatives

92.   The other Roma related activities that received funding have included: Media and public awareness campaigns (5.8%); Administration (3.6%); Legislation and strategy development (3.3%); Institutional training (2.4%); Health (0.9%) and Health information (0.3%); Business Development (0.2%) and Research (0.1%).

Media and public awareness campaigns

93.   Media and public awareness campaigns have been sub-components of programmes in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia and will be the primary component in the "Promote anti-discrimination and tolerance towards the Roma Minority (2002)" programme in Hungary, implementation of which has not yet started. In all five countries such campaigns are considered to be of significant importance to change opinions of the majority population and to improve conditions for social inclusion of Roma. In all five countries the press and media coverage of Roma minorities remains discriminatory, which contributes to, and continues to compound the negative stereotypical views of Roma which are frequently expressed. This is an area where much work still has to be done, not only to change opinions in the majority population but also at a political level and across public administration structures, where discriminatory practices are inherent and have not been tackled with any degree of rigour or commitment. Involving local press and TV in local partnership projects is an example of good practice.

Institutional training

94.   Activities which have been categorised under this heading refer primarily to anti-discrimination training in public sector institutions. In all five countries, these activities were reported to be a critical factor that will engender change in the attitudes of public sector employees (as described above) towards Roma minorities. Other donors have also been active in supporting such projects. For example the UK Department for International Development for the last six years has supported a partnership between the UK and Bulgarian police, to provide anti-discrimination and community policing training.

---

[32]See http://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/communities36/Web/Site/Whatwedo/Social_Inclusion.asp and http://domain210579.sites.fasthosts.com/sip/Default.htm   for information about social inclusion partnerships, both area based and thematic in Scotland. http://www.rcu.gov.uk/abi/default.asp for information about area based initiatives in England and Wales.

95.   This is an area that was funded by Phare, as a sub-component of larger projects. It is however, primarily a staff training responsibility that should be met by Government and public authorities. Good practice would be the introduction of anti discrimination and social inclusion awareness training as an ongoing and core function across all public institutions. Increasing awareness of discriminatory practices and the effects of social exclusion would improve the administrative capacity and ability of public servants to deal effectively and fairly with minority and disadvantaged groups in society.

96.   The public authorities can lead by example and should have a long-term aim to increase the representation of minority groups through the introduction of anti-discrimination policies in recruitment and promotion, and by changing internal working practices. According to one project coordinator, "Roma are under-represented throughout public institutions, including the police force. The fact that many Roma do not have the education to meet the basic entry qualifications is the biggest problem, but even then the public institutions do not make it easy to gain entry".

Health

97.   Poor health and its connections with poverty and social exclusion are generally regarded as a critical factor in social inclusion policies. Given the life expectancy difference between Roma and non-Roma, estimated to be 12 years less for men and 8 years for women, it has not been given the significance it deserves in Roma programmes.

98.   A fairly large (M€ 1.1) health intervention programme "Ensuring Minority Access to Health Care" has started in Bulgaria, with its primary aim to provide GP surgeries in Roma communities. Although the projects in this programme have not progressed beyond the tendering and contracting phase, indications are that the approach will be top-down and that little has been done to involve Roma in project design or to ensure that the planned activities will meet local needs. The focus is on refurbishment of premises, and like other works projects, it poses the question whether such measures should be initiated without both extensive community involvement and advanced community planning, where local residents have identified the need as a priority.

99.   In contrast, there was a small-scale health project in Romania to provide mobile cervical cancer screening for women. The project was developed and managed by an NGO but with full co-operation and partnership working between oncologists and medical professionals from the mainstream health care services. A key component of the project was the involvement of Roma women as health mediators. In the opinion of all involved, it was that factor that guaranteed success and helped to overcome the resistance displayed by many Roma women. The participatory approach adopted by this project is one of good practice, particularly the involvement of health mediators. A weakness was that the project was short term and that it was not sufficiently well integrated or connected with mainstream health service activities to guarantee continuation or to ensure that problems identified during the course of the screening would be taken up by mainstream services[33].

Business Development

100.   This activity is as a sub-component in a Bulgarian programme "Urbanisation and Social Development of Areas with disadvantaged populations" that was developed in partnership with, and includes M€ 0.26 co-finance from, UNDP. UNDP believes, quite rightly, that

---

[33] This project was funded through a grant scheme managed by the RCRC in Romania.

business development; stimulation of the business infrastructure, and promotion of entrepreneurship are important factors in employment and income generation of Roma. This programme has not yet started, but the outcome of business development activities should be watched with interest by the other countries.

Research

101.   Research has been almost totally ignored in Phare programmes, and was only included in one in the Czech Republic. The most recent research seeking to understand Roma communities has been undertaken by UNDP (2002) and the World Bank (2003), and the findings of both reports are extremely valuable and provide a significant insight into the needs, aspirations and expectations of Roma minorities. What may be surprising to many is that those needs and aspirations are not significantly different from those of the rest of the population.

102.   Phare provided small project funding, through grant schemes, for research institutes to undertake research and attitudinal studies across Roma communities. Good practice from this is that some of these organisations and their activities have been sustainable and after several years they help to ensure that there is a continuous flow of up to date information about the dynamics of Roma communities. Although this research is very valuable, it cannot be seen by Governments as a substitute for commissioning and gathering information for their own policy making purposes.

103.   Research is also required to establish appropriate, and non-discriminatory, mechanisms to ensure that Roma participation is being achieved. The current Minority Legislation prohibits monitoring on the basis of ethnicity, but for future SF – ERDF and ESF, some mechanism will need to be established to allow data to be collected within the framework of the legislation. MS ensure that target groups are included, but declaration of ethnic origin is voluntary, and data collection is done in such a way that the information cannot be tied to the individual, but it also ensures that enough information is collected to present an accurate breakdown of the participation levels of different groups of society.

3.2   Do Phare programmes address the wider social inclusion agenda?

104.   At this stage, there is no wider social inclusion agenda in the five countries covered in this review. The EU has a wider social inclusion agenda and a set of "appropriate objectives for the fight against poverty and social exclusion" which recognise that:

> Poverty and social exclusion take complex and multi-dimensional forms which require the mobilisation of a wide range of policies under that overall strategy. Alongside employment policy, social protection has a pre-eminent role to play, while the importance of other factors such as housing, education, health, information and communications, mobility, security and justice, leisure and culture should also be acknowledged'
>   EU : Objectives in the fight against poverty and social exclusion(2002)

105.   In line with these objectives Candidate Countries are required to prepare Joint Memorandum for Social Inclusion (JIM), which are signed before accession. The process of drafting social inclusion strategies is in progress and draft reports were not available at the time of this review.

106.   Social exclusion and inclusion are multidimensional concepts, and economic factors such as income and employment are without doubt critical factors. But the social dynamics of living conditions, education, health, culture and political dimensions also have to be taken into account. While all the Phare Roma programmes would meet these criteria, and they did bring crucial financial support to the sector, how finances were allocated and the way projects were implemented could not be determined in an orderly manner. With only a few exceptions, and certainly until recently, the Phare programmes for Roma minorities have had to be reactive, facilitated more by external pressure than domestic policies and aimed at dealing with the most visible problems. At a political level, there was no across-the-board ministerial commitment to social inclusion, and no strategic framework or comprehensive social and economic development plans directed towards it. Consequently, Phare was not generally in a position to address the root causes of exclusion, and could not be expected to do so. Phare programmes, inevitably, had a direct impact which was generally limited to bringing improvements in the quality of life and living conditions of individual Roma families or communities, but were hardly able to contribute to wider objectives. There is clear evidence of this, particularly in infrastructure, and some education and employment projects, which failed to bring social inclusion any closer.

The multi-dimensional context of applying social inclusion policies

107.   In the same way that social exclusion is a multi-dimensional concept, so too are the approaches that are proving to be successful in MS. Some past Phare programmes have tried to mirror this concept by including a range of different

> Poverty, dependency on social welfare, and a disinterest in adopting proactive life strategies are historical legacies of the past and the root causes of the social exclusion and discrimination that Roma experience today. ….the underlying problems are exacerbated by discrimination against the Roma. Since the roots of Roma problems are socio-economic and poverty-related, improved access to development opportunities is a precondition for the full realisation of their human rights.
>   UNDP: Avoiding the dependency trap(2002)

activities into one single project, but the outcomes have fallen far short of what was initially anticipated. Tackling social inclusion is not about creating small-scale interventions covering different factors of social exclusion. It is much more about bringing together the expertise and the resources of the different ministries, and organisations, to simultaneously concentrate on either one area or one target group. There is no single policy that can effectively tackle social exclusion nor one ministry, local authority or organisation that can bring about social inclusion through its own efforts. Partnership and collaborative working involving all ministries and organisations is at the core of social inclusion, though it is essential that lead responsibility is specifically allocated to one body for each initiative. So far, in the five countries, this multi-agency, multi-faceted approach is not in evidence.

108.   The easiest part about social inclusion is writing the policies. Transforming the policies into operational realities is the most difficult part. What Phare has been is an introduction, for Government ministries and other organisations, into the complex and multi-dimensional forum of social inclusion. According to one professional involved in implementation of an early Phare project "more than anything, Phare has helped to identify where the main weakness in the current policies and practices lie. It has also shown that there is no simple easy solution or quick fix remedy".

Mainstreaming of social inclusion

109.   A critical factor of successful social inclusion policies is mainstreaming, which is an approach to policymaking and service delivery where equality principles, strategies and practices are integrated into the everyday work of Government and other public bodies. It is a long-term strategy with an ultimate goal to create a fairer and more inclusive society. It puts people, and their diverse needs and experiences, at the heart of policymaking. Although some Phare programmes have, in a small way, influenced the practices of some ministries, overall the programmes have been additional to, and outside the mainstream of the ministries' normal work. Only in a few instances, in the MoEL, the MoE in Hungary and the MoER in Romania, is there clear evidence that Phare is regarded as an integrated measure to practice and test future social inclusion type policies.

110.   Responsibility for making sure that social inclusion (or integration) policies for Roma are translated into practice lies very firmly in the hands of Government. Social inclusion is not a realistic objective unless there is an across the board commitment to bring about systemic change in the current systems. Social inclusion requires commitment not only on a strategic and policy level, but also financial support. An area based approach which acknowledges that additional resources, financial and human, should be directed towards areas where communities are most affected by social and economic deprivation, is a policy that goes some way towards mainstreaming and guarantees that social inclusion (integration) policies for Roma minorities, are underpinned by a long term financial commitment. An area-based approach has been adopted and applied in the UK to underpin Government commitment to social inclusion.[34]

Is social inclusion the appropriate arena for Roma related policies ?

111.   A question that was asked throughout this review is whether practitioners and policy makers consider 'social inclusion' the most appropriate context for policies to tackle the problems being faced by Roma. There was widespread agreement that the issues affecting Roma minorities should be included in a broader social inclusion agenda, and that this would be a step towards a more coherent and strategic approach to the problems. However, allied with this response were also strong concerns that such a move would undermine the level of attention that is beginning to be given to Roma and also put at risk the dedicated resources that have so far been made available, to the greater benefit of other disadvantaged groups within the majority population or other minority populations.

112.   A perceived solution is that Roma should feature as a clearly identified high priority group within a wider social inclusion strategy and resource allocations should be clearly identified and explicitly guaranteed.

---

[34]Seehttp://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/communities36/Web/Site/Whatwedo/Social_Inclusion.aspand
http://domain210579.sites.fasthosts.com/sip/Default.htm   for information about social inclusion partnerships, both area based and thematic in Scotland.   http://www.rcu.gov.uk/abi/default.asp for information about area based initiatives in England and Wales.

3.3   How successful has Phare been in influencing change in the policy arena?

Anti-discrimination legislation and the Equality Bodies

113.   To meet the requirements of Chapter 13 of the *acquis*, those countries acceding in 2004 must have completed the transposition of Directive 2004/43/EC and established an Equality Body. Transposition of the legislation is at different stages in the three acceding countries: in the Czech Republic, the draft legislation is currently in the consultation period, and is forecast to be approved by government by the end of February 2004. The final decision regarding whether the equality office will be a separate body or an extension of the existing Ombudsman's office has not yet been made. In Hungary the legislation was approved by government in December 2003 and becomes law from 28 January 2004. The equality office will be established as a separate independent body: it is proposed that the Authority will have full regulatory powers, ie to impose fines for non compliance. But at this stage the exact parameters of responsibility have not been approved by Government. In Slovakia, the draft legislation is under discussion and is likely to be adopted by Cabinet at the beginning of February and approved by Parliament some time in March 2004. Final decisions have not yet been made about the status of the Equality Body.

114.   In the other two countries. Bulgaria adopted a comprehensive anti-discrimination law in September 2003, which is aimed at reaching a large degree of alignment with the *acqui*s. It introduces a system of sanctions and envisages the establishment of a Commission for protection against discrimination as an independent body. In Romania the current anti-discrimination legislation is an important step forward in tackling discrimination, although the legislation still requires some adjustments to be in line with the *acquis.* Of all the acceding and candidate countries, Romania is the first to have a functioning equality body. The National Council for Combating Discrimination became operational during the last quarter of 2002 and has dealt with over 450 discrimination cases since its creation.

