



Decade Watch

RESULTS OF THE 2009 SURVEY



DECADE
WATCH

Decade Watch

RESULTS OF THE 2009 SURVEY

BUDAPEST 2010

The report was prepared by the national Decade Watch teams and the Decade Watch Advisory (Stephan Müller, Ferenc Zsigo).

For more information contact:

Roma Initiatives
Open Society Institute
Október 6. utca 12.
H-1051 Budapest
Hungary

Tel: (+36 1) 882 3100

Fax: (+36 1) 882 3101

Email: roma@osi.hu

www.soros.org/initiatives/roma

Editing: Andrew Reid

Design and layout: Judit Kovács | Createch Ltd.

Cover photo: © Janos Kummer | First Day of School (Hungary, 2008)

This photo was an entry in the Chachipe Youth photo contest (photo.romadecade.org)
organised in 2008 by the Open Society Institute and OSA Archivum.

Printed in Hungary by Createch Ltd.

September 2010

National Decade Watch Team Contacts

Albania

Adriatik Hasantari, Roma Active Albania (a.hasantari@gmail.com)

Bulgaria

Toni Tashev, Regional Policy Development Centre (rpdc@europe.com)

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Sanela Besic, Kali Sara–Roma Information Center (sanelabesic@yahoo.com)

Czech Republic

Ivan Vesely, Dzeno Association (vesely.ivan@wo.cz)

Hungary

Gabor Hera, Kurt Lewin Foundation (hera.gabor@kla.hu)

Macedonia

Aleksandra Bojadjieva, Institute for Social Change (alexandra@insoc.org.mk)

Montenegro

Aleksandar Sasa Zekovic, independent (asz@t-com.me)

Romania

David Mark, Roma Civic Alliance of Romania (david.mark@accr.ro)

Serbia

Andrea Colak, League for Roma Decade (andrea.colak@mrc.org.rs)

Slovakia

Lydia Gabcova, Civic Association In Minorita (lydiagabcova@yahoo.co.uk)

Spain

Manuela Fernandez Ruiz, State Council of Roma Community
(mfernandezru@gencat.cat)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	7
Looking Ahead	13
1. Methodology	17
1.1 Development Process	17
1.2 Questionnaire/Survey	18
1.3 Limitations	19
2. Priorities of the Recent Decade Presidencies	21
3. Key Developments and Challenges since 2007	25
3.1 Roma-related Policies	25
3.2 Decade Priority Sectors	29
3.3 Race-related Violence and Discrimination	33
3.4 Migration	36
4. Survey Analysis	39
4.1 Summary of Results	40
4.2 Index Overview	45
4.3 General Data Analysis	59
4.3.1 Participation of Roma in the Policy Process	59
4.3.2 Impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion	61
4.3.3 Gender	62
4.4 Integration and Discrimination	64
4.4.1 Integration	65
4.4.2 Discrimination	69
4.4.3 Comparison of Integration and Discrimination	73
4.5 Decade Priority Sectors	74
4.5.1 Education	76
4.5.1.1 Priorities in Education	76
4.5.1.2 Impact of Education Programs	77
4.5.1.3 Relevance of Education Programs	82

4.5.2	Housing	83
4.5.2.1	Priorities in Housing	83
4.5.2.2	Impact of Housing Programs	84
4.5.2.3	Relevance of Housing Programs	89
4.5.3	Employment	89
4.5.3.1	Priorities in Employment	89
4.5.3.2	Impact of Employment Programs	90
4.5.3.3	Relevance of Employment Programs	94
4.5.4	Health	95
4.5.4.1	Priorities in Health	95
4.5.4.2	Impact of Health Programs	96
4.5.4.3	Relevance of Health Programs	100
Annex 1—Tables		103
Annex 2—Questionnaire		165
Glossary of Terms		183

Executive Summary

The document represents the third Decade Watch report, monitoring the implementation of the Decade of Roma Inclusion.

The two previous reports primarily assessed the input of the governments and the creation of structures for the implementation of the Decade Action Plans. The reports did not intend to measure the ‘impact and change of outcomes for Roma’.

With the new 2009 report, Decade Watch changed its focus from solely measuring input to providing an assessment by independent experts of the impact of relevant government policies in the priority areas of the Decade, and on the changes over the last five years.

However, it should be taken into account that the survey is still not a representative study for the 11 countries that measures the ‘impact and change of outcomes for Roma’; it rather reflects an expert assessment of the impact of the different policies or activities regarding the inclusion of Roma.

The **2009 report** reveals that in an overall ranking, the new countries participating in the Decade (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Spain), as well as Serbia, are at the top of the table. Slovakia, however, received by far the worst ranking, followed by the Czech Republic and Hungary.

While Hungary and the Czech Republic received the best assessment in the 2007 report, they were assessed negatively in the 2009 study. In other words, while government input in both countries was appreciated, the experts identified only a limited impact from ‘government input’ in these two countries. On the other hand, government input in Serbia in 2007 was considered to be low, while the impact was relatively well-received by the experts.

IMPACT OF THE DECADE OF ROMA INCLUSION

The best assessment was given to two countries, Albania and Spain, which had only recently joined the Decade. In general, countries in the Western Balkans (and the countries that had only recently joined the Decade) tend to receive a positive assessment, while in the five new member states of the European Union, the results show a tendency to assess the impact of the Decade more neutrally (in particular Slovakia and the Czech Republic).

INTEGRATION AND DISCRIMINATION

Looking at the results regarding **changes in integration** over the last five years, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic have received the worst assessment, while Spain, Serbia and Montenegro have received the best.

Regarding **changes in discrimination** over the last five years, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic again received the worst assessment, while changes in discrimination were assessed relatively positively in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Spain.

When it comes to the assessment of the current state of integration and discrimination, at least the situation in the Czech Republic was considered relatively positively.

The **current level of integration** of Roma was assessed most favorably in Spain, the Czech Republic and Romania; Albania, Macedonia and Serbia were assessed the least.

The **current level of discrimination** of Roma was assessed most favourably in Bulgaria, Albania and the Czech Republic; Hungary, Serbia and Slovakia were assessed the least.

Obviously, the number of violent incidents in the three countries—in particular the killings of Roma in Hungary, and the persistence of extreme right-wing, radical political views among large sections of the population and among politicians—have strongly influenced these assessments.

With regard to the countries undergoing the accession process, one can conclude that despite considerable improvements regarding integration and discrimination, the situation is still considered to be worse than in the EU member states.

Spain seems to be in an extraordinary position. Both the current situation and developments over the last five years as regards integration and discrimination are considered relatively positive. The results for Spain also demonstrate that the assessment of integration and discrimination does not always directly correlate (e.g., that the level of integration is assessed more favorably than the level of discrimination).

IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

The above-mentioned change of focus in Decade Watch methodology might have contributed to the change in the assessment of performance for individual countries. The 2007 report identified Hungary as the country ‘which has made the most advances, with the most significant progress on implementation across most, if not all, of the priority areas’. Hungary was followed by the Czech Republic and Macedonia, in that ‘both have made substantial progress since 2005/2006’, along with Bulgaria, Slovakia, Romania and Croatia. Serbia and Montenegro continued to lag behind, although both have made above-average improvements.

The **2009 report** shows a different picture.

The analysis of the **impact of the government programs** in the four Decade priority areas reveals that as regards **education**, Romania, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina received the best assessment, while Slovakia, Bulgaria and Spain received the worst.¹

In the priority area ‘**Housing**’, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Czech Republic and Albania received the best assessment, while Bulgaria, Slovakia and Hungary received the worst.

In the priority area ‘**Employment**’, Serbia, Macedonia and Albania received the best assessment, while Slovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria received the worst.

In the priority area ‘**Health**’, Macedonia, Romania and Spain received the best assessment, while Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Montenegro received the worst.

With the exception of ‘Housing’, where it received the second-worst rating, **Slovakia** showed the worst performance in the other three priority sectors—often lagging behind the other countries by a great distance. Its policies are even considered to have had a negative to very negative impact!

In **Hungary**—ranking leader in 2007—the impact of government programs in ‘Employment’ and ‘Housing’ (if not others) are considered to be negative or tending towards negative.

On the other hand, the 2007 report found that **Serbia** and **Montenegro** are continuing to lag behind. In 2009, Serbia received the best assessment for the impact of her programs in employment, and was seen to be second-best in education.

In general, the data reveal that, according to the assessment of the experts, none of the countries participating in the Decade seem to implement successful programs in all four Decade priority areas.

Looking at the different policy fields in the four priority sectors across the countries, the results reveal that two programs in education received the best assessment: ‘Primary

¹ The following scaling was applied: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 (don't know).

and Secondary Education’ with a 66.33 per cent positive assessment and ‘Early Childhood and Preschool’ with 64.20 per cent.

On the other hand, the impact of programs in three policy fields of the sector ‘Housing’ actually received considerable negative assessment: ‘Formalization of Informal Settlements’; ‘Communal Services and Infrastructure’; and ‘Quality Social Housing’.

The experts have not assessed the programs as sufficient, and the results could be interpreted in such a way that only comprehensive and holistic programs covering all priority areas might achieve a sustainable impact on the situation of the Roma. Addressing one or two priority area is not sufficient—a Roma inclusion policy has to simultaneously address all spheres of life, if it wants to be successful.

Further, the data demonstrate that in general, the impact of the policies in the four Decade priority areas is assessed more positively in the countries from the Western Balkans undergoing the accession process than in the member states of the European Union, the new EU member states in particular. We have seen a similar result regarding changes in integration and discrimination over the last five years.

Taking into account that far more financial resources are available in the EU member states than in the countries undergoing the accession process, this result could reflect the experts’ disappointment in those EU members that increased financial resources, but did not make a better impact.

However, this result could also confirm the above analysis that in addition to financial resources, a comprehensive and holistic approach to Roma inclusion policy and an efficient implementation structure are necessary in order to have a successful Roma inclusion policy.

On the other hand, results for the countries in the accession process reveal a relatively high appreciation of the impact of the policies compared to the new EU member states.

GENDER

The survey also asked to what degree the respective programs address **gender issues**. The results display an obvious neglect of the gender perspective across all countries, and across all programs.

Only in Spain did the experts assess that the relevant programs ‘somewhat’ addressed gender issues, followed by Albania and Serbia. In Hungary, the Czech Republic and Romania, the programs hardly addressed gender issues.

PARTICIPATION OF ROMA

Across the countries, the participation of Roma in the policy process was assessed more negatively than positively. The effectiveness of the consultations were assessed negatively by 67.95 per cent, with an additional 11.33 per cent stating that they were no consultations. Meanwhile, the role of Roma in creating policies was assessed negatively by 46.96 per cent, and the role in implementing policies was assessed negatively by 44.02 per cent.

Interesting differences reveal a comparison between the three new Decade participant countries and the 'old' Decade countries. With regard to all three issues (effectiveness of consultations, participation of Roma in creation and implementation of policies), three times as many respondents from the new Decade countries (as compared to the old Decade countries) gave a positive assessment.

In general, the participation of Roma in Roma inclusion policies was considered the highest in Spain, Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic received the worst assessments.

This result is somewhat surprising taking into account the limited capacity of the Roma civil society and the existing 'Roma participation' structures in Albania (and partly in Bosnia and Herzegovina) compared to countries such as Romania, Macedonia, Serbia or the Czech Republic. The different expectations in countries with more developed civil society and participation structures might have contributed to this assessment.

CONCLUSIONS

It can be concluded that all countries participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion have to improve their policies across all four priority areas, and that they have to intensify their activities promoting integration and fighting discrimination.

In addition to sufficient financial resources, a comprehensive and holistic policy should be developed and efficient implementation structures have to be created. In particular, with regard to 'housing', it seems to be necessary to increase efforts and implement adequate policies.

All countries should increase their efforts to compile disaggregated data on Roma, to design indicators, and introduce an efficient monitoring structure.

In particular, the new EU member states should reconsider their Roma inclusion policies.

The more negative assessments of the impact of policies in the new EU member states could also be considered as a warning to not repeat the mistakes made there for those countries currently undergoing the accession process.

In particular, the European Union (as the main donor and driving force behind the inclusion of Roma in the accession countries) should make use of lessons learnt. The

EU should introduce a comprehensive and holistic approach in its own policy towards Roma in the accession countries, and encourage them to introduce such policies.

All countries have to immediately and radically change their gender approaches in Roma inclusion policies—as far as they exist at all.

All countries have to increase their activities and improve effectiveness regarding the participation of Roma in the Roma inclusion policy process.

Looking Ahead

In general, the agenda for government action that Decade Watch laid out in the first two volumes remains valid.

THE DECADE AGENDA FOR GOVERNMENTS FOR 2010–2011

- **Set targets for outcomes and achievements in Roma inclusion for 2015**
While reporting systems and data-collection mechanisms remain absent with regard to tracking performance over time, setting targets would allow governments to demonstrate their success in 2015.
- **Provide country reports on the progress made**
The governments of those countries participating in the Decade should, in the course of 2010, publish reports presenting the progress made in the implementation of the Decade Action Plans.
- **Adopt intermediate operational plans covering, for example, two-year periods**
Shorter-term operational plans allow for setting a more concrete agenda and demonstrating progress. They would be a key tool to re-invigorate the Decade at national and local levels and to link the Decade to governments' reform agendas in the four priority areas.
- **Decentralize the Decade**
It is essential that the Decade be embedded in what local governments, as well as local branches of sector ministries, do. The Czech Republic's new Social Inclusion Agency shows one promising avenue, as does the elaboration of local Decade Action Plans in

many countries. National governments are primarily accountable for progress under the Decade, but they need to involve municipalities in the Decade, and decentralize to the local level their political commitment expressed in the Decade pledge.

- **Promote systemic solutions**

Countries should move away from a fragmented project approach to developing systematic targeted policies, and make mainstream programs and policies inclusive of and effectively reaching out to Roma. This requires the involvement of Roma themselves in advising on design and implementation, in particular where programs cater for the population at large, and do not have specific Roma targets.

- **Continue lobbying for a European Roma Policy, building on the Decade**

The Decade is a pan-European initiative to foster the integration of the Roma—the largest minority in Europe—and has been the vehicle for a European solution to the challenge of Roma exclusion. The move towards a European Roma policy is an effort to take this agenda to the next level. Decade Watch strongly endorses the development of a European Roma Policy and suggests reflecting key Decade principles, such as Roma participation, involvement of member states and non-member states, focusing on results, and the monitoring and cross-country exchange of good practice.

- **Invite further countries to participate in the Decade of Roma Inclusion**

The Decade presidencies should continue promoting the Decade at international meetings and invite additional countries to join the Decade of Roma Inclusion.

- **Address the issue of migration**

Migration of Roma from Decade-participant countries, as well as migration towards Decade-participant countries, is an important issue that could be used to create tensions between Roma and non-Roma. The participating states of the Decade of Roma Inclusion should discuss this issue.

ABOUT THE DECADE OF ROMA INCLUSION

In February 2005, heads of governments from Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia launched the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015 by signing the following declaration:

‘Building on the momentum of the 2003 conference, ‘Roma in an Expanding Europe: Challenges for the Future,’ we pledge that our governments will work toward eliminating discrimination and closing the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society, as identified in our Decade Action Plans. We

declare the years 2005–2015 to be the Decade of Roma Inclusion, and we commit to support the full participation and involvement of national Roma communities in achieving the Decade’s objectives and to demonstrate progress by measuring outcomes and reviewing experiences in the implementation of the Decade’s Action Plans. We invite other states to join our effort.’

Since 2005, three more countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Spain) have joined the Decade; Slovenia participates as an observer. All countries drafted Decade Action Plans in the priority areas of education, employment, health and housing and created institutional arrangements for implementing the Decade commitments.

The founding international partner organizations of the Decade are: the World Bank; the Open Society Institute (OSI); the United Nations Development Program (UNDP); the Council of Europe (CoE); the Council of Europe Development Bank; the Contact Point for Roma and Sinti Issues of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE–ODIHR–CPRSI); the European Roma Information Office (ERIO); the European Roma and Traveller Forum (ERTF); and the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC).

In 2008, UN–HABITAT, UNHCR, and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) also became partners in the Decade.

The Decade Presidency is held annually (starting on July 1) by a participating Decade country. Currently, Slovakia holds the presidency, having followed Serbia (2008/2009) and Hungary (2007/2008). In July 2010, the Czech Republic follows Slovakia in holding the presidency.

ABOUT DECADE WATCH

The Decade promotes the participation of Roma civil society in drafting action plans and their implementation, including in monitoring the implementation. Building on the principle of Roma participation in the Decade, a group of Roma activists and researchers from the Decade participating countries formed the initiative ‘Decade Watch’ in order to assess progress under the Decade of Roma Inclusion. Decade Watch is a constructive contribution by Roma activists towards making the Decade a success.

The first Decade Watch report, published in June 2007, reviewed the period from the launch of the Decade in early 2005 until the end of 2006. The first update, published in 2008, covered the year 2007 and reported any changes and new initiatives that governments introduced in that year.

Yet, Decade Watch assessed government action on implementing the commitments expressed under the Decade of Roma Inclusion. Given the absence of consistent and systematic outcome indicators and data, these exercises focused only on input: What

did governments do in the respective years, and what have they done since the launch of the Decade?

The two previous reports focused on measuring:

- (i) the existence and quality of Decade Action Plans, including the availability of data with which to report on progress;
- (ii) the institutional arrangements for Decade implementation;
- (iii) whether measures have been put in place across the four Decade priority areas (education, employment, health and housing).

PURPOSE

The Decade succeeded in involving more countries and important players, leading to more awareness of the need to urgently address the situation of Romani communities all over Europe. However, did the Decade of Roma Inclusion also lead to a change in policy regarding the inclusion of Roma at both the national and regional (European) levels? Also, did the Decade lead to an improvement of the situation for Roma in the participating countries?

In February 2010, we encountered the mid-way point of the Decade—an appropriate time to assess the progress made in the previous five years and to analyse whether the Decade of Roma Inclusion influenced both public policies on Roma and the situation of the Roma. This report is part of the assessment process, based on a total of 300 interviews with experts on the integration of Roma (25 interviews in each of the Decade-participant countries). This process will be continued in 2010 with extensive research on the implementation of the Decade commitments.

In April 2010, the European Union holds its second European Roma Summit in Spain. Together with governments, the European Union is the major donor to Roma-related policies in the European Union member states, as well as in the accession countries. The institutions of the European Union regular refer to the Decade of Roma Inclusion when assessing the situation of the Roma and when planning Roma-related policies.

The second European Roma Summit constitutes an excellent opportunity to call upon the European Union, its member states and accession countries to further increase their Roma-related activities (which Roma in all those countries would urgently require).

1. Methodology

In February 2010, we encounter the mid-way point of the Decade—an appropriate time to assess the progress made in the last five years. This report is the start of an assessment process that will be continued with research on the implementation of the Decade commitments.

The report at hand is the third report published by Decade Watch, and the first report which also comprises the three new participating countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Spain.

1.1 DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

In 2008, a general consensus emerged, leading to the assessment that the Decade Watch could achieve more. This essentially entailed a gradual shift from input monitoring to impact monitoring.

At a workshop in March 2009 in Budapest, the Decade Watch teams reviewed Decade Watch activities and proposed steps and possible activities for the further development of Decade Watch, as well as agreeing on a common vision and mission.

The main conclusions were as follows.

- There is a need to develop new indicators for a 2010 report. The 2010 report should use the previous two reports as a starting point, but should move ahead methodologically, toward using impact monitoring and indicators.
- There is a need to develop a new methodology for Decade Watch after 2010, whereby it can serve as an advocacy network based on reliable data and impact indicators.

- There is a need to develop and implement an intensive training program based on needs and capacity assessments of the existing Decade Watch teams.

This report still does not reflect ‘impact monitoring’; however, the applied, modified methodology reflects a move from identifying whether actions have been implemented to independent experts’ assessment of the actions taken.

In spring 2009, a needs and capacity assessment was conducted. The Decade Watch teams identified as priorities (in addition to their monitoring activities) issues such as policy development and policy advice, advocacy, lobbying and campaigning. The assessment also clearly revealed that training programs would be indispensable to be able to work in the areas mentioned.

It is envisaged that from 2010 onwards, a new approach for the work of Decade Watch will be introduced, including the conduct of household surveys, long-term observations, research projects and spot reports on specific issues.

In this regard, this report is a first step and its results should help identify areas for more in-depth research.

1.2 QUESTIONNAIRE/SURVEY

In workshops in June 2009 (Belgrade) and September 2009 (Bratislava), the methodology for the monitoring activities for the 2010 report was further defined. It was concluded that the conduct of a survey among 25 experts on Roma inclusion in each Decade-participant country should be the core monitoring activity for the 2010 report. The survey should be complemented by the results of desk research which will be published later in the year.

Twenty-five experts on Roma inclusion in each Decade-participant country were invited to participate in the survey. In each country, Decade Watch teams interviewed five persons from each of the following groups:

- government officials from the relevant line ministries and the institution in charge of (coordinating) Roma-related policies;
- municipal leaders, (one from the capital; two from medium-sized municipalities; two from villages/small towns);
- Romani civic leaders;
- experts on Roma-related issues or minority issues in political parties;
- researchers with expertise in Roma-related issues.

The final decision about which interlocutors would be chosen was up to each national Decade Watch team.

The survey does not claim to be representative, but it reflects the independent, though subjective, assessment of 300 experts on both the current situation of Roma in their country, and the progress made in the integration of Roma over the last five years.

The questionnaire focuses on the four priority areas of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. However, it poses more detailed questions within the different sub-areas (e.g. looking at education, it looks at the impact of programs in early childhood and pre-school education, primary education, secondary education, and in tertiary education, etc.). Further questions refer to the:

- (i) involvement and participation of Roma in the policy process;
- (ii) level of integration and discrimination;
- (iii) the priorities of Roma-related policy; and
- (iv) the gender-sensitivity of the introduced measures.

The Decade Watch teams conducted the interviews in the fall and winter of 2009/2010.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the state delegated competencies (e.g. in the sector of education) to the two entities—the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska—the survey was conducted independently in both entities.

Unfortunately, the Decade Watch team in Croatia was not able to conduct the interviews. Data for Croatia are therefore not available.

Also, some of the contacted interlocutors were not able or willing to participate in the survey.

In Slovakia, three of the government representatives were not willing or able to participate, though the Slovak Decade Watch team asked on several occasions for an appointment. Meanwhile, in Spain in particular, representatives of the political parties refused to participate.

In Bulgaria, and partly in the Czech Republic, only a small number of respondents replied to questions on the assessment of the impact of policies in different fields of the four priority sectors.

1.3 LIMITATIONS

Any monitoring of the change of outcomes (or even the impact of Roma-related policies in general) faces the problem of the lack of country-wide, comprehensive data on the situation of the Roma.

Yet, country-wide or geographically limited surveys provide the only reliable data on the situation of Roma. Since the surveys in general do not follow a standardized

methodology and are not conducted regularly, cross-country comparative analyses or continuous monitoring (in order to identify developments) face limitations.

The governments participating in the Decade have recognized the problem and agreed—according to the Terms of Reference of the Decade of Roma Inclusion—that they shall ‘[m]ake available disaggregated data in accordance with the international standards on data collection and data protection’. However, the governments have not made comprehensive and disaggregated data available as yet.

Decade Watch is aware that this report still does not objectively measure the impact and change of outcomes for Roma. Systematic outcome monitoring—in particular, making cross-country comparisons—is currently impossible because of significant data gaps.

The indicators chosen for the first two reports were deemed critical to the Decade’s success in achieving its aims. It was then argued that success in Decade implementation relies on the availability and quality of action plans, on the right institutional framework, on the policies put in place by governments in the four priority areas, and on how systematically these policies are designed and implemented. The current report acknowledges the importance of the previous indicators, but intends to widen the range of indicators and to ask for more detailed questions.

Another limitation derives from the different situation in the twelve countries participating in the Decade.

Six countries are member states of the European Union. Six others are at different stages in the accession process to the European Union. This is an important differentiation when it comes to the availability of financial resources for the implementation of Roma-related policies. The Structural Funds available to member states allow for more financial resources than the funds available for candidate and potential candidate countries.

Nine countries have been participating in the Decade from the very beginning, while three countries only joined recently: it is more appropriate to measure progress made over a period of five years than over a period of one or two years, which might be premature.

Some countries have, in absolute and relative numbers, a large Romani population—estimated up to ten per cent in some countries. Other countries have a relatively small Romani population.

In some countries, Romani communities face specific problems in addition to general problems (e.g. refugees and returnees).

Finally, the countries differ with regard to the existence of laws and/or policy measures (e.g. regarding access to health insurance, which may or may not be free).

2. Priorities of the Recent Decade Presidencies²

Priorities of the Hungarian Presidency (July 2007–June 2008)

- To invite new countries to join the Decade (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Portugal, Slovenia and Spain)
- To place the Decade on the EU Institutions' agenda
- To set up an Indicator Working Group with the goal to create common indicators used in the monitoring system
- To organize communication campaigns at the national and international levels to increase the knowledge of the Decade and to improve the sensitivity of public opinion as well as decision-makers
- To introduce new topics to the Decade, such as corporate social responsibility (CSR), creating a European Roma Policy, and an anti-segregation policy in the field of education and housing
- To organize two workshops regarding housing and anti-discrimination issues

² See the website of Decade of Roma Inclusion: www.romadecade.org.

Priority areas of the Serbian Presidency (July 2008–June 2009)

- Housing
- Combating discrimination in education
- Development of a monitoring and evaluation system
- Development of a European Roma Policy
- Access to European Union funds for non-EU countries for programs aiming at the improvement of the Roma situation

Priorities of the Slovak Presidency (July 2009–June 2010)

- Integrated school system and multi-cultural education
- Roma identity
- Fifth year of the Decade—revision of National Action Plans

The priorities of the recent Decade presidencies reveal the importance of the introduction of a monitoring system. Hungary and Serbia declared related activities as one of their priorities during their presidencies.

The availability of **data** and of common indicators constitutes a *conditio sine qua non* for the **monitoring** and evaluation of Roma-related policies across all Decade countries. However, no concrete progress has been made regarding the availability of common data or indicators for all the Decade countries.

It remains one of the biggest challenges of the Decade of Roma Inclusion to solve the issue of data availability and the (cross-country) monitoring and evaluation of Roma-related policies in general, or of the implementation of the Decade Action Plans in particular.

Hungary and Serbia promoted a further common priority: the creation and development of a **European Roma Policy**—both from the perspective of a European Union member state and also from the perspective of a potential candidate country. Decade Watch, in its second report, also proposed that governments promote a European Roma Policy (*Decade Watch 2007 Update: Looking Ahead: The Decade Agenda for Governments*).

In fact, the development of a European Roma Policy has made considerable progress since the end of 2007 when the Council of the European Union for the first time included the issue of Roma inclusion in its Conclusions. Since then, the Council, as well as the European Parliament, has addressed the issue of European Roma Policy a couple of times. Though a European Roma Policy has not been established yet, the creation of the **Integrated European Platform for Roma Inclusion** is a positive step in the right direction.

Primarily, the emerging new European Roma Policy targets the member states of the European Union. However, it also refers regularly in related documents to Roma in the countries acceding to the European Union. This is an important development for the Decade of Roma Inclusion, since half of its members are currently in the accession process to the European Union, while the other half are already member states (for more details on the European Roma Policy, see chapter 3).

The Slovak presidency introduced two further challenging priorities: Roma **identity** and the **revision of National Action Plans**.

The latter priority seems to be of relevance, since most of the National Action Plans were already adopted five years ago. However, such a revision has to be accompanied by an evaluation of the implementation of the current National Action Plans, and should not be limited to changing current plans. Further, such a revision of National Action Plans should also address the issues of common indicators and the availability of data.

The revision could also take up a proposal made by Decade Watch to adopt intermediate operational plans, for example covering two-year periods (*Decade Watch 2007 Update: Looking Ahead: The Decade Agenda for Governments*).

Shorter-term operational plans allow for setting a more concrete agenda and demonstrating progress. They would be a key tool to re-invigorate the Decade at national and local levels, and to link the Decade to governments' reform agendas in the four priority areas.

3. Key Developments and Challenges since 2007

3.1 ROMA-RELATED POLICIES

An increasing number of politicians have realized that the deterioration of the situation of the Roma puts the social cohesion and harmony of their countries in danger. The limited inclusion of Roma in the labor market and the education system, as well as continuing or even increasing the segregation of housing areas, have contributed to a tendency for two parallel, nearly segregated societies to emerge.

Governments, in close co-operation with Roma and society at-large, have to urgently address the vulnerable position of Roma in education, employment, health and housing. They have to vigorously condemn and persecute discrimination and increasing racist violence against Roma. In addition, the phenomenon of migration has to be addressed.

Some of the governments of the Decade countries have increased their efforts to improve the situation of Roma. The government of the Czech Republic approved a long-term strategy in December 2009 for the integration of Roma until 2013. It aims to create equal work and education opportunities and reverse the ongoing 'ghettoization' of the Czech Roma. The government considers this strategy as a first step in a process that could last up to 40 years.³ In Serbia, the government finally adopted in 2009 a strategy for the integration of Roma and relevant action plans, starting in 2010 with a new, comprehensive Roma inclusion policy.

³ Daniela Lazarova, *Cabinet approves long-term strategy for Romany integration* (December 22, 2009): <http://romove.radio.cz/en/article/22964>.

The major development, however, is the endeavor to create a European Roma Policy. 2008 and 2009 saw considerable progress on creating the European Roma Policy. In the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, such a policy has been requested and promoted for a long time. Decade Watch requested in its 2008 report that the governments of the Decade countries ‘push towards an EU Roma policy, building on the Decade’. Hungary and Serbia determined the ‘European Roma Policy’ as one of their priorities during their respective presidencies.

Initially, the focus of the European Roma Policy was on the European Union and its member states. However, the situation of Roma in accession countries in the Western Balkans has gradually gained more attention and is addressed in most relevant documents. The Commission Staff Working Document on Roma of June 2008 acknowledges that addressing the needs of Roma communities is ‘critically important for maintaining social cohesion in South-East Europe’.⁴

This constitutes an important move for the six Western Balkan countries in the accession process that are participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia).

The Process of Establishing a European Roma Policy

On **December 14, 2007**, the Council of the European Union included the issue of Roma inclusion in its Conclusions for the first time. This marked an important change, since the Council asked the European Commission to come up with a European approach to tackle Roma exclusion. Prior to this, the approach of the Commission was to refer to the responsibility of the member states and to the availability of EU money which may (or may not) be used by member states.⁵

⁴ Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, 2.7.2008 SEC (2008) 2172 Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: *Non-discrimination and equal opportunities: A renewed commitment, Community Instruments and Policies for Roma Inclusion* {COM(2008) 420 final}.

⁵ A European Commission Staff Working Document of June 2008 stated: ‘Core issues of Roma inclusion—education, employment, public health, housing and infrastructure and the fight against poverty—fall mainly under the responsibility of member states. The EU plays, however, an important role in ensuring the principle of non-discrimination and in policy coordination. Moreover, the Structural Funds (and in particular the European Social Fund) are crucial instruments in supporting the Lisbon strategy at national, regional and local level’.

In **January 2008**, the European Parliament adopted a resolution ‘A European Strategy for Roma’ requesting the introduction of a ‘European Framework Strategy on Roma Inclusion’ and of a ‘Community action plan on Roma inclusion’.⁶

In **spring 2008**, a ‘European Roma Policy Coalition’ was established, consisting of ten civil society and human rights organizations. The Coalition called on the EU to adopt a ‘Framework Strategy on Roma Inclusion’, to be developed in full consultation with Romani communities.

