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- The challenges - why indicators are important?
- What kind of indicators are we talking about?
- What are the possible sources of data for the indicators?
- Useful (replicable) examples from the region
The challenges

- Lack of data?
- Lack of indicators?
- Or rather lack of awareness why are indicators and monitoring frameworks are important, how to produce data and use it in indicators…
Indicators and the policy cycle: analysing the situation

- Setting objectives
- Policy and strategy
- Analysis
- Fully costed programmes
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Implementation

“Where are we now?”
- Including quantitative and qualitative analysis
  - Characteristics of the population
  - Macro, social, political constraints
    - Current national strategies
The policy cycle: setting the objectives

"Where do we want to go?"

- Set priorities and objectives
- Define medium- and long-term goals (for growth, poverty reduction etc)
- Integrate MDGs

Setting objectives
Policy and strategy
Fully costed programmes
Policy implementation
Monitoring
Analysis
The policy cycle: developing policies and strategies

- Setting objectives
- Policy and strategy
- Analysis
- Fully costed programmes
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Policy implementation

“What do we need to do to reach objectives?”
- Examine existing programmes
- Identify priority policies and programmes
- Research: evidence-based policy making
The policy cycle: costing programmes

“How much is it going to cost and where is the financing coming from?”

- Cost the range of policies and programmes that have been identified
- Align with budget process

Setting objectives
Policy and strategy
Costing programmes
Poverty analysis
Monitoring
Implementation
The policy cycle: implementation

What do we do to get there?
- Following the steps to deliver the policies and programmes
- Pilot testing and implementing new programmes

Policy formulation → Policy and strategy
Poverty analysis → Fully costed programmes
Monitoring → Implementation
The Policy Cycle: Monitoring and Evaluation

- Setting objectives
- Financing
- Communication
- Analysis
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Policy implementation

“Are we following the steps set out and moving in the right direction?”

“How can we improve progress against objectives?”

“Have we reached objectives?”

“Do we need to review objectives?”
The NAPs as results oriented, evidence-based policy cycle

- **2005 status**
- **2007 status**
- **2015 objectives**
- **Policy and Strategy – 2007-8 objectives**
- **Updated policy and specific objectives**
- **Updated budget and costing**
- **Costed activities in priority areas**
- **Implementation first stage**
- **Monitoring and Evaluation**
- **Implementation second stage**
- **Monitoring and Evaluation second stage**

- **2005 status**
- **2007 status**
- **2015 objectives**
- **Policy and Strategy – 2007-8 objectives**
- **Updated policy and specific objectives**
- **Updated budget and costing**
- **Costed activities in priority areas**
- **Implementation first stage**
- **Monitoring and Evaluation**
- **Implementation second stage**
- **Monitoring and Evaluation second stage**
What kind of indicators?
Data and indicators

- **Data**
  - Measurement of status of one particular phenomenon
  - Doesn’t mean much if taken out of context

- **Indicators**
  - *Combination of data* from two or more data sets
  - Shows *status* and *tendency* of a phenomenon in a relevant context
  - show progress or regress

- **Data ≠ indicators**; you can have data without indicators but not vice versa
Indicators based monitoring chains

- Intermediate
  - Input
    - Financial, physical resources (budget allocations for housing)
  - Output
    - Goods and services produced by inputs (houses built, apartments provided)
  - Outcome
    - Access to, use of, and satisfaction with services (access utilities)
  - Impact
    - Effect on dimension of well-being, housing conditions

Plus sustainability and positive externalities
Example: Housing improvement projects

- **Inputs**: $$$, number of bricks, man/days of work
- **Outputs**: number of houses built/refurbished; km of infrastructure built
- **Outcome**: number of people whose living conditions have been improved; share of population with access to piped water, sanitation
- **Impact**: improvement of living conditions, level of satisfaction
- **Positive externalities**: decline of morbidity rates associated with usage of unsafe water; improved school results of children working in the area;
- **Possible data sources**: Project budgets, construction plans, progress reports, population statistics, health and education records
- **Additional “policy related” indicators**: efficiency (costs of “reaching the beneficiary”), the costs of the alternative approaches, opportunity costs, costs of inaction
Types of indicators and levels of monitoring

- **Qualitative** indicators (descriptive, may be statement of opinion or feeling)
- **Quantitative** indicators (directly measurable, one-dimensional)

Qualitative indicators are not less important and can be (and usually are) quantified.

