



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

Meeting of the EURoma Network

The integrated approach of projects and the combination of EU funds to achieve a higher impact of the interventions for the social inclusion of the Roma community

Madrid, 13 December 2012

Background context

The EURoma Network held its autumn meeting on the 13th and 14th of December in Madrid. Hosted by the Spanish partners, the meeting gathered 63 participants, including Structural Funds Managing Authorities and public bodies in charge of Roma policies from sixteen European countries, as well as representatives of the European Commission's DG Regional Policy and DG Employment, Social Affairs and other relevant stakeholders, in addition to the EURoma Technical Secretariat.

The two-day debates focused primarily on the **integrated approach of programmes explicitly targeting the Roma population, as well as on the combination of EU funds (mainly ESF and ERDF) for such programmes**. The meeting aimed to support members of the network in achieving a higher impact of the interventions aimed at Roma inclusion in the current programming period, but also in planning for the next Structural Funds programming period (2014-2020). It also addressed other key issues, including the current state of the implementation process of the National Roma Integration Strategies and the contribution of Structural Funds to the latter.

This meeting's conceptual starting point was that integrated interventions and the allocation of sufficient resources are indispensable to effectively address the complexity and interdependence of the problems currently affecting the Roma population. Taking into consideration the fact that the future Regulations are expected to provide an appropriate framework for integrated and multidimensional actions addressing Roma exclusion, participants at the meeting exchanged ideas and debated issues related to the coordination of EU Funds as well as the provision of mechanisms and instruments required for a more effective implementation of programmes.

Welcoming Words

Ms. Olga Robles Molina (Head of Spain's ESF MA) and **Ms. María Salomé Adroher Biosca** (National Contact Point for NRIS, Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality, Spain) opened the session and updated participants on the latest developments in the Spanish context, highlighting the current situation of the OPs and



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

the upcoming opportunities for the Roma population in this country. *Olga Robles Molina* insisted on the fact that the Multiregional OP Fight against Discrimination in Spain is a clear point of reference of good practice at the European level. It constitutes a palpable example of how SF can reach people on the ground. She made reference to the difficult current context of crisis and to the transition towards the new programming period of SF and highlighted the ever greater weight of the integrated approach, a highly relevant theme for SF and for the issue of a combination of funds. The transnational element takes full significance in this context, allowing mutual learning to improve the effectiveness of the actions aimed at vulnerable groups such as Roma and co-financed with SF, and to insist on putting social inclusion high on the agenda of SF. The new EURoma network recently approved by the European Commission illustrates the quality of the work achieved by EURoma to this day.

Ms. Adroher assured that the themes and issues addressed in the meeting will be taken into account by Spain's General Directorate of Services for Family and Childhood. There is a clear need to work in the framework, and towards achieving the objectives, of the Europe 2020 Strategy. She insisted on the access to services to guarantee rights and on explicit targeting to balance disadvantages, and referred to the aims of the Spanish NRIS in relation to the strategic areas of employment, education, healthcare and housing. She vowed that Spain would take full advantage of the mechanisms offered by SF to develop integrated interventions, including through a combination of EU funds.

Following these opening words, **Mr. Isidro Rodriguez** (Director of the Fundación Secretariado Gitano and EURoma Technical Secretariat) welcomed participants before emphasising that as we have reached the end of the fifth year of existence of EURoma, we must pause and reflect on past achievements and shortcomings. EURoma has achieved an ever greater participation of key stakeholders and addressed highly relevant themes, clearly contributing to an improvement of the policies and instruments used for Roma inclusion and to an expansion of the volume and effectiveness of funds aimed at Roma and coordination between Managing Authorities and national public bodies dedicated to Roma. He highlighted the participation of representatives of the Norwegian funds for development cooperation and representatives of Spanish municipalities intending to implement integrated programmes targeted explicitly to Roma with SF, as a demonstration of EURoma's relevance. Nonetheless, in spite of these advances, and of the large volume of available EU funds, Roma continue to be insufficiently benefitting from SF. SF have a social function and Roma and other vulnerable groups can and should not be excluded from them. He highlighted milestones such as the Common Basic Principles which brought some methodological order to targeted actions with Roma, and the launch of NRIS as concrete policy instruments, and insisted on the need to ensure that SF can help to fulfil the objectives of the NRIS.