In **June 2008**, the Commission published the Commission Staff Working Document report on the request of the European Council in December 2007.⁷

In **September 2008**, the European Union organized its first ‘European Roma Summit’ in Brussels, primarily dedicated to the situation of Roma in member states of the European Union.⁸

On **December 8, 2008**, the Council of the European Union adopted at its 2914th General Affairs Council meeting ‘Council Conclusions on inclusion of the Roma’. *Inter alia*, the conclusions call upon the Commission and the member states, in close co-operation:

‘to take account of the situation of the Roma when designing and implementing policies to defend fundamental rights, combat poverty and discrimination and uphold gender equality, and ensure access to education, housing, health, employment, justice and culture, and where appropriate to identify specific actions for 2009 and 2010 to that end’.

Further, it called for the better use of existing funds—for both Roma in the member states and in the countries undergoing the accession process.

On **March 11, 2009**, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the social situation of Roma and their improved access to the labor market in the EU. The resolution refers in particular to the economic situation of Roma in the new member states,

⁶ European Parliament Resolution of January 31, 2008 on a European Strategy for the Roma: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2008-0035+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>. The resolution states: ‘the plan must be drawn up and implemented by the group of Commissioners who have responsibility for the social inclusion of EU citizens through their portfolios on employment, social affairs, equal opportunities, justice, freedom, education, culture and regional policy’.

⁷ Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, 2.7.2008 SEC (2008) 2172 Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: *Non-discrimination and equal opportunities: A renewed commitment, Community Instruments and Policies for Roma Inclusion* {COM(2008) 420 final}.

⁸ For an analysis of the Summit see: *Policy Center for Roma & Minorities, Closing the social exclusion cycle in the European Union: A European Union Framework Strategy on Roma (2009)*.

who could not profit from the enlargement process, but saw a deterioration of their economic situation.⁹

In **June 2009**, the European Council adopted at the 2947th Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council meeting: the ‘Council Conclusions on Inclusion of the Roma’.¹⁰

The Council invites the Commission and the member states:

‘to take into account the Common Basic Principles, where appropriate, when designing and implementing policies to promote the full inclusion of the Roma, as well as when designing and implementing policies to defend fundamental rights, uphold gender equality, combat discrimination, poverty and social exclusion, and ensure access to education, housing, health, employment, social services, justice, sports and culture, and also in the EU’s relations with third countries’.

An Integrated European Platform for Roma Inclusion

As a first step towards a European Roma Policy, the European Union initiated the ‘**Integrated European Platform for Roma Inclusion**’. The aim of the Platform is to provide an arena for exchanging knowledge, experience and good practice, making commitments for initiatives and possibly monitoring progress achieved for the inclusion of Roma in Europe.

Two meetings of the ‘Integrated Platform’ were held in 2009. At the first meeting, the participants discussed the ‘**Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion**’ that should guide the future inclusion process.¹¹

The European Roma Policy Coalition criticized the Platform *inter alia* for not identifying and defining key target areas in order to achieve a ‘coherent, coordinated and strategic EU approach’ and for the lack of a structure of the Platform and for lack of transparency. It recommends a closer involvement of Roma representatives, and that Western Balkan countries should be represented in the Platform.¹²

⁹ See: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2009-0117+0+DOC+XML+V0//en>.

¹⁰ Council of the European Union, 2947th Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council meeting, Council Conclusions on Inclusion of the Roma Luxembourg, June 8, 2009.

¹¹ For the full text of the ‘Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion’, see Annex 3.

¹² See the ERPC press release *ERPC Expresses Concerns about the European Platform for Roma Inclusion*: http://www.romadecade.org/erpc_expresses_concerns_about_the_european_platform_for_roma_inclusion_

EU Policy towards Roma in the Accession Countries

The European Commission annually publishes its Progress Reports on the progress made in the countries intending to accede to the European Union. Protection of minorities' rights is a crucial part of these reports.

The Commission regularly calls upon the countries to increase their efforts to improve the situation of the Roma and points at frequent discrimination and the vulnerable position of Roma communities. Yet, the Commission does not follow a comprehensive and sustainable policy towards Roma in the Western Balkans.

In the framework of the emerging European Roma Policy, the Council of the European Union, as well as the Commission, is also committed to increasing their efforts with regard to Roma in the Western Balkan countries. They have also called upon member states and the countries undergoing the accession process to increase their efforts towards the inclusion of Roma.

In the preparations of the Progress Reports, individual Decade Watch members have been invited by the Commission to provide their assessment of the situation of Roma in the respective countries.

Data on Roma

The lack of data is not only an obstacle for the monitoring and evaluation of the Roma-related policies. It is also an obstacle for a proper planning process, since neither the dimension of a specific problem nor the size of the target group is known.

As a general rule, the majority of Roma do not disclose their identity when it comes to census-taking. The census data are generally used for policy planning, which makes it invaluable to increase the number of Roma stating their ethnicity in census-taking.

2011 will see a census-taking endeavor in the Western Balkan countries participating in the Decade (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia). The census-taking should be used as an opportunity to improve the Roma-related data in the census.

3.2 DECADE PRIORITY SECTORS

A lack of data for assessment and comparison across all Decade countries still prevails, both for the current situation of Roma in the four Decade priority sectors, and for the developments since the start of the Decade in 2005.

Despite the efforts of the governments, and support from the European Union and other donors to address the situation of the Roma, individual indicators point towards

limited progress or no progress at all in the Decade priority areas of education, employment, health and housing.

The re-integration of the Roma into socio-economic life remains a big challenge for politics and society in all Decade countries. While the general economic and social situation of the population in the five new member states participating in the Decade (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia) has improved in the last two decades, the situation of Roma has deteriorated.¹³

The Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) of the European Union published two studies in 2009 on the situation of the Roma in EU member states (**housing and migration**), while the European Parliament commissioned a study: *The social situation of the Roma and their improved access to the labor market in the EU*.

Two further studies focused on both the prevalence and perception of **discrimination** and the phenomenon of ethnic distance in EU member states. In 2009, UNDP conducted a study in Serbia: *Public opinion about discrimination and inequality in Serbia*.

In the framework of an EU-sponsored project conducted in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Greece, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain, a comparative study *Health and the Roma Community, analysis of the situation in Europe* was published in 2009.

The studies reflect important snapshots of the current state of affairs, but they inform neither on recent developments, nor on whether the countries participating in the Decade have fulfilled their commitments.

Related comprehensive and comparative studies on the situation of Roma in the Decade countries which are not members of the EU, or covering all Decade countries, are still missing.

¹³ See *inter alia* to Hungary, press release from MTI: *SURVEY—Roma living in slums see no hope for improvement*. <http://english.mti.hu/default.asp?menu=1&theme=2&cat=25&newsid=266175>; Czech Republic: Jan Richter, *Czech-Romany relations hit low point, says government report* (July 21, 2009). <http://romove.radio.cz/en/article/22626>,

ANALYSIS (HOUSING)

Residential segregation, lack of security of tenure (forced eviction), informal settlements, low quality housing and discrimination in housing constitute the major problems for Roma in housing.

Residential Segregation

According to a recently published EU report, in **the Czech Republic** live an estimated 80,000 Roma in some 300 excluded localities—or ghettos—across the country.

According to a study by the Fundamental Rights Agency of the European Union (FRA), *Housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in the European Union*, in **Slovakia** 41 per cent and in **Bulgaria** as much as 47 per cent of the Roma population ‘live in neighbourhoods or areas which are distant or separated from the cities to which they are associated’.

In **Hungary** a focus of the Roma inclusion policy is on housing integration, the elimination of segregated settlements and the development of new tools for financing the acquisition of housing. *Inter alia*, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor now requires most towns and cities in Hungary to elaborate an ‘Integrated Development Strategy’ incorporating an ‘Anti-segregation Plan’ in order to be eligible for urban development funds. In 2007–2008, 20 out of 23 Budapest districts and nearly 150 towns and cities in the country have elaborated such strategies and plans.

Forced Evictions and Informal Settlements

Forced evictions of Roma remain a serious problem. A report for the European Parliament pointed out the consequences of forced evictions: ‘Roma without permanent homes will not receive adequate health care, the difficulty of getting a job will increase, their children will be less likely to get an education, and they will generally be more likely to be homeless and impoverished’.¹⁴

According to Amnesty International, across **Romania**, Roma families are being evicted from their homes without adequate consultation, adequate notice or adequate alternative housing. This perpetuates racial segregation.¹⁵

In **Serbia**, the relocation of Roma who lived in slums in Belgrade (in particular in the Gazella Bridge settlement) to other places has created tension, since their prospective neighbors protested against the move.¹⁶

In particular, Roma living in informal settlements are targets of forced evictions. ‘Informal settlements’ are an issue also for non-Roma, since houses or settlements all over the Western Balkans have been built without the requested legal requirements. UN HABITAT assesses that

¹⁴ European Parliament, Policy Department, Economic and Scientific Policy, *The social situation of the Roma and their improved access to the labour market in the EU* (2008).

¹⁵ Amnesty International, *Romania: Treated like waste: Roma homes destroyed, and health at risk, in Romania* (EUR 39/001/2010), January 2010.

¹⁶ See *Goran Antic*, ‘Roma Exiles from Belgrade Go Hungry in South’ in: *Balkan Insight*, January 21, 2010. <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/main/analysis/25148/>.

in Macedonia, around 320,000 people (15 per cent of Macedonia's population) live in a total of 80,000 illegally constructed buildings.¹⁷

According to a study by the FRA, 'Housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in the European Union', (e.g. in **Slovakia**) the Mid-Term Development Strategy of the Romany Ethnic Minority in the Slovak Republic defines unsettled land ownership as one of the principal reasons behind housing problems.

In **Bulgaria**, according a 2002 report, 70 per cent of houses in urban Romani neighborhoods were illegally built.¹⁸ Consequently, Bulgaria focuses its Roma inclusion policy *inter alia* on the spatial/town planning status of the Roma settlements, their regularization, improvement of their social and technical infrastructure, and providing social housing.

The FRA study also provides, however, a positive example of improving home ownership among Roma. Spain implements a housing policy that promotes home-ownership through state subsidies in preference to the provision of rented social housing. It is estimated that around half of Roma home-owners acquired their house through this policy.

Quality of Housing

According to the above-mentioned FRA study, in **Slovakia** in 2004, only 19 per cent of Roma settlements had sewage, 41 per cent access to a gas supply, and 63 per cent access to a water supply, although 91 per cent had access to a mains power supply. One out of five lacked public road access. In Slovakia, nearly half of the Roma population (47 per cent) live in sub-standard housing and only six per cent in shanty towns.

In **Romania**, a 2007 report notes that Roma are far more disadvantaged compared to other ethnic groups in access to public utilities: 75 per cent have no access to a gas supply (others 21 per cent), 72 per cent have no access to sewage (others 15 per cent), 73 per cent have no running water in the house (others 10 per cent), 12 per cent have no home power supply (others one per cent), and 14 per cent use waste for heating their homes or do not heat them at all (others two per cent).

In **Macedonia**, a UN HABITAT study found out that 'access to potable water and sewage is scarce in rural areas and in many urban slums. These conditions are particularly grave for households of the minority Roma.'¹⁹

In **Bulgaria**, nearly two-thirds of the population (64 per cent) live in neighborhoods with poor health conditions, and 34 per cent in areas separated from the cities.

These data stand in contrast to the situation in **Spain**, where 92 per cent of the Roma population live in standard flats or houses.

¹⁷ See the website of UN HABITAT at: <http://www.habitat.org/intl/eca/240.aspx>

¹⁸ Fundamental Rights Agency of the European Union, *Housing conditions of Roma and Travellers in the European Union. Comparative Report*. October 2009.

¹⁹ See the website of UN HABITAT: <http://www.habitat.org/intl/eca/240.aspx>.

3.3 RACE-RELATED VIOLENCE AND DISCRIMINATION

Race-related Violence

Tensions between Roma and other ethnic groups are on the rise in some of the Decade countries, as well as in non-Decade countries, which are fuelled and exploited by racist and neo-fascist groups.

The most shocking incidents happened in 2008 and 2009 in Hungary. In a series of attacks on Roma all over the country, six Roma were killed.

In other Decade countries (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Serbia, and Slovakia) attacks on Roma have also been recorded. In Hungary and the Czech Republic, extreme right-wing, paramilitary groups have marched into Romani neighborhoods.

With particular regard to Hungary, the survey reflects the impact of recent developments in the country: the killings of Roma, the rise of the extremist, anti-Roma party Jobbik and of the para-military *Magyar Gárda* group as well as the public discussion about 'Gypsy crime' and the lack of 'compassion' of Hungarian society. Respondents identified considerable deterioration in the respective levels of integration and discrimination.

In particular, in underdeveloped, neglected regions with larger, poor Romani communities (e.g. Northeast Hungary, East Slovakia) it only seems to be a matter of time as to when local violent conflicts will increase. Slovakia and Hungary had the worst results regarding changes in integration and discrimination in the last five years.

In non-Decade countries such as Ireland, Italy, France or Austria, the presence of Romani migrants from Decade-participant countries provoked violent attacks on Roma, or police actions.

In addition, the Italian government has decided to collect ethnicity data on Roma migrants and the fingerprints of adults and children.

Discrimination

Politicians in Decade countries have made use of 'racist language' when referring to Roma and have thereby contributed to upholding racism and discrimination of Roma in their countries.

On February 11, 2010, according to an official press statement on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Minister Baconschi, when referring to the Roma community in France, stated:

'We have some natural, physiological problems, of criminality within some of the Romanian communities, especially among the communities of the Romanian citizens of Roma ethnicity.'

The official press release of the Romanian government, after an official meeting between Romanian Prime Minister Boc and French State Secretary Lellouche on the same day stated:

‘An important issue on the agenda of the meeting concerned the measures taken into account by the Romanian authorities for preventing and discouraging the crimes committed in France by the Romanian citizens of Roma ethnicity.’

Decade Watch is very concerned that a minister of a member state of the European Union is directly associating criminality with ethnicity, and offering a biological explanation for it; an explanation similar to Holocaust justification in Nazi Germany.²⁰

Prime Minister Robert Fico of Slovakia stated in a public address on March 8, 2010 that his government should ‘continuously enrol as many Romani children as possible into boarding schools and continually remove these children from the way of life they are currently leading in the settlements.’²¹

Decade Watch is very concerned that the prime minister of an EU member state, and one which currently holds the presidency of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, promotes (illegal) segregation as a possibility to integrate Roma into mainstream society. Mr. Fico should be reminded that the ‘concept of segregation’ and of taking children away from parents has failed already, in the 18th century under Maria Theresia.

The Czech government’s 2008 report on the state of the Roma in that country identified *inter alia* ‘general discrimination’ and a growing gap between the majority and minority population.²²

The Fundamental Rights Agency of the European Union conducted a survey in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia, identifying the level of discrimination experienced by Roma. On average, every second Romani respondent stated that s/he was discriminated against at least once in the previous 12 months. Roma who were discriminated against experienced on average 11 incidents of discrimination over a 12-month period.

Depending on the country, between 66 per cent and 92 per cent of Roma did not report their most recent experience of discrimination in the last 12 months to any competent organization, or at the place where the discrimination occurred. 23 per cent of Roma respondents avoided places because of potential discriminatory treatment.

²⁰ For more details, see the Protest Letter ‘Diplomatic speech with racist content. Anti-discrimination NGOs are demanding the resignation of the Romanian Minister of Foreign Affairs Baconschi’, Bucharest, February 16, 2010.

²¹ For more details see the letter of the European Roma Rights Centre to the Prime Minister of the Slovak Republic, Mr Robert Fico of March 10, 2010.

²² Jan Richter, *Czech-Romany relations hit low point, says government report* (July 21, 2009): <http://romove.radio.cz/en/article/22626>.

This result suggests that levels of discrimination would be higher if avoidance measures were not adopted.

Table 1: Discrimination in selected EU member states²³

Country	Bulgaria	Czech Republic	Hungary	Romania	Slovakia
Experienced discrimination in last 12 months	26%	64%	62%	25%	41%
Didn't report discrimination	92%	66%	82%	81%	80%

With regards to discrimination, the European Court of Human Rights issued another ruling of importance for Roma, after the 2007 ruling on discrimination of Romani children in the education system of the Czech Republic.

The constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina, based on the General Framework for Peace (GFAP, 'Dayton Agreement') brokered by the international community in 1995, still does not recognize Roma as citizens on an equal footing with Bosnians, Croats and Serbs; more than 14 years after the end of the war and entering the constitution into force. However, a Roma and a Jew from Bosnia and Herzegovina went to the European Court of Human Rights, which ruled in 2009 that the constitution was not in line with the European Convention on Human Rights, and that Bosnia and Herzegovina had to change its constitution.²⁴

In November 2007, the Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights ruled that segregating Roma students into special schools was a form of unlawful discrimination in breach of the European Convention.²⁵ This landmark decision of the European Court of Human Rights had, however, only a limited impact. Research by Amnesty International in 2009 revealed that discrimination of Romani children still persisted in Czech schools.²⁶

²³ The relatively positive results in Bulgaria and Romania could be rooted in the fact that the Roma in particular in Bulgaria, 'as reflected in the survey results, are more isolated from mainstream society, and effectively operate in a "parallel society" with infrequent contacts with the outside world'. See FRA, EU-MIDIS (European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey), *Data in Focus Report—The Roma*, Vienna 2009.

²⁴ For more details on *Sejdic and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* (application nos 27996/06 and 34836/06) see the website of the European Court of Human Rights: <http://www.echr.coe.int/echr>.

²⁵ For more details on *D.H and Others v. the Czech Republic* (application no. 57325/00) see the website of the European Court of Human Rights: <http://www.echr.coe.int/echr>.

²⁶ Amnesty International, Czech Republic: *Injustice renamed: Discrimination in education of Roma persists in the Czech Republic* (EUR 71/003/2009), January 2010.

Ethnic Distance

Research by the European Commission revealed the rejection and mistrust of other ethnic groups towards Roma in the member states of the European Union.

Attitudes towards Roma in the private sphere were examined using the 'neighbor scenario'. Respondents were asked to rate how comfortable they would be having various neighbors on a ten-point scale, with ten representing the highest level of comfort. In comparison with other groups, Roma received the lowest rate.

At the EU level, the average score was six. Thirty-six per cent would be comfortable with Romani neighbors, while 24 per cent would be uncomfortable. Fourteen per cent stated they had Roma friends or acquaintances.

Research in the EU member states participating in the Decade revealed the following attitudes:²⁷

Table 2: Ethnic distance in selected EU member states

	Average	Comfortable with Romani neighbors	Uncomfortable with Romani neighbors	Romani friends or acquaintances
Bulgaria	4.8	21%	36%	47%
Czech Republic	3.7	9%	47%	18%
EU	6.0	36%	24%	14%
Hungary	5.5	28%	28%	42%
Romania	6.2	34%	20%	42%
Slovakia	4.5	17%	38%	37%
Spain	6.8	42%	13%	32%

3.4 MIGRATION

The issue of migration was not identified as one of the priorities or cross-cutting issues of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. In light of the frequent discrimination of their community and the desperate socio-economic situation in their home country, many Roma from Decade-participant countries decided to migrate to Western European countries or Canada in order to find employment and a better life as equal citizens.²⁸ Thus, the

²⁷ European Commission, *Special Euro-barometer 296: Discrimination in the EU, Perceptions, Experiences and Attitudes*. July 2008.

situation in the crucial areas of the Decade, such as anti-discrimination, employment, education or housing led to the decision of many Roma to flee their home country.

In comparison to their total number, only small numbers of Roma have migrated in recent years to Western Europe and Canada. However, this small number of Romani migrants has been sufficient enough to create tensions—or has been used as pretext for creating tensions—and to clamp down on migration laws.²⁹

In 2008 and 2009, Romani migrants, primarily from Romania, have caused tensions (or been used as pretexts for creating tensions) in Italy and Ireland.

The controversial census of Roma in Italy in July 2008 revealed that 12,346 Roma people lived in camps around Rome, Naples and Milan. The Italian government estimated that 12,000 Roma, mostly from Romania, have left the country independently since beginning of June 2008.³⁰

In Italy, France or Greece, the authorities clamped down on (illegal) settlements of Roma who had migrated from Romania, Bulgaria, Albania or the former Yugoslavia. In May 2008 in Italy, in a case of mob violence, locals torched a Romani camp in Naples.

In Austria, 'begging Gypsies', primarily from Slovakia and Bulgaria, became an issue for public discussion, and were used to tighten administrative instructions on begging in public.³¹

In England, the possible migration of Roma from Romania and Bulgaria was used to express opposition against the accession of Romania and Bulgaria (and previously, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia) to the European Union.

Romani migrants from the Czech Republic fleeing to Canada led to the re-introduction of a visa regime for Czech citizens in July 2009.

Also, Roma from Slovakia and Hungary fled to Canada and according to newspaper reports, Canada considered the re-introduction of a visa regime for Hungary too.³² In the first nine months of 2009 alone, 1,353 Hungarians filed applications for refugee status

²⁸ For analysis and case studies of migration see: FRA, *The situation of Roma EU citizens moving to and settling in other EU Member States*. Vienna November 2009.

²⁹ For an overview on 'Romani migration' see: Claude Cahn, Elspeth Guild, *Recent Migration of Roma in Europe, A study for the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights and the High Commissioner for National Minorities of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe*, Strasbourg, The Hague 2008.

³⁰ See http://www.wantedinrome.com/news/news.php?id_n=5024.

³¹ As recently as 2006, police in Vienna apprehended 650 minors from Bulgaria. See http://www.news.at/articles/0720/10/173438/betteln-news-schicksal-roma-kinder_.

³² *The Star* (Toronto), January 9, 2010: <http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/article/748501--visa-clampdown-near-for-hungarian-visitors>. From 2000 on, Roma fled to Canada, which led to the introduction of a visa regime for Hungarian citizens. The same is true of the UK from 1998, Finland from 1999, and other countries from 2000 introduced visa regimes for Slovak citizens following the flight of Slovak Roma abroad.

and the numbers for the remaining three months of 2009 are believed to be even higher.³³

Finland registered in the second half of 2009 a sharp increase in the number of asylum seekers from Bulgaria (708 persons). The Bulgarian applicants, almost without exception, were members of the Roma minority.³⁴

In several cases (e.g. regarding incidents with Roma from Romania in Italy or in France), Romani communities in the home country also had to face repercussions of the incidents, and some politicians used the incidents to make anti-Roma statements.

At the end of 2009, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia were put on the Schengen White List, allowing for visa-free travel to the Schengen countries.

At the beginning of 2010, several hundred Roma (and also Albanians), in particular from Macedonia and Serbia fled to Belgium and Sweden, asking for political asylum. In February 2010, more than 300 Serb citizens asked for asylum in Sweden and 330 in Belgium, while more than 400 Macedonian citizens asked for asylum in the latter country. According to the Swedish ambassador to Serbia, 80 per cent of the people who fled to Sweden were Roma.³⁵

Of further concern with regard to migration is the situation of Romani refugees and IDPs from Kosovo. Ten of thousands who have lived for up to ten years in Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina are not able to return.

On the other hand, Roma are still fleeing Kosovo. According to an internal paper of the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), only Hungary registered (between January and April 2009) nearly 1,000 asylum applications from people claiming to originate from Kosovo, most of whom were Roma.

³³ 2008 was the first year that Hungarians were allowed to enter Canada without visas; 285 Hungarians filed applications. See Doug Sanders, 'The next stop for Roma: Canada' in *Globe and Mail*, January 22, 2010: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/the-next-stop-for-the-roma-canada/article1441459/>.

³⁴ *Helsingin Sanomat* (International Edition), January 14, 2010.

³⁵ See *inter alia* 'Citizens seeking asylum in Sweden as well', *B92*, March 5, 2010: http://www.b92.net/eng/news/politics-article.php?yyyy=2010&mm=03&dd=05&nav_id=65599. The majority of people who fled to Belgium were allegedly ethnic Albanians from Southern Serbia and Macedonia. See 'Belgium sends back asylum seekers', *B92*, March 10, 2010 http://www.b92.net/eng/news/politics-article.php?yyyy=2010&mm=03&dd=10&nav_id=65705; 'Belgium will not grant political asylum to economic refugees', *Eubusiness.com*, March 9, 2010: <http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/macedonia-belgium.3ip>.

4. Survey Analysis

Taking into account the indicator framework of the previous reports, more detailed questions were developed for each of the four priority sectors of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. Each of the four priority sectors was divided into several policy fields, and the interlocutors went on to assess the impact of the programs in the respective policy fields.

Further questions in each of the four priority sectors referred to:

- (i) the priorities of the interlocutors;
- (ii) whether the relevant programs brought about the desired change;
- (iii) whether they helped achieve the objectives of the country's action plans;
- (iv) whether the state has a monitoring system in place;
- (v) whether the programs are gender sensitive; and
- (vi) how integration and discrimination develop in the sector.

Prior to specific questions on the four priority sectors, general questions addressed the current level of integration and discrimination and their respective changes over the last five years, the participation of Roma in the policy process, and the impact of the Decade.

In the first part of the survey analysis, several indices were presented. These were introduced primarily to provide an opportunity to compare assessments across the 11 countries, and among groups of countries.

The indices were developed on the basis of a point system reflecting the assessment of the activities, ranging in general from 5 (very positive) to 0 (no program/no activity). More detailed explanations of the indices are given when appropriate.

The core part of the analysis presents the most important results of the questionnaire, presented without extensive use of tables. An Annex will provide all relevant tables to the questions.

It should be taken into account that the survey is not a representative study for the 11 countries, but reflects an experts' assessment of different policies or activities regarding the inclusion of Roma. However, the results might allow for the identification of 'good practices' and 'bad practices' and pave the way for further, more detailed research into these.

4.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The two previous reports primarily assessed the input from governments and the creation of structures for the implementation of the Decade Action Plans. They introduced indicators measuring:

- (i) the existence and quality of Decade Action Plans, including the availability of data with which to report on progress;
- (ii) the institutional arrangements for Decade implementation; and
- (iii) whether measures had been put in place across the four Decade priority areas.

The reports did not intend to measure the 'impact and change of outcomes for Roma'.

With the new 2009 report, Decade Watch changed its focus from solely measuring input towards providing an assessment by independent experts of the impact of relevant government policies in the priority areas of the Decade, and of the changes over the last five years.

However, it should be taken into account that the survey is still not a representative study for the 11 countries which measures the 'impact and change of outcomes for Roma', but it rather reflects an experts' assessment of the impact of different policies or activities regarding the inclusion of Roma.

The **2009 report** reveals that, in an overall ranking, the new Decade-participant countries Bosnia and Herzegovina (3.07) and Spain (2.99), as well as Serbia (2.99) are at the top of the table. Slovakia (2.10) received by far the worst ranking followed by the Czech Republic (2.46) and Hungary (2.48).

While Hungary and the Czech Republic received the best assessment in the 2007 report, they were assessed negatively in the 2009 report. In other words, while government input in both countries was appreciated, the experts identified only a limited impact from 'government input' in these two countries. On the other hand, government input in Serbia in 2007 was considered to be low, while the impact was relatively well appreciated by the experts.

Impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion

The highest assessment was given to two countries: Albania (4.00) and Spain (3.92), both of which had only recently joined the Decade. In general, the countries in the Western Balkans (and the countries that had only recently joined the Decade) tended to receive a positive assessment, while in the five new member states of the European Union, the results show a tendency to assess the impact of the Decade more neutrally (in particular Slovakia with 3.05 and the Czech Republic with 3.06).

Integration and Discrimination

Looking at the results regarding the **change in integration** over the last five years, Slovakia (2.48), Hungary (2.63) and the Czech Republic (3.04) received the worst assessments, while Spain (3.62), Serbia (3.58) and Montenegro (3.57) received the best.

Regarding **changes in discrimination** over the last five years, Hungary (2.27), Slovakia (2.63), and the Czech Republic (2.75) again received the worst assessment, while changes in discrimination were relatively positively assessed in Bosnia and Herzegovina (3.67), Montenegro (3.59) and Spain (3.24).

When it comes to the assessment of the current state in integration and discrimination, the situation in the Czech Republic was considered relatively positively.

The **current level of integration** of Roma was assessed the best in Spain (3.17), the Czech Republic (2.52) and Romania (2.40); the lowest assessments were given to Albania and Macedonia (1.92 each) and Serbia (1.95).

The **current level of discrimination** of Roma was assessed most highly in Bulgaria (3.26), Albania (2.84) and the Czech Republic (2.79), and least in Hungary (2.00), Serbia (2.23) and Slovakia (2.35).

Despite the negative assessment of the developments over the last five years, the experts still consider the current situation in the Czech Republic better than in most of the other countries, while the developments over the last five years have led to Hungary and Slovakia receiving a negative assessment.

How can the negative assessment of the developments in **Hungary, Slovakia and The Czech Republic** be explained?

In all three countries there seems to prevail a disappointment among respondents that, despite considerable government input (and after the accession to the European Union, increased financial resources), the overall situation of Roma has not improved. Further, in light of anti-Roma sentiments, one could conclude that the fact that Roma inclusion policies serve the interests of society at large has not been communicated to the wider public.

With regard to Hungary, widespread anti-Roma attitudes in large parts of society (including the media) have manifested themselves in the infamous discussion on ‘Gypsy crime’ and the rise of an extremist political party; this, along with the killings of Roma, has certainly influenced the assessment.

The Czech Republic and Slovakia have also seen public anti-Roma activities and statements from extremist political parties, and serious crimes committed against Roma in particular.

On the other hand, the improvement of the situation regarding discrimination and integration in **Montenegro** in particular seems to be remarkable. However, one should compare the impressive improvement over the last five years with the assessment of the current level. The current level of integration (1.96) is rated relatively low, and the level of discrimination could be considered as medium (2.60).

Montenegro could serve as an example for most countries in the accession process. Despite considerable improvements regarding integration and discrimination, the situation is still considered as being worse than in the EU member states.

Spain seems to be in an extraordinary position. Both the current situation and the development over the last five years regarding both integration (change: 3.62; current situation: 3.17) and discrimination (change: 3.24; current situation: 2.78) are considered as relatively positive.

The results for Spain also demonstrate that the assessment of integration and discrimination does not always directly correlate (e.g. that the level of integration is assessed better than the level of discrimination).

Impact of Government Programs

The above-mentioned change of focus in Decade Watch methodology might have contributed to the changed assessment of the performance of individual countries. The 2007 report identified Hungary as the country ‘which has made the most advances, with the most significant progress on implementation across most, if not all, of the priority areas’.

Hungary was followed by the Czech Republic and Macedonia (‘both have made substantial progress since 2005/2006’), and Bulgaria, Slovakia, Romania and Croatia. ‘These countries show a mixed performance with examples of both systematic and limited government action across the priorities. Slovakia’s performance has least improved, and thus has fallen behind in comparison.’

Serbia and Montenegro continued to lag behind, although both had made above-average improvements.

The 2009 report shows a different picture.

The analysis of the **impact of the government programs** in the four Decade priority areas reveals that in ‘**Education**’, Romania (3.51), Serbia (3.42) and Bosnia and

Herzegovina (3.33) received the best assessment, while Slovakia (2.26), Bulgaria (2.51) and Spain (2.65) received the worst.³⁶

In the priority area '**Housing**', Bosnia and Herzegovina (3.34), the Czech Republic (2.98) and Albania (2.82) received the best assessment, while Bulgaria (1.68), Slovakia (1.87) and Hungary (2.12) received the worst.

In the priority area '**Employment**', Serbia (3.28), Macedonia (3.27) and Albania (3.20) received the best assessment while Slovakia (1.88), Hungary (2.57) and Bulgaria (2.63) received the worst.

In the priority area '**Health**', Macedonia (3.41), Romania (3.22) and Spain (3.10) received the best assessment while Slovakia (1.84), the Czech Republic (2.08) and Montenegro (2.73) received the worst.

With the exception of 'Housing', where it received the second worst rating, **Slovakia** showed the worst performance in the other three priority sectors—often lagging behind the other countries by a great distance. Its policies are even considered to have had a negative to very negative impact.

The 2007 report still identified **Hungary** as the country 'with the most significant progress on implementation across most, if not all, of the priority areas'. The 2009 report reveals a different picture. At least in 'employment' and 'housing', the impact of the government programs in Hungary is considered as negative or tending to be negative.

