

# RomaIntegration2020

## REPORT ON

### FIRST REGIONAL POLICY WORKSHOP ON MONITORING AND REPORTING

12-13 DECEMBER 2016, VIENNA

Prepared by

**NATASHA AMDIJU and TODOR TODOROV, Consultants**

## 1. SUMMARY

The Regional Cooperation Council Roma Integration 2020 Action Team organized a regional workshop on *Monitoring and Reporting on Roma Integration Policy within the framework of the Roma Integration 2020 project* on 12-13 December 2016 in Vienna, Austria.

The purpose of this regional workshop was to contribute to building the understanding and capacities of relevant public servants from the participating economies in annual monitoring and reporting on their current strategies for Roma integration, including mapping the gaps in understanding the theoretical and practical parts. For this purpose, a Monitoring and Reporting Template was developed by the RCC Roma Integration 2020 Action Team and presented at the above workshop. The Roma Integration 2020 participants are the IPA II beneficiaries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo\*, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Turkey.

The workshop addressed the need of better understanding the steps to respond to the reporting template by the participating economies in order to gather data from the region, based on a unified template, previously developed in cooperation with other regional stakeholders

---

\* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

working in the field of data collection and based on the previous results and mapped needs (Roma Decade, EU, FRA, UNDP, etc.).

This report provides detailed conclusions, recommendations and guidelines regarding the preparation of the reports on annual implementation of Roma integration public policies in the participating economies. Issues such as the definition of the term ‘Roma’, self-identification of Roma as such and the implication of the latter for the reliability of official statistics on Roma are comprehensively discussed in the report, providing clarifications and recommendations to deal with respective challenges regarding the collection and reporting of data on the implementation of Roma integration policies. Other aspects, covered by the current report include: definitions, way of calculating and focus on quantitative evaluation as regards impact assessment indicators; availability and reliability of information and data; role of National Roma Contact Points (NRCs) and the need for involvement of the civil society, and more particularly, representative organisations of the Roma community in the monitoring and reporting process; the mismatch between the Roma integration monitoring cycle and the policy cycles, the need that participating economies declared of assistance from international organisations (incl. technical and financial) in conducting Roma-dedicated surveys, etc.

## **2. WORKSHOP DELIVERY**

### **2.1. PARALLEL WORKSHOPS ON PRIORITY AREAS (EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, HOUSING, HEALTH, CIVIL REGISTRATION) – DAY 1**

Following the presentation of the Monitoring and Reporting Template, the participants were divided into five thematic groups covering different priority areas of Roma integration. The thematic groups were working in five parallel panels: Education, Employment, Health, Housing and Civil registration.

Each group consisted of representatives from each of the participating economies, working in smaller sub-groups on their own parts of the Strategies, in one of the above-mentioned priority areas (see the Annex 1 for details on flow of work). During some of the panels, the focus of discussion was put on specific countries’ contexts, while in others – general issues regarding Roma integration were discussed and best/poor practices were shared among the workshop participants.

All panel groups were following the same structure of discussion:

- 1) The problem of data availability (national/regional sources, as well as the alternative sources of data, such as NGOs);
- 2) Challenges in the process of data collection for the preparation of the Annual Report 2016 on the implementation of Roma integration policies;
- 3) Possible solutions for overcoming the problems.

Information on the main points of discussion from each priority area is provided below.

### **A) EDUCATION PANEL**

- a) The issue of definition of who are Roma and the definition of the term ‘Roma’ was tackled in this panel. The experts who facilitated the discussion explained that the term ‘Roma’ within the Roma Integration 2020 is used, in line with other documents of the European Commission and various international organisations, as an umbrella term, to refer to a number of different groups (such as Roma, Ashkali, Egyptians, Sinti, Kale, Gypsies, Romanichels, Boyash, Yenish, Dom, Lom) without denying the specificities and varieties of lifestyles and situations of these groups.
- b) It was also underlined that in some countries the inter-disciplinary body dealing with the Roma integration issues in order to improve the data collection process needs to be formed or expanded.
- c) In order to verify the findings, especially in the countries where such data is missing, it is important to collect data from five to six different sources, such as those provided by the Roma Inclusion Index and other regional/national surveys.
- d) In the process of data collection, it is important to learn from each other’s experience in order to avoid the mistakes to be repeated, such as focusing on only one area in the implementation of the planned measures.