115.   Establishment of the Equality Bodies should be a significant step towards ensuring that anti-discrimination legislation is translated into practice but, to be fully effective, they need to be more than just regulatory authorities and should be proactive organisations committed to improve people's understanding of the factors that lead to discriminatory practices. An example of good practice in this field is the Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities, who received EU funding to develop a training programme and manual to teach government and local authorities about the importance of taking account of cultural and ethnic diversity in policy design, working practices and recruitment and promotion procedures.[35]

The effect of the Accession Partnership agreements in this area

116.   Including Roma issues as an Accession Partnership priority has ensured that the issue remained under discussion throughout the accession process. Phare assistance is closely tied to the process of EU accession and is therefore more implicitly connected to the political environment of the country, probably more than assistance from other bi-lateral and international donors.

---

[35] See www.nicem.org.uk for more information about the proactive training developed by the Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities.

117.   As an outcome of EU pressure, the Roma question has moved to a position of higher priority, but at the same time it has also become much more a political and partisan issue.

> It is widely acknowledged that Phare has been, and continues to be, a significant lever that has stimulated discussion and created a forum for more open dialogue about the need for social inclusion (integration) of Roma. Roma are considered to be more 'on the agenda' than ever before. This is a move in the right direction, but it is just the beginning of a much longer process that requires stronger commitment from Governments and significant financial investment from Government, the European Union and other donors.
>
> People who contributed to this review (2003)

118.   In the five countries, there is no open multi-party consensus about Roma issues. Therefore, whether or not the problem is openly acknowledged and the need for urgent action accepted depends on partisan links. Given that political will and commitment drive the policy environment, this has had a significant impact on whether, and how, policies are translated into practice. Through the years, changes of governing parties have had a direct impact on the level of commitment to Roma integration and have hampered progress. Meanwhile agreements and policies, adopted by the previous government, are altered to reflect the political views of the incoming political party.

119.   The political and operational environment surrounding the policies for Roma Integration remains fragile. Pressure on the countries to make the right decisions is immense, and in some cases the capacity of those responsible for driving the process does not reflect the scale of the task. There almost seems to be a reluctance to make decisions for fear that they may not be the right ones, or that they do not meet the requirements of the vast array of international donors and pressure groups, who have an active stake in the process. Rightly or wrongly, many of those involved at policy level feel that an international microscope is poised ready to examine their every move.

120.   An outcome of the accession process, in all five countries, has been the establishment, at Government level, of some form of National Office for Roma affairs charged with responsibility for inter-ministerial coordination and for ensuring that Roma issues are taken into account in the policies of each Ministry. The fact that these offices now exist should be acknowledged as a very positive development. But they are fairly small administrative units, with relatively limited power and insufficient staff to co-ordinate such a significant influencing agenda. Whether those involved have sufficient institutional capacity or breadth of experience to deal with such a high profile and difficult agenda is questionable. The Roma office in Hungary has been recently been absorbed into a new Ministry for Equal Opportunities. At this stage it is impossible to predict how this change will be affect the staffing and capacity levels. There is a trend for Roma offices to attract new staff from civil society organisations, active in the field of Roma Affairs. Although this goes some way to ensuring sound knowledge and understanding of the issues, it does not guarantee the necessary experience or public sector skills to operate effectively or to drive inter-ministerial coordination across the ranks of large public institutions. It also suggests that there is an element of human resource recycling, rather than expansion, within the sector.

The formulation of policies

121.   Roma cannot be considered as one homogeneous group in society but all too often the national policies, as well as measures that stem from these policies, do not take account of the variety of different elements in the Roma population. One of the missing components, that forms the basis of effective policy, is a clear and informed understanding, not only about the problems and barriers that Roma face, but also about why and how the current policies are failing Roma communities. In its own right, Phare has helped focus the attention of policy makers and practitioners on the suitability and relevance of interventions that can be applied in this area. However only in a few instances is this experience being used constructively to inform future policies and measures. Therefore, without comprehensive knowledge and understanding, policies and policy measures cannot be developed that accurately reflect local circumstances. Very little is being invested by governments to assemble the necessary knowledge and understanding for effective planning. As a result there is no well-informed, clear vision and goal to define exactly what Roma inclusion means and how this will be achieved.

122.   In some instances the lack of ministerial commitment to a long-term strategy for social inclusion (integration) of Roma and the lack of resources to underpin the development process might be interpreted as deliberate discrimination that has stifled and suppressed the process of change. Whether or not this is the situation, the overall lack of vision and direction means there is no clear underpinning policy direction or commitment to systemic change. Without a clear policy framework for Roma inclusion (integration), Phare provided a range of different interventions that were largely task driven. It is difficult to draw direct connections between these interventions and any major policy change.

Phare's influence in the policy arena

123.   This said, in some instances initiatives that started through Phare or the lessons that have been drawn from implementation of a Phare project have successfully influenced and been absorbed into mainstream government policies. An example where this has occurred is the new education legislation in Hungary, which outlaws segregated education practices. Although this was not as a direct result of Phare, the lessons and evidence drawn from Phare programme demonstrated the endemic nature of segregated education. The recruitment of Roma classroom assistants, a practice now used to some extent in all five countries, has become accepted policy and thereby a mainstream function of their education ministries.

124.   A more positive outcome of Phare, across all five countries, is that those involved in either project management or implementation acknowledged that Roma issues are now being taken into account more than in the past. What Phare clearly demonstrated is that existing policies and practices are failing Roma. It also exposed that within current national systems there is a lack of capacity and understanding to effectively deal with the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the problem. Progress has been made in this direction and as a result of the EU accession process and Phare; social inclusion of minorities and disadvantaged groups in society has been highlighted in National Development Plans and Sectoral Operational Plans and Roma minorities are generally recognised to fall within that definition.

125.   Other positive developments that have the potential to make a significant impact on how policies affect Roma minorities are the social inclusion strategies that the countries are preparing. There have been recent shifts in policy, that so far have not had time to produce results, but they do give some room for optimism. The test will be, of course, how these

polices are translated into practice, and whether the measures are effectively oriented to ensure that they successfully reach socially excluded individuals and communities, like many in the Roma minorities.

126.   In all five countries, there are clusters of individuals and organisations that unequivocally accept that the Roma problem is sufficiently severe to demand urgent and intensive action and the critical mass of such individuals and organisations has grown over recent years. This group of very committed people spans ECDs, government ministers, public servants, non-government organisations and community activists.   However, the size and composition of the group is not yet sufficiently robust, in terms of their access to power or the availability of resources, to engender sufficient support and financial commitment for long-term systemic change.

127.   There is also a vast gap between the policy level and operational reality. The ministries and implementing agencies responsible for the management of Phare have, in the main, focused on project management and have taken a very hands-off approach to implementation. In all countries this has meant heavy involvement of external organisations, such as NGOs and private contractors, which is not in itself a bad thing. It does however, create a significant divide and a lack of cohesion between those at the top responsible for the policy and those working at the operational level. This was clearly evident in the views of those involved in the sector at a local level, who are aware that policy changes have been made and they acknowledge the importance and significance of these, but see little evidence of the changes filtering down and across the institutional structures. Those involved at the forefront of service delivery, working on a daily basis with Roma people in severely disadvantaged situations, reported very little real evidence of change but ample reasons for optimism that things will improve in the future.

3.4   How successful has Phare been in promoting learning by doing in this sector?

128.   It is in the area of learning by doing that Phare has achieved the most. Of the people who contributed to this review, most saw the greatest benefit of Phare in terms of capacity building, since it both stimulated and prepared people to apply for and gain funding from EU programmes, which otherwise would not have happened.   Learning by doing has been successful across Government ministries, NGOs and other organisations involved with Phare projects.

129.   Learning by doing and preparing for SF has been one of the wider benefits of the Phare programme as a whole. Phare has served to introduce government ministries, and other organisations, into the complex and multi-dimensional forum of social inclusion.   The experience that has been gained so far in this field cannot be lost, and has the potential to provide a foundation for more effective policies and strategies in the future. Some countries have utilised their experience more constructively than others. Good examples are to be found in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, where more recent programmes take account of both the shortcomings and successes of past practices.

Learning in programming for Phare

130.   Programming for Phare projects for Roma minorities has proven challenging for those involved in Government ministries and the ECDs. For some reason, possibly because of the international attention and pressure, there is an assumption that programmes for Roma have to be so significantly different, multi dimensional and innovative that it has challenged their

capacity to be effective. Such assumptions are in fact discriminatory, although seldom recognised as such, and often this has been a barrier that has restricted and limited the opportunity for effective programming. Rather than creating such a range of multi faceted projects, it would have been better to have started with a few well tested social and economic interventions.

131. Of course Roma communities have different priority needs, but the extent of the differences between them are probably not as extensive as most people assume[36]. The critical factor in taking account of the differences, real or imagined, is more in how policies are adjusted to overcome the exclusionary barriers that exist and how projects are implemented to ensure that they meet the differing needs of different individuals and communities. It is in this area that Phare has stimulated learning by doing not only in the projects that have been effective, but also when implementation has been difficult. Those involved have had to analyse the situations and react to overcome problems.

The value added from learning by doing

132. Significant value added from Phare has been a cadre of young, qualified professionals functioning within this complex policy area, although they are not sufficient in numbers and certainly not enough of them are Roma. Learning has taken place, and awareness of EU compliant practices has been heightened. The practical experience that has been gained in this area should not be underestimated, but should be channelled and effectively utilised to shape better operational practices for the future.

133. Recent Phare programmes in Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary, more so than earlier Phare programmes, demonstrate a clearer understanding of the need for Roma involvement, and partnership working, to better design projects that meet identified need and to facilitate a more inclusive and participatory approach to implementation. This demonstrates that there has been growth in understanding and a greater acknowledgement of both the extent of the problems and the participatory interventions required to address such problems. At this stage no results have been derived from these projects and success will depend heavily on whether the countries have sufficient management and implementation capacity to cope with the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the projects. In all three there is evidence of good practice as they seek to involve the expertise of an experienced partner; in Bulgaria the project will be implemented in partnership with UNDP; in Hungary the project relies on the extensive knowledge of the PAA; and in Romania the RCRC will act as a intermediary NGO, responsible for management of the funds and for continuing the inclusive approach that was established in earlier projects.

Partnership working

134. Partnership working with other donors has not been a strong feature in Phare programmes in this field. When the first NGO managed programme emerged in the Czech Republic "Improvement of integration of the Roma Community" (CZ9807) there was a National Donors' Forum to provide an overview of where assistance programmes were targeting their resources, but that forum is no longer in existence. Until 2002, partnerships with other donors has been limited to small NGO projects, where other donor funding was used

---

[36] UNDP Report, Avoiding the Dependency Trap (2002) provides sufficient evidence to show that the aspirations and expectations of Roma in relation to quality of life, employment, education and health, and family life are not significantly different, but very much the same as the wider society.

to provide the necessary co-finance to support grant scheme applications. The first programme that demonstrates an active partnership with another international donor is in Bulgaria "Urbanisation and Social Development of Areas with disadvantaged populations" (BG-0204.01). In this case UNDP has been involved in project preparation. It is providing 25% co-financing for the project and will be actively involved in project management and implementation. Phare, in this field, has not stimulated a culture of partnership working with other donors. This could be because other donors find it difficult to align their budgets, which usually need to be spent within the financial year, with the long lead-in time before implementation of a Phare project actually begins. It could also be a consequence of the inexperienced staff involved in project management who do not have sufficient professional expertise in social development to recognise the value of partnership working, or who would naturally seek out partners as a basic principle of successful and sustainable development. There is also a lack of donor coordination to ensure that there is no overlap or duplication of donor funded activities. Thus far, the opportunity to establish successful and sustainable development partnerships with other donors has not been effectively utilised under Phare, and for those countries acceding in 2004, it is also an opportunity that has not been used constructively in advance of SF.

The NGO sector

135.   The Roma grant schemes, funded by Phare, were a lever that stimulated participation of Roma NGOs[37], and also brought Roma to the attention of other NGOs who extended their activities to include Roma minorities. This is a very positive outcome that stimulated participation of some 400 NGOs in the Czech Republic and Romania.

136.   NGOs both large and small have been involved in implementation of a significant number of projects that benefited from Phare. Learning by doing has taken place about how to use EU funded grant procedures, where project management, accounting and reporting procedures are more stringent. Learning about project development, project preparation and the application procedures, whether or not the application was successful, has also been a factor. The process has also improved wider skills such as, planning, budgeting, following rules, meeting deadlines, factors that had been quite unnecessary with previous donors. Collectively these have all stimulated the level of professionalism across the NGO sector, not only in project management but also in terms of quality management and monitoring of services they provide. Above all the need for accountability has been clearly demonstrated and accepted.

Local Authority involvement

137.   An aspect that is missing, particularly from earlier programmes, is learning by doing across local authorities (regional and municipality according to the institutional structures in each country). Involvement with Phare, at this level, has primarily been passive, reacting to the availability of new resources and being involved in the delivery of work in infrastructure projects. Only in a few small local projects have local authorities been actively involved in planning and preparation before a project becomes fully operational. In the NGO grant schemes in Romania and in the Hungarian labour market projects, local authority involvement is a key component. Local authorities, together with locally based NGOs, have a critical role to play and should be actively involved as fully contributing partners in community

---

[37] In this context Roma NGOs are organisations that are either operated and managed by Roma people, are serving the needs of Roma as a community or client group.

development initiatives. This is valid, not only from the point of view of effective project development and implementation but also as a means of breaking down barriers between the local authorities and Roma communities and thereby raising levels of mutual understanding. Those who have been involved in implementation of this type of project, both Roma and non-Roma, are strongly supportive of the partnership approach and reported that they have learned a significant amount in a professional, cultural and social context from their participation.

