

# No Data—No Progress

Data Collection  
in Countries Participating  
in the Decade of Roma  
Inclusion 2005–2015



## PRIMARY EDUCATION COMPLETION RATE

Country	Year	Roma
Albania	2005	14%
	Most Recent	<b>Insufficient Data</b>
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Bulgaria	2005	28.3%
	Most Recent	31.6%
Croatia	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Czech Republic	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Hungary	2005	76%
	Most Recent	<b>No Newer Data</b>
Macedonia	2005	50.8%
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Montenegro	2005	9.2%
	Most Recent	20%
Romania	2005	31.7%
	Most Recent	19.7%
Serbia	2005	22.7%
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Slovakia	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Spain	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>

## INFANT MORTALITY RATE

Country	Year	Roma
Albania	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Bulgaria	2005	25 per 1000
	Most Recent	25 per 1000
Croatia	2005	25.1 per 1000
	Most Recent	11.5 per 1000
Czech Republic	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Hungary	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Macedonia	2005	<b>Insufficient Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>Insufficient Data</b>
Montenegro	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Romania	2005	<b>Insufficient Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Serbia	2005	25 per 1000
	Most Recent	<b>No Newer Data</b>
Slovakia	2005	<b>No Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>
Spain	2005	<b>Insufficient Data</b>
	Most Recent	<b>No Data</b>





## No Data—No Progress

Data Collection in Countries Participating in  
the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015



# No Data—No Progress

## Data Collection in Countries Participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015

June 2010

Roma Initiatives



OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS

Copyright © 2010 by the Open Society Institute. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by  
Open Society Institute  
400 West 59th Street  
New York, NY 10019 USA  
[www.soros.org](http://www.soros.org)

For more information:

Roma Initiatives  
Open Society Institute–Budapest  
Oktober 6 u. 12  
H–1051 Budapest, Hungary  
(36 1) 882 3100  
[www.soros.org/initiatives/roma](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/roma)

Design and printing by Judit Kovács | Createch Ltd.

Cover photographs from the Chachipe photography contest:

top left, “First Day of School,” Hungary, 2008 | Photograph courtesy of © Janos Kummer

bottom right, “Mother,” Serbia, 2006 | Photograph courtesy of © Darko Milosavljevic

# Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Summary	9
The Importance of Data	11
The International Legal Framework on Data Collection and Protection	13
Demystifying Data Protection Laws	15
Good Practice in Collecting Ethnic Data: The United Kingdom	17
The Decade of Roma Inclusion: History and Goals	19
Progress in Monitoring and Evaluating the Decade	21
Research Design	25
Main Findings from Country Research	27
Data Collection Findings	28
Decade Indicator Findings	29
Conclusions	33
Recommendations	35
Data Table	39
Notes	43
Sources	47





# Acknowledgements

*No Data—No Progress* was written by Christina McDonald and Katy Negrin and includes material from a study conducted by Roma Initiatives in December 2009–June 2010. The full text of the study can be found on the Open Society Foundations website at [www.soros.org/initiatives/roma](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/roma).

Roma Initiatives gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following researchers, who conducted background research in their respective countries:

Albania	Shaqir Hasantari	Roma Active, Albania
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dervo Sejdić	OSCE
Bulgaria	Maria Metodieva	Open Society Institute, Sofia
Croatia	Biserka Tomljenović	Independent consultant
Czech Republic	Štěpán Ripka	Open Society Foundation, Prague
Hungary	Julianna Kiss	Kurt Lewin Foundation
Macedonia	Katerina Sojic	National Roma Centrum
Montenegro	Miloš Bešić	University of Montenegro
Romania	Daniel Arpinte	Research Institute for the Quality of Life
Serbia	Andrea Colak	Minority Rights Center
Slovakia	Marek Hojsík	Roma Institute, Bratislava
Spain	Alphia Abdikeeva	Independent consultant

Tatjana Lipiainen from the Open Society Foundation–London provided background research support.



# Summary

The year 2010 marks the half-way point of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. It is a logical place for the 12 participating Decade countries to assess their progress to date so they can ensure that their initiatives are on track and are effective, and that conditions for the 4.5 million Roma who live in these countries' are improving. By evaluating their efforts, governments would demonstrate their seriousness and commitment to the political pledges they made to their Roma populations at the Decade's inception in 2005.

Yet five years later, the lack of data about Roma communities remains the biggest obstacle to conducting any thorough assessment of how governments are meeting their Decade commitments, despite widespread agreement among participating governments about the crucial need to generate data disaggregated for ethnicity in order to assess and guide policies.

This data deficit prompted the Open Society Foundations' Roma Initiatives to ask the basic questions that guided this report: What are the barriers to governments compiling or generating data disaggregated for ethnicity? Do such data even exist? If so, have governments collected disaggregated data to assess progress? Have governments made the necessary changes in their practices to ensure that this can be done, and that data are available? Are there other organizations (NGOs, policy institutes, multilateral and intergovernmental agencies) that are producing quality data that could help states to measure progress?

These questions were applied to the current context in which censuses continue to be the main instruments that countries use to collect disaggregated data on their populations, yet current census practices result in an undercount of Roma. This discrepancy shows up as a wide gap in official and unofficial data. There are also gaping holes in existing,

available data disaggregated by ethnicity in each and every Decade priority area. For example, information on primary school completion rates for Roma children did not exist in two thirds of the countries participating in the Decade. Completion rate data in the remaining countries were largely the result of independent research. While some information from independent studies and initiatives is useful and important, it cannot fill the needs for clear, comprehensive data.

With gaps and unknowns like this, how can policymakers devise effective policies and responsibly allocate resources? The lack of disaggregated data on ethnicity and other criteria not only hinders progress in monitoring the Decade, but also limits the ability of participating countries to implement sound policies to promote more equitable societies.

Without comprehensive data to evaluate government efforts and guide policies, the situation of Roma—a group already on the margins of Europe—is likely to remain dire.

The stark gaps in data revealed in this report are a call to governments to make a serious, concerted effort to reduce the Roma data deficit before the Decade has passed. *No Data—No Progress* offers 11 concrete, achievable measures that policymakers at the national and international levels can act upon in the next 18 months.

Improving data about the living standards and conditions of Europe's Roma communities is an achievable goal that can have an immediate and long-term impact on projects, policies, and people. The support, resources, and independent data for such an effort exist. It is largely a matter of taking action and having the political will to collect the data and confront the realities they reveal.

# The Importance of Data

In 2003, eight governments in Central and South Eastern Europe took a historic step by agreeing to a common framework for action toward improving the situation of Roma communities. That initiative, the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015, has now reached its midpoint; the number of participating states has grown to twelve,<sup>2</sup> hundreds of pages of action plans, research studies, and working papers have been produced, and millions of euros have been committed in funding.

It is widely acknowledged<sup>3</sup> that Roma throughout Europe are dramatically undercounted—or not counted at all—in official data collection efforts, such as national censuses, and in other ministerial administrative data collection mechanisms. The Roma Initiatives' research has confirmed that in each of the priority areas covered by the Decade of Roma Inclusion, reliable data that can delineate the specific situation of Roma are largely absent. How could participating Decade countries justifiably expect to track developments when data are so weak?

The collection of ethnic data often prompts discussion and controversy. Much of the debate centers around whether the collection of ethnic statistics will work to help or harm minority groups. As it stands, there is an almost universal lack of disaggregated data, in both Decade countries and the European Union.<sup>4</sup> The absence of disaggregated data can allow for policymakers to disregard, or be unaware of, negative, race-specific outcomes. Lack of data can also undermine efforts to achieve policy goals and inhibit governments from making sound policy decisions.

The reality is that the European Commission itself (2000/43/EC) has long acknowledged the crucial role played by statistics in activating antidiscrimination policies and

increasing its capacity to ensure social cohesion and promote diversity and equality. Ethnic data—as one component within disaggregated data—can be generated and used in ways that protect the privacy of individuals and groups while providing critical information to help policymakers fight racism and discrimination and draft viable equality programs.