### **B) EMPLOYMENT PANEL**

- a) The main problems facing the countries in the preparatory phase of data collection and analysis of the data availability lie in the fact that many of the Strategies and Action Plans are unrealistically planned in terms of the timeframe and the budget or in other words, the level of implementation is far beyond the planned targets.
- b) Some of the measures are planned on a 4-year basis. Therefore, the participants noticed that it would be difficult to provide numbers for the planned 2016 annual budgets. Additionally, there are no milestones in Roma Integration Strategy or the Action Plan envisaged.
- c) In cases where the Roma Integration Strategies and Action Plans are covering three communities – Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians, budgets and indicators have to be reported cumulatively for these groups.
- d) It is not clear whether in certain countries, the newly adopted strategies and action plans will set milestones and budget allocations.
- e) It would be very helpful if the Roma Integration 2020 Action Team can provide the participating economies’ teams with some form of a guide on how to complete the Monitoring and Reporting Template, including definitions of terms such as “baseline”, “milestone”, etc.

### **C) HOUSING PANEL**

- a) Regarding housing data, the main concern of the group was the lack of gender desegregated data, as well as the lack of defined milestones as housing is planned within the framework of other programmes.
- b) Another point of concern was that budgets for housing are not precise.
- c) The template requires specific data and an issue was raised how to proceed if the data is not available from alternative official sources – in this case, should unofficial alternative data be used, already presented in the reports of other stakeholders?

### **D) HEALTH PANEL**

- a) Participants in this panel pointed out that there were discrepancies between the Strategies and Action Plans, as the measures do not necessarily follow the same lines.
- b) There were questions regarding what to report for 2016 in cases when the Action Plans have not yet been adopted.
- c) Participants also suggested including additional indicator/s in the template related to reproductive health, early marriage, etc.

### **E) CIVIL REGISTRATION PANEL**

- a) There are available data; both, official and unofficial (in some cases these are provided by NGOs).
- b) In some countries it was underlined that Roma have no trust in the institutions, they do not address them to solve the issue of lack of personal identification documents, even if this is a prerequisite to enjoy basic human rights.
- c) Challenges for the future will be:
  - To create a mechanism for data collection in all participating economies;
  - To increase the trust in the state/local institutions among the Roma population;
  - Exchange of good practice for data collection among different economies.
- d) Possible solutions are:
  - Strengthening inter-sectoral cooperation;
  - Introduction of good practices and development of best practice model/s.

## **2.2. PARALLEL WORKSHOPS ON BUDGET AND IMPACT – DAY 2**

During Day 2 the participants were regrouped in teams on a geographic principle to facilitate workshop discussions.

The two parallel workshops were conducted in the same manner, as per the detailed workshop dynamics plan, and started with a 20-minute session to allow teams to familiarise themselves with the monitoring and reporting templates that have been handed to them in Day 1, and more particularly – with the “Budget” and “Impact Assessment” parts. This was followed by a

group discussion during which participants asked questions and received clarifications from the consultants about the structure of the template, fields to be filled in, definition of impact indicators, etc. The participants had also a brief discussion on their first impressions about the data needed for the purpose of filling in the templates, availability of information, etc.

The country teams had to work on the templates and try to identify the availability of data and information as well as the challenges related to the finances and indicators, the responsible bodies, statistical services and administrative registers. Exchange of information was encouraged among different country teams in order to facilitate peer learning, exchange of good practices and progress on the assignment.

During the final sub-sessions of the parallel workshops, consultants initiated a discussion about the challenges that participants faced while working on their assignments as well as any future issues that they might have while compiling the annual reports. Each country team was asked to briefly present the challenges they had identified regarding the completion of the necessary information. The most problematic parts of the template were identified, whereas recommendations for resolving the challenges were proposed to the Roma Integration 2020 Action Team members regarding the existing gaps in the available information and statistical data as well as its collection, processing and reporting.