4.   CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

138.   This chapter and chapter 5 of the report seek to reach conclusions, make recommendations and draw on lessons learned and good practice to answer the final question – 'What conclusions and lessons can be learned for developing an integrated approach to Roma minorities?

Conclusion 1: Social inclusion of disadvantaged and marginalised groups is a prerequisite for the social cohesion of each country and for society as a whole. The accession process and the Phare programmes have been instrumental in ensuring that the issue of social inclusion (or integration) of Roma has been on the policy agenda more than ever before. With the support of Phare, policies have been adopted; legislation has been put in place, and a number of ground-breaking initiatives have been successfully launched. A growing 'critical mass' of stakeholders motivated to achieve progress in Roma affairs has been encouraged. That this has been achieved in the face of deep-seated, very long-standing and pervasive negative attitudes is a remarkable and praiseworthy achievement. But social inclusion of Roma will be a long-term process that must be underpinned by strong and sustained Government commitment to improve and expand employment opportunities for Roma individuals; build human capital through better education and health; and strengthen social capital and community development to underpin the process:

139.   In all five countries some form of document or strategy that outlines the government's commitment to integration of Roma has been adopted. While this is a significant step forward, at a political level there is no comprehensive Government and ministerial commitment to social inclusion for Roma, and so far no genuine strategic framework to clearly define exactly what social inclusion (integration) of Roma means, how it will be achieved, over what period of time or how the process will be resourced.

Conclusion 2: Anti-discrimination legislation should go a long way to supporting the fight against discrimination provided the law is imposed and translated into practice. But anti-discrimination legislation on its own will not tackle the root causes of social exclusion, as discrimination is only one contributing factor.

140.   Establishment of the Equality Bodies should be a significant step towards ensuring that anti-discrimination legislation is translated into practice, but to be fully effective they need to be more than just regulatory authorities and should be proactive organisations committed to improving people's understanding of the factors that lead to discriminatory practices.

141.   In all five countries the press and media coverage of Roma minorities remains discriminatory, which contributes to, and continues to compound, the negative stereotypical views of Roma frequently expressed. The public authorities can lead by example and should have a long-term aim to increase the representation of minority groups through the introduction of anti-discrimination policies in recruitment and promotion, and by changing internal working practices. Good practice would be anti discrimination and social inclusion awareness training as an ongoing and core function across all public institutions.

Conclusion 3: Rather than Roma specific policies and programmes, there is widespread agreement that the issues affecting Roma minorities should be included in a broader social inclusion agenda. However, allied to this response are also strong reservations that such a move should not be allowed to dilute the level of attention that is beginning to be given to Roma or put at risk the dedicated resources that have so far been made available.

142. Roma minorities should be included in a broader social inclusion agenda which would be a step towards a more coherent and strategic approach to the problems. Roma should feature as a clearly identified high priority group within a wider social inclusion strategy and resource allocations should be clearly identified and explicitly guaranteed. But there are also considerable concerns that, in such a wide strategy context, discrimination would be exercised and Roma would be overlooked in favour of other disadvantaged groups within the majority population or other minority populations.

Conclusion 4: Education projects cannot, on their own, integrate Roma into the mainstream education system unless they are underpinned by a strong and long-term Government commitment to systemic change. A lifelong learning approach should be at the heart of education polices to ensure that the system is accessible to, and inclusive of Roma people of all ages. Such change should be coupled with modernisation and reform of outdated and rigid education systems and practices.

143. In all five countries some steps have been taken to introduce an element of multiculturalism into education. Although useful lessons can be drawn from the projects analysed in the course of this review, they clearly demonstrate that responsibility for change in education lies very firmly in the hands of Governments. Greater investment in education and training support in the mainstream institutions is needed to change school books and other learning material and to concentrate on anti-poverty for young people in a "whole school" approach.

144. Although Phare projects provide an opportunity to make the system more flexible, projects alone are unlikely to have a significant impact on education systems where segregated and outdated education practices still exist. Without a strong commitment to bring about systemic change in education practices, assistance programmes like Phare can only provide localised improvements, of uncertain sustainability. The rigidity across all levels of the education systems is a significant part of the problem, failing others from disadvantaged backgrounds as well as Roma.

145. Lifelong Learning and a more flexible approach to all strands of education from child parent learning to adult learning opportunities is required to make the system more accessible, oriented and relevant for Roma and other disadvantaged groups in society.

Conclusion 5: Employment and labour income problems are usually ranked highest among the problems seriously affecting Roma household. In all five countries this view was strongly expressed by the Roma people who contributed to this review. But not enough is being done, and not enough resources are being targeted, to tackle long-term unemployment that is endemic in many Roma communities.

146.   Given the scale of unemployment in Roma communities it is surprising that only 9% of Phare assistance for Roma minorities was spent on tackling unemployment.   Tackling unemployment, labour market reintegration and human resource development within the Roma minorities, has been largely unaddressed.

147.   Although future ESF assistance should be a useful tool to address the situation of Roma unemployment, it is not enough to develop generic employment and labour market reintegration type projects and assume that they will reach the most vulnerable, particularly Roma who live in marginalized communities in areas with very limited potential for economic growth.   This review found that insufficient attention has been paid to the patterns of unemployment and the complexity of the barriers which exclude Roma people from the labour market and also from participation in ALM projects.

Conclusion 6: Infrastructure interventions to upgrade and improve living conditions in Roma settlements do not bring the goal of social inclusion of Roma any closer unless they are part of a comprehensive and adequately resourced regeneration strategy.

148.   Although there is an explicit need to improve living conditions in Roma settlements, such interventions do not bring the goal of social inclusion (or integration) of Roma any closer unless there is a long-term plan and clear vision of how the area regeneration (improvement) process will continue and how it will be resourced in the future.   The bottom-up approach is founded in good practice that fits the same profile as many participatory community development type projects supported by SF and ERDF.   However such projects were, in practice, difficult to achieve within the short life of a Phare project.   The integrated community development approach has been long recognised as good practice in EU MS.

149.   Infrastructure projects should not start the community planning and development cycle, but should be used as an extension of preparatory work that has stimulated local involvement and generated a level of local capacity and local planning that is ready to react to, and absorb the resources available.   This concept combines a range of different activities; concentrating on defined geographic areas; involving the local community; building partnerships between local Roma communities, NGOs, and public institutions; and is a solid approach that mirrors those applied in Member States to tackle the multi-dimensional problems of social exclusion[38].

Conclusion 7: Poor health and its connections with poverty and social exclusion, although regarded as a critical factor in social inclusion policies, was an area that was given little attention in the Roma projects.

150.   Overall only 0.12% of Phare resources were dedicated to health projects or to the provision of health information.   This is surprising, given the life expectancy difference between Roma and non-Roma, estimated to be 12 years less for men and 8 years less for women.   It has not been given the significance it deserves in Roma programmes.

Conclusion 8: Phare clearly demonstrated that existing policies and practices are failing Roma and that, within current systems, there is a lack of resources and capacity to deal effectively with the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the problem.

---

[38] An area based approach has been adopted in the UK to tackle social and economic exclusion. For more information see web site http://www.rcu.gov.uk/   and http://www.rcu.gov.uk/abi/default.asp for information about the types of initiatives that have been applied.

151.   Phare was an introduction for Government ministries and many other organisations into the complex arena of social inclusion, but it also exposed a lack of capacity and professional experience to deal with such a complex and multi-dimensional range of issues. The goal of Social Inclusion of Roma must be underpinned by strong Government commitment that requires partnership working across all Government ministries and all strands of the public and NGO sectors, with other donors, and with Roma and non-Roma communities. Achieving social inclusion of Roma will be a long term process of sustainable development that requires significant resource allocations and the input of development professionals to ensure that the policies and interventions are designed and oriented to overcome the many complex and inter-connected barriers that exclude Roma from mainstream society.

152.   The following recommendations are aimed at:

- The Governments of : Bulgaria; Czech Republic; Hungary; Romania; and Slovakia
- DG Employment and Social Affairs in the European Commission.

Conclusion	Recommendation	References
Strategic Framework		
Anti-discrimination legislation should go a long way to supporting the fight against discrimination provided the law is imposed and translated into practice.	The Equality Bodies that have still to be established in four countries, (in Romania the Equality body is already functioning) must have a clear and independent role with the necessary regulatory powers to enforce anti-discrimination legislation. The role of the Equality Body should extend beyond these regulatory functions, to ensure that they are proactive organisations committed to improving people's understanding of the factors that lead to discriminatory practices. They should be responsible for training and awareness raising across public and private sectors to teach how cultural and ethnic diversity should be taken into account in policy design, working practices, recruitment and promotion procedures.	16, 114 -117, and 137
The National Offices for Roma Affairs, in all five countries, are fairly small administrative units, with relatively limited power and insufficient staff to co-ordinate such a significant influencing agenda.	In all five countries a much higher profile should be attached to national Roma offices. Staffing levels should be reviewed to ensure that they match the magnitude and complexity of the tasks. Professional training should be given to staff to ensure that they have the necessary skills and professional expertise in social and economic development. Strengthening the role of these offices should be considered a contribution to the wider goal of Roma social inclusion.	24, 25, and 117
So far there is no genuine strategic framework to clearly define exactly what social inclusion (integration) of Roma means, how it will be achieved, over what period of time or how the process will be resourced.	Social inclusion of Roma should have a long-term agenda that it is given the necessary status and priority by Governments. Roma should be a clearly named priority group with a specific allocation of funding, within the overall social inclusion policy of the relevant country.	17, 23, 28, 38, 40, 42, 107 – 110, 122, 126 and 141
Existing policies and practices are failing Roma. Projects cannot integrate Roma into the mainstream education system unless they are underpinned by a strong and long-term Government commitment to systemic change.	Governments must lead in ensuring that social inclusion (integration) policies for Roma are translated into practice. Social inclusion is not an attainable objective unless there is an across the board commitment to bring about systemic change in the current systems. This is particularly important in the education sector.	28, 31, 38, 51, 53, 57, and 140 – 142
Policy and Programming		
Employment and labour income problems are usually ranked highest among the problems seriously affecting Roma household.	Addressing the problems of Roma unemployment should be regarded as a much higher, if not the highest priority in all future policies relating to social inclusion of Roma. More money should be spent on employment and labour market re-integration projects for unemployed Roma.	19, 22, 32, 71–81, and 143, 144

Conclusion	Recommendation	References
Not enough is known or understood about either the patterns of unemployment or the complexity of the barrier that exclude Roma people from the labour market and also from participation in active labour market (ALM) projects.	More emphasis and resources should be dedicated to research and attitudinal studies to enable governments to better understand, not only the problems and barriers that Roma face in their countries, but how and why their current policies are failing Roma communities.	32, 81, 102, 118, 143 and 144 Lesson 2 Annex 3
It is not enough to develop generic employment and labour market reintegration type projects and assume that they will reach the most vulnerable, particularly Roma who live in marginalized communities in areas with very limited potential for economic growth.	Government active labour market policies and ESF assistance are critical to address the long term and pervasive unemployment that affects Roma minorities. Roma minorities should be a priority group within these policies and the active labour market measures and ESF projects should be oriented to reflect labour market opportunities and to take account of the barriers that exclude Roma from the labour market.	19, 32, 79 – 81, 124, 143 and 144 Lesson 8 Annex 3 Annex 4
Active labour market measures to reintegrate hard to employ people can be successful, but they require a different and more innovative approach.	The social economy and intermediate labour market training and employment projects that combine public benefit employment with training and personal development should be recognised as a means of generating employment opportunities for unemployed Roma. Providing socio-economic and local economic development training to Roma individuals would help underpin and contribute to the long-term sustainability of social inclusion policies in Roma communities.	78 - 79 Lesson 9 Annex 4
Infrastructure interventions to upgrade and improve living conditions in Roma settlements can further entrench segregation and do not bring the goal of social inclusion of Roma any closer	Top-down interventions, particularly when they relate to infrastructure upgrading should not be accepted in future Phare Roma programmes. Infrastructure development programmes should be closely scrutinised to ensure that they are an extension of previous community planning and development activities, before Phare or other funds are committed.	21, 30, 58 – 70, and 145 – 146 Lesson 6 Lesson 7
A lifelong learning approach should be at the heart of education polices to ensure that the system is accessible and inclusive to Roma people of all ages.	Greater priority should be given to lifelong learning opportunities from 'cradle to grave' in the mainstream of all educational sectors. A learner-centred approach should be adopted to make learning opportunities more relevant and accessible for people's lives	54, 140-142
Poor health and its connections with poverty and social exclusion were given little attention in the Roma projects.	Greater focus should be given to health projects in Roma communities, and should be a component part of the wider social inclusion policies in all five countries. This should include a wider dissemination of the information available concerning the proven links between poor health and its connection with poverty and social exclusion.	18, 96 – 98 and 148
Within current systems there is a lack of capacity and understanding to deal effectively with the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the problem.	Twinning for candidate countries and Community Programmes for the New Member states should be utilised to allow for an active exchange of information between New Member States, Candidate Countries and Member States.	24, 28, 33, 37 and 83 Lesson 11

