

ECMI
REPORT



EUROPEAN CENTRE
FOR
MINORITY ISSUES

**Roma Policies for a Positive Change:
From Inclusion towards Empowerment**

Flensburg, Germany

31 March - 01 April 2014

Zora Popova

REPORT # 66
October 2014



The European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) is a non-partisan institution founded in 1996 by the Governments of the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the German State of Schleswig-Holstein. ECMI was established in Flensburg, at the heart of the Danish-German border region, in order to draw from the encouraging example of peaceful coexistence between minorities and majorities achieved here. ECMI's aim is to promote interdisciplinary research on issues related to minorities and majorities in a European perspective and to contribute to the improvement of interethnic relations in those parts of Western and Eastern Europe where ethnopolitical tension and conflict prevail.

ECMI Working Papers are written either by the staff of ECMI or by outside authors commissioned by the Centre. As ECMI does not propagate opinions of its own, the views expressed in any of its publications are the sole responsibility of the author concerned.

ECMI Report #66
European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)
Director: Dr. Tove H. Malloy
© ECMI 2014



Roma Policies for a Positive Change: From Inclusion towards Empowerment

Flensburg, Germany
31 March-1 April 2014

Roma Policies for a Positive Change: from Inclusion towards Empowerment was the topic of a two-day workshop organized end of March 2014 in Flensburg by the European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI). Gathering policy researchers and practitioners, the event aimed at addressing the state of the art of policy-making for Roma in Europe and at providing an open platform for discussions about the ways forward. The workshop examined: (1) The EU Roma inclusion project; (2) Roma policies in a critical perspective; and (3) Institutional approaches to Issues related to Roma.

**Zora Popova,
October 2014
ECMI Report # 66**

I. INTRODUCTION

For more than a decade, ECMI has been actively involved in research and action-oriented Roma-related projects covering all 28 EU Member States as well as the countries of the Western Balkans outside the European Union (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia) and Georgia.¹ As described in the report “ECMI’s Work on and with Roma: From Research to Action for Empowerment” the situation of Roma has been a focus of ECMI activities since 2000, when Romani non-governmental

organizations played a key role in the establishment of the ECMI NGO Network for the Improvement of Interethnic Relations in the Republic of Macedonia. For just over a decade, in addition to the 16 action-oriented initiatives, ECMI has published 25 documents with a focus on Roma² and a special issue of the Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe (JEMIE), in which experts external to ECMI treated various aspects of political activity by and policy toward Roma.

Taking into account the long-standing marginalization of the largest European minority, ECMI has developed a particular approach to Roma with the aim to support the empowerment of their communities. ECMI has focused its efforts in four broad domains and their relevant thematic sub-areas: informational, political (including capacity building, civil rights, participation, policy), social (covering employment, health, migration), and cultural (culture, gender). In a reflection of the complexity of Roma's needs, most of ECMI's activities with Roma bridge multiple themes and domains and focus on laying foundations for active, equitable, and informed participation by Roma.

Consistent with ECMI's overall approach of developing and providing sustainable tailor-made tools, ECMI's activities with Roma are rooted in minority standards and ground action toward more effective realization of those standards in expert research. At the same time, from early on ECMI has distinguished itself for the degree to which Roma have been actively involved in all stages of project design and implementation.³

The decade of ECMI work with Roma has produced some notable successes, especially in the domains of informational and political empowerment. More importantly, ECMI's experience has built institutional expertise on the topic and enabled the identification of key challenges that still demand attention:

- In the light of increased activity of the European Union in relation to Roma, the wide range of policies adopted at national level and the number of projects

implemented by a range of governmental and non-governmental, national and international actors, call for systematic comparative analysis and evaluation of the achievements (or the lack of such).

- Education has been widely recognized as a crucial factor for Roma's social empowerment. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the problems Roma face in this thematic area challenges the efficiency and the adequacy of all the past and current programmes and approaches. The recent innovations in ECMI activity in the field of education of Roma – e.g. ECMI Kosovo's strategic litigation on segregation in standard education and an ECMI Working Paper on the treatment of education in submissions under the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies⁴ - make clear that much work lies ahead in order to bring about palpable improvements in Roma daily life.

- Mainstreaming issues of gender is still a challenge that has not been thoroughly covered; this increases the risk that Roma women continue to face multiple discriminations. ECMI Kosovo's recent project focused exclusively on the economic empowerment of Roma, Ashkali, and Egyptian women provide important insights on how to move ahead in addressing issues of gender among Roma.⁵

As a research and policy-oriented institution, ECMI has been closely monitoring the policies targeting Roma throughout and beyond the European Union at national and regional levels. The relatively recent development of EU-level policy targeting Roma integration is of particular interest to ECMI researchers.

Alongside progress and achievements, analyzing the policy processes over the past decade and the current situation, ECMI has identified certain shortfalls that could diminish the positive impact of targeted efforts.

II. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE WORKSHOP

ECMI has found that the general approach to the development of policies for Roma integration is scattered and hardly coordinated, based more on assumptions than on the evaluation of project outcomes and field findings. International and national level agendas are quite often top-down, formulated without taking into account the success or failure of earlier programmes, and addressing Roma as vulnerable beneficiaries rather than agents of expected change. The objective evaluation of current policies and practices and the critical discussion of achievements, existing needs and future challenges, require the active involvement of scholars and policy experts, of practitioners experienced in programme planning and implementation, but also of the stakeholders themselves.

Preliminary research undertaken by ECMI experts identified a lack of cross-cutting comparative analysis of Roma-related policies and strategies covering the complexity of the issues and their interaction in the EU Member States thoroughly. The focus of the assessments to date has been either on particular problems (e.g. on the monitoring of the NRIS implementation, data collection, allocation and spending of funds) or particular countries. ECMI also aimed to open a discussion on reasons for

the inefficiency of the projects targeting Roma inclusion and of the usage of allocated funds.

Taking the state of affairs into account, the main objective of the workshop was to gather practitioners and scholars in a structured debate about the reasons behind the limited success of Roma inclusion policies and measures and to reflect about possible ways that those challenges could be addressed and overcome. Welcoming the participants, ECMI Director Dr. Tove Malloy acknowledged the significant achievement of the first EU-coordinated attempt to approach the challenge of Roma inclusion through the collection of the National Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS) and presented the aims of the workshop, namely:

- **To reflect on the feasibility of the EU project for common policy on Roma inclusion** by addressing questions such as:

- What are the steps for the EU to move forward from the puzzle of national strategies and to become a truly coherent strategy implemented through a coordinated approach?

- Should the EU Roma policy become a “common policy implemented locally” and how to achieve it?

- To what extent would the identified common problems require common actions/measures?