Generating and using disaggregated data in this way is supported by civil society groups such as the European Roma Rights Centre and the Open Society Justice Initiative,<sup>5</sup> as well as by government organizations like the EU’s Fundamental Rights Agency (formerly the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, EUMC). In 2004, the EUMC report *Migrants, Minorities, and Education: Documenting Discrimination and Integration in 15 Member States* noted the utility and importance of disaggregated data:

The collection of differentiated data, including pupils’, students’ and parents’ citizenship status, place of birth, **ethnic group affiliation**, and socio-economic status as well as pupils’ or students’ sex will allow the collection of data of highest relevance, improve its comparability, and avoid unjustified generalizations based on aggregate undifferentiated quantitative data.<sup>6</sup>

While the European Union does not explicitly ban the collection of ethnic data, it must rely upon Member States for the collection of such data, which has caused problems with its own monitoring. Indicator systems developed to track the implementation of the Lisbon agenda,<sup>7</sup> for example, fail to register disparate impacts on ethnic groups. This weakness in data collection capacity has been an ongoing issue for reporting progress on the Lisbon agenda’s implementation.

The lack of disaggregated data has also caused problems regarding the accession obligations of governments of EU candidate countries. In the process of working with the Employment and Social Affairs Directorate of the European Commission on Joint Inclusion Memoranda, the deficiency of reliable Roma-related statistics loomed large as a major obstacle to rights-based policy of Roma inclusion.<sup>8</sup>

The European Common Basic Principles for Integration<sup>9</sup> adopted in 2004 calls for establishing clear objectives and a need for evaluation and monitoring, and requires EU Member States to specify who should be monitored. Further, a number of international monitoring bodies have called for the provision of data on the situation of marginalized ethnic groups and has repeatedly called on EU Member States to provide statistical data on the situation of ethnic groups.<sup>10</sup> So far, however, there has been a failure to do so.

# The International Legal Framework on Data Collection and Protection

Even though ethnic data are an integral part of public policy planning, adequate and comparable data on various aspects of ethnic minorities at the national and the EU levels are rare in Europe.<sup>11</sup> The United Kingdom is one of the few countries where ethnic data collection practices have become a constituent part of public policy planning.<sup>12</sup> British policymakers, for example, collect disaggregated ethnic data to check the participation and achievement of individuals and groups, and this use of data is widely regarded as a component of good practice.<sup>13</sup> The United Kingdom is also the only country in the European Union that has legitimized the collection of sensitive data from the workplace.<sup>14</sup> The British approach is that the collection of data on race or ethnic origin is not discriminatory, and that it serves to implement and verify equality policies.<sup>15</sup>

Much of the rest of Europe continues to be influenced by approaches developed after World War II. In the aftermath of a war fuelled by racial and ethnic hatred, legitimate fears were raised about the misuse of personal data, especially data on ethnic or racial origin. In response, clear standards have been developed at both the European and international levels to create safeguards against the improper use of personal information. These guidelines require that personal information can only be collected with the individuals' consent, that such information is used only as aggregated statistical data that cannot identify specific individuals, and that governments create mechanisms to monitor adherence to these

requirements. European data protection laws do not outlaw ethnic data collection outright; rather, they distinguish between the collection of individually identifiable personal data and that of aggregate data.<sup>16</sup> The Council of Europe notes that statistical results are not personal data because they are not linked to an identifiable person.<sup>17</sup>

All the Decade countries are signatories to the following instruments relating to data protection:

- ▶ The Council of Europe's Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950)
- ▶ Convention of the Council of Europe No. 108 for Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data (1981) (hereinafter Convention ETS 108)
- ▶ The United Nations' International Covenant on Civic and Political Rights and its International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The European Union regulates the collection and protection of personal data via several instruments. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union under Article 8<sup>18</sup> safeguards an individual's right to access data which has been collected, and to correct it if necessary; it also requires an individual's consent to permit the processing of personal data. The Directive 95/46/EC (hereinafter Directive 95), commits states to regulate details under which processing of personal data is legal and permissible, including Article 28 that appoints a body responsible for monitoring the adherence to legal regulations adopted to protect personal data.



# Demystifying Data Protection Laws

The collection and processing of statistics are governed by two main types of international and national regulations: data protection laws and laws on statistics that govern the conduct of surveys and the collection of data. The standardization and existence of this framework in all the Decade countries stems largely from two texts: Convention ETS 108 and Directive 95.<sup>19</sup>

Despite the elaboration of procedural safeguards to ensure that personal data are not put to improper use, some countries maintain that the collection of such data is impermissible, and often directly cite the international treaties as rationale for this. Some human rights groups claim that it is a way for governments to justify their inaction.

The European Commission itself (2000/43/EC) refers to the persistent misunderstandings, and strategic maneuvers, which dog relations between data protection and the production of statistics on discrimination:

The scarcity of ethnic data in most Member States might hinder proper monitoring of the application of Community legislation. There have been objections to the collection of such data on the grounds that it would breach the provisions of the EU Data Protection Directive. This does not reflect the true situation. [...] It is for the Member States to decide whether or not ethnic data should be collected to produce statistics for combating discrimination, provided that the safeguards set out in the Data Protection Directive are respected.<sup>20</sup>

An external, expert analysis of the various data protection laws in different Council of Europe countries reveals that although “sensitive data” are subject to special controls, they may in all cases be collected within a regulatory framework; but these frameworks are often literally interpreted, and legislators interpret “appropriate safeguards” as meaning that ethnic data are forbidden. Thus, ethnic data do not get collected. Unless the law specifically encourages the collection of ethnic data—which none of the laws in Decade countries do—they are not collected.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, overbroad interpretation of data protection standards goes beyond the intent of those very standards. Indeed, since governments have the duty to ensure equality, there is a clear correlative obligation to collect and use data disaggregated by ethnicity in order to identify and redress inequalities. As one UNDP analysis noted, “ethnic data—statistical or research data—may be crucial for sensitive and effective use of positive actions in countries.”<sup>22</sup>

# Good Practice in Collecting Ethnic Data: The United Kingdom

In the early 1990s, the United Kingdom made positive policy changes in its census and data collection systems in response to the government's recognition that "very detailed statistical data are needed to implement positive action policies."<sup>23</sup> Because of these changes, the United Kingdom has been identified as an example of "good practice" in regards to the collection of ethnic data. In fact, it stands alone in all of Europe as the one place that compiles and manages ethnic data extremely well.

The collection of data on ethnicity and religion is based on laws and regulations which govern the production of sensitive statistics, and which make collection not only possible, but mandatory. Collection is jointly supervised by the data protection authorities, the statistical institute, and agencies specializing in the protection of minorities. In short, the effective monitoring of inclusion and exclusion by ethnicity in the United Kingdom has been driven by requirements of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. The Data Commissioner uses the legal obligation within the Race Relations Act to derogate from the prohibition of collecting ethnic data. Though the Law on Statistics and the Data Protection Act have safeguards against the release of individual data except under certain provisions, the aim of equal treatment is specifically mentioned in the list of exemptions. The Data Protection Act and the Race Relations Act are linked by including equal treatment as a reason for which to waive the prohibition on collecting sensitive data. In this context, there are no further obstacles to the compilation of statistics on ethnicity or religion. In the United Kingdom, the initial and decisive condition is the Race Relations Act's explicit statement

that collecting statistical data is a legal obligation. Ethnic data are not only collected in the census, but in places of employment, in schools, and in other institutions. The act requires collection of data on ethnicity and religion from all firms with over 100 employees as well as from local authorities and public-sector employers.<sup>24</sup>

In England's education sector,<sup>25</sup> for example, the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) collects data on the ethnicity of pupils in government-maintained schools through its Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC). The pupil census uses a basic ethnicity classification: white, Asian, black, mixed heritage, and other, with three to five subcategories under each heading. It also allows local education authorities to choose to use an extended list of ethnicity options, with a greater amount of detail regarding the country or region of birth or heritage, for local planning purposes. This allows the production of comprehensive national data on a range of attainment indicators disaggregated by ethnicity, by matching the pupil census records with the national test and examination results held in the National Pupil Database.<sup>26</sup>

The collection and use of data disaggregated by ethnicity allows groups at risk of underachievement in certain areas to be targeted with resources and effectively designed interventions. Along with data on national test scores and permanent exclusions, schools also monitored examination tiering, the "gifted and talented" register, pupil withdrawals, attendance, and parents' evenings.<sup>27</sup> This approach demonstrates that an appropriate legal framework coupled with clear policy directives can allow the collection of ethnic data that can facilitate the development of more nuanced policies tailored to the population.

