# ROMA INCLUSION INDEX 2015

# ROMA INCLUSION INDEX 2015

# CONTENTS

# DEMONSTRATING PROGRESS AND MEASURING OUTCOMES WITHIN THE DECADE

Governments[1] participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 committed to "demonstrate progress by measuring outcomes" of their efforts to include Roma according to the Action Plans they committed to develop and implement.[2] This particular part of the Decade's declaration related to measuring results of Roma inclusion efforts has been the continuous subject of discussions and actions within the Decade involving all the Decade partners. Approaching the end of the Decade term, Decade partners, most notably participating governments as the main responsibility bearers, have not succeeded in establishing effective mechanisms to measure the outcomes of their Roma inclusion policies on a regular basis, comparable over time and geography, that would meaningfully inform policy making processes. At the same time, a wide range of data illustrating the situation of Roma and the gap between Roma and the overall population exist from a variety of sources, including state statistics.

## OFFICIAL SOURCES OF DATA

Participating governments have different statistical systems enabling some quantitative knowledge about the situation of Roma in their societies. The most important statistical tool in all the countries is the census. Valuable data on households, education levels and employment are collected through censuses, although not on all the crucial indicators needed to develop substantial and meaningful policies in all priority and cross-cutting areas.[3] Since all the countries are also asking about ethnicity of persons in one way or another, it is possible to produce ethnically disaggregated data. However, this is not done systematically in the Decade participating countries for various reasons, including legal obstacles for ethnic disaggregation of data or the lack of an official request for particular data important in Roma inclusion policies. Moreover, a census is conducted infrequently, usually every 10 years, thus without more frequent statistical exercises to update or complete census data, the census is not sufficient to demonstrate changes timely and effectively and to provide quantitative knowledge for all the crucial indicators.

---

[1] Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia founded the Decade in 2005, and Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Spain joined in 2008.

[2] The Declaration of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015 reads: Building on the momentum of the 2003 conference, "Roma in an Expanding Europe: Challenges for the Future," we pledge that our governments will work toward eliminating discrimination and closing the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society, as identified in our Decade Action Plans. We declare the years 2005–2015 to be the Decade of Roma Inclusion and we commit to support the full participation and involvement of national Roma communities in achieving the Decade's objectives and to demonstrate progress by measuring outcomes and reviewing experiences in the implementation of the Decade's Action Plans. We invite other states to join our effort. Sofia, Bulgaria, February 2, 2005

[3] Decade's priority areas are: education, employment, health and housing, while its cross-cutting areas are: nondiscrimination, gender equality and poverty reduction.

Governments are also conducting other helpful statistical exercises, such as the Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (SILC), Labor Force Surveys (LFS) and others. In some cases these surveys contain ethnic identifiers and representative samples of Roma, but not always. Thus, such surveys are only rarely used to quantify Roma inclusion, and need to be updated in order to serve this purpose. The positive side of such statistical exercises, including the census, is that these are being gradually standardized over the different countries and over time, through the efforts of the European Union's statistical service Eurostat, which makes it possible to compare over time and countries. It is also possible to use datasets established through these official statistical exercises in combination with other data in order to extract useful data on Roma inclusion. This has been proposed in the course of the Decade, but has been used only in a couple of exercises led by international Decade partners.

Another type of useful official data source is the administrative registers maintained by various state institutions in various areas. Such administrative registers differ significantly not only across countries, but also within countries, notably when maintained by local governments without strict standardization and instruction by the central government. Examples of such administrative registers are numerous and include health insurance holder lists maintained by health funds, school attainment or drop-out data maintained by the schools and unemployment registers maintained by employment agencies. Such administrative registers are not representative and in many cases are not comparable, but are still useful in combination with other datasets, particularly for estimations and adjustments of statistical data over time. Administrative registers, particularly for so called "process indicators" are frequently used by governments when reporting to various international bodies on the situation of Roma.[4]

# INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS' MONITORING EFFORTS

International partners of the Decade, particularly the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Bank, and lately the European Union's Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) have been very active in both assisting and guiding governments to collect and analyze data and collecting and analyzing data themselves. The aim is not to take over governments' obligation for "demonstrating results by measuring outcomes", but to demonstrate good practice and to standardize systems enabling regular collection of comparable data.