- **To reflect on the reasons behind the limited success with Roma inclusion** in light of the numerous integration projects and programmes, allocated funds, number of actors involved, national/international level strategies and policies;

- **To identify the relevant measures that could enable positive societal change.**

Touching upon the above-mentioned problematic areas and examining Roma-related policies, projects and initiatives in a critical and comparative horizontal perspective, the participants delivered the following presentations in the three topical sessions:

THE EU ROMA INCLUSION PROJECT

- Roma Inclusion: a Feasible EU project? (Dr Zora Popova)
- Education in Member State Submissions under The EU Framework For National Roma Integration Strategies (Dr Eben Friedman)
- The situation of Roma: between human rights and economics (Dr Eben Friedman)
- EU Framework for Roma integration: Doomed to fail? (Dr Bernard Rorke)
- Video message by MEP Lívía Járóka

ROMA POLICIES IN A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

- Decade Intelligence: Factors for success and failure of Roma targeting projects -overview of the findings on these factors (examples of projects) (Ms Alexandra Bojadjieva)
- Limits and potentials of policies targeting Roma (Dr Márton Rövid)
- Identity and policy making: Is there a role for identity in designing policies towards minorities? (Mr Iulius Rostas)

THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO ISSUES RELATED TO ROMA

- The Council of Europe ROMED/ROMACT programmes, Mr Marius Jitea
- The European Roma & Travellers' Forum (ERTF), Mr Henry Scicluna
- From Research to action for Empowerment: ECMI's Work on and with Roma, Dr Eben Friedman.

In the final session of the workshop, the participants had a roundtable debate about the issues raised in previous sessions and the possible measures for overcoming the identified challenges.

The current report presents the focal points for each session of the event. A summary of the discussions at the end of the report outlines the findings and the policy recommendations formulated by the participants on the basis of two days of intensive and focused analysis, policy debate and brainstorming.

III. THE EU ROMA INCLUSION PROJECT

The presentations delivered within the framework of this thematic section outlined the background of the EU Roma inclusion project. They also focused on some of the major challenges that need to be faced and overcome at EU level in order for real positive change to be achieved within the expected time frames.

Dr Zora Popova opened the workshop with a critical assessment of the ongoing EU Roma integration project.⁶ Reflecting upon the economic aspects behind the impetus for Roma inclusion that led to the 'proliferation'

of policies and projects over the past decade, she noted the particular impact of the global financial and economic crisis which has increased awareness about the need for a new approach to development to guarantee stability and ‘flexicurity’ of systems (as outlined in the strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth „Europe 2020“).⁷

According to the Council of Europe estimates, the Roma population in the EU28 has reached 10 to 12 million people, unevenly distributed across communities of just a few hundred people in Luxembourg (and even less in Malta) to 1 850 000 in Romania,⁸ with an average age of 25.1 years. In the light of the aging population in Europe (of 40.2 years of average age for EU28)⁹ this young group emerges as a significant factor for EU economic development. The vast majority of the working-age Roma lack education and skills to participate successfully in the labour market, which makes the cost of non-inclusion (in terms of lost productivity and fiscal contributions to governments) very high for the EU countries.¹⁰ If the level of Roma employment is brought to the EU average, it will result in a 4-5 % GDP increase - more than the defence budget of any European country.¹¹

Adopting the socio-economic approach to inclusion and addressing Roma as an ‘economic target audience’,¹² the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020 (hereinafter “EU Framework”) has called Member States to join forces under the common structure but to retain responsibility for policy development and their implementation at the

national level. Analysing the Framework and the submitted 27 NRIS,¹³ Dr Popova identified four major interrelated challenges to the EU project that could put at risk the aimed coherence of the EU Roma policy and the expected positive societal change:

- Lack of a common cognitive platform that challenges the synchronization of policies and efforts within the frameworks of the coordinated structural approach;

- A general lack of focus on equity as a guiding principle for Roma inclusion strategies;

- Disregarding cultural aspects in designing Roma-related policies and programmes;

- Lack of coherence between political discourses on different levels (EU, Member States, stakeholders) and between political and pragmatic perspectives on inclusion;

In conclusion, Dr Popova pointed out that an integrated approach aiming at fostering positive societal change should ensure that subjective risk-factors such as various levels of experience and expertise of national governments, knowledge gaps, and lack of capacities or political will, are overcome. Achieving an overall positive change requires not only a common general EU framework and a common structured approach to inclusion, but also synchronised procedures and suitable, efficient measures to address respective issues. In the age of globalization a structural approach to developmental challenges requires not only mutual consent on policy frameworks and targeted outcomes, but also a common platform of understanding, a common ‘language’, and agreed intervention

procedures and mechanisms. The elaboration of such an integrated in-depth strategy looking at both ‘what is needed’ but also at ‘how to achieve it’, requires a critical assessment of the problems and identification of the horizontal cross-cutting measures that could be implemented through synchronised and coordinated efforts.

In line with the topic, Dr Eben Friedman presented his preliminary assessment of the success of the EU Framework Convention in bringing about the adoption and further development of the National Strategies on Roma Integration. He paid particular attention to education as a key area of the EU Framework.¹⁴ Beginning his evaluation with a look at the refusals and reservations of Member States,¹⁵ Dr Friedman posed the question “What counts as a National Roma Integration Strategy (NRIS),“ since among the NRIS there are:

- **Targeted national strategies** (BG, HR, CZ, FI, On EL, HU, IT, LT, PL, PT, RO, SK, SI, ES, SE) , four of which were produced before the EU Framework (CZ, FI, PL, SI) and

- **Integrated sets of policy measures** (AT, BE, CY, DK, EE, FR, DE, IE, LV, LU, NL, UK) – all of which were produced **in response to the Framework.**

Taking into account the prior participation of six Member States in the Decade of Roma Inclusion, only five EU Member States appeared to have changed their overall approach in policy for Roma as a result of the EU Framework: Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Portugal, and Sweden. As the total estimated number of Roma in these five Member States is only around ten percent of the total for the EU, the likely

contribution of the EU Framework to changes in the situation of Roma through a fundamental change in policy approach is relatively small.

Looking at the area of education, only in the submissions of Sweden, Poland and Greece is there a clear indication of how education should be prioritized relatively to other areas. A key design weakness of the EU Framework, according to Dr Friedman, is that some of the indicated means proposed risk compromising realization of the corresponding objectives. Beyond design weaknesses, the EU Framework has not effectively disseminated its package of education objectives among the Member States:

- None of the education objectives secured the assent of all EU Member States which submitted a document in response to the Framework, while only five submissions address all six of the education objectives included in the EU Framework.

- The relatively small numbers of submissions taking into account issues of discrimination, access to quality education, and early school leaving suggest low levels of awareness of the barriers faced by Roma in the area of education.