# The Decade of Roma Inclusion: History and Goals

The Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015 now encompasses 12 countries, and is supported by a number of international organizations, including the World Bank, a number of programs of the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the Council of Europe Development Bank, and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the OSCE. Nongovernmental organizations such as the Open Society Foundations and the European Roma Rights Centre are also partners in the Decade. The European Union launched the Platform for Roma Inclusion in 2009, which explicitly aims to coordinate with the Decade.<sup>28</sup> However, the Decade remains an initiative of the participating national governments: the roadmaps for progress are the national action plans drafted and endorsed by each country.<sup>29</sup> The action plans are designed to address four priority areas identified by the Decade: education, employment, health, and housing. In addition, the cross-cutting themes of poverty, discrimination, and gender mainstreaming are to be taken into account in the national action plans. The initiative's main coordinating body is the Decade Presidency, which is held annually by one of the participating countries according to a scheduled rotation. An international steering committee consists of representatives from participating governments, Roma organizations, international donors, and other international organizations, and holds meetings annually to coordinate planning and priorities.<sup>30</sup>

The need and responsibility for countries to gather information and data about the status of their Roma populations is implicit in the Decade's 2005 opening declaration that commits participating countries to:

work toward eliminating discrimination and closing the unacceptable gaps between Roma and the rest of society, as identified in our Decade Action Plans [... and] 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.<sup>31</sup>

# Progress in Monitoring and Evaluating the Decade

The importance of collecting data, and recognition of the need to improve existing procedures, was understood well before the launch of the Decade. In 2004 the Decade's International Steering Committee discussed draft forms of the national action plans and articulated several important points about the need for data. The committee noted that indicators should be selected to measure outcomes and results, not input or processes; data should either be already available, or measures to gather data should be under development; and the action plans should include specific numerical goals to be used in measuring progress.<sup>32</sup>

However, an examination of the action plans as part of the research for this report revealed that very few of the plans' data and measurement strategies rise to the level outlined in the steering committee's meeting notes. Although the lack of existing data was flagged early on, with most action plans acknowledging that there was little baseline data from which to monitor improvements,<sup>33</sup> efforts to address gaps have been minimal. Most action plans continue to rely on existing governmental data, rather than create surveys or other means to collect new data, or seek data through other research. While several action plans were developed with well-defined indicators focused on measurable outcomes, the majority of the plans set extremely broad goals and use indicators that are not the most appropriate.

There have been several efforts from Decade countries hosting the Presidency to elevate monitoring and evaluation as a priority. During its 2007–2008 Presidency, the Hungarian government called attention to the need for an indicator framework that would be applicable at the transnational level to monitor Roma integration. Decade participants

responded by forming the Decade Indicator Working Group, which issued a report proposing a mechanism to enable the Decade countries to track and report on the results of Roma inclusion policies in 2015 using a unified methodology across countries and time. The working group finished its work by completing the report in April 2009 and making it available to all Decade partners.<sup>34</sup>

The Decade Secretariat included the issue of monitoring and evaluation in the recommendations to the Serbian Decade Presidency that began in 2008, calling attention to the need to support the process of development of indicators and permanent monitoring systems, and to regularly and comprehensively survey the status of Roma in the region, particularly through involving Roma in data collection.<sup>35</sup> Although the Decade Secretariat does its best to support governments and to urge the importance of monitoring and evaluation, in the end it is in the hands of the governments to take concrete steps to achieve workable monitoring systems.

The Serbian Presidency of the Decade responded to the secretariat by paying special attention to the issues of building the monitoring and evaluation system, including the issues of availability of valid data and indicators. In 2009, the Serbian Presidency worked with the UNDP and the World Bank to hold an international workshop devoted to the problems of monitoring in Decade countries. The workshop included a presentation of the Hungarian presidency's Indicator Working Group report and resulted in a set of conclusions about monitoring and evaluation that are available for use by all governments participating in the Decade.<sup>36</sup>

The Slovak Presidency in 2009–2010 has also defined data collection as one of the strategic areas in its Presidency program. The UNDP recently supported a workshop in March 2010 in this field where it proposed a methodology for revising the action plans.

The UNDP has done, by far, the most technical and practical work to support Decade countries to achieve real monitoring of their action plans. The UNDP's assistance is due to their assigned role by the Decade's International Steering Committee to provide support to the participating governments to improve monitoring and evaluation practices<sup>37</sup> and its recognition of the shortcomings in many of the action plans. The UNDP also has a strong commitment to the Decade and, through its regional center in Bratislava, has led efforts in the field of ethnically disaggregated data and indicators since 2001. With UNDP support, national teams are setting up a common monitoring framework and respective data collection mechanisms in Decade countries. The UNDP plans to introduce a handbook to guide scaling up efforts, as well as harmonize and improve monitoring in all the Decade countries.<sup>38</sup> A large amount of responsibility, however, still lies with participating governments to take advantage of the resources and expertise offered by the UNDP.

In 2006, the UNDP released its data report *Faces of Poverty, Faces of Hope*, based on research on vulnerable populations in the Decade region.<sup>39</sup> The research was explicitly tied



to the Decade initiative<sup>40</sup> and is often the only baseline data that exists in many countries. The research also had the long-term goal of helping to establish an expert group on data and measurement:

The group's purpose was to suggest specific (and feasible) ways of overcoming existing barriers in the area of ethnically disaggregated data collection so that in a few years the capacity for disaggregated data collection is in place at the country level. By 2006–2007, the whole responsibility for data collection should be transferred to the relevant bodies in the individual countries.<sup>41</sup>

These efforts have helped move monitoring and evaluation forward on the Decade agenda, but have been hindered because there are no binding mechanisms to prompt governments to implement the proposed tools, recommendations, and policies. The findings of this report have helped confirm that the national governments participating in the Decade have done little to move forward. The only monitoring of Decade implementation at the transnational level to date has been by the Decade Watch, a group of Roma civil society organizations formed in 2007 that issues assessments of compliance and achievements in individual member countries. The difficulty with these reports, however, is that they are not accompanied by a system of indicators or mechanisms for their production. At the rate that work has progressed, the Decade will be over before any systemic change can take place, and it will be too late to maximize the effects of the Decade on Roma integration.



# Research Design

In order to better assess the extent to which Decade governments have existing disaggregated data, or are collecting data and monitoring progress within the Decade, Roma Initiatives selected six indicators—one in each of the Decade sectors and priority areas—to compare results across the 12 participating countries. While additional indicators are essential to elaborate a fully developed perspective in each country, those selected for this study represent very basic benchmarks with which governments can assess progress over the course of the Decade, and are considered essential in achieving real integration of Roma in society.

The goal of the research was to reveal where data are available to the public, whether these data are collected as part of routine statistical methods, or otherwise, and if they are disaggregated by ethnicity. The research aimed to confirm whether there were data available in 2005 to form a baseline to measure progress within the Decade, and whether more current data can be used to indicate progress.

The methodology was developed by a team of Roma Initiatives staff and consultants. Two lead researchers reviewed all 11 current action plans of the participating countries to assess whether the chosen indicators were included in those plans, and to review whether plans for data collection and monitoring were laid out. The two lead researchers also prepared a questionnaire seeking information on data collection practices, and on data for the indicators, which was completed by a national researcher in each of the 12 Decade countries. The national researchers were independent consultants contracted by Roma Initiatives, working in various institutions in their home countries; in two instances the researchers were employed by a national Soros foundation.

The questionnaire included an introduction with guidelines outlining precisely what was expected from each researcher for reporting. It contained general questions on the overall context in each country, including questions on legal provisions and mechanisms for data collection for national records as well as for the Decade. The researchers were then asked to supply figures, with context as appropriate, for each of the indicators selected by OSI.<sup>42</sup>

Drawing on the information provided in the questionnaires and their own review of literature in English, the lead researchers prepared this report. A draft version was reviewed by a panel in February 2010.