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

He subsequently referred to the new EURoma network, the pragmatic objective of which is to complement the current network's management and technical knowledge with the political level, with a view to raising awareness and enhancing the coordination of national policies and instruments aimed at Roma. Finally, he introduced the agenda of the meeting, including six practical cases in EU member states of the combination of funds and/or integrated approaches.

The integrated approach of projects and the combination of EU funds to achieve a higher impact of the interventions for the social inclusion of the Roma community. EC contribution

Mr. Dominique Bé (DG EMPL) emphasised the relevance of the integrated approach for Roma inclusion in EU Roma policy and explained how to integrate and combine funds with a view to achieving a higher impact of the interventions aimed at Roma inclusion, underlining that the combination of EU funds has proven to be a major challenge both for the European Commission and other stakeholders. He referred to the amendment of the current ERDF Regulation (with Art. 7.2, which allows the ERDF to initiate integrated housing interventions through a combination of ERDF and ESF) as a milestone in promoting the development of multi-fund OPs. The amendment of Art.7.2 fosters the need to change OPs (for instance, the ERDF had virtually no social inclusion investment in 2007 and there were almost exclusively mono-fund programmes). He mentioned that the CSF 2014-2020 provide for Calls for the integrated use of CSF Funds to address the territorial dimension of poverty, in particular for the Roma. He described the timeline ahead related to the 2014-2020 Regulations, CSF, Partnership Contracts and draft OPs. The new regulations should be adopted in 2013 and followed by formal negotiations between EC and Member States. All these developments are taking place in a negative wider context. MFF are blocked until next European Council meeting of February 2013.

Mrs. Enrica Chiozza (DG REGIO) offered some reflections on the integrated approach, referring both to integration in terms of funds and to intervention on the field. The aim is not focus merely on social infrastructure but also on the soft side of interventions, co-funded by the ESF. She also emphasised the breakthrough in 2010 with the modification of the ERDF, allowing all member states to put through the integrated approach in both rural and urban areas for first time. One key officer from DG REGIO is already working 100% on developing the integrated approach in concrete terms. She pointed to the achievement of some quite impressive results already. A substantial number of Member States have initiated technical assistance projects for local capacity-building or new integrated interventions, for instance with centres for mediation, employment, education pooled together. Examples include municipalities in Bulgaria (four in total, of which Ostrava was highlighted as a particularly interesting



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

example), Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, and Greece. Spain also interested in integrated interventions in spite of delays and some obstacles. She point to France as a good example of an 'old' Member State taking advantage of the amendment of Art. 7.2 of the ERDF Regulation: eleven regions are currently investing, or planning to do so, a total of 20 million Euros for integrated interventions. The work on conceiving and concretising interventions involves the construction of cooperation mechanisms with other organisations (CoE, municipalities, etc.), along with research inputs (eg. a study currently undertaken in collaboration with the LSE).

She mentioned that the amendment of the ERDF Regulation presents other challenges. Traditionally ERDF co-funding was exclusively for urban initiatives, but rural interventions are now possible too. She addressed the question of how to capitalise on achievements to date, lessons learned on the ground, and to follow up on that for future integrated housing interventions. The new network complementing EUroma will allow putting through ideas and better influencing those actors who are now negotiating the future OPs. In spite of some opposition, she insisted that the two funds are very much complementary. The issue is to put into place the pieces of a big jigsaw - NRPs, future Programmes for Regions, Roma Strategies – and the starting-point is Commission's position paper for negotiation with Member States. She insisted that the ball is now on the side of Member States to propose integrated OPs, or integrated interventions with a combination of funds. However, a limitation is that future SF will be submitted to macro-economic conditionality.