Dr Friedman pointed out that among the weaknesses of the approach to Roma education in general are:

- the lack of **attention to gender issues** (absent from the EU Framework as well);

- the projection of prejudices even in the positive initiatives (e.g. scholarships available only for the artistically gifted Roma youth, but not for mathematics for example);

- continuous segregation policies (e.g. in promotion of the idea of boarding schools and special colleges for Roma in Hungary and France with regulation of ethnic composition);

- relatively little attention to discrimination, access to quality education, and early school leaving

Considering that rates for Roma completion of primary education are fairly good but that less than a third complete secondary education, perhaps the overall goal of the EU Framework needs to be reconsidered, concluded Dr Friedman and proceeded to his second contribution to the workshop.

Examining “**The situation of Roma: between human rights and economics**”,¹⁶ Dr Eben Friedman looked at the different approaches to Roma population in Europe in a historical perspective, distinguishing four guiding principles (extermination, assimilation, human rights, and economics) of policy making towards Roma since their arrival in Europe more than seven centuries ago. As signatories of the *UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* and the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, most (but not all) member states of the Council of Europe have in principle eliminated extermination and assimilation from consideration as policy goals.

Whereas documents on Roma published in the 1990s by intergovernmental organizations tended to emphasize human rights as a basis for calls for measures to improve the Roma’s situation, since the first several years of the current millennium similar calls have been increasingly rooted

in the proposition that improvements in the situation of Roma can be expected to provide economic benefits for the general populations of the countries in which Roma live. In Dr Friedman’s view, each approach has its liabilities:

- The ostensibly hermetic nature of human rights appears to drive some opponents of rights-based policies to call into question Roma’s very humanity - the continued deployment of human rights discourse as used to date in relation to Roma risks deepening divisions between Roma and non-Roma.

- Economic arguments for improving the situation of Roma introduce an element of contingency which opens the door also to similarly grounded arguments against improving the situation of Roma and ultimately even to arguments for killing them.

Human rights and economic discourses are sometimes deployed together in attempts to build support for measures to improve the situation of Roma, but the coexistence of the two discourses is rather problematic. On the one hand, adding economic considerations to considerations of human rights does not address the ongoing backlash against talk about Roma in terms of human rights. On the other hand, combining human rights arguments with economic ones does not provide explicit guidance on how to adjudicate between the two in case of conflict.

According to Dr Friedman, the significant risk today **is that the economic arguments and the developmental perspective within which the policies targeting Roma are currently articulated**

might drive away attention from human rights issues. There is an immediate need for vigilance to prevent backsliding on human rights commitments, which is implicit in discussions of assimilation or extermination as policy options in the present day.

The promotion of a broad understanding of human rights (as including economic, cultural, civil, and political rights) among non-Roma, seems a promising mechanism in a longer term perspective. But even becoming an integral part of the compulsory education, the human rights discourse could become credible for Roma only through concrete improvements, as for example the unequivocal recognition of Roma as legitimate rights bearers, concluded Dr Friedman.

The shortfalls of the human rights perspective in the ongoing public and political debate about, and in the conceptualization and the implementation of policies targeting Roma were also emphasized by Dr Bernard Rorke. Referring to recent public statements on Roma by prominent European politicians,¹⁷ Dr Rorke **questioned the meaning implied by the concept ‘integration’ of Roma as opposed to ‘assimilation’.** In his view, the notion of integration is now seen as a **“one-way street” with the onus being placed on the minorities to make adjustments, and accommodations deemed necessary for social cohesion.**

If integration is understood in terms of equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance (as defined by the UK Home Secretary (1966) Roy Jenkins), the guiding

question of all integration policies should be **how members of minority communities can become equal citizens bound to the rest by ties of common belonging.** Integration should, therefore, **be viewed not as an end, but as the means of a two-way process,** an open-ended sequence of negotiated adjustments between Roma and non-Roma citizens.

Achieving the goals of promoting empowerment, active involvement and participation of Roma at all levels of policy development, decision-making and implementation of measures, as outlined by the 2013 European Council Conclusions, according to Dr Rorke seems rather optimistic when all the existing challenges to Roma inclusion are considered.

Despite the focused efforts of the European Commission towards **building a strategic and sustainable approach to Roma inclusion** over the past few years (marked by the adoption of the EU Roma Framework), Member States are still inefficient in absorbing the available funds and numerous administrative and technical barriers which prevent small civil society organizations from access to them. There is no clear understanding of what has been achieved and which practices should be categorized as good, bad or useless. The focus still falls on the process but not on the policy substance and impact, with little attention to how the use of EU funds has made a tangible difference to lives of Roma.

Another key challenge is the ongoing atavistic **racism** (also projected in the media coverage) and the radical and extreme **prejudice** against Roma – a mainstream predisposition across the European Union.

As Dr Rorke emphasized, **effective social inclusion must be accompanied by rigorous implementation of anti-discrimination legislation and respect for fundamental human rights.** Among the other measures, this implies that there is a need for:

- More targeted efforts to combat the ongoing practices of direct and indirect discrimination against Roma, including school segregation, racism and hate speech;

- More efficient implementation of the provisions of the Racial Equality Directive (already transposed into domestic legislation across the Union);

- Identification and repeal of discriminatory and segregation measures and all forms of institutional racism;

- Revision of strategies to reflect an unambiguous recognition of the interdependence of inclusion and anti-discrimination as a prerequisite for meaningful integration;

- EU action to ensure effective and comprehensive implementation and enforcement of the legislation against discrimination across the Member States,

- EU support to Member States in coordinating and scaling up existing efforts to work with local authorities, educational institutions, and civil society partners on awareness-raising campaigns to dispel anti-Roma prejudice and negative attitudes; and

- Empowerment of Roma to know their rights and support inter-cultural dialogue and cooperation.

Furthermore, while national contexts vary, and progress is uneven, across most of the EU countries **common deficits include:**

- The absence of a child-centred approach;

- Failure to address the lack of reliable disaggregated baseline data necessary for the “robust monitoring mechanisms”¹⁸ requested by the Commission;

- Lack of focused efforts to mainstream gender equity across the priority policy areas;

- No systemic moves to end school segregation;

- Evidence of stagnation and regress in many countries especially in terms of combating discrimination and racism.

Concluding his presentation, Dr Rorke emphasized that the responsibility for promoting inclusion, tackling discrimination, diffusing tension and fostering inter-cultural dialogue lies with Member States, elected national governments and local authorities. Fully inclusive societies that foster a sense of common belonging, cohesion, and mutual respect among all citizens require governments that fulfil their democratic responsibilities. Although an important partner in the process, civil society organizations have neither the capacity nor the legitimacy to manage public service provision effectively, especially in regions of acute poverty. However, NGOs can have a great impact on the political environment combating injustice, discrimination, and segregation.

Finally, Dr Rorke shared his fears that the Framework might recede into the background, as the so-called stakeholders steadily reduce the stakes, and lower expectations to the extent that by 2020, failure can masquerade as success, manifest

in parades of good practice, steps forward, and lessons learned.