Conclusion	Recommendation	References
Implementation		
The goal of Social Inclusion of Roma must be underpinned by strong Government commitment that is translated into an integrated, multi-agency approach where Roma social inclusion is regarded as a mainstream issue.	To meet the objective of social inclusion of Roma, there must be partnership working involving public institutions at all levels, community based organisations, other donors and the Roma and non-Roma communities. An area based approach should be regarded as an example of good practice. Partnership working, consultation and collaboration should be at the core of all policies and strategies. Since partnership working does not happen naturally or spontaneously, it is therefore an approach that needs to be managed, co-ordinated and also learned. Area based development partnerships should be established to manage inputs and ensure coordination across all agencies.	23, 28, 38, 39, 42, 63, 64, 89, 90, 107, 108, 135 and 148 Lesson 7
On their own, NGOs have neither the power nor the resources to tackle social exclusion of Roma.	NGOs and their activities should be seen as a component part of a wider and more integrated approach, and complementary to mainstream functions.	85 – 90, 125, 132, 133, and 148 Lesson 10
The public authorities can lead by example to increase the representation of minority groups through the introduction of anti-discrimination policies in recruitment and promotion, and by changing internal working practices.	Project implementation should stimulate Roma participation and overcome the barriers, including discrimination, that exclude Roma from employment projects. Public authorities should lead by example and have an active policy (affirmative action) to increase the employment of minority groups through the introduction of anti-discrimination policies in recruitment and promotion.	93 – 95, 115, 137 and 138 Lesson 4

	Recommendations for Phare 2004 – 2006 - Bulgaria and Romania
1	Roma inclusion (or integration) programmes should be part of the Phare Economic and Social Cohesion programmes for 2004 – 2006. This should be translated into the National Development Plans and relevant Sectoral Operational Plans, where Roma should be recognised as a priority target group
2	A multi annual programming approach should be adopted in the 2004 – 2006 programmes, to provide longer term commitment, longer implementation periods and to allow for a developmental type approach to be applied.
3	In the 2004 – 2006 Phare ESC programmes; Roma should be regarded as a priority. Phare funding from the ESC programmes should be earmarked to develop integrated Roma projects, although emphasising Roma as a priority they should not be so exclusive that they further intensify the problems of Roma segregation. DG Employment and Social Affairs should take an active role in these projects, as they provide an opportunity to determine whether such an approach can be effectively translated into practice.
4	To meet the objective of social inclusion of Roma, projects should be based on partnership working, involving public institutions at all levels, community based organisations and Roma and non-Roma communities. The approach in Romania of involving the RCRC as an intermediary management organisation should be regarded as good practice that should be expanded in Romania to generate a wider spread of area based development partnerships. The involvement of UNDP in Bulgaria in a 2001 Phare project is good practice: however for sustainability there should be a long-term aim to establish area based development partnerships. A proactive approach should be adopted to involve other donors in joint activities. Phare, where possible in partnership with other donors and with national or regional co-finance, should provide financial support for at least three years to allow the area based partnerships to be firmly established.
5	Project managers should ensure that implementation is sufficiently well oriented to make the projects attractive and to stimulate participation in Roma communities. As a rule of thumb, in projects where Roma are the priority, if the project attracts some non-Roma, this in most cases is evidence of need, and those people should not be excluded from participation; but if the project fails to attract Roma or attracts a higher number of non-Roma, this is an indication that the project is not sufficiently well oriented to meet the needs of Roma communities.
6	Within the area based partnerships, there should be training projects in local socio-economic development and partnership working. There should also be affirmative action to ensure that a mix of Roma and non-Roma people are trained and employed to work together within these area-based partnerships.
7	Addressing the problems of Roma unemployment should be regarded as a much higher, if not the highest priority. More money should be spent on employment and labour market re-integration projects for unemployed Roma. The social economy and intermediate labour market training and employment projects that combine public benefit employment with training and personal development, should be recognised as a means of generating employment opportunities for unemployed Roma. Providing socio-economic and local economic development training to Roma individuals would help underpin and contribute to the long-term sustainability of social inclusion policies in Roma communities. The model in Hungary should be regarded as an example of good practice as the first stage of a much longer process to find effective and sustainable active labour market policies.
8	Infrastructure development projects for Roma communities should only be considered in the 2004 – 2006 Phare if they are an extension of previous community planning and development activities, with involvement of local communities.

	Recommendations for Phare 2004 – 2006 - Bulgaria and Romania
9	Education projects should focus on the introduction or extension of multi-cultural teaching practices, and should be regarded as a component part of national education policies for systemic change and education reform. The model in Romania should be regarded as a good practice that should be expanded or replicated.
10	Greater emphasis should be placed on health projects, and more money should be allocated towards local health projects. The example of the local mobile health-screening project in Romania developed in partnership with local health practitioners, and involving Roma women as health mediators, should be regarded as a basic model of good practice. This example could be used to address other health problems and should be expanded or replicated. Such projects should ensure stronger involvement and commitment from local health authorities.

5.   LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICE

153.   Stemming from the findings of this review of Phare assistance to Roma minorities there are a number of key **"lessons learned"** that can be used to stimulate a more integrated approach to social inclusion of Roma minorities. The lessons learned reflect some of the good practices that have so far been demonstrated through the application of Phare assistance, or that can be drawn from discussions with those involved in the management and implementation of Phare projects in this field.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

LESSON 1   Most people who contributed to this review acknowledged that poverty, unemployment and social exclusion of Roma should be addressed in the wider arena of social inclusion, largely because the problems not only affect Roma but other communities. However, it is strongly felt that in the short to medium term there is still a need for a guaranteed allocation of financial support specifically for the Roma community.

LESSON 2   Government knowledge and informed understanding forms the basis for accurate and effective policy making. Roma communities are very varied, but what Roma people need from society is not fundamentally different from the rest of the population. Too often this is overlooked and Roma are considered as 'different'. To achieve a coherent policy on Roma there is a need for a greater understanding of not only the problems and barriers that Roma face, but also why and how current policies are failing the Roma communities.

LESSON 3   Although each country has established some form of national Roma office, so far these offices do not have the political leverage or the staffing levels to be fully effective as the agents of change in such a complex and partisan arena. Strengthening the role of these offices should be considered a contribution to the wider goal of Roma social inclusion in these countries.

LESSON 4   Those working on Phare, and large numbers of the Roma community, consider that discriminatory practices are endemic throughout public institutions. Discrimination, in this form, creates barriers and exclusion from public services.

PROGRAMMING

LESSON 5   Education projects cannot, on their own, integrate Roma into the mainstream education system unless they are underpinned by a strong and long term government commitment to systemic change and education reform. Phare projects can provide the testing ground for policies and the implementation framework for new teaching practices, where multiculturalism and respect for diversity is at the heart of the whole education system.

LESSON 6   Top-down interventions, particularly when they relate to infrastructure upgrading in detached Roma settlements, do little more than make slum conditions marginally more habitable and cannot on their own bring the goal of social inclusion (or integration) of Roma any closer. To achieve sustainable objectives, such infrastructure projects need to embedded in a comprehensive and adequately resourced regeneration strategy

LESSON 7   To ensure that projects have a greater chance of a successful and sustainable impact on Roma communities there needs to be a multi-agency approach based on continuous community planning and community development activities. This brings together the local community, local authorities, and other organisations, and other donors to prepare action plans that take account of and respond to clearly identified local need.

LESSON 8   Phare ESF type projects provide an opportunity to test the effectiveness of active labour market polices and to refine implementation methodologies that take account of local circumstances and encourage Roma participation.

LESSON 9   Recent thinking in Hungary, Slovakia and Romania is beginning to recognise the social economy (which should encompass social care, education, health, research and NGO sectors) as a legitimate sector to generate employment. This matches thinking in Member States where it is now recognised and documented[39] that the social economy has the potential to be a provider of employment, particularly in areas of high unemployment. If this approach were used to provide socio-economic development training for Roma individuals, it could create a critical mass of Roma working in the sector, which would underpin and guarantee sustainability of future social inclusion policies.

IMPLEMENTATION

LESSON 10   NGOs have a crucial role to play as social partners. Involvement and investment in NGOs as intermediaries should be recognised as good practice. They can create links between those developing the policies and those translating policy measures into operational realities at a community level, such as local authorities, health practitioners and labour offices to name a few. Their know-how and grass root knowledge can help to engender trust and overcome the barriers and reservations that can emanate from both sides. Their involvement in building local partnerships can bring together and facilitate better cooperation, and joint implementation, between the NGO sector and mainstream organisations.

NETWORKING

LESSON 11   Twinning has proven to be an effective means of transferring experiences and practices from Member States. This has included the institutional structures that have been set in place to support anti-discrimination legislation and also provided a wider exposure to the type of policies and interventions that have been applied by MS.

---

[39] See *Valuing the Social Economy: the Social Economy and Economic Inclusion in Lowland Scotland ; Community Enterprise in Strathclyde (Macgregor et al 2002)* also see http://www.objective3.org/equal/site.php?pageid=10 for information about Strengthening the Social Economy Partnership that has been establish under Objective 3 in Scotland.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. Extracts from the Accession Partnership documents relating to Roma Minorities.

1999 Bulgaria	Start implementation of the Roma Framework Programme and strengthen the National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues including provision of necessary financial support; implement measures aimed at fighting discrimination (including within the public administration); foster employment opportunities and increase access to education.
2001 Bulgaria	Continue to implement the Roma Framework Programme with particular attention to providing necessary financial support, significant strengthening of the National Council of Ethnic and Demographic Issues, and ensuring equal access to health, education and social security.
2003 Bulgaria	Take concrete action to implement the Roma Framework Programme with particular attention to providing necessary financial support, significant strengthening the government body in charge of minority issues and ensuring equal access to health, housing, education and social security. Elaborate a concrete action plan and financial framework to the Roma Framework Programme which improves implementation.
1999 Czech Republic	Implement actions contained in the Government Resolution of 7 October on Roma including provision for the necessary financial support at national and local levels; implement measures aimed at fighting discrimination (including within the public administration); foster employment opportunities and increase access to education.
2001 Czech Republic	Continue efforts, at national, regional and municipal level, to improve the condition of the Roma minority. Efforts should address employment opportunities, access to education, including appropriate measures to integrate Roma children into mainstream schools, measures to fight discrimination in society and access to housing. In particular, implement tasks contained in the government policy for Roma integration of June 2000.
1999 Hungary	Start implementation of the medium-term Roma action programme including provision for the necessary financial support at national and local levels; implement measures aimed at fighting discrimination (including within police services); foster employment opportunities and increase access to education.
2001 Hungary	Improve the integration of the Roma minority in the Hungarian society through more efficient implementation and impact assessment of the medium-term Roma action programme, with particular emphasis on promoting access to mainstream education, fighting discrimination in society (including within the police services), fostering employment, and improving the housing situation.
1999 Romania	Strengthen dialogue between the Government and the Roma community with a view to elaborating and implementing a strategy to improve economic and social conditions of the Roma and provide adequate financial support to minority programmes.
2001 Romania	Provide adequate financial support and administrative capacity in order to implement the Government Strategy on the improvement of the situation of Roma.
2003 Romania	Provide adequate financial support and administrative capacity in order to implement the national strategy on the improvement of the situation of Roma.
1999 Slovakia	Improve the situation of the Roma through strengthened implementation including provision for the necessary financial support at national and local levels, of measures aimed, notably, at fighting against discrimination (Including within the public administration), foster employment opportunities and increase access to education; provide adequate financial support.
2001 Slovakia	Continue improving the situation of the Roma through strengthened implementation of the relevant strategy, including the provision of the necessary financial support at national and local levels; measures aimed at fighting against discrimination (including within the public administration), fostering employment opportunities, increasing access to education, improving housing conditions; provide adequate financial support.

ANNEX 2. Objectives in the fight against poverty and social exclusion

Introductory note

1.   Political guidelines laid down by the European Council

At the European Councils in Lisbon and in Feira, the Member States of the European Union took a major initiative by making the fight against poverty and social exclusion one of the central elements in the modernisation of the European social model. The Heads of State and Government agreed on the need to take steps to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty by setting suitable objectives to be agreed by the Council by the end of the year. They also agreed that policies for combating social exclusion should be based on an open method of coordination combining national action plans and a programme presented by the Commission to encourage cooperation in this field.

The European Councils in Lisbon and in Feira made the promotion of social cohesion an essential element in the global strategy of the Union to achieve its strategic objective for the next decade of becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. It also set a goal for full employment in Europe in an emerging new society which is more adapted to the personal choices of women and men. This initiative follows from the inclusion, through the Amsterdam Treaty, of the fight against exclusion in the provisions relating to the Union's social policy (Articles 136 and 137 of the Treaty).

2.   Multi-dimensional approach

Poverty and social exclusion take complex and multi-dimensional forms which require the mobilisation of a wide range of policies under that overall strategy. Alongside employment policy, social protection has a pre-eminent role to play, while the importance of other factors such as housing, education, health, information and communications, mobility, security and justice, leisure and culture should also be acknowledged.

