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Why this, now?

► We need to know *What works?*
► So as to replicate, scale up, extend
► We need to avoid what does *not* work
► Identify role for funders alongside EU
► Funding guide also done

**Method**

Requests for good practice from Commission, Roma networks, others funders (e.g. UNDP)
Identify good practice using international standards
Request for evaluative material
Good practice: funds

- EQUAL
- European Social Fund (ESF)
- European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)
- Social Exclusion Programme (SEP)
- Community Programme against Discrimination
- Culture programme
- Health programme
- Leonardo
- PHARE
- CARDS
- European Initiative Democracy & Human Rights (EIDHR)
47 examples

► Main countries
  ▪ Romania, Bulgaria, Czech Rep, Slovakia, Hungary
  ▪ Neighbouring states, principally FYROM
  ▪ Fewer in EU15. Best represented: Spain

► Limited range of programmes
  ▪ EQUAL
  ▪ Then ESF, PHARE, CARDS
  ▪ None URBAN, cross-border

► Very few published outcomes.
Case study comments

- A lot of labour market training, social service development
- Minority tackle ‘hard’ issues
- Some leave a legacy
- Some leave a added value (social economy)
- Few build organizational capacity, leaders
- Most are single-phase
- Few offer learning points, self-analysis
- Different approaches to labour market
- Gender issues in a small number
- Some address broader EU agenda e.g. environment, energy
- Innovation most apparent in EQUAL
- Use of cultural mediators in several projects
Evaluations

► Several PHARE evaluations now available

► Consistent criticisms:
  - Insufficient scale for problem
  - Too short time scales, spread too wide & thin
  - Top-down, isolated interventions, lacking Roma participation, rushed preparation
  - High entry, continuation barriers
  - Lack sustainability
  - No connexion to govt policy or institutions
  - Mono-dimensionality
But evaluations show *What works*

- When part of broader policy framework
- With institutional support from government
- Bottom up, participatory, partnership approach
- Significant scale, building capacity
- Global grants (CZ, SK), Intermediary Funding Bodies (IFBs), technical assistance (HU) work
- Multidimensionality works
- Focus on issues, addressing inequalities of power
- Evaluation, dissemination
- Linked to wider national, European networks
Good and bad funding programmes

► Good: EIDHR
  - Rights-based approach

► Good: EQUAL
  - Partnership, empowerment, focus, discrimination & gender, innovation, trans-nationality, scale (€1m/project), linkages

► CARDS
  - Innovation, ‘hard’ issues, focus, legacy

► SEP: serious problems of visibility, dissemination, raising strategic issues

► Programme against discrimination was successfully re-focused around judicial, administrative, political system
Problems of programme management

- No system of collective analysis of lessons arising for Roma programmes
- No place or system where lessons can be heard, absorbed (HLG? ISG? Capacity? Authority?)
- Lessons have *not* been learned:
  
  EQUAL, to be abandoned
  SEP outcomes not improved, despite 2005 evaluation
  *Striking a balance* report on funding?
  Social economy downgraded
  Global grants, technical assistance, IFBs in 2007-2013?
Problem of programme values

Current programming values:
- One-shot applications
- Technical compliance
- High level administrative skills
- Compliance as supreme administrative attribute
- Quantitative monitoring
- Ability to withstand cash-flow, delay, uncertainty

Instead, we need:
- Two-stage application process
- More *qualitative* monitoring, evaluation, dissemination with proportionate accounting
Conclusion: What is good practice?

► Adequate preparation time
► Roma community as stakeholders
► Bottom-up, empowering approach
► Partnership
► Multidimensionality
► Policy and thematic focus
► Institutional linkages
► Evaluation
► Dissemination
► National networks, transnationality
► Innovation

And...
What is good practice? (2)

► Address root causes
► Deal with harder political issues as well as softer social ones
► Rights-based approach
► Leaving a legacy
► Capacity-building
► Leadership development
Bad practice

- Rushed preparation to meet deadlines
- Absence of, or only token consultation
- Top down approach
- Lack of NGO-government mix
- Mono-dimensionality
- Lack of policy dimensions
- Lack of connexions to government
- No evaluation, dissemination
- Absence of new thinking
- Isolation from rest of country, Europe, not networked
- Focus on ‘soft’ issues, no rights base
- Addressing symptoms, not causes
- No legacy
- No leadership, capacity development
General conclusions

- Good programme design = good projects
- Programmes get the projects they deserve
- Culture of programme design and subsequent operation does matter
- Bad procedures drive out those community-based organizations most likely to deliver good projects
- We need to find ways of bringing in those most likely to deliver good practice
This means...(1)

► Reduce entry barriers. Instead, initial phases which value consultation, preparation, bottom-up approach, Roma involvement

► Reduce operational barriers esp. nature of financial compliance

► Scale for sufficient size (e.g. EQUAL), length (5 to 7 years). *Should* be possible in FP 2007-2013.

► Make policy demands on participants e.g. analyze, report, bring issues into heart of political system
This means...(2)

► Supervisory systems to ensure outcomes are disseminated
► Explain to member states what is expected of them, so policies can be uploaded
► System to identify, incentivize good practice (Roma Education Fund does this)
► Use the technical systems which promote good practice: global grants, IFBs, technical assistance
Finally, for other funders

► Role for helping with proposals, build NGO capacity, dissemination, ineligible spending, cash flow crises, leadership etc

► But: leaves programmes unreformed

► So, consider supporting Roma groups to:

  ▪ Analyze, evaluate EU funding systems
  ▪ Empower as a voice of critical opinion
  ▪ Develop capacity to work with govt, EU to improve programme design & operation

► Thank you!