

MAKING THE MOST OF EU FUNDS FOR ROMA

**USE OF IPA FUNDS FOR ROMA
COMMUNITIES IN MACEDONIA
AND SERBIA**

Aleksandar Krzalovski (and Ivan Knezevic)

**Presentation for International Conference
Perspectives for Financing Roma Inclusion with EU Funds
Zagreb, 01.03.2013**

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	Unofficial %
Croatia	2011	16,975	0.40%	35,000	0.81%
Macedonia	2004	53,879	2.66%	135,000	6.70%
Serbia	2011	147,604	2.05%	450,000	6.26%

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), Office for 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 two countries (MK 0.6; SRB 1.4)

In addition, multi-beneficiary component

Programming with MIFF, MIPD and OP

Operational structures in place (partly decentralised)

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	857.40	749.67	87.44%	484.68	56.53%
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 - Macedonia

Awarded projects:

- 2 (Roma Strategy implementation) 0.6 m. EUR
- 1 SC for improvement of employment of minority communities 1.5 m. EUR
- 7 grants for the same purpose (same amount)
- In addition – 3 EIDHR projects
- Less than 1% of total IPA funds

IPA FUNDS - Serbia

Awarded projects (~6.5% Roma related)

- Support to refugees * (37.2 m. EUR)
- 4/500 CBC (2.3 m. EUR*)
- 14/168 ESSWeSP (561,289 EUR; 9.6%)
- 4/75 CSO (279,545 EUR; 4.65%)
- Plus 3/80 EIDHR (162,917 EUR; 3.2%)
- Opportunities: SDEPBAE, IMPRESS, MB

CONCLUSIONS (& some Recommendations)

1. Roma population in Macedonia (53,879) and Serbia (147,604), according last censuses are persons, which is 2.66 & 2.05% of the total population in those countries. Unofficial estimates are going over half million people.

CONCLUSIONS (& some Recommendations)

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.

CONCLUSIONS (& some Recommendations)

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.

CONCLUSIONS

(& some Recommendations)

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.

CONCLUSIONS

(& some Recommendations)

5. Roma actors (organizations and representatives) are hardly participating in IPA programming processes (e.g. only 7 CSOs in Serbia SECO mechanism, 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.

CONCLUSIONS (& some Recommendations)

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.

CONCLUSIONS

(& some Recommendations)

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

CONCLUSIONS

(& some Recommendations)

8. Total of 25 IPA projects targeting exclusively Roma population and/or are implemented by Roma:

- Macedonia, 2 projects amounting 628,623 € (0.4% of contracted IPA funds) + 1 SC + 7 gr.
- Serbia, 23 projects (4 CBC, 1 RESDP, 14/168 ESSWeSP, 4/75 CSO)

CONCLUSIONS (& some Recommendations)

9. Many of the projects were service contracts (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

11. Local communities/municipalities were not much engaged in attracting IPA funds for Roma.

CONCLUSIONS (& some Recommendations)

All in all

“not much music, for so little funds”

(kol’ko para, tol’ko muzike)