In the subsequent Q&A session, the representative of the region of Ile de France Paris mentioned that he is very keen on a common strategy and common budget, but in relation to combined ESF+ERDF, the preoccupation is that the national level does not achieve integrated funding for integrated projects. He assured that he will insist with colleagues at the national level to have a strategy. In response, it was asserted that there are several options offered to each country, eg. Multi-fund programmes. However, it depends on national institutional setups – for example if one Ministry manages all SF, it will be more easily amenable to integrated OPs, but in cases where different ministries undertake the management, it is not sure that they will take advantage of these possibilities. It was argued that we cannot have traditional regional funds anymore; it is no longer business as usual. Results-oriented programmes are needed, focusing on certain strategic areas critical to the growth and development of country and region. Evaluation methods are being developed for outcomes and outputs. In strategic areas like promoting social inclusion and fighting poverty, it is not so difficult to have one OP.



National experiences in the use of the integrated approach and the combination of EU funds for Roma inclusion

In order to exchange experiences and learning from different countries, six practical initiatives were expounded, where MS could take advantage of the know-how available in the fields of employment, housing, community development, education and antidiscrimination.

Czech Republic

Ms. Veronika Marcinková (ESF Managing Authority, Czech Republic) and **Mr. Jakub Horacek** (ERDF Managing Authority, Czech Republic) described the links between ERDF and ESF OPs in the Czech Republic through the Integrated OP (one of 3 ESF OPs) and Human Resources and Employment OP (ERDF). They explained that coordination mechanisms' main objective is the development of more sustainable interlinked systems of assistance and synergy effects.

They described the *social entrepreneurship* intervention area, a very good example of synergies between both OPs, as well as the *Improving the quality of living in deprived urban areas* intervention area of the Integrated OP (IOP), which provides for an integrated urban development Plan (IUDP) involving 41 cities. The latter is structured along 3 lines of action: 1. Revitalisation of public areas; 2. regeneration of apartments / houses; 3. pilot projects focused on solving problems of Roma communities.

Mr Horacek described pilot projects undertaken in the framework of the IOP, with 6 participating cities. Regarding the ERDF, there are 45 pilot projects in housing and public environment (cost 7.6 million EUR) and 8 projects of community centres (3.1 million EUR). In relation to the ESF, in every city there are approximately 15 soft projects of different costs that are evaluated at the end of each year. He then explained the activities of pilot projects combining ERDF and ESF, the ERDF elements (regeneration of housing apartments, revitalisation of public areas, community centres) and results (improving housing and living, public safety project); and ESF elements (links to other OPs or national funds, projects focused on education, social, care, criminality prevention, etc.; cooperation linked to Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Interior and Government Agency for social inclusion) and results (strengthening local and social educational services). He explained the risks of the interventions: Communication difficulties from MAs to cities to majority citizens, which is critical; the involvement of NGOs, the will of political representatives, and sustainability; as well as the lessons learned, including the need for good monitoring



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

system and evaluation, the development of a social economy (involve economic project, social enterprises), of good communication and of a system of sanctions.

In the subsequent Q&A session, it was asked how to ensure sustainability of integrated interventions. Keys to success include the active involvement of both Roma and majority populations, the interconnection of social and economic intervention as well as political participation. It was then asked whether there are any reports from the pilot projects. There are no evaluation reports yet as the projects only just started – monitoring system is in place but there are no results yet. The report for each project is expected in 2 years. Another question addressed the issue of one organisation submitting distinct applications to both ERDF ('hard' social infrastructure) and ESF ('soft' components such as professional training) for integrated projects. What would happen if one good ERDF application is approved and then followed by a bad ESF application? The Commission might recommend changes to project, although there is as yet no experience of weak social projects.

