MINUTES
of the Indicator Working Group's
meeting
Objective 4: Support to making the Decade a success

wich took place on 10-11th of June 2008, at OSI Budapest room 302

with the following participants:

- Ms. Melinda Horváth, Ministry of Social and Labor Hungary
- Ms. Susanne Milcher, Institute for the Study of Labor
- Ms. Csilla Kaposvári, OSI – Health Project
- Ms. Tünde Buzetzky, Decade Secretariat
- Mr. Ferenc Zsigó, Decade Watch Hungary
- Mr. Martin Kahanec, Institute for the Study of Labor
- Mr. Daniel Skobla, UNDP Slovakia
- Mr. Ljuan Koka, Agency of Human and Minority Rights, Serbia
- Mr. Aleksander Baucal, Assistant Professor of Developmental Psychology at the University of Belgrade.
- Mr. Andor Ürmös, Ministry of Social and Labor Hungary
- Mr. Christian Bodewig, World Bank (trough phone contact)
- Mr. Gábor Daróczi, Senior Policy Officer - Decade Coordination

with the following parts:

- Where do we stand? - Martin Kahanec, Christian Bodewig, Andor Ürmös
- Presentation of the draft report - Martin Kahanec
- Employment - Martin Kahanec
- Education - Mihai Surdu
- Health - Csilla Kaposvari
- Housing - Andor Ürmös
- Policy conclusions and recommendations - Susanne Milcher
- Conclusions and directions - Martin Kahanec

The meetings main purpose is
- to speed up the work of the IWG
- to identify a well working mechanism
- to involve the next Presidency country (Serbia) into the work of the IWG
- to discuss the report of the Group focusing on parts 6 (Monitoring practice) and 7 (Policy conclusions).
- to identify those tools that make possible to urge the governments to fulfill their tasks agreed and signed under the Chapter III of the ToR (Duties and Responsibilities), like:

- o establish an effective monitoring mechanism, which includes a way to measure progress at the national level of the National Decade Action Plan.
- o make available disaggregated data in accordance with the international standards on data collection and data protection.
- **to identify concrete practical solutions in every countries**

The participants are invited to provide concrete suggestions on these parts (available datasets, feasible measurement options, policy recommendations). These will be discussed in four discussion sessions, each focusing on a specific integration area (employment, education, housing, health).

The short description about the present situation stated, that
- the IWG has to choose (identify) the indicators and after discussion we have to agree and use them
- It was agreed that the framework should propose a set of primary, secondary and potentially tertiary (proxy) indicators (like the EU social inclusion framework) for each sector, where the purpose of the primary indicators is cross-country comparability while the other indicators serve national specific monitoring needs.
- It was suggested the report should contain a table with indicators including a clear definition, indication/suggestion of a source and suggestion of a framework for the first and second best approaches to data collection (including frequency and responsibilities). The solutions should be based on already conducted surveys (pilot approaches) done by various actors (i.e. UNDP' databases of the regional and Slovakian Roma surveys, OSI' s researches, etc.) and be described as "good practices".
- we have to work out how to bridge the framework and the reality (how to get data)
- immediate feedback is needed from the participants about the framework
- there is a big difference between the different Decade pillars – education and employment is in the focus, but to less effort is put on housing and health
- all of the participants expertise is needed in order to know the answers for these questions

Deliverables: It was agreed among members that Martin's technical report will be used as a background paper (once it is finalised) and the Working Group will elaborate a shorter and more practical paper presenting the framework to be shared with the Decade members.

EMPLOYMENT
The most important objectives are:
- Propose data collection mechanisms in collaboration with the existing national systems
- Propose first and second best options, to find the best indicators and sources country – by - country

- More details in the presentation from the 13th International Steering Committee meeting: http://www.romadecade.org/index.php?content=288:

Decade Working Group on Indicators

Report
by Martin Kahanec & the Indicator Group

Zsigó Ferenc

International Steering Committee Meeting
Budapest, June 23-24, 2008

-

EDUCATION
- The Roma Education Fund uses no special indicators, but other international bodies' (UNICEF, EUROSTAT, PISA, etc.) data
- There is two main categories of the used indicators:
  - access to the existing mainstream education
  - quality of the reachable (provided) education
- according to the different implemented programs supported by the REF the most important indicator is their policy impact
- The most important indicators are:
  - participation in pre-primary education
    - percent of the children on country level – percent of the children from the target group
    - average years in the pre-primary education
    - percent of those who have never been enrolled (out of the system)
  - rate of enrollment and share of Roma in
    - "mainstream" primary
    - special/disabled/Roma majority primary
    - never enrolled
  - drop out rate in primary
  - completion of secondary and tertiary
  - level of segregation
    - in classroom level
    - in low quality level but in mainstream schools
    - special schools
    - other "techniques" (private student status)
  - education achievements
    - external standards
    - screening
    - national surveys, etc.