# Main Findings from Country Research

This section is divided into two parts: data collection findings, and findings on Decade indicators (population, primary school completion rates, unemployment, infant mortality, housing, and discrimination). There were varying sources of data for each indicator in each country. Official sources were the first choice for data. If official data were unavailable, or if data did not correspond to the indicator, the second choice was data from the UNDP and the World Bank since both organizations have established research capacities and are official supporters of the Decade. Absent these two sources of data, the third choice was to use another unofficial source. In order to reveal any data that may be available, the information that researchers selected was mainly based on availability and timeliness of data, and presented in the country profile. Some of the data reported on are from publications which may take the data from other sources. It was beyond the scope of this research to ascertain the original source, validity, and quality of these statistics.

The data table at the end of this report presents the available data in figures. Full details for each country are available in the online version of this report, at [www.soros.org/initiatives/roma](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/roma).

# Data Collection Findings

## **Misinterpreted Legislation Hinders Data Collection Policy**

The data protection legislation, coupled with any laws regulating statistics, constitute the supporting framework for data collection policy in each country reviewed. Thus, every country has a policy, but as has been reported above (see Demystifying Data Protection Laws), those laws are either overinterpreted, which impedes ethnic data collection, or there is not sufficient legislation, such as the Race Relations Act 2000 in the United Kingdom, to derogate those safeguards. It is simply a myth that the collection of ethnic data in countries is forbidden.

## **Census Inappropriately Used to Calculate Data on Other Indicators**

The census is often the only instrument used to collect ethnic data; it is also often used by the state to measure indicators other than the population (due to the lack of data on ethnicity collected through other means), although it was not designed to collect data on those indicators. Using a census for this purpose is not applicable. In countries with Roma populations, census data on the Roma are unreliable and account for only a fraction of the number of people who may identify as Roma. Figures calculated from this flawed basis are even less trustworthy.

## **Underutilized Data Sources**

There are three main sources of data on the various indicators: official national-level sources, international intergovernmental sources (UNDP, CoE, UNICEF, etc.), and academic and NGO publications and materials that draw upon these official datasets as well as upon authors' own research. Roma Initiatives' research has shown that where there are large gaps in official data, often data exist from other sources that fill those gaps.<sup>43</sup> The initiatives' review of government national action plans, however, indicates that few governments are drawing on these sources to monitor their compliance with their Decade commitments.

## **Weak Monitoring**

Governments have officially published only very limited evaluations on Decade progress. The reports that are available lack analytic depth and often amount to little more than a restatement of the action plans' goals. The lack of data from which to monitor progress, and the existence of indicators for which there are no data, are major factors behind the dearth of monitoring and evaluation of the Decade so far.

# Decade Indicator Findings

## **Total Roma Population**

Knowing the total numbers of a minority group can be useful and important, especially when it comes to policymaking and resource allocation. Across the Decade countries, the official population figures for Roma are dramatically lower than estimates prepared by various independent organizations. While the methodology of any population census must be individually evaluated to gauge its accuracy, consistently large gaps between official numbers and other estimates call into question how well governments have developed procedures that allow the expression of ethnicity in a way that best reflects personal identities.

In most countries, the census conducted every 10 years is the only opportunity to collect data disaggregated by ethnicity. Roma have the option to self-declare their identity in all countries surveyed except Spain, yet Roma populations remain under-counted in all Decade countries. The discrepancy between the official and estimated Roma population across the Decade region ranges from 45 to 99 percent. Many Decade countries will hold the next census in 2011, bringing an urgency to the need to create more inclusive methodologies. Questions of identity, privacy, stigmatization, and access to collection procedures must be addressed as part of the process of enhancing Roma participation in data collection exercises.

Though there are 2005 baseline Roma population data—generally taken from earlier censuses (which in most countries took place in 2001 or 2002)—baseline data for the other indicators were mostly available only from research conducted by multilateral organizations or derived from census-based calculations.

## **Education**

### *Primary school completion rate among Roma*

Completion of primary education was selected as an indicator as primary school attendance is compulsory in all the Decade countries, and, alongside preschool participation and completion of secondary education, is a key element of assessing educational attainment. While monitoring *enrolment* in school is important for understanding whether Roma children participate in education, their actual completion is a more significant indicator of whether the educational system is succeeding in fully educating its pupils.

There are large gaps in the data for this indicator. First, most of the Decade countries do not track primary school completion rates at all; instead, only the numbers of students finishing primary schools are recorded, or they track enrolment. Second, very few countries have data for Roma on this indicator collected in any systematic, representative way.<sup>44</sup> Romania and Serbia were the only two countries that reported on official data for this indicator, which was available due to MICS<sup>45</sup> and, in the case of Romania, to a government sponsored survey. Where other data do exist, it was drawn from intergovernmental research. The

World Bank does maintain data on completion rates based mainly on national statistics, but does not provide disaggregated data. Despite all this, several of the countries have included primary school completion as an indicator in their action plans (Montenegro, Macedonia, Serbia). To accommodate the lack of comprehensive data, data should be sought in existing research, and the use of proxies and other methods to get the most from existing data are necessary.

## **Employment**

### *Unemployment rate among Roma*

This indicator is included as the basic measure of whether efforts to improve employment among Roma are successful.

There are large gaps in the data for this indicator for Roma. The *UNDP Vulnerability Groups Dataset* was a frequent source for data in view of the lack of official data. The general lack of this indicator in action plans may reflect the fact that while labor statistics are generally available broken down by sex and age group, ethnicity is not tracked in the standard labor force survey methodology used by most countries. In Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Macedonia some estimates from the governments for unemployment levels among Roma exist, while in most other countries there are no data on Roma at all. Macedonia is a country that exhibits good practice in collecting ethnic data in this sector. Data for employment and unemployment are collected by the Agency for Employment of the Republic of Macedonia. Data are fed from local employment centers to the central, national employment agency. The local centers register unemployed Roma and provide them and other Macedonians with training and information to help them find jobs or develop businesses. The national employment agency's annual report contains data about its activities and all the groups it serves.

Although reducing the high level of unemployment among Roma populations is an overarching goal for all Decade countries, this indicator is not frequently included in the action plans. Rather, the number of employed Roma is addressed. Exceptions to this are Macedonia and Serbia, which received assistance from the UNDP in revising their action plans and monitoring frameworks.

## **Health**

### *Infant mortality rate among Roma*

This indicator was selected as a means to assess the adequacy of access to health care, and quality of living conditions, among Roma. The infant mortality rate is influenced by prenatal maternal care and living conditions once the child is born; this indicator is significant since the birth rate among Roma tends to be higher than average.



There are large gaps in this indicator for Roma. Only two countries could report official data at all. Croatia has made data available on infant mortality rates among Roma, although it is unclear how these data are collected. Serbia's data are only available due to its participation in the third cycle of the MICS survey. Rather than including this indicator, many of the Decade action plans focus on inputs such as the number of health mediators serving Roma populations, or information sessions on health-related topics. Macedonia and Serbia are exceptions, and have included this indicator in their revised action plans and their new monitoring and evaluation plans. One model of how governments can compile disaggregated data in the health field in partnership with NGOs comes from Spain, where the country's largest Roma organization in 2006 used EU funding and cooperation from the Ministry of Health to coordinate research on Roma health.<sup>46</sup>

## **Housing**

*Reducing the number/population of Roma settlements, ghettos, or "settlements with low socio-cultural conditions"*

Residential segregation of Roma is thought to be widespread in the Decade countries. Many Roma live in rural settlements with a high proportion of Roma, or in urban neighborhoods with a similarly homogenous population. The conditions in these segregated areas are frequently poor, with limited access to utilities and services, and most inhabitants living in dilapidated structures. Residential segregation has widespread impact, on access to employment, education, and health care. In order to monitor improvements to housing in these areas, it is necessary to have an accurate census of their numbers, location, and population.