- Levels of monitoring
  - National
  - International
  - Depend on **what** do we want to monitor and compare
Abuse of indicators

1. Wrong indicator (using input and reporting as outcome indicators)
2. Wrong interpretation
3. Comparing unlike scales (for example, comparing CPI of two countries which use different consumer baskets)
4. Errors in data or analysis methods
5. Using out of date values
6. Inappropriate extrapolation
7. Ignoring variability
What sources of data?
The Decade as data challenge

- Intends to address the needs of *fluid* population. Unclear what to put in the denominator when computing various indicators.
- NAPs need reliable estimate to allocate resources.
- Both sides – governments and Roma – often speak different languages. High level of mistrust.
- Susceptible to manipulation by both sides
  - Government has incentives to ‘report success’
  - Roma CSO have incentives to report failures
Possible data sources

- **Census data**
  - Population censuses
  - Establishment censuses

- **Sample based surveys**
  - Household budget surveys, labour force surveys, sociological surveys
  - Anonymous surveys conducted on the spot by service providers (labour offices, hospitals)

- **Registries**
  - Administrative registries; line ministries registries (in particular, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health); special agencies registries (Health insurance institute, social insurance institutes)
  - Local administrations ‘custom data collection’ exercises

- **Satellite data** (GIS technologies)
Different sources compared

- Population censuses
  - Rich information about housing conditions, could include data on access and quality of services but conducted once in 10 years and extremely expensive

- Establishment censuses
  - Cheaper, can be conducted once in 1-3 years; less expensive but still more than sample surveys; don’t provide data on other socioeconomic variables; penetration of communities difficult

- Sample surveys
  - Relatively easy and cheap but samples are always a problem; penetration of communities difficult
Different sources compared

- Administrative registries
  - Readily available information on housing but not available for informal settlements, unauthorized constructions, slums, etc. Land cadastres can be useful for establishing the status, particularly in combination with GIS. Scarce data on conditions, access, etc.

- Satellite mapping and GIS
  - Can identify houses in informal settlements and slums and serve as basis for other studies; housing surface can be estimated, but don’t supply data on conditions, access. Increasingly popular (South Africa, Kosovo, Laos, Pakistan, India)
Examples of possible approaches in the area of housing
Major principles

- No “Roma-specific” indicators are needed in the area of housing. The challenge is not inventing indicators but filling in existing ones with data.
- Indicator sets should be linked to the needs of the policy cycle outlined above.
- No single data source is reliable and sufficient enough.
- Combination of various data sources can fill major gaps.
- Territorial mapping – a leading principle (primary criterion).
- Ethnic identity – secondary criterion (complementing the territorial layer).
- Individual data integrity should be respected.
- Involvement of Roma in data collection and analysis is a must.
Using census data for territorial mapping at the level of statistical control units in BG

- Share of Roma – census 2001 data
- Housing stock and other parameters can be monitored
- Once territorial units with large share of Rom population are identified, in-depth studies are possible
- Good starting point for analysis
- Needs update through other instruments (census usually once every 10 years)
GIS update of territorial mapping at statistical control units

Sofia, Fakulteta district, 2001 census snapshot

GIS (Google Earth image) makes possible updates between censuses
## Establishment census: Sociographic mapping of Roma settlements in SK