It is necessary, therefore, to mainstream the objective of fighting poverty and social exclusion into relevant strands of policy, at both national and community level.

Employment is the best safeguard against social exclusion. In order to promote quality employment it is necessary to develop employability, in particular through policies to promote the acquisition of skills and life-long learning. The implementation of the objectives to which the European Union has committed itself within the European Employment Strategy will, therefore, make a vital contribution to the fight against exclusion. Economic growth and social cohesion are mutually reinforcing. It is a precondition for better economic performance that we create a society with greater social cohesion and less exclusion.

Social protection systems also play a key role. In this context, the national social assistance and minimum income schemes are important instruments in social protection policy. It is vital, in the context of an active welfare state, to create modern systems of social protection which promote access to employment. Retirement pensions and access to health care also play an important role in the fight against social exclusion.

The new knowledge-based society offers great possibilities for reducing social exclusion, both by creating the economic conditions for greater prosperity and by opening up new ways of participating in society. The emergence of new information and communication technologies constitutes an exceptional opportunity, provided that the risk of creating an ever-widening gap between those who have access to the new knowledge and those who do not is avoided. The Lisbon Council directed that exclusion from the information society should be prevented and that it was necessary to pay special attention to the needs of people with disabilities. The implementation of the Commission's action plan "E-Europe 2005 – an Information Society for all", approved by the Seville European Council, as well as the "2003 European Year for Disabled People" should contribute to the achievement of this objective.

In line with the conclusions of the Lisbon European Council, setting appropriate objectives should also involve promoting a better understanding of social exclusion; mainstreaming the promotion of inclusion in Member States' employment, education and training, health and housing policies; and developing priority actions in favour of specific target groups (for example, minorities, children, the elderly and disabled), with Member States choosing amongst those actions according to their particular situations.

3.   Arrangements for implementation

Articles 2 and 3 of the Treaty respectively give to the Community the task of promoting equality between men and women and of ensuring that all its activities aim to eliminate inequalities and promote equality between men and women. It is therefore necessary to ensure that a concern for gender equality is mainstreamed in all action to be taken to achieve the stated objectives, in particular by assessing the implications for both men and women at the different stages of the planning of, decision-making on and monitoring of that action.

The implementation of this approach must take account of the principle of subsidiarity. Combating social exclusion is first and foremost the responsibility of Member States and their national, regional and local authorities, in cooperation with the full range of the bodies concerned, in particular the social partners and NGOs. Furthermore, the nature of the response depends particularly on the nature of national social protection systems and social policies.

Applying the open method of coordination to the fight against social exclusion, in line with the principles defined in the conclusions of the Lisbon European Council, will allow for both coherence and diversity of action at national level. Policies in pursuit of the objective of fighting social exclusion and poverty can vary in nature, and in their implications for Member States and their target groups. Differences in approach between Member States in dealing with these problems will result in solutions and priorities reflecting their individual circumstances.

The open method of coordination will continue to combine national action plans with the Community action programme to encourage cooperation between Member States to combat social exclusion. In this context, it would be desirable for the Member States to present their second national action plans by July 2003. The Social Protection Committee will play a key role in following up this initiative. On employment matters, it will work closely with the Employment Committee.

4.   Continuing Implementation of the Lisbon European Council's conclusions

The objectives set at the European Council of Nice have proved robust and viable. The priority now is to build on and consolidate the progress that has been made with a view to further increasing efforts to advance the process launched by the Lisbon European Council. In the light of this, the Council, having regard to the guidelines defined by the Lisbon and Feira European Councils and taking account of the conclusions of the European Councils of Laeken and Barcelona, proposes to the Copenhagen European Council that the common objectives and implementation arrangements endorsed at the European Council of Nice should be confirmed with the addition of amendments which emphasise the importance of setting targets, the need to strengthen the gender perspective in national action plans and the risks of poverty and social exclusion faced by immigrants. Thus the Council proposes to the Copenhagen European Council:
–   The following objectives, detailed in the annex are:
–   to facilitate participation in employment and access by all to the resources, rights, goods and services;
–   to prevent the risks of exclusion;
–   to help the most vulnerable;
–   to mobilise all relevant bodies;
–   the following arrangements to pursue these objectives:

The Member States,

will continue to pursue the objectives of fighting social exclusion and poverty;

will underline the importance of mainstreaming equality between men and women in all actions aimed at achieving those objectives by taking into account the gender perspective in the identification of challenges, the design, implementation and assessment of policies and measures, the selection of indicators and targets and the involvement of stakeholders;

are invited to develop their priorities within the framework of those overall objectives and to present a second national action plan by July 2003 covering a period of two years; are invited to set targets in their National Action Plans for significantly reducing the number of people at risk of poverty and social exclusion by 2010 and in doing this to draw, as appropriate, on the commonly agreed indicators endorsed at the Laeken European Council;

in order to make it possible to monitor the policies set out here, are also invited to develop, at national level, indicators and monitoring mechanisms capable of measuring progress in regard to each of the objectives elaborated in their national action plans.

The Commission,

with a view to a joint report, is invited to present, on the basis of the national action plans to be prepared by the Member States, a summary report identifying good practice and innovative approaches of common interest to the Member States.

The Member States and the Commission

are invited to work together in the context of the Social Protection Committee to prepare a Joint Report on Social Inclusion for submission to the Spring Council of 2004;

are invited to continue to cooperate at European level in order to bring about a better understanding of the problem of exclusion, to promote exchanges of good practice, including on targets and indicators, and to seek to further develop common approaches and compatibility in regard to these issues. The Action Programme adopted by the European Parliament and the Council will continue to support that cooperation.

_____

OBJECTIVES IN THE FIGHT
AGAINST POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION

1.   To facilitate participation in employment and access by all to resources, rights, goods and services

1.1.   Facilitating participation in employment

In the context of the European employment strategy, and the implementation of the guidelines in particular:

(a)   To promote access to stable and quality employment for all women and men who are capable of working, in particular:
   – by putting in place, for those in the most vulnerable groups in society, pathways towards employment and by mobilising training policies to that end;
   – by developing policies to promote the reconciliation of work and family life, including the issue of child- and dependent care;
   – by using the opportunities for integration and employment provided by the social economy.

(b)   To prevent the exclusion of people from the world of work by improving employability, through human resource management, organisation of work and life-long learning.

1.2.   Facilitating access to resources, rights, goods and services for all

(a)   To organise social protection systems in such a way that they help, in particular, to:
   – guarantee that everyone has the resources necessary to live in accordance with human dignity;
   – overcome obstacles to employment by ensuring that the take-up of employment results in increased income and by promoting employability.

(b)   To implement policies which aim to provide access for all to decent and sanitary housing, as well as the basic services necessary to live normally having regard to local circumstances (electricity, water, heating etc.).

(c)   To put in place policies which aim to provide access for all to healthcare appropriate to their situation, including situations of dependency.

(d)   To develop, for the benefit of people at risk of exclusion, services and accompanying measures which will allow them effective access to education, justice and other public and private services, such as culture, sport and leisure.

2.   To prevent the risks of exclusion

(a)   To exploit fully the potential of the knowledge-based society and of new information and communication technologies and ensure that no-one is excluded, taking particular account of the needs of people with disabilities.

(b)   To put in place policies which seek to prevent life crises which can lead to situations of social exclusion, such as indebtedness, exclusion from school and becoming homeless.

(c)   To implement action to preserve family solidarity in all its forms.

3.   To help the most vulnerable

(a)   To promote the social integration of women and men at risk of facing persistent poverty, for example because they have a disability or belong to a group experiencing particular integration problems such as those affecting immigrants.

(b)   To move towards the elimination of social exclusion among children and give them every opportunity for social integration.

(c)   To develop comprehensive actions in favour of areas marked by exclusion.

These objectives may be pursued by incorporating them in all the other objectives and/or through specific policies or actions.

4.   To mobilise all relevant bodies

(a)   To promote, according to national practice, the participation and self-expression of people suffering exclusion, in particular in regard to their situation and the policies and measures affecting them.

(b)   To mainstream the fight against exclusion into overall policy, in particular:
  –   by mobilising the public authorities at national, regional and local level, according to their respective areas of competence;
  –   by developing appropriate coordination procedures and structures;

  –   by adapting administrative and social services to the needs of people suffering exclusion and ensuring that front-line staff are sensitive to these needs.

(c)   To promote dialogue and partnership between all relevant bodies, public and private, for example:
  –   by involving the social partners, NGOs and social service providers, according to their respective areas of competence, in the fight against the various forms of exclusion;
  –   by encouraging the social responsibility and active engagement of all citizens in the fight against social exclusion;
  –   by fostering the social responsibility of business.

ANNEX 3. Information about Roma in the Labour Market

During the course of this review, information emerged to suggest that a number of additional factors further compound the problem of labour market reintegration of unemployed Roma. Although the information is not directly tied to Phare projects, it is an example of factors that need to be understood and taken into account in the design and implementation of active labour market policies.

To work in Romania there is a requirement to have a '*labour card*´ issued by the National Labour Office and to obtain a labour card individuals must have both an identity and a trade that is recognised and accepted by the Labour Office. In some cases this is impossible for Roma, as there are those who do not have identity cards and the traditional crafts and skills practiced by Roma are not recognised by the labour office. Although there can be a market for the skills, they are not part of the 'accepted' occupations and therefore Roma have no opportunity to obtain a qualification that recognises the job skills. With exclusionary practices such as these, Roma people can find they are in the catch 22 situation of wanting to work but not being able to acquire the necessary documentation to do so. This could very well be one of the exclusionary practices that drive Roma toward non-legitimate work in the black economy.

Although many Roma people are dependent on social assistance there is no connection between registering unemployed and receiving social assistance. Unemployment registration applies to only those who are entitled to unemployment benefit. As many Roma have no entitlement to Unemployment benefit, they have no reason to have regular contact with labour offices and are very often part of hidden rather than the formally measured unemployment. Given that labour offices are often used as the point of contact to steer people towards participation in active labour market projects, this is another potential barrier not only to employment but also to participation in active labour market projects.

It also emerged that unemployment does not necessarily mean '*worklessness*'. For example, in a housing complex for Roma people in Czech Republic, the percentage of those living in the complex reported to be unemployed was around 90%. In contradiction of this there was no evidence of unemployed people, particularly men, hanging around during the day. When asked, we were informed that the men were *'at work'* but that the work was informal, casual work and not of a quality or duration to take them out of unemployment. This suggests that the term 'unemployed' does not always fit with the traditional measures of unemployment.[40] The situation applies in all five countries, and it should therefore be recognised that some Roma do manage to find paid employment (in the ILO sense) in the informal economy, performing the same heavy labouring work as they had during the Communist era.

---

[40] Unemployment is normally measured in two ways: by the number of people registered unemployed at a given time in the country: or by using the ILO definition of unemployment. Generally the "unemployed" comprise all persons above a specified age who during the reference period were: "Without work", i.e. were not in paid employment or self-employment - "Currently available for work", i.e. were available for paid employment or self-employment during the reference period; and "Seeking work", i.e. had taken specific steps in a specified recent period to seek paid employment or self-employment. The definition of *ILO employed* applies to anyone (from the economically active population) who has done at least one hour's paid work in the week prior to interview, or has a job they are temporarily away from.

ANNEX 4. Roma participation in Phare Labour Market Projects

The following information was extracted during the course of the review and relates to Roma participation in wider, non-Roma specific, labour market projects.

- In Bulgaria, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy reported that there had been no specific targeting of Roma in the Phare ESF type projects, either as service providers or as recipients of the service and the Minority Legislation means there is no way of substantiating how many had been involved. Roma were included in the earlier Beautiful Bulgaria projects and since its inception some 31% of the unemployed people hired on the project sites are of Roma origin[41]. The problem here is that Beautiful Bulgaria, like most public works schemes require basic manual labour with only limited provision for permanent employment as an outcome. The 2001 Social Inclusion project includes a Roma specific component, but the project is running very late and the application evaluation stage is still ongoing. As a result there was no means of quantifying how successful the project has been in attracting Roma as a priority group.

- In Czech Republic – The National Training Fund staff stated that in past human resource development and employment and training projects Roma minorities have had equal opportunity to access the projects, but they have not been specifically identified as a priority target group. Again the level of individual involvement was impossible to quantify due to the restrictions of Minority Legislation. According to their information the involvement of either Roma organisations or individuals has been comparatively small scale:

  - from the *Promoting Employability /Employment measures* (Phare *1999*) – there was one sub project - *Integration of Adolescents and Citizens from the Labour Market*" which provided employment for 6 Roma;
  - 11 small projects with a total value of €102.190 in the Social Welfare Initiative Fund projects between 1996-2000;
  - one large subproject (€600,000) being delivered by a Roma organisation, from the two 2000 projects (i) *investment in the Target Region Ostrava and (ii) investment in the Target Region North- West Bohemia;* and
  - in the 2002 Equal Programme there is one subproject specifically targeting Roma, although they will be an obvious target group for all 10 Equal projects.