The first session of the workshop ended with a video message by **the MEP Lívia Járóka**, who pointed out certain aspects of the EU Framework, which call for improvement. In her opinion the National Strategies

- should be brought closer to reality by clarifying implementation mechanisms and generating a dashboard of inclusion indicators;

- must include the stakeholders in the process;

- must better target Roma ensuring their multisectoral involvement; and

- must protect Roma (fight hand-in-hand with discrimination and anti-gypsyism).

Moreover, according to Ms. Járóka, the EU Framework should reach Roma outside the EU as well. Ms Járóka concluded that a successful social and economic inclusion programme require the involvement of authorities at all political levels.

IV. ROMA POLICIES IN A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

The second workshop session focused on policies targeting Roma practices. Ms Alexandra Bojadjieva presented the project ‘Decade Intelligence’. The aim of the initiative was to map projects implemented under the ‘Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015’ and to analyse the level of their success and transferability.

An analysis of 314 projects performed by independent consultants aimed not only to distinguish practices as good or bad, but

also to identify the factors that contributed to the respective projects’ success (or lack thereof). Projects were assessed along the following parameters:

- **the involvement of government;**
- **the gap between Roma and non-Roma** (considering not only the change within the Roma community, but whether the gaps have shrunk or increased);
- **participation of Roma;**
- **the official incorporation of the practice within the system** (i.e., how projects have been developed into policies).

After the initial assessment, 42 projects were examined more closely with the goal to identify the factors that have contributed to or hindered the success of the projects. As Ms Bojadjieva revealed, the assessment indicated that the average points that the projects score was 16 out of 30 but also that the indicator of Roma participation had the best average individual score.

According to the findings, the most significant role in the process of project implementation was that of non-governmental actors, either international organisations or NGOs, while governments were involved as donors or consultants. The relatively low level of governmental involvement was identified as a serious failure, and the conclusion was reached that there is a need for mechanisms to ensure that authorities fulfil their commitments.

Categories such as thorough and meaningful involvement of Roma, designing and implementing Roma inclusion in interventions, external factors, organisation of resources, and funding were used to evaluate the success of the projects. Under each of the categories, a set of indicators has

been identified. The analysis revealed that ‘outreach’ and ‘provision of safety and incentives’ were the factors that most strongly influenced the project success. Projects bringing Roma and non-Roma together, encouraging communities to find ground and goals, appeared rather successful.

The evaluation also revealed that external factors can play a significant role in project success or failure. Ms Bojadjeva gave examples of the failure of good projects in Romania due to lack of supportive legislation and negative results of government change in Hungary. Among the other factors considered were cost-efficiency and gender involvement.

Discussing the shortfalls of policies targeting Roma Dr Márton Rövid pointed out that both the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the EU Framework are facing the same key challenge – the lack of a system for effective monitoring and evaluation. A pilot programme for shadow reporting has been launched by the Decade Secretariat and the Open Society Roma Initiatives Office and Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma programme. The selected 8 + 8 civil society organisations (first cycle: Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, Spain; and second cycle: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, France, Germany, Italy, Montenegro, Serbia, United Kingdom) have been monitoring both mainstream and targeted government measures.

Mr Rövid provided examples for six types of identified measures, ranging from the most successful to the largely negative:

Successful Measures of NRIS

- Czech Republic: Roma pedagogical assistants;
- Hungary: a kindergarten enrolment subsidy for multiple disadvantaged children, integrated pedagogic system, bonus for teachers in this system;
- NRIS monitoring system;
- Macedonia: inclusion of Roma Children in Public Pre-Schools;
- Romania: affirmative action at high school and university levels.

Positive Mainstream Measures

- Czech Republic: changing admission criteria for kindergartens;
- Macedonia: project of housing for socially vulnerable groups;
- Romania: the universal Milk & Roll school meal program;
- Spain: Antennas’ Network fighting discrimination.

Positive but Insufficiently Designed or Implemented Measures

- Czech Republic: Roma health assistants (no sustainable funding);
- Hungary: Roma women social assistants (selection and training to be improved);
- Romania: Caravans of Roma employment, job fairs (should be scaled up);
- Slovakia: a new provision of the anti-discrimination law allowing for affirmative action (should be applied).

Largely Negative Measures of NRIS

- Czech Republic: no proper budgeting or monitoring of NRIS;
- Hungary: public employment scheme without training for primary labour market;

- Macedonia: infrastructural developments not addressing residential segregation;

- Slovakia: ‘zero year’ preparatory classes stigmatizing Roma.

Largely Negative Mainstream Measures

- Czech Republic: social reforms radically reduce assistance of labour offices to job-seekers;

- Hungary: educational reforms disadvantage Roma (e.g. reducing compulsory age of schooling, changes in the tuition fee arrangements in higher education);

- Slovakia: parallel school track for mentally disabled children;

- Spain: reducing support for socially disadvantaged students, the reduction of medicines and vaccines covered by the health system.

According to Rövid, there is a number of reasons behind the failure of a number of Roma-related policies. Among those are: the inadequate mainstreaming of Roma-related policies, the lack of democratic solidarity and continuous resistance at local level, and the state failures in tackling massive social changes such as the post-communist economic collapse and the recent economic crisis. There is a need for effective participation of Roma (as watchdog, advocacy, grassroots Roma NGOs); for coordinated policies (to ensure that mainstream policy measures do not contradict targeted measures); for tackling the prejudice of non-Roma society and promoting a culture of equality and diversity in the education, media, private and public sectors; and for the involvement of the

private sector in the inclusion of Roma. Furthermore, crucial for the further development of the EU Framework and its successful implementation is to:

- Streamline the monitoring and reporting in the EU Framework and the Decade of Roma Inclusion: common template, mandatory state reports, independent expert committee set up by EC;

- Set up expert working groups to support the Roma Task Force and National Contact Points allowing for continuity between Platform meetings;

- Perform an EU wide-ranging external review of EU funds that have been used for Roma inclusion;

- Set up EU-wide monitoring on hate speech and hate crime against Roma.

How do policymakers define Roma in the policymaking process?, was the question that Mr Iulius Rostas addressed at the end of the second session of the workshop. Shifting the focus from the macro to the micro perspective – namely on the role of identity in designing policies towards minorities - Mr Rostas examined the intersection of identity and policymaking along four dimensions: Roma participation, ethnic claims and grievances, the representation of ethnic group and of the problems it faces in the public sphere and causal relationships that explain the current situation.