The main conclusions from the delivery of Day 2 parallel workshops can be summarised as follows:

- The Day 2 parallel workshops and the regional workshop as a whole presented a good opportunity for representatives of different national institutions and NGOs to get together and discuss, with the support of RCC Roma Integration 2020 Action Team as well as with representatives of other economies, the issues related to monitoring and reporting on the implementation of their Roma Integration Strategies.
- The allocation of time among the different sub-sessions was quite effective as workshop participants had sufficient time to get acquainted with the Monitoring and Reporting Template as well as identify and discuss with their counterparts, as well as with other economies and Roma integration policy experts any possible challenges they would have in completing the reports.
- Participants had the opportunity to get clarifications on the definitions of some of the impact assessment indicators found in the “Impact Assessment” part of the template, as well as form their opinion and give their comments on the availability of the indicators, future efforts needed to secure the missing information, etc.
- Issues were raised related to the need for preparation of guidelines for the completion of the report as well as for receiving technical and financial assistance from international organisations in securing the data and information necessary for effective monitoring and reporting on the implementation of Roma Integration Strategies.

- The Roma Integration 2020 Action Team received a general view of what to expect in terms of monitoring and reporting on data and information relevant for Roma integration policies from each participating economy.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During the first Regional Policy Workshop on Monitoring and Reporting several issues and solutions were raised, taking into consideration the differences between the countries, and the level of implementation of the Strategies for Roma Integration and the respective Action Plans. Generally, there are three main issues which should be taken into account:

- 1) Instructions have to be prepared for completing the template in order to ensure that further instructions by the National Roma Contact Points (NRCs) to all relevant bodies are clear and understandable.
- 2) In-house on-going support of NRCs has to be ensured for preparation of the Annual 2016 Report on the implementation of Roma integration policies in each participating economy in order to strengthen the cooperation between institutions.
- 3) Providing regular opportunities for exchange of best practices on regional level (such as the first Regional Policy Workshop on Monitoring and Reporting) are necessary as there are good practices, from which the less advanced economies in the field of implementation of the Strategies for Roma Integration can learn from their counterparts.

The more specific conclusions and recommendations, which came up from the discussions in the Day 1 and Day 2 parallel workshops, as well as from the concluding session of the event, can be summarised, as follows:

- The discussions revealed that there were unclarified issues regarding the **definition of the term 'Roma'** and whether ethnicities such as Egyptians and Ashkali have to be included in the monitoring and reporting documents. In response to this, it should be noted that the term 'Roma' within the Roma Integration 2020 is accepted as the term used by the European Commission and other international organizations, and refers to Roma, Sinti, Kale, Ashkali, Egyptians and related groups in Europe, including Travellers and the Eastern groups (Dom and Lom), and covers the wide diversity of the groups concerned, including persons who identify themselves as Gypsies. In the context of participating economies, the term 'Roma' also covers Ashkali and Egyptians as relevant.
- Another issue referred to the **affiliation or, respectively non-affiliation of certain groups and individuals to the Roma community**. Whereas the participating economies have the flexibility to employ their own methods adequate to the context, it is generally recommended that Roma are considered only those who freely declare themselves as Roma (those who do not, even though the society may consider them as

such, should not be regarded as Roma as that is not their free choice). As most of the economies represented at the workshop are parties to the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities,<sup>1</sup> the principles enshrined in the convention should be followed. Article 3 states that persons are free to declare as persons belonging to a certain minority (in this case Roma) and are free to decide if they wish to be treated as such. It means that in this regard, every citizen has the following options: 1) not to declare as Roma (regardless of what others think the ethnic identity of that person is); 2) to declare as Roma but not to wish to be treated as such (for example, somebody who declares as Roma otherwise, does not declare as such when registering at the Public Employment Service, thus (s)he does not wish to be treated as Roma within the (un)employment measures, and this should be respected as the respective individual's free choice not to be involved in specific measures directed to Roma; yet the same person may declare as Roma within the education system, thus measures for Roma within the area of education should be targeted at this person); 3) to declare as Roma and at the same time express a wish to be treated as such (meaning that any specific measures for Roma should consider this person as beneficiary). While this may seem to complicate statistics, it is one of the fundamental human rights on freedom of choice and freedom of self-declaration, and should be respected. Moreover, it should be well explained to the public in order to avoid misunderstandings and dissatisfaction.

