



# Civil Society Monitoring Report

on the Implementation of the National Roma Integration Strategy  
and Decade Action Plan in 2012 in

MACEDONIA



DECADE OF  
ROMA  
INCLUSION  
2005-2015

# Civil Society Monitoring Report

on the Implementation  
of the National Roma Integration Strategy  
and Decade Action Plan in 2012 in

MACEDONIA

**Prepared by a civil society coalition comprising the following organizations:**

InSoC – Initiative for Social Change (lead organization)  
Humanitarian and Charitable Roma Association “Mesecina”  
Roma Democratic Development Association “Sonce”  
Roma Education Center “Ambrela”



**Written by**

Eben Friedman ■ Ferdi Ismaili ■ Gordana Rodić-Kitanovski  
Samet Skenderi ■ Ljatife Šikovska ■ Muhamed Toči

**Coordinated by**

the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation  
in cooperation with the Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma programme  
and the Roma Initiatives Office of the Open Society Foundations



**Published by**

Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation  
Teréz körút 46.  
1066 Budapest, Hungary  
[www.romadecade.org](http://www.romadecade.org)

Design and layout: [www.foszer-design.com](http://www.foszer-design.com)

Proofreading: Marianne Powell

©2013 by Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any forms or by any means without the permission of the Publisher.

ISSN: 2064-0749

All civil society monitoring reports are available at [www.romadecade.org](http://www.romadecade.org)

This report was prepared by a civil society coalition comprising the following organisations: Initiative for Social Change (Skopje), Humanitarian and Charitable Romani Association “Mesečina” (Gostivar), Roma Democratic Development Association “Sonce” (Tetovo), and Roma Education Centre “Ambrela” (Šuto Orizari – Skopje). The lead researcher of the coalition is Eben Friedman (independent consultant) and the project manager is Gordana Rodić-Kitanovski (independent consultant/Roma Education Centre “Ambrela”).

The authors of the report are: Eben Friedman (independent consultant), Ferdi Ismaili (Roma Democratic Development Association “Sonce”), Gordana Rodić-Kitanovski (independent consultant/Roma Education Centre “Ambrela”), Samet Skenderi (Initiative for Social Change), Ljatife Šikovska (Roma Education Centre “Ambrela”), and Muhamed Toči (Humanitarian and Charitable Romani Association “Mesečina”). The following researchers have been involved in the project: Nedime Alievska, Abdulselam Arifi, Martina Asanovski, Džengis Huseini, Samedin Kananoski, Rabija Mamudovska, Irfan Martez, Aida Mustafovska, Šenaj Osmanov, Sabina Ramadanova, Ljatife Šikovska, Ervin Šikovski, Šukri Toči, and Ferizan Zekirov.

The following organisations have been involved in the advising on the report: the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation, the Central European University’s Department of Public Policy, the European Roma Rights Centre, Habitat for Humanity, the Roma Education Fund, and from the Open Society Foundation: Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma program, the Roma Initiatives Office, and the Roma Health program.

In the pilot year of 2012, the Decade Secretariat decided to support reports from civil society coalitions in seven countries (Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, Spain), and the Roma Initiatives Office commissioned an additional report from the Czech Republic. In addition, the Decade Secretariat made a template public in order to encourage additional civil society actors to monitor the implementation of National Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS) and Decade Action Plans.

In the reports, civil society coalitions supplement or present alternative information to Decade Progress Reports submitted by Participating Governments in the Decade of Roma Inclusion and to any reports submitted by State parties to the European Commission on implementation of their NRIS. These reports are not meant to substitute for quantitative monitoring and evaluation by State authorities but to channel local knowledge into national and European policy processes and reflect on the real social impact of government measures. The civil society reports provide additional data to official ones, proxy data where there are no official data, or alternative interpretation of published data.

The project is coordinated by the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation in cooperation with Open Society Foundation’s Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma program and the Roma Initiatives Office.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Executive Summary	7
Recommendations	15
List of Abbreviations	21
Introduction	23
1. Structural Requirements	27
2. Anti-Discrimination	33
3. Education	39
4. Employment	45
5. Healthcare	49
6. Housing	53
Case Studies	57
Bibliography	69
Annex 1	77
Annex 2	79
Annex 3	87
Annex 4	89



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Overall assessment

Although the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* remained relevant in 2012 as a broad framework for policy aimed at improving the situation of the country's Romani population, implementation faltered in 2012, even under the Macedonian presidency of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. The findings of a review of implementation of the national action plans for education, employment, health, and housing conducted in mid-2012 were not applied, with none of the action plans replaced or updated since expiring at the end of 2011. Coordination at central level and between central and local levels remained a problem, as did the availability of relevant data on and funding for the implementation of initiatives for Roma at both central and local levels. While successful programmes established in previous years were generally continued and a promising Romani health mediation programme was introduced, clear signs of a government commitment to sustaining and expanding all relevant programmes to meet outstanding needs were lacking.