Bulgaria

Ms. Tatyana Angelcheva (ERDF Managing Authority, Bulgaria), **Ms. Viktoria Nenkova** (ERDF Managing Authority, Bulgaria) and **Ms. Galya Savova** (ESF Managing Authority, Bulgaria) presented two experiences of integrated schemes from Bulgaria, the *Pilot integrated housing scheme* (ERDF), and the *Support for the deinstitutionalisation of children* scheme (ESF).

The *deinstitutionalisation of children scheme* involved 5 projects. The scheme involved setting up a Management and Coordination Working Group, with monthly meetings to assess the progress of the strategy. The integrated approach was a key element of the scheme. The presentation provided a description of quantitative data related to the ERDF component of the integrated intervention, including: total budget (54,696,185 EUR, 85% ERDF co-financing), number of beneficiaries, construction of 133 Family Type Residential Centres and 27 shelter houses in 62 municipalities, 5 million EUR under OPRD for Ministry of Health for restructuring of 8 pilot Homes for Medical and Social Care for children to establish innovative integrated services for deinstitutionalisation of children.

In relation to the ESF-financed soft measures of the deinstitutionalisation scheme, **Ms. Galya Savova** presented some background information, including the challenges that the scheme has faced. The latter was initiated as a Phare Programme in 2004-2006 and developed in three phases. The assistance made a tangible contribution to the development of community-based services for vulnerable people, as an alternative to institutionalisation. The access to community based services as an alternative to institutionalisation was improved in 97 out of 264 Bulgarian municipalities, and 80% of projects included the training of staff and experts, and there was a total of 6000



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

children and 3000 family beneficiaries. Deinstitutionalisation involves 6 schemes, of which 3 cover the integrated approach. Galya Savova made a brief description of the DEI integrated schemes: 'Chance for a Happy Future', 'To not abandon any child', 'Life in the community'. In spite of the success achieved in the process of modernisation of the system through the Pre-accession Phare period and by means of EU funds now, efforts for the achievement of a higher quality of the social services and bringing them close to the family environment are still needed. She concluded with a description of critical success factors for the programme, both in the design of the intervention (strategic vision, coordinated and integrated approach, targeting) and in partnerships (involvement of families). One precondition of the programme was to avoid physical segregation.

In the subsequent Q&A session, it was asked whether financing for deinstitutionalisation comes both from ESF and ERDF. Infrastructure activities are financed by ERDF, and when construction finishes, a new set of projects under the ESF is initiated, delivered by social services themselves (including maintenance). Another participant asked how the Roma community benefitted from programme. They benefit indirectly but no disaggregated data is available. It was emphasised that political will and support is key to achieve success in interventions. It was then asked whether it would it be more difficult to develop an integrated approach explicitly targeting Roma. According to the Bulgarian MAs, communication in this scheme was very important, but specific Roma integration measures are more difficult to communicate and would receive less political support.

The next presentation focused on the Pilot Integrated Housing Scheme (Bulgaria). Regarding the ERDF element thereof, the presentation focused on the different priority axes (2 priorities), and the process itself, involving the establishment of an inter-institutional working group with the Council of Ministers under the leadership of the Minister of EU Funds Management for the elaboration of a Concept for integrated projects. It followed with a description of the main tasks of the Working Group, including the selection of integrated projects and their criteria (analysis of status and needs of target group, and desegregation, integrated approach in provision of public services and prerequisites for employment of members of the target group); the eligible activities and requirements for funding under OPRD scheme; and the envisaged investments under OPRD within the framework of the selected pilot municipalities (443 individual social housing, expected completion late 2014-early 2015). The Working Group selected 4 integrated projects in 4 pilot municipalities. See PPT for further info.