Participation in the decision-making process is a key factor for empowerment of Roma. But for the vulnerable population lacking voice, suffering stigma and prejudices and highly stratified, this is a particular challenge. Exploring the case of Romania, Mr Rostas noted that Roma

participation in policymaking is ensured only through the national minority representation system, a system that is inadequate for the challenges Roma are facing. The problems faced by Roma go beyond the national minority framework and thus Roma are excluded from participation in important decisions affecting their lives. Even representation through national minority representation mechanisms are, in fact, limited to consultations with selected NGOs, and accountability is minimal. Claims are fragmented and made by actors with diverse interests; they are sometimes even confusing and with no direct connection to larger societal problems. Together with social distance towards Roma, this creates further obstacles to place the problems faced by Roma on the governmental agenda.

The greatest problem is that Roma do not have a mechanism to represent their interests. Needed is a widespread and complex representation that reflects the diversity of the population. To this end, a mixture of ethnic and non-ethnic measures is required.

Furthermore, to reduce the significant gap between Roma and non-Roma and to achieve any meaningful integration, the majority has to be part of the process. It does not necessarily entail that everyone learns to “like” Roma, but means recognising that the problems that Roma are facing are in fact problems for everyone. One could notice a large gap between the priorities of the Roma in the policymakers discourse – criminality, migration, education – and priorities defined by Roma actors – discrimination, employment, and

infrastructure. Roma-specific measures are sometimes left out of larger strategies (e.g. education) because it is perceived that these are to be covered by the one “Roma strategy”. Policies need to be integrated and issues to be addressed with the goal of inclusiveness, in a deliberative way. The process however requires overcoming the notion that Romani culture is a culture of poverty, as this underlies many of the persisting prejudices and attitudes of systemic discrimination.

V. THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES TO ISSUES RELATED TO ROMA

The third thematic session of the workshop began with Mr Henry Scicluna’s treatment of participation and representation as crucial but problematic factors for Roma empowerment in the light of a set of institutional challenges. Mr Scicluna outlined the numerous difficulties faced by the European Roma and Travellers Forum just to come into existence. The lack of any form of institutional organisation of the numerous and diverse Roma communities dispersed all over Europe challenged the legitimacy of the process for selection of NGOs to serve as national representatives to the Forum.

ERTF was the first putatively (although contested) representative Roma body comprised of interested NGOs. During the process of its constitution, the Forum already achieved several things:

- promoting the idea of representation;
- creating awareness of a common destiny;

- establishing links between various Roma communities throughout Europe;
- establishing formal direct links with the Council of Europe and national governments;
- facilitating the dialogue with authorities and participation in decision-making processes affecting Roma at national and international level;
- providing a platform for communities to support each other in cases of crisis and to monitor and react to certain events (e.g. legal response to racist statements made by the Mayor of Nice, collective complaint against the Czech Republic over housing, education and health); and
- empowering individuals to shape their future.

ERTF is also actively working to raise the awareness of public officials at both international and national level about Roma and their problems. Aiming at enhancing empowerment, ERTF has been working for the adoption of a charter for Roma rights, which does not call for specific rights but the right of citizens to Roma identity. Among the priorities of the Forum are also the establishment of the notion of *anti-gypsyism* as a specific type of discrimination (in the same vein as ‘anti-Semitism’), establishment of relations with national equality bodies, achieving official recognition by international institutions of the genocide of the Roma, and seeking inclusion of Roma in literature and educational resources about the Holocaust.

Mr Scicluna pointed out that many further efforts are needed to ensure that Roma organisations start to work together

for a common cause and to overcome the rivalry for funds and challenge to the legitimacy. At the same time, Mr Scicluna noted the need to adjust priorities in order to focus not only on NGOs, but also on Roma citizens.

Adding to the bottom-up perspective to Roma institutionalisation presented by Mr Scicluna, Mr Marius Jitea outlined the Council of Europe approach to empowerment of Roma through the programmes ROMACT and ROMED2.

To improve the dialogue between Roma communities and local authorities and to strengthen the role of Roma at community level, between 2011 and 2013 the Council of Europe trained more than 1300 mediators from 22 countries. Furthermore, ROMED2 aims to help the decisions of the Roma community to be taken seriously by local administration – not only as a written suggestion but also as an action plan to be supported by the local municipality.

The ROMACT programme was launched with the aim to raise the awareness of local administration about Roma-related issues. It aimed to counteract the negative practice, common for many local authorities, of designing policies and drafting action plans on the basis of assumptions and not of the actual needs of the respective Roma communities. The programme was piloted in 14 municipalities of five different countries (Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Italy). Although currently there are 36 municipalities involved, still there is significant reluctance and resistance from local administrations.

The Council of Europe aims at empowering individuals and facilitating the

shift from the previous top-down model by working with local communities on action plans, then working with administration to understand specific requirements of the local community. Positive results are currently observed in some municipalities in Romania and Bulgaria, where local authorities have already decided to take on action plans proposed by Roma communities. For both programmes, however, the primary focus falls not on the expected outcomes but the **process**.

The last presentation of the workshop was an overview presented by Dr Eben Friedman on ECMI's work on and with Roma within and beyond the EU over the last decade.

Starting from human diversity and cultural pluralism as European heritage, ECMI has been providing knowledge and tools for constructive dialogue through its Synergy wheel[©] approach.¹⁹ Since the year 2000, ECMI has published more than 30 research and project-related papers on Issues related to Roma while implementing 17 different action-oriented initiatives targeting Roma populations. ECMI has pursued the empowerment of Roma in four different areas through various initiatives, examples of which are given in the list below.

Informational Empowerment

- First global assessments of needs of Roma in Macedonia (2003) and Serbia and Montenegro (2004);
- First systematic overview of the situation of Roma in Georgia (2008)
- Cooperation with UNDP on methodology for assessing progress of Decade of Roma Inclusion (2006-2007);

- Original research by the Romani Expert Groups in Macedonia on civil rights, education, employment, health.

Political Empowerment

- **Capacity building** (13 initiatives) – ensuring Roma and non-Roma duty-bearers can put informed choices into practice;
- **Civil rights** (6 initiatives) – combating and preventing discrimination;
- **Participation** (5 initiatives) – articulating and raising awareness about Roma's interests;
- **Policy** (3 initiatives) – input into key documents adopted at the central level (Macedonia) and at the local level (Kosovo and Serbia).

Social Empowerment

- **Education** (9 initiatives) – addressing needs of both children and adults;
- **Employment** (5 initiatives) – assessing policies and improving employability;
- **Health** (3 initiatives) – field research (Macedonia and Georgia) and training for community leaders (Georgia);
- **Migration** (4 initiatives) – examination of consequences (Georgia, Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro) and outreach (Georgia).

Cultural Empowerment

- **Culture** (2 initiatives) – research (Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden) and action (Georgia) based on a multidimensional view of social inclusion;

- **Gender** (10 initiatives) – analysis plus efforts at mainstreaming (Macedonia) and targeting (Georgia, Kosovo, Serbia).

