MAKING THE MOST OF EU FUNDS FOR ROMA INITIATIVE

USE OF IPA FUNDS FOR ROMA COMMUNITIES IN CROATIA, MACEDONIA AND SERBIA

by Milena Babic, Aleksandar Krzalovski, Ivan Knezevic

Presentation for OSI /MTM Regional Partners and Coordination Meetings Belgrade, 17.10.2012 & 04.02.2013

INTRODUCTION

- 1. BACKGROUND (countries, Roma status)
- 2. ENVIRONMENT (Roma policies, legislation)
- 3. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK
- (Political representation, Government bodies, Local governance/municipalities, Civil society CSO's)
- 4. IPA FUNDS (Programming, Structure, Use)
- 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BACKGROUND

Countries in study: Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia

Sizes: 56, 25, 88 square km, respectively

Populations: 4.3, 2.0, 7,5 million people

BACKGROUND

Country	Census	Roma population	% of total	Unofficial estimate	Unoffi- cial %
Croatia	2001	9,463	0.21%	35,000	0.77%
Macedonia	2004	53,879	2.66%	135,000	6.70%
Serbia	2002	108,193	1.44%	900,000	12.00%

ENVIRONMENT

National Roma Strategies are adopted

Decade of Roma Action Plans, too

Other strategies present (Poverty reduction, Employment, Social inclusion, Roma women, etc.)

Legislation mainly in place and adequate – Constitutions, Laws (e.g. discrimination), Conventions

INSTITUTIONS

- Political representation: MP's, National Councils
- Government bodies: Minister (MK), Offices for
- Human Rights (CRO) or Social Inclusion (SRB)
- Local governance/municipalities
- Civil society CSO's (between 50 and 150)

IPA FUNDS

- Five components (two in Serbia)
- A total of 11.5 billion euro, out of which around 2
- billions for these three countries (Croatia 1,
- Macedonia 0.6; Serbia 1.4)
- In addition, multi-beneficiary component
- Programming with MIFF, MIPD and OP
- Operational structures in place (partly decentralised)

MAKING THE MOST OF EU FUNDS FOR ROMA INITIATIVE

IPA FUNDS

IPA Beneficiary Country	Committed	Contracted	% Contracted	Paid	% Paid
Albania	266.37	104.97	39.41%	52.07	19.55%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	295.95	125.95	42.65%	66.69	22.59%
Croatia	167.50	55.39	33.07%	33.16	19.80%
FRY Macedonia	145.11	49.84	34.35%	24.99	17.22%
Kosovo*	412.20	251.26	60.96%	128.77	31.24%
Montenegro	107.74	63.83	59.24%	34.7	32.21%
Serbia	678.84	350.43	51.62%	225.76	33.26%
Turkey	934.63	271.00	28.99%	178.05	19.05%
Multibeneficiary prog.	760.58	538.13	70.75%	346.01	45.49%

IPA FUNDS

Analysis limitations/reservations:

- Various data sources (and formats)
- Stage of implementation (programmed, allocated, committed, contracted, paid)
- Multi-beneficiary
- Fisches vs concrete granted projects
- Grants/services... & institutions building

IPA FUNDS

Awarded projects:

- Croatia 4 (80% Medjimurje)
- Macedonia 2 (Roma Strategy implement.)
- Serbia 20 (1 CBC, 1 RESDP, 14/168 ESSWeSP, 4/75 CSO)
- Less than 1% of total IPA funds

1. Roma population in Croatia, Macedonia and Serbia, according last censuses is 171,535 persons, which is 1.24% of the total population in those countries (between 0.21% and 2.66%). Unofficial estimates are going over one million people.

2. Although these countries has provided equal treatment in their legal system (starting with explicit mentioning in the Constitution as one of the constituting peoples of Macedonia), Roma people in these, as in other countries in the Balkans and wider, remain one of the most deprived and marginalized ethnic group.

3. Roma related policies are in place (Strategy, Decade Action Plans... although some need update), but their implementation and monitoring is not consistent and verifiable. Legislation is also mainly aligned with EU standards and requirements.

4. Political representation is vivid (various political parties, MP's, many civil society organisations and in Macedonia even one municipality with Roma mayor and majority of Roma people and Roma as official language there as well) and structures are mainly in place...but, lacking coordination&results.

5. Roma actors (organizations and representatives) are hardly participating in IPA programming processes (e.g. only 7 CSOs in Serbia SECO mechanism, Roma network in Croatia, informally in Macedonia) and are lacking capacities (more in terms of previous projects/ references, financial portfolio), as well as willingness for partnerships for successful drawing of IPA funds.

- **6.** IPA funds are providing space for direct benefits of the Roma communities (Minority rights, Democracy, Civil Society Support) and some indirect (through funding of relevant institutions dealing with Roma issues IPA I).
- Not clear whether and to what extent due to Roma actors influences. They are almost not represented in IPA monitoring structures.

- 7. This space translates into concrete Roma-related goals and provision in the guidelines for tenders:
- For example in Serbia, this amount to 6,2% of all committed IPA funds (2007-2012)
- However, not all of these provisions end up in concrete projects specifically for Roma.
- Some (IPA I) are/were aimed at State institutions
- In Serbia, significant amount for IDP's

- **8.** Total of 28 IPA projects targeting exclusively Roma population and/or are implemented by Roma:
- Croatia, 6 projects in total amount of 3,354,280 € (0.9% of contracted IPA funds)
- Macedonia, 2 projects amounting 628,623 €
 (0.4% of contracted IPA funds)
- Serbia, 20 projects (4 CBC, 1 RESDP, 14/168 ESSWeSP, 4/75 CSO) in amount of 1,146,087 €

- 9. Majority of the projects were service contracts (76% in Croatia, both in Macedonia) and for some is not clear whether the benefits were for the Roma.
- 10. Other opportunities through EIDHR (3 projects in each of the countries) or other programmes (e.g. 6 PHARE projects in Croatia)
- 11. Local communities/municipalities were not much engaged in attracting IPA funds for Roma.

All in all

"not much music, for so little funds"

(kol'ko para, tol'ko muzike)