On the other hand, the 2007 report found that **Serbia** and **Montenegro** are continuing to lag behind. In 2009, Serbia received the best assessment of the impact of its programs in employment, and the second-best in education.

Looking at the different policy fields in the four priority sectors across the countries, the results reveal that two programs in education have received the best assessment: 'Primary and Secondary Education' with a 66.33 per cent positive assessment, and 'Early Childhood and Preschool' with 64.20 per cent.

On the other hand, the impact of programs in three policy fields of the 'Housing' sector actually received a considerably negative assessment: 'Formalization of Informal Settlements' received a 25.60 per cent negative assessment; 'Communal Services and Infrastructure' received 22.68 per cent; and 'Quality Social Housing' received 21.79 per cent.

In general, the data reveal that, according to the assessment of the experts, none of the countries participating in the Decade seem to implement successful programs in all four of the Decade priority areas.

In comparison with the data from 2007, the results reveal that considerable input does not necessarily lead to a positive impact and successful policy, or that 'input' will only demonstrate 'results' in the longer term.

³⁶ The following scaling was applied: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 (don't know).

The experts do not assess the programs as being sufficient, and the results could be interpreted in such a way that only comprehensive and holistic programs covering all priority areas might achieve a sustainable impact on the situation of Roma. Addressing one or two priority area is not sufficient—Roma inclusion policy has to address simultaneously all spheres of life, if it wants to be successful.

Further, the data point at another important result of the experts' survey: in general, the impact of the policies in the four Decade priority areas is assessed more positively in those countries from the Western Balkans undergoing the accession process than in the EU member states (in particular the new member states). A similar result can be seen regarding changes in integration and discrimination over the last five years.

Taking into account that far more financial resources are available for EU member states than countries undergoing the accession process, this result could reflect the disappointment of the experts in the EU member states, which have increased financial resources, but have not shown a greater impact.

However, this result could also confirm the above analysis that, in addition to financial resources, a comprehensive and holistic approach to Roma inclusion policy, and an efficient implementation structure are necessary in order to make that policy successful.

On the other hand, the results for the countries undergoing the accession process reveal a relatively high appreciation of the impact of the policies (compared to the new EU member states). However, one has to take into account that the starting point in these countries was lower than in the (new) EU member states, and that with less input, relatively more impact could have been achieved.

Gender

The survey also asked to what degree the respective programs address **gender issues**. The results display an obvious neglect of the gender perspective across all countries and across all programs.

Only for Spain did the experts assess that the relevant programs 'somewhat' addressed gender issues (2.95), followed by Albania (2.21) and Serbia (2.02).

In Hungary (1.24), the Czech Republic (1.28) and Romania (1.33), the programs barely addressed gender issues.

Participation of Roma

Across the countries, the participation of Roma in the policy process was assessed more negatively than positively. The effectiveness of the consultations were assessed negatively by 67.95 per cent (20.72 per cent positive) with an additional 11.33 per cent stating

that there were no consultations. Meanwhile, the role of Roma in creating policies was assessed negatively by 46.96 per cent (19.57 per cent positively), and the role in implementing policies was assessed negatively by 44.02 per cent (18.50 per cent positively).

A comparison between the three new Decade-participant countries and the 'old' Decade countries reveals interesting differences. With regard to all three issues (effectiveness of consultations, participation of Roma in the creation and implementation of policies), three times as many respondents from the new Decade countries gave a positive assessment, as compared to the old Decade countries.

In general, the participation of Roma in Roma inclusion policies was considered the highest in Spain (3.44), Albania (3.02) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (2.86), while Slovakia (2.00), Hungary (2.23) and the Czech Republic (2.30) received the worst assessments.

This result is somewhat surprising, taking into account the limited capacity of Roma civil society and existing 'Roma participation' structures in Albania (and partly in Bosnia and Herzegovina) compared to such countries as Romania, Macedonia, Serbia or the Czech Republic.

The different expectations in countries with a better developed civil society and participation structures might have contributed to this assessment.

4.2 INDEX OVERVIEW

The following indices were developed:

- a 'meta-index' comprising the scoring of all other indices;
- an index reflecting the impact of the Decade;
- a participation index;
- indices on discrimination and integration;
- an index on gender;
- impact indices for different policy fields in the four priority sectors of the Decade;
- relevant indices for different policy fields in the four priority sectors of the Decade.

Meta-index

According to the results of a 'meta-index' developed based on the rates of all indices, the experts from **Bosnia and Herzegovina** gave the best rating (3.07) to the different aspects of the integration of Roma as asked for in the questionnaire. The next-best assessments were attributed to **Serbia** (2.99) and **Spain** (2.99).

Slovakia received the worst assessment (2.10), followed by **the Czech Republic** (2.46) and **Hungary** (2.48).³⁷

Table 3: Meta-index

Country	Rate
BiH	3.07
Serbia	2.99
Spain	2.99
New Decade	2.95
Non-EU members	2.92
Macedonia	2.89
Romania	2.85
Montenegro	2.82
Albania	2.80
Average	2.74
Old Decade	2.65
EU members	2.58
Bulgaria	2.62
New EU members	2.51
Hungary	2.48
Czech Republic	2.46
Slovakia	2.10

The Impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion Index

Respondents were asked ‘How do you assess the impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion in your country?’.

The best assessments were given to two countries: Albania (4.00) and Spain (3.92), both of which had only recently joined the Decade. In general, the countries in the Western Balkans tended to be given a positive assessment, while in the five new member states of the European Union, the results show a tendency to assess the impact of the Decade more neutrally.

³⁷ See the ‘Meta-index’ table in Annex 1 for detailed data on the different policy fields and countries.

Table 4: Impact of Decade index³⁸

Country	Rate
Albania	4.00
Spain	3.92
New Decade	3.86
Non-EU members	3.76
Montenegro	3.75
Macedonia	3.71
Serbia	3.68
BiH	3.67
Average	3.51
Old Decade	3.37
Hungary	3.30
EU members	3.29
Bulgaria	3.27
New EU members	3.17
Romania	3.14
Czech Republic	3.06
Slovakia	3.05

Participation Index

The Participation index is based on three questions:

- the effectiveness of consultations with Roma;
- to what degree Roma organizations have a say in *creating* Roma-related policy;
- to what degree Roma organizations have a role in *implementing* Roma-related policies.

³⁸ Score: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 points (don't know).

Table 5: Participation index³⁹

Country	Rate
Spain	3.44
New Decade	3.10
Albania	3.02
BiH	2.86
Macedonia	2.84
Non-EU members	2.83
Romania	2.74
Serbia	2.73
Montenegro	2.70
Average	2.66
EU members	2.52
Old Decade	2.49
Bulgaria	2.35
New EU members	2.33
Czech Republic	2.30
Hungary	2.23
Slovakia	2.00

Gender Sensitivity Index

For each of the priority areas, the interlocutors should assess to what degree the respective programs address gender issues.

The index reveals that in all sectors, the programs aren't assessed positively; in particular in the priority sector 'Housing', gender was either not considered, or the respondents did not know anything about the gender sensitivity of the programs.

The most positive assessments received were for the education and health programs in Spain and the health program in Serbia.

³⁹ Score: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 points (don't know).

Table 6: Gender sensitivity index⁴⁰

Country	Education programs	Housing programs	Employment programs	Health programs	Average
Spain	3.46	2.23	2.82	3.27	2.95
New Decade	2.64	1.89	2.19	2.69	2.35
Albania	2.38	1.80	1.89	2.76	2.21
Serbia	2.15	0.75	2.00	3.19	2.02
Bulgaria	1.70	1.86	1.75	2.60	1.98
Non-EU members	2.22	1.42	1.72	2.32	1.92
BiH	2.08	1.64	1.86	2.03	1.90
Montenegro	2.42	1.95	1.81	1.37	1.89
Average	2.01	1.37	1.80	2.04	1.80
EU members	1.84	1.32	1.85	1.81	1.70
Old Decade	1.78	1.16	1.64	1.80	1.60
Macedonia	2.09	0.95	1.05	2.26	1.59
New EU members	1.51	1.13	1.66	1.52	1.46
Slovakia	1.53	0.65	1.94	1.64	1.44
Romania	1.33	0.81	1.52	1.65	1.33
Czech Republic	1.60	1.50	1.67	0.33	1.28
Hungary	1.40	0.87	1.35	1.33	1.24

Integration Indices

The interlocutors should assess the current level of integration in their country and the change of the level of integration in the last five years, as well as the development of integration of Roma in the last five years in each of the four priority sectors.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Score: 5 points (very much); 3 points (somewhat); 1 point (not at all); 0 points (don't know).

⁴¹ Integration: 5 points (very high); 4 points (high); 3 points (medium); 2 points (low); 1 point (very low); 0 point (don't know). Change in integration: 5 points (increased very much); 4 points (increased); 3 points (remained); 2 points (decreased); 1 point (decreased very much); 0 point (don't know).

Table 7: Current level of integration index

Country	Current situation
Spain	3.17
Czech Republic	2.52
EU members	2.47
Romania	2.40
New Decade	2.38
Bulgaria	2.37
New EU members	2.33
Hungary	2.28
Average	2.24
Old Decade	2.19
Slovakia	2.09
BiH	2.06
Montenegro	1.96
Non-EU members	1.96
Serbia	1.95
Albania	1.92
Macedonia	1.92

Table 8: Change in integration index—last five years

Country	General	Education	Housing	Employment	Health	Average	Current ⁴²
Spain	4.00	3.00	3.83	3.33	3.92	3.62	3.17
Serbia	3.68	3.85	3.25	3.23	3.87	3.58	1.95
Montenegro	3.64	4.04	3.81	3.24	3.12	3.57	1.96
BiH	3.65	3.99	2.58	3.51	3.70	3.49	2.06
Macedonia	3.83	4.04	2.95	3.33	3.16	3.46	1.92
Non-EU members	3.69	3.89	3.07	3.25	3.35	3.45	1.96
Bulgaria	3.25	3.80	3.43	3.50	3.20	3.44	2.37
New Decade	3.76	3.50	3.05	3.26	3.50	3.41	2.38
Average	3.37	3.50	3.02	3.08	3.21	3.24	2.24
Old Decade	3.22	3.51	3.01	3.01	3.10	3.17	2.19
Romania	3.16	3.71	2.38	3.05	3.45	3.15	2.40
Albania	3.64	3.52	2.75	2.95	2.88	3.15	1.92
EU members	3.10	3.19	2.98	2.94	3.09	3.06	2.47
Czech Republic	3.08	3.05	3.22	3.20	2.67	3.04	2.52
New EU members	2.92	3.22	2.81	2.86	3.09	2.98	2.33
Hungary	2.71	2.90	2.70	2.30	2.53	2.63	2.28
Slovakia	2.43	2.65	2.31	2.25	2.77	2.48	2.09

The level of integration, according to the respondents, is low across all Decade-participant countries—even for **Spain**, the average assessment is only slightly better than ‘medium’.

Despite the current low level of integration, the data demonstrate that in the last five years a process was initiated that improved integration in the Western Balkan countries; in particular, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia saw considerable progress with regard to integration in the sector of ‘Education’.

The least amount of progress seems to prevail in Slovakia; the country received (with the exception of ‘Health’) the worst assessment regarding progress made in integration in the last five years. With ‘Employment’ and ‘Housing’ in particular, it seems that integration actually decreased. Hungary, too, has demonstrated no progress, according to the interlocutors, regarding the integration of Roma in the last five years.

The tables confirm the division between the EU member states and the Western Balkan countries (or non-EU members). While respondents assessed the level of integration in the EU member states to be generally higher than in the Western Balkan countries, the data reveals the Western Balkan countries performed better than the EU member states regarding changes to integration (with the exception of Spain and Bulgaria, which showed the best performance in both categories).

Overall, integration in education (3.50) seems to have improved more than in the other sectors (general: 3.37; health: 3.21; employment: 3.08 and housing: 3.02).

Discrimination Indices

The interlocutors should first assess the current level of discrimination in their country. In addition, they should assess the development of discrimination against Roma in the last five years in each of the four priority sectors.⁴³

⁴² Current situation only for comparison.

⁴³ Discrimination: 5 points (very low); 4 points (low); 3 points (medium); 2 points (high); 1 point (very high); 0 points (don’t know). Change in discrimination: 5 points (decreased very much); 4 points (decreased); 3 points (remained); 2 points (increased); 1 point (increased very much); 0 points (don’t know).

Table 9: Current level of discrimination index

Country	Current situation
Bulgaria	3.26
Albania	2.84
Czech Republic	2.79
New Decade	2.79
Spain	2.78
BiH	2.76
Non-EU members	2.61
Macedonia	2.60
Montenegro	2.60
Average	2.60
EU members	2.59
New EU members	2.55
Old Decade	2.52
Romania	2.36
Slovakia	2.35
Serbia	2.23
Hungary	2.00

Table 10: Change in discrimination index—last five years

Country	General	Education	Housing	Employment	Health	Average	Current ⁴⁴
BiH	3.74	3.81	3.70	3.40	3.70	3.67	2.76
Montenegro	3.68	4.00	3.24	3.67	3.37	3.59	2.60
New Decade	3.39	3.67	3.28	3.07	3.43	3.37	2.79
Non-EU members	3.46	3.63	3.16	3.20	3.09	3.31	2.61
Spain	3.00	3.64	3.00	2.91	3.64	3.24	2.78
Albania	3.44	3.57	3.15	2.89	2.94	3.20	2.84
Macedonia	3.36	3.23	2.95	3.22	2.84	3.12	2.60
Romania	3.08	3.37	2.48	3.09	3.10	3.02	2.36
Average	3.10	3.22	2.87	2.98	2.95	3.02	2.60
Serbia	3.09	3.55	2.75	2.82	2.62	2.97	2.23
Old Decade	2.99	3.05	2.71	2.95	2.78	2.89	2.52
Bulgaria	2.87	3.00	2.50	2.60	3.00	2.79	3.26
EU members	2.79	2.88	2.63	2.80	2.84	2.79	2.59
Czech Republic	2.92	2.33	3.12	3.40	2.00	2.75	2.79
New EU members	2.75	2.72	2.55	2.77	2.68	2.70	2.55
Slovakia	2.80	2.41	2.47	2.73	2.75	2.63	2.35
Hungary	2.08	2.50	2.20	2.05	2.53	2.27	2.00

The index regarding the current level of discrimination shows the relative positive assessment for Bulgaria (3.26). On the other hand, both the current level of discrimination (2.0), and development over the last five years (2.27) seems to be worst in Hungary.

The tables confirm again the differences between the new EU member states (2.72) and the non-EU members (3.63), in particular in the field of education.

Education Indices

Education Impact

The Education impact indices are based on answers to questions about the assessment of the impact of the programs in seven education policy fields.

Table 11: Education impact index I⁴⁵

Country	Preschool	Primary and secondary	Tertiary	Desegregation	Language, culture	Employment	Adult education	Average
Romania	3.25	3.67	3.83	3.71	3.75	3.58	2.79	3.51
Serbia	3.40	3.80	3.65	3.00	3.20	3.45	3.45	3.42
BiH	3.92	3.97	3.36	2.45	3.15	3.23	3.25	3.33
Non-EU members	3.54	3.90	3.28	2.35	2.88	2.67	2.95	3.08
Hungary	2.95	3.60	3.40	2.45	3.25	2.85	3.00	3.07
Macedonia	4.00	4.04	3.77	1.57	2.68	2.57	2.36	3.00
New Decade	3.44	3.69	2.69	2.35	3.02	2.39	2.96	2.93
Average	3.35	3.56	3.00	2.39	2.65	2.54	2.95	2.92
Old Decade	3.32	3.52	3.12	2.41	2.51	2.59	2.95	2.92
Montenegro	3.12	3.83	3.29	1.83	2.21	2.17	3.37	2.83
Albania	3.24	3.86	2.33	2.90	3.14	1.95	2.33	2.82
New EU members	3.21	3.29	2.85	2.58	2.40	2.50	2.88	2.82
EU members	3.20	3.28	2.77	2.43	2.46	2.42	2.95	2.79
Czech Republic	3.23	3.53	3.40	3.22	—	2.83	2.85	2.72
Spain	3.15	3.23	2.38	1.71	2.77	2.00	3.31	2.65
Bulgaria	3.70	3.00	2.20	1.50	2.40	1.50	3.30	2.51
Slovakia	2.94	2.65	1.41	2.00	2.59	1.76	2.47	2.26

⁴⁴ Current situation only for comparison.

⁴⁵ Score: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 points (don't know).

Table 12: Education impact index II

Policy field	Rate
Primary & secondary education	3.56
Early childhood and preschool	3.35
Tertiary education	3.00
Adult education	2.95
Average	2.92
Romani language, culture, history & identity	2.65
Employment of Roma in the education sector	2.54
Desegregation	2.39

Housing Indices

Housing Impact

The Housing impact indices are based on the answers to questions assessing the impact of programs in five housing policy fields.

Table 13: Housing impact index I⁴⁶

Country	Quality social housing	Formalization of informal settlements	Prevention of homelessness	Communal services	Improvement of current housing	Average
BiH	3.08	3.35	3.04	3.39	3.85	3.34
Czech Republic	2.44	2.67	3.12	2.89	3.80	2.98
New Decade	2.79	2.76	2.74	3.25	3.27	2.96
Non EU members	2.99	2.79	2.36	3.02	2.99	2.83
Albania	2.45	3.00	2.50	3.50	2.65	2.82
Macedonia	3.19	2.62	2.57	2.71	2.81	2.78
Spain	2.85	1.92	2.69	2.85	3.31	2.72
Serbia	2.93	2.81	2.37	2.81	2.62	2.71
Average	2.59	2.45	2.06	2.91	2.71	2.54
Montenegro	3.28	2.19	1.33	2.71	3.00	2.50
Romania	2.33	2.76	1.81	3.09	2.19	2.44
Old Decade	2.52	2.33	1.80	2.78	2.50	2.39
EU members	2.27	2.16	1.81	2.81	2.48	2.30
New EU members	2.15	2.20	1.63	2.80	2.31	2.22
Hungary	1.40	2.95	1.80	2.25	2.20	2.12
Slovakia	2.29	1.06	1.00	2.65	2.35	1.87
Bulgaria	2.28	1.57	0.43	3.14	1.00	1.68

Table 14: Housing impact index II

Policy field	Rate
Communal services	2.91
Improvement of current housing	2.71
Quality social housing	2.59
Average	2.54
Formalization of informal settlements	2.45
Prevention of homelessness	2.06

⁴⁶ Score: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 points (don't know).

Employment Indices

Employment Impact

The Employment impact indices are based on answers to questions assessing the impact of programs in four employment policy fields.

Table 15: Employment impact index I⁴⁷

Country	Training and retraining	Job placement	Self-employment	Equal treatment	Average
Serbia	3.88	2.47	3.53	3.23	3.28
Macedonia	3.83	3.55	3.22	2.47	3.27
Albania	3.50	3.05	3.40	2.85	3.20
BiH	3.29	2.82	3.42	3.07	3.15
Non EU members	3.65	2.90	3.25	2.80	3.15
New Decade	3.29	3.04	3.25	2.75	3.08
Romania	3.52	3.00	2.57	3.14	3.06
Czech Republic	3.20	3.20	3.00	2.53	2.98
Spain	3.07	3.25	2.92	2.33	2.89
Old Decade	3.24	2.90	2.68	2.45	2.89
Average	3.25	2.93	2.83	2.53	2.89
Montenegro	3.76	2.62	2.67	2.38	2.86
EU members	2.92	2.96	2.48	2.31	2.67
Bulgaria	2.75	3.50	2.50	1.75	2.63
New EU members	2.88	2.90	2.40	2.31	2.62
Hungary	2.95	3.00	1.91	2.41	2.57
Slovakia	2.00	1.82	2.00	1.70	1.88

Table 16: Employment impact index II

Policy field	Rate
Training & retraining	3.25
Job placement	2.93
Average	2.89
Self-employment	2.83
Equal treatment	2.53

⁴⁷ Score: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 points (don't know).

Health Indices

Health Impact

The health impact indices are based on answers to questions assessing the impact of programs in eight health policy fields.

Table 17: Health impact index I⁴⁸

Country	Access to primary health care	Women's health	Child's health	Promotion of employment in health sector	Promotion of healthy lifestyles	Access to health insurance	Access to medicine	Access to specialized treatment	Average
Macedonia	3.37	3.89	3.63	2.79	3.58	4.16	3.17	2.72	3.41
Romania	3.25	3.90	3.00	3.80	3.20	3.05	3.00	2.55	3.22
Spain	3.83	3.67	3.64	1.33	3.33	3.64	3.18	2.64	3.16
BiH	3.42	3.23	3.50	2.45	3.13	3.14	3.04	2.90	3.10
Serbia	3.50	3.69	3.75	2.56	3.06	3.06	2.62	2.37	3.08
Hungary	3.20	3.25	3.46	2.89	3.21	2.90	2.92	2.37	3.03
Non EU	3.23	3.42	3.48	2.24	3.07	3.26	2.90	2.52	3.01
New Decade	3.34	3.34	3.50	2.04	3.05	3.18	3.03	2.53	3.00
Bulgaria	3.40	4.00	3.20	3.00	2.00	3.60	2.40	1.80	2.93
Average	3.08	3.30	3.15	2.27	2.82	3.14	2.71	2.30	2.85
Old Decade	2.98	3.29	3.02	2.36	2.74	3.12	2.59	2.21	2.79
Albania	2.76	3.12	3.35	2.35	2.70	2.76	2.88	2.06	2.75
Montenegro	3.12	3.19	3.19	1.06	2.87	3.19	2.81	2.43	2.73
EU	2.95	3.20	2.88	2.30	2.62	3.03	2.56	2.14	2.71
New EU	2.78	3.11	2.72	2.49	2.47	2.91	2.43	2.04	2.62
Czech Republic	2.25	2.25	1.50	1.75	2.25	2.00	2.33	2.33	2.08
Slovakia	1.78	2.14	2.46	1.00	1.71	3.00	1.50	1.14	1.84

⁴⁸ Score: 5 points (very positive); 4 points (positive); 3 points (neutral); 2 points (negative); 1 point (very negative); 0 points (don't know).

Table 18: Health impact index II

Policy field	Rate
Women's health	3.30
Child's health	3.15
Access to health insurance	3.14
Access to primary health care	3.08
Average	2.85
Promotion of healthy lifestyles	2.82
Access to medicine	2.71
Access to specialized treatment	2.30
Promotion of employment in health sector	2.27

Relevance Index

Table 19: Relevance index⁴⁹

Country	Education	Housing	Employment	Health	Average
Serbia	3.20	2.56	2.85	2.88	2.87
BiH	2.58	2.94	2.46	2.76	2.68
Montenegro	2.77	3.02	2.40	2.41	2.65
Romania	3.09	1.96	2.74	2.73	2.63
Spain	2.23	2.89	2.67	2.68	2.61
Bulgaria	2.80	2.07	2.50	3.00	2.59
Non-EU members	2.78	2.56	2.44	2.57	2.59
New Decade	2.53	2.69	2.39	2.59	2.55
Average	2.63	2.43	2.36	2.44	2.46
Old Decade	2.67	2.31	2.35	2.38	2.43
Albania	2.76	2.48	2.05	2.33	2.40
EU members	2.51	2.32	2.29	2.33	2.36
Macedonia	2.58	1.83	2.44	2.49	2.33
New EU members	2.56	2.21	2.22	2.26	2.31
Hungary	2.33	2.53	2.23	2.11	2.30
Slovakia	2.48	2.68	1.47	1.72	2.09
Czech Republic	2.11	1.84	2.17	1.75	1.96

⁴⁹ 5 points (very much); 3 points (somewhat); 1 point (not at all); 0 points (no programs, or don't know).

The relevance index is based on answers to two questions in each Decade priority area:

- to what degree programs bring about desired change; and
- to what degree programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan.

4.3 GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS

4.3.1 Participation of Roma in the Policy Process

The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Decade of Roma Inclusion highlight the importance of the participation of Roma in the policy process. One of the two objectives of the Decade ToR stipulate accelerating ‘progress toward improving the welfare of Roma by including Roma in the decision-making process’. The ToR further stipulates involving ‘Roma meaningfully in all policy making on matters concerning them’.⁵⁰

Three questions targeted the issue of participation of Roma in Roma-related policy processes: to what degree Roma organizations have a role in both creating and implementing Roma-related policies, as well as how effective consultations are with Roma.

Overall, only 20.71 per cent considered the consultations to be effective, while nearly 68 per cent considered the effectiveness (very) low, and 11.33 per cent stated that there weren’t any consultations. Not so negative were responses to Roma participation in creating and implementing policies affecting them. However, relative majorities assessed the role of Roma organizations as (very) low.

Summarizing, one could conclude that the participation of Roma in policy processes is limited, and even this limited participation is characterized by low effectiveness.

Table 20: Assessment of the participation of Roma in the policy process
(positive: very high/high; negative: very low/low) (%)

	Positive	N=	Negative	No consultations
Effectiveness of consultations	20.72	268	67.95	11.33
Role in creating policies	19.57	270	46.96	X
Role in implementing policies	18.50	265	44.02	X

⁵⁰ For the Terms of Reference of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, see the website of the Decade: [http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/Decade per cent20Documents/Roma per cent20 Decade per cent20TOR.pdf](http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/Decade%20per%20Documents/Roma%20per%20Decade%20TOR.pdf)

Effectiveness of Consultations

In **Spain**, 73.33 per cent assessed the effectiveness of the consultation process as high or very high, and 20 per cent as low.

In all other countries, a negative assessment of the consultation process was dominant. While in Albania (29.17 per cent positive) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (28.89 per cent positive) at least a quarter of the respondents gave a positive assessment, in countries such as the **Czech Republic** (4 per cent), **Slovakia** (5 per cent) or **Romania** (8 per cent), the assessment was very low. In **Bulgaria** 37.5 per cent and 20 per cent in **Slovakia** stated that there weren't any consultations.

Romania showed interesting results. The effectiveness of the consultations (8 per cent positive) was assessed as low, while the role of Roma in implementing policies received a quite positive assessment (high or very high: 29.16 per cent). Only **Spain** with 64.71 per cent performed better.

The 'Participation Index' again underlines both Spain's outstanding approach and the negative approach of Slovakia regarding the participation of Roma in the policy process. The average index rate is 7.98, with **Spain** reaching 10.32 points and **Slovakia** 5.99 points.

A comparison of the results of the **non-EU member states** with the results of the **new EU members** reveals a considerable difference in the effectiveness of the consultations (non-EU: 22.62 per cent positive; new EU: 8.30 per cent positive) and in creating Roma-related policies (non-EU: 22.24 per cent positive; new EU: 10.21 per cent positive). Since, with regard to the implementation of the policies, half of the respondents from the non-EU member states ascribed the Roma a 'medium role', the positive assessment does not show big differences. However, 60.22 per cent of the respondents from the new member states saw Roma organizations as having a limited or very limited role in implementing policies—compared to 33.09 per cent among the non-member states.

Participation of Roma in Creating and Implementing Policies

With the exception of Spain, the participation of Roma in the policy process and the effectiveness of the consultations are considered to be limited, or even very limited.

The results for **Spain** again demonstrate its advanced approach. 52.94 per cent saw a high or very high involvement of Roma in the creation of Roma-related policies, and as much as 64.71 per cent in the implementation of the policies.

In **Albania** (creation: 36.37 per cent; implementation: 16.67 per cent), **Bosnia and Herzegovina** (creation: 19.56 per cent; implementation: 26.31 per cent), **Romania** (creation: 12.5 per cent; implementation: 29.16 per cent) and **Macedonia** (creation: 25 per cent; implementation 16 per cent), the participation of Roma in the policy process does not reach the level of Spain, but still seems to be better than in the other Decade countries.

In **Slovakia** 5.26 per cent considered the involvement of Roma organizations in the creation of Roma-related policy to be high or very high, while not a single interviewee (0 per cent) considered the involvement in the implementation to be high or very high.

In particular, **the Czech Republic** (creation: 12.5 per cent; implementation: 4.17 per cent), **Hungary** (creation: 8.33 per cent; implementation: 12 per cent) and **Bulgaria** (creation: 12.5 per cent; implementation: 8.33 per cent) showed similar results.

Interesting differences reveal a comparison of the three new Decade participating countries with the 'old' Decade countries. With regard to all three issues, three times as many respondents from the new Decade countries (compared with the old Decade countries) gave a positive assessment.

- **Effectiveness of consultations:** old Decade: 12.07 per cent; new Decade: 43.79 per cent.
- **Participation of Roma in creation of policies:** old Decade: 13.30 per cent; new Decade: 36.29 per cent.
- **Participation of Roma in implementation of policies:** old Decade: 11.98 per cent; new Decade: 35.89 per cent.

4.3.2 Impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion

Overall, a slight majority (51.26 per cent) considered the impact of the Decade to be (very) positive. Comparing the assessments of the experts from non-EU member states with assessments from the EU members, the data reveal a difference in the perception between non-EU members (70.52 per cent positive) and the new EU members (28.89 per cent positive); a difference is also obvious between the new Decade states (69.82 per cent positive) and the old Decade states (44.19 per cent positive).

In Macedonia and Albania, around three-quarters of respondents see a positive or very positive impact (75 per cent and 73.91 per cent respectively), followed by Bosnia and Herzegovina (68.88 per cent), Serbia (68.18 per cent) and Montenegro and Spain (both 66.67 per cent).

At the other end of the scale are Slovakia (15.79 per cent), Bulgaria (22.72 per cent), the Czech Republic (23.43 per cent), Romania (38.98 per cent) and Hungary (43.48 per cent). In Romania and Bulgaria, a considerable share (23.81 per cent and 17.64 per cent respectively) identified a negative impact of the Decade.

Table 21: How do you assess the impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion in your country?

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative
Czech Republic	5.88	17.65	58.82	11.76	5.88
Slovakia	0.00	15.79	73.68	10.53	0.00
Hungary	0.00	43.48	47.83	4.35	4.35
Romania	0.00	38.09	38.09	23.81	0.00
Bulgaria	4.54	18.18	77.27	0.00	0.00
Spain	25.00	41.67	33.33	0.00	0.00
Albania	30.43	43.48	21.74	4.35	0.00
BiH	15.55	53.33	17.78	8.89	4.44
Macedonia	4.17	70.83	16.67	8.33	0.00
Serbia	4.54	63.64	27.27	4.54	0.00
Montenegro	20.83	45.83	25.00	4.17	4.17
EU members	5.90	29.29	54.59	8.51	1.71
New EU members	2.08	26.81	58.85	10.21	2.05
Non-EU members	15.10	55.42	21.69	6.06	1.72
New Decade	23.66	46.16	24.28	4.41	1.48
Old Decade	5.00	39.30	45.40	8.51	1.80
Average	10.09	41.17	39.64	7.39	1.71

4.3.3 Gender

‘The Decade’s priority areas shall be: employment, education, health, and housing. While focusing on these priority areas, each participating Government shall in addition take into account the other core issues of poverty, discrimination, and gender mainstreaming.’

(Decade of Roma Inclusion, Terms of Reference)

Romani women are doubly discriminated—on the one hand as Roma, and on the other hand as women. The available indicators demonstrate that illiteracy and unemployment among Roma women are even higher than among Romani men and the average health status of Romani women is precarious.

The Terms of Reference of the Decade of Roma Inclusion recognizes this situation and asks governments to take gender mainstreaming into account as a core issue of the Decade.

The Decade Watch survey, therefore, explored the consideration of gender issues in relevant government programs. For each of the priority areas, the interlocutors should assess the degree to which respective programs address gender issues.