The second presentation focused on the ESF component of these 4 pilot projects. The ESF component of pilot project is within the Human Resources Development OP (1.2 billion EUR). It was highlighted that equal opportunities, anti-discrimination, the integration of marginalised groups are all horizontal priorities, and a specific chapter is



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

dedicated to Roma inclusion. This was followed with a description of the political and institutional context, including the NRIS, before explaining the 4 policy domains that form the “social package” of the pilot project (employment, education and training, social inclusion, sustainable desegregation). In relation to the procedure followed, the pilot project involves 1) a coordination unit at the municipal level – with public authorities and stakeholders; 2) capacity-building activities; and 3) the elaboration of individual action plans for sustainable social integration of representatives of the target group, which receive support in the 4 policy domains described above. Consultation and local partnership networks are key elements of projects for public support and project sustainability. The presentation concluded with some critical success factors, including political leadership, sufficient administrative capacity (public admin, beneficiaries), positive attitudes (broad public, local community, stakeholders, including media and NGOs, target groups); delivery mechanisms; design of the intervention (strategic vision, coordinated and integrated approach, targeting – diversity of target group, adequate information on target group), strong partnerships, monitoring and evaluation of results.

In the Q&A session, one participant asked what the concrete selection criteria of representatives of target groups are. How to ensure representativeness and sustainability? Who works with target group? At the municipal level and municipalities are still elaborating the criteria, as the project in its initial phase. Representatives of Roma locally should actively work in the interest of Roma. Roma NGOs are selected, which ensure active involvement of Roma. Municipalities only intervene in municipal properties, not segregated slums, which are often illegal. It was highlighted in response that municipalities should go for both private and public property, because focusing exclusively on municipal property is a big constraint to reach Roma and the most vulnerable. Finally, it was asked what solutions are offered to people living in houses that are renovated under the programme. They are relocated in other social homes during reconstruction process.

Hungary

Ms. Lilla Jutkusz (Head of Department for Evaluation and Monitoring, State Secretariat for Social Inclusion, Ministry of Human Resources, Hungary) then presented the complex program Promoting Social Inclusion in Hungary. She described of model programme for segregated zone residents – a call was launched in 2011, with 1.5 million EUR of national funds, for programme on 8 sites, with the involvement of 600 persons, 24 community services and 100 refurbished housing units. The complex settlement programme aims at segregated residential zones with the potential to be integrated (within the tissue of settlements). The programme involves integrated actions in social, health, education, training, labour market integration and community development related components in order to eliminate disadvantages. The available funds total 20.3 million EUR. There were over 120 applications, to support 30-50



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

settlements – in 2009 similar call attracted less than 10 applications. The programme for housing is to be launched in 2013 (5.36 million EUR). She emphasised that partnership in planning and implementation of projects is a key requirement for applications, and projects need some (but not all) of the aforementioned components of an integrated intervention.

She offered a description of the basic principles of the project, including: mid-term development (intervention) plan (municipality and community level) based on Local Situation analysis, mapping individual problems; complex integrated actions (early intervention and extracurricular development, training and labour market services, community development, health, social work in the field, improvement of infrastructure and access to services); the inclusion of relevant stakeholders (including residents); individual development plans (for at least 60 per cent of the residents aged 3-45 living in segregated zones); and programme assessment. The expected results regarding individuals include: a total of 2500 persons involved; improved access to services; higher level of qualification of the persons involved (at least 75% of the individuals with individual development plans), more people employed; and improved housing conditions (with the involvement of participants in the refurbishing and building activities). She also described further plans, including the launching of a *residential integration pilot programs* in 3 regions (ERDF): Northern Hungary, Northern Great Plain, and Southern Transdanubia (1.78 million EUR per region). In 2013 the housing strategy will be devised. For 2014-2020, devising settlement rehabilitation programmes will continue using previous grants.

She concluded by explained challenges in the current and future programming periods, including restricted time and resources for 2007-2013 (possibility of pilot actions and mainly rehabilitation), and in relation to 2014-2020 the challenge is to plan interventions before programme experiences and assessments are available from the previous programming period. For both periods the harmonisation of ESF and ERDF resources and actions are key challenges.