- The above approach however may lead to generating **misleading official data about the number and structure of Roma population** in certain countries, as it is not unusual that some Roma are unwilling to self-declare as such as they fear that they might suffer negative consequences. For example, if a Roma woman self-declares as Roma while registering as unemployed in the Public Employment Service, she may well fear that she will be an object of prejudice on part of potential employers and will have difficulties in finding a decent and well-paid job. Serious efforts are needed to overcome the negative effect on applying the principle of self-declaration. This, in some countries seriously underestimates the total number of Roma population, as in censuses the question of ethnic affiliation is based on self-identification and is furthermore not obligatory to answer (as per respective national legislation). In this regard, it is recommended that government institutions (including National Roma Contact Points (NRCs) and the bodies, responsible for the respective priority areas of Roma integration) as well as Roma NGOs and other civil society organisations, dealing with Roma issues, initiate awareness raising campaigns at national, regional and local level in order to help representatives of the Roma community realise that, being the Europe's largest ethnic minority, they are a top priority of the EU social inclusion policy and self-declaring as Roma can be to their own benefit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council of Europe (1995), Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Explanatory Report, Strasbourg.

- There were discussions regarding the question **should only Roma be accounted for in the monitoring and reporting**. This actually depends on the nature of the measures, implemented to achieve the goals of the Roma integration strategies and action plans. If the measures are targeted, meaning Roma and only Roma are beneficiaries of such measures, the reporting should be on Roma. If the measures are, for example targeting specific deprived geographic regions, vulnerable groups, specific category of unemployed, etc.), it is recommended that such measures encompass specific methods, through which outreach to Roma is ensured. This means, that although the specific measure is relevant for the wider population, there are activities to make sure that Roma benefit from such measures. For example, if free meals are provided to deprived students, teaching assistants or other relevant staff should make sure Roma are included and also benefit from the measure (instead of again being left out). In such case, data on Roma beneficiaries should be available through those public servants reaching out to Roma. When this is not possible, as in some cases of geographic targeting (for example: a road is built or public bus line introduced that is used by both Roma and non-Roma in a deprived settlement), efforts should be made to calculate at least approximate number of Roma beneficiaries. In case measures are mainstream and thus relevant for the wider public (for example, self-employment loans), such measures should be part of a more general policy (in the example of the employment policy) and the Strategy/Action Plan for Roma should describe the specific measures on how Roma shall be involved in the mainstream measure (outreach methods). Efforts should be made to provide the actual number of Roma, benefiting from the mainstream measure through the outreach measure encompassed in the strategy/action plan for integration of Roma.
- Regarding the **starting point of the Monitoring and Reporting Template**, whether it is the Strategy or the Action Plan, economies have different experiences. Some only have Strategies, other have only Action Plans. In this case, the one existing should be the starting point for reporting. There are economies with both Strategies and Action Plans. Ideally, Strategies should contain the goals (along with legal background, principle values, etc.), while the Action Plans should cover specific objectives, measures and all other details. Moreover, it is presumed that Action Plans are strictly following the Strategy. Hence, some of the elements are included in both the Strategy and the Action Plan. If this is not the case, public servants completing the template should use the Strategy for the goals, while the Action Plans for the objectives, measures and other details, or consult with the Roma Integration 2020 Action Team and reflect the situation as well as possible in their reports.
- It should further be noted that the **gender dimension** is a mainstream throughout the Monitoring and Reporting Template, as each indicator mentioned requires gender disaggregation. Moreover, economies are required to include information on the gender dimension wherever relevant throughout the template, including in statements of goals and objectives, description of measures, calculation of impact assessment indicators, etc. In case the economy has included Gender Equality (or similar) as a

separate chapter/thematic area in their Strategies/Action Plans, this chapter should be added in the ‘Measures by priority areas’ part as one of the thematic areas.