Table 22: To what degree do programs address gender issues? (%)

	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't know	N=
Gender education programs	9.57	40.01	31.34	19.08	223
Gender housing programs	4.29	27.43	35.23	33.06	195
Gender employment programs	5.42	41.18	28.14	25.25	198
Gender health programs	9.24	45.72	20.73	24.30	173
Average	7.13	38.59	28.86	25.42	197

The results reveal that, in all sectors, programs aren't assessed positively—in particular in the priority sector 'Housing', gender was either not considered, or the respondents did not know anything about the gender sensitivity of the programs.

The results are particularly disappointing when taking into account that the Decade of Roma Inclusion is built on the commitment of participating states to considering gender mainstreaming a core issues.

Nearly 29 per cent of respondents stated that the identified programs in the four priority sectors of the Decade do not address gender issues at all. The high percentage of 'don't know' replies (one quarter of all respondents) is also striking. This reveals, on the one hand the lack of interest for gender issues among many of the consulted experts, but also underlines the assessment that 'gender sensitivity' does not play a prominent role in Roma-related programs.

The countries in the Western Balkans which are not members of the Decade seem to pay more attention to gender issues than the new EU member states: 22.37 per cent of respondents of the Western Balkans assessed that gender issues are not considered at all; but the rate is 43.72 per cent with respondents from the new EU member states.

Education and health programs in Spain and the health program in Serbia received the most positive assessments.

Only in Spain do **education** programs seem to address gender issues (42.86 per cent, very much). In the Czech Republic, 53.33 per cent, and in Romania and Bulgaria, 50 per cent each stated that the consideration of the specific situation of Romani women does not play a role at all.

In **employment** programs, gender issues did not play a major role. The highest assessment was recorded in Spain, with 18.18 per cent of experts stating that employment programs addressed gender issues very much. In Slovakia and Serbia, 47.06 per cent each stated that employment programs did not address gender issues at all.

Nor in the **housing** sector did gender issues play a major role. The highest assessments were recorded in Montenegro, with 19.05 per cent, and Spain with 15.38 per cent of experts stating that housing programs addressed gender issues very much. In the Czech Republic, 75 per cent, in Bulgaria 57.14 per cent, and in Albania 50 per cent stated that housing programs do not address gender issues at all.

In the **health** sector, gender issues gained a bit more importance. The highest assessments were recorded in Spain with 27.27 per cent, in Serbia with 18.75 per cent, and in Slovakia with 14.28 per cent of experts stating that health programs addressed gender issues very much. On the other hand, in Slovakia 50 per cent, and in Hungary and the Czech Republic 33.33 per cent stated that health programs did not address gender issues at all.

Respondents identified the relative positive impact of health programs addressing women's health (across all countries, 56.09 per cent positive and only 8.84 per cent negative).⁵¹ In particular in Romania (85 per cent), Bulgaria (80 per cent) and Macedonia (78.95 per cent), the assessments were very positive, which could be related to the existence of health mediators.

The analysis demonstrates that it is deemed necessary that more gender-sensitive programs are introduced. The countries participating in the Decade have to increase their efforts in order to realize their commitments with regard to Romani women and develop and implement programs that actually take into account gender mainstreaming, or specifically target Romani women.

Further possibilities would be to introduce specific budget lines in projects or programs for funds to be allocated to Romani women, and to provide possibilities to monitor and evaluate the impact of programs or projects on Romani women.

4.4 INTEGRATION AND DISCRIMINATION

Five years of the Decade of Roma Inclusion should have made an impact on Roma integration and discrimination in the participating countries. However, experts assessed neither the current level of and changes in integration very positively, nor the current level of and changes in discrimination.

Comparing the assessment of results from new EU member states and the Western Balkan countries which are not members of the European Union demonstrates a division between the two groups.

Interlocutors should assess both the current level of integration, and changes to the level of integration in the last five years, along with the level of discrimination and changes to the level of discrimination. In addition, interlocutors should assess the development of Roma integration and discrimination against Roma in the last five years in each of the four priority sectors (education, housing, employment, health).

⁵¹ For more details, see Section 4.5.4 on health.

4.4.1 Integration

The level of integration is, according to respondents, low across all Decade-participant countries—even for **Spain**, the average assessment is only slightly better than ‘medium’.

Despite the current low level of integration, the data demonstrate that in the last five years a process was initiated that has improved integration in the Western Balkan countries. In particular in the sector of education, Montenegro, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia have seen considerable progress with regard to integration.

The integration in education seems to have improved more than in the other sectors, particularly the countries in the Western Balkans. The lowest improvement was registered in housing and employment, while the general development in integration and in the health sector was assessed slightly better.

The least progress seems to prevail in Slovakia. With the exception of health, the country received the worst assessments regarding progress made in integration in the last five years. Particularly in employment and housing, it seems that integration has actually decreased. Hungary too, has demonstrated (according to the interlocutors) no progress regarding the integration of Roma in the last five years. Changes in integration in the employment sector in Slovakia and Hungary received the lowest assessments.

Across all countries, only 5.69 per cent assessed the **current level of integration** as high or very high, but 64 per cent saw it as low or very low. A slight majority (53.87 per cent) identified an **increase** in the general integration of Roma in their country, and 14.79 per cent a **decrease** in integration.

In the education system in particular, a strong majority of respondents identified a positive development with regard to integration (73.87 per cent). In housing, employment and health, only a relative majority of respondents identified an increase in integration.

Of particular concern for politicians and society at large should be that a majority of experts saw an improvement in integration, but only 5.69 per cent consider the current level of integration as (very) high, while 64.11 per cent consider the level of integration as (very) low.

The data confirm the division between the EU member states and the Western Balkan countries (or non EU members). While in general, respondents assessed the level of integration in the EU member states as higher than in the Western Balkan countries, Western Balkan countries seemed to have performed better than the EU member states with regard to changes in integration (with the exception of Spain, which showed the best performance in both categories, and Bulgaria).

Table 23: Overview: assessment (positive: much increased/increased; negative: much decreased/decreased) of the development of integration over the last five years (%)

Changes to integration	Positive assessment	N =	Negative Assessment
General changes to integration	53.87	279	14.79
Changes to integration in education	73.87	229	11.53
Changes to integration in housing	41.44	199	22.39
Changes to integration in employment	43.12	201	20.02
Changes to integration in health	45.01	173	13.29
Average	51.46	216	16.40
Assessment of current situation of integration	5.69	283	64.11

Current Level of Integration

Table 24: Please grade the overall level of Roma integration in your country (%)

Country	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Czech Republic	4.00	—	48.00	40.00	8.00
Slovakia	—	—	33.33	42.86	23.81
Hungary	—	8.00	32.00	40.00	20.00
Romania	—	4.00	36.00	56.00	4.00
Bulgaria	—	—	45.83	45.83	8.33
Spain	5.56	38.89	27.78	22.22	5.56
Albania	—	—	20.00	52.00	28.00
BiH	—	2.08	27.08	45.83	25.00
Macedonia	—	—	24.00	44.00	32.00
Serbia	—	—	18.18	45.45	36.36
Montenegro	—	—	20.00	56.00	24.00
EU members	1.59	8.48	37.16	41.15	11.62
New EU members	0.80	2.40	39.03	44.94	12.83
Non-EU members		0.42	21.85	48.66	29.07
New Decade	1.85	13.66	24.95	40.02	19.52
Old Decade	0.50	1.50	32.17	46.27	19.56
Average	0.87	4.82	30.20	44.56	19.55

Spain is the only country with a relatively high level of overall integration (44.45 per cent high or very high), followed by Hungary with 8 per cent, the Czech Republic and Romania (4 per cent), and Bosnia and Herzegovina (2.08 per cent). In Albania,

Bulgaria, Macedonia, Montenegro, Slovakia and Serbia, none of the respondents considered the level of integration as high.

Serbia (81.81 per cent), Albania (80 per cent) and Montenegro (80 per cent) display the lowest levels of integration, with 36.36 per cent in Serbia and 32 per cent in Macedonia (76 per cent total) saying that the level of integration is very low.

Spain (27.78 per cent) and the Czech Republic (48 per cent) were the only two countries in which less than half of the respondents identified a low or very low level of integration.

The data also reveal a difference between the member states of the European Union and the countries undergoing the accession process. While 77.73 per cent of respondents from the **non-EU** member states assessed integration as low or very low, so did 52.77 per cent of respondents from the member states. However, looking only at the five **new member states** (without Spain) the percentage increases to 57.77 per cent.

Changes to Integration

Table 25: Over the past five years, this level of integration has ... (%)

Country	Increased a lot	Increased	Remained constant	Decreased	Decreased a lot
Czech Republic	0.00	36.00	44.00	12.00	8.00
Slovakia	0.00	9.52	42.86	28.57	19.05
Hungary	0.00	25.00	37.50	16.67	16.67
Romania	0.00	44.00	32.00	20.00	4.00
Bulgaria	0.00	41.67	41.67	16.67	0.00
Spain	16.67	66.67	16.67	0.00	0.00
Albania	4.00	64.00	24.00	8.00	0.00
BiH	0.00	69.56	26.09	4.35	0.00
Macedonia	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
Serbia	4.54	63.64	27.27	4.54	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	64.00	36.00	0.00	0.00
EU members	2.78	37.14	35.78	15.65	7.95
New EU members	0.00	31.24	39.61	18.78	9.54
Non-EU members	1.71	68.91	26.01	3.38	0.00
New Decade	6.89	66.74	22.25	4.12	0.00
Old Decade	0.57	45.90	34.75	12.31	5.97
Average	2.29	51.58	31.34	10.07	4.34

In general, a slight majority of respondents (53.87 per cent) saw an increase and 14.41 per cent saw a decrease in integration over the last five years. In the **non-EU** member states, 70.62 per cent saw an increase in integration, and only 3.38 per cent a decrease. In the **new EU** member states, only 31.24 per cent saw an increase, but 28.32 per cent saw a decrease in integration.

Looking at the developments over the last five years, the results for Slovakia and Hungary are particularly striking: 47.62 per cent in **Slovakia** (19.05 per cent very much) and 37.50 per cent in **Hungary** (16.67 per cent very much) saw a decrease in the overall integration of Roma. Other countries also saw a considerable deterioration: **Bulgaria** (16.67 per cent), the **Czech Republic** (20 per cent) and **Romania** (32 per cent).

In **Macedonia**, **Montenegro** and **Spain**, none of the respondents saw an overall decrease in integration.

The respondents from the non-EU member states and Spain identified considerable progress over the last five years. In Spain and Macedonia, 83.33 per cent each stated that integration had increased; in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 69.56 per cent; Serbia, 68.18 per cent; Albania, 68 per cent; and Montenegro, 64 per cent.

In the Western Balkan countries, where experts assessed the current level of integration to be very low (Serbia, 81.81 per cent; Albania, 80 per cent; Montenegro, 80 per cent; Macedonia, 76 per cent; and Bosnia and Herzegovina, 70.83 per cent), they identified positive developments over the last five years—which means that five years ago, the integration of Roma was even worse.

In Western Balkan countries in particular, the assessment of the development of integration in the **education** sector is impressive. In Macedonia, 100 per cent of respondents reported that integration in education had increased (very much); in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 96.87 per cent; and in Montenegro, 95.83 per cent. On the other hand, only 29.41 per cent of the experts from Slovakia identified an increase.

Regarding integration in education, 47.06 per cent of the Slovak experts and 40 per cent of the Hungarian experts assessed that it had decreased (very much). The fact that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, not a single expert (and in most other countries, only individuals) gave such an assessment, underlines that integration in education in Hungary and Slovakia can not be considered successful.

The differences between the new EU member states and the Western Balkan countries also prevails in this issue: 59.40 per cent of respondents from the new EU member states, compared with 88.83 per cent of respondents from the Western Balkans, identified an increase in integration in education.

In the sector of **employment**, again the results from Slovakia and Hungary are particularly striking. In Hungary, not a single respondent, along with 6.25 per cent in Slovakia, identified any increase in integration in employment; however, a majority identified a decrease (Slovakia, 56.25 per cent; Hungary, 55 per cent).

The most positive assessment prevails in Macedonia and Spain, with 61.11 per cent and 58.33 per cent respectively identifying an increase in integration.

In the countries that are not members of the EU, 53.10 per cent identified an increase of integration in the employment sector, while in the new EU member states, only 30.11 per cent were of this opinion.

In **housing**, considerable improvements were identified in Bosnia and Herzegovina (77.77 per cent), Spain (75 per cent) and Montenegro (71.42 per cent); while in Slovakia only 12.5 per cent, in Macedonia only 14.28 per cent, and in Hungary only 15 per cent identified an improvement.

In Romania (57.14 per cent) and Slovakia (56.25 per cent), a majority actually identified a decrease in integration in housing.

In the countries that are not members of the EU, 48.44 per cent identified an increase of integration in the housing sector, while in the new EU member states, only 27.72 per cent were of this opinion.

In **health**, considerable improvements were identified in Spain (83.33 per cent), Serbia (81.25 per cent), Bosnia and Herzegovina (70.27 per cent) and Romania (70 per cent); while in the Czech Republic, not a single respondent and in Hungary only 6.67 per cent identified an improvement.

In Romania (57.14 per cent) and Slovakia (56.25 per cent), a majority actually identified a decrease of integration in housing.

In the countries that are not members of the EU, 57.41 per cent identified an increase of integration in the health sector, while in the new EU member states, only 23.95 per cent were of this opinion.

4.4.2 Discrimination

The data on the current state of discrimination and changes to discrimination in the last five years reveal a 'mixed perception'.

With regard to changes to discrimination, the education sector showed the most positive development (45.37 per cent positive), while with regard to general changes to discrimination (36.26 per cent positive and 24.47 per cent negative) and the other priority sectors, a more indifferent assessment prevails. The difference between the percentages of respondents giving a positive assessment and respondents giving a negative assessment was relatively small.

The data reveal differences in the assessment between countries in the Western Balkans and the (new) EU member states; the former sees a far stronger decrease in discrimination than the latter.

Of particular concern should be the situation in Hungary. Both the current level of discrimination and changes to discrimination over the last five years are assessed very negatively. The killings of Roma in recent years and the public discourse on 'Gypsy crime' in Hungary might have contributed to these results.

Table 26: Overview: assessment (positive: much decreased/decreased; negative: much increased/increased) of the development of discrimination over the last five years (%)

Change of discrimination	Positive assessment	N =	Negative assessment
General changes to discrimination	36.26	279	24.47
Changes to discrimination in education	45.37	228	23.04
Changes to discrimination in housing	30.09	201	27.67
Changes to discrimination in employment	32.29	199	28.70
Changes to discrimination in health	32.42	172	21.27
Average	35.29	216	25.03
Assessment of current situation of discrimination	14.90	274	45.89

Current Level of Discrimination

Table 27: Please grade the level of discrimination against Roma in your country

Country	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
Czech Republic	8.70	12.13	33.33	41.66	4.17
Slovakia	0.00	10.00	25.00	55.00	10.00
Hungary	0.00	4.00	24.00	40.00	32.00
Romania	0.00	4.00	36.00	52.00	8.00
Bulgaria	4.35	26.08	60.87	8.70	0.00
Spain	5.56	22.22	22.22	44.44	5.55
Albania	0.00	16.00	56.00	24.00	4.00
BiH	4.35	17.39	36.96	32.61	8.69
Macedonia	0.00	16.00	36.00	40.00	8.00
Serbia	0.00	9.09	40.91	13.63	36.36
Montenegro	0.00	4.00	60.00	24.00	8.00
EU member states	3.10	13.07	33.57	40.30	9.95
New EU members	2.61	11.24	35.84	39.47	10.83
Non-EU members	0.87	12.50	45.97	26.85	13.01
New Decade	3.30	18.54	38.39	33.68	6.08
Old Decade	1.63	10.66	39.51	34.37	13.32
Average	2.09	12.81	39.21	34.19	11.34

Across all countries, a relative majority graded the level of discrimination as high or very high (45.53 per cent) while only 14.90 per cent graded it as low or very low.

In **Bulgaria**, only 8.70 per cent of respondents perceived the level of discrimination to be high; an outstanding result, considering that **Albania** attained the second-best result with 28 per cent (high and very high).

Discrimination was considered to be high or very high by 72 per cent in **Hungary** (as much as 32 per cent declared it to be very high) and 65 per cent in **Slovakia**; in **Serbia**, 50 per cent considered discrimination to be high or very high (36.36 per cent as very high).

On the other hand, 30.43 per cent in Bulgaria and 27.78 per cent in **Spain** considered discrimination to be low or very low, with only 4 per cent doing so in Hungary, **Montenegro** and **Romania**.

Changes to Discrimination

Table 28: Over the past five years, this level of discrimination against the Roma has...

Country	Decreased very much	Decreased	Remained constant	Increased	Increased very much
Czech Republic	0.00	12.00	68.00	20.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	10.00
Hungary	0.00	8.00	16.00	52.00	24.00
Romania	8.33	33.33	41.67	16.67	8.33
Bulgaria	0.00	16.67	54.17	29.17	0.00
Spain	0.00	22.22	61.11	11.11	5.56
Albania	8.00	44.00	32.00	16.00	0.00
BiH	8.69	63.04	21.74	6.52	0.00
Macedonia	0.00	44.00	48.00	8.00	0.00
Serbia	0.00	40.91	27.27	31.82	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	68.00	32.00	0.00	0.00
EU member states	1.39	20.37	45.16	26.49	7.98
New EU members	1.67	20.00	41.97	29.57	8.47
Non-EU members	3.34	51.99	32.20	12.47	—
New Decade	5.56	43.09	38.28	11.21	1.85
Old Decade	1.04	31.61	39.64	23.46	5.29
Average	2.27	34.74	39.27	20.12	4.35

With regard to changes to discrimination, the respondents could not provide an unequivocal assessment overall; 39 per cent identified no change over the last five years, while 37 per cent saw a decrease and 24 per cent saw an increase in discrimination.

A comparison of the results between the **non-EU** member states and the five **new EU** member states reveals considerable differences. In the non-EU member states, 55 per cent saw a decrease in discrimination and 12.47 per cent an increase; in the new EU member states, only 21.67 per cent saw a decrease, but 38 per cent an increase in discrimination.

In **Hungary**, 76 per cent of respondents identified an increase in discrimination in the last five years (24 per cent very much) and in **Slovakia** 40 per cent (10 per cent very much); not a single respondent in **Montenegro**, only 6.52 per cent in **Bosnia and Herzegovina**, and only 8 per cent of the respondents in Macedonia saw an increase in discrimination.

On the other hand, 71.73 per cent of the experts from **Bosnia and Herzegovina** and 68 per cent of the **Montenegrin experts** saw a decrease in discrimination.

Despite the relatively positive assessment of integration in **Spain**, 50 per cent still identified discrimination and 22.22 per cent saw a decrease in discrimination.

With regard to discrimination in **education**, considerable improvements were identified in Montenegro (83.33 per cent) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (81.99 per cent); while in the Czech Republic (5.55 per cent) and Slovakia (5.88 per cent) only a few respondents identified a decrease in discrimination in education.

In the Czech Republic (77.78 per cent) and Slovakia (58.82 per cent) a majority actually identified an increase in the level of discrimination in education.

In the countries which are not members of the EU, 65.62 per cent identified a decrease in discrimination, while in the new EU member states, only 22.42 per cent were of this opinion.

With regard to **employment**, only in Montenegro (66.66 per cent) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (54.05 per cent) did a majority identify a decrease in discrimination; while in Bulgaria not a single respondent identified a decrease in the level of discrimination in employment, and only 5 per cent did so in Hungary.

In Hungary, an overwhelming majority of 80 per cent identified an increase in discrimination; a relative majority did so in Spain (45.45 per cent), Slovakia and Bulgaria (40 per cent each).

In non-members of the EU, 41.82 per cent identified a decrease in discrimination, while in the new EU member states, only 21.95 per cent were of this opinion.

With regard to **housing**, only in Bosnia and Herzegovina (75.67 per cent) and Montenegro (67.14 per cent) did a majority identify a decrease in discrimination; in Hungary and Bulgaria, not a single respondent identified a decrease in the level of discrimination in housing.

In Hungary, a majority of 70 per cent identified an increase in discrimination; in both the Czech Republic and Bulgaria, 50 per cent did so.

In the countries that are not members of the EU, 45.07 per cent identified a decrease in discrimination while in the new EU members states, only 13.98 per cent were of this opinion.

With regard to **health**, 72.97 per cent of respondents from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and 68.75 per cent of Montenegrin respondents identified a decrease in the level of discrimination. In Hungary, a majority of 53.34 per cent and 50 per cent in Serbia identified an increase of discrimination in the health sector.

In the non-EU countries, 42.43 per cent identified a decrease in the level of discrimination, while in the new EU member states, only 18 per cent were of this opinion.

4.4.3 Comparison of Integration and Discrimination

Across all countries, only 5.69 per cent assessed the **current level of integration** as high or very high, and 64 per cent saw it as low or very low. Meanwhile, 14.90 per cent assessed the **current level of discrimination** as being (very) low, and 45.89 per cent as (very) high.

The current level of both integration and discrimination demonstrates considerable differences. The level of discrimination was rated better than the level of integration; this could be interpreted that the experts do not limit the reasons for a lack of integration to discrimination, but see other contributing factors. Further research could identify these additional issues contributing to lack of integration.

In general, the **development over the last five years** with regard to the integration of Roma was assessed more positively than the progress made with regard to discrimination.

In the education system in particular, a clear majority of respondents identified a positive development with regard to integration (73.87 per cent), but less with regard to discrimination (45.37 per cent).

Across all countries, a slight majority (53.87 per cent) identified an increase in the general integration of Roma in their country, and 14.79 per cent saw a decrease. On the other hand, the general level of discrimination decreased according to only 36.26 per cent, while 24.47 per cent saw an increase.

In housing, employment and health, only a relative majority of respondents identified an increase of the integration.

Regarding changes to discrimination in housing and employment, the experts could not provide an unequivocal assessment; those declaring a positive assessment were only slightly more than those declaring a negative one.

In housing, 30.09 per cent gave a positive assessment and 27.67 per cent a negative one; in employment, 32.29 per cent gave a positive and 28.70 per cent a negative assessment.

Of particular concern for politicians and society at large should be that the majority of experts saw some improvement in integration, but only 5.69 per cent consider the current level of integration as (very) high; 64.11 consider it to be (very) low.

The relatively positive results regarding discrimination in Bulgaria correspond with the results of a survey by FRA, which found a low perception of discrimination.

The FRA report stated that these results could be rooted in the fact that Roma in Bulgaria, as ‘reflected in the survey results, are more isolated from mainstream society, and effectively operate in a “parallel society” with infrequent contacts with the outside world’.⁵²

An analysis of the results of the Decade Watch survey on discrimination and integration supports the FRA assessment.

In Albania, only 28 per cent state that a high level of discrimination prevails in the country (16 per cent say that discrimination is low); but 80 per cent say that the level of integration is low and 28 per cent very low.

In Montenegro, 36 per cent report that the level of discrimination is high or very high; 68 per cent say that the level of discrimination has decreased over the last five years. This comparatively positive result has to be seen in light of the assessment of the integration level: 80 per cent say that the level of integration is low and 24 per cent very low; however, 64 per cent identified an increase in integration in the last five years, meaning that five years ago, the level of integration was even worse.

In Bulgaria, despite positive results regarding discrimination, more than half of respondents (54.16 per cent) say that the level of integration is low or very low, and none of the respondents stated that the level of integration is high or very high.

In Spain, 44.45 per cent consider integration to be high or very high, but 50 per cent still state that discrimination against Roma is high or very high in the country.

These country results support the FRA assessment that in some countries, the low level of discrimination could be due to the low level of interaction between Roma and non-Roma (i.e. their low level of integration).

4.5 DECADE PRIORITY SECTORS

The core part of the survey sought to identify the impact of government programs in different fields of the four priority sectors: education, housing, employment and health. For each of the sectors, the most crucial policy fields were identified, and the respondents were asked to prioritize and to assess the impact of these policy fields.

Further questions referred to the changes to integration and discrimination over the last five years (see chapters on integration and discrimination), to gender sensitivity (see section 4.3.3), to the relevance of the programs (whether they brought the desired change and helped achieve the objectives of the action plans) and monitoring structures.

⁵² See Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), EU-MIDIS (European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey), *Data in Focus Report—The Roma*, Vienna 2009.

Impact of Programs in the four Decade Priority Areas

In general, programs in the priority sectors of education (primary and secondary education; early childhood and preschool; tertiary education) and health (access to health care; women's health; children's health) received a better assessment than programs in the priority sectors of employment and housing. Of the programs in the latter two sectors, only training and retraining in employment was assessed positively by more than 50 per cent of the respondents.

Table 29: Overview: positive assessment (very positive/positive) and negative assessment (very negative/negative) of the programs in the four priority sectors (%)

Program	Priority sector	Positive assessment	N =	Negative assessment
Primary and secondary education	Education	66.33	229	8.50
Early childhood and preschool	Education	64.20	228	7.26
Access to health insurance	Health	56.71	165	11.86
Women's health	Health	56.09	171	8.84
Training and re-training	Employment	55.13	205	14.39
Child's health	Health	52.73	170	6.98
Tertiary education	Education	51.29	229	10.76
Primary health care	Health	47.59	169	10.83
Communal services and infrastructure	Housing	46.46	200	22.68
Adult education	Education	46.18	229	13.68
Job placement	Employment	44.10	204	19.48
Average		44.03	197	13.74
Access to medicine	Health	42.96	165	9.45
Improving state of current housing	Housing	42.46	202	12.26
Promotion of healthy lifestyles	Health	39.72	172	13.91
Romani language, culture and history	Education	39.08	209	11.08
Self-employment and entrepreneurship	Employment	37.23	203	14.52
Equal treatment	Employment	36.62	203	15.29
Employment of Roma in the education sector	Education	35.53	225	15.85
Quality social housing	Housing	35.49	201	21.79
Employment in the health sector	Health	34.68	168	16.14
Access to specialized treatment	Health	33.28	163	10.05
Formalization of informal settlements	Housing	32.55	197	25.60
Desegregation	Education	32.46	227	13.48
Prevention of homelessness	Housing	27.93	199	15.43

Interestingly, the programs in three housing policy fields (formalization of informal settlements; communal services and infrastructure; quality social housing) received the worst assessments by the respondents, whereby at the same time, a share of the respondents assessed the programs which addressed communal services and infrastructure as positive.

Table 29 also demonstrates that relatively few respondents felt confident enough to answer the questions on the health priority sector, while for the education sector, most people felt competent to do so.

In this context, it should be pointed out that in some countries (primarily Bulgaria and the Czech Republic) only a few people felt competent enough to answer questions on the impact of the programs.

4.5.1 Education

4.5.1.1 Priorities in Education

Experts were asked to prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of education:

- early childhood and preschool;
- primary and secondary education;
- tertiary education;
- desegregation;
- promotion of the Romani language, culture, history and identity;
- promotion of employment of Roma in the education sector;
- adult education.

Early childhood and preschool, as well as primary and secondary school education, are considered across all countries as by far the most important policy fields of education—the least importance is assigned to programs addressing adult education and the Romani language, culture, history and identity.

The data also demonstrate differences in the assessments between countries which might reflect the different situations of the Roma in these countries. The experts from countries such as Albania (5.32) and Hungary (5.16) assign a high priority to desegregation (an average of 4.23), while for the experts from Spain (3.20) or Macedonia (3.36), the issue of desegregation is less important.

While the Albanian (5.0) and Romanian experts (4.44) assign a relatively high priority to adult education (average 3.26), their Bulgarian (2.0) and Hungarian colleagues (2.12) assign less importance to adult education.

4.5.1.2 Impact of Education Programs

General

The two policy fields in education considered by the experts to be the most important—preschool and primary and secondary education—were also assessed to have the most positive impact. Nearly two-thirds assessed the impact of the programs addressing primary and secondary education and early childhood and preschool education as (very) positive; among the experts from the non-EU member states as much as 32 per cent assessed them as very positive.

The impact of the two programs with the lowest priority—adult education and Romani language, culture, history and identity—received mixed assessments whereby the experts from the Western Balkans gave more positive assessments than those from the (new) EU member states (see Table 30).

Programs addressing desegregation received the lowest assessment. Only 32.46 per cent assessed the impact of such programs as (very) positive; with an additional 20.21 per cent stating that these do not exist.

Table 30: Assessment of policy fields

Policy field	Positive assessment	N =	Negative assessment
Primary and secondary education	66.33	229	8.50
Early childhood and preschool	64.20	228	7.26
Tertiary education	51.29	229	10.76
Average	47.87	225	11.51
Adult education	46.18	229	13.68
Romani language, culture and history	39.08	209	11.08
Employment of Roma in the education sector	35.53	225	15.85
Desegregation	32.46	227	13.48

Comparison between New and Non-EU Member States

The following table reveals considerable differences in the assessments for the new EU member states (Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, and Spain) on the one hand, and the non-EU states from the Western Balkans (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Serbia, and Montenegro) on the other.

In general, the countries that are not EU member states assess the impact of the respective programs more positively than their EU counterparts, the new member states in particular.

84.26 per cent of the respondents from the Western Balkan countries assessed the impact of the programs in the **primary and secondary education** as (very) positive, but only 52.45 of the experts did so from the new EU member states.

The assessments of the impact of the other programs do not show such big differences, but still demonstrate that the impact of the different education programs is assessed more positively in the countries of the Western Balkans.

- **Preschool education.** Western Balkan countries: 70.44 per cent gave a positive assessment; new EU member states: 58.49 per cent.
- **Tertiary education.** Western Balkan countries: 62.37 per cent; new EU member states: 45.85.
- **Desegregation:** Western Balkan countries: 36.16 per cent; new EU member states: 30.96 per cent.
- **Culture, language, history:** Western Balkan countries: 47.95 per cent; new EU member states: 32.69 per cent.
- **Employment in education:** Western Balkan countries: 42.40 per cent; new EU member states: 31.88 per cent.
- **Adult education:** Western Balkan countries: 52.79 per cent; new EU member states: 36.51 per cent.

In general, one can conclude that the policies/activities in the fields of primary and secondary education, as well as in early childhood and preschool, were successful. The following tables on the results of the individual countries reveal that considerable differences exist between them.

In some countries, some policy fields received a very positive assessment. For example, in Macedonia 95.45 per cent assessed the impact of the programs addressing primary and secondary education as positive (average: 66.33 per cent), and 90.90 per cent saw the impact of programs addressing early childhood and preschool as positive (overall: 64.20 per cent).

On the other hand, the assessment of the impact of policies was relatively low in other countries, in particular in Slovakia. Only 5.88 per cent assessed tertiary education and adult education as (very) positive (average: 51.29 per cent). Programs addressing primary and secondary education in Slovakia were assessed positively by only 23.53 per cent (average: 66.33 per cent).

In Albania and Hungary, where experts assigned a high priority to desegregation (see above), the impact of programs addressing desegregation was considered as (very) positive by 52.38 per cent (Albania) and 30 per cent (Hungary). Not a single respondent from Albania considered the impact of these programs as (very) negative, but 30 per cent did so from Hungary.

Further research could identify which detailed activities were considered to be particularly successful or unsuccessful, which lessons could be learnt from policies of individual countries, and whether best practices could be transferred from one country to another.