The UNDP identified lack of data regarding Roma inclusion as an obstacle in the process of founding the Decade. An absence of reliable data was an impediment to developing meaningful policies for inclusion of Roma and to establishing the baseline for measuring the effects of the policies within the Decade. To remedy this absence and to demonstrate how data can be collected, UNDP conducted a survey in 2004, providing the Decade with some of the desperately needed numbers about the situation of Roma in most of the Decade participating countries and for most of the relevant indicators. This effort by UNDP was followed by a number of efforts of international partners to assist governments to try and/or adopt various statistical exercises and to discuss regular, standardized data collection at various Decade meetings, most notably at the Decade's indicator and monitoring workshop.[5] Unfortunately, Decade participating governments were not ready to take over such data collection either partially or fully, neither as a separate exercise nor incorporated into other statistical exercises. Some of the participating governments, however, used the guidelines, examples and efforts of the international partners to develop comprehensive monitoring methodology policies that are still awaiting implementation.

---

[4] In 2010 governments started submitting written reports to the Decade Secretariat. These reports can be found at: http://www.romadecade.org/decade-documents-decade-progress-reports. The reports mostly describe actions taken by the governments according to their Action Plans, and also contain some quantitative data illustrating the situation, which are rarely standardized and comparable over time and countries, and most often are data on process rather than outcome indicators.

[5] For the agenda, speakers and some of the presentations and materials of this workshop, see: http://www.romadecade.org/egy-cikk.php?hir_id=9356. UNDP website on data on Roma can be found at: http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/rbec/en/home/ourwork/sustainable-development/development-planning-and-inclusive-sustainable-growth/roma-in-central-and-southeast-europe/roma-data/. The World Bank's work on Roma, including a number of relevant publications can be found at: http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/ECAEXT/EXTROMA/0,,menuPK:615993~pagePK: 64168427~piPK:64168435~d:y~theSitePK:615987,00.html.

## FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AGENCY:
## WORKING PARTY ON ROMA INTEGRATION INDICATORS

The work of the FRA deserves a special focus because, although it only conducted some small surveys before and joined more substantive efforts of monitoring Roma inclusion later than other partners, it has gradually become the leader in these efforts.[6] FRA published the first significant quantitative data on the phenomenon of discrimination against Roma resulting from its European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey (MIDS). Later, in 2011, FRA joined UNDP and the World Bank supported by the European Commission in conducting a mid-term survey on the situation of Roma in all the Decade countries, similar to the UNDP survey conducted in 2004 (hereafter: UNDP/World Bank/FRA survey). The most important effort of FRA in the field of Roma integration data collection is its effort to capacitate governments to independently collect, analyze and publish reliable, systematic, regular and comparable official data on the integration of Roma. FRA's Working Party on Roma Integration Indicators[7] comprises policy and statistical experts from the national governments of the EU member states, as well as experts from the FRA and other EU agencies and other international bodies. Besides compiling and agreeing on a list of indicators, both process and outcome, the Working Party works on standardized definitions and methods for collecting data for such indicators, exchanges practice in collecting data and seeks existing and new statistical methods adequate for the countries to collect data for the listed indicators which will be piloted and, in time, institutionalized as regular government practice. The Working Party's goal is a standardized system of monitoring Roma integration comparable over time and countries, feeding policy making for Roma integration. It will enable the European Commission to periodically gather relevant reliable and comparable data on Roma integration from EU member states (and hopefully from enlargement countries) that would inform its own and individual countries' Roma integration policies.

## CIVIL SOCIETY MONITORING EFFORTS

Roma and pro-Roma civil society is the main actor in the Decade participating countries holding governments responsible for their Decade commitments. Thus, civil society has continuously insisted on governments' adherence to their commitment to "demonstrating progress by measuring outcomes" throughout the Decade. Civil society does not have the capacity or the resources to regularly collect representative and comparable data. However, it has always stood ready to assist the governments by informing the process of defining indicators and assisting the outreach to the Roma community in data collection. It has also been very helpful in conducting qualitative research, which can be important along with the quantitative data in informing policies. While criticizing governments for the lack of standardized comparable periodic quantitative data on Roma inclusion, civil society has made significant efforts in providing alternative overview on the policy developments regarding Roma inclusion in the countries, notably with the DecadeWatch and the Civil Society Monitoring Reports.[8] These reports contain only some quantitative data (mostly produced by governments) on relevant indicators, mostly process rather than outcome indicators.