- As decided at the first Regional Workshop on Monitoring and Reporting within the Roma Integration 2020, economies define **civil registration** as registration of people in the birth registries and providing adequate proofs of such registrations (birth certificates, citizenship certificates).
- During the parallel workshops, participants requested clarifications regarding **the form in which impact assessment indicators should be monitored and reported** (e.g. in absolute values /number of individuals/ or as rates /percentages), including how are different indicators calculated for male, female, total Roma population and overall population. In this respect, “overall population” represents the whole population in the respective economy (including Roma and non-Roma), while “total population” is the number of all persons, belonging to a certain population, which may be total Roma population, total overall population or other population group. In order to provide the necessary information in their reports, public servants have to adhere as closely as possible to the definitions of the impact assessment indicators, as explained below.
- The need for providing **definitions of the impact assessment indicators** was raised by a number of workshop participants from different countries. In response to this, it should be mentioned that indicators contained within the Monitoring and Reporting Template as adopted by the NRCPs from all the participating economies follows the list of indicators of the Roma Inclusion Index.<sup>‡</sup> The Monitoring and Reporting Template contains additional indicators, the definitions of which should be further discussed. Proposals to feed the discussion are provided below:

EDU2	Primary education enrolment rate	<u>Primary education enrolment rate</u> is the number of enrolled persons at the age of 6/7 (enrolment age) divided by the total number of persons at the age of 6/7 (enrolment age), from the adequate population (Roma or overall), expressed as a percentage.
EDU3	Secondary education enrolment rate	<u>Secondary education enrolment rate</u> is the number of enrolled persons at secondary school enrolment age (differs in different economies, generally 14/15) divided by the total number of persons at the age of secondary school enrolment age, from the adequate population (Roma or overall), expressed as a percentage.
EDU4	Tertiary education enrolment rate	<u>Tertiary education enrolment rate</u> is the number of enrolled persons at university enrolment age (differs in different economies, generally 18/19) divided by the total number of persons at the age of university enrolment age, from the adequate population (Roma or overall), expressed as a percentage.

<sup>‡</sup> The list of indicators with their definitions as used within the Roma Inclusion Index is available at [http://www.romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9810\\_file1\\_roma-inclusion-index-2015-s.pdf](http://www.romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9810_file1_roma-inclusion-index-2015-s.pdf).

EDU5	Primary education drop-out rate	<u>Primary education drop-out rate</u> is the number of persons at primary education age (differs in different economies, generally from 6/7 to 14/15) who have left school before successfully completing primary education, divided by the total number of persons at primary education age, from the adequate population (Roma or overall) expressed as a percentage.
EDU6	Secondary education drop-out rate	<u>Secondary education drop-out rate</u> is the number of persons at secondary education age (differs in different economies, generally from 14/15 to 18/19), who have left school before successfully completing secondary education, divided by the total number of persons at secondary education age, from the adequate population (Roma or overall) expressed as a percentage.
CRC5	Civil registration rate	<u>Civil registration rate</u> is the number of persons either not registered OR not holding a certificate on registration, into either citizenship OR book of births divided by the total population (Roma or overall).

- It is furthermore important to note that **monitoring and reporting is not done for the purpose of comparing different economies!** Monitoring and reporting may be used for regional trends or indication of needed policies and measures, but it is primarily intended as a policy tool within the economy, by which governments can evaluate the success towards achievement of policy goals and the need for adjustments of measures. Therefore, economies have the flexibility to use somewhat modified definitions of indicators or definitions adapted to the specific context and practices of data collection, which might differ from those proposed with the Roma Inclusion Index. Particularly, definitions of indicators on education should be adjusted to the education system in the respective economy (as legal provisions for enrolment age or number of years in school may differ). Full definitions of indicators, found in the “Impact Assessment” part of the Monitoring and Reporting Template, as well as sources of data and/or methods of calculation or approximation (if this is the case), may be provided as footnotes, but it is more recommendable that they are presented as a separate annex to the report.
- With regards to the **quantitative and qualitative indicators** dilemma, it is important to emphasise that the template is focused on the quantitative reflection of the implementation of Roma integration policies. Certain measures may produce limited quantitative results, but with high quality (meaning sustainable solutions), high level of achievement of rights and standards, etc. Elaborated descriptions on the quality of the achievements from the implementation of Roma integration policies should be provided as an annex to the report as necessary.
- Any **additional information** economies find important to share and closely linked to the report, should be provided as an annex to the report. This may include: definitions, sources and calculations of various indicators and data provided in the report; qualitative assessments and descriptions regarding any information contained in the