## Findings

### *Structural requirements*

There is a degree of confusion resulting from the division of responsibilities for coordinating work at the central level on Roma inclusion between the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion within the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, and the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia. Responsibility for day-to-day coordination has remained with the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, due in large part to the fact that the Minister without Portfolio lacks a budget of its own.

Local authorities have been involved in the implementation of the 2004 Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia and the national action plans through the elaboration of local action plans, the signing of Memoranda of Cooperation with the central government, and the provision of space for Romani Information Centres (RICs). Civil society involvement in developing and implementing the 2004 Strategy and the national action plans has been more extensive and more consistent, sometimes to the point of placing NGOs at risk of losing their independence while freeing the state of obligations to its citizens. While Romani NGOs have played a central role in the operation of RICs, there is no evidence that the Centres have monitored local-level implementation of the 2004 Strategy as envisioned. Finally, representatives of Romani NGOs have participated in the National Coordinating Body, but this institution has been largely inactive since 2008.

There is little evidence of successful coordination among the different layers of governance involved in the implementation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the national action plans. In the case of local action plans, coordination appears to be limited to agreement on common objectives. Although the central government provides funding for project proposals submitted by municipalities implementing the 2004 *Strategy* and the national action plans, the absence of formal criteria for evaluating these proposals suggests that real coordination through this funding mechanism is minimal. The objectives of Romani Information Centres include the establishment of structures for cooperation with municipal institutions for issues related to the 2004 *Strategy* and the Decade, but implementation of

this objective has been extremely limited. There have also been reports of the misuse of Romani Information Centres for political purposes.

The introduction of targeted policy for Roma with the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* has generally served to complement mainstream policies. However, projects financed on the basis of a Memorandum of Cooperation between a municipality and the central government for the purpose of improving infrastructure in *de facto* segregated Romani settlements are inconsistent with the objective of mainstreaming. Attention to the ongoing construction of a secondary school in Šuto Orizari is also needed to ensure that the facility is completed, equipped, and staffed in such a way as to provide quality education for inhabitants of the municipality, while at the same time promoting integration by attracting members of other ethnic communities.

Despite the inclusion of concrete indicators for most measures of the five national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, monitoring and evaluation are generally absent. While the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion collects data on the activities of line ministries toward implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and the national plans, there is no unified database containing information important for adapting and revising strategies as necessary. Moreover, the reports submitted by line ministries on implementation of the national action plans do not refer to specific measures within those plans. Finally, the findings of a review of implementation of the national action plans for education, employment, health, and housing have not been applied, as none of the action plans have been replaced or updated since expiring at the end of 2011.

Funding for the implementation of action plans adopted at both central and local levels in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion has been inadequate to date, and prospects for improvement in the period 2014-2020 are at best unclear. At the central level, budgetary allocations for measures contained in the national action plans have been largely *ad hoc*, with last-minute budget proposals submitted by line ministries often radically reduced, and without explanation by the Ministry of Finance. Funding for implementation of local action plans has also been problematic, in large part because incomplete fiscal decentralisation has often resulted in municipalities waiting for funds from line ministries. No funds were awarded to Romani NGOs under the two relevant EU-funded calls for proposals concluded in 2012. Planning the allocation of funds for the inclusion of Roma in the 2014-2020 period has been left to line ministries, and allocations have been largely dependent on the presence within the respective ministries' IPA structures of individual employees who have an overview of and/or access to advice about the needs of Roma.

Signs of a clear commitment to securing financing for all measures contained in any of the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, as well as in the 2004 *Strategy* with its ten priority areas are lacking. At the same time, the ongoing withdrawal of international donors, together with the tendency among those which remain to support short-term projects, while requesting evidence of impact which can be realistically expected only in the medium to long term, means NGOs in Macedonia are often caught in a funding vacuum.

Romani NGOs have been reluctant to apply for IPA funding due to the associated administrative and financial demands. As a result, Romani NGOs have more often featured as junior partners in applications led by larger, more established non-Romani organisations. The fact that all applications for EU funding submitted to date by Romani NGOs in Macedonia have been unsuccessful carries with it the risk that these NGOs will be discouraged from attempting to access such funding in future.

### *Anti-discrimination*

Concrete efforts to date to ensure that all Roma are registered have been undertaken primarily by NGOs. The *Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014* marks an increase in official attention to the issue of personal documentation, with a mapping of the situation completed by early 2013 and initial steps taken to reduce the ascertained number of Roma without complete personal documentation by 10% for each year of this Strategy's implementation.