In the following Q&A session, it was asked what sorts of services are provided to Roma in the programme. Work is undertaken both with Roma and residents of areas where they are resettled – with municipalities as lead partners. The work involves step-by-step measures, radial movement, beginning with the community level – segregated areas – then expanding to the areas where resettlement takes place. It was then asked what the initial results of the programme are. The MA has obtained results for an evaluation report that will be soon available.



Romania

Thereafter, **Ms. Marta Marczis** (UNDP), **Ms. Ana Maria Gorog** (North-West Regional Development Agency, Romania) and **Mr. Adrian Raulea** (Head of Local Development, Cluj municipality) presented the *Integrated Project for Housing and Inclusion in the municipality of Cluj* in Romania from three governance levels (UNDP – international; regional and municipal).

They described the context in which the project was elaborated on the 4 targeted communities in the Pata Rat settlement in Cluj. The project has to address the significant increase in the Roma population in the area, and is financed with 82 million EUR. The motto of the project is: *“The solution to Pata Rat is not in Pata Rat”*. They explained the project, which involves both short-term interventions (2012-2015 – project package financeable in this programming period, emergency interventions) and long-term development (2011-2020). The latter involves implementing a long-term strategy for complex solutions to the problems of exclusion of vulnerable citizens, including Roma, in an integrated and sustainable way in Cluj. The project involves social innovation in terms of empowerment of the citizens at risk, improving inclusion oriented services, setting up a social housing system with the participation of the target group and social enterprises in planning and implementation of the housing programme.

They subsequently described the objectives and methodological principles of the project. In relation to the latter, **Mr. Adrian Raulea** insisted on participation, motivation and commitment, joint development, strengthening communication, social organisation, complexity, area-based approach, integrated development, social cohesion and desegregation. They described the planning and strategic hierarchy as well as the institutional hierarchy in the project development, and explained the preparatory phase of the project (OSI-UNDP project), which took place in 2012. Community coaching process has begun in the frame of the UNDP-OSI project. They presented the key elements of the short-term interventions (2012-2015) in the integrated flagship project, including the reconstruction and building of flats with participation of trained professionals and families; a business incubator (SME and social enterprises) to create long-term job opportunities for beneficiaries whose skills and knowledge have increased through different vocational activities (waste recycling, management of city’s green areas and produce renewable energy from green waste); and a Metropolitan Inclusion Centre providing different public services for inclusion. The Metropolitan Inclusion Centre has to be set up for management; and other pending tasks include the reorganisation of public services and social housing regulation as well as the creation of an enabling environment for social enterprises.

They provided a map highlighting the locations of the integrated housing pilot package in Cluj, and insisted on one of the keys to success, which is to start from the ground up,



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

addressing the concrete problems of people in the area – rather than from the EU regulations. They mentioned key obstacles, including a lack in participation and action, lack of strategy, lack of data on background and trends, lack of coordination and mutual exchange and knowledge, lack of managerial skills, political and administrative obstacles. The programming process can be a problem too due to a lack of horizontal and vertical coordination.

In their view, the notion '*integrated*' means integrated thinking to act locally. They conceptualised a 'Holy Trinity' of the community-led local development: 'area', 'partnership' and 'strategy'. Any kind of aspect of development has to be included. Roma should be seen as partners rather than as a target group. A key aim is to teach them how to have a voice and be involved as partners of other stakeholders. They analysed the keys to inclusive local development, including following an area-based approach, a combination of top-down and bottom-up work, establishing tri-partite partnerships, management and financing, integrated and multi-sectorial approach – linkage between actions, innovation, and national and transnational cooperation and networking. They explained the role of the UNDP as an external facilitator, and elaborated on the community coaching process for launching social innovation. They finally insisted on the fact that 'strategy is a process, not the first and not a paper'. This process involves the following step-by-step actions: community coaching, local survey with community involvement, participatory actions and assessment ('urgent needs plan'), participatory planning, mapped and reorganised local resources and partnerships, multi-level exchange, and the development of a local inclusion centre.