report; elaboration of problems or challenges faced during the implementation that have influenced the results of the implementation (for example: in cases where housing deteriorates because of flood and the measures seem insufficient to have resolved any housing issues should be described in an annex to the report); future plans to mitigate or solve any outstanding issues, including problems faced during previous implementation; etc.

- An object of discussion was whether to include in the report **measures which were not implemented** during the year of reporting. As a response to that, it should be noted that all measures planned with the strategy/action plan for Roma integration should be listed in the report, along with description of the measure. Those measures that may have been postponed, completed or not implemented in the year of reporting for any reason, should also be included (with “0” entered for spent annual budget and “0” – for beneficiaries in the year of reporting). Any explanation on the reasons for not implementing the specific measure during the year of reporting may be provided as an annex to the report.
- Throughout the parallel workshops there were a lot of discussions, comments and concerns expressed, regarding the **availability and reliability of information and data** (including statistics) on the implementation of Roma integration policies. Different countries had different issues in this aspect, such as: lack of information on certain education indicators, unavailability of ethnically disaggregated data, no official data on Roma population. In this regard, it is advised that all figures, provided in the report on the implementation of the Roma integration policies for the respective economy should be the best possible, as accurate as possible and officially recognised (including in the cases when the source of information and statistical data is not official). Those data that are collected by official institutions and may directly be used, should be used as such. Those data that are not directly collected by official institutions, but may be indirectly provided (by means of additional calculations, merging datasets, making approximations, or similar), should be provided as such. Those data that cannot be provided by official institutions neither directly, nor indirectly, should be sought from other (unofficial) sources, such as civil society organisations or universities, and the most accurate data should be officially recognised and included in the report. For those data, which are required for completing the report, but no information exists in the economy, governments are encouraged to make the best estimations possible in consultation with relevant institutions and organisations. In the last two cases (using unofficial data or making estimations), it has to be clearly explained (in a footnote or in an annex to the report, if this is associated with a more complex methodology) how respective data were produced. Leaving blank boxes should only be an option if nothing else works to provide any data. Economies should strive to improve their monitoring and data collection systems with a view to officially provide all the necessary data they need to monitor their Roma integration strategies/action plans in the upcoming years. Relevant plans in this respect are the intentions shared by workshop participant, representing

Serbia, where the development of one-stop-shop database on Roma is envisaged, as well as by participants from Turkey, where a Roma-dedicated national survey is planned for the end of 2017.