### Banskobystrický kraj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Názov obce</th>
<th>Mesto/ obec</th>
<th>Lokalizácia osídlenia</th>
<th>Poloha osídlenia</th>
<th>Vzdialenosť osídlenia (v m)</th>
<th>Vysporiadanost pozemkov</th>
<th>Vodovod</th>
<th>Kanalizácia</th>
<th>Elektrina</th>
<th>Plyn</th>
<th>Dostupnosť inžinierskych sietí</th>
<th>Verejná zosvetlenie</th>
<th>Prístupová cesta</th>
<th>Dostupnosť inžinierskych sietí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Badín</strong></td>
<td>obec</td>
<td>intravílán</td>
<td>mimo obce</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>vysporiadané</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Badín</strong></td>
<td>obec</td>
<td>intravílán</td>
<td>mimo obce</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>vysporiadané</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
<td>ano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparing years

V porovnaní s rokom 2004 zmena nenastala, jedná sa len o upresnenie údajov.

V porovnaní s rokom 2005 zmena nenastala, jedná sa len o upresnenie údajov.

**Dúbravica - Lesť**

| rok 2004   | obec        | extravílán | mimo obce | 1000 | nie | čiastočne vysporiadané | ano | nie | ano | nie | ano | ano | ano | ano |
| rok 2005   | obec        | extravílán | mimo obce | 1000 | nie | čiastočne vysporiadané | ano | nie | ano | nie | ano | ano | ano | ano |

**Slovenská Ľupča**

| rok 2004   | obec * mimo obce | 100 | nie | nie | ano | nie | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano |
| rok 2005   | obec * mimo obce | 100 | nie | nie | ano | nie | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano | ano |

### Monitoring of progress:

Changes between 2004 and 2005

**Infrastructure in the district**

**Infrastructure in the Roma settlement**
Sample surveys

Living conditions
Percentage of Roma and non-Roma households without

- Secure housing: Roma 25%, Non-Roma 3%
- Improved sanitation: Roma 72%, Non-Roma 22%
- Improved water source: Roma 22%, Non-Roma 6%

“At Risk” UNDP Regional database (SEE countries)
### Sample surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rooms per HH member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOS</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNT</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERB</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- **BG, CRO, CZ, HU, KOS, MAC, MNT, RO, SERB** are the countries listed.
- The bars represent the number of rooms per household member for the majority and Roma populations.

**Graph:**

A bar graph showing the number of rooms per household member for the majority and Roma populations in various countries.

**Legend:**

- **Blue** bars represent the majority population.
- **Red** bars represent the Roma population.

**At Risk** UNDP Regional database (SEE countries)
Sample surveys

Roma in Moldova: quality of dwelling and access to infrastructure

Figure 25. Basic conditions in the dwellings of Roma and non-Roma households

- Electricity: 10% non-roma, 2% Roma
- Kitchen: 42% non-roma, 17% Roma
- Piped water: 100% non-roma, 76% Roma
- Sewerage: 100% non-roma, 60% Roma
- Bathroom: 99% non-roma, 81% Roma
- Flushed WC: 99% non-roma, 81% Roma
Conclusions – data

- Data is a **priority** – indicators come second
- **Sociographic mappings** or Roma settlements could be recommended for all Decade countries. They can
  - provide the **picture of current status** and progress monitoring in the area of housing
  - serve as **sample frames** for surveys
- **Local governments** should be supported in terms of data-related capacities
- Housing is privileged in terms of data and monitoring indicators. Robust frameworks of indicators are **feasible at reasonable cost**
- Roma activists and particularly **young Roma** should be **supported and trained** in the area of data collection and processing – with REF support perhaps?
Conclusions – indicators

- Revision of NAPs to make them evidence-based result oriented policy instruments with relevant indicators is desirable
- National and international levels of monitoring should be seen as complementary
- Mapping of what data exists where is urgently necessary. It can
  - outline both gaps and useable data currently not being used
  - suggest complementarities between different data sets and types of data