---

[6] A complete overview of FRA's work on Roma, including links to relevant publications, is available at: http://fra.europa.eu/en/theme/roma.
[7] See brief overview of the Working Party on: http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2013/multi-annual-roma-programme/member-states.
[8] DecadeWatch and Civil Society Monitoring Reports can be found at: http://www.romadecade.org/decade-documents-civil-society-monitoring.

# ROMA INCLUSION INDEX

## OBJECTIVE, INDICATORS AND METHODOLOGY

The Roma Inclusion Index is an attempt to propose a list of relevant indicators and test the availability of existing data. The Roma Inclusion Index is not a data collection exercise – it only attempts to identify and gather in a comprehensive yet easily readable form existing data collected either officially by governments or by others. It incorporates all the problematic aspects of the data used, including lack of comparability or representativeness.

The idea for the Roma Inclusion Index is based on the Decade's Terms of Reference, according to which the Decade Secretariat serves as an informational hub. The Secretariat has never attempted to collect existing data on Roma inclusion and present those in a comprehensive and easily readable form to the Decade partners. The reason for this is not only the scarce existence of official periodic comparable data, but also the lack of agreement among Decade partners on a simple list of the most important indicators relevant for Roma inclusion. The Secretariat therefore decided to propose such a list itself, to gather all the available

quantitative data, although not sufficiently comparable and representative, and to publish the results. We hope this experience will assist the FRA and the European Union in establishing a standardized system of data collection on Roma inclusion.

The Decade aimed at "eliminating discrimination and closing the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society", notably in the areas of employment, education, health and housing, taking into consideration the cross-cutting areas of nondiscrimination, gender equality and poverty reduction. Therefore, the Roma Inclusion Index contains a selection of indicators in these four priority areas, as well as several "horizontal" indicators reflecting the cross-cutting areas of poverty and nondiscrimination. Gender is mainstreamed in all the indicators by reporting on gender disaggregated data where they exist. For all the indicators the Roma Inclusion Index is looking for the difference (gap) between Roma and the overall population as the goal of the Decade was to close the gap.

The selection of indicators within the Roma Inclusion Index takes into account what the Secretariat knows about the availability of data. The full list of indicators of the Roma

Inclusion Index, including full definitions and short names of the indicators used, is provided in the following chapter. Reviewing this table before looking at the country profiles will improve understanding. The indicators of the Roma Inclusion Index are intended to be fully consistent with the larger set of indicators being developed by the Fundamental Rights Agency.

The Roma Inclusion Index applied a very simple and flexible methodology for gathering data. Consultants were engaged for each of the Decade countries to identify and gather sources of quantitative data and to populate the table of indicators. Consultants prioritized official data, primarily from census and other official statistical exercises (as SILC, LFS, etc.), but also used data produced by international partners (mostly the UNDP and UNDP/World Bank/FRA surveys) or civil society where appropriate. They gathered data for the years 2005 and 2014 if available, or otherwise data from years closest to the target dates.  Consultants adhered to indicator definitions as strictly as possible. However, in cases where data fitting these definitions were not available, consultants provided available data as close to the definition of the indicator as possible. Finally, in cases of unavailable data consultants combined datasets (and administrative registers, qualitative data, and other available data) and performed estimations on existing data in order to calculate the required values as close to the proposed definitions and preferred years as possible, as long as the deviations of such approximations were statistically acceptable. A number of the consultants engaged were professional statisticians, some of them working at the state statistical agencies, and thus had access to raw datasets which enabled them to perform relevant additional analysis. This helped the process significantly and can be advised for similar exercises.

# FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS ON THE DATA GATHERING EXERCISE

## AVAILABILITY OF DATA BY COUNTRY

The data gathering experience for the Roma Inclusion Index differed significantly depending on the country. A quick

glance at the data tables below reveals that the table for Montenegro is the most complete, containing mostly official statistics and professional statistical estimations, rarely using alternative sources. Serbia, Bulgaria and Hungary similarly utilize official statistics and updates on statistical databases available in the state statistical office, combined with the use of alternative sources, such as the UNDP and UNDP/World Bank/FRA regional or other (national) surveys. In these four countries, consultants had direct access to datasets, either as employees of state statistical offices (Montenegro and Serbia), as academics (Bulgaria) or through payment of a fee to the state statistical office (Hungary).

