

## Evaluation of developments serving Roma integration

The consortium of Pannon Elemző Iroda Kft. (Pannon Institute for Analyses Ltd.), HÉTFA Elemző Központ Kft. (HÉTFA Center for Analyses Ltd.) and Városkutatás Kft. (Metropolitan Research Institute) was commissioned by the National Development Agency to carry out the „Evaluation of developments serving Roma integration”. The evaluation was conducted between 11<sup>th</sup> July 2011 and 27<sup>th</sup> December 2011.

### Goal of the evaluation and accomplished tasks

According to the task description, the key question of the evaluation was as follows: “which are the factors and instruments or regulatory frameworks that efficiently facilitate and which are the ones that may inhibit the achievement of the related goals formulated in the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies and the EU 2020 Strategy.” The task description also formulated an additional 11 research questions (altogether 17 with the sub-questions) in connection with the key question of the evaluation.

Based on the above, the Consortium **defined the task as the identification and assessment of causes and factors (whether they are of regulatory, institutional or public policy nature)**, whose dissemination or limitation could enhance the contribution of development policy to Roma integration goals in the programming period beginning in 2014..

The National Development Agency requested the evaluation to be based on the analysis of development policy documents and case studies on six predetermined measures, two of them assessed in-depth<sup>1</sup>. In the case of the latter two, the evaluation was complemented by a large number of interviews with final beneficiaries. In order to deliver robust findings, the Consortium broadened the range of gathered and analysed information as compared to the minimum requirements set up by the National Development Agency. This included the preparation of five territorial case studies on municipalities with significant Roma population, a DELPHI survey carried out among experts and stakeholders familiar with development policy and Roma integration, and the expansion of the beneficiary query required in the detailed measure case studies into a full survey<sup>2</sup>.

### Roma integration goals in development policy

Although several documents have been prepared during the current planning period, even if after the ratification of the operational programs aiming to promote Roma inclusion with the help of EU funds, no single document defined the tasks of a Roma integration policy, and particularly, the tasks and goals of development policy related to Roma inclusion in general. Therefore, the National Development Agency called on to follow up on the goals of the European Framework for National Roma Inclusion Strategies (NRIS) and the EU 2020 Strategy. The Consortium complemented the goals set herein with recommendations identified in the recent Roma research literature. These resources provided the basis for a set of eight goals used by the Consortium as a normative framework for the evaluation (in agreement with the National Development Agency).<sup>3</sup>

It is important to note that the above-mentioned set of goals was developed after the launch of the observed measures. Thus, this system of goals chosen as a benchmark to the evaluation was not available for the

---

<sup>1</sup> TÁMOP 5.3.1, TÁMOP 5.1.1/6-7, TÁMOP 5.2.2., TÁMOP 3.3.7/1,2, social urban rehabilitation calls for proposals of ROPs, ÁROP 2.2.9/A,B

<sup>2</sup> The question of original and remaining lack of data as well as the methodology is detailed in a separate annex.

<sup>3</sup> As to the system of goals see chapter 4.1

stakeholders of development policy. For their operations, only the goals set out in the program and intervention documents were available. Thus, the evaluation could not and did not examine the efficiency and efficacy of their operations compared to their intentions, but only compared to a desirable (normative) set of goals.

## **Summary of findings**

### **(1) Development policy level**

All but one element of the normative set of goals of Roma inclusion are matched by the chosen measures. The unmatched goal is the one that should serve efficiency, sustainability and institutionalization of development policy results in general, that is, the **organization of public services based on continuous monitoring of the conditions and needs of marginalized groups.**

**Proportionately little funding flows into regions with insufficient capacities, among them regions with an overrepresentation of Roma.** This is true notwithstanding the fact that the program targeting the 33 most disadvantaged micro-regions was created to this end and has reached important achievements in this field. **The lack of projects in these regions often originates in the lack of capacities and competences of civil society.**

**Formation of further capacities in regions with an overrepresentation of Roma could not be facilitated by development policy.** Moreover, in many cases, the case-by-case arrangements and competitive functioning of development policy, not being projectable, has posed a risk for existing capacities.

**The lack of organizational capacities restricted not only the formation but also the follow-up and sustainability of implemented projects,** institutional improvements and complex services.

**The approach of a tendering system based on individual projects is not compatible with the complex and long-term tasks necessary to handle the concentrated and multi-dimensional problems of the Roma.**

Due to the disconnection of development policy and public policies, **the current institutional settings of development policy (1) cannot handle conflicting local interests, (2) do not mitigate uncertainties stemming from the volatility of public policies, (3) cannot vindicate the horizontal priorities of social inclusion even within the funding schemes.**

**The success of development policy is strongly restricted by the incompatibility of the expectations of experts and project owners in many fields,** especially regarding the issues of decentralization and social integration and ethnic vs. social targeting.

**The integration of the Roma – due to the scale and the complexity of the problem – can only be realized in close cooperation within the government and especially in close cooperation between various public policies.** The NRIS, accepted in December, delegates all tasks related to Roma integration into the competence of István Türr Training and Research Institute (TKKI). Since this institution is still in the making and may need long time to build up its capacities, it is vital to examine whether, and if yes, from when and in what fields development policy can count on this institution, or, without a well-functioning TKKI how development policy can define its tasks among governmental policies.