One participant subsequently asked how to deal with organised crime. Coaches started to work in June, and a meeting between the police, municipality and NGOs is planned, because we now have a clearer picture of the pattern of the settlement, of the areas that harbour organised crime. Well organised partnership is absolutely needed, as sitting down together has not been done before to share information and methods.

France

Mr. Vincent Rey (Director of European Affairs, Île de France Region, France) presented the implementation of Art.7.2 in programmes benefitting Roma in the Ile-de-France region. He insisted on the diversity, heterogeneity and disparities of the region. In Ile-de-France, the ERDF and ESF OPs were managed until now at the central government level. Regions will now manage their own ERDF programmes. In relation to the ESF, the regions and departments will now have their own axes of action although they will continue to be managed at the national level. This is considered as a key progress.

He offered an overview of the social situation of Roma in the Ile-de-France, pointing out that many actions towards Roma migrants were taken but in an uncoordinated fashion. From 2005, the commitment of the region was expressed in the establishment



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

of 'Insertion villages' in the Seine-St-Denis, the region has voted a budget to 'help to eradicate slums', and three integration villages have been set up since 2007. He explained the process to achieve their objectives, taking full advantage of the revised ERDF regulation by modifying the OP. The managing authorities used the results of the consultation launched by the regional prefecture in order to grasp the needs related to integration through housing of marginalised communities. They observed a high level of needs (24 projects for a total cost of 70million EUR) and diverse target groups (Roma, gypsies, migrant workers, women victims of violence, poor housing tenants), and hence took on board the need for differentiated interventions: traveller sites, family plans, modular housing, individual housing, rehabilitation in social residence, homes and shelters.

He emphasised the difficulties encountered in relation to the creation of a new budgetary line with a constant budget. Modifying the OP involved the creation of an Axis no.6 within the OP on the housing for marginalised communities. 1 million EUR were granted to this axis to contribute to 4 projects. The modification of OP was validated by Commission on 2 December 2011. He subsequently described the 4 projects financed through the creation of axis no.6, one key goal of which is to achieve activation for employment. He insisted on the commitment of the Ile-de-France local authorities to Roma inclusion. They are currently working on cartography of integrated housing projects for the next operational programme. At the national level, we need to be vigilant on the axis that will be part of the next ESF OP.

In the Q&A session that followed, it was asked how the Ile-de-France region is dealing with transnational, cross-border integrated approach. The shared responsibility of host and origin Member States was emphasised, and EURoma is an excellent forum for cooperation and information exchange in this regard. One key issue is international territorial cooperation for Roma issues, with similar and coherent lines of action in related OPs of different countries. The URBACT project was mentioned as a relevant example of such cooperation.

Spain

Mr. Pedro Navarrete (Institute for Reallocation and Social Integration [IRIS], Madrid Region, Spain) presented the impact assessment of the housing interventions in social integration of the IRIS in Madrid. The situation of the 'second generation' Roma in these interventions has improved, in terms of educational level or in terms of interacting with non-Roma (more than 50% have a majority of non-Roma friends), and in terms of the opinion of non-Roma neighbours after relocation. The impact assessment was to be presented in the following week. Social accompaniment is key – eg. monthly inspection of houses and strict conditions for relocated families.



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

The relocation takes place through social housing rental contract. Flats never become the property of relocated families. The rent ranges from 50 to 100 Euros monthly; and the contract involves a set of obligations on the part of beneficiaries, including the schooling of children and respect for public/common areas. One key criterion is desegregation: one Roma family is located per housing block, with no other directly neighbouring block housing other another Roma family. This criterion is due to the problems generated by mass relocation, including resistance from neighbours. Dispersion was the response, on the basis of proportional distribution. For example, Madrid has 3 million inhabitants, and 1800 Roma families have thus been relocated in the municipality. No Roma families were relocated in smaller municipalities with 30 families. Lots of prospection is thus needed. For example, for the IRIS to buy 50 flats, 700 were studied. Rehabilitation takes place if the flats purchased are deteriorated. The relocation programme included an employment component, which unfortunately is going to be terminated.