Preserving its critical and unbiased approach to impact evaluation, ECMI has the following remaining challenges:

- **Policy** – there is a need for extensive comparative analysis in light of the wide range of national policies and increased EU activity;

- **Education** – the centrality and magnitude of problems demand continued attention and innovative approaches;

- **Gender** – mainstreaming has not been effective to date in addressing multiple discriminations;

- **Empowerment** – the emphasis should fall on tools/skills to promote the active participation of Roma as subjects;

- **Linking research and action** – could predetermine the levels of success of Roma-related policies and programmes.

VI. DEBATES

Much of the time during the two-day workshop was devoted to open discussions among the participating policy experts and practitioners in the field of Roma projects and programmes. A summary of these discussions below is structured around the major themes raised.

Is there a real need for separate policies and special programmes targeting Roma?

This key question emerged on the first day of the workshop. It challenged the

participants to reflect on the need for explicit and/or exclusive targeting of Roma as a distinct group of people and/or distinct category of EU citizens. The discussion around this topic logically led to the formulation of the second key problem:

What do the concepts of [Roma] INTEGRATION / INCLUSION mean?

Currently, there is no clear definition of the notions when used with reference to Roma. The general assumption is that they denote reduction of the social, economic and political distance between the rest population in Europe and the representatives of the numerous Roma communities. When speaking of integration, politicians refer to providing Roma with a ‘normal way of living’ introduce implicitly the idea that there is a ‘Roma way of living’ and that there is something wrong with that. These considerations were identified by participants as directly related to the question:

Should Roma be considered a minority or a vulnerable group?

If the first approach is adopted, then integration and inclusion aiming at changing the way of life amount to a direct violation of minority rights. At the same time, if Roma are seen as a marginalized vulnerable group of citizens, then improving their situation is just a matter of structural measures and changes that democratic governments are obliged to provide for all of their constituents.

Reflecting upon this issue, Dr Malloy referred to the example of Germany where the German citizens who are members of minority communities are fully integrated, and Roma are represented by the President of the Roma City Council. Hence, there is no need for special ethnicity-related programmes but perhaps for a Roma-related component within the frameworks of the large social cohesion programmes.

From the point of view of Dr Rorke, the introduction of the EU Framework and promotion of national strategies was necessary because it pushed governments to address their Roma populations in ways in which they might otherwise not have done.

Is Roma integration a national or EU matter?

Drawing on previous discussion, Dr Popova indicated that a serious problem before the Roma-related policy making in the EU is the **absence of a common language** at local, national, and EU levels when discussing the situation of Roma and the possible policy measures and strategies.

The discussion thereafter shifted to **the role of the EU institutions** and in particular of the European Commission in ensuring that national governments focus their efforts in implementing the Framework provisions and bringing about a positive change. According to Mr Jitea, there is a real need for the Commission to move away from the principle of subsidiary in order to create a binding document that will force the states to become accountable. The current situation however requires that Member States **governments fulfil their democratic**

responsibilities and provide for their citizens on equal grounds, indicated Dr Rorke. Dr Popova also pointed at the need for **coordinated horizontal policies** that would ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of implemented measures.

Discussing the efforts invested by governments, Mr Rostas expressed his doubts that even **allocation of significant funds** would change the situation without a change in paradigm about Roma policy-making. The question is, in fact, how effective was the use of the funds and how this could be determined when there is a lack of transparency even about the numbers of the targeted population. That is a signal for another gap in the EU Framework, in addition to the low level of Roma participation.

Looking at the role of the national institutions for improving the situation of Roma, Dr Rövid argued that the ‘Decade’ is seen by many as the most important historical development for Roma, because this was the first international **initiative involving actively governments** and certainly an inspiration for the EU Framework. Focused on improving participation, promoting dialogue, and reaching out to NGOs, the Decade started and improved political discussion in the EU relating to Roma. Furthermore, a key contribution of the initiative was that it brought together EU and non-EU countries. As Dr Rövid pointed out, it is extremely important that Roma integration policies are designed and implemented in co-operation and encompass all relevant stakeholders within and beyond the borders of the EU.

How can integration policies truly protect and promote Roma culture and identity to overcome segregation?

Debating whether the concept “Roma” is adequate for addressing the great variety of communities, languages and people, who in reality do not represent one single entity, the participants entered into discussion on how integration measures can ensure protection of cultural diversity without falling into segregation.

Dr Malloy noted that segregation of schools is a delicate question because minorities want to protect their culture as can be seen by the example of the Danish minority in Germany or the German minority in Denmark. Some minorities want to make use of schools to transfer their language, customs, and culture from generation to generation. On the other hand, as Dr Friedman pointed out, although there are cases of Roma schools that are founded with a focus on culture and function very well, these examples are exceptional. In practice, most of the Roma schools are *de facto* segregated schools that are simply those closest to the places where Roma live.

Mr Scicluna shared his view that Roma do not want to be segregated, but that society forces them to live separate lives by means of discrimination. This view shifts the focus to the mentality of the majority, which must be changed if policies in support of inclusion are to be effective. Here, the role of education is not only particularly important, but also particularly difficult. How to educate children who are bullied on their first day at school because they are dirty for lack of water and electricity?

Poverty is a major problem to Roma education that needs to be taken into account.

Dr Rorke pointed out that it is the primary responsibility of governments to provide secure school conditions. In recognition of the dignity of all children, there should be protection of all without separation on the basis of ethnicity. By way of contrast, segregated schools are often found in regions of extreme poverty, situated in ghettos and certainly not providing quality education. In such cases, governments cannot use security as an excuse for continued neglect.

Dr Rövid emphasised that the approach to integration needs to focus on community building and overcoming of divisions between Roma and non-Roma as well as of the general attitudes that keep Roma apart in all aspects of life. This requires that efforts are invested in overcoming discriminatory practices and embedding the human rights approach in all policies targeting Roma. Mr Rostas confirmed that there should be mutual understanding between majority communities and Roma; non-Roma should also be interested in Roma and their culture. In this respect intercultural education is a powerful mechanism for bringing people together, noted Mr Scicluna referring to the Council of Europe initiative calling for teaching of Romani language and Roma history at schools and strengthening of Romani identity as a basis for empowerment. The role of education hence is not only to enable people to make informed decisions about their lives but also to raise awareness about their rights and to enhance the feeling of ownership of

processes, suggested Dr Malloy. Access to quality education is a democratic right that governments need to respect and ensure. To foster tolerance, changes of mentality and respectively of societies, human rights should be incorporated into education everywhere.