Across the board, no country regularly collects official data on this indicator, although significant efforts have been made in many countries to assess the housing situation of Roma through surveys and other means. Surveys have been commissioned and conducted in Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovakia, and Spain, often in cooperation with NGOs and in line with social inclusion goals. These approaches toward collecting meaningful data have potential as models for other focus areas, although it is essential that such surveys collect data on ethnicity and are conducted at regular intervals for monitoring purposes. There is also research conducted by international and regional organizations, as well as national level institutes, in Decade countries which can inform housing data. Many action plans have included an indicator in alignment with this one, such as "the proportion of the population living in shacks reduced to 10 percent."<sup>47</sup>

## **Discrimination**

*Number of cases brought to an equality body by Roma*

Discrimination against Roma has been identified as a priority within the Decade, and is a cross-cutting issue that influences each of the action plan areas. Most countries participating

in the Decade have already established an equality body in line with the European Council's Directive 2000/43/EC. The number of complaints brought to this body concerning discrimination against Roma is one indicator of how well measures to combat discrimination are being implemented; as the mechanisms are quite new, an increasing number of cases would suggest that public awareness of the equality body as an avenue to address discrimination is rising. Once the body is well established, the number of complaints could be expected to plateau or decline, and a continued rise would suggest measures to prevent discrimination are not adequate.

There are large gaps in the data for Roma for this indicator. Four of the twelve countries had data disaggregated by ethnicity for Roma. In the majority of Decade countries an equality body issues reports on the cases received and decided upon. The exceptions are Montenegro (which still does not have antidiscrimination legislation in place), Bosnia, Macedonia, and Serbia (where legislation is too new to have an established equality body in place), and Croatia and Spain, which have not yet released reports on the work of their relatively new equality bodies. As these mechanisms become a more established means of addressing claims of discrimination, it will be important to track disaggregated statistics to gain perspective on the level of discrimination among Roma communities.

# Conclusions

By bringing governments together, the Decade of Roma Inclusion has already made an important contribution toward improving the situation of Roma across Europe. The fact that a growing number of states have agreed to participate in the Decade signals an increasing awareness that the issues facing Roma communities can and must be addressed in a coordinated, consistent manner. As a multi-country effort, one of the great strengths of the Decade is the opportunities it affords the participating governments to share good practices and examine the possibilities for reproducing successful programs.

This review of available data indicates, however, that the substantial lack of disaggregated data on basic indicators makes recognizing achievements on any scale difficult. As the Decade moves past its halfway mark, the need for data that can help assess what has both worked and what is falling short is becoming increasingly urgent.

The Decade, despite existing technical support and resources, has not prompted most national authorities to significantly reform their data collection practices. While some specific research has been carried out in line with Decade objectives, the general practice of not disaggregating data by ethnicity continues. National legal frameworks are overwhelmingly in line with international data protection standards that permit the collection of data on ethnicity under specified conditions; concerns do remain in some countries regarding the interpretation of these laws, but in general, legal objections to the collection of personal data have been successfully addressed through appropriate safeguards.

In part prompted by the needs of the Decade, authorities have collected relevant data in some fields, particularly housing.<sup>48</sup> Yet, this research must be repeated at regular intervals to allow for useful monitoring. Using the local offices of central government agencies, as

Macedonia has done (see “Employment” in the Decade Indicator Findings section), offers another possibility for improving data collection, as long as roles, responsibilities, and tasks are clear. Such possibilities and examples should be examined seriously, as there is a persistent lack of capacity in many national data collection agencies. Governments should increase their capacity by working closely with NGOs and other institutions to jointly develop tools and methods that will provide better data on Roma populations.

Other data do exist, and reliable research from nongovernmental organizations and academic institutions should be considered for monitoring and policymaking purposes until official mechanisms can be sufficiently improved. Existing international datasets are good sources for data in monitoring the Decade and could be models for a broader range of international data collection initiatives. The Program for International Student Assessment,<sup>49</sup> organized by the OECD, assesses between 4,500 and 10,000 15-year-old students in each participating country at three-year intervals.<sup>50</sup> Serbia has initiated a pro-active measure worthy of consideration by other Decade members that will provide estimates on educational achievement gaps between 15-year-old Roma and non-Roma students.<sup>51</sup> Another dataset, MICS, is supported by UNICEF, and assists countries in collecting data on the situation of children and women.<sup>52</sup> MICS findings have been used extensively as a basis for policy decisions and program interventions. Researchers for this report often found that MICS data was the only available information for indicators they were examining.

The UNDP’s work with selected countries to refine the Decade action plans and create monitoring and evaluation frameworks has focused on identifying indicators and methods that make the most of the available data, and using pilot surveys to target collection of additional data.<sup>53</sup> This approach may be extended in other countries, and the Decade working group on indicators has developed important insights on how to move forward in the current context of limited data.

Data are needed not only on the level of costs and outputs of national action plans, but also on the level of impact, through methodologically sound evaluation. The presentation of data on Roma-related costs and activities, without assessments of efficiency and effectiveness, can be counter-productive by potentially provoking popular discontent and anti-Roma stereotypes as the public may transfer blame for inefficient policies away from officials and toward Roma recipients.

Overall, the appropriate collection and use of disaggregated data is not only an essential tool for monitoring progress within the Decade of Roma Inclusion, but also a key component for a broader, long-term social inclusion process.

# Recommendations

Roma Initiatives urges the European Union, as well as governments participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion to take action within *the next 18 months* to improve the collection of data relating to Roma.

1. The European Commission should issue guidelines on the interpretation of its regulations on ethnic data collection and processing to clearly and authoritatively prevent any misconceptions or misinterpretations that the regulations are an absolute prohibition on the use of data regarding ethnicity.
2. The EU Platform for Roma should support and facilitate the collection of disaggregated data in European countries as part of its work toward the effective inclusion of Roma-related data into European and national policies.
3. Governments should collect ethnic data and use it for the purposes of inclusion policies; to this end, the Decade governments should ensure that any restrictions on the use of personal data are proportionate to the security measures laid out in international data protection guidelines to avoid overinterpretation at the national level that could impede disaggregated data collection. It is up to public authorities in the Member States to acknowledge and act upon provisions in data protection laws that make it possible to collect “sensitive data.”

4. National policymakers should ensure that disaggregated ethnic data collection is used as a means for measuring and overcoming discrimination, and as a complement to initiatives aimed at reducing prejudice and negative stereotyping.
5. The Decade governments should take up the UNDP's work to establish guidelines and set clear indicators for monitoring the effects and impact of the Decade action plans and planning policies, with appropriate support and follow-through. Such action is a practical step to achieving real monitoring of the Decade.
6. The Decade governments should strengthen national statistical agencies; a research center or NGO with solid expertise in data collection, monitoring, and evaluation should be assigned to work closely with these agencies to develop methodologies that increase Roma participation in data collection processes.
7. The Decade governments should adjust their statistical systems to collect data disaggregated by ethnicity. Governments can incorporate ethnic data components into regular statistical surveys of the labor force and household budgets. They can also obtain data by conducting specialized sample surveys in marginalized Roma communities. Most of the indicators for monitoring living conditions can be constructed in manifold ways and data gleaned with diverse methodologies.
8. National statistical agencies should gather and process data not only on the national level, but also *ad hoc* within local and regional initiatives, to confirm whether the mainstream policies are reaching Roma beneficiaries.
9. National statistical agencies should explore various census methodologies, such as allowing respondents to choose both primary and secondary identification as a national or ethnic group, providing multiple identity categories to help improve the chances of Roma self-identifying, and using ethnically neutral markers such as traditions, language, etc., as proxies to help determine ethnicity.
10. National statistical agencies should include Roma in census activities as data collectors, as they have much greater access and credibility in Roma communities, which can result in more Roma self-identifying and responding to the census. Data collectors should also inform the Roma community about basic terminology when filling in the census forms, e.g., understanding the difference between “nationality” and “ethnicity” to help improve the accuracy of data collected during censuses, and encourage members of the Roma community to declare their Roma identity.

- II. Different statistical and data collection institutions within and between countries should coordinate their efforts, using similar definitions and methodologies for collecting data. The primary goal should be to ensure more standardized national data collection to facilitate the compilation of reliable, cross-sectoral data that would also allow for international comparability.





# Data Table

This table consolidates the data that were collected as part of the research for *No Data—No Progress*. It provides readers with a quick glimpse of the large gaps that exist in data for each indicator. Those large gaps are clearly indicated in red and pink. This table has some limitations, which are listed below.





## **What this table is:**

- ▶ A table containing data for 12 discrete Decade countries according to six main indicators.
- ▶ An attempt to show change within each country itself in measuring Decade progress between 2005 (the beginning of the Decade) and 2010 (Decade mid-point).
- ▶ An illustration of the limitations and gaps in data collection for six indicators at the national level rather than an international comparison of the values.
- ▶ A snapshot of the different data that do exist for indicators, from private institutional data to government data.
- ▶ A mid-Decade snapshot of where there are gaps in data per country, indicating the dire need to address the issue of disaggregated data collection, and also of transparency of government data.