Table 31: Comparison between EU member states and non-EU member states

Policy field	Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No programs	Don't know
Preschool	EU members	12.79	46.21	17.94	4.37	3.49	11.28	3.93
	New EU members	15.35	43.14	16.92	5.24	4.19	11.99	3.18
	Non-EU members	32.13	38.31	9.93	2.89	3.67	7.34	5.72
	Average	21.58	42.62	14.30	3.69	3.57	9.49	4.74
Primary and secondary	EU members	5.36	46.04	31.17	9.16	3.64	3.34	1.28
	New EU members	4.89	47.56	29.72	9.46	4.36	4.01	—
	Non-EU members	23.63	60.63	7.72	2.51	0.83	1.79	2.89
	Average	13.66	52.67	20.51	6.14	2.36	2.63	2.01
Tertiary	EU members	8.13	33.92	26.58	7.79	5.51	13.85	4.22
	New EU members	6.68	39.17	24.21	9.35	3.53	13.54	3.53
	Non-EU members	17.17	45.20	15.34	6.36	1.36	7.48	7.08
	Average	12.24	39.05	21.47	7.14	3.62	10.95	5.52
Desegregation	EU members	6.00	23.37	26.71	11.40	6.35	19.66	6.50
	New EU members	5.78	25.18	29.20	10.83	6.19	17.88	4.94
	Non-EU members	10.33	25.83	21.78	7.00	1.36	20.87	12.83
	Average	7.97	24.49	24.47	9.40	4.08	20.21	9.38
Culture, language, history	EU members	3.65	28.05	27.12	12.20	3.10	8.24	0.98
	New EU members	2.84	29.04	26.39	10.02	2.18	8.35	1.18
	Non-EU members	13.66	34.29	24.75	3.72	2.31	14.37	6.89
	Average	8.20	30.88	26.04	8.34	2.74	11.03	3.67
Employment	EU members	6.75	23.06	27.25	12.33	7.26	21.83	1.53
	New EU members	6.56	26.13	28.08	11.72	5.64	20.04	1.83
	Non-EU members	13.58	28.82	21.39	8.51	2.87	19.22	5.60
	Average	9.85	25.68	24.59	10.59	5.26	20.64	3.38
Adult education	EU members	9.79	30.90	27.32	14.70	3.63	8.23	5.45
	New EU members	8.67	27.84	31.25	13.02	4.35	8.33	6.54
	Non-EU members	15.63	37.16	19.00	4.31	3.79	12.37	7.73
	Average	12.44	33.74	23.54	9.98	3.70	10.11	6.49

Policy Fields

► **Early childhood and preschool**

The respondents identified 'early childhood and preschool' as the priority policy field in education. This assessment of the respondents seems to correlate with the quality of the programs addressing this issue. With the exception of Slovakia (47.06 per cent), in all countries a majority sees the programs as (very) positive (e.g. Macedonia, 90.90 per cent; Bosnia and Herzegovina, 76.31 per cent).

Relative negative assessments prevail in the Czech Republic, where 31.58 per cent stated that such programs do not exist (and 5.26 per cent see the programs' impact as negative). In Montenegro, 12.50 per cent saw the programs (very) negatively and 16.67 per cent stated there was no such program. In Slovakia, 23.52 per cent saw the programs (very) negatively, and 5.88 per cent stated there was no such program.

► **Primary and secondary education**

Primary and secondary education was identified by the respondents as the second-most important education policy field.

Particularly in the Western Balkan countries, respondents expressed support for the current programs. In Macedonia 95.45 per cent assessed the impact of the programs in primary and secondary education as (very) positive. In Albania, this was 90.48 per cent; in Montenegro, 83.33 per cent; Bosnia and Herzegovina, 82.05 per cent; and in Serbia, 70.00 per cent.

Whereas in Romania and Hungary around 70 per cent assessed the programs as positive, support in Slovakia (23.53 per cent) was seen to be very low. In Bulgaria (40 per cent) and Spain (46.18 per cent), less than half of the respondents supported the programs. In Slovakia, 29.41 per cent actually consider the impact of the programs to be (very) negative.

► **Tertiary education**

The most positive assessment of the impact of the programs in tertiary education came from the respondents from Romania (83.33 per cent); respondents in Macedonia (72.73 per cent), Serbia (70 per cent) and Hungary (65 per cent) also gave positive assessments. On the other hand, only 5.88 per cent of the respondents from Slovakia and 23.07 per cent of those from Spain assessed the programs as (very) positive.

29.41 per cent of the Slovak respondents identified a negative impact, with an additional 23.58 per cent stating that there hasn't been any such program (and 17.65 per cent stating that they didn't know). In Albania, 23.81 per cent stated that there isn't any such program and 14.28 per cent said they weren't aware of any.

► **Desegregation**

The programs addressing desegregation received the second-lowest appreciation (32.46 per cent very positive) among all 24 identified programs of the four Decade priority areas.

Only in Romania (54.16 per cent) and Albania (52.38 per cent) did a slight majority assess the relevant programs as (very) positive. In Serbia (50 per cent) and in Bosnia and Herzegovina (42.10 per cent) did respondents give a positive assessment.

In Slovakia and Montenegro in particular, a negative assessment prevailed of the impact of the programs. In Slovakia, 11.76 per cent were positive and 41.17 per cent were (very) negative; in Montenegro, 12.50 per cent were (very) positive and 29.17 per cent were (very) negative). In addition, in both countries considerable proportions of respondents (Slovakia: 29.41 per cent; Montenegro: 16.67 per cent) believed that such programs do not exist; in Bulgaria this rate was as much as 60 per cent and in Macedonia, 33.33 per cent.

► **Romani language, culture and history**

In Romania in particular (75 per cent), and to a limited extent in Albania (52.37 per cent) and Serbia (50 per cent), the relevant programs were assessed very positively, while in Hungary (35 per cent) and Spain (30.77 per cent), one third of respondents assessed the programs as (very) negative.

► **Employment of Roma in the education sector**

Only in Serbia (65 per cent), Bosnia and Herzegovina (64.87 per cent) and Romania (58.34 per cent) did a majority assess the programs as (very) positive. In Slovakia (11.76 per cent) and Spain (15.38 per cent), few respondents assessed the programs as positive, while in Slovakia (47.06 per cent) and in Spain (28.56 per cent) assessed them as (very) negative. An additional 23.53 per cent in Slovakia and 30.77 per cent in Spain stated that aren't any such programs.

► **Adult education**

Adult education received the lowest priority among the listed education policy fields. The programs in Bosnia and Herzegovina (63.16 per cent), Montenegro (62.50 per cent), Spain (60.44 per cent) and Bulgaria were appreciated by the majority of the respondents. In Slovakia, only 5.88 per cent considered the programs as positive, while 47 per cent see the impact as neutral and 23.53 per cent said they did not know.

Approximately a quarter of the respondents in Albania (28.57 per cent) and in Macedonia (22.73 per cent) stated that such programs do not exist.

Country-based Summary of All Education Programs

A country-based summary of the assessment of the impact of all education programs reveals that nearly two-thirds of experts from Bosnia and Herzegovina (64.97 per cent) assessed the education programs in their country as being (very) positive, followed by Romania (63.68 per cent) and Serbia (59.29 per cent), while among the Slovak experts, only 19.32 per cent assessed them as (very) positive.

On the other hand, the Slovak experts were most numerous in giving a negative assessment of the education programs in their country (30.24 per cent), while the percentage in Macedonia was only 2.69 per cent.

4.5.1.3 Relevance of Education Programs

► **Do education programs bring about desired change?**

In all the countries, a majority assessed that the education programs brought about the desired change to some extent; in Montenegro and Romania, it was as much as 91.67 per cent, and in Serbia 90 per cent. In Slovakia, 88 per cent of respondents assessed that the programs had brought about the desired change to some extent—despite the relative negative assessments of the impact of the programs in the different education policy fields.

The programs in the Czech Republic received the lowest assessment, with 26.31 per cent stating that the programs did not bring about the desired change at all and ‘only’ 63.16 per cent stating that the programs had brought about the desired change to some extent.

► **Do education programs help achieve the objectives in the country action plan?**

With the exception of Spain, in all countries a majority of respondents stated that the programs helped somewhat or very much to achieve the objectives of the country’s action plan on education.

In three countries, more than a fifth stated that the programs helped very much to achieve the objectives of the country’s action plan on education: Albania (28.56 per cent); Spain (23.08 per cent); and Romania (20.83 per cent).

The relatively high share of respondents (in Spain 30.76 per cent, in Hungary 20 per cent) who answered ‘don’t know’ is interesting, leading to the possible conclusion that these countries might not be entirely acquainted with the Action Plan on Education.

4.5.2 Housing

4.5.2.1 Priorities in Housing

Experts were asked to prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of housing:

- quality of social housing;
- formalization of informal settlements;
- prevention of homelessness;
- communal services and infrastructure;
- improving the current state of housing.

The data demonstrate that the experts identified different priorities, depending on their country of origin. The different priorities might reflect the different situation of the Roma in the countries under focus.⁵³

Overall, access to quality social housing (2.55) and formalization of informal settlements (2.41) were considered the highest priority. While access to quality social housing is an important issue in Montenegro (3.10), Spain (3.08), Romania and Slovakia (3.0 each), the experts from Hungary (1.73), Serbia (1.81) and Bulgaria (1.83) assign less importance to this issue.

Formalization of informal settlements does not seem to be an issue at all in the Czech Republic (0.60), but quite important in Hungary (3.37) and Bulgaria (3.50).

In general, the lowest priority was assigned to the prevention of homelessness (1.64). In Slovakia (0.29), Bulgaria (0.33) and Montenegro (0.90), this does not seem to be a priority at all; only in Albania (3.00) and to a limited extent in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2.58) did it seem to have some importance.

Access to communal services and infrastructure is considered a higher priority in Bulgaria (3.14) and to an extent in Albania (2.84); improving the current state of housing was considered important in Albania (3.05).

⁵³ To some questions, only small numbers of respondents replied.

4.5.2.2 Impact of Housing Programs

General

In general, the impact of the housing programs was considered to have the least (positive) impact of all four priority areas.

Only one policy field in the sector of housing (communal services and infrastructure, with a 46.46 per cent positive assessment) received a better rating than the general average of all programs in the four priority sectors (44.03 per cent). On the other hand, the impact of three of the housing policy fields received the most negative assessments of all the policy fields in the priority sectors.

Slightly more than a quarter of respondents gave a negative assessment of the impact of the programs addressing the formalization of informal settlements (25.60 per cent).

22.68 per cent assessed the impact of the programs addressing communal services and infrastructure negatively; and 21.79 per cent assessed the programs addressing quality social housing similarly.

Table 32: Assessment of policy fields

Policy field	Positive assessment	N =	Negative assessment
Communal services and infrastructure	46.46	200	22.68
Improving state of current housing	42.46	202	12.26
Average	36.98	200	19.55
Quality social housing	35.49	201	21.79
Formalization of informal settlements	32.55	197	25.60
Prevention of homelessness	27.93	199	15.43

Comparison of New and Non-EU Member States

The most striking difference between the non-EU member states and the (new) EU member states appears in the assessment of the impact of the programs addressing quality social housing. While 53.17 per cent of the Western Balkan country experts assessed the impact as (very) positive, only 17.23 per cent of the experts from the five new EU member states were of this opinion.

Further, a strong difference prevails in assessing the impact of programs addressing improvements to the state of current housing (non-EU: 52.68 per cent; new EU: 31.50 per cent).

The assessments of the impact of other programs do not show such big differences, but still demonstrate that the impact of the different housing programs is assessed more positively in the countries in the Western Balkans.

- **Formalization of informal settlements:** Western Balkan countries: 42.25 per cent; new EU member states: 24.76 per cent.
- **Prevention of homelessness:** Western Balkan countries: 37.87 per cent; new EU member states: 17.44 per cent.
- **Communal services and infrastructure:** Western Balkan countries: 51.08 per cent; new EU member states: 41.90 per cent.

It is worth mentioning that in the new EU member states, with regard to the prevention of homelessness, 35.54 per cent of experts stated that such programs do not exist; with regard to improving the current state of housing, 26.30 per cent of the experts stated the same.

Table 33: Comparison of EU member states and non-EU states

Policy field	Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No programs	Don't know
Quality social housing	EU members	5.13	15.64	30.53	19.52	7.90	19.62	1.67
	New EU members	0.00	17.23	32.02	20.35	9.48	18.92	2.00
	Non-EU members	11.21	41.96	16.93	8.73	6.31	11.57	3.29
	Average	7.89	27.60	24.35	14.61	7.18	15.96	2.40
Formalization of informal settlements	EU members	2.12	22.37	17.61	28.88	4.91	21.03	3.10
	New EU members	1.00	23.76	19.59	28.50	4.35	20.62	2.18
	Non-EU members	10.87	31.38	23.36	13.84	1.95	12.55	6.05
	Average	6.09	26.46	20.22	22.04	3.56	17.17	4.44
Prevention of homelessness	EU members	2.56	17.10	23.06	13.72	3.10	32.18	8.28
	New EU members	0.00	17.44	21.52	13.39	2.18	35.54	9.94
	Non-EU members	9.74	28.13	17.30	9.66	4.11	16.84	14.22
	Average	5.82	22.11	20.44	11.88	3.55	25.21	10.98
Communal services and infrastructure	EU members	5.74	36.87	21.38	15.61	9.63	5.86	4.91
	New EU members	3.81	38.09	21.04	17.19	11.56	3.95	4.35
	Non-EU members	13.18	37.90	16.70	15.45	4.15	9.45	3.15
	Average	9.12	37.34	19.25	15.54	7.14	7.49	4.11
Improving state of current housing	EU members	8.81	25.14	26.15	11.41	1.67	23.20	3.63
	New EU members	5.95	25.55	25.23	10.61	2.00	26.30	4.35
	Non-EU members	12.46	40.22	23.10	7.43	3.86	8.86	4.07
	Average	10.47	31.99	24.76	9.60	2.66	16.68	3.83

In general, one can conclude that the impact of the programs in the priority area of housing received the worst assessment compared to programs in the other three priority areas. Housing, therefore, seems to be the weakest area and the countries participating in the Decade should seriously consider how they could improve their performance in this sector.

In particular, the new EU member states should make better use of Structural Funds to improve the impact of their policies in the housing sector.

The data below demonstrate that—based on the assessment of the experts—Slovakia in particular should reconsider its housing policies. For example, 58.83 per cent stated that the programs addressing quality social housing in Slovakia had a (very) negative impact (compared to the average of 21.79 per cent).

The impact of some of the programs received remarkable assessments in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The best individual assessment (82.47 per cent) concerned those programs addressing the improvement of the current state of housing (the average is 42.46 per cent), while 70.72 per cent assessed the programs targeting communal services and infrastructure positively (average: 46.46 per cent).

The highest priority was assigned to the formalization of informal settlements in Bulgaria (3.50) and Hungary (3.37) (see above).

The relevant programs in both countries were assessed positively by 50 per cent in Hungary and by 14.28 per cent in Bulgaria, with 42.86 per cent in that country saying that such programs do not exist.

Access to quality social housing is an important issue in Montenegro (3.10), Spain (3.08), Romania and Slovakia (3.0 each). How did the experts assess the impact of the relevant programs?

In Montenegro, 66.66 per cent considered the impact to be (very) positive; in Spain 38.46 per cent; in Slovakia 23.53 per cent; and in Romania 19.05 per cent. In Slovakia, however, 58.83 per cent considered the impact to be (very) negative.

Access to quality social housing was thought to have the lowest priority in Hungary (1.73); this was somehow mirrored in the 30 per cent of experts there who believed that such programs do not exist, and an additional 30 per cent assessing the impact to be (very) negative.

An extremely low priority was assigned to the formalization of informal settlements in the Czech Republic (0.60) and to the prevention of homelessness in Slovakia (0.29) and Bulgaria (0.33). How did the experts assess the impact of the relevant programs?

16.67 per cent assessed the relevant programs in the Czech Republic as very positive, and 50 per cent as negative. The impact of programs addressing the prevention of homelessness in Slovakia was considered to be negative by 23.53 per cent, and 52.94 per cent said that such programs do not exist.

In Bulgaria, as many as 71.43 per cent said that such programs do not exist.

Further research would be able to identify which detailed activities were considered to be particularly successful or unsuccessful, which lessons could be learnt from the policies of individual countries, and whether best practices could be transferred from one country to another.

Detailed Data on Policy Fields

► **Quality social housing**

In general, the programs addressing quality social housing did not receive a positive assessment across the Decade countries (35.49 per cent positive or very positive).

With the exception of Bosnia and Herzegovina (70.78 per cent), Montenegro (66.66 per cent) and Macedonia (57.14 per cent), in all the Decade countries less than 50 per cent of the respondents assessed the impact of the programs addressing quality social housing as positive. In Slovakia and Hungary, a majority even assessed the programs as negative (Slovakia: 58.83 per cent; Hungary: 30 per cent) or stated that such programs do not exist (Slovakia: 5.66 per cent; Hungary: 30 per cent).

► **Formalization of informal settlements**

Less than a third of the respondents ranked the programs addressing the formalization of informal settlements as (very) positive (32.55 per cent). The programs received more (very) negative assessments (25.60 per cent) than any of the other programs in the four Decade priority areas.

The best assessments received were from Bosnia and Herzegovina (58.34 per cent) and Albania (55 per cent), while in Slovakia, none of the respondents assessed the respective program as (very) positive; 50 per cent in the Czech Republic and 41.17 per cent in Slovakia assessed the impact as negative, with an additional 41.18 per cent in Slovakia stating that such a program does not exist. In Bulgaria, 42.86 per cent stated that such programs do not exist.

These results are surprising, taking into account that in **Slovakia** the Mid-Term Development Strategy of the Romani Ethnic Minority in the Slovak Republic defines unsettled land ownership as one of the principal reasons behind housing problems, and that **Bulgaria** focuses on its Roma inclusion policy *inter alia* the spatial/town planning status of the Roma settlements and their regularization.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ See Fundamental Rights Agency of the European Union, *Housing conditions of Roma and Travelers in the European Union. Comparative Report*. October 2009.

► **Prevention of homelessness**

27.93 per cent of the respondents assessed the impact of the programs preventing homelessness as (very) positive—the lowest positive assessment among the 24 identified programs in the four Decade priority areas.

Only in Bosnia and Herzegovina did a majority assess the programs as positive (55.96 per cent); 25 per cent in the Czech Republic, 23.53 per cent in Slovakia and 23.07 per cent in Spain assessed them as negative. In Slovakia, an additional 52.94 per cent stated that such programs do not exist—however, the Slovak experts also assigned a very low priority to this issue.

► **Communal services and infrastructure**

In general, 46.46 per cent assessed the relevant programs as (very) positive. In Albania, 70 per cent gave a positive assessment, while 60.72 per cent did so in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In Bulgaria, 42.85 per cent, and 33.33 per cent in the Czech Republic assessed the programs to be negative. In Macedonia, 28.57 per cent gave a negative assessment, and 14.28 per cent stated that such programs do not exist.

► **Improving the current state of housing**

Overall, 42.46 per cent assessed the relevant programs to be positive, in particular in Bosnia and Herzegovina (82.47 per cent) and in the Czech Republic (70 per cent). In Macedonia (28.57 per cent), in Slovakia (23.53 per cent) and in Hungary (20 per cent), a relatively large share gave a negative assessment.

In Bulgaria and Romania a relatively high percentage of respondents (71.43 per cent and 33.33 per cent respectively) stated that programs improving the state of current housing do not exist.

Country-based Summary of All Housing Programs

A country-based summary of the assessment of the impact of all the housing programs reveals that only in Bosnia and Herzegovina (65.64 per cent) and Albania (52 per cent) do a majority of experts assess the housing programs in their country positively, while only 2 per cent of Slovak experts assess them to be (very) positive.

On the other hand, the Slovak experts were most numerous in giving a negative assessment of the housing programs in their country (34.12 per cent), while the percentage in Macedonia was 9.05 per cent and in Serbia 12.50 per cent.

4.5.2.3 Relevance of Housing Programs

► **Do housing programs bring about the desired change?**

With the exception of the Czech Republic and Macedonia, a majority in all countries stated that the programs very much or somewhat brought about the desired change. In Spain, as much as 23.08 per cent stated that the programs very much brought about the desired change; the figure for Montenegro was 19.05 per cent.

On the other hand, 66.66 per cent in the Czech Republic and 47.62 per cent in Macedonia stated that the housing programs did not bring about the desired change at all.

► **Do housing programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan?**

In Macedonia (38.09 per cent) and Bulgaria (42.85 per cent), a minority assessed that the housing programs very much or somewhat help to achieve the objectives of the country Action Plan. On the other hand, overwhelming majorities in Montenegro (85.72 per cent) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (82.47 per cent) gave positive assessments.

In the Czech Republic, 50 per cent stated that the housing programs do not help at all in achieving the objectives of the Action Plan; the figure was 42.86 per cent in both Bulgaria and Macedonia.

4.5.3 Employment

4.5.3.1 Priorities in Employment

Experts were asked to prioritize these issues facing Roma in the area of employment:

- training and retraining;
- job placement;
- self-employment and entrepreneurship;
- equal treatment.

Overall, the highest priority was assigned to job placement, with the highest rates in Bulgaria (2.75), Albania (2.47) and Slovakia (2.37). These also represent the highest priority rates in the employment sector.

Further high priority was assigned to training and retraining by the experts from Spain (2.25) and Romania (2.19).

The lowest priority rates in the employment sector were given to the issue of self-employment and entrepreneurship by the experts from the Czech Republic (0.71), Slovakia (0.79), Hungary (0.82) and Spain (1.0)—four member states of the European Union.

In addition, training and retraining received low priority ratings from the Czech experts (0.93) and equal treatment ratings from the Macedonian experts (0.89).

4.5.3.2 Impact of Employment Programs

General

Two of the policy fields in the sector of employment (training and retraining with 55.13 per cent, as well as job placement with 44.10 per cent) received an assessment greater than the general average of all programs in the four priority sectors.

The most negative assessment was received by the programs targeting job placement in the public and private sectors (19.48 per cent).

Table 34: Assessment of policy fields

Policy field	Positive assessment	N =	Negative assessment
Training and retraining	55.13	205	14.39
Job placement	44.10	204	19.48
Average	43.27	203	15.92
Self-employment and entrepreneurship	37.23	203	14.52
Equal treatment	36.62	203	15.29

Comparison between New and Non-EU Member States

All four different policy fields in employment reveal considerable differences between the non-EU member states and the (new) EU States, in particular in the policy fields of training and retraining as well as self-employment and entrepreneurship.

- **Training and retraining:** Western Balkan countries: 73.63 per cent; new EU member states: 37 per cent.
- **Job placement:** Western Balkan countries: 50.47 per cent; new EU member states: 32.16 per cent.
- **Self-employment and entrepreneurship:** Western Balkan countries: 52.92 per cent; new EU member states: 20.64 per cent.
- **Equal treatment:** Western Balkan countries: 43.39 per cent; new EU member states: 32.15 per cent.

Table 35: Comparison between EU member states and non-EU member states

Policy field	Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No programs	Don't know
Training and retraining	EU members	6.03	33.69	31.94	15.74	7.62	2.75	2.22
	New EU members	3.24	33.76	34.33	18.88	6.48	3.30	0.00
	Non-EU members	16.33	57.30	15.77	3.62	0.00	2.79	4.18
	Average	10.71	44.42	24.59	10.23	4.16	2.77	3.11
Job placement	EU members	4.96	30.18	35.88	17.03	6.07	3.74	2.15
	New EU members	0.95	31.21	38.06	18.77	5.61	4.48	0.91
	Non-EU members	7.30	43.17	17.74	12.84	2.29	10.63	6.03
	Average	6.02	36.08	27.64	15.13	4.35	6.87	3.91
Self-employment and entrepreneurship	EU members	5.48	18.67	37.87	14.37	3.88	11.98	7.75
	New EU members	3.24	17.40	38.77	17.24	2.99	12.71	7.63
	Non-EU members	13.11	39.81	27.34	7.97	2.06	6.49	3.21
	Average	8.95	28.28	33.08	11.46	3.06	9.49	5.68
Equal treatment	EU members	30.73	25.84	26.92	9.43	10.16	15.16	7.37
	New EU members	2.81	29.34	25.64	11.32	10.52	14.86	5.50
	Non-EU members	11.40	31.99	26.07	6.83	3.30	13.81	6.58
	Average	7.98	28.64	26.53	8.25	7.04	14.55	7.01

In general, though only one program was considered as (very) positive by more than 50 per cent of the respondents, the assessment of the impact of the programs in the priority area of employment did not reveal any extreme positive or extreme negative results. It is, again, the difference between the new EU member states and the non-EU states from the Western Balkans that is remarkable, in particular taking into account:

- (i) the new EU member states have paid a lot of attention to social inclusion issues prior to acceding to the European Union; and
- (ii) the availability of financial resources for social inclusion (and employment) from the European Union Structural and Social Funds.

The data below demonstrate that—based on the assessment of the experts—in particular in Slovakia, the employment programs have had a very limited impact. Not a single respondent from Slovakia assessed the impact of the programs addressing training and retraining as (very) positive, though the overall rate was 55.13 per cent; the programs addressing training and retraining received the best individual assessment in

Montenegro with 85.70 per cent, and in Macedonia with 77.77 per cent. 47 per cent of the respondents from Slovakia assessed these programs as (very) negative (average: 14.39 per cent).

The experts from Slovakia assessed the impact of all the programs in the priority sector of employment as more negative than positive. Job placement was assessed by 63.70 per cent as negative (average: 20.48 per cent), though it was considered to be high priority by the experts; self-employment and entrepreneurship were assessed as negative by 35.29 per cent (average: 14.52 per cent); equal treatment was 52.94 per cent (average: 15.29 per cent).

Interestingly, the programs in the two policy fields of job placement and training and retraining received a (very) positive assessment by the Macedonian respondents (77.77 per cent each). This assessment could be considered a result of the Ohrid Agreement, which has obliged the government of Macedonia to implement the *Strategy for Equitable Representation of Ethnic Communities in the Public Sector*. The Strategy should guarantee that all ethnic groups in Macedonia are equitably represented in the public service. Though Roma are not equitably represented yet, the implementation of the Strategy seems to have shown an impact.⁵⁵

Further research would be able to identify which detailed activities were considered as particular successful or unsuccessful, which lessons could be learnt from policies of individual countries, and whether best practices could be transferred from one country to another.

Further issues which were considered to be high priority were job placement (ranking 2.75 with the Bulgarian experts and 2.47 with the Albanian) as well as training and retraining (receiving 2.25 from the Spanish experts and 2.19 from the Romanian). The impact of the job placement programs was considered to be (very) positive by 55 per cent of the experts from Albania, and by 50 per cent of the experts from Bulgaria.

66.67 per cent of the experts from Romania and 53.33 per cent of those from Spain considered the impact of the training and retraining programs to be (very) positive.

The issue of self-employment and entrepreneurship was considered a low priority by the experts from the Czech Republic (0.71), Slovakia (0.79), Hungary (0.82) and Spain (1.0).

How did the experts assess the impact of the relevant programs?

In Hungary (36.36 per cent) and Slovakia (35.29 per cent), a large share considered the impact as (very) negative; while in Spain (41.67 per cent) and the Czech Republic (33.33 per cent), a considerable share identified a (very) positive impact.

⁵⁵ The European Commission refers to the 2009 *Progress Report to the Strategy*. The report acknowledges in general some progress on implementing the *Strategy for Equitable Representation of Ethnic Communities in the Public Sector*, however, recruitment targets for non-majority communities in public administration have not yet been met. In particular, the ethnic Turkish and Roma communities are still under-represented.

Detailed Data on Policy Fields

► **Training and re-training**

In general, a majority (55.13 per cent) assessed the programs addressing training and retraining as positive.

In particular, respondents from countries undergoing the accession process to the European Union gave relatively positive assessments: Montenegro (85.70 per cent), Macedonia (77.77 per cent), Serbia (70.59 per cent) and Albania (70 per cent), and also from Bosnia and Herzegovina (64.09 per cent). Negative assessments came from the Central European countries of Slovakia (0 per cent!), the Czech Republic (33.33 per cent) and Hungary (35 per cent).

In Slovakia, 47.06 per cent assessed the impact of training and retraining programs as (very) negative.

► **Job placement**

Overall, 44.10 per cent of respondents positively assessed the programs addressing job placement in the public and private sectors. The highest level of positive assessment can be found in Macedonia (77.77 per cent) followed by Albania with 55 per cent. In Macedonia, not a single respondent gave a negative assessment or stated that programs in this field do not exist.

In Slovakia, 63.70 per cent of the respondents assessed the relevant programs as negative, while 17.65 per cent of the experts in both Slovakia and Serbia stated that such programs do not exist.

Interestingly, the programs in the policy fields of job placement and training and retraining received a (very) positive assessment by the Macedonian respondents. Due to the Ohrid Agreement, the government of Macedonia is obliged to implement the *Strategy for Equitable Representation of Ethnic Communities in the Public Sector*, which should guarantee that all ethnic groups in Macedonia are equitably represented by public services. Though Roma are not equitably represented yet, the implementation of the Strategy seems to have made an impact.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ The European Commission refers to the 2009 *Progress Report to the Strategy*. The report acknowledges in general some progress on implementing the *Strategy for Equitable Representation of Ethnic Communities in the Public Sector*. However, recruitment targets for non-majority communities in public administrations have not yet been met. In particular, the ethnic Turkish and Roma communities are still under-represented.

► **Self-employment and entrepreneurship**

Experts from the Western Balkan countries of Albania (65 per cent), Bosnia and Herzegovina (58.57 per cent) and Serbia (52.94 per cent) gave a positive assessment, while the experts from countries such as Hungary (4.54 per cent) or Slovakia (11.76 per cent) were barely positive at all.

The experts from Hungary and Slovakia also provided a negative assessment (Hungary: 36.36 per cent; Slovakia: 35.29 per cent).

► **Equal treatment**

In Romania in particular (71.42 per cent), but also in Bosnia and Herzegovina (55.16 per cent), the impact of programs addressing equal treatment was considered (very) positive.⁵⁷

The most negative assessment of these programs was given by experts from Slovakia (52.94 per cent) and the Czech Republic (33.33 per cent).

Country-based Summary of All Employment Programs

The experts from Macedonia showed the highest appreciation of the impact of all employment programs (63.15 per cent), but the programs were also assessed (very) positively in Albania (58.75 per cent) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (56.01 per cent).

On the other hand, 50 per cent of the Slovak experts assessed the employment programs as (very) negative, followed by Hungary with 25.68 per cent

4.5.3.3 Relevance of Employment Programs

► **Do employment programs bring about the desired change?**

In Spain (83.33 per cent) and Serbia (82.35 per cent) in particular, a majority stated that the programs very much or somewhat brought about the desired change.

The respondents from Slovakia gave the most negative assessment with 64.80 per cent stating that the programs did not bring about the desired change at all, and an additional 5.88 per cent stating that there aren't any such programs.

⁵⁷ The high appreciation score in Romania could be a result of the efficient performance of the National Council for Combating Discrimination.

► **Do employment programs help achieve the objectives of the country Action Plan?**

Across the majority of countries, the employment programs helped to achieve the objectives of the action plan (in particular Romania with 80.95 per cent, and Serbia with 76.47 per cent).

On the other hand, a considerable proportion of experts in the Czech Republic (40 per cent) and in Slovakia (35.29 per cent) assessed that the programs did not help at all to achieve the objectives of the action plan.

4.5.4 Health

4.5.4.1 Priorities in Health

Experts were asked to prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of health:

- access to primary health care;
- women's health;
- child's health;
- promotion of employment of Roma in the health sector;
- promotion of healthy lifestyles;
- access to health insurance;
- access to medicine;
- access to specialized treatment.

In general, the highest priority was assigned to access to primary health care (5.53), child's health (4.91) and women's health (4.73). The lowest priority was assigned to the promotion of employment of Roma in the health sector (2.8) and access to specialized treatment (2.94).

There were hardly any significant differences between the Western Balkan countries and the (new) EU member states (with the exception of access to health insurance, which seems to be a more important issue in the non-EU member states (5.09) than in the new EU states (3.12)).

The relatively low priority that experts from Montenegro (1.60), Hungary (1.80) and Slovakia (1.83) assign to the promotion of Roma employment in the health sector is also of interest and could be further analyzed.

4.5.4.2 Impact of Health Programs

General

Four of the policy fields in the sector of health (access to health insurance: 56.71 per cent; women's health: 56.09 per cent; children's health: 52.73 per cent; access to primary health care: 47.59 per cent) received an assessment greater than the general average of all the programs in the four priority sectors. The strongest negative assessment received was for the programs targeting Roma employment in the health sector (16.14 per cent).

In comparison with the other Decade priority sectors, fewer experts felt competent to answer the questions.