Dr Popova concluded that the need for changing society through education could be achieved not by focusing exclusively on Roma-related measures but by rethinking the educational system in general and embedding intercultural and human rights education as an integral part of it. The structure of education, the approaches to knowledge, the methods for recognition of qualifications, and certification of education need to be changed. Roma education needs to become a component of the general system with a stronger emphasis on facilitating access to the labour market. The system of education should become more flexible in order to enable all to complete secondary education, with forms of flexibility potentially including (but not necessarily limited to) the introduction of special modules, flexible time of attendance, and evening classes. The system should be implemented throughout Europe so that mobility of people does not challenge the process of acquisition of knowledge and skills. Therefore, there is a need not only for national policies, but also for horizontal European measures.

What are the key factors that challenge or could enable success of Roma-related policies?

Although this question was underlying all of the presentations and discussions within the frameworks of the workshop, at the end of the debates participants paid particular attention to it and reached the following key conclusions:

- **The success of policies targeting Roma is closely related to the level of awareness that society, public authorities and policy makers have about the issues.**

Policymakers need to have a clear understanding of Issues related to Roma in order to be able to formulate adequate policies that would further be implemented by governments. It is crucial, therefore, that the production of knowledge on which assumptions and attitudes are based derives from the intersection of academic and research perspectives, practitioners' expertise and strategic policy thinking and planning. Dr Malloy further emphasised that people implementing policy need to be self-reflective and need to understand the way in which they approach these issues is coloured by their experience and prejudices. Experts could provide policymakers with more sophisticated insights and a clearer understanding about the issues particularly affecting Roma and help them to overcome the transfer of false assumptions.

According to Dr Rostas, the lessons from practice have shown that the policies designed and implemented at the local level have proven to be most successful. But the bottom-up approach should be just a start and not the end of the process. All policy levels need to be involved.

- **There is a need for change of the general approach to policymaking with regard to Roma.**

Elaborating on examples from the Roma Decade, Ms Bojadjieva emphasised that the individual/case-based approach has proven to be more successful in contrast to large-scale programming. Within the framework of a housing project in Macedonia, Roma were enabled to discuss and decide what they wanted from that policy. They subsequently engaged in successful advocacy, influencing the mainstream policy in order to reflect Roma's needs. While such cases are rare, the Decade has shown that the best projects come from empowered Roma communities; taking into account particular needs in designing measures and implementing the measures properly result in real positive changes.

Ms Bojadjieva further pointed to the need for the EU to shift its emphasis to **discriminatory practices, anti-gypsyism and administrative obstructions to fundamental human rights** as the main problems faced by the Roma. Policies are currently shaped through a discourse that legitimises the status quo, argued Dr Rostas. Activation policies have the effect of taking people out of the labour market by placing them in subsidised work places. Instead of improving employability, this approach weakens Roma's position.

Allowing that **Roma voice is heard** is the other key element that policies targeting Roma need to address and incorporate, emphasized Mr Scicluna. Roma need to become aware that they have the power to shape their future. They need to become

responsible for their destiny. But to be able to do that people need to make informed decisions and choices and to take existing opportunities.

- **Empowerment of Roma means that they become agents of change.**

Over the two days of discussions and analyses, the participants achieved a consensus around this conclusion. Approaching the topic, Mr Rostas pointed out that if empowerment is the aim, then the figure of Roma mediator needs to be left to the past. Although the 1993 Council of Europe programme achieved positive results, it needs to be considered that the context was different then. Training of mediators was seen as a way to address the pogroms in Eastern Europe. Now it's seen – mistakenly -- as a cure-all for every issue to do with the Roma. There must be more oversight to prevent exploitation and oppression carried out by mediators in the communities. Dr Rorke supported this opinion and pointed out that endless series of trainings that provide no accredited, internationally recognised qualifications of the kind that would enable a person to find professional employment beyond 'Roma mediating' is not appropriate for the 21st century labour market. In the age of empires, there were roles for mediators - to mediate between the rulers and the ruled. It is worrying that the most appropriate recipe for 10-12 million Roma who are citizens and not subjects is that well-intentioned bright young people be destined to mediate on behalf of entire communities, individuals and families whose needs are diverse and

complex. According to Dr Rorke, the problem is that not enough Roma are being trained as kindergarten, primary and secondary school teachers; being trained to qualify as professional social workers or medical professionals, what we have is a mass production of mediators. Dr Rorke was sure that a temporary fix there can result in good outcomes, and without a doubt there are mediators who have made a real difference in people's lives. But mediating cannot be seen as an end in itself. The Roma population shouldn't have to have a mediator to see their doctor, or for their child to be able to attend school. These are fundamental rights, and public service providers have fundamental democratic responsibilities, responsibilities that should not be diffused or contracted out.

Dr Rorke pointed out further that there are expectations that the Roma should be empowered, energetic mobilised and active while it is normal for majorities to be apathetic. In some cases, there seems to be a projection of leftist nostalgia for the notion of the risen and mobilised masses as agents of revolutionary transformation. But the reality for many millions of Roma people living in conditions of acute deprivation is that day-to-day life is a struggle to survive, to shelter and feed their families. An outbreak of hepatitis or dysentery is not necessarily conducive for a mobilised citizenry to demand human rights and emancipation. Access to fundamental rights and basic services should not be dependent on any community's capacity to mobilise, or conditioned upon them being active citizens.

Recent research conducted in Romania, Serbia and Hungary exploring Roma

participation and self-organisation in communities found that many **people do not even believe that they could have an influence** over authorities and the decision-making process. The language of democratic representation and human rights doesn't make sense in this context, commented Dr Rövid. But this situation is not entirely unique, argued Dr Carstocea; in the 19th century, many of the Eastern European national groups were in a similar position – uneducated and lacking participation. This changed in time with mobilisation around national projects, and this is what Roma lack.

Ms Bojadjieva concluded that what prevents Roma from mobilising is that they do not have faith that their rights will be granted. She also noted that mobilisation brings with it risks of even worse treatment and victimisation, with Roma claiming their basic human rights faced in many countries with torture by police. In essence, the justice system is failing the Roma most of the time. One way to address this problem might be including justice as a priority area in future policies.

Dr Popova closed the discussion by noting that whenever Issues related to Roma are discussed the general policy approach currently is to address Roma as *objects* of change. Inclusion and integration are usually discussed through the prism of what "we" must do with /for/about Roma. Even in projects focusing on participation, the tone often is that "we" need to make Roma participate. Very rarely do programmes for Roma look at what Roma want to change and how they see the change happening. A key precondition for the achieving the

desired positive societal change is to create and foster a feeling not only of involvement with but also of ownership of processes.

VII. CONCLUSION

Over the past decade, the EU has moved significantly forward in its efforts to develop and launch policies and programmes aiming at bringing about a positive change in the life of the largest European minority – Roma. The shift of the political interest to Roma-related issues and the targeted efforts to actively involve national governments in developing and implementing integration programmes is something that EU should be praised for.