- In Hungary, the ESF type projects: *Employability and long term employment of multiple disadvantaged groups (HU-0008.03)* and *Promoting Social Integration of disadvantaged groups with particular emphasis on the Roma Minority (HU-0101.01)* identify Roma as a priority group. As the first large scale employment and training initiative with identified priority groups, implementation of *HU-0008.03* proved challenging for the MoEL and demanding for applicants who had little or no experience of participating in a Phare project. Steps were taken to ensure that Roma were involved and as a key condition, a Roma partner had to be involved in the application and implementation. Technical assistance was also provided, via a local company with experience of working with the target group, to assist inexperienced potential applicants with project preparation. Some aspects of the first project were not as successful as anticipated, for example in the supported employment element, it was difficult to attract employers with only 30% of the employment costs on offer. Those involved in the Ministry of Labour feel that they have learned from the experience and that the value added from implementation has been considerable. The project provided an opportunity for the MoEL to test and refine a methodology and also for extensive learning by doing by everyone involved both in the management of the grant scheme and in project development and implementation.

- In Romania, employment and training initiatives has not appeared as a primary theme in projects, but has been an activity supported by small grants. Initiatives have been generated and implemented at local level to overcome some of the exclusionary barriers. For example, a vocational training project that bypasses the lack of educational qualifications and invests in people who wish to formalise their work skills at a later time in life. Often these are people who do not register unemployed and are part of the hidden rather than formal

---

[41] According to information provided by the Beautiful Bulgaria management team in October 2003 – since its inception in 1997 the project has generated a total of 21,319 man months (which works out at over 5 years, approximately 12 months work for 200 people) of employment for people of Roma origin. Generally 31% of the unemployed people hired on the projects' sites are of Roma origin. Beautiful Bulgaria was described as employment generation project rather than an active labour market policy. The numbers who continue in employment, after participation in the project, is estimated to be approximately 25%.

unemployment. A project, which, although not funded by Phare, offers an example of good practice in the field of human resource development. The Resource Centre for Roma Communities are at the centre of a Soros Foundation scheme providing supported training in: management; human rights; business communication; project development; and academic debate. An outcome of this scheme is that young Roma people are successfully finding high quality employment, primarily in the social economy within the NGO or social care sectors. The RCRC is committed to building a critical mass of educated and qualified Roma, in their view; investment in human capital will form the basis for future change.

- In Slovakia, training of young Roma for vocational trades has been a feature of the initial and follow-up projects. This has included training young Roma; placing others in supported employment; and training Roma advisors and placing them in Labour Offices to support other Roma with job search. Motivation of Roma participants is not guaranteed since unenthusiastic uptake at the outset was only corrected by pressure applied through threats to social benefits. A further initiative has been NLO training for entrepreneurs, an area thought promising for Roma by both UNDP (2002) and the World Bank (2003). However an integrated course for entrepreneurs reportedly failed to function until Roma and non-Roma participants were segregated.

ANNEX 5. Phare Summary Sheet for Programmes examined

Programme Number	Title	IE Report Number	Report Issue Date	Programme Value	Total Co-fin	% Co-fin	Total Phare
Bulgaria							
BG-9907	Integration of Roma Minority	R/BG/SOC/02004	20 March 2002	0.500	0.000	0.00%	**0.500**
BG-0104.01	Roma Population Integration	R/BG/SOC/02004 R/BG/SOC/02015	20 March 2002 14 January 2003	2.325	0.675	**29.03%**	**1.650**
BG-0104.02	Ensuring Minority Access to Health Care	R/BG/SOC/02004 R/BG/SOC/02015	20 March 2002 14 January 2003	1.100	0.100	9.09%	**1.000**
BG-0102.06	Social Inclusion (Roma specific components)	R/BG/SOC/02004 R/BG/SOC/02015 R/BG/SOC/03004	20 March 2002 14 January 2003 4 September 2003	2.059	0.333	16.17%	**1.726**
BG-0204.01	Urbanisation and Social Development of Areas with disadvantaged populations	*No Interim Evaluation*		6.030	1.530	25.37%	**4.500**
Czech Republic							
CZ-9806	Improvement of integration of the Roma Community into Czech society	R/CZ/CIV/00018*	22 November 2000	0.900	0.000	0.00%	**0.900**
CZ-9901	Improvement of Relations between the Roma and Czech Communities	R/CZ/CIV/02031	7 October 2002	0.800	0.300	37.50%	**0.500**
CZ-0002-01	Civil Society Development /Support to Roma Integration Initiatives	R/CZ/CIV/02031	7 October 2002	2.850	1.500	52.63%	**1.350**
CZ-0002-02	Promotion of Racial and Ethnic Equality	R/CZ/CIV/02031	7 October 2002	0.600	0.100	16.67%	**0.500**
CZ-0002-03	Civil Society Development / Multi Culture Education Reform	R/CZ/CIV/02031	7 October 2002	1.600	0.600	37.50%	**1.000**
CZ2002-000-282.08.03	Preparation of the National Action Plan on Social Inclusion	*No Interim Evaluation*		0.750	0.000	0.00%	**0.750**
Hungary							
HU-9904.01	Social Integration of Disadvantaged Youth with Particular Emphasis on the Roma Minority	R/HU/POL/02001 R/HU/POL/02063	20 March 2002 23 May 2003	9.600	4.600	47.92%	**5.000**
HU-0002.01	Roma Social Integration Programme	R/HU/POL/02001 R/HU/POL/02063	20 March 2002 23 May 2003	3.350	0.850	25.37%	**2.500**

Programme Number	Title	IE Report Number	Report Issue Date	Programme Value	Total Co-fin	% Co-fin	Total Phare
HU-0008.03	Employability and long term employment of multiple disadvantaged groups (ESF Type pilot project) Roma Specific component	R/HU/REG/02064	2 April 2003	3.000	1.500	50.00%	**1.500**
HU-0101.01	Promoting Social Integration of disadvantaged groups with particular emphasis on the Roma Minority	R/HU/POL/02001 R/HU/POL/02063	20 March 2002 23 May 2003	10.000	5.000	50.00%	**5.000**
HU2002/000-315.01.01	Increasing effectiveness of policies and programmes promoting the Roma integration	*No Interim Evaluation*		0.850	0.350	41.18%	**0.500**
HU2002/000-315.01.02	Promote anti-discrimination and tolerance towards the Roma Minority	*No Interim Evaluation*		3.930	0.930	23.66%	**3.000**
Romania							
RO-9803	Improvement of Roma Situation	R/RO/SOC/01031*	21 August 2001	2.000	0.000	0.00%	**2.000**
RO-0004.02.02	Fund for Improvement of the Situation of Roma - Roma specific component	R/RO/SOC/02116	13 March 2003	1.000	0.000	0.00%	**1.000**
RO-0104.02	Access to Education for Disadvantaged groups, with a focus on Roma	R/RO/SOC/02116	13 March 2003	8.330	1.330	15.97%	**7.000**
RO2002/000-586.01.02	Support to the national strategy to improve Roma conditions	*No Interim Evaluation*		7.600	1.600	21.05%	**6.000**
Slovakia							
SR-9905.02	Minority tolerance programme	R/SR/JHA/01041	25 September 2001	2.300	0.500	21.74%	**1.800**
SK-0002	Improvement of the Situation of Roma in the SR	R/SK/JHA/03044 R/SK/CIV/03045 R/SK/CIV/03121	10 March 2003 26 March 2003 7 October 2003	4.109	0.309	7.52%	**3.800**
SR-0103.02	Infrastructure Support for Roma Settlements	R/SK/JHA/03044 R/SK/CIV/03045 R/SK/CIV/03121	10 March 2003 26 March 2003 7 October 2003	16.700	8.400	50.30%	**8.300**
SR-0103.01	Support of the Roma Minority in the Educational Field	R/SK/JHA/03044 R/SK/CIV/03045 R/SK/CIV/03121	10 March 2003 26 March 2003 7 October 2003	2.375	0.675	28.42%	**1.700**
SR2002/000-610.03	Further Integration of the Roma Children in the Educational Field and Improved Living Conditions	R/SK/CIV/03045 R/SK/CIV/03121	26 March 2003 7 October 2003	1.110	0.050	4.50%	**1.060**

* Programmes evaluated by the OMAS Consortium.

ANNEX 6. List of Documents Referred to

Name of Originator and Date	Document Title
Multi country	
Enlargement briefing – DG Enlargement Information Unit. (May 2002)	*EU support for Roma communities in Central and Eastern Europe*; Brussels May 2002
UNDP (2002)	*Roma in Central and Eastern Europe: Avoiding the Dependency Trap*, UNDP/ILO Regional Human Development Report, Bratislava: UNDP.
Ringold, D., *et al :* The World Bank (2003)	*Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle*, Washington, D.C.:
World Bank July 2003	*The Decade of Roma Inclusion : Concept Note – 2005 – 2015*
World Bank July 2003	Roma Education Fund : Concept Note 2003
World Bank April 2002	Poverty and Welfare of Rom in the Slovak Republic
Macgregor *et al (2002)*	*Valuing the Social Economy: the Social Economy and Economic Inclusion in Lowland Scotland ; Community Enterprise in Strathclyde*
Policy Studies Institute (UK) –1992	*Does Active Labour Market Policy Reduce Unemployment?*
FSGG (2002)	*Activities report 2002. - Annual report*
Nicolae Bobu (2002)	*Book about RROMS. Common Law – a Legal Peace Process*
Bulgaria	
EMS Consortium	*Interim Evaluation No. R/BG/SOC/02004*: Civil Society and Social Development Sector : 20 March 2002 *Interim Evaluation No. R/BG/SOC/02015*: Social Development Sector : 12 January 2003 *Interim Evaluation No. R/BG/SOC/03004*: Social Development Sector : 4 September 2003
Government of Bulgaria and Commission of the European Communities	Standard Summary Project Fiche : BG9907: Promoting the integration of the Roma Standard Summary Project Fiche : BG9914: Beautiful Bulgaria II: Temporary Employment and Vocational Training Summary Project Fiche : BG0104.01: Roma Population Integration Summary Project Fiche : BG0104.02: Ensuring minority access to health care
Government of Bulgaria and Commission of the European Communities	Standard Summary Project Fiche : BG0102.06 Social Inclusion Standard Summary Project Fiche : BG0204.01 Urbanisation and Social Development of Areas with Disadvantage Minority Populations
Commission of the European Communities (2002)	Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament – Roadmaps for Bulgaria and Romania*: Brussels Nov 2002*
Commission of the European Communities - DG Enlargement (1999)	Accession Partnership 1999 – Bulgaria
European Commission (2003)	*2003 Regular Report of Bulgaria's progress Towards Accession*
ESC Delegation : Seventh meeting of the EU Bulgaris Joint Consultative Committee	*Social Policy Issues in the Bulgaria against the Background of Accession : The partical closure of the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Pland and the Minority Roma issue:* Working Document : (2002)
The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Bulgaria. (2003)	*Beautiful Bulgaria*
UNDP (1998)	*National Human Development Report, Bulgaria 1998. The State of Transition and Transition of the State.*
European Commission Delegation to Bulgaria (2003)	*Needs assessment of Vulnerable Groups for the purposes of implementing the Phare 2001 project - Bulgaria.*
European Commission Delegation to Bulgaria (October 2003)	*Assessment of Phare Access 2000 Programme in Bulgaria.*
Tomova (2002)	*Problems Concerning Education of Roma People in Bulgaria* : Independent Paper

Name of Originator and Date	Document Title
Czech Republic	
EMS Consortium 17 May 2002	*Interim Evaluation No. R/CZ/ESC/02.023*: Economic and Social Cohesion
Government of Czech Republic and Commission of the European Communities	Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ 9901-01 Civil Society Development / Support to Roma Integration Initiatives Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ0102-01 Strengthening of Civil Society Organisations in the Czech Republic Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ0010-02 Investment in Target region NUTS II North-West Bohemia Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ0010-03 Investment in Target region NUTS II Ostrava Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ 0002-01 Improvement of Relations between Roma and Czech communities: Standard Summary Project Fiche: CZ0002-02Promotion of Racial and Ethnic Equality
Government of Czech Republic and Commission of the European Communities	*Standard Summary Project Fiche: CZ0002-03 Support to Roma Integration / Multi-Cultural Education Reform* *Standard Summary Project Fiche* : CZ2002/000-282.08.01 Long Term Sustainability of Civil Society Development Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ2002/000-282.08.02 Equal Initiative Standard Summary Project Fiche : CZ2002/000-282.08.03 Preparation of the National Action Plan for Social Inclusion
Commission of the European Communities (2003)	Proposals for a Council decision : on the principles, priorities, immediate objectives, and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with Czech Republic : *Brussels March 2003*
European Commission (2003).	*Monitoring Report on the Czech Republic's Progress in Its Preparation for EU Membership: September 2002–May 2003*, Brussels: European Commission
European Commission – DG Enlargement (1999)	*Accession Partnership 1999* – Czech Republic
Barsova (2001)	Housing Problems of Ethnic Minorities and trends Towards Residential Segregation in the Czech Republic : Prague 2001
VISEK (2001)	*Naked Apartments as a tool of Ethnic Segregation :* Prague 2001
Government of the Czech Republic (March 2003)	*The Roma Integration Policy Concept.*
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic (2003)	*Strategy of Human Resources Development for the Czech Republic.*
NROS (2002)	*10 Years of NROS Annual report.*
MoLSA National Training Fund (200)	*EQUAL – Tackling discrimination and inequalities in the Labour Market. Community initiative EQUAL in the Czech Republic. :* Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs – National Training Fund – National Support Structure in Czech Republic
Roma Newsletter, Czech Republic (Jan 2003)	*Roma newsletter of the Roma Rights and Access to Justice in Europe Programme.*
Hungary	
EMS Consortium	*Interim Evaluation No. R/HU/POL/02063*: Political Criteria Sector : 23 May 2003 *Interim Evaluation No. R/HU/POL/02001:* Political Criteria Sector : 20 March 2002