A similar attempt to use official statistics was made in the Czech Republic, but without direct access to the raw datasets. In Romania, the consultant did not have direct access to the raw datasets but successfully utilized unofficial (mainly international) sources. In Albania, official statistics were largely unavailable. Thus, alternative sources – surveys conducted by international organizations and NGOs (mainly UNDP and UNDP/World Bank/FRA, and OSF), were used much more.

On the other side of the spectrum are Macedonia and Slovakia, where UNDP and UNDP/World Bank/FRA surveys were used as the main source of data. As these surveys have lower sample sizes and definitions of indicators may differ from the official ones, the data are used directly rather than with updates through estimations.  In Macedonia the reason to use alternative sources is the absence of official data from a recent census, while in Slovakia the consultant had direct access to raw datasets of alternative sources.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina the results from the last census has not been published, but upon joining the Decade the country conducted a Roma specific survey, the results of which have been established in an official dataset. There are several highly problematic aspects of this system, including its reliance on government social service centers to gather and upload data (which they do not do consistently or comprehensively). In addition, the Ministry deletes older data when newer data are uploaded, preventing comparison over time.

In Spain there is strong public-private partnership in data collection; many surveys are supported by the government and implemented by Roma NGOs. The results of such surveys are officially recognized and largely used in policy

making. These data are therefore used for this Roma Inclusion Index. However, such surveys are not harmonized in definitions of indicators, are only sporadically conducted, and contain data only on Roma, rarely comparable to the total population.[9]

Based on the above experience, the best model for compiling Roma inclusion statistics should involve the active engagement of state statistical offices, preferably through professionals assigned as responsible for Roma inclusion statistics, and by application of certain modifications to existing official data gathering. The FRA Working Party is expected to harmonize indicators across countries and assist statistical offices to effectively and efficiently perform statistical exercises for the required data.

Most of the "baseline data" are in fact from 2005, the beginning of the Decade, while more recent data are mostly from 2011 (the year of much census activity), 2013 and 2014. Going forward, it may not be necessary to compile annual statistics, as changes in the impact of policies and practices on inclusion are slow, but triennial statistics may prove to be optimal for adequate monitoring.

## AVAILABILITY OF DATA BY PRIORITY AREA

The selection of indicators for the Roma Inclusion Index was done on the basis of the Decade declaration, the important work undertaken by the Fundamental Rights Agency and previous experience reflecting the availability of data. However, data are still missing for some of the indicators for one or more countries. For some of the indicators slightly modified definitions were used.

### a ) EDUCATION

In the area of education, the indicator on primary education for the Roma Inclusion Index was defined as completion rate for the age group of 25-64, but most of the available data are for the enrolment or attendance rate of the age group from 3-6. Furthermore, data for this indicator are missing for three countries for recent years and for five countries for the baseline year. The indicators for completion rates in primary, secondary and tertiary education are quite clear and data are available, although most of the datasets embed data on the "highest level of education achieved". The Albanian consultant proposed to replace these three indicators with one on "number of years successfully completed in education". Such an indicator can be very informative and is simpler, but would need standardization in statistical exercises and research. Literacy rate is available except for the baseline data in one country. Rate of students in special schools is an indicator for which recent data for four countries and baseline data for five countries are missing, and in two countries data are provided only for the Roma. One of the countries where data are missing is Albania, where allegedly there is no problem of overrepresentation of Roma in special schools. For school segregation, baseline data are missing in five countries, while recent data are missing in two. The definition of segregated schools / education differs in some countries from the definition of the Roma Inclusion Index.

### b ) EMPLOYMENT

Unemployment and employment rates are available in all the countries. For employment in the informal sector, baseline data are missing for five and recent data for one country. Long-term unemployment is missing data altogether in three countries. Last employment and no employment experience are interrelated and sometimes last employment experience contains in itself the no employment experience indicator. The first is missing recent data in two and baseline data in eight countries, while the second is missing recent data in one and baseline data in six countries. Further, last employment experience is sometimes expressed in average number of years from last employment, and sometimes in percentage of persons with last employment experience more than certain number of years. Roma Inclusion Index presents the results of both, but it seems that retaining only the "no employment experience" may be sufficient and more comparable.