- A number of comments were made as for the **role of National Roma Contact Points** in coordinating the process of monitoring, reporting and data collection. It was stated that in some economies, coordination is lacking between different bodies, responsible for Roma integration, monitoring and reporting, whereas in order to develop monitoring and reporting mechanisms, regular coordination meetings and joint action would be needed with the active support of respective NRCP. In order to strictly define the role of NRCP in each economy, it should be reaffirmed that this is the national body which is responsible for submitting the report on annual implementation of Roma integration public policies to the Roma Integration 2020 Action Team in due time (as agreed by the Task Force). Thus, the NRCP is responsible to coordinate the process of information and data gathering, and filling out the reporting template. The NRCP has to ensure that all the required data for the report is adequately placed in the report, examine the report as a whole in order to make sure that the data is logically presented and is reflecting the entire situation in the economy, as well as provide annexes elaborating additional information. In order to do that, the NRCP leads the process, coordinates the efforts of all institutions and organisations in the economy and closely cooperates with them in preparing the report. The NRCP is also assisting responsible institutions in providing adequate information, and in case of unclear requirements or queries, should provide adequate explanations or immediately contact the Roma Integration 2020 Action Team for clarification, advice or suggestion. The NRCP is performing the monitoring and reporting responsibilities in closest cooperation with the inter-disciplinary body established in the economy for Roma integration policies (coordinative body, consultative body, or any other body comprising responsible implementing institutions and organisations, including Roma civil society). The inter-disciplinary body members are responsible to assist the NRCP in the monitoring function and take over monitoring responsibilities in the respective priority area (such as education, employment, housing, health, civil registration, financing, statistics, etc.).
- It is furthermore important to underline that **local and/or regional-level governance** should be involved in the monitoring process, directly by the NRCP or through institutions responsible for decentralisation. Mechanisms should be established to ensure monitoring responsibility of the lower-level governance involved in the implementation of the Roma integration strategy/action plan, depending on the governance arrangements in each particular economy.
- Another issue of key importance for the timely and adequate monitoring of the implementation of Roma integration policies raised at the workshop was the **involvement of the civil society, and more particularly, representative organisations of the Roma community** in the process. In this regard, it is highly

recommended that Roma actively participate in the process of monitoring of the Roma integration strategy/action plan in each economy. Besides the independent reporting that civil society will produce through the support of the European Commission and the Open Society Foundations, the NRCPs in each economy should strive to meaningfully involve Roma in the monitoring process, either through their participation in the inter-disciplinary body, by means of public consultations during the monitoring report, or through direct involvement in the monitoring (as partners in the implementation or monitoring with a clearly specified role).

- **Mismatch between the Roma integration monitoring cycle and the policy cycles** (programming and monitoring/reporting) in some countries was also raised as a potential problem regarding timely preparation of national reports on Roma integration policies. Indeed, it is the case that in some economies, data relevant for the Roma integration reporting, such as data on budget spent or some statistical data for the year on reporting, may be produced by various responsible institutions at different time than the time of Roma integration reporting. For example, final accounts may be ready in April or statistical results from a relevant survey may be available in June. In such cases, the economies should decide to use data from the previous year with some adjustments or approximations, or use other alternative (second base) sources of information. If necessary, economies may decide to use unofficial/preliminary (those data that would be officially published at a later stage) or partial data in order to keep up with the Roma integration monitoring cycle.
- **Itemised instead of programming budgeting.** Economies often face the problem of programmatic planning of Roma integration strategies/action plans on annual or longer basis, followed by itemised budget planning that does not clearly define planned budget on programmes. While programme budget planning is recommended for all the economies, in cases where this is still not the case, responsible institutions, primarily the NRCP, should make efforts to clarify with the responsible financial institutions on the budgets planned and spent for the Roma integration programme(s). Based on the prices and resources spent for implementation of various measures, programmatic budget calculation is also possible, at least as the best possible approximation.
- A commonly discussed issue was the **need that participating economies declared of assistance from international organisations** (including technical and financial) in conducting Roma-dedicated surveys. While such practices may serve as positive examples for other countries to follow, it should be noted that initiatives of such nature may serve only the purpose of pilot actions, whereas the sustainability of the results these initiatives have achieved depend mostly on the efforts of the NRCPs, inter-disciplinary bodies, responsible priority areas' institutions and statistical services to build sustainable and effective monitoring mechanisms in their own countries.

**4. INSTRUCTIONS TO PUBLIC SERVANTS ON HOW TO FILL IN THE INFORMATION RELATED TO “MEASURES BY PRIORITY AREAS” AND “IMPACT ASSESSMENT” PARTS OF THE TEMPLATE (COVERED BY DAY 1 AND DAY 2 PARALLEL WORKSHOPS RESPECTIVELY)**

- **Institutional Arrangement part:** needs to provide policy information, National Roma Coordinator, National Roma Contact Point support and inter-ministerial body members’ contact details.
- **Measures by Priority Area:** this section needs to be filled with transposing the GOAL from the Strategy and/or the Action Plan for the specific area (example: Employment).