Table 36: Assessment of policy fields

Policy field	Positive assessment	N =	Negative assessment
Access to health insurance	56.71	165	11.86
Women's health	56.09	171	8.84
Child's health	52.73	170	6.98
Access to primary health care	47.59	169	10.83
Average	45.47	168	11.01
Access to medicine	42.96	165	9.45
Promotion of healthy lifestyles	39.72	172	13.91
Employment in the health sector	34.68	168	16.14
Access to specialized treatment	33.28	163	10.05

Comparison between the EU Member States and Non-EU Member States

With the exception of the promotion of Roma employment in the health sector, the non-EU member states showed better results than in all other seven policy fields.

In general, the promotion of Roma employment in the health sector received a relatively negative assessment. Only in Romania (75 per cent) and Bulgaria (60 per cent) were the relevant programs assessed positively by the experts. This positive assessment might be due to the health mediator programs widely implemented in both countries. Consequently, the new EU member states received better results (with 42.32 per cent) than the Western Balkan countries (with 30.65 per cent); 29.36 per cent of the Western Balkan experts even stated that programs addressing the promotion of employment of Roma in the health sector do not exist.

The other policy fields demonstrated again that the experts from the Western Balkan countries assessed the respective programs more positively than the EU experts, in particular from the new EU member states.

Table 37: Comparison between EU member countries and non-member countries

Policy field	Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No programs	Don't know
Access to primary health care	EU members	9.72	31.11	32.42	11.07	2.86	11.63	1.19
	New EU members	5.00	29.00	35.57	13.29	3.43	12.29	1.43
	Non-EU members	17.44	38.25	22.96	5.00	2.11	11.44	2.82
	Average	13.23	34.36	28.12	8.31	2.52	11.54	1.93
Women's health	EU members	10.56	37.58	34.17	5.99	2.58	7.94	1.19
	New EU members	6.00	38.43	37.67	5.52	3.09	7.86	1.43
	Non-EU members	17.44	48.18	16.79	6.15	3.01	8.43	0.00
	Average	13.69	42.40	26.27	6.06	2.78	8.16	0.65
Children's health	EU members	7.49	34.88	34.46	6.52	2.56	7.80	6.28
	New EU members	3.54	32.77	39.54	6.00	3.08	7.54	7.54
	Non-EU members	17.55	47.62	20.79	3.21	1.25	9.56	0.00
	Average	12.06	40.67	28.25	5.01	1.97	8.60	3.43
Employment in health sector	EU members	4.45	33.60	17.12	7.65	6.28	21.59	9.33
	New EU members	2.00	40.32	18.87	7.51	5.87	17.57	7.86
	Non-EU members	8.35	22.30	15.76	15.16	3.65	29.36	5.42
	Average	6.22	28.46	16.50	11.06	5.09	25.12	7.55
Promotion of healthy lifestyles	EU members	10.08	21.11	30.99	15.24	3.57	16.63	2.38
	New EU members	5.43	22.00	33.86	13.28	4.28	18.29	2.86
	Non-EU members	11.27	38.69	26.31	6.76	1.25	13.21	2.50
	Average	10.62	29.10	28.87	11.39	2.52	15.07	2.43
Access to health insurance	EU members	13.01	38.13	18.33	14.45	1.67	8.74	5.68
	New EU members	8.33	36.67	22.00	17.33	2.00	8.67	5.00
	Non-EU members	17.75	45.66	14.19	6.76	0.00	8.70	6.94
	Average	15.16	41.55	16.45	10.95	0.91	8.72	6.25
Access to medicine	EU members	5.38	30.63	30.83	6.11	1.39	17.63	8.03
	New EU members	1.00	27.67	37.00	7.33	1.67	19.33	6.00
	Non-EU members	11.30	40.01	17.97	8.19	3.53	14.81	4.18
	Average	8.07	34.89	24.99	7.06	2.36	16.35	6.28
Specialized treatment	EU members	1.52	22.09	33.77	7.32	2.08	18.86	14.36
	New EU members	0.00	15.59	40.52	8.79	2.50	19.00	13.59
	Non-EU members	7.26	37.63	15.61	8.47	2.36	17.35	11.32
	Average	4.13	29.15	25.52	7.84	2.21	18.18	12.98

- **Access to primary health care:** Western Balkan countries: 55.69 per cent; new EU member states: 34 per cent.
- **Women's health:** Western Balkan countries: 65.62 per cent; new EU member states: 44.43 per cent.
- **Child's health:** Western Balkan countries: 65.17 per cent; new EU member states: 36.31 per cent.
- **Healthy lifestyle:** Western Balkan countries: 49.96 per cent; new EU member states: 27.43 per cent.
- **Health insurance:** Western Balkan countries: 63.41 per cent; new EU member states: 45 per cent
- **Access to medicine:** Western Balkan countries: 51.31 per cent; new EU member states: 28.67 per cent.
- **Access to specialized treatment:** Western Balkan countries: 44.89 per cent; new EU member states: 15.59 per cent.

The programs addressing children's health received the least amount of negative assessment (6.98 per cent) of all the programs in the four Decade priority sectors. The programs targeting women's health (8.84 per cent) also received a low negative assessment.

Detailed Data on Policy Fields

► **Primary health care**

In Spain (75 per cent) and Romania (65 per cent) in particular, the programs addressing access to primary health care were positively assessed; in Slovakia, none of the respondents gave a positive assessment.

On the other hand, 28.57 per cent in Slovakia identified a negative impact, and 21.43 per cent said that such programs do not exist; in Romania, Bulgaria, Spain, Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina, not a single expert gave a negative assessment. In the Czech Republic, 25 per cent stated that such programs do not exist; in Albania, this figure was 23.53 per cent.

Also of interest are the greater positive assessments from the Western Balkan countries (55.69 per cent (very) positive) in comparison with the new EU member states (34 per cent (very) positive).

► **Women's health**

Overall, 56.09 per cent assessed the impact of the programs as (very) positive, in particular in Bulgaria (805), Macedonia (78.95 per cent) and Romania (85 per

cent). On the other hand, not a single respondent from the Czech Republic, and only 7.14 per cent from Slovakia, gave a positive assessment. Meanwhile, 21.42 per cent of the Slovak experts gave a negative assessment.

► **Children's health**

Overall, 52.73 per cent gave a positive assessment, in particular in Romania (75 per cent), Macedonia (73.68 per cent) and Spain (72.72 per cent). Again, in Slovakia, only a very small percentage (7.69 per cent) gave a positive assessment.

With the exception of the Czech Republic (25 per cent) and Montenegro (12.5 per cent), only individuals gave negative assessments.

► **Employment in the health sector**

Only 34.68 per cent gave an overall positive assessment on the programs addressing the promotion of Roma employment in the health sector. Romania (75 per cent) and Bulgaria (60 per cent) were the only countries with a majority which gave a positive assessment. This assessment could be due to the fact that both countries have promoted the employment of Romani health mediators in recent years.

On the other hand, several experts from Macedonia (36.84 per cent), Hungary (33.33 per cent) and Slovakia (28.57 per cent) provided negative assessments.

In Montenegro (50 per cent), Slovakia (42.86 per cent), Spain (41.67 per cent) as well as in Bosnia and Herzegovina (38.48 per cent) and Albania (35.29 per cent), considerable proportions of the experts are not aware of any program which addresses the promotion of Roma employment in the health sector.

► **Promotion of healthy lifestyles**

Only 39.72 per cent gave an overall positive assessment of programs addressing the promotion of healthy lifestyles. The programs in Macedonia (57.89 per cent) and Albania (52.94 per cent) received the best assessment, and Slovakia the least positive (7.14 per cent).

From Bulgaria, 40 per cent of experts, and 29.41 per cent from Albania stated that such programs do not exist in their countries.

► **Access to health insurance**

Overall, the relevant programs received a (very) positive assessment from 56.71 per cent of the respondents. In the non-EU member states (63.41 per cent) in particular, a (very) positive assessment prevailed, especially in Macedonia (84.18 per cent); with the new EU member states, 45 per cent gave a (very) positive assessment (in Slovakia, this was only 25 per cent).

In Hungary, 40 per cent of the experts gave a (very) negative assessment of the programs targeting access to health insurance.

► **Access to medicine**

Overall, the relevant programs received a (very) positive assessment from 42.96 per cent of the respondents. In the non-EU member states (51.31 per cent) a more positive assessment prevailed, in particular in Bosnia and Herzegovina (65.78 per cent); with the new EU member states, only 28.67 per cent gave a (very) positive assessment. In Slovakia, the figure was only 16.67 per cent.

The relevant programs in Spain received the best assessment, with 72.72 per cent. On the other hand, 22 per cent in Macedonia assessed the impact as (very) negative.

► **Access to specialized treatment**

Only 33.28 per cent of the respondents gave a (very) positive assessment of the relevant programs; in Spain it was 63.63 per cent and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 58.29 per cent. Not a single respondent in Bulgaria, and only 7.14 per cent of the Slovak experts gave a positive assessment.

In the non-EU member states (44.89 per cent) a better assessment prevails, compared to the new EU member states, where only 15.59 per cent gave a (very) positive assessment.

Country-based Summary of All Health Programs

The experts from Spain (62.40 per cent) showed the highest appreciation of the impact of all the health programs, but the programs were also assessed (very) positively in Macedonia (59.80 per cent) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (58.78 per cent).

On the other hand, only 9.74 per cent of the Slovak experts assessed the health programs as (very) positive, followed by Hungary with 27.08 per cent.

4.5.4.3 Relevance of Health Programs

► **Do health programs bring about desired change?**

With the exception of Slovakia, a majority of experts in all countries assessed that the programs brought about the desired change somewhat or very much. However, in a number of countries (the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia) one-quarter to one-fifth of the experts stated that the programs did not bring about the desired change at all.

► **Do health programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan?**

With the exception of Slovakia and the Czech Republic, the majority of respondents assessed that the programs very much or somewhat helped to achieve the objectives of the action plan.

Annex 1—Tables

PARTICIPATION OF ROMA

Table A1.1: Effectiveness of consultations with Roma (%)

Country	Very high	High	Low	Very low	No consultation
Albania	0.00	29.17	50.00	12.50	8.33
BiH	2.22	26.67	51.11	17.78	2.22
Bulgaria	0.00	12.50	37.50	12.50	37.50
Czech Republic	0.00	4.00	48.00	36.00	12.00
Hungary	0.00	12.00	32.00	44.00	12.00
Macedonia	0.00	14.28	71.43	14.28	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	21.74	56.52	17.39	4.35
Romania	0.00	8.00	60.00	20.00	12.00
Slovakia	0.00	5.00	40.00	35.00	20.00
Serbia	0.00	19.05	57.14	14.28	9.52
Spain	13.33	60.00	20.00	0.00	6.67
EU members	2.22	16.96	39.06	24.89	16.87
New EU members	0.00	8.35	42.87	29.87	18.91
Non-EU members	0.44	22.18	57.24	15.25	4.88
New Decade	5.18	38.61	25.23	10.09	5.74
Old Decade	0.00	12.07	50.32	24.18	13.42
Average	1.41	19.33	47.32	20.51	11.42

Table A1.2: Role of Roma organizations in creating Roma-related policies (%)

Country	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Albania	13.64	22.73	45.45	13.64	4.54
BiH	2.17	17.39	34.78	30.43	15.22
Bulgaria	4.17	8.33	29.17	50.00	8.33
Czech Republic	0.00	12.50	37.50	16.67	33.33
Hungary	0.00	8.33	37.50	25.00	29.17
Macedonia	0.00	25.00	41.67	20.83	12.50
Montenegro	0.00	16.00	28.00	28.00	28.00
Romania	0.00	12.50	50.00	20.83	16.67
Slovakia	0.00	5.26	10.52	52.63	31.58
Serbia	4.76	9.52	47.62	14.28	23.81
Spain	11.76	41.18	5.88	23.53	17.65
EU members	2.66	14.73	28.52	31.01	23.08
New EU members	0.83	9.44	33.06	32.50	24.17
Non-EU members	4.11	18.13	39.50	21.44	16.81
New Decade	9.19	27.10	28.70	22.53	12.47
Old Decade	1.12	12.18	35.25	28.53	22.92
Average	3.32	16.28	33.52	26.66	20.23

Table A1.3: Role of Roma organizations in implementing Roma-related policies (%)

Country	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Albania	4.17	12.50	45.83	33.33	4.17
BiH	7.89	18.42	39.47	21.05	13.16
Bulgaria	0.00	8.33	25.00	54.17	12.50
Czech Republic	0.00	4.17	41.67	20.83	33.33
Hungary	0.00	12.00	20.00	24.00	44.00
Macedonia	0.00	16.00	48.00	28.00	8.00
Montenegro	4.17	12.50	54.17	20.83	8.33
Romania	8.33	20.83	37.50	29.17	4.17
Slovakia	0.00	0.00	21.05	52.63	26.31
Serbia	4.76	4.76	61.90	9.52	19.05
Spain	17.65	47.06	17.65	5.88	11.76
EU members	4.33	15.40	27.34	30.68	22.26
New EU members	1.67	9.07	29.28	35.63	24.36
Non-EU members	4.20	12.84	49.87	22.55	10.54
New Decade	9.90	25.99	34.32	20.09	9.70
Old Decade	2.16	9.82	38.66	29.89	19.46
Average	4.27	14.23	37.58	26.98	16.93

GENDER

Table A1.4: To what degree do education programs address gender issues?

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't know
Czech Republic	6.67	26.67	53.33	13.33
Slovakia	0.00	35.29	35.29	29.41
Hungary	10.00	20.00	30.00	40.00
Romania	4.17	20.83	50.00	25.00
Bulgaria	0.00	40.00	50.00	10.00
Spain	42.86	42.86	14.28	0.00
Albania	4.76	61.90	28.57	4.76
BiH	5.56	55.56	13.89	25.00
Macedonia	4.54	54.54	22.73	18.18
Serbia	10.00	45.00	30.00	15.00
Montenegro	16.67	37.50	16.67	29.17
EU members	10.62	30.94	38.82	19.62
New EU members	4.17	28.56	43.72	23.55
Non-EU members	8.31	50.90	22.37	18.42
New Decade	17.73	53.44	18.91	9.92
Old Decade	6.51	34.98	36.00	22.51
Average	9.57	40.01	31.34	19.08

Table A1.5: To what degree do employment programs address gender issues?

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't know
Czech Republic	6.67	33.33	33.33	26.67
Slovakia	11.76	29.41	47.06	11.76
Hungary	0.00	35.00	30.00	35.00
Romania	9.52	23.81	33.33	33.33
Bulgaria	0.00	50.00	25.00	25.00
Spain	18.18	63.64	0.00	18.18
Albania	0.00	52.63	31.58	15.79
BiH	2.85	48.57	25.71	22.86
Macedonia	0.00	27.78	22.22	50.00
Serbia	5.88	41.17	47.06	5.88
Montenegro	4.76	47.62	14.28	33.33
EU members	7.69	39.20	28.12	24.99
New EU members	5.59	34.31	33.74	26.35
Non-EU members	2.70	43.55	28.17	25.57
New Decade	7.01	54.95	19.10	18.94
Old Decade	4.82	36.02	31.54	27.62
Average	5.42	41.18	28.14	25.25

Table A1.6: To what degree do housing programs address gender issues?

	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	25.00	75.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	47.06	47.06
Hungary	5.00	25.00	15.00	55.00
Romania	0.00	19.05	23.81	57.14
Bulgaria	0.00	42.86	57.14	0.00
Spain	15.38	46.15	7.69	30.77
Albania	5.00	35.00	50.00	10.00
BiH	2.78	41.67	25.00	30.56
Macedonia	0.00	20.00	35.00	45.00
Serbia	0.00	12.50	37.50	50.00
Montenegro	19.05	28.57	14.28	38.09
EU members	3.40	27.32	37.62	31.66
New EU members	1.00	23.56	43.60	31.84
Non-EU members	5.37	27.55	32.36	34.73
New Decade	7.72	40.94	27.56	23.78
Old Decade	3.01	22.36	38.10	36.54
Average	4.29	27.43	35.23	33.06

Table: A1.7: To what degree do health programs address gender issues?

	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	0.00	33.33	66.66
Slovakia	14.28	14.28	50.00	21.43
Hungary	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33
Romania	5.00	45.00	5.00	45.00
Bulgaria	0.00	80.00	20.00	0.00
Spain	27.27	63.64	0.00	9.09
Albania	17.65	52.94	29.41	0.00
BiH	8.11	48.65	16.22	27.03
Macedonia	10.53	52.63	15.79	21.05
Serbia	18.75	75.00	0.00	6.25
Montenegro	0.00	37.50	25.00	37.50
EU members	7.76	39.38	23.61	29.25
New EU members	3.86	34.52	28.33	33.28
Non-EU members	11.01	53.34	17.28	18.37
New Decade	17.68	55.08	15.21	12.04
Old Decade	6.07	42.22	22.81	28.90
Average	9.24	45.72	20.73	24.30

INTEGRATION

Table A1.8: Current level of integration index*

Country	Current situation
Spain	3.17
Czech Republic	2.52
EU members	2.47
Romania	2.40
New Decade	2.38
Bulgaria	2.37
New EU members	2.33
Hungary	2.28
Average	2.24
Old Decade	2.19
Slovakia	2.09
BiH	2.06
Montenegro	1.96
Non-EU members	1.96
Serbia	1.95
Albania	1.92
Macedonia	1.92

* 5 points (very high); 4 points (high); 3 points (medium); 2 points (low); 1 point (very low); 0 points (don't know)

Table A1.9: Change in integration index—last five years

Country	Integration change in ...					Average index	Current situation*
	general	education	housing	employment	health		
Spain	4.00	3.00	3.83	3.33	3.92	3.62	3.17
Serbia	3.68	3.85	3.25	3.23	3.87	3.58	1.95
Montenegro	3.64	4.04	3.81	3.24	3.12	3.57	1.96
BiH	3.65	3.99	2.58	3.51	3.70	3.49	2.06
Macedonia	3.83	4.04	2.95	3.33	3.16	3.46	1.92
Non-EU members	3.69	3.89	3.07	3.25	3.35	3.45	1.96
Bulgaria	3.25	3.80	3.43	3.50	3.20	3.44	2.37
New Decade	3.76	3.50	3.05	3.26	3.50	3.41	2.38
Average	3.37	3.50	3.02	3.08	3.21	3.24	2.24
Old Decade	3.22	3.51	3.01	3.01	3.10	3.17	2.19
Romania	3.16	3.71	2.38	3.05	3.45	3.15	2.40
Albania	3.64	3.52	2.75	2.95	2.88	3.15	1.92
EU members	3.10	3.19	2.98	2.94	3.09	3.06	2.47
Czech Republic	3.08	3.05	3.22	3.20	2.67	3.04	2.52
New EU members	2.92	3.22	2.81	2.86	3.09	2.98	2.33
Hungary	2.71	2.90	2.70	2.30	2.53	2.63	2.28
Slovakia	2.43	2.65	2.31	2.25	2.77	2.48	2.09

* 5 points (increased very much); 4 points (increased); 3 points (remained constant); 2 points (decreased); 1 point (decreased very much); 0 points (don't know). Current situation only for comparison.

Table A1.10: Over the past five years, the level of integration in education has... (%)

Country	increased very much	increased	remained constant	decreased	decreased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	68.42	26.31	0.00	5.26	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	29.41	23.53	29.41	17.65	0.00
Hungary	5.00	35.00	20.00	25.00	15.00	0.00
Romania	4.17	75.00	12.50	4.17	4.17	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	0.00	71.43	0.00	7.14	0.00	21.43
Albania	4.76	66.67	9.52	14.28	4.76	0.00
BiH	11.75	85.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.12
Macedonia	4.54	95.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Serbia	5.00	75.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	8.33	87.50	4.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU members	1.53	59.88	17.06	10.95	7.01	3.57
New EU members	1.83	57.57	20.47	11.72	8.42	—
Non-EU members	6.88	81.95	6.74	2.86	0.95	0.62
New Decade	5.50	74.41	3.17	7.14	1.59	8.18
Old Decade	3.38	68.22	15.81	7.32	5.26	0.00
Average	3.96	69.91	12.37	7.27	4.26	2.23

Table A1.11: Over the past five years, the level of integration in employment has ... (%)

Country	increased very much	increased	remained constant	decreased	decreased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	46.67	40.00	6.67	0.00	6.67
Slovakia	0.00	6.25	37.50	31.25	25.00	0.00
Hungary	0.00	0.00	45.00	40.00	15.00	0.00
Romania	4.76	42.86	14.28	28.57	9.52	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	8.33	50.00	16.67	16.67	8.33	0.00
Albania	0.00	45.00	25.00	15.00	10.00	5.00
BiH	0.00	54.05	43.24	2.70	0.00	0.00
Macedonia	0.00	61.11	27.78	0.00	5.55	5.55
Serbia	0.00	52.94	35.29	0.00	5.88	5.88
Montenegro	0.00	52.38	38.09	0.00	0.00	9.52
EU members	2.18	32.63	33.91	20.53	9.64	1.11
New EU members	0.95	29.16	37.36	21.30	9.90	1.33
Non-EU members	0.00	53.10	33.88	3.54	4.29	5.19
New Decade	2.78	49.68	28.30	11.46	6.11	1.67
Old Decade	0.60	39.03	35.99	13.31	7.62	3.45
Average	1.19	41.93	33.90	12.81	7.21	2.97

Table A1.12: Over the past five years, the level of integration in housing has ... (%)

Country	increased very much	increased	remained constant	decreased	decreased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	11.11	33.33	33.33	11.11	11.11	0.00
Slovakia	6.25	6.25	25.00	43.75	12.50	6.25
Hungary	0.00	15.00	50.00	25.00	10.00	0.00
Romania	0.00	23.81	14.28	42.86	14.28	4.76
Bulgaria	0.00	42.86	57.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	16.67	58.33	16.67	8.33	0.00	0.00
Albania	0.00	35.00	25.00	25.00	10.00	5.00
BiH	8.33	69.44	13.89	2.78	2.78	2.78
Macedonia	0.00	14.28	71.43	9.52	4.76	0.00
Serbia	0.00	43.75	43.75	6.25	6.25	0.00
Montenegro	9.52	61.90	28.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU members	5.67	29.93	32.74	21.84	7.98	1.84
New EU members	3.47	24.25	35.95	24.54	9.58	2.20
Non-EU members	3.57	44.87	36.53	8.71	4.76	1.56
New Decade	8.33	54.26	18.52	12.04	4.26	2.59
Old Decade	3.36	30.15	40.44	17.31	7.36	1.38
Average	4.72	36.72	34.46	15.87	6.52	1.71

Table A1.13: Over the past five years, the level of integration in health has ... (%)

Country	increased very much	increased	remained constant	decreased	decreased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	0.00	66.66	33.33	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	23.08	46.15	23.08	0.00	7.69
Hungary	0.00	6.67	60.00	13.33	20.00	0.00
Romania	0.00	70.00	10.00	15.00	5.00	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	8.33	75.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
Albania	0.00	41.18	35.29	5.88	5.88	11.76
BiH	2.70	67.57	27.03	2.70	0.00	0.00
Macedonia	0.00	36.84	47.37	10.53	5.26	0.00
Serbia	6.25	75.00	18.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	62.50	18.75	0.00	6.25	12.50
EU members	1.39	32.46	46.58	14.12	4.17	1.28
New EU members	0.00	23.95	52.56	16.95	5.00	1.54
Non-EU members	1.79	56.62	29.44	3.82	3.48	4.85
New Decade	3.68	61.25	26.33	2.86	1.96	3.92
Old Decade	0.78	36.76	43.46	11.91	4.56	2.52
Average	1.57	43.44	38.79	9.44	3.85	2.90

Table A1.14: Over the past five years, the level of integration has ... (%)

	increased very much	increased	remained constant	decreased	decreased very much
Municipal					
General integration	1.75	57.89	31.58	5.26	3.51
Integration in education	6.98	69.77	18.60	4.65	0.00
Integration in housing	4.54	43.18	29.54	18.18	4.54
Integration in employment	0.00	43.59	38.46	15.38	2.56
Integration in health	3.03	57.57	30.30	6.06	0.00
Average	3.26	54.40	29.70	9.91	2.12
Academic					
General integration	3.39	42.37	35.59	16.95	1.69
Integration in education	5.55	68.52	18.52	5.55	1.85
Integration in housing	0.00	31.82	40.91	18.18	4.54
Integration in employment	2.22	31.11	46.67	8.88	4.44
Integration in health	6.25	37.50	50.00	3.12	0.00
Average	3.48	42.26	38.34	10.54	2.50
Political party					
General integration	1.88	52.83	32.07	7.55	3.77
Integration in education	4.76	73.81	9.52	2.38	9.52
Integration in housing	2.78	36.11	33.33	16.66	8.33
Integration in employment	0.00	51.28	30.77	12.82	2.56
Integration in health	0.00	55.88	23.53	5.88	5.88
Average	1.88	53.98	25.84	9.06	6.01
NGO					
General integration	1.67	50.00	26.67	13.33	8.33
Integration in education	3.77	64.15	9.43	15.09	7.55
Integration in housing	6.52	36.96	23.91	19.56	13.04
Integration in employment	0.00	34.00	26.00	16.00	22.00
Integration in health	0.00	43.48	30.43	17.39	8.69
Average	2.39	45.72	23.29	16.27	11.92
Government					
General integration	0.00	59.26	29.63	5.56	1.85
Integration in education	2.70	86.49	5.40	2.70	0.00
Integration in housing	15.62	46.87	25.00	9.37	0.00
Integration in employment	3.33	56.67	26.66	13.33	0.00
Integration in health	0.00	70.00	30.00	0.00	0.00
Average	4.33	63.86	23.34	6.19	0.37

DISCRIMINATION

Table A1.15: Current level of discrimination index

Country	Current situation
Bulgaria	3.26
Albania	2.84
Czech Republic	2.79
New Decade	2.79
Spain	2.78
BiH	2.76
Non-EU members	2.61
Macedonia	2.60
Montenegro	2.60
Average	2.60
EU members	2.59
New EU members	2.55
Old Decade	2.52
Romania	2.36
Slovakia	2.35
Serbia	2.23
Hungary	2.00

Table A1.16: Change in discrimination index—last five years

Country	Discrimination change in ...					Average	Current situation*
	general	education	housing	employment	health		
BiH	3.74	3.81	3.70	3.40	3.70	3.67	2.76
Montenegro	3.68	4.00	3.24	3.67	3.37	3.59	2.60
New Decade	3.39	3.67	3.28	3.07	3.43	3.37	2.79
Non-EU	3.46	3.63	3.16	3.20	3.09	3.31	2.61
Spain	3.00	3.64	3.00	2.91	3.64	3.24	2.78
Albania	3.44	3.57	3.15	2.89	2.94	3.20	2.84
Macedonia	3.36	3.23	2.95	3.22	2.84	3.12	2.60
Romania	3.08	3.37	2.48	3.09	3.10	3.02	2.36
Average	3.10	3.22	2.87	2.98	2.95	3.02	2.60
Serbia	3.09	3.55	2.75	2.82	2.62	2.97	2.23
Old Decade	2.99	3.05	2.71	2.95	2.78	2.89	2.52
Bulgaria	2.87	3.00	2.50	2.60	3.00	2.79	3.26
EU members	2.79	2.88	2.63	2.80	2.84	2.79	2.59
Czech Republic	2.92	2.33	3.12	3.40	2.00	2.75	2.79
New EU	2.75	2.72	2.55	2.77	2.68	2.70	2.55
Slovakia	2.80	2.41	2.47	2.73	2.75	2.63	2.35
Hungary	2.08	2.50	2.20	2.05	2.53	2.27	2.00

* Current situation only for comparison.

Table A1.17: Over the past five years, the level of discrimination in education has ... (%)

Country	decreased very much	decreased	remained constant	increased	increased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	5.55	16.67	77.78	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	35.29	52.94	5.88	0.00
Hungary	0.00	20.00	30.00	35.00	10.00	5.00
Romania	0.00	62.50	25.00	4.17	4.17	4.17
Bulgaria	0.00	18.18	63.64	18.18	0.00	0.00
Spain	23.08	30.76	30.76	15.38	0.00	0.00
Albania	4.76	57.14	28.57	9.52	0.00	0.00
BiH	5.50	76.49	11.75	6.25	0.00	0.00
Macedonia	4.54	36.36	45.45	9.09	0.00	4.54
Serbia	0.00	65.00	30.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU members	3.85	23.81	33.56	33.91	3.34	1.53
New EU members	0.00	22.42	34.12	37.61	4.01	1.83
Non-EU members	2.96	63.66	26.49	4.97	1.00	0.91
New Decade	11.11	54.80	23.69	10.38	0.00	0.00
Old Decade	0.57	37.10	32.84	24.65	3.13	1.71
Average	3.44	41.93	30.35	20.76	2.28	1.25

Table A1 18: Over the past five years, the level of discrimination in employment has ... (%)

Country	decreased very much	decreased	remained constant	increased	increased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	13.33	26.67	46.67	13.33	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	26.67	33.33	26.67	13.33	0.00
Hungary	0.00	5.00	15.00	55.00	25.00	0.00
Romania	0.00	38.09	38.09	19.05	4.76	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	0.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	9.09	27.27	18.18	36.36	9.09	0.00
Albania	0.00	26.31	52.63	10.53	5.26	5.26
BiH	0.00	54.05	37.83	5.40	0.00	2.70
Macedonia	5.55	38.89	38.89	5.55	11.11	0.00
Serbia	0.00	17.65	47.06	35.29	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	66.66	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
EU members	3.74	20.62	35.21	31.74	8.70	0.00
New EU members	2.67	19.29	38.62	30.81	8.62	0.00
Non-EU members	1.11	40.71	41.95	11.35	3.27	1.59
New Decade	3.03	35.88	36.21	17.43	4.78	2.65
Old Decade	2.36	27.45	39.05	24.36	6.78	0.00
Average	2.54	29.75	38.27	22.47	6.23	0.72

Table A1.19: Over the past five years, the level of discrimination in housing has ... (%)

Country	decreased very much	decreased	remained constant	increased	increased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	25.00	12.50	12.50	50.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	13.33	46.67	20.00	13.33	6.67
Hungary	0.00	0.00	30.00	60.00	10.00	0.00
Romania	0.00	19.05	47.62	9.52	9.52	14.28
Bulgaria	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	7.14	28.57	42.86	7.14	7.14	7.14
Albania	0.00	50.00	35.00	0.00	10.00	5.00
BiH	5.40	70.27	18.92	2.70	0.00	2.70
Macedonia	4.76	19.05	52.38	19.05	0.00	4.76
Serbia	0.00	18.75	50.00	18.75	12.50	0.00
Montenegro	4.76	52.38	28.57	0.00	4.76	9.52
EU members	5.36	12.24	38.28	32.78	6.67	4.68
New EU members	5.00	8.98	37.36	37.90	6.57	4.19
Non-EU members	2.98	42.09	36.97	8.10	5.45	4.40
New Decade	4.18	49.61	32.26	3.28	5.71	4.95
Old Decade	4.32	16.88	39.72	28.42	6.26	4.40
Average	4.28	25.81	37.68	21.56	6.11	4.55

Table A1.20: Over the past five years, the level of discrimination in health has ... (%)

Country	decreased very much	decreased	remained constant	increased	increased very much	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	0.00	66.66	0.00	0.00	33.33
Slovakia	0.00	25.00	33.33	33.33	8.33	0.00
Hungary	0.00	13.33	33.33	46.67	6.67	0.00
Romania	0.00	35.00	45.00	15.00	5.00	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	16.67	66.66	16.67	0.00	0.00
Spain	9.09	45.45	45.45	0.00	0.00	0.00
Albania	11.76	29.41	35.29	0.00	11.76	11.76
BiH	0.00	72.97	24.32	2.70	0.00	0.00
Macedonia	5.26	5.26	57.89	31.58	0.00	0.00
Serbia	0.00	18.75	31.25	43.75	6.25	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	68.75	18.75	0.00	6.25	6.25
EU member states	1.52	22.58	48.41	18.61	3.33	5.56
New EU members	0.00	18.00	49.00	22.33	4.00	6.67
Non-EU members	3.40	39.03	33.50	15.61	4.85	3.60
New Decade	6.95	49.28	35.02	0.90	3.92	3.92
Old Decade	0.66	22.85	44.11	23.38	4.06	4.95
Average	2.37	30.05	41.63	17.25	4.02	4.67

EDUCATION

Table A1.21: Priorities in education

Country	Early childhood and preschool	Primary and secondary education	Tertiary education	Desegregation	Romani language, culture, history, identity	Employment of Roma education	Adult education
Czech Republic	5.84	4.47	3.56	4.59	3.84	4.47	2.47
Slovakia	6.00	6.19	3.69	4.33	3.07	3.43	3.43
Hungary	5.25	5.74	4.16	5.16	2.80	3.00	2.12
Romania	6.46	5.78	3.91	4.75	4.68	3.68	4.44
Bulgaria	6.60	5.30	3.30	3.78	3.63	3.50	2.00
Spain	5.08	6.25	4.66	3.20	3.55	3.18	3.46
Albania*	6.74	6.30	5.17	5.32	5.11	4.95	5.00
BiH	5.96	5.93	4.99	3.92	4.10	3.56	3.51
Macedonia	5.82	6.00	4.74	3.36	3.23	3.48	3.56
Serbia	6.50	5.65	3.53	4.32	2.65	3.45	3.33
Montenegro	6.00	5.34	3.88	3.80	3.00	3.42	2.58
EU members	5.87	5.62	3.88	4.30	3.60	3.54	2.99
New EU members	6.03	5.50	3.72	4.52	3.60	3.54	2.89
Non-EU members	6.20	5.84	4.46	4.14	3.62	3.77	3.60
New Decade	5.93	6.16	4.94	4.15	4.25	3.90	3.99
Old Decade	6.06	5.56	3.85	4.26	3.36	3.55	2.99
Average	6.02	5.72	4.14	4.23	3.61	3.65	3.26

* Albanian respondents ranked each policy field from 1–7.