The indicator on the rate of young people not in education, employment or training (youth NEET rate) has been proposed during the pilot phase of the Roma Inclusion Index and seems very informative, and also an indicator for which recent data are more and more available (missing only in one country), while baseline data are missing in 5 countries.

---

[9] Croatia is not included in the Roma Inclusion Index at all due to the failure of the consultant in Croatia to deliver any work product.

## c ) HOUSING

The homelessness rate was a difficult indicator to assess, since in five countries data are completely unavailable, while in three more countries only recent data are available. As informed by the consultant in Montenegro, homeless persons are identified and enumerated in statistical exercises, particularly the census, but census definitions don't provide for data on homelessness per se. Access to drinking water and electricity are very well populated. Data on holding property documents are missing only baseline data in three countries, but definitions in use need harmonization. To measure segregated housing, recent data are missing in one country, baseline data in three. Overcrowding in the household is an indicator that has been defined differently in different countries, some reporting on "rooms per person", others on "persons per room" and others on "square meters per person". The last definition provides the most accurate information on overcrowding regardless of the size of the rooms, thus is recommended for standardizing definitions of this indicator across countries. Data are available except for the baseline data in three countries. Gender disaggregation of data in housing is rarely done, mainly because housing indicators reflect the situation of whole families often consisting of both males and females, thus disaggregation is considered unnecessary. When done, it is often based on the gender of the "head of household".

## d ) HEALTH

For access to health care, recent data are missing in one and baseline data are missing in six countries. Infant mortality and life expectancy is reflected sometimes in official and sometimes unofficial sources. For both these indicators recent data are missing in two countries and baseline data in three countries.

## e ) CROSSCUTTING ISSUE: POVERTY

The risk of poverty is an indicator that is in use in recent years (with only one country missing data), but for six countries baseline data are missing. Average income is missing recent data for three, while baseline data for four countries. Another indicator on poverty is absolute poverty which is well populated with recent data missing only for one country and baseline data missing for three. Gender disaggregation is also unavailable for many of the countries across poverty

indicators for similar reasons as housing indicators, although it makes more sense here to disaggregate.

## f ) CROSSCUTTING ISSUE: DISCRIMINATION

Discrimination seems to have been quite a difficult indicator to populate, not only because of the necessity to use alternative sources than the regular ones (most, and in fact almost the only one used is the FRA's survey on minorities), but also because of controversies surrounding this issue. Many countries are offering data on reported (or judicially confirmed) cases of discrimination, which may underrepresent the phenomenon. The Roma Inclusion Index applied the definition based on the FRA's survey, related to the (subjectively) perceived experience of discrimination. It is encouraging, however, that recent data are missing only for one country, although baseline data are missing for eight countries.

## g ) CROSSCUTTING ISSUE: GENDER

While data collection on Roma inclusion should be generally improved, standardized and made more frequent, the situation with gender disaggregation should be more seriously considered. In many countries for a significant number of indicators it was difficult to gather gender disaggregated data for Roma. Gender disaggregated data are less common for indicators closely related to households, such as housing and poverty. Such is the case in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria and Macedonia. In some countries gender disaggregation is missing also in the areas of education, employment and health for some of the indicators (in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Spain, Hungary and Romania). In the Czech Republic, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovakia only a few indicators lack gender disaggregated data. Gender disaggregated data for the total population has not been used in the Roma Inclusion Index.  The comparison of the situation of Romani females is done against the total population, because it makes more sense to assess ulnerability and exclusion against a group that is included than against another vulnerable and excluded group.

# WHAT THE DATA SHOW: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

## a ) EDUCATION

**Albania:** Gaps between Roma and the total population are still very significant in all areas of education, particularly for Romani females. Very few Roma are completing primary and secondary education, and almost no Roma complete tertiary education. The gaps between Roma and the total population in Albania have increased and the situation with school segregation has worsened since the beginning of the Decade.

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:** The gaps between Roma and total population still persist and are significant across all education indicators, although the gap in completing primary school has decreased over time. Baseline data for preschool and special education are missing.