## **What this table is not:**

- ▶ A presentation of comparable data sets. Data from each country were collected with different methodologies, and using different definitions; countries and data are displayed side-by-side merely for practical purposes.
- ▶ The last word on these indicators; only data readily available are included. Indeed, this table should serve as a reminder of the work that lies ahead.

Country	Year	Population			Primary education completion rate		Unemployment rate		Infant mortality rate		Number of "Roma settlements," etc. with low social & cultural conditions," etc.	Discrimination cases brought to equality body	
		Total	Roma, official	Roma, estimated	General	Among Roma	General	Among Roma	General	Among Roma		Total	Among Roma
Albania	2005	3,142,065	No data	80,000–150,000	Insufficient data	14%	Insufficient data	30%	16 per 1000	No data	No data	2,300	No data
	Most recent	3,170,048	31,786	30,000–120,000	Insufficient data	Insufficient data	12.8%	No newer data	13 per 1000	No data	No data	2,862	230
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2005	3,781,274	9,864	40,000–60,000	Insufficient data	No data	35.5%	No data	Insufficient data	No data	100 settlements	No data	No data
	Most recent	3,842,566	No newer data	76,000	Insufficient data	No data	24.1%	No data	13 per 1000	No data	No newer data	No data	No data
Bulgaria	2005	7,718,750	370,908	No data	Insufficient data	28.3%	10.1%	34%	10.4 per 1000	25 per 1000	88 settlements	194	No data
	Most recent	7,606,551	No newer data	638,162–815,313	Insufficient data	31.6%	6.7%	53.1%	8.6 per 1000	25 per 1000	888 settlements	1,015	No data
Croatia	2005	4,442,000	9,463	30,000–40,000	95%	No data	12.7%	80.2%	5.7 per 1000	25.1 per 1000	19 settlements	No data	No data
	Most recent	4,434,000	No newer data	No newer data	101%	No data	16.7%	Insufficient data	4.5 per 1000	11.5 per 1000	No newer data	No data	No data
Czech Republic	2005	10,351,079	12,444	179,778	102%	No data	7.9%	57.3%	3.4 per 1000	No data	310 settlements	No data	No data
	Most recent	10,501,200	No newer data	188,000	93.2%	No data	9.2%	61%	2.7 per 1000	No data	No newer data	39	No data
Hungary	2005	10,090,330	205,720	50,000–650,000	95%	76%	7.3%	71%	6.2 per 1000	No data	36,000 people	491	42
	Most recent	10,039,975	No newer data	No newer data	96.7%	No newer data	7.9%	No newer data	5.6 per 1000	No data	500–550 settlements	368	54
Macedonia	2005	1,607,997	53,879	135,490	96%	50.8%	Insufficient data	53%	12.8 per 1000	Insufficient data	No data	No data	No data
	Most recent	2,053,799	No newer data	No newer data	92%	No data	32.8%	73%	10.8 per 1000	Insufficient data	No data	No data	No data
Montenegro	2005	620,145	2,601	20,000	91.1%	9.2%	21.8%	41%	9.5 per 1000	No data	No data	No data	No data
	Most recent	627,000	9,934	No newer data	No newer data	20%	11.5%	No data	7.5 per 1000	No data	No data	No data	No data
Romania	2005	21,629,849	535,140	1,500,000	No data	31.7%	5.9%	28.5%	15 per 1000	Insufficient data	No data	No data	5 to 10
	Most recent	21,498,616	No newer data	No newer data	No data	19.7%	8.1%	No data	11 per 1000	No data	No data	No data	5 to 10
Serbia	2005	7,440,769	108,193	No data	95%	22.7%	21.8%	39%	8 per 1000	25 per 1000	593	No data	No data
	Most recent	7,334,935	No newer data	250,000–500,000	99.46%	No data	17.4%	No newer data	6.7 per 1000	No newer data	No data	No data	No data
Slovakia	2005	5,389,180	98,170	320,000–380,000	94%	No data	16.2%	34.9%	7.2 per 1000	No data	787	217	16
	Most recent	5,412,254	104,034	No newer data	No newer data	No data	9.6%	No newer data	5.86 per 1000	No data	No newer data	1,571	15
Spain	2005	43,098,035	No data	650,000–700,000	105%	No data	9.2%	No data	4.42 per 1000	Insufficient data	No data	No data	No data
	Most recent	45,828,172	No data	650,000	No newer data	No data	11.34%	No data	4.21 per 1000	No data	65,000–78,000 people <sup>1</sup>	No data	No data

- <sup>1</sup> For the 30–49-year-old age group.
- <sup>2</sup> This refers to the 25–54-year-old age group only.
- <sup>3</sup> A 2008 World Bank survey found 56 percent of working age Roma (15–64) out of the labor market, 5 percent seeking employment.
- <sup>4</sup> Among 18-year-olds.
- <sup>5</sup> For the 15–49-year-old age group.
- <sup>6</sup> This refers to the 25–54-year-old age group only.
- <sup>7</sup> Of those 15 years and older.
- <sup>8</sup> Refers to those between 7–13.
- <sup>9</sup> Calculated from a study finding that 10–12 percent of Roma live in substandard housing, using the lowest estimate for the total Roma population.
-  Official data available: Data from official sources, usually government statistical offices. Academic or other studies commissioned by government authorities, or from multilateral sources drawing upon official statistics, are included.
-  Unofficial data available: Data from studies undertaken by academic institutions, the UNDP or UNICEF, or NGOs are included where not commissioned or otherwise supported by government authorities.
-  Insufficient data available: Some data may be available, but do not meet the requirements of the specified indicator.
-  No data available: No data meeting the requirements of this indicator could be identified from publicly available sources.



# Notes

1. Total from estimated populations from Decade countries.
2. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, and Spain.
3. See for example, European Roma Rights Centre. *Stigmata: Segregated Schooling of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe—A Survey of Patterns of Segregated Education of Roma in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia*. Budapest: ERRC, 2007. <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1892> (accessed June 3, 2010); European Commission. *The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2004. <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=21191> (accessed June 3, 2010).
4. Jana Huttova, Christina McDonald, Caroline Harper. *Making the Mark? An Overview of Current Challenges in the Education for Migrant, Minority, and Marginalized Children in Europe*. Budapest and New York: Open Society Institute, 2008, 110–111. [http://www.soros.org/initiatives/esp/articles\\_publications/publications/mark\\_20090416](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/esp/articles_publications/publications/mark_20090416) (accessed May 21, 2010).
5. Dimitrina Petrova. “Ethnic Statistics,” *Roma Rights Quarterly*, No. 2 (2004). <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1995&archiv=1> (accessed May 21, 2010). See also Daniel Škobla, Tadas Leončikas, Martina Štěpánková. *Ethnicity as a Statistical Indicator for Monitoring Living Conditions and Discrimination: Analytical Report and Recommendations for the Slovak Republic*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2008. <http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/show/99069234-F203-1EE9-BEE5795FA4A9D586> (accessed June 3, 2010).
6. Mikael Luciak. *Migrants, Minorities, and Education: Documenting Discrimination and Integration in 15 Member States*. Luxembourg: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), September 2004, 126. <http://194.30.12.221/fraWebsite/attachments/CS-Education-en.pdf> (accessed May 21, 2010).
7. The Lisbon Agenda is a program of reforms aimed at making the EU economy more competitive internationally. It was agreed at the European Council in March 2000, where the European Union set itself the goal of becoming “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-

based economy in the world, capable of sustainable growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” by 2010.

8. Dimitrina Petrova. “Ethnic Statistics.”

9. Available at: <http://www.enaro.eu/dsip/download/eu-Common-Basic-Principles.pdf> (accessed May 21, 2010).

10. European Commission. *The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union*, 47.

11. Mikael Luciak. *Migrants, Minorities and Education*, 123.

12. Patrick Simon. “Ethnic” Statistics and Data Protection in the Council of Europe Countries: *Study Report*. Strasbourg: ECRI/Council of Europe, 2008, 22. [http://book.coe.int/sysmodules/RBS\\_fichier/admin/download.php?fileid=3066](http://book.coe.int/sysmodules/RBS_fichier/admin/download.php?fileid=3066) (accessed May 21, 2010); Škobla et al. *Ethnicity as a Statistical Indicator for Monitoring Living Conditions and Discrimination*, 55.