Regardless of the underlying economic reasons, reducing the gap between the Roma and non-Roma citizens and fostering social cohesion is certainly a step forward in the policy-making of the EU. But achieving the expected societal and developmental outcomes is still challenged by the general lack of political will at the local and national levels, continued prejudices against Roma, discriminatory practices and the significant reluctance of Roma themselves to get involved. Although fostering the implementation of regulatory frameworks, policies and measures at all political levels within and beyond the EU is crucial for the success of the processes, a sustainable change can occur only with the change of mindsets of all stakeholders. A precondition for this is the development of critical thinking on issues that would allow:

- The EU to realistically evaluate the success of its initiatives and programmes;
- Policy and decision makers to identify and address the gaps in their knowledge about Roma and to eliminate discriminatory practices;
- National governments to commit to the implementation of policies and measures aiming at effectively reducing the gaps between Roma and non-Roma citizens;
- Politicians and public authorities to evaluate the efficiency of programmes and projects targeting Roma and to invest the necessary efforts to redesign them accordingly;
- Experts to recognize the need for a multidisciplinary approach combining academic and practical perspectives;
- Civil society to recognize that prejudices are often dominant in attitudes towards Roma and thus hamper the human rights approach;
- Roma to gain ownership of the processes and become actively involved as primary agents of change.

During the two days of intensive discussions, the participants in the ECMI workshop have exchanged many ideas. Reflecting on the issues they came to the conclusion that real **integration of Roma can happen only when the general policy approach shifts from addressing Roma as objects of change to empowering them as both citizens and as members of their local communities.**

Notes

¹ ECMI 2014, ECMI's Work On And With Roma: From Research To Action For Empowerment. At: <http://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/ECMI_Work_Roma.pdf>.

² ECMI also contributed to the United Nations Development Programme's „Quantitative Indicators for the Decade of Roma Inclusion Progress Monitoring: Review of the Existing Experience and Possible Approaches for Bulgaria”, Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme, 2007.

³ ECMI 2014, *Op.cit.* note 1.

⁴ European Commission 2011, An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions COM (2011) 173 final. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. At: <http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/com2012_226_en.pdf >.

⁵ ECMI 2014, *Op.cit.* note 1.

⁶ Popova, Zora 2014, Roma Inclusion: A Feasible EU Project. Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues. At: <http://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/ECMI_Working_Paper_75.pdf >.

⁷ European Commission 2010, Europe 2020: A Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, Communication from the Commission, Brussels, 3.3.2010, COM(2010) 2020.

⁸ Council of Council of Europe, Estimates on Roma Population in European Countries. At: <http://hub.coe.int/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=3f6c4a82-0ca7-4b80-93c1-fef14f56fdf8&groupId=10227>.

⁹ Fundación Secretariado Gitano 2009, Health and the Roma Community, analysis of the situation in Europe: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain; Report arising from the project Health and the Roma Community: Analysis of The Situation in Europe, funded by the European Union Public Health Programme, (Fundación Secretariado Gitano, 2009, Madrid), 19. At: <http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/roma_health_en.pdf >.

¹⁰ World Bank, Europe and Central Asia: Economic Costs of Roma Exclusion, Knowledge brief, 2010. At: <<http://go.worldbank.org/G1EL5HZ8S0>>. ; According to the World Bank estimates, the lower bound of annual productivity losses ranges from 231 million Euro (Serbia) to 887 million Euro (Romania); the lower bound annual fiscal losses are between 58 million Euro (Serbia) to 370 million Euros (Bulgaria).

¹¹ Jaroka, Livia 2011, interview, “Inclusion of the Roma: an Ethnic and Social Issue”, Article date: 2011, March 8 modified date: 2011. At: <<http://www.eu2011.hu/news/roma-integration-no-discrimination-just-beginning#sthash.0u4begJD.dpuf>>.

¹² Jaroka, Livia 2010, Report on the EU Strategy on Roma Inclusion (2010/2276(INI)), Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, Explanatory Statement To The Report (item 8) Rapporteur: Livia Járóka, Available at Livia Járóka. At: <<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2011-0043+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>>.

¹³ Malta did not develop the required document under the Framework filing in an explanatory note that there is no respective Roma population to be addressed by the such a national policy.

¹⁴ Friedman, Eben, 2013. Education in Member State Submissions under the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies. Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues. At: <http://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/WP_73.pdf >.

¹⁵ E.g. Malta's claim that developing NRIS would be “disproportionate” because there are no Roma in the country; Cyprus' approach to ‘Cypriot Gypsies’ as members of Turkish community; France and Luxembourg rejection of targeting on basis of ethnicity; Belgium emphasis on “countries of origin”.

¹⁶ Friedman, Eben, 2014, The Situation of Roma: Between Human Rights and Economics, Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues. At: <http://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/Brief_31.pdf >.

¹⁷ Such as the European Commissioner for Justice and Fundamental Rights Viviane Reding, the English labour politician David Blunkett, the French Interior Minister Manuel Valls and the Slovak Prime Minister Robert Fico

¹⁸ European Commission 2011, *Op.cit.* note 4.

¹⁹ The synergy between standards, research and action is therefore core to the methodology that the ECMI applies in all projects and programmes. ECMI sees this as a cyclic relationship going in both directions. Further information about the ECMI Synergy Wheel [©] at: <http://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/doc/ECMI_Approach_Folder_5-12.pdf >.

PARTICIPANTS

- **Ms Alexandra Bojadjieva**, Policy and Research Officer at the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat;
- **Dr Raul Carstocea**, Senior Research Associate at the European Centre for Minority Issues ;
- **Dr Eben Friedman**, Senior Non-Resident Research Associate, European Centre for Minority Issues;
- **MEP Livia Jaroka**, Vice-Chair Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, European Parliament (video message);
- **Mr Marius Jitea**, Programme Officer ROMED/ROMACT, Council of Europe;
- **Dr Tove Malloy**, Director of the European Centre for Minority Issues;
- **Mr Bernard Rorke**, Independent expert on Roma issues;
- **Mr Iulius Rostas**, Independent expert on Roma issues;
- **Dr Márton Rövid**, Research and Advocacy Officer at the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat ;
- **Mr Henry Scicluna, Mr Henry SCICLUNA**, Council of Europe Co-ordinator for Activities concerning Roma and Travellers, European Roma and Travellers Forum;
- **Dr Zora Popova**, Senior Research Associate at the European Centre for Minority Issues.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Zora Popova

Senior Research Associate at the European Centre for Minority Issues, the Culture and Diversity-Cluster, Germany.

Contact: popova@ecmi.de

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION SEE

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR MINORITY ISSUES (ECMI)

Schiffbruecke 12 (Kompagnietor) D-24939 Flensburg

 +49-(0)461-14 14 9-0 * fax +49-(0)461-14 14 9-19

* E-Mail: info@ecmi.de * Internet: <http://www.ecmi.de>