**Bulgaria:** The gap between Roma and others has remained the same over the years in completing primary education and literacy. In secondary and tertiary education it has increased, although the situation of Roma has slightly improved in absolute terms. Rate of Roma in special schools is 5 times the rate of the total population. One quarter of Roma learns in segregated schools.

**Czech Republic:** In all the aspects of education (except preschool where data are not available) the situation of Roma has improved and the gap between Roma and the total population has decreased, with remarkable results particularly in literacy and tertiary education. However, Czech schools remain highly segregated (both in mainstream and special education).

**Hungary:** While literacy is not a problem and preschool inclusion has been significantly improved, the situation of Roma in education in all areas is worsening. Gaps are increasing and percentages of Roma not completing different levels of education are very high. At the same time school segregation is increasing and the only available data for special education indicate overrepresentation of Roma.

**Macedonia:** Completion rates for Roma in compulsory levels of education – primary and secondary – are low, although the gap in primary school completion has been slightly reduced in the course of the Decade. Other areas of education also raise concerns, both with the high level of Roma exclusion and no trend of improvement. More positive developments are shown in literacy and segregation although gaps remain.

**Montenegro:** Very few Roma are completing any education level and while the situation of Roma is slightly improving, exclusion increases compared to others. Placement in special schools and school segregation are also prevalent.

**Romania:** The situation of Roma in education shows trends of improvement and a reduction of the gap between Roma and non-Roma in most areas, but not in secondary and tertiary education where the trends are negative.

**Serbia:** The situation of Roma has slightly improved in primary and secondary education, but the gap remains significant. The percentage of Roma completing tertiary education is almost zero. Roma overrepresentation in special education is high. Positive developments can be noted in preschool education and literacy, while segregation doesn't seem to be much of a problem.

**Slovakia:** The situation of Roma in education has improved in preschool, primary and slightly in secondary education. The gap has also been reduced for the last two. Nevertheless the percentage of Roma not completing school is high, particularly for secondary education. The gap in tertiary education has remained the same. Literacy improved, but placement of Roma in special and segregated schools worsened from the beginning of the Decade.

**Spain:** Lack of data in preschool, special and segregated education, as well as gender disaggregation across education (except in literacy) makes it difficult to assess the situation. Rates of Roma completing different levels of education are significantly low and gaps exist, even increasing in the case of secondary education. Only in literacy the gap is minor and decreased over time.

Summarizing data across the Decade region for education indicates a possible overall improvement of the situation of Roma in preschool, primary and secondary education, and in regard to literacy. Moreover, the gaps with the total population are reduced but are far from being eliminated. The gap in tertiary education possibly increased, although the situation of Roma slightly improved (the situation of the total population improved more). Overrepresentation of Roma in special schools has possibly worsened. Overall segregation of Roma in education may also have increased during the Decade time frame.

## b ) EMPLOYMENT

**Albania:** The gap between Roma and the total population has decreased in almost all of the different aspects in the area of employment. This may be partly due to increased employment in the informal sector, where the percentage of Roma, particularly Roma females, has increased significantly.

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:** Much of the data on employment are missing. The Roma employment rate is less than others, and significantly less for Romani women. The rate of Roma without any employment experience is also significantly higher than of others. On the other hand the gap in the unemployment rate between Roma and the total population has been reduced.

**Bulgaria:** The gap between Roma and others decreased in no employment experience, youth NEET, and informal employment. However, the gap in the employment rate has increased, although the situation of Roma has slightly improved. The gap between Roma and others in unemployment has doubled with more than 40% of Roma being unemployed, including many long-term unemployed.

**Czech Republic:** The gaps between Roma and the total population decreased in employment, unemployment, long-term unemployment and youth NEET rate, with percentages for Roma still very high (very low for employment). In informal employment, last and no employment experience baseline data are missing, but recent ones show that Roma are in worse situation than others.

**Hungary:** The situation of Roma and the difference with others in employment improved, but the gap in unemployment increased, and percentage of unemployed Roma rose higher than double. There are also more informally employed and long-term unemployed among Roma than among others and the rate of youth not in employment, education or training is significantly higher. Romani females are unemployed 1.4 months longer than others after their last employment experience.