If inter-ethnic relations in Macedonia are characterised by lower levels of discrimination and racism toward Roma than in other countries in the region, there have also been few efforts to raise awareness and build public understanding of the benefits for the entire society of the integration of Roma. Official efforts to promote rights awareness among Romani citizens have also been few. On the other hand, high-level officials have consistently served as role models in promoting respect towards Roma, and the symbolic importance of the presence in the Macedonian government of a Romani Minister without Portfolio should not be underestimated.

Attention to institutional racism and discrimination in 2012 was concentrated in the priority areas of education and health. In the area of education, official attention to the procedures for enrolment of children in special education increased as the Ministry of Education registered cases of children enrolled in special education without appropriate documentation and initiated a discussion of possibilities for modifying enrolment procedures in such a way as to prevent abuse by special education institutions and Romani parents. In the area of health, 15 Romani health mediators based in municipal health centres began work in May 2012. An example of backsliding in the area of institutional discrimination comes in the form of ethnic profiling by Macedonian border police, resulting in a considerable increase in the frequency with which Roma with Macedonian citizenship have been prevented from leaving the country because of concerns from Western European countries about Romani migration.

While the Commission for Protection against Discrimination provides legal assistance to individual complainants and conducts independent investigations of anti-discrimination cases based on ethnicity, it does not always process complaints within the mandatory three-month limit and has not thus far played a role in screening governmental strategies, action plans, or programmes targeting Roma. Problems raised by focus group participants from Romani NGOs included the absence of Roma on the Commission and the Commission's anticipated rejection of a pending (and overdue) complaint filed in relation to an incident involving an allegedly discriminatory restriction of the freedom of movement.

Implementation of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights related to Roma in Macedonia had concluded before 2012. While the 2010 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* allows for collective complaints before Macedonian courts, among issues of non-compliance with the EU Race Directive and the Employment Equality Directive is the non-use of statistics as evidence in indirect discrimination cases. Another important shortcoming is that the *Law* does not address segregation as a special form of discrimination. The independence and impartiality of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination are questionable, given that three of the seven members are employed in state institutions.

Official efforts for the protection of Romani children as a particularly vulnerable group were confined in 2012 to the right to education. The project "Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Preschools" continued being implemented in 18 municipalities. At the level of primary education, the enrolment of non-disabled Romani children in schools and classes for children with mental disabilities received increased institutional attention as a problem, but has not yet been addressed in the form of institutional changes. Finally, at the level of secondary education a conditional cash transfer programme provides a monthly benefit to households which receive social assistance for each child enrolled in secondary education who meets attendance requirements, with Roma accounting for 10.2% of all programme beneficiaries in the 2011-2012 school year.

The absence of a clear fit between the *National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women* and the national action plans adopted in the areas of education, employment, health, and housing, combined with the lack of evidence of implementation of the former, suggests that there has been little, if any, progress toward meeting the needs of Romani women. This view is supported by the findings of the survey conducted in preparing this report: 63.7% reported a lack of action by the central government and 76.1% pointed to inaction by local government to improve the situation of Romani women.

Despite indications that Romani girls and women resident in the Čičino Selo shelter on the outskirts of Skopje may fall victim to trafficking, this issue has not received attention from the Macedonian government as a problem particularly affecting Roma. While it may be the case that Roma in Macedonia do not often fall victim to human trafficking, their overall vulnerable position points to the importance of ethnically disaggregated data in this area, which are currently lacking.



The implementation of anti-discrimination legislation in Macedonia has brought few if any benefits for the country's Romani population. As of December 2012, no court in Macedonia had issued a decision based on the *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination*. Moreover, the Commission for Protection against Discrimination's sole positive decision on a complaint filed by or on behalf of Roma came only in April 2013. Low levels of awareness about discrimination and its remedies within the population of Macedonia in general and the country's Romani population in particular are aggravated by a lack of clarity in the division of labour among institutions tasked with implementing the country's anti-discrimination law.

### Education

While available information suggests that segregated schools and classes for Roma are the exception rather than the rule, data on the share of children in segregated education are not available and there has been no visible progress in addressing this phenomenon in 2012. A complaint submitted in 2011, concerning school segregation in Bitola, had still not been processed by the Commission for Protection against Discrimination as of mid-April 2013.

Separate projects implemented in various localities in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Science to promote inclusive education were supported in 2012 by the EU Delegation, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, OSCE, Pestalozzi Children's Foundation, Roma Education Fund, UNESCO, UNICEF, and USAID. Still, 44.1% of respondents to the survey conducted for the purposes of this report were of the opinion that content on Roma in the subject matter taught in schools is sparse, with another 30.2% apparently unable to provide a response to this question.