13. Department for Education and Skills. *Removing the Barriers: Raising Achievement Levels for Minority Ethnic Pupils—Exploring Good Practice*. London: DfES, 2002, 13. [http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/links\\_and\\_publications/763009/Removing\\_the\\_Barriers.pdf](http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/links_and_publications/763009/Removing_the_Barriers.pdf) (accessed May 21, 2010); Maud Blair, Jill Bourne, Caroline Coffin, Angela Creese, and Charmian Kenner. *Making a Difference: Teaching and Learning Strategies in Successful Multi-Ethnic Schools*. Department of Education and Employment, Research Brief 59. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University, 1998. <http://publications.dcsf.gov.uk//DownloadHandler.aspx?ProductId=RB59&VariantID=Making+the+Difference%3a+Teaching+and+Learning+Strategies+in+Successful+Multi-ethnic+Schools++Brief+DOC&> (accessed May 21, 2010); Leon Tikly, Chamion Caballero, David Gillborn, Jo Haynes, and John Hill. *Evaluation of Aiming High: African Caribbean Achievement Project*. London: Department for Education and Skills, 2006, 42. <http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/resources/ACAPEvalrsrchreportoct06.pdf> (accessed May 21, 2010).

14. Škobla et al. *Ethnicity as a Statistical Indicator for Monitoring Living Conditions and Discrimination*, 46. Due to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000) all public authorities are obliged to be proactive in challenging racial discrimination and promoting race equality. See “Good Practice in Collecting Ethnic Data: The United Kingdom.”

15. Ibid.

16. EU Directive on the Protection of Individuals with Regard to the Processing of Personal Data and on the Free Movement of Such Data, 95/46/EC, 24 October 1995, [http://ec.europa.eu/justice\\_home/fsj/privacy/docs/95-46-ce/dir1995-46\\_part1\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/privacy/docs/95-46-ce/dir1995-46_part1_en.pdf) (accessed May 21, 2010).

17. Council of Europe, Convention for the Protection of Individuals with Regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data (1981), <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Word/108.doc> (accessed May 21, 2010); Recommendation No. R (97) 18 of the Committee of Ministers Concerning the Protection of Personal Data Collected and Processed for Statistical Purposes (1997). [www.legislationline.org/download/.../15039859f31b32919fa9955f392a.pdf](http://www.legislationline.org/download/.../15039859f31b32919fa9955f392a.pdf) (accessed June 3, 2010).

18. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000/C 364/01). [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text\\_en.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf) (accessed May 21, 2010).

19. Patrick Simon. “Ethnic” Statistics and Data Protection, 8.

20. COM (2006) 643 of 30 October, 2006 quoted by Ibid, 68.

21. Patrick Simon. “Ethnic” Statistics and Data Protection, 68.

22. Škobla et al. *Ethnicity as a Statistical Indicator for Monitoring Living Conditions and Discrimination*, 32.

23. Maire Ní Bhrolcháin. "The Ethnicity Question for the 1991 Census: Background and Issues," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (1990) quoted by Patrick Simon, "Ethnic" *Statistics and Data Protection*, 61.
24. Ibid.
25. Fewer comprehensive data are collected and are available for the other parts of the United Kingdom, although Wales and Scotland have recently begun to collect comparable information. See Jana Huttova, et al. *Making the Mark?*, 112.
26. Department for Education and Skills. *National Curriculum Assessment, GCSE and Equivalent Attainment and Post-16 Attainment by Pupil Characteristics, in England 2005*. London: DFES, 2006, 5. [http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/soo0640/SFR09\\_2006.pdf](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/soo0640/SFR09_2006.pdf) (accessed May 21, 2010).
27. For a description of the practices, please refer to: Department for Education and Skills (DfES). *Removing the Barriers*; Maud Blair et al. "Making a Difference: Teaching and Learning Strategies in Successful Multi-Ethnic Schools;" Leon Tikly et al. *Evaluation of Aiming High: African Caribbean Achievement Project*.
28. See MEMO/09/193, 24 April 2009, on the EU Platform for Roma Inclusion, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/09/193&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> (accessed May 21, 2010).
29. Spain has not indicated that it will prepare an action plan after joining the Decade in February 2009.
30. See the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015 Terms of Reference, <http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/Decade%20Documents/Roma%20Decade%20TOR.pdf> (accessed May 21, 2010).
31. Declaration of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015, [http://www.romadecade.org/decade\\_declaration](http://www.romadecade.org/decade_declaration) (accessed May 21, 2010).
32. Third Meeting of the Roma Decade Steering Committee: Minutes and Summary, June 24–25, 2004, Budapest, Hungary, 2. <http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/Decade%20Documents/3rd%20ISC%20Meeting.pdf> (accessed May 21, 2010).
33. The Czech Republic's action plan repeatedly notes "data do not exist at this moment," the Slovak action plan refers to data "not available in required quality and scope," and the Croatian action plan, while setting out measures to collect more information throughout, in the health sector finds "no data" for most indicators. Though several of the action plans state this, there is some level of baseline data on some of the OSI-chosen indicators provided through the UNDP's work in the Decade with their 2005 *Vulnerable Groups Dataset*.
34. The report is available at: [http://www.iza.org/en/webcontent/publications/reports/report\\_pdfs/iza\\_report\\_21.pdf](http://www.iza.org/en/webcontent/publications/reports/report_pdfs/iza_report_21.pdf) (accessed June 1, 2010).
35. E-mail correspondence with Tunde Buzetsky, facilitator, Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation, January 25, 2010. The recommendations also noted that a focus should be not only on the production of new data, but on using data that already exist.
36. The conclusions of and materials presented at this meeting are available online at [http://www.romadecade.org/decade\\_of\\_roma\\_inclusion\\_indicator\\_and\\_monitoring\\_workshop](http://www.romadecade.org/decade_of_roma_inclusion_indicator_and_monitoring_workshop) (accessed June 1, 2010).

37. E-mail correspondence with UNDP staff, March 5, 2010.
38. E-mail correspondence with UNDP staff, December 1, 2009.
39. The data set is called *UNDP Vulnerable Groups Dataset*. According to the website, collecting disaggregated quantitative data is a precondition for developing national policies for sustainable inclusion of vulnerable groups such as the Roma, internally displaced persons, and refugees. Since no disaggregated data had existed, the UNDP decided to conduct a survey of the Roma and other vulnerable groups in Central and South Eastern Europe. All data are available at: <http://vulnerability.undp.sk/>.
40. According to the UNDP, the objective of the publication was to provide the governments involved in the *Decade of Roma Inclusion* with some quantitative information on the scope of the challenges ahead and make future monitoring of the process possible, [http://vulnerability.undp.sk/DOCUMENTS/explanatory\\_note.pdf](http://vulnerability.undp.sk/DOCUMENTS/explanatory_note.pdf) (accessed May 21, 2010).
41. UNDP. *Faces of Poverty, Faces of Hope*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme, 2005, 6. <http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/show/67D47F90-F203-1EE9-BB4A88AD1FF2FF8D> (accessed May 21, 2010).
42. The questionnaire is included in Annex A of the full report, available online at [www.soros.org/initiatives/roma](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/roma).
43. Many unofficial and independent reports were reported on in the country questionnaires. Not all the data that was presented from these reports were used in the country profiles. However, their existence was confirmed, and demonstrates that there are data. It was beyond the scope of this research, and not in the original terms of reference, however, to do a thorough assessment of other existing research that could inform monitoring of the Decade.
44. There have been attempts to do this in Serbia via its new Management Information System (MIS) and educational database.
45. UNICEF assists countries in collecting and analyzing data in order to fill data gaps for monitoring the situation of children and women through its international household survey initiative the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS). See [http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index\\_24302.html](http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html) (accessed on June 1, 2010).
46. Fundacion Secretariado Gitano. *Health and the Roma Community: Analysis of the Situation in Europe*. Madrid: 2009 [data from 2006]. <http://www.gitanos.org/upload/04/25/salud.pdf> (accessed June 1, 2010).
47. Montenegrin Action Plan.
48. Although contracted by government, they were undertaken by NGOs or academic institutions.
49. See <http://www.pisa.oecd.org/>.
50. Among Decade members, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, and Spain have participated in PISA.
51. Open Society Institute, Education Support Program, internal report, July 2009.
52. Albania, Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia have all participated in the third MICS survey.
53. See, for example, UNDP Croatia. *Monitoring Framework for the Decade of Roma Inclusion, Croatia*. Zagreb: UNDP Croatia, 2008. [http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/211/105998/FILENAME/monitoring\\_framework\\_-\\_complete\\_document.pdf](http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/211/105998/FILENAME/monitoring_framework_-_complete_document.pdf) (accessed June 1, 2010).