Name of Originator and Date	Document Title
Government of Hungary and Commission of the European Communities	Standard Summary Project Fiche : HU 9904-01 Social Integration of Disadvantage Youth with a Particularly Emphasis on the Roma Minority. Standard Summary Project Fiche : HU0002-01 Roma Social Integration Programme *Standard Summary Project Fiche : HU0008-02 - PNDP – Vocational Education ESF-type Approach to Promote Transition from Training toWorking Life* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: HU0008-03 Employability and long-term employment of multiply disadvantaged groups (ESF type pilot project)* *Standard Summary Project Fiche:: HU0101.01 Promoting Social Integration of disadvantaged groups with Particular Emphasis on the Roma Minority* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: 2002/000-315.01.01 HU/IB/2002/SO/04 Increasing effectiveness of policies and programmes promoting the Roma integration* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: 2002/000-315.01.02 Promote anti-discrimination and tolerance towards the Roma Minority*
Government of Hungary and Commission of the European Communities	*Standard Summary Project Fiche: 2002/000-315.01.04 Combating exclusion from the world of work - Local initiatives for labour market re-integration of the long-term unemployed and of people living on regular social assistance, with special emphasis on the Roma population*
Commission of the European Communities (2003)	Proposals for a Council decision: on the principles, priorities, immediate objectives, and conditions contained in the Accession Partnership with Hungary: *Brussels March 2003*
European Commission (1997)	Commissions Opinion on Hungary's Application for Membership of the European Union: *Brussels 15 July 1997*
European Commission – DG Enlargement (1999)	Accession Partnership 1999 - Hungary
European Commission (2003).	*Monitoring Report on Hungary's Progress in Its Preparation for EU Membership: September 2002–May 2003*, Brussels: European Commission
Fleck (2003)	*Study of Phare programme Supporting the Social Integration of Disadvantaged Youth with Particular Emphasis on the Roma Minority (HU 9904-1)*
Romania	
EMS Consortium	*Interim Evaluation No. R/BGRO/SOC/02116*: Social Sector : 13 March 2003
Government of Romania and Commission of the European Communities	*Standard Summary Project Fiche : RO 9803.01* Improvement of Rroma situation - Sub-programme : Strengthen democracy, the rule of law and human rights *Standard Summary Project Fiche : RO-0004.02 Civil Society* *Standard Summary Project Fiche : RO.0104.02: Access to education for disadvantaged groups with a special focus on Roma* Standard Summary Project Fiche : RO-2002/000-586.01.02 Support to the national strategy to improve Roma conditions
Commission of the European Communities (2002)	Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament – Roadmaps for Bulgaria and Romania: *Brussels Nov 2002*
European Commission – DG Enlargement (1999)	Accession Partnership 1999 - Romania
European Commission (2003)	*2003 Regular Report of Romania's progress Towards Accession*
Ministry of Public Information, National Office of the Roma, EU. (2002)	*Improving the Roma situation. Successful projects from Romania and lessons learned.*
Robin Oakley – Lead consultant for Romania, RrAJE programme. Costel Bercus – Executive Director, Romani CRISS. (June 2003)	*The RrAJE programme in Botosani, Romania. Building an integrated strategy for Roma inclusion at the local level.*
Romanian Social Development Fund. (May 2003)	*Poverty alleviation contribution – Romania.*
Association Sfantul Stelian (2002).	*Annual report.*

Name of Originator and Date	Document Title
	Slovakia
EMS Consortium	*Interim Evaluation No. R/SK/JHA/03044*: Justice and Home Affairs, Minorities and Public Administration Sector : 10 March 2003 *Interim Evaluation No. R/SK/CIV/03121*: Civil Society Social Sector: October 2003 *STTS Report on Phare programmes to improve the situation of the Roma minority in the Slovak Republic (SK-0002, SR- 0103.01, SR- 0103.02)* : Dr Will Guy Centre, for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship, Department of Sociology, University of Bristol UK : Feb 2003
Government of the Slovak Republic and Commission of the European Communities	*Standard Summary Project Fiche : SR9905.02Political criteria Sub-programme: Minority tolerance programme* *Standard Summary Project Fiche : SK0002 Improvement of the situation of the Roma in the Slovak Republic* *Standard Summary Project Fiche : SK0009.03 Human Resources Development through counselling and training at regional level* *Standard Summary Project Fiche SR0103.02Infrastructure for Roma settlements* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: SR0103.01Support to the Roma minority in the educational field* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: SR0107.02 1.2. Title: Human Resources Development through preventive and individual active measures for the unemployed* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: 2002/000.610-03 Further integration of the Roma children in the educational field and* *improved living conditions* *Standard Summary Project Fiche: 2002/000.610-15 Human Resource Development Grant Scheme*
European Commission – DG Enlargement (1999)	Accession Partnership 1999 – Slovakia
European Commission (2003).	*Monitoring Report on the Slovak Republic's Progress in Its Preparation for EU Membership: September 2002–May 2003*, Brussels: European Commission
The World Bank – Foundation S.P.A.C.E. – INEKO – The Open Society Institute (April 2002)	*Poverty and Welfare of Roma in the Slovak Republic*
ERRC (1997)	*Time of the Skinheads: Denial and Exclusion of Roma in Slovakia*, European Roma Rights Center, Country Reports Series, 3, Budapest: ERRC, January.
David Canek	*Roma and Other Minorities in Czech and Slovak Schools (1945 – 1998)*

ANNEX 7. List of Interviews

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Czech Republic			
NROS Civil Society Development Foundation Jeleni 15, Prague 1 Czech Republic	**Ms. Hana SILHANOVA** CSDF Director and PAO	Phone +420 2 3335 0021 Fax +420 2 3335 4708	6/10/2003
NROS Civil Society Development Foundation Jeleni 15, 118 00 Prague 1 Czech Republic	**Mr Ivan FIALA** Head of Roma Integration Programme	Phone +420 2 3335 1831 Fax +420 2 3335 4708 ivan.fiala@nros.cz	6/10/2003 8/10/2003 22-24/10/2003 accompanied field visits
Government Office, Vladislavova 4, Prague 1 Czech Republic	**Ms Andrea Barsova** on behalf of **Mr. Jan JARAB** Commissioner for Human Rights,	Phone ++ 420 2 9615 3318 barsova.andrea@vlada.cz	7/10/2003
Delegation of the European Commission to Czech Republic Pod hradbami 17, Prague 6 Czech Republic	**Mr. Howard HARDING** Phare Co-ordinator, Investment Section	Phone +420 233 324 754 Fax +420 224 312 850 Howard.HARDING@cec.eu.int	correspondence and interview questionnaire completed by email 29/10/2003
Delegation of the European Commission to Czech Republic Pod hradbami 17, Prague 6 Czech Republic	**Nancy Meech** Phare Co-ordinator, Investment Section	Phone +420 233 324 754 Fax +420 224 312 850 nancy.meech@cec.eu.int	7/10/2003 23-24/10/2003 accompanied field visits
Delegation of the European Commission to Czech Republic Pod hradbami 17, Prague 6 Czech Republic	**Mr Frantisek HAUSER** Sectoral Policies	Phone +420 233 324 754 Fax +420 224 312 850 frantisek.hauser@cec.eu.int	7/10/2003
Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs Na poricnim pravu 1, Prague 2 Czech Republic **SOCIOKLUB** (Director) Plzenska 175 Box 19 150 06 Phara 56	**Peter Visek** SOCIOKLUB (Director **Gabriela Rosnero**	Phone + 420 602 365 612 Fax: +420 257 328 office@socioklub.cz Gabriela.Rosnerova@mpsv.cz	8/10/2003
National Training Fund Opletalova 25 110 00 Prague 1 Czech Republic	**Dr Miroslava Kopicova** Director **Veronika Cechova** PALMIF/ESF Unit **Denise Faltova** NTF Equal **Irena Tomesova** SWIF Section of Social Programmes **Katerina Povysilova** HRD – Phare 2000	Phone + 420 224 500 500 Fax: +420 224 500 501 kopicova@nvf.cz cechova@nvf.cz faltova@nvf.cz tomasova@nvf.cz povysilova@nvf.cz	8/11/2003

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Armada Spasy Salvation Army Stankova 6 602 00 Brno Czech Republic	**Iain Stewart** Captain - Project Manager	Phone + 420 541 211 801 sdasbrno@volny.cz	23/10/2003
DROM Romske Stredisko **Bratislavska Street 41** 602 00 Brno Czech Republic	**Miroslav Zima** Manager	Phone +420 545 211 576 Fax +420 545 574 346 drom@iol.cz	23/10/2003
Museum of Romani Culture Bratislavska Street 67 602 00 Brno Czech Republic	**Dr Ilona Laznickora** Manager **Dr Jana Horvathova** Director **Lenka Matejkova** PR and Fundraiser	Phone +420 545 581 206 Fax +420 545 571 798 secretariat.mrk@posta.ca jhorvathova@selnam.cz pr.mrk@posta.cz	23/10/2003
The Association of Romanies in Moravia Francouzska 84 602 00 Brno Czech Republic	**Karel Holomek** Chairman **Zusana Holmek** Economist	Phone +420 545 246 647 holomek@srnm.zx srnm@srnm.cz	23/10/2003
Department of Health & Social Work **Jihomoravsky kraj –** **Regional South Moravia Authority** Zerotinovo nam 3/5 601 82 Brno Czech Republic	**Dr Libuse Holasova**	Phone +420 541 652 185 Fax +420 541 651 149 holasova.libuse@kr-jihomoravsky.cz	24/10/2003
Trialog Orlf 20 602 00 Brno Czech Republic	**Dr Miloslav Kotek** Director	Phone +420 542 221 501 Fax +420 542 221 502 kteck@traialog-brno.cz	24/10/2003
-Hungary			
Ministry of Education, Phare Office 1146 Budapest, Ajtosi Durer sor 19-21. Hungary	**Dr Tamas Kepeczi** Deputy General Director **Mr. Andras UJLAKY** Head of Phare Office **Vektoria Csandi** Programme coordinator	Phone +36-1 344-0337 Fax: +36-1 344-0338 tamas.kopeczi@om.hu ujlaky@pjareoffice.hu csandi@phareoffice.hu	13/10/2003
Ministry of Education, Phare Office currently studying in Boston, USA	**Mr. Henrik LENARD** Head of Department	lenard@phareoffice.hu	correspondence and interview questionnaire completed by email 7/11/2003
Office of the Prime Minister, Department of International Roma Programmes 1053 Budapest, Magyar u. 36. VI. Floor Hungary	**Ms. Agnes KELEMEN** Acting Head of Office	Phone:+36-1 266-8847 Fax: +36-1 266-9027 Kelemen@MEH.HU	14/10/2003
Office for National and Ethnic Minorities 1133 Budapest, Pozsonyi ut 56.	**Mr. Antal HEIZER** President **Mrs Judit Solymosi** Head of Department	Phone +36-1 237 4400/425, Fax: +36-1 239 0000 nekh.titkarsag@mail.datanet.hu solymosij@mail.datanet.hu	14/10/2003

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Ministry of Education 1055 Budapest, Szalay u. 10-14.	**Viktoria Mohacsi Bernath** Ministerial Commissioner for Integration of Roma and Disadvantaged Children	Phone: +36-1 473 7091 Fax +36-1 312 0032 bmohacsiv@om.hu	14/10/2003
Office of the Prime Minister Office of the National Development Pan and EU Support 1133 Budapest, Pozsonyi ut 56. Hungary	**Ms Edina Szabo** Deputy Director General Monitoring and Evaluation	Phone: +36-1 237 4400 Fax +36-1 329 2092 edina.szabo@meh.hu	15/10/2003
European Social Fund National Implementing Agency 1146 Budapest Hermina út 17. Hungary Previously programme manager - Office for National and Ethnic Minorities	**Ms. Alexandra Koves** Programme Manager	Phone: +36-1 471 7676	15/10/2003
Office of the Prime Minister 1055 Budapest, Kossuth ter 4.	**Mr. Laszlo TELEKI** Political State Secretary, (responsible for Roma affairs)	Phone +36 1 441 3170, Fax +36 1 441 3172 laszlo.te.eki@meh.hu	15/10/2003
European Commission Delegation to Hungary 1016 Budapest, Berc u. 26. Hungary	**Caroline Maion** Task Manager – Roma Programmes **Annamaria Molnar** Programme Manager (HRD–ESF type)	Phone: +36-1 209-9700 Fax: +36-1/466-4221 Caroline.Maion@cec.eu.int Annamaria.Molnar@cec.eu.int	16/10/2003
European Social Fund National Implementing Agency 1146 Budapest Hermina út 17. Hungary	**Dr Ferenc Tatrai** Managing Director	Phone: +36-1 471 7676 tatrai@asza.ph.hu	16/10/2003
Ministry of Employment and Labour 1051 Budapest Akademia u 3 Hungary	**Ms Noemi Danajka** Head of Department – SPO	Phone +36 1 332 3311 Fax: +36 1 332 3311 danajka.noemi@fmm.gov.hu	16/10/2003
Office of the Prime Minister, Department of International Roma Programmes 1053 Budapest, Magyar u. 36. VI. Floor Hungary	**Ramon De Marcos** Pre Accession Advisor **Zsuzsanna Lakatos** PAA Assistant	Phone:+36-1 327 6066 Fax: +36-1 327 6065 RamonDeMarcos@meh.hu lakatos.zsuzsanna@meh.hu	16/10/2003
Romania			
Civil Society Development Foundation 2K Splaiul Independentei, 4th floor Sector 3, Bucharest Romania	**Carmen Epure** **Executive Director** **Eliza Lupascu** Programme Director **Corina Oltenanu** Programme Manager	Phone +40 21 310 0177 Fax +40 21 310 0180 Carmen-e@fdsc.ro eliza@fsdc.ro corina@fsdc.ro	3/11/2003 4/11/2003 accompanied to field visits