**The role of development policy in the integration of the Roma can be improved efficiently and easily if it incorporates the experiences of the past few years into the planning process of the next financial period, and, more importantly, if it does not only “assume” the Roma integration effect to be enforced in the assessment or implementation phases of projects.**

### **(2) Measure-level findings**

**In the case of the selected measures, the lack of efficient focusing results in a limited support of activities addressing the needs of the Roma, and they target the Roma, and disadvantaged target groups in general, to**

**a varying extent.** The inclusion of the Roma and integration goals had noticeably little importance during the design of the assessment process. That is, it approaches the Roma – based on the approach of the NSRF and the operational programs – either as part of a larger disadvantaged group or on a territorial basis. Due to the lack of explicit targeting, the implemented projects did not reflect this goal either, and problems occurring during the implementation also showed the ad hoc nature of targeting. However, the measure “Sure Start” (TÁMOP 5.2.2) is exemplary in this respect.

**Regarding the planning of measures aiming at Roma integration, the institutional system could efficiently rely on a distribution logic which – through its focus - ensures reaching out to disadvantaged groups, including the Roma.** These are not without antecedents (e.g. IUDS<sup>4</sup>, equal opportunities plans), thus, territorial targeting based on social parameters combined with group targeting in an appropriately mentored planning process can ensure the Roma integration effect. As to appropriate mentoring, a balanced use of expectations and incentives is needed, for which there have also been examples in some previous measures.

**Although several measures attempted, not all of them managed to make up for the deficiencies of mainstream service provision which are of utmost importance with regard to Roma integration.** This problem partly stems from the fact that institutional cooperation is neither enforced nor incited, The follow-up funding of developments is not ensured, either.

**The sustainability of the development results is uncertain because of the deficient links with mainstream service delivery.** The dependence of good projects and project owners on consecutive individual call-based resources and the failure to open consecutive calls for proposals risks not only the loss of effects achieved among the Roma, but also of the knowledge gathered in best practices. The sustainability of achievements could be enhanced if the sectoral institutional systems utilized the achievements of measures and their methodologies. However, we have hardly found any examples of this.

### **(3) Project-level findings**

**The planning framework challenged the integration efficiency in several respects.** Measures do not only live “independently” from sectoral policies, but they are also often disconnected from local and micro-regional processes. Thus, their synergic effect is low and impossible to plan for local actors. Indicator-measured commitments induce risk-averse behaviour, which often crowds out ‘high cost-high risk’ groups, among them the Roma. Efficient planning of educational, training and employment interventions responding to real needs was also challenged by the short time span available for preparation. Due to their weaker advocacy capacities and interest representation, the considerations of Roma minority self-governments, NGOs and poorer municipalities at the (micro-)regional level were poorly reflected in the planning.

**Neither the content, nor the process of the assessment of projects promoted the efficiency of Roma integration.** The relevance of Roma integration was kept weak among the factors of assessment except for some projects of certain measures (e.g. the measures of the 33 most disadvantaged micro-regions). Delays in the assessment process were often coupled with the deterioration of implementation capacities.

**Problems occurring during the implementation of projects were:** 1) **fragility of consortium partnerships;** 2) **due to the risk-aversion stemming from indicator commitments, the Roma were often crowded out from projects;** 3) **calls for proposals with large administrative burdens and liquidity needs often crowded out organizations having expertise in the integration of the Roma,** 4) **connections with relevant sectoral public service system(s) proved to be fragile,** if they existed at all.

---

<sup>4</sup> Integrated Urban Development Strategy

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The inclusion of the Roma is a long process which can only be accomplished with good quality public service delivery that contributes to integration. **Our fundamental recommendation is that the NDA should initiate a review by the line ministries about which of the public services (education, social and health services and public transport) can be only restrictedly accessed by the Roma and other excluded groups, and how it could improve the access and quality of these services with the help of EU funding.** This should serve as a basis for planning both measures and projects.

Further recommendations are developed for three levels: public policy making, defining development measures and generating and managing projects. The detailed explanation and analysis of recommendations and their monitoring table can be found in chapters 8 and 10 of the final report.

Recommendations for the development policy level	
(1)	The harmonization and strategic redesign of public policies and coherent strategic goals related to Roma inclusion, based on evidence gained so far
(2)	Enhancing professional and social embeddedness of development policy measures serving Roma inclusion by providing expert support and monitoring, evidence-based planning and the inclusion of advocacy organizations
(3)	Changing the pattern of the distribution of funding in the case of developments for Roma inclusion (restricting the project-based open application system with complex and long-term programming, enhancing building on best practices)
(4)	Strengthening local developmental and social organizational capacities in order to improve the sustainability of developments
(5)	Increasing the relevance of horizontal equal opportunity goals, incorporation of incentives and conditionality into the entire funding system
Recommendations for the level of measures	
(6)	Processing the experiences of corresponding planning methodologies, maintaining their achievements <sup>5</sup>
(7)	Supporting complex activities for longer periods of time
(8)	Ensuring the involvement and participation of the Roma among the beneficiaries and target group members, enforcement of this factor in the assessment process
(9)	Promoting the incorporation of the achievements and applied methodologies into mainstream public service delivery
(10)	Providing financial resources in the development of organizational capacities to maintain institutional developments and complex services
Recommendations for the project level	
(11)	Supporting 4-5-year-long projects related to Roma integration developments
(12)	Simplification of project financing and administration (lump sum and unit cost accounting with professional monitoring assistance in the case of low-budget projects)
(13)	Mentoring planning and implementation, feedback
(14)	Linking the activities of public service delivery and projects, their mutual support and recognition
(15)	Defining eligible costs and activities based on local/micro-regional needs

---

<sup>5</sup> The planning methodology applied in the 33 most disadvantaged micro-region program and the "HEFOP 2.2.2" planning methodology is described in the "TÁMOP 5.3.1" case study in detail.