Presentation of DGREGIO “Study on Sustainable Regeneration in Suburbs – promoting social integration in deprived neighbourhoods through housing interventions by the ERDF”

Dr. Iván Tosics (Metropolitan Research Institute, Member of Research Group of European Parliament study on ERDF housing interventions in deprived neighbourhoods) presented the European Parliament study on “sustainable regeneration in suburbs – promoting social integration in deprived neighbourhoods through housing interventions” by the ERDF. He analysed policy and legal changes in relation to housing interventions that accompanied the expansion of the EU to Central and Eastern Europe, including 1) the fact that it is no longer necessary for targeted housing to be public social housing, given that most new EU member states privatised their social houses; and 2) the promotion of an integrated approach through the amendment of the ERDF Regulation. He emphasised that most countries did not spend any EU funds on housing: 10 of the 27 did not use the new opportunities for housing at all. Some of them might claim to have solved most of the problems from their own resources (eg. DE, DK, AU...), in other cases, SF programming was too advanced in time when the new opportunities came.

The study analyses comparatively 10 case studies. Three key indicators have been crossed to assess the degree of integration in the approach taken: economy/jobs, sustainability/energy, social/inclusion. The study asked whether ERDF housing projects contribute to integrated sustainable regeneration in deprived areas. The preliminary results are mitigated at best, and the ‘integrated’ programmes are sometimes integrated only in name. Results show that Eastern European projects are the least integrated of all. Individuals rather than neighbourhoods have benefitted. A key issue is the lack of match funding required for ERDF housing projects, loans etc.



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

Dr. Tosics presented emerging findings at the EU level. The clarity of regulations is essential; deployment of ERDF regulations depends heavily on whether similar national approaches are in place. Possible types of ERDF intervention could be:

General energy efficiency programmes, with weak social targeting (but explicitly excluding high income areas, with substantial mandatory stakeholder contributions.

Strongly socially targeted integrated improvement of deprived multi-family housing areas including energy efficiency and job creating measures, with mandatory stakeholder contributions.

Complex integrated improvement of the most marginalised residential areas/housing conditions with extremely strong social targeting, little or no stakeholder contributions, featuring housing and job related measures within area or through measures outside of it.

A balance of these three types of project should be transparent at a national level. Carefully designed conditionality criteria could set a minimum level for the more complex projects. If the EU does not pressure for 2nd and 3rd types of interventions, the overwhelming majority, if not all interventions will be confined to the first type, which is a profound mistake. Indicators based on valid information are key for results. Other lessons include:

Short timescales do not allow for integration, particularly in the case of complex projects (type 3).

Mentoring and support by higher levels of governance should replace heavy handed bureaucracy. Current approaches deter, instead of encourage, integration and creative local solutions. Cities should have access to technical assistance in developing and implementing complex and integrated projects to foster social inclusion.

ESF and ERDF integration should be pushed forward.

Cities and regional administrations may regard multiple partners as problems rather than solutions. Sufficient time and flexible administrative networks are needed to build effective partnerships. There is a big role to play for ETC programmes (eg. URBACT).



Structural Funds: Investing in Roma

Resident engagement and empowerment delivers multiple benefits in identifying and delivering good local solutions and in managing expectations.

Importance of communication and marketing cannot be overestimated in implementing a successful rehabilitation project targeting excluded neighbourhoods. Information, explanation and participation should involve residents in the wider neighbourhood and the city as a whole.

The report will be released in February.

Ms. Belen Sanchez-Rubio (EUroma Technical Secretariat) concluded by insisting on the novelty of integrated interventions, which will therefore remain on the agenda of EUroma.

Annex: [List of Participants](#)