<b>Goal: Increase employment of Roma</b>			
<b>Increase the formal employment among Roma from 17 to 35% within 4 years.</b>			
<b>Total budget</b>	3.000.000 EUR		
<b>Indicator</b>	% of employed Roma from the Roma in the workforce		
<b>Baseline (2015)</b>	Roma male	Roma female	Overall population
	17%	12%	37%
<b>Milestone (2016)</b>	22%		
<b>Budget planned (2016)</b>	800.000 EUR		
<b>Budget spent (2016)</b>	770.000 EUR		
<b>Achievement (2016)</b>	Roma male	Roma female	Overall population
	20%	17%	38%

- **Objective(s):** statement, budget, impact indicator which includes:
  - Baseline for 2015 (male, female, overall population) – current situation;
  - Milestone for 2016 – what is set to be achieved;
  - Budget planned and Budget spent in 2016;
  - Achievements in 2016.

<b>Objective 1: Ensure employment of Roma in the private sector</b>			
<b>Increase the formal employment among Roma in the private sector by 700 persons, 400 of which women within 4 years.</b>			
<b>Total budget</b>	1.800.000		
<b>Indicator</b>	# of Roma formally employed in the private sector		
<b>Baseline (2015)</b>	Roma male	Roma female	Overall population
	384	258	1.780.261
<b>Milestone (2016)</b>	150 men, 200 women		
<b>Budget planned (2016)</b>	500.000 EUR		
<b>Budget spent (2016)</b>	500.000 EUR		
<b>Achievement (2016)</b>	Roma male	Roma female	Overall population
	182	186	21

- **Measure(s):** short description, budget, output indicator which includes:
  - short title and description of the measure;
  - info on mainstream (outreach to Roma)/targeted;
  - responsible implementing institution and partners;
  - engagement of Roma in the implementation and their role;
  - period of implementation;
  - contribution towards the objective;
  - added values (anti-discrimination, gender, link with other measures, etc.);
  - and other info of importance;
  - indicator: to estimate the number of Roma, Romani women and overall population – direct beneficiaries from the described measure;
  - reporting person, contact and date of submission.

<b>Measures under objective 1 implemented in 2016</b>			
<b>M1.1</b>	Subsidising employment of Roma by covering half gross salary during 12 month period (obligation to retain); targeted; Roma employed as employer-Roma mediators		150.00
			170.000
	Roma	Romani women	Overall population
	57	42	0
<b>M1.2</b>	Joining unemployed Roma and non-Roma (at least 5) to establish shared company, support until independent by funds, administration; mainstream; Roma in the committee		250.000
			300.000
	Roma	Romani women	Overall population
	71	58	11
<b>M1.3</b>	Converting informal into formal work by change of legislation (lump sum taxation) – support for legal procedures; mainstream; Roma mediators involved		100.000
			30.000
	Roma	Romani women	Overall population
	54	86	10

- **Impact Assessment:** in this section the respective indicators, as per the definitions provided above, have to be filled in for Roma male, female, total population as well as for the overall population of the respective economy. Below, an explanation for calculation the Employment rate (EMP1) is provided.
  - In order to calculate the employment rate for Roma (including male, female, total Roma population) for a certain year, it is necessary to: 1) have the number of employed Roma (defined as those who have declared to have had a paid job the week before the date of the respective survey) aged 15-64, divided in the above groups (Roma male, Roma female, total Roma population); 2) have the total number of Roma aged 15-64, again divided in Roma male, Roma female and total Roma population; 3) calculate the respective rates, as for example, employment rate for Roma males would equal the number of employed Roma males aged 15-64, divided by the total number of Roma males aged 15-64, multiplied by 100. Employment rates for Roma females and total Roma population would be calculated in the same manner.

## 5. LIST OF ANNEXES

Annexed to the present report are the following documents:

- Annex 1. Detailed Workshop Dynamics Plan.
- Annex 2. Presentation on Monitoring and Reporting – working definitions.
- Annex 3. Presentation of the Monitoring and Reporting Template and working groups' instructions.