**Macedonia:** While the gaps in different areas of employment decreased, this may be the result of a significant increase in the gap and presence of Roma in informal employment. Moreover, situation of Roma worsened across employment areas and percentage of employed Roma has not increased.

**Montenegro:** The overall situation in employment seems to have improved, although gaps remain and problems persist, particularly regarding Romani females. A significant increase in the rate of Roma without any working experience is evident.

**Romania:** Data are contradictory. While the gap in unemployment decreased, the gap in employment increased. The unemployment rate is still high, and employment remains low. At the same time, compared to the total population, Roma are longer unemployed, more of them have no employment experience and more young Roma are not in employment, education or training.

**Serbia:** Gaps for all employment indicators decreased, except for no employment experience. Rates of Roma without employment experience and of young Roma that are not in education, employment or training are very high, particularly for Romani women.

---

[10] For all priority areas, the summaries provided in this report are only a reflection of the data collected by consultants, and should not be considered definitive. A definitive summary across the Decade as a whole is not possible because of missing data and differences in data collection (definitions, methods, periods, etc.). Summaries for each priority area have to be taken with caution and only as an indication of the possible outcome of the Decade.

**Slovakia:** The gap in employment slightly decreased and the situation of Roma improved. However, both the gaps and situation of Roma, particularly of Romani females, significantly worsened in informal employment, unemployment and long-term unemployment. Roma also wait much longer for a job than others and many more of them have no working experience at all. The situation in employment among youth also worsened.

**Spain:** In all employment areas for which data exist, a worsening of the situation for all and even more for Roma is apparent, except in employment for Romani females. This trend is particularly strong in long-term unemployment where the gap significantly increased, while the gap across other indicators decreased. Data are missing for last and no employment experience, while for youth NEET rate baseline data are missing and recent data show a significant gap.

Summarizing data across the Decade region for employment shows encouraging trends but the improvement in most indicators is very small over a 10-year time frame. The only indicator where an increase of the gap is likely present is employment in the informal sector, and a worsening of the situation for Roma is detectable in the average number of months from the last employment experience.

## c ) HOUSING

**Albania:** In most of the housing areas the gaps between Roma and others increased, except for improved access to drinking water.

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:** A significant percentage of Roma are homeless, have no water or electricity in their homes, suffer from overcrowding, lack property documents and as many as three-fourths live in segregated neighborhoods. While the situation with property documents has improved over the course of the Decade, the situation with homelessness and drinking water access has significantly worsened.

**Bulgaria:** About half of the Roma live in segregated neighborhoods with far more household members per room than the total population.

**Czech Republic:** Besides the problem of missing data for housing segregation, data show that the Czech Republic

has minor problems regarding the situation of Roma and their exclusion in the areas of homelessness and access to drinking water and electricity. However, the gap in holding property documents is very high and increasing with only one-fifth of the Roma holding such documents. The gap in overcrowding is also high.

**Hungary:** Data on homelessness are missing, as well as recent data on segregated housing. However, older data show that about three-fourths of the Roma live in segregated neighborhoods. Other housing indicators show decrease of gaps between Roma and total population.

**Macedonia:** There is an increase in the gap and worsening of the situation of Roma in overcrowding and access to electricity. Housing also became more segregated, with more than 90% of Roma living in segregated neighborhoods. The gap is reduced and the situation improved only with property documents and access to drinking water.

**Montenegro:** Homelessness data are missing. All of the other indicators in housing are showing that the situation of Roma is worsening and gaps increasing, except for access to drinking water.

**Romania:** Data are not available on homelessness. Available data show that the situation of Roma is worsening and the gap is increasing in access to electricity and overcrowding. For the rest of the indicators baseline data are not available and recent data show significant gaps between Roma and the total population.

**Serbia:** In most areas of housing indicators show improvement of the situation of Roma and a reduction of the gap compared to the total population. However, rates of Roma without property documents, living in segregated neighborhoods, and overcrowding are very high.

**Slovakia:** Besides slight improvement in access to electricity for Roma, in all the aspects of housing the situation worsened and the gap increased, as in property documents, segregated housing and overcrowding. Data on homelessness are unavailable.

# Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

> ➢ HTML (Free /Available to everyone)

> ➢ PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)

> ➢ Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below