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Ministry of Public Information National Office for Roma	**Maria Ionescu** Head of PIU	Phone +40-744 759 565 maria.ionescu@gov.ro	interviewee not available for interview due to sickness absence
IMC Consulting 22 Ion Majorescu St Bucarest 2 Romania	**Maria Andruszkiewicz** **Team Leader** Rome Education Project	Phone +40 21 212 3594 Fax +42 21 212 3858 maria.andruszkiewicz@inccons ulting.ro	3/11/2003
Department for International Development **Strategic Support to the Romanian Social Development Fund** 22 Ion Majorescu St Bucarest 2 Romania	**Jim Miller** International Consultant	Phone +40 21 212 3594 Fax +42 21 212 3858 jim_miller90@hotmail.com	3/11/2003
Sfantu Stelian 5/8 Nasaud No 2 Bucahrest Romania	**Dora Marinescu** Education Project	Phone +40 21 336 4116 doramarienescu@yahoo.com	4/11/2003
Ministry of Education and Research and Youth 28 – 30 G ral Berthelot Street 010186 Bucharest Romania	**Mrs Liliana Preoteasa** General Director	Phone +40 21 314 3665 Fax +40 21 313 5547 liliana@mec.edu.ro	4/11/2003
Aven Amensa Roma Civil Society NGO	**Delia Grigore** Director	Phone +40 744 489 732 deliagrigore@yahoo.com	4/11/2003
European Commission Delegation to Romania Str. Jules Michelet nr. 18 Sector 1 Bucharest Romania	**Simona (Botea) Lupu** Team Leader – Social Sector and Civil Society	Phone +40 21 203 5408 Fax +40 21 230 2453 Simona.Lupu@cec.eu.int	5/11/2003
Resurce centre for Roma Communities (RCRC) 3400 Cluj Napoca Romania sts Tebei nr 21 Romania	**Florin Moisa** Executive President **Radu Lacatus** Programme Coordinator	Phone +40 26 442 0474 Fax +40 26 442 0470 fmoisa@romacenter.orf.ro rlacatus@romacenter.osf.ro	10/11/2003 10-11/11/2003 accompanied field visits
The Association of the Roma Gabor People from Romania – Si ei au nevoie de educatie **Roma Association Cluj Napoca**	Burcea Ambrus - project coordinator **Marius Lakatos** – Roma reprezentant to Local Council of Cluj	contact via RCRC rlacatus@romacenter.osf.ro	10/11/2003
Focus Group Meeting Including **Romania Cancer Society** **Project - Access for roma women to the social services at the cancer testing**	**Marlene Farcas** - Project coordinator, President of organisation **Nicula Florian** - Reprezentant of the Oncologyc Institute Cluj- partner of project **Ofelia Suteu** – doctor - Oncologyc Institute Cluj	Phone +40 264 450 095 src@onco.codec.ro	10/11/2003
Wassdas Foundation Project - a One chance	**Otvos Geza** project coordinator **Ioana Etves** - accountable of Wassdas Foundation		10/11/2003

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Prefectura Alba Alba County Council 1 IIC Bratianu Sqyare 2500 Alba Iulia Romania Project - Together for the community	**Eugen Popa** - President **Diana Bolog** Project coordinator **Ilie Patru** Roma Reprezentatnt **Oros Ligia Elena** - trainer **Pavel Maria** - trainer **Huțanu Rodica** - trainer **Candrea Olimpia** - trainer **Bucur Lenica** - trainer **Bodea Ioan** - trainer **Aitai Marian Florin** - trainer **Lazăr Ioana** - trainer **Docea Emilian** - trainer	Phone +40 25 886 1013 eugenpop@www.cjalba.ro	11/11/2003
Primăria Cugir – **Roma Center for roma in Cugir** Premarie Cugir 2566 Str I.I.Caragiale Nr 1	**Voicu Aurel** – Major of Cugir **Murg Cornel**- vice-major , Project coordinator **Teban Adrian** - consultant **Lup Ioan** - president of roma association Asociatia Rom CRUC Gros Leon - ID consultant **Pivotă Ioan**- secretary to roma organization Asociatia RomCRUC	Phone +40 25 875 2349 Fax +40 25 875 1001 primariacugir@xnet.ro	11/11/2003
Bulgaria			
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works PHARE Implementing Agency, Economic and Social Cohesion - Department 17-19, St. Cyril and Methodius Str., 1202 Sofia, Bulgaria	**Mr Hristo Medarov**, Head of Department	Phone : +359 2 940 5237 Fax: : +359 2 986 5387 hmedarov@mrrb.government.bg	5/11/2003
Ministry of Health Directorate of International Co-operation and European Integration 5 Sv Nedelia Sq Sofia 1000 Bulgaria	**Svetla Todorova** State Secretary	Phone : +359 2 9301 203 Fax: : +359 2 9875 983 stodorova@mh.government.bg	5/11/2003
Ministry of Health Direction of International Cooperation and European Integration 5 Sv Nedelia Sq Sofia 1000 Bulgaria	**Eleonora Racheva** Expert	Phone : +359 2 893 1203 Fax: : +359 2 88 795 592 eratcgeva@mh.government.bg	5/11/2003
Delegation of the European Commission to Bulgaria 9 Moskovska St. 1000 Sofia, BULGARIA	**Isabel Uribe** Advisor	Phone: +359 2 933 5252 Fax: +359 2 933 5233 Isabel.URIBE@cec.eu.int	5/11/2003

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Communication Strategy Directorate, Programming priorities Department,	**Kiril Dramov** Chief Expert	Phone : +359 2 978 2799 kdramov@barda.net	6/11/2003
Council of Ministers, "National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues", 1, Dondoukov Blvd., 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria	**Mr Mihail Ivanov**, Secretary	Phone : +359 2 987 8326 +359 2 888 908 839 M.Ivanov@government.bg	6/11/2003
Council of Ministers, "National Council on Ethnic and Demographic Issues", 1, Dondoukov Blvd., 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria	**Ms Penka Vassileva**, PHARE Procedures Expert	Phone +359 2 940 2489 + 359 489 26 393 P.Vassileva@government.bg	6/11/2003
United Nations Development Programme ATM Centre Tsarigradsko shousse, Blvd 7th km, 3rd floor Sofia 1784 Bulgaria	**Alexander O'Riordan** Programme Anaylst	Phone + 359 2 9696 112 Fax + 359 2 974 3089 alexander.o'riordan@undp.org	6/11/2003
Foundation for Entrepreneurship Development 18, Dukatska planina str., 1606 Sofia Bulgaria	**Antonina Stoyanovska** Director	Phone + 359 2 952 5798 Fax + 359 2 952 5783 stoyanovska@fed-bg.org	6/11/2003
Beautiful Bulgaria Project Employment Agency Doundukov 3, 6th floor, room 613 Sofia 100 Bulgaria	**Daniela Kalaydjieva** National Project Director	Phone + 359 2 981 0288 Fax + 359 2 986 946 3089 bb3@cablebg.net	
Ministry of Education and Science Doundukov 2A, Sofia 100 Bulgaria	**Ofelia Krumova**	Phone + 359 2 921 7441 ofkrumova@minedu.government .bg	interview set but cancelled as interviewee was not authorised to carry out meeting
Parliament Roma Knyaz Boris 1 No 160A Sofia Bulgaria	**Petar Georgiev** Parliament Roma Representative	Phone +359 2 983 9880, + 359 982 204 14	7/11/2003
Ministry of Internal Affairs Directorate of the National Police Office 235 Slivnitza Blvd Sofia Bulgaria	**Tomi Iliev** Chief of Section	Phone +359 2 982 3981 Fax + 359 2 982 4503	7/11/2003
Bulgarian Academy of Science (Studi Romani, NGO) **Differenz und Integration Institut fur Ethnologic** Scillersts 6 D-04109 Leipzig	**Vesselin Popov** **Dr Elena Marushiakova** Ethnologie	Phone +359 850 55 40, +359 887350 689 studiiromani@geobiz.net Phone +49 341 97 31 814 www.nomadsed.de	7/11/2003

Institution	Name	Phone/ Fax/Email	Date
Slovakia			
National Labour Office EU Policy and Programmes Dept. Directorate General Zupne namestie 5-6 SK-812 67 Bratislava Slovakia	**Ms. Valeria Kubalova**	Phone +421 2 59 200 740 Fax +421 2 59 200 747	15/12/2003
Civil Society Development Foundation Ruzova dolina 6 SK-821 08 Bratislava Slovakia	**Ms. Katarina Vajdova** Head of Department	Phone +421 2 50221 550 Fax +421 2 50221 553	15/12/2003
Amrop Jenewein Group (Non-Profit Consulting) Vysoka 30 SK-814 99 Bratislava Slovakia	**Mr Patrik Zoltvany** Partner	Phone +421 2 52 920 100-4 Fax +421 2 52 920 100-4	15/12/2003
The Slovak Republic Government Office Section of Human Rights and Minorities Namestie Slobody 1 SK-813 70 Bratislava Slovakia	**Ms. Jana Kviecinska** General Director	Phone +421 2 57 295 167 Fax +421 2 57 295 424	16/12/2003
The Slovak Republic Government Office Department of Project Co-ordination Section of Human Rights and Minorities Namestie Slobody 1 SK-813 70 Bratislava Slovakia	**Ms. Kinga Novotna** Director	Phone +421 2 57 295 273 Fax +421 2 57 295 424	16/12/2003
Ministry of Education Department of European Integration Stromova 1 SK-813 30 Bratislava Slovakia	**Ms. Julia Stepankova** Project Manager	Phone +421 2 6920 2225 Fax +421 2 6920 2227	17/12/2003
Institute for Public Affairs Hviezdoslavovo nam. 15 SK-811 02 Bratislava Slovakia	**Mr. Michal Vasecka** Senior Research Fellow	Phone +421 2 54 434 030 Fax +421 2 54 434 041	16/12/2003
UK			
Focus Consultancy Ltd Ekmnsgaet House Steeple Ashton Trowbridge Wiltshire BA14 6HP England. UK	**Christopher Knee** Operational Director International and Regional Development chrisknee@focus-consultancy.co.uk	Phone +44 1380 871 121 Fax +44 1380 871 049	13/11/2003

ANNEX 8. Example of review questionnaire

Country		Organisation	
Programme Number		**Name**	

1.	**Where did the concept for the Programmes originate? What was the main driver behind the concept? Who was the main driver behind it?**

2.	**Was the programme part of the National Programme? Was it tied into a National strategy?**

3.	**How easy was it to get the programme off the ground? What difficulties were encountered?**

4.	**Did the programme attract any press interest – negative or positive?**

5.	**How much interest did the programme attract? Were there any difficulties finding applicants? How was this overcome?**

6.	**In hindsight what were the most positive aspects of the programme and why?**

7.	**What were the negative aspects about the programme?**

8.	**What was the language used by applicants – did this make a difference to the number of applicants?**

9.	**Were any difficulties encountered in the management of the funded projects? How was this overcome?**

10.	**Has the programme been sustainable – explain?**

11.	**How many individual projects have been sustained – and how? (number and percentage)**

12.	**In terms of good practice – can you cite examples?**

13.	**Similarly – can you give examples of failed projects and explain the main reasons behind the failure?**

14.	**Did the programme have any impact on Government or Regional strategies?**

15.	**In your opinion. Is the wider Social Inclusion arena the place for Roma issues to be addressed and why?**

16.	Social inclusion is a wide arena – within that do you think there is a major priority?
17.	In your opinion. Are ring-fenced dedicated resources more appropriate than wider social inclusion programmes? What are the potential risks?
18.	Who is driving the social inclusion agenda at Government level? How are Roma issues reflected in those policies?
19.	Have you seen a change in the Governments attitude towards social inclusion of Roma?
20.	Have you witnessed other changes since the first Roma related programmes?
21.	Is the environment more supportive now than before – in what way?
22.	What in your opinion is the main driver of those changes?
23.	What part did Phare play as a lever or change – if any?