## Sources

Blair, Maud, Jill Bourne, Caroline Coffin, Angela Creese, and Charmian Kenner. *Making a Difference: Teaching and Learning Strategies in Successful Multi-Ethnic Schools*. Department of Education and Employment, *Research Brief 59*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University, 1998. <http://publications.dcsf.gov.uk//DownloadHandler.aspx?ProductId=RB59&VariantID=Making+the+Difference%3a+Teaching+and+Learning+Strategies+in+Successful+Multi-ethnic+Schools+-+Brief+DOC&>.

Commission of the European Communities. "Commission Staff Working Paper: Progress Towards the Common Objectives in Education and Training: Indicators and Benchmarks." Luxembourg: Commission of the European Communities, 2004. [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/progress\\_towards\\_common\\_objectives\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/progress_towards_common_objectives_en.pdf).

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). *Removing the Barriers: Raising Achievement Levels for Minority Ethnic Pupils. Exploring Good Practice*. London: DfES, 2002. [http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/links\\_and\\_publications/763009/Removing\\_the\\_Barriers.pdf](http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/links_and_publications/763009/Removing_the_Barriers.pdf).

Department for Education and Skills (DfES). *National Curriculum Assessment, GCSE and Equivalent Attainment and Post-16 Attainment by Pupil Characteristics, in England 2005*. London: DfES, 2006. [http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000640/SFR09\\_2006.pdf](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000640/SFR09_2006.pdf).

European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI). *Guidelines for Dealing with Issues Related to Ethnic Data Collection in ECRI's Work*. Document finalized by ECRI at its 38th meeting held from 13–16 December 2005. <http://www.errc.org/db/00/15/m00000015.pdf>.

European Roma Rights Centre. *Stigmata: Segregated Schooling of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe—A Survey of Patterns of Segregated Education of Roma in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia*. Budapest: ERRC, 2007. <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1892>.

European Commission. *The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2004. <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=21191>.

Fundacion Secretariado Gitano (FSG). *Health and the Roma Community: Analysis of the Situation in Europe*. Madrid: FSG, 2009. <http://www.gitanos.org/upload/04/25/salud.pdf>.

Huttova, Jana, Christina McDonald, Caroline Harper. *Making the Mark? An Overview of Current Challenges in the Education for Migrant, Minority, and Marginalized Children in Europe*. Budapest and New York: OSI, 2008. [http://www.soros.org/initiatives/esp/articles\\_publications/publications/mark\\_20090416](http://www.soros.org/initiatives/esp/articles_publications/publications/mark_20090416).

“Integrating Immigrant Children into Europe.” *Briefing Paper 17*, EU-Supported Educational Research 1995–2000. New Perspectives for Learning, Cambridge: pjb Associates, 2001. <http://www.pjb.co.uk/npl/bp17.htm>.

Luciak, Mikael. *Migrants, Minorities and Education: Documenting Discrimination and Integration in 15 Member States of the European Union*. Luxembourg: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), September 2004. [http://www.stop-discrimination.info/mc\\_scripts/doclib/files/CS-Education-en.pdf](http://www.stop-discrimination.info/mc_scripts/doclib/files/CS-Education-en.pdf).

Ní Bhrolcháin, Maire. “The Ethnicity Question for the 1991 Census: Background and Issues.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (1990), 542–567.

Petrova, Dimitrina. “Ethnic Statistics.” *Roma Rights Quarterly*, No. 2. (2004): 5–6. <http://www.errc.org/cikk.php?cikk=1935>.

Roma Decade Watch, Statement, April 1, 2009 [http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/211/105999/FILENAME/DW-statement-indicators\\_April\\_1\\_2009.doc](http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/211/105999/FILENAME/DW-statement-indicators_April_1_2009.doc).

Simon, Patrick. *“Ethnic” Statistics and Data Protection in the Council of Europe Countries: Study Report*. Strasbourg: ECRI/Council of Europe, 2004. [http://book.coe.int/sysmodules/RBS\\_fichier/admin/download.php?fileid=3066](http://book.coe.int/sysmodules/RBS_fichier/admin/download.php?fileid=3066).

Škobla, Daniel, Tadas Leončikas, Martina Štěpánková. *Ethnicity as a Statistical Indicator for Monitoring Living Conditions and Discrimination: Analytical Report and Recommendations for the Slovak Republic*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2008. <http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/show/99069234-F203-1EE9-BEE5795FA4A9D586>.

Tikly, Leon, Chamion Caballero, David Gillborn, Jo Haynes, and John Hill. *Evaluation of Aiming High: African Caribbean Achievement Project*. London: Department for Education and Skills, 2006. <http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/resources/ACAPevalrsrchreportocto6.pdf>.

United Nations Development Programme. *Faces of Poverty, Faces of Hope*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme, 2005. <http://europeandcis.undp.org/home/show/67D47F90-F203-1EE9-BB4A88AD1FF2FF8D>.

United Nations Development Programme Croatia. *Monitoring Framework for the Decade of Roma Inclusion, Croatia*. Zagreb: UNDP Croatia, 2008. [http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/211/105998/FILENAME/monitoring\\_framework\\_-\\_complete\\_document.pdf](http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/211/105998/FILENAME/monitoring_framework_-_complete_document.pdf).



## Roma Initiatives

Roma Initiatives builds upon the Open Society Foundations' many years of support for Roma communities, seeking to challenge prejudice and discrimination and to pursue policy change. It guides all OSI program and grantmaking activity related to the Decade of Roma Inclusion, a commitment by 12 European governments to improve the social and economic status of Roma.

Roma Initiatives works to increase the ability of Roma to participate in public life, advocate for systemic change in policies affecting Roma, challenge anti-Roma prejudice and negative stereotypes, and increase Roma participation in the Decade to make it an enduring success. As part of this effort, Roma Initiatives supports Decade Watch, a monitoring project in which Roma activists hold governments participating in the Decade accountable for implementing policies to end discrimination and the marginalization of the Roma.

## Open Society Foundations

Active in more than 70 countries, the Open Society Foundations work to build vibrant and tolerant democracies whose governments are accountable to their citizens. Working with local communities, the Open Society Foundations support justice and human rights, freedom of expression, and access to public health and education.





The year 2010 marks the half-way point of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. It is a logical place for the 12 participating Decade countries to assess their progress and to ensure that their initiatives are on track, and that living conditions for the 4.5 million Roma who live in these countries are improving. By evaluating their efforts, governments would demonstrate their seriousness and commitment to the political pledges they made to their Roma populations at the Decade's inception in 2005.

Yet five years later, the lack of data about Roma communities remains the biggest obstacle to conducting any thorough assessment of how governments are meeting their Decade commitments.

*No Data—No Progress* is an effort by the Open Society Foundations' Roma Initiatives to challenge the data deficit. The report asks questions like what are the barriers to governments compiling or generating data disaggregated for ethnicity? Do such data even exist? And, if so, have governments collected disaggregated data to assess progress?

*No Data—No Progress* aims to compel policymakers and advocates to take action against a lack of fundamental statistics that continues to be one of the biggest barriers to monitoring the Decade of Roma Inclusion and to implementing sound policies to promote more equitable societies.

*No Data—No Progress* offers achievable measures that policymakers at the national and international levels can immediately act upon to help improve data about the living standards and conditions of Europe's Roma communities. The report makes it clear that getting solid data is a realistic goal that will have a strong impact on projects, policies, and people.