Table A1.22: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing early childhood and preschool education? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Albania	14.28	52.38	14.28	0.00	0.00	4.76	14.28
BiH	50.00	26.31	7.89	5.26	0.00	5.26	5.26
Bulgaria	10.00	50.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Czech Republic	31.58	26.31	5.26	5.26	0.00	31.58	0.00
Hungary	5.00	60.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	10.00	10.00
Macedonia	36.36	54.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.08
Montenegro	25.00	33.33	12.50	4.17	8.33	16.67	0.00
Romania	12.50	50.00	16.67	4.17	4.17	12.50	0.00
Slovakia	17.65	29.41	17.65	11.76	11.76	5.88	5.88
Serbia	35.00	25.00	15.00	5.00	10.00	10.00	0.00
Spain	0.00	61.54	23.08	0.00	0.00	7.69	7.69
EU members	12.79	46.21	17.94	4.37	3.49	11.28	3.93
New EU members	15.35	43.14	16.92	5.24	4.19	11.99	3.18
Non-EU members	32.13	38.31	9.93	2.89	3.67	7.34	5.72
New Decade	21.43	46.74	15.08	1.75	0.00	5.90	9.08
Old Decade	21.64	41.07	14.01	4.42	4.91	10.83	3.12
Average	21.58	42.62	14.30	3.69	3.57	9.49	4.74

Table A1.23: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing primary and secondary education? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	5.26	52.63	31.58	10.52	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	5.88	17.65	41.17	11.76	17.65	5.88	0.00
Hungary	5.00	65.00	15.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Romania	8.33	62.50	20.83	0.00	4.17	4.17	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	40.00	40.00	10.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Spain	7.69	38.46	38.46	7.69	0.00	0.00	7.69
Albania	23.81	66.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.76	4.76
BiH	30.77	51.28	10.26	2.56	0.00	0.00	5.13
Macedonia	22.73	72.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.54
Serbia	20.00	50.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	20.83	62.50	8.33	0.00	4.17	4.17	0.00
EU members	5.36	46.04	31.17	9.16	3.64	3.34	1.28
New EU members	4.89	47.56	29.72	9.46	4.36	4.01	0.00
Non-EU members	23.63	60.63	7.72	2.51	0.83	1.79	2.89
New Decade	20.76	52.14	16.24	3.42	0.00	1.59	5.86
Old Decade	11.00	52.88	22.11	7.16	3.25	3.03	0.57
Average	13.66	52.67	20.51	6.14	2.36	2.63	2.01

Table A1.24: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing tertiary education? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	15.00	40.00	35.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Slovakia	5.88	0.00	23.53	11.76	17.65	23.53	17.65
Hungary	0.00	65.00	10.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Romania	12.50	70.83	12.50	0.00	0.00	4.17	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	20.00	40.00	10.00	0.00	30.00	0.00
Spain	15.38	7.69	38.46	0.00	15.38	15.38	7.69
Albania	4.76	42.86	9.52	4.76	0.00	23.81	14.28
BiH	18.42	44.74	13.16	7.89	2.63	5.26	7.89
Macedonia	31.82	40.91	18.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.08
Serbia	10.00	60.00	15.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	20.83	37.50	20.83	4.17	4.17	8.33	4.17
EU members	8.13	33.92	26.58	7.79	5.51	13.85	4.22
New EU members	6.68	39.17	24.21	9.35	3.53	13.54	3.53
Non-EU members	17.17	45.20	15.34	6.36	1.36	7.48	7.08
Old Decade	12.85	31.76	20.38	4.22	6.00	14.82	9.95
New Decade	12.00	41.78	21.88	8.24	2.73	9.50	3.86
Average	12.24	39.05	21.47	7.14	3.62	10.95	5.52

Table A1.25: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing desegregation? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	5.55	33.33	50.00	5.55	0.00	0.00	5.55
Slovakia	0.00	11.76	17.65	29.41	11.76	29.41	0.00
Hungary	5.00	25.00	25.00	15.00	15.00	0.00	15.00
Romania	8.33	45.83	33.33	4.17	4.17	0.00	4.17
Bulgaria	10.00	10.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	60.00	0.00
Spain	7.14	14.28	14.28	14.28	7.14	28.56	14.28
Albania	9.52	42.86	23.81	0.00	0.00	23.81	0.00
BiH	18.42	23.68	15.79	5.26	2.63	10.52	23.68
Macedonia	9.52	14.28	14.28	4.76	0.00	33.33	23.81
Serbia	10.00	40.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00
Montenegro	4.17	8.33	25.00	25.00	4.17	16.67	16.67
EU members	6.00	23.37	26.71	11.40	6.35	19.66	6.50
New EU members	5.78	25.18	29.20	10.83	6.19	17.88	4.94
Non-EU members	10.33	25.83	21.78	7.00	1.36	20.87	12.83
New Decade	11.69	26.94	17.96	6.51	3.26	20.96	12.65
Old Decade	6.57	23.57	26.91	10.49	4.39	19.93	8.15
Average	7.97	24.49	24.47	9.40	4.08	20.21	9.38

Table A1.26: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the promotion of the Romani language, culture and history? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	5.88	23.53	35.29	11.76	5.88	11.76	5.88
Hungary	0.00	25.00	40.00	30.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
Romania	8.33	66.66	16.67	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	30.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	30.00	0.00
Spain	7.69	23.08	30.77	23.08	7.69	7.69	0.00
Albania	14.28	38.09	28.57	0.00	4.76	14.28	0.00
BiH	26.31	36.84	7.89	5.26	2.63	13.16	7.89
Macedonia	22.73	18.18	27.27	0.00	0.00	22.73	9.08
Serbia	5.00	45.00	35.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	5.00
Montenegro	0.00	33.33	25.00	8.33	4.17	16.67	12.50
EU members	3.65	28.05	27.12	12.20	3.10	8.24	0.98
New EU members	2.84	29.04	26.39	10.02	2.18	8.35	1.18
Non-EU members	13.66	34.29	24.75	3.72	2.31	14.37	6.89
New Decade	16.09	32.67	22.41	9.45	5.03	11.71	2.63
Old Decade	5.24	30.21	27.40	7.93	1.88	10.77	4.06
Average	8.20	30.88	26.04	8.34	2.74	11.03	3.67

* No respondent from the Czech Republic replied to this question.

Table A1.27: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the promotion of Roma employment in the education sector? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	11.11	22.22	44.44	0.00	5.55	16.67	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	11.76	17.65	29.41	17.65	23.53	0.00
Hungary	5.00	35.00	35.00	5.00	5.00	10.00	5.00
Romania	16.67	41.67	33.33	4.17	0.00	0.00	4.17
Bulgaria	0.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
Spain	7.69	7.69	23.08	15.38	15.38	30.77	0.00
Albania	14.28	9.52	19.05	14.28	0.00	33.33	9.52
BiH	16.22	48.65	13.51	2.70	5.40	8.11	5.40
Macedonia	19.05	14.28	28.57	4.76	4.76	23.81	4.76
Serbia	10.00	55.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Montenegro	8.33	16.67	20.83	20.83	4.17	20.83	8.33
EU members	6.75	23.06	27.25	12.33	7.26	21.83	1.53
New EU members	6.56	26.13	28.08	11.72	5.64	20.04	1.83
Non-EU members	13.58	28.82	21.39	8.51	2.87	19.22	5.60
New Decade	12.73	21.95	18.55	10.79	6.93	24.07	4.97
Old Decade	8.77	27.08	26.85	10.52	4.64	19.36	2.78
Average	9.85	25.68	24.59	10.59	5.26	20.64	3.38

Table A1.28: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing adult education? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	15.00	25.00	25.00	15.00	5.00	10.00	5.00
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	47.06	11.76	11.76	0.00	23.53
Hungary	0.00	35.00	45.00	10.00	5.00	5.00	0.00
Romania	8.33	33.33	29.17	8.33	0.00	16.67	4.17
Bulgaria	20.00	40.00	10.00	20.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Spain	15.38	46.16	7.69	23.08	0.00	7.69	0.00
Albania	9.52	33.33	14.28	4.76	0.00	28.57	9.52
BiH	18.42	44.74	15.79	2.63	5.26	10.53	2.63
Macedonia	22.73	22.73	9.08	0.00	4.54	22.73	18.18
Serbia	15.00	35.00	35.00	10.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	12.50	50.00	20.83	4.17	4.17	0.00	8.33
EU members	9.79	30.90	27.32	14.70	3.63	8.23	5.45
New EU members	8.67	27.84	31.25	13.02	4.35	8.33	6.54
Non-EU members	15.63	37.16	19.00	4.31	3.79	12.37	7.73
New Decade	14.44	41.41	12.59	10.16	1.75	15.60	4.05
Old Decade	11.70	30.87	27.64	9.91	4.43	8.05	7.40
Average	12.44	33.74	23.54	9.98	3.70	10.11	6.49

Table A1.29: Summary data on all education programs

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	11.93	28.50	27.33	5.19	1.51	9.75	1.51
Slovakia	5.04	14.28	28.57	16.80	13.44	14.28	7.56
Hungary	2.86	44.29	25.00	15.00	5.00	3.57	4.29
Romani	10.71	52.97	23.21	4.17	1.79	5.36	1.79
Bulgaria	5.71	30.00	28.57	8.57	0.00	27.14	0.00
Spain	8.71	28.41	25.12	11.93	6.51	13.97	5.34
Albania	12.92	40.82	15.64	3.40	0.68	19.05	7.48
BiH	25.51	39.46	12.04	4.51	2.65	7.55	8.27
Macedonia	23.56	33.95	13.91	1.36	1.33	14.66	11.22
Serbia	15.00	44.29	25.00	6.43	2.14	6.43	0.71
Montenegro	13.09	34.52	19.05	9.52	4.76	11.91	7.14
Average	12.28	35.59	22.13	7.90	3.62	12.15	5.03

Table A1.30: To what degree do education programs bring about desired change? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	63.16	26.31	5.26	5.26
Slovakia	0.00	88.24	0.00	5.88	5.88
Hungary	15.00	65.00	10.00	10.00	0.00
Romania	20.83	70.83	4.17	4.17	0.00
Bulgaria	10.00	70.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	15.38	61.54	7.69	15.38	0.00
Albania	19.05	61.90	0.00	9.52	9.52
BiH	2.94	81.41	2.27	5.21	8.15
Macedonia	10.00	70.00	5.00	5.00	10.00
Serbia	25.00	65.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	4.17	87.50	4.17	0.00	4.17
EU members	10.20	69.80	11.36	6.78	1.86
New EU members	9.17	71.45	12.10	5.06	2.23
Non-EU members	12.23	73.16	4.29	3.95	6.37
New Decade	12.46	68.28	3.32	10.04	5.89
Old Decade	10.63	72.47	9.96	3.79	3.16
Average	11.12	71.33	8.15	5.49	3.91

Table A1.31: To what degree do education programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	62.50	18.75	6.25	12.50
Slovakia	0.00	75.00	6.25	0.00	18.75
Hungary	10.00	60.00	5.00	5.00	20.00
Romania	20.83	62.50	4.17	4.17	8.33
Bulgaria	10.00	70.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	23.08	15.38	15.38	15.38	30.76
Albania	28.56	42.86	0.00	14.28	14.28
BiH	10.44	73.23	8.38	2.50	5.44
Macedonia	4.54	72.73	9.09	0.00	13.64
Serbia	15.00	75.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	12.50	66.66	4.17	4.17	12.50
EU members	10.65	57.56	11.59	5.13	15.06
New EU members	8.17	66.00	10.83	3.08	11.92
Non-EU members	14.21	66.10	6.33	4.19	9.17
New Decade	20.69	43.82	7.92	10.72	16.83
Old Decade	9.11	68.05	9.68	2.45	10.72
Average	12.27	61.44	9.20	4.70	12.38

Table A1.32: Education program relevance—index

Country	Desired change	Action Plan objectives	Average
Serbia	3.30	3.10	3.20
Romania	3.21	2.96	3.09
Bulgaria	2.80	2.80	2.80
Non-EU members	2.80	2.76	2.78
Montenegro	2.87	2.67	2.77
Albania	2.81	2.71	2.76
Old Decade	2.81	2.53	2.67
Average	2.75	2.50	2.63
BiH	2.36	2.80	2.58
Macedonia	2.65	2.50	2.58
New EU members	2.72	2.40	2.56
New Decade	2.62	2.43	2.53
EU members	2.72	2.29	2.51
Slovakia	2.65	2.31	2.48
Hungary	2.80	1.85	2.33
Spain	2.69	1.77	2.23
Czech Republic	2.16	2.06	2.11

HOUSING

Table A1.33: Priorities in housing

Country	Access to quality social housing	Formalization of informal settlements	Prevention of homelessness	Communal services and infrastructure	Improving state of current housing
Czech Republic	2.70	0.60	1.20	1.60	2.30
Slovakia	3.00	2.31	0.29	2.37	2.50
Hungary	1.73	3.37	2.19	1.61	1.66
Romania	3.00	2.85	2.05	1.89	1.80
Bulgaria	1.83	3.50	0.33	3.14	1.57
Spain	3.08	1.25	2.11	1.30	1.82
Albania	2.74	3.00	3.06	2.84	3.05
BiH	2.91	2.12	2.58	2.07	2.44
Macedonia	2.15	2.45	1.90	2.45	2.05
Serbia	1.81	2.87	1.47	1.75	1.87
Montenegro	3.10	2.19	0.90	1.86	1.86
EU members	2.56	2.31	1.36	1.99	1.94
New EU members	2.45	2.53	1.21	2.12	1.97
Non-EU members	2.54	2.53	1.98	2.19	2.25
New Decade	2.91	2.12	2.58	2.07	2.44
Old Decade	2.42	2.52	1.29	2.08	1.95
Average	2.55	2.41	1.64	2.08	2.08

Table A1.34: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing access to quality social housing? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	0.00	66.66	22.22	0.00	11.11	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	23.53	11.76	41.18	17.65	5.88	0.00
Hungary	0.00	15.00	15.00	5.00	25.00	30.00	10.00
Romania	0.00	19.05	38.09	19.05	4.76	19.05	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	28.57	28.57	14.28	0.00	28.57	0.00
Spain	30.77	7.69	23.08	15.38	0.00	23.08	0.00
Albania	5.00	35.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	30.00	0.00
BiH	16.23	54.55	8.12	3.57	0.00	5.84	11.69
Macedonia	14.28	42.86	19.05	4.76	9.52	4.76	4.76
Serbia	6.25	25.00	37.50	6.25	12.50	12.50	0.00
Montenegro	14.28	52.38	0.00	19.05	9.52	4.76	0.00
EU members	5.13	15.64	30.53	19.52	7.90	19.62	1.67
New EU members	0.00	17.23	32.02	20.35	9.48	18.92	2.00
Non-EU members	11.21	41.96	16.93	8.73	6.31	11.57	3.29
New Decade	17.33	32.41	17.07	9.65	0.00	19.64	3.90
Old Decade	4.35	25.80	27.08	16.47	9.87	14.58	1.85
Average	7.89	27.60	24.35	14.61	7.18	15.96	2.40

Table A1.35: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the formalization of informal settlements? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	16.67	33.33	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	0.00	11.76	29.41	11.76	41.18	5.88
Hungary	5.00	45.00	10.00	25.00	10.00	0.00	5.00
Romania	0.00	42.86	28.57	9.52	0.00	19.05	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	14.28	14.28	28.57	0.00	42.86	0.00
Spain	7.69	15.38	7.69	30.77	7.69	23.08	7.69
Albania	10.00	45.00	15.00	10.00	5.00	5.00	10.00
BiH	19.05	39.29	16.67	16.67	0.00	2.38	5.95
Macedonia	19.05	19.05	23.81	9.52	0.00	23.81	4.76
Serbia	6.25	25.00	37.50	18.75	0.00	12.50	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	28.57	23.81	14.28	4.76	19.05	9.52
EU members	2.12	22.37	17.61	28.88	4.91	21.03	3.10
New EU members	1.00	23.76	19.59	28.50	4.35	20.62	2.18
Non-EU members	10.87	31.38	23.36	13.84	1.95	12.55	6.05
New Decade	12.25	33.22	13.12	19.15	4.23	10.15	7.88
Old Decade	3.79	23.93	22.88	23.13	3.32	19.81	3.15
Average	6.09	26.46	20.22	22.04	3.56	17.17	4.44

Table A1.36: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the prevention of homelessness? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	37.50	37.50	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	11.76	17.65	5.88	52.94	5.88
Hungary	0.00	20.00	25.00	10.00	5.00	20.00	20.00
Romania	0.00	23.81	19.05	14.28	0.00	33.33	9.52
Bulgaria	0.00	0.00	14.28	0.00	0.00	71.43	14.28
Spain	15.38	15.38	30.77	15.38	7.69	15.38	0.00
Albania	10.00	35.00	10.00	15.00	0.00	25.00	5.00
BiH	16.67	39.29	11.90	14.28	0.00	2.38	15.48
Macedonia	9.52	38.09	9.52	9.52	9.52	4.76	19.05
Serbia	12.50	18.75	31.25	0.00	6.25	18.75	12.50
Montenegro	0.00	9.52	23.81	9.52	4.76	33.33	19.05
EU members	2.56	17.10	23.06	13.72	3.10	32.18	8.28
New EU members	0.00	17.44	21.52	13.39	2.18	35.54	9.94
Non-EU members	9.74	28.13	17.30	9.66	4.11	16.84	14.22
New Decade	14.02	29.89	17.56	14.89	2.56	14.25	6.83
Old Decade	2.75	19.19	21.52	10.75	3.93	29.32	12.54
Average	5.82	22.11	20.44	11.88	3.55	25.21	10.98

Table A1.37: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing communal services and infrastructure? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	33.33	33.33	22.22	11.11	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	41.18	23.53	5.88	17.65	0.00	11.76
Hungary	0.00	35.00	15.00	15.00	10.00	15.00	10.00
Romania	4.76	38.09	33.33	14.28	4.76	4.76	0.00
Bulgaria	14.28	42.86	0.00	28.57	14.28	0.00	0.00
Spain	15.38	30.77	23.08	7.69	0.00	15.38	7.69
Albania	15.00	55.00	10.00	10.00	5.00	5.00	0.00
BiH	17.86	42.86	21.43	7.14	0.00	5.95	4.76
Macedonia	14.28	28.57	9.52	28.57	0.00	14.28	4.76
Serbia	18.75	25.00	18.75	12.50	6.25	12.50	6.25
Montenegro	0.00	38.09	23.81	19.05	9.52	9.52	0.00
EU members	5.74	36.87	21.38	15.61	9.63	5.86	4.91
New EU members	3.81	38.09	21.04	17.19	11.56	3.95	4.35
Non-EU members	13.18	37.90	16.70	15.45	4.15	9.45	3.15
New Decade	16.08	42.88	18.17	8.28	1.67	8.78	4.15
Old Decade	6.51	35.27	19.66	18.26	9.20	7.01	4.10
Average	9.12	37.34	19.25	15.54	7.14	7.49	4.11

Table: A1.38 How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the improvement of current housing? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	20.00	50.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	29.41	23.53	23.53	0.00	11.76	11.76
Hungary	5.00	15.00	35.00	10.00	10.00	15.00	10.00
Romania	4.76	19.05	33.33	9.52	0.00	33.33	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	14.28	14.28	0.00	0.00	71.43	0.00
Spain	23.08	23.08	30.77	15.38	0.00	7.69	0.00
Albania	5.00	45.00	15.00	5.00	5.00	20.00	5.00
BiH	30.52	51.95	5.84	3.57	0.00	2.27	5.84
Macedonia	9.52	23.81	28.57	23.81	4.76	4.76	4.76
Serbia	12.50	37.50	37.50	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00
Montenegro	4.76	42.86	28.57	4.76	9.52	4.76	4.76
EU members	8.81	25.14	26.15	11.41	1.67	23.20	3.63
New EU members	5.95	25.55	25.23	10.61	2.00	26.30	4.35
Non-EU members	12.46	40.22	23.10	7.43	3.86	8.86	4.07
New Decade	19.53	40.01	17.20	7.98	1.67	9.99	3.61
Old Decade	7.07	28.99	27.60	10.20	3.04	19.19	3.91
Average	10.47	31.99	24.76	9.60	2.66	16.68	3.83

Table A1.39: Summary data on all housing programs

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	4.00	27.50	38.16	25.89	2.22	2.22	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	20.00	16.47	23.53	10.59	22.35	7.06
Hungary	2.00	26.00	20.00	13.00	12.00	16.00	11.00
Romania	1.90	28.57	30.47	13.33	1.90	21.90	1.90
Bulgaria	2.86	20.00	14.28	14.28	2.86	42.86	2.86
Spain	18.46	18.46	23.08	16.92	3.08	16.92	3.08
Albania	9.00	43.00	14.00	10.00	3.00	17.00	4.00
BiH	20.06	45.58	12.79	9.05	0.00	3.76	8.74
Macedonia	13.33	30.48	18.09	15.24	4.76	10.47	7.62
Serbia	11.25	26.25	32.50	7.50	5.00	13.75	3.75
Montenegro	3.81	34.28	20.00	13.33	7.62	14.28	6.67
Average	7.88	29.10	21.80	14.73	4.82	16.50	5.15

Table A1.40: To what degree do housing programs bring about the desired change? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	33.33	66.66	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	5.88	88.23	0.00	0.00	5.88
Hungary	10.00	60.00	15.00	10.00	5.00
Romania	9.52	42.86	28.57	14.28	4.76
Bulgaria	14.28	42.86	14.28	28.57	0.00
Spain	23.08	69.23	0.00	7.69	0.00
Albania	10.00	60.00	15.00	15.00	0.00
BiH	15.06	69.88	5.75	2.18	7.14
Macedonia	0.00	47.62	47.62	0.00	4.76
Serbia	6.25	75.00	6.25	12.50	0.00
Montenegro	19.05	71.43	0.00	9.52	0.00
EU members	10.46	56.09	20.75	10.09	2.61
New EU members	7.94	53.46	24.90	10.57	3.13
Non-EU members	10.07	64.79	14.92	7.84	2.38
New Decade	16.05	66.37	6.92	8.29	2.38
Old Decade	8.12	57.67	22.30	9.36	2.55
Average	10.28	60.04	18.10	9.07	2.50

Table A1.41: To what degree do housing programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	5.88	70.59	0.00	0.00	23.53
Hungary	20.00	50.00	10.00	5.00	15.00
Romania	4.76	42.86	33.33	9.52	9.52
Bulgaria	14.28	28.57	42.86	14.28	0.00
Spain	23.08	46.15	0.00	15.38	15.38
Albania	10.00	65.00	5.00	15.00	5.00
BiH	25.65	56.82	9.41	2.27	5.84
Macedonia	9.52	28.57	42.86	4.76	14.28
Serbia	6.25	68.75	12.50	12.50	0.00
Montenegro	19.05	66.67	0.00	9.52	4.76
EU members	11.33	48.03	22.70	7.36	10.57
New EU members	8.98	48.40	27.24	5.76	9.61
Non-EU members	14.09	57.16	13.95	8.81	5.98
New Decade	19.58	55.99	4.80	10.88	8.74
Old Decade	9.97	50.75	23.94	6.95	8.39
Average	12.59	52.18	18.72	8.02	8.48

Table A1.42: Housing programs relevance—index

Country	Desired change	Action Plan objectives	Average
Montenegro	3.09	2.95	3.02
BiH	2.91	2.96	2.94
Spain	3.23	2.54	2.89
New Decade	2.84	2.54	2.69
Slovakia	2.94	2.41	2.68
Serbia	2.62	2.50	2.56
Non-EU members	2.59	2.53	2.56
Hungary	2.45	2.60	2.53
Albania	2.45	2.50	2.48
Average	2.50	2.37	2.43
EU members	2.41	2.24	2.32
Old Decade	2.36	2.26	2.31
New EU members	2.25	2.17	2.21
Bulgaria	2.14	2.00	2.07
Romania	2.05	1.86	1.96
Czech Republic	1.67	2.00	1.84
Macedonia	1.90	1.76	1.83

EMPLOYMENT

Table A1.43 : Priorities in employment

Country	Training and retraining	Job placement	Self-employment and entrepreneurship	Equal treatment
Czech Republic	0.93	1.64	0.71	1.64
Slovakia	1.20	2.37	0.79	1.67
Hungary	2.05	1.67	0.82	1.35
Romania	2.19	2.15	1.40	1.40
Bulgaria	1.00	2.75	1.25	1.00
Spain	2.25	1.28	1.00	1.56
Albania	2.11	2.47	1.95	2.05
BiH	2.09	1.66	1.91	1.57
Macedonia	1.95	2.00	1.39	0.89
Serbia	1.77	1.18	1.47	1.35
Montenegro	2.05	1.43	1.14	1.38
EU members	1.60	1.98	1.00	1.44
New EU members	1.47	2.12	0.99	1.41
Non-EU members	1.99	1.75	1.57	1.45
New Decade	2.15	1.80	1.62	1.73
Old Decade	1.64	1.90	1.12	1.34
Average	1.78	1.87	1.26	1.44

Table A1.44: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing training and retraining? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	6.67	26.67	46.67	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	0.00	41.18	29.41	17.65	11.76	0.00
Hungary	0.00	35.00	35.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
Romania	9.52	57.14	23.81	0.00	4.76	4.76	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	50.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	20.00	33.33	20.00	0.00	13.33	0.00	13.33
Albania	20.00	50.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	5.00	5.00
BiH	12.27	51.82	18.03	3.34	0.00	8.94	5.61
Macedonia	22.22	55.55	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.55
Serbia	17.65	52.94	29.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	9.52	76.18	4.76	4.76	0.00	0.00	4.76
EU members	6.03	33.69	31.94	15.74	7.62	2.75	2.22
New EU members	3.24	33.76	34.33	18.88	6.48	3.30	0.00
Non-EU members	16.33	57.30	15.77	3.62	0.00	2.79	4.18
New Decade	17.42	45.05	16.01	4.45	4.44	4.65	7.98
Old Decade	8.20	44.19	27.81	12.40	4.05	2.07	1.29
Average	10.71	44.42	24.59	10.23	4.16	2.77	3.11

Table A1.45: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing job placement in the public and private sectors? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	40.00	40.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	11.76	41.18	23.52	17.65	0.00
Hungary	0.00	36.36	40.91	13.64	4.54	0.00	4.54
Romania	4.76	23.81	47.62	19.05	0.00	4.76	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	25.00	25.00	25.00	8.33	8.33	0.00	8.33
Albania	5.00	50.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	10.00	5.00
BiH	8.94	37.27	21.37	12.27	0.00	11.21	8.94
Macedonia	16.67	61.10	0.00	11.11	5.55	0.00	5.55
Serbia	5.88	29.41	23.52	11.76	5.88	17.65	5.88
Montenegro	0.00	38.09	23.81	19.05	0.00	14.28	4.76
EU members	4.96	30.18	35.88	17.03	6.07	3.74	2.15
New EU members	0.95	31.21	38.06	18.77	5.61	4.48	0.91
Non-EU members	7.30	43.17	17.74	12.84	2.29	10.63	6.03
New Decade	12.98	37.42	22.12	10.20	2.78	7.07	7.42
Old Decade	3.41	35.58	29.70	16.97	4.94	6.79	2.59
Average	6.02	36.08	27.64	15.13	4.35	6.87	3.91

Table A1.46: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing self-employment and entrepreneurship? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	6.67	26.67	40.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	6.67
Slovakia	0.00	11.76	29.41	29.41	5.88	5.88	17.65
Hungary	0.00	4.54	36.36	27.27	9.09	13.64	9.09
Romania	9.52	19.05	38.09	9.52	0.00	19.05	4.76
Bulgaria	0.00	25.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
Spain	16.67	25.00	33.33	0.00	8.33	8.33	8.33
Albania	20.00	45.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	0.00
BiH	17.14	41.43	24.29	9.05	0.00	2.38	5.72
Macedonia	16.67	33.33	33.33	0.00	5.55	5.55	5.55
Serbia	11.76	41.18	35.29	11.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	38.09	23.81	19.05	4.76	9.52	4.76
EU members	5.48	18.67	37.87	14.37	3.88	11.98	7.75
New EU members	3.24	17.40	38.77	17.24	2.99	12.71	7.63
Non-EU members	13.11	39.81	27.34	7.97	2.06	6.49	3.21
New Decade	17.94	37.14	25.87	3.02	2.78	8.57	4.68
Old Decade	5.58	24.95	35.79	14.63	3.16	9.83	6.06
Average	8.95	28.28	33.08	11.46	3.06	9.49	5.68

Table A1.47: How do you assess the impact of programs which aim to guarantee equal treatment in the labor market? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	26.67	33.33	13.33	20.00	0.00	6.67
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	23.53	29.41	23.53	5.88	11.76
Hungary	4.54	27.27	27.27	9.09	9.09	13.64	9.09
Romania	9.52	61.90	19.05	4.76	0.00	4.76	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
Spain	16.67	8.33	33.33	0.00	8.33	16.67	16.67
Albania	20.00	25.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	15.00	10.00
BiH	13.49	41.67	19.09	7.88	0.00	5.61	12.27
Macedonia	17.65	29.41	11.76	0.00	5.88	29.41	5.88
Serbia	5.88	35.29	41.18	11.76	5.88	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	28.57	33.33	9.52	4.76	19.05	4.76
EU members	30.73	25.84	26.92	9.43	10.16	15.16	7.37
New EU members	2.81	29.34	25.64	11.32	10.52	14.86	5.50
Non-EU members	11.40	31.99	26.07	6.83	3.30	13.81	6.58
New Decade	16.72	25.00	25.81	4.29	2.78	12.43	12.98
Old Decade	4.70	30.00	26.81	9.73	8.64	15.34	4.77
Average	7.98	28.64	26.53	8.25	7.04	14.55	7.01

