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Presentation themes

• Poverty as cross-cutting issue in the Roma Decade
• A human development approach to Roma poverty
  – Monetary versus non-monetary poverty
  – Multidimensional poverty index
• Why this matters
• Some possible future considerations
  – Data
  – Indicators
Roma Decade: Priority areas and cross-cutting themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority areas</th>
<th>Cross-cutting themes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty reduction</td>
<td>Gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to develop systematic, holistic approaches to Roma poverty?

• Make use of quantitative data
  – 2004 regional Roma data set (baseline)
  – 2011 regional Roma data set (midpoint)

• Apply appropriate indicator(s)
  – Monetary poverty: Income poverty rates
  – Broader measures: Multidimensional poverty index (MPI)

• Anchor to human development paradigm
Monetary poverty: Measurement

• PPP$4.30/day threshold, based on:
  – Equivalized household budget survey data, showing reported household expenditures
    • Proxy for per-capita income
  – Internationally comparable exchange rates

• This approach often used to measure poverty in:
  – Middle-income countries
  – Where:
    • Extreme poverty is not the issue
    • Significant shares of household budgets are spent on winter heating, clothes
What do these data show?

• Monetary poverty rates during 2004-2011 fell for:
  – Roma
  – Non-Roma

• Greater declines in poverty for Roma than for:
  – Non-Roma living in close proximity
  – Countries as a whole

• Particularly large declines for:
  – Albania
  – Serbia

• Declines in Roma poverty due in part to high initial levels?

“R”—Roma; “NR”—Non-Roma
• Eurostat (relative) poverty threshold: 60% of median income

• Income inequality is much greater than national averages for both:
  – Roma
  – Non-Roma living in proximity

• How should this be interpreted?

(2011 data)
Roma poverty is multidimensional (not only about low incomes)
Roma poverty is also multi-generational.

- **Legacies of past deprivation, exclusion**
- **Poverty today**
- **Less capacity for future development**
The human development paradigm can capture these dimensions

• Improving people’s lives should be the objective of development

• Development challenges are inter-generational:
  – Access to services (education, health) needed to respond
  – Addressing inequalities: A key issue

• Rights-based approach to development
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## Multi-dimensional poverty index

**MPI aggregates different indicators of current, future welfare**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material well-being (current welfare)</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Access to basic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Livings in “slums”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living standards</td>
<td>Extreme poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to household amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour market</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capabilities (future welfare)</td>
<td>Basic rights</td>
<td>Civil status (IDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited access to health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ivanov-Kagin MPI methodology

• Data for indicators are taken from:
  – National statistics
  – Targeted regional surveys of:
    • Roma
    • Non-Roma living in proximity

• An individual is considered:
  – “Multi-dimensionally poor” if s/he falls below the threshold for 5-7 indicators
  – “Severely multi-dimensionally poor” if s/he falls below the threshold for more than 7 indicators

• Thresholds are indicator-specific
  – If a respondent has an ID, s/he is above the “civil status” threshold

• Different specifications/methodological choices produce different results
  – Policy considerations should dictate these choices
What does the MPI tell us?

- Multi-dimensional poverty rates:
  - Generally high
  - Rising for non-Roma (in close proximity)

- For Roma—MPIs:
  - Fell in FYRoM, BiH, Montenegro
  - Rose in Serbia, Albania

“R”—Roma; “NR”—Non-Roma
Some conclusions from the paper

• People-centred (as opposed to solely monetary) measures of Roma poverty, addressing all the Decade’s priority areas, can be devised and used

• They can produce very different results
  – Example: In Albania and Serbia, during 2004-2011, Roma poverty when measured in:
    • Monetary terms—it fell
    • Multi-dimensional terms—it rose
  – These differences are important for policies in key sectors where higher incomes may not automatically translate into better living conditions
    • Housing

• Income inequalities among Roma are much greater than among populations overall
Possible future considerations: Data

• More Roma inclusion data are needed
  – Disaggregated by ethnicity
• Nationally: Statistical authorities
• Regionally:
  – If the data from the 2004 regional Roma survey provided a baseline for the Decade . . .
  – . . . And if the 2011 regional Roma survey data offer a mid-term assessment . . .
  – . . . Shouldn’t we have another survey in 2015—at the end-point of the Decade (in its current form)?
• UNDP would welcome the opportunity to work with FRA, other partners on this
Possible future considerations: Indicators

• Like the Decade (in its current form), the Millennium Development Goals end in 2015

• Their successors—the Sustainable Development Goals—are now being negotiated by UN member states

• Unlike MDGs, SDGs are to be universal
Key driver: Inter-governmental Open Working Group (OWG) on SDGs

• Seven Decade countries represented on the OWG: Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Spain

• OWG proposed 17 draft SDGs in mid-July
  – 170 targets
  – No indicators yet specified
  – Negotiations on these issues now on-going

• SDGs to be submitted to UN General Assembly at September 2015 Summit for approval
Roma inclusion indicators and the SDGs: A lot in common?

- SDG1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere.
- SDG2: End hunger/food insecurity, improve nutrition . . .
- SDG3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all . . .
- SDG4: Ensure inclusive, equitable, quality education . . .
- SDG5: Ensure gender equality, empower women and girls . . .
- SDG6: Ensure availability . . . of water and sanitation for all.
- SDG7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all.
- SDG8: Promote . . . full and productive employment and decent work for all.
- SDG10: Reduce inequality within and among countries.
- SDG11: Make . . . human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable.
In conclusion—UNDP:

• Thanks Andrey Ivanov and Justin Kagin for this important, innovative study, and

• Invites Decade partners to consider joint action on:
  – Data and indicators
  – Contextualizing them vis-à-vis the post-2015 future of Roma inclusion policies and programming, especially regarding:
    • The future of the Roma Decade
    • Other relevant post-2015 global and regional monitoring frameworks (e.g., SDGs)
Thank you very much!

ben.slay@undp.org