HEALTH

Key issues: there are too many indicators; it is necessary to have priorities, but can not rely on national health surveys only. In many cases the biggest problem is that Roma are not seen by the health systems. The key issues seem to be -as elsewhere-representativeness (enough observation or access to the existing health system), sources of data and identification of the target groups. Generally speaking there is a significant difference between the administrative (system provided) and the (independently made) surveys data. Health Program uses the European Commission's European Community Health Indicator (ECHI) system. (ECHI is covering 7 different topics such as: lifestyle and other health determinants, mortality and morbidity, health systems, health and environment, mental health, accidents and injuries, and health indicators)

- The most important indicators are:
    o life expectancy at born
    o health status
    o vaccination rate for children
    o access to the existing services (the average distance to the nearest hospital, general practitioner, pharmacy; registration with GP)
    o number and share of Roma who are not officially member of the system (not having health insurance at all)
    o share of Roma among health personnel
- Main surveys used by the Health Program
    o UNDP surveys
    o UNICEF survey (in Serbia)
    o (National) Health Interview Surveys (HIS)

HOUSING

The IWG has to decide what we concern as the basic of housing
a) The house itself (water, electricity, heating)
b) The living conditions in bigger terms

- If the version b) will be the IWG preference we have to combine the existing measurements according to the house itself and to clarify the living conditions. The main indicator shall be presented on an *integrated segregation scale*, which includes
    o Low scale housing
        ▪ Water
        ▪ Electricity
        ▪ Heating
        ▪ Sewerage
        ▪ Square meter/capita

    o Access to the existing services
        ▪ Transportation (roads)
        ▪ Job places (on the primary labor market)
        ▪ Schools (precisely clarifying the type: segregated, special, mainstream)
        ▪ Health services (Hospital, GP, pharmacy)

We agreed on the followings:

- the **IWG has to work as a Steering Committee** towards every country and in order to achieve this it is necessary
  - to involve one expert from each country
  - to revise and clarify its plan for the future
  - to turn the theory into practice
- **the whole Decade** (including international institutions, Governments, NGOs, international bodies, etc.) **have to be the stakeholders and the beneficiaries** of the products of the IWG
- the **Governments shall have the ownership** of this initiative
  - it is necessary to **involve the National Statistical Institutes** (NSI) but towards the NSIs the IWG has 3 different approaches

    1. expecting that their existing system (registers, households' budgets, EU-SILC, LFS etc.) provides data.

    2. expecting that with only financial support they will be able to provide data

    3. expecting that with financial support and indicators, questions, methodology to oversampling Roma etc. given by the IWG, and permanent monitoring on their work make them able to provide data

all of the different approaches might be used but special attention shall be paid to the third one

- the IWG has to find its **channels on international level** in order to make the Decade visible and understandable
  - OSI and the IWG have to be involved on European level in the Roma issue; we have to pay special attention that the European Commission's communication already includes the Roma issue, tackling Member Countries – good indicators are needed on international level as well
  - our approach has to be involved in the big international institutes (OECD, ILO, WHO, UN, UNICEF, EUROSTAT, etc.) existing, regular/permanent, surveys, in order to achieve this it is necessary
    - to contact the surveys' leaders (like OECD's Program for International Student Assessment - PISA)
    - to convince the countries ministries, NSIs, to be involved in this work
    - to elaborate the criteria for collaboration
    - to *clarify the target groups* in every country, (specify through researches that according to the national data protection laws is it possible to nominate Roma - based on ethnicity, language, cultural identity, social background, segregated living conditions, etc.) and *to prioritize the different programs most appropriate target groups* (from those who live in segregated area without any access to

mainstream services until those who live in integrated circumstances and full access to every services)

Still necessary to clarify:
- To elaborate how to ensure primary indicators' cross-country comparability, under conditions when available datasets and methodologies of data collection diverge between countries?
    - Since the discussion was about the 'third best approach' (use of 'proxy' indicators under conditions that it is impossible to break-down existing data by ethnicity) more discussion will be needed.
    On the one hand the use of 'proxy' indicator is a convenient tool; on the other hand, it is not exact analytical tool and 'approving' of use of proxies for Decade, might not stimulate governments to adopt measures to collect ethnic data. However, in some cases the use proxy indicators will be inevitable.

Budapest, July 8, 2008

………………………………………….
Gábor Daróczi
Senior Policy Officer –
Decade Coordination