Table A1.48: Summary data on all employment programs

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	3.34	30.00	40.00	18.33	5.00	0.00	3.34
Slovakia	0.00	5.88	26.47	32.35	17.65	10.29	7.35
Hungary	1.14	25.79	34.89	17.50	8.18	6.82	5.68
Romania	8.33	40.48	32.14	8.33	1.19	8.33	1.19
Bulgaria	0.00	37.50	37.50	6.25	0.00	18.75	0.00
Spain	19.59	22.92	27.92	2.08	9.58	6.25	11.67
Albania	16.25	42.50	18.75	6.25	0.00	11.25	5.00
BiH	12.96	43.05	20.70	8.14	0.00	7.04	8.14
Macedonia	18.30	44.85	15.44	2.78	4.25	8.74	5.63
Serbia	10.29	39.71	32.35	8.82	2.94	4.41	1.47
Montenegro	2.38	45.23	21.43	13.10	2.38	10.71	4.76
Average	8.42	34.35	27.96	11.27	4.65	8.42	4.93

Table A1.49: To what degree do employment programs bring about desired change? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	66.66	13.33	13.33	6.67
Slovakia	0.00	29.41	64.70	5.88	0.00
Hungary	5.00	55.00	30.00	10.00	0.00
Romania	14.28	61.90	19.05	4.76	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	33.33	50.00	8.33	0.00	8.33
Albania	10.00	55.00	10.00	10.00	15.00
BiH	12.27	54.09	19.09	3.34	11.21
Macedonia	5.55	66.66	16.67	0.00	11.11
Serbia	17.65	64.70	11.76	5.88	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	80.95	9.52	4.76	4.76
EU members	8.77	56.33	26.74	5.66	2.50
New EU members	3.86	57.59	30.42	6.79	1.33
Non-EU members	9.09	64.28	13.41	4.80	8.42
New Decade	18.53	53.03	12.47	4.45	11.51
Old Decade	5.31	62.54	23.75	5.58	2.82
Average	8.92	59.94	20.68	5.27	5.19

Table A1.50: To what degree do employment programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	35.29	35.29	11.76	17.65
Hungary	5.00	60.00	20.00	5.00	10.00
Romania	9.52	71.43	9.52	0.00	9.52
Bulgaria	0.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	25.00	25.00	8.33	16.67	25.00
Albania	0.00	60.00	5.00	20.00	15.00
BiH	18.03	53.94	20.16	0.00	7.88
Macedonia	5.55	66.66	16.67	0.00	11.11
Serbia	17.65	58.82	11.76	5.88	5.88
Montenegro	0.00	71.43	14.28	9.52	4.76
EU members	6.59	54.45	23.02	5.57	10.36
New EU members	2.90	60.34	25.96	3.35	7.43
Non-EU members	8.25	62.17	13.57	7.08	8.93
New Decade	14.34	46.31	11.16	12.22	15.96
Old Decade	4.72	62.33	21.57	4.02	7.37
Average	7.34	57.96	18.73	6.26	9.71

Table A1.51: Employment programs' relevance—index

Country	Desired change	Action Plan objectives	Average
Serbia	2.94	2.76	2.85
Romania	2.76	2.71	2.74
Spain	3.25	2.08	2.67
Bulgaria	2.50	2.50	2.50
BiH	2.42	2.49	2.46
Macedonia	2.44	2.44	2.44
Non-EU members	2.51	2.36	2.44
Montenegro	2.52	2.28	2.40
New Decade	2.64	2.14	2.39
Average	2.45	2.27	2.36
Old Decade	2.38	2.32	2.35
EU members	2.40	2.19	2.29
Hungary	2.20	2.25	2.23
New EU members	2.22	2.21	2.22
Czech Republic	2.13	2.20	2.17
Albania	2.25	1.85	2.05
Slovakia	1.53	1.41	1.47

HEALTH

Table A1.52: Priorities in health

Country	Access to primary health care	Women's health	Children's health	Promotion of employment in health sector	Promotion of healthy lifestyles	Access to health insurance	Access to medicine	Access to specialized treatment	Average
Czech Republic	4.25	4.50	2.50	4.25	2.00	1.75	2.50	2.00	2.97
Slovakia	6.08	4.91	5.09	1.83	3.09	1.90	2.60	2.36	3.48
Hungary	6.25	4.08	5.46	1.80	3.17	3.66	3.66	0.90	3.62
Romania	5.37	4.55	5.40	3.42	2.84	4.80	3.82	4.21	4.30
Bulgaria	3.75	4.00	4.60	2.40	3.60	3.50	2.75	3.25	3.48
Spain	6.00	6.00	5.87	4.00	4.66	5.17	4.80	3.80	5.04
Albania	6.47	6.53	6.60	4.27	4.73	5.40	5.27	4.33	5.45
BiH	6.01	4.60	4.93	2.25	2.24	5.81	4.23	3.44	4.19
Macedonia	6.32	4.16	5.11	2.42	3.26	5.53	3.68	2.32	4.10
Serbia	4.87	4.14	3.36	2.60	2.13	5.00	3.36	3.80	3.66
Montenegro	5.50	4.60	5.10	1.60	2.60	3.70	2.90	1.90	3.49
EU members	5.28	4.67	4.82	2.95	3.23	3.46	3.36	2.75	3.82
New EU members	5.14	4.41	4.61	2.74	2.94	3.12	3.07	2.54	3.57
Non-EU members	5.83	4.81	5.02	2.63	2.99	5.09	3.89	3.16	4.18
New Decade	6.16	5.71	5.80	3.51	3.88	5.46	4.77	3.86	4.89
Old Decade	5.30	4.37	4.58	2.54	2.84	3.73	3.16	2.59	3.64
Average	5.53	4.73	4.91	2.80	3.12	4.20	3.60	2.94	3.98

Table A1.53 : How do you assess the impact of programs addressing access to primary health care? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	0.00	42.86	21.43	7.14	21.43	7.14
Hungary	0.00	60.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
Romania	5.00	60.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	0.00
Bulgaria	20.00	0.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	33.33	41.67	16.67	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00
Albania	17.65	29.41	23.53	0.00	0.00	23.53	5.88
BiH	25.49	35.54	20.20	0.00	0.00	15.93	2.94
Macedonia	31.58	26.31	21.05	0.00	10.53	5.26	5.26
Serbia	12.50	37.50	37.50	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	62.50	12.50	12.50	0.00	12.50	0.00
EU members	9.72	31.11	32.42	11.07	2.86	11.63	1.19
New EU members	5.00	29.00	35.57	13.29	3.43	12.29	1.43
Non-EU members	17.44	38.25	22.96	5.00	2.11	11.44	2.82
New Decade	25.49	35.54	20.13	0.00	0.00	15.93	2.94
Old Decade	8.64	33.91	31.11	11.43	3.46	9.90	1.55
Average	13.23	34.36	28.12	8.31	2.52	11.54	1.93

Table A1.54: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing women's health? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	0.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	7.14	50.00	14.28	7.14	14.28	7.14
Hungary	0.00	50.00	33.33	8.33	8.33	0.00	0.00
Romania	10.00	75.00	10.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bulgaria	20.00	60.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	33.33	33.33	16.67	8.33	0.00	8.33	0.00
Albania	17.65	47.06	5.88	5.88	5.88	17.65	0.00
BiH	25.49	40.20	11.28	7.11	2.94	12.99	0.00
Macedonia	31.58	47.37	10.53	5.26	0.00	5.26	0.00
Serbia	12.50	50.00	31.25	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	56.25	25.00	6.25	6.25	6.25	0.00
EU members	10.56	37.58	34.17	5.99	2.58	7.94	1.19
New EU members	6.00	38.43	37.67	5.52	3.09	7.86	1.43
Non-EU members	17.44	48.18	16.79	6.15	3.01	8.43	0.00
New Decade	25.49	40.20	11.28	7.11	2.94	12.99	0.00
Old Decade	9.26	43.22	31.89	5.67	2.72	6.35	0.89
Average	13.69	42.40	26.27	6.06	2.78	8.16	0.65

Table A1.55: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing children’s health?

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	25.00
Slovakia	0.00	7.69	69.23	0.00	7.69	7.69	7.69
Hungary	7.69	46.15	38.46	0.00	7.69	0.00	0.00
Romania	10.00	65.00	10.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	5.00
Bulgaria	0.00	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	27.27	45.45	9.09	9.09	0.00	9.09	0.00
Albania	23.53	41.18	17.65	0.00	0.00	17.65	0.00
BiH	25.40	43.32	13.27	4.55	0.00	13.37	0.00
Macedonia	26.31	47.37	10.53	5.26	0.00	10.53	0.00
Serbia	12.50	50.00	37.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	56.25	25.00	6.25	6.25	6.25	0.00
EU members	7.49	34.88	34.46	6.52	2.56	7.80	6.28
New EU members	3.54	32.77	39.54	6.00	3.08	7.54	7.54
Non-EU members	17.55	47.62	20.79	3.21	1.25	9.56	0.00
New Decade	25.40	43.32	13.34	4.55	0.00	13.37	0.00
Old Decade	7.06	39.68	33.84	5.19	2.70	6.81	4.71
Average	12.06	40.67	28.25	5.01	1.97	8.60	3.43

Table A1.56: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the promotion of employment of Roma in the health sector? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	25.00
Slovakia	0.00	7.14	7.14	21.43	7.14	42.86	14.28
Hungary	0.00	44.44	22.22	11.11	22.22	0.00	0.00
Romania	10.00	65.00	20.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bulgaria	0.00	60.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00
Spain	16.67	0.00	8.33	8.33	8.33	41.67	16.67
Albania	11.76	35.29	5.88	5.88	5.88	35.29	0.00
BiH	14.22	17.65	7.11	7.11	7.11	38.48	8.34
Macedonia	15.79	21.05	15.79	31.58	5.26	10.53	0.00
Serbia	0.00	25.00	43.75	12.50	0.00	12.50	6.25
Montenegro	0.00	12.50	6.25	18.75	0.00	50.00	12.50
EU members	4.45	33.60	17.12	7.65	6.28	21.59	9.33
New EU members	2.00	40.32	18.87	7.51	5.87	17.57	7.86
Non-EU members	8.35	22.30	15.76	15.16	3.65	29.36	5.42
New Decade	14.22	17.65	7.11	7.11	7.11	38.48	8.34
Old Decade	3.22	32.52	20.02	12.55	4.33	20.11	7.25
Average	6.22	28.46	16.50	11.06	5.09	25.12	7.55

Table A1.57: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the promotion of healthy lifestyles? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	7.14	35.71	14.28	7.14	21.43	14.28
Hungary	7.14	42.86	28.57	7.14	14.28	0.00	0.00
Romania	0.00	35.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00
Bulgaria	20.00	0.00	20.00	20.00	0.00	40.00	0.00
Spain	33.33	16.67	16.67	25.00	0.00	8.33	0.00
Albania	11.76	41.18	11.76	5.88	0.00	29.41	0.00
BiH	22.55	28.93	14.22	15.44	0.00	18.87	0.00
Macedonia	15.79	42.10	36.84	0.00	0.00	5.26	0.00
Serbia	6.25	31.25	43.75	6.25	6.25	0.00	6.25
Montenegro	0.00	50.00	25.00	6.25	0.00	12.50	6.25
EU members	10.08	21.11	30.99	15.24	3.57	16.63	2.38
New EU members	5.43	22.00	33.86	13.28	4.28	18.29	2.86
Non-EU members	11.27	38.69	26.31	6.76	1.25	13.21	2.50
New Decade	22.55	28.93	14.22	15.44	0.00	18.87	0.00
Old Decade	6.15	29.17	34.36	9.87	3.46	13.65	3.35
Average	10.62	29.10	28.87	11.39	2.52	15.07	2.43

Table A1.58: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing access to health insurance? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	25.00
Slovakia	16.67	8.33	50.00	16.67	0.00	8.33	0.00
Hungary	0.00	40.00	20.00	30.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
Romania	5.00	45.00	20.00	20.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Bulgaria	20.00	40.00	20.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	36.36	45.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.09	9.09
Albania	17.65	35.29	11.76	5.88	0.00	17.65	11.76
BiH	27.01	40.37	5.88	2.94	0.00	13.37	10.43
Macedonia	31.58	52.63	15.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Serbia	6.25	37.50	37.50	6.25	0.00	6.25	6.25
Montenegro	6.25	62.50	0.00	18.75	0.00	6.25	6.25
EU members	13.01	38.13	18.33	14.45	1.67	8.74	5.68
New EU members	8.33	36.67	22.00	17.33	2.00	8.67	5.00
Non-EU members	17.75	45.66	14.19	6.76	0.00	8.70	6.94
New Decade	27.01	40.37	5.88	2.94	0.00	13.37	10.43
Old Decade	10.72	42.00	20.41	13.96	1.25	6.98	4.69
Average	15.16	41.55	16.45	10.95	0.91	8.72	6.25

Table A1.59: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing access to medicine? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	33.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00
Slovakia	0.00	16.67	25.00	0.00	8.33	33.33	16.67
Hungary	0.00	33.33	41.67	16.67	0.00	0.00	8.33
Romania	5.00	35.00	45.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	5.00
Bulgaria	0.00	20.00	40.00	20.00	0.00	20.00	0.00
Spain	27.27	45.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.09	18.18
Albania	5.88	52.94	11.76	0.00	11.76	17.65	0.00
BiH	16.58	49.20	5.88	0.00	5.88	13.37	9.09
Macedonia	27.78	16.67	22.22	22.22	0.00	5.55	5.55
Serbia	6.25	25.00	43.75	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	56.25	6.25	18.75	0.00	12.50	6.25
EU members	5.38	30.63	30.83	6.11	1.39	17.63	8.03
New EU members	1.00	27.67	37.00	7.33	1.67	19.33	6.00
Non-EU members	11.30	40.01	17.97	8.19	3.53	14.81	4.18
New Decade	16.58	49.20	5.88	0.00	5.88	13.37	9.09
Old Decade	4.88	29.53	32.15	9.71	1.04	17.46	5.23
Average	8.07	34.89	24.99	7.06	2.36	16.35	6.28

Table A1.60: How do you assess the impact of programs addressing access to specialized treatment? (%)

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	33.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33
Slovakia	0.00	7.14	14.28	21.43	0.00	50.00	7.14
Hungary	0.00	12.50	50.00	12.50	12.50	0.00	12.50
Romania	0.00	25.00	45.00	10.00	0.00	5.00	15.00
Bulgaria	0.00	0.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	0.00
Spain	9.09	54.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.18	18.18
Albania	5.88	47.06	11.76	0.00	0.00	23.53	11.76
BiH	7.49	50.80	5.88	0.00	0.00	20.86	14.97
Macedonia	16.67	27.78	16.67	11.11	5.55	11.11	11.11
Serbia	6.25	25.00	25.00	12.50	6.25	18.75	6.25
Montenegro	0.00	37.50	18.75	18.75	0.00	12.50	12.50
EU members	1.52	22.09	33.77	7.32	2.08	18.86	14.36
New EU members	0.00	15.59	40.52	8.79	2.50	19.00	13.59
Non-EU members	7.26	37.63	15.61	8.47	2.36	17.35	11.32
New Decade	7.49	50.80	5.88	0.00	0.00	20.86	14.97
Old Decade	2.87	21.03	32.88	10.79	3.04	17.17	12.23
Average	4.13	29.15	25.52	7.84	2.21	18.18	12.98

Table A1.61: Summary data on all health programs

Country	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Very negative	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic	0.00	27.08	27.08	9.38	0.00	22.92	13.54
Slovakia	2.08	7.66	36.78	13.69	5.57	24.92	9.29
Hungary	1.85	41.16	30.53	13.22	10.63	0.00	2.60
Romania	5.63	50.63	28.75	5.63	0.00	6.25	3.13
Bulgaria	10.00	25.00	42.50	7.50	0.00	15.00	0.00
Spain	27.08	35.32	8.43	6.34	1.04	14.01	7.77
Albania	13.97	41.18	12.50	2.94	2.94	22.80	3.68
BiH	20.53	38.25	10.47	4.64	1.99	18.41	5.72
Macedonia	24.64	35.16	18.68	9.43	2.67	6.69	2.74
Serbia	7.81	35.16	37.50	7.03	1.56	7.81	3.13
Montenegro	0.78	49.22	14.84	13.28	1.56	14.84	5.47
Average	10.40	35.07	24.37	8.46	2.54	13.97	5.19

Table A1.62: To what degree do health programs bring about desired change? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic*	0.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
Slovakia	7.14	28.57	35.71	14.28	14.28
Hungary	7.14	57.14	28.57	7.14	0.00
Romania	10.00	70.00	15.00	5.00	0.00
Bulgaria*	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	33.33	41.67	8.33	0.00	16.67
Albania	11.76	58.82	11.76	17.65	0.00
BiH	22.55	50.25	10.05	8.83	8.34
Macedonia	10.53	57.89	26.31	0.00	5.26
Serbia	12.50	62.50	25.00	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	75.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
EU members	9.60	62.06	18.77	4.40	5.16
New EU members	4.86	66.14	20.86	5.28	2.86
Non-EU members	11.47	60.89	19.62	5.30	2.72
New Decade	22.55	50.25	10.05	8.83	8.34
Old Decade	5.91	65.76	22.57	3.30	2.44
Average	10.45	61.53	19.16	4.81	4.05

* only a small number of respondents replied to this question.

Table A1.63: To what degree do health programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan? (%)

Country	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all	No program	Don't know
Czech Republic*	0.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	50.00
Slovakia	7.14	35.71	42.86	0.00	14.28
Hungary	0.00	57.14	14.28	14.28	14.28
Romania	10.00	70.00	10.00	5.00	5.00
Bulgaria*	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spain	27.27	27.27	18.18	9.09	18.18
Albania	5.88	58.82	11.76	17.65	5.88
BiH	16.58	43.05	14.97	13.37	12.03
Macedonia	5.55	66.67	16.67	5.55	5.55
Serbia	12.50	75.00	12.50	0.00	0.00
Montenegro	0.00	68.75	25.00	0.00	6.25
EU members	7.40	52.52	18.39	4.73	16.96
New EU members	3.43	57.57	18.43	3.86	16.71
Non-EU members	8.10	62.46	16.18	7.31	5.94
New Decade	16.58	43.05	14.97	13.37	12.03
Old Decade	4.40	62.28	18.29	3.10	11.92
Average	7.72	57.04	17.38	5.90	11.95

* only a small number of respondents replied to this question.

Table A1.64: Health program relevance—index

Country	Desired change	Action Plan objectives	Average
Bulgaria	3.00	3.00	3.00
Serbia	2.75	3.00	2.88
BiH	2.59	2.93	2.76
Romania	2.75	2.70	2.73
Spain	3.00	2.36	2.68
New Decade	2.69	2.49	2.59
Non-EU members	2.57	2.57	2.57
Macedonia	2.53	2.44	2.49
Average	2.55	2.33	2.44
Montenegro	2.50	2.31	2.41
Old Decade	2.50	2.27	2.38
Albania	2.47	2.18	2.33
EU members	2.53	2.13	2.33
New EU members	2.44	2.08	2.26
Hungary	2.36	1.86	2.11
Czech Republic	2.50	1.00	1.75
Slovakia	1.57	1.86	1.72

Description		Slovakia	Czech Republic	Hungary	New EU	EU members	Bulgaria	Old Decade	Average	Albania	Montenegro	Romania	Macedonia	Non-EU	New Decade	Spain	Serbia	BiH
Discrimination change in general		3.74	3.09	3.00	3.39	3.46	3.36	3.08	3.68	3.44	3.10	2.99	2.87	2.79	2.75	2.08	2.92	2.80
Discrimination change in education		3.81	3.55	3.64	3.67	3.63	3.23	3.37	4.00	3.57	3.22	3.05	3.00	2.88	2.72	2.50	2.33	2.41
Discrimination change in housing		3.70	2.75	3.00	3.28	3.16	2.95	2.48	3.24	3.15	2.87	2.71	2.50	2.63	2.55	2.20	3.12	2.47
Discrimination change in employment		3.40	2.82	2.91	3.07	3.20	3.22	3.09	3.67	2.89	2.98	2.95	2.60	2.80	2.77	2.05	3.40	2.73
Discrimination change in health		3.70	2.62	3.64	3.43	3.09	2.84	3.10	3.37	2.94	2.95	2.78	3.00	2.84	2.68	2.53	2.00	2.75
Current situation*		2.76	2.23	2.78	2.79	2.61	2.60	2.36	2.60	2.84	2.60	2.52	3.26	2.59	2.55	2.00	2.79	2.35
Education impact and relevance																		
Preschool		3.92	3.40	3.15	3.44	3.54	4.00	3.25	3.12	3.24	3.35	3.32	3.70	3.20	3.21	2.95	3.23	2.94
Primary & secondary		3.97	3.80	3.23	3.69	3.90	4.04	3.67	3.83	3.86	3.56	3.52	3.00	3.28	3.29	3.60	3.53	2.65
Tertiary		3.36	3.65	2.38	2.69	3.28	3.77	3.83	3.29	2.33	3.00	3.12	2.20	2.77	2.85	3.40	3.40	1.41
Desegregation		2.45	3.00	1.71	2.35	2.35	1.57	3.71	1.83	2.90	2.39	2.41	1.50	2.43	2.58	2.45	3.22	2.00
Language and culture		3.15	3.20	2.77	3.02	2.88	2.68	3.75	2.21	3.14	2.65	2.51	2.40	2.46	2.40	3.25	0.00*	2.59
Employment		3.23	3.45	2.00	2.39	2.67	2.57	3.58	2.17	1.95	2.54	2.59	1.50	2.42	2.50	2.85	2.83	1.76
Adult education		3.25	3.45	3.31	2.96	2.95	2.36	2.79	3.37	2.33	2.95	2.95	3.30	2.95	2.88	3.00	2.85	2.47
Desired change in education		2.36	3.30	2.69	2.62	2.80	2.65	3.21	2.87	2.81	2.75	2.81	2.80	2.72	2.72	2.80	2.16	2.65
Objectives of education Action Plan		2.80	3.10	1.77	2.43	2.76	2.50	2.96	2.67	2.71	2.50	2.53	2.80	2.29	2.40	1.85	2.06	2.31

* none of the experts replied to this question.

Health impact and relevance																		
Primary health care	3.42	3.50	3.83	3.34	3.34	3.23	3.37	3.25	3.12	2.76	3.08	2.98	3.40	2.95	2.78	3.20	2.25	1.78
Women's health	3.23	3.69	3.67	3.34	3.34	3.42	3.89	3.90	3.19	3.12	3.30	3.29	4.00	3.20	3.11	3.25	2.25	2.14
Children's health	3.50	3.75	3.64	3.50	3.50	3.48	3.63	3.00	3.19	3.35	3.15	3.02	3.20	2.88	2.72	3.46	1.50	2.46
Employment in health sector	2.45	2.56	1.33	2.04	2.04	2.24	2.79	3.80	1.06	2.35	2.27	2.36	3.00	2.30	2.49	2.89	1.75	1.00
Healthy lifestyle	3.13	3.06	3.33	3.05	3.05	3.07	3.58	3.20	2.87	2.70	2.82	2.74	2.00	2.62	2.47	3.21	2.25	1.71
Access to health insurance	3.14	3.06	3.64	3.18	3.18	3.26	4.16	3.05	3.19	2.76	3.14	3.12	3.60	3.03	2.91	2.90	2.00	3.00
Access to medicine	3.04	2.62	3.18	3.03	3.03	2.90	3.17	3.00	2.81	2.88	2.71	2.59	2.40	2.56	2.43	2.92	2.33	1.50
Access to specialized treatment	2.90	2.37	2.64	2.53	2.53	2.52	2.72	2.55	2.43	2.06	2.30	2.21	1.80	2.14	2.04	2.37	2.33	1.14
Desired change in the health sector	2.59	2.75	3.00	2.69	2.69	2.57	2.53	2.75	2.50	2.47	2.55	2.50	3.00	2.53	2.44	2.36	2.50	1.57
Health Action Plan objectives	2.93	3.00	2.36	2.49	2.49	2.57	2.44	2.70	2.31	2.18	2.33	2.27	3.00	2.13	2.08	1.86	1.00	1.86

Annex 2—Questionnaire

Respondent Background Information

Name of respondent (optional): _____

MUN SCH PRT NGO GOV

Respondent code (MUN1, MUN2, etc.): _____

Female Male

Employer: _____

Position: _____

Country: _____

Date: _____

General Questions

Please estimate the number of Roma living in your country:

_____ / No answer

Please give the official estimate of the number of Roma living in your country:

_____ / No answer

Please grade the level of overall Roma integration in your country:

- Very high
- High
- Medium
- Low
- Very low
- Don't know

In your opinion, over the past five years, has this level of integration:

- increased very much?
- increased?
- remained the same?
- decreased?
- decreased very much?
- don't know

Please grade the level of discrimination against the Roma in your country:

- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very high
- Don't know

Over the past five years, this level of discrimination against the Roma has:

- decreased very much
- decreased
- remained the same
- increased
- increased very much
- Don't know

Please indicate how the government has prioritized the following areas of Roma integration by numbering the items in the list (1 = the highest priority, 2 = the second-highest, etc.):

- Health
- Education
- Employment
- Housing
- Political participation
- Anti-discrimination
- Gender
- Anti-poverty
- Hate crime
- Other: _____

What are the government's three key sources of information on defining Roma-related policies?

How do you assess the impact of the Decade of Roma Inclusion in your country?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- Don't know

Rank the success of Decade actions over the priority areas (1 = most successful, 2 = second most successful, 7 = least successful):

- Health
- Housing
- Employment
- Education
- Gender
- Equal treatment
- Anti-poverty
- Hate crime
- Other: _____

Policy Input and Political Participation

What is the effectiveness of consultation between Roma actors and government?

- Very high
- High
- Limited
- Very limited
- No consultation
- Don't know

To what degree do Roma organizations have a say in *creating* Roma-related policy?

- Very high
- High
- Medium
- Limited
- Very limited
- Don't know

Why? (please be brief)

To what degree do Roma organizations have a role in *implementing* Roma-related policies?

- Very high
- High
- Medium
- Limited
- Very limited
- Don't know

Why? (please be brief)

Please estimate the proportion of Roma women among the most politically influential Roma in your country:

_____ % / Don't know

Education

Ask the respondent if she/he feels qualified to discuss this topic. If “yes”, please fill out this section. If “no”, please move on to next section.

Please prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of education (1 = the highest priority, 2 = the second highest, etc.):

- Early childhood and preschool
- Primary and secondary education
- Tertiary education
- Desegregation
- Promotion of Romani language, culture, history and identity
- Promotion of employment of Roma in the education sector
- Adult education
- Other: _____

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *early childhood and preschool education*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *primary and secondary education*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *tertiary education*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *desegregation*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing the *promotion of Romani language, culture and history*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *promotion of employment of Roma in the education sector*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *adult education*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

To what degree do education programs bring about desired change?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

To what degree do education programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

In your opinion, over the past five years, has integration in education:

- increased very much?
- increased?
- decreased?
- decreased very much?
- Not changed?
- Don't know

Does the state have a monitoring and evaluation program in this field?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If yes, then to what degree is this monitoring and evaluation program effective?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

To what degree do education programs address gender issues?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

Over the past five years, has discrimination against the Roma in education:

- decreased very much?
- decreased?
- not changed?
- increased?
- increased very much?
- Don't know

Housing

Ask the respondent if she/he feels qualified to discuss this topic. If “yes”, please fill out this section. If “no”, please move on to next section.

Please prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of housing (1 = the highest priority, 2 = the second highest, etc.):

- Access to quality social housing
- Formalization of informal settlements
- Prevention of homelessness
- Communal services and infrastructure
- Improving the current state of housing
- Other: _____

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *access to quality social housing*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *formalization of informal settlements*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *prevention of homelessness*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *communal services and infrastructure*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *improving the state of current housing*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

To what degree do housing programs bring about the desired change?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

To what degree do housing programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

In your opinion, over the last five years, has integration in housing:

- increased very much?
- increased?
- decreased?
- decreased very much?
- not changed?
- Don't know

Does the state have a monitoring and evaluation program in this field?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If yes, then to what degree is this monitoring and evaluation program effective?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

To what degree do housing programs address gender issues?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

Over the past five years, has discrimination against the Roma in housing:

- decreased very much?
- decreased?
- not changed?
- increased?
- increased very much?
- Don't know

Employment

Ask the respondent if she/he feels qualified to discuss this topic. If “yes”, please fill out this section. If “no”, please move on to next section.

Please prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of employment (1 = the highest priority, 2 = the second highest, etc.).

- Training and retraining
- Job placement (public and private sector)
- Self-employment and entrepreneurship
- Guaranteeing equal treatment in the labor market (e.g., equal pay for equal work)
- Other: _____

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *training and retraining*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *job placement in the public and private sector*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *self-employment and entrepreneurship*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *guaranteeing equal treatment in the labor market*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

To what degree do employment programs bring about desired change?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

To what degree do employment programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

In your opinion, over the last five years, has integration in employment:

- increased very much?
- increased?
- decreased?
- decreased very much?
- not changed?
- Don't know

Does the state have a monitoring and evaluation program in this field?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If yes, then to what degree is this monitoring and evaluation program effective?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

To what degree do employment programs address gender issues?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

Over the past five years, has discrimination against the Roma in employment:

- decreased very much?
- decreased?
- not changed?
- increased?
- increased very much?
- Don't know

Health

Ask the respondent if she/he feels qualified to discuss this topic. If “yes”, please fill out this section. If “no”, please thank the respondent.

Please prioritize the issues facing Roma in the area of health (1 = the highest priority, 2 = the second highest, etc.):

- Access to primary health care
- Women’s health
- Children’s health
- Promotion of employment of Roma in the health sector
- Promotion of healthy lifestyles
- Access to health insurance
- Access to medicine
- Access to specialized treatment
- Other: _____

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *access to quality health care*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don’t know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *women’s health*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don’t know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *children's health*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *promotion of employment of Roma in the health sector*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *promotion of healthy lifestyles*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *access to health insurance*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *access to medicine*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

How do you assess the impact of programs addressing *access to specialized treatment*?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative
- No program
- Don't know

To what degree do health programs bring about desired change?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

To what degree do health programs help achieve the objectives in the country Action Plan?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No programs
- Don't know

In your opinion, over the last five years, has integration in health:

- increased very much?
- increased?
- decreased?
- decreased very much?
- not changed?
- Don't know

Does the state have a monitoring and evaluation program in this field?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

If yes, then to what degree is this monitoring and evaluation program effective?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

To what degree do health programs address gender issues?

- Very much
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- Don't know

Over the past five years, has discrimination against the Roma in health:

- decreased very much?
- decreased?
- not changed?
- increased?
- increased very much?
- Don't know

Thank you for helping us conduct this research.

Glossary of Terms

Integration: a process of fitting into a community, notably applied to ‘visible’ minorities.

Discrimination: unequal treatment of a person belonging to a specific group, on the basis of this belonging (religion, ethnicity, in our case Roma), in comparison with the treatment of other people in similar situations, resulting in the restriction or violation of human rights; discrimination is also equal treatment of a person belonging to a specific group in comparison with other people in different situation, again resulting in the restriction or violation of human rights.

Impact: the sustainable difference in the real lives (situation, attitude, behaviour, etc.) of Roma and non-Roma who are connected to Roma, caused by the actions of the Decade or other efforts related to integration.

Decade Watch is an assessment of government action to implement the commitments expressed under the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015.

The Decade aims to give Roma a voice in the process of inclusion, and the Decade Watch assessments are conducted by coalitions of Roma NGOs and activists from countries participating in the Decade. With this third report, Decade Watch has changed its focus from solely measuring input to providing an assessment by independent experts regarding the impact of government policies during the first half of the Decade.

Decade Watch is a contribution by Roma activists toward making the Decade of Roma Inclusion a success.

Decade Watch is supported by the Open Society Foundations and the World Bank.



www.decadewatch.org