No measures were taken over the past year to address discrimination in access to education and the discriminatory treatment of Romani pupils in school, with three apparent cases of ethnically based violence against Roma in Primary School "Strašo Pindžur" in the Skopje municipality of Gjorče Petrov not adequately investigated.

Following through on the findings of research conducted by the Office of the Ombudsman in 2010 and by non-governmental organisations in 2011 and 2012, the Ministry of Education and Science took action by registering cases of children enrolled in special education without appropriate documentation and initiating a discussion of possibilities for modifying enrolment procedures in such a way as to prevent abuse by special education institutions and Romani parents. The findings of the survey conducted for this report further point to low levels of awareness among Roma about overrepresentation in special education as a problem. This finding may in turn reflect a lack of understanding about the nature of special education.

Enrolment rates among Roma continue to lag well behind those of non-Roma, at 74% versus 90% in primary education and 27% versus 65% in secondary education. There have been no government initiatives to ensure that Romani (or other) children complete primary education and there is no official strategic document on tackling early school leaving. In (compulsory) secondary education, there is a scholarship programme for Romani students, as well as a conditional cash transfer to promote the completion of secondary education among children from families receiving social financial assistance. The Macedonian government has arranged to waive administrative fees for the certificate of immunisation necessary for enrolment in primary education, also providing free textbooks, transportation, and dormitory accommodation for Roma in secondary education.

In the 2011-2012 school year, the project "Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Pre-Schools" covered 380 children in 18 pre-school facilities in 18 municipalities. The Roma hired through the project to work in pre-school facilities have thus far been neither employed on a long-term basis nor paid consistently. Of the respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, nearly three quarters (74.3%) indicated that participation of Romani children in pre-school education had increased over the last two years, although no data on enrolment trends exist. Moreover, as is the case in primary and secondary education, Roma participate in pre-school education at a lower rate than their non-Romani neighbours.

A system of affirmative action based on ethnically defined admissions quotas in public institutions of higher education has been in place since the late 1990s. The extent to which these quotas are accessed by

Roma is unclear in the absence of monitoring, with Romani students and NGOs reporting that non-Roma frequently declare Romani ethnicity in order to gain easier admission to higher education.

### Employment

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* includes three types of subsidised employment programmes: a general programme targeting 600 unemployed persons of which up to 100 are to be selected from vulnerable groups, a programme for persons with disability, and a pilot programme for 15 unemployed persons. Whereas neither the programme for persons with disability nor the pilot programme target Roma, 31 of the 81 Romani applicants to the general subsidised employment programme were accepted.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* includes a pilot programme of local-level public work for 20 unemployed persons which targets Roma, with a public work programme for 2,000 unemployed persons and not targeting Roma introduced in mid-2012. Whereas no data are available on the number of Roma participating in the pilot programme, the larger public work programme had registered 141 Romani beneficiaries as of late October 2012.

Roma constitute a target group of the traineeship programme included in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013*. The programme does not include a quota for Roma, but targets a total of 233 registered unemployed persons below the age of 27. No data are available on the number of Roma involved in this programme.

The *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* includes three training programmes aimed at equipping unemployed persons with skills in short supply, relative to labour market demand, in order to facilitate successful (re)entry to the labour market. While none of the three programmes explicitly target Roma, 105 Roma applied for the third programme and 22 were accepted. An additional 62 Roma were trained in the framework of IPA-funded programmes in 2012. No measures were taken in 2012 to address the particular barriers to the labour market encountered by Romani women, with data collected by Local Employment Centres suggesting that Romani women's take-up of active employment measures is low.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's portfolio of active employment measures for 2012 includes a self-employment programme targeting 900 unemployed persons and a pilot programme combining training in occupations for which demand exceeds supply with additional support for self-employment for ten unemployed persons, as well as training for 2,000 unemployed persons on skills for starting and running a business. None of these programmes specifically targets Roma, with the number of Roma benefiting from them small (i.e., under 100) in 2012, as in previous years. The situation of Romani women informally employed on a long-term basis as domestic help in non-Romani households has not been the object of official attention.

Although Roma in Macedonia live concentrated in cities, they nonetheless feature as a target group of an agricultural subsidy programme. Moreover, rather than aiming at increasing participants' labour market mobility, the programme targets 100 (unemployed) recipients of social financial assistance for registration as individual farmers.

Roma have been included as an explicit target group of employment programmes administered by the national Employment Service Agency since 2009. If all employment programmes targeting Roma in 2012 had operated at their stated capacity with regard to Romani participants, the total number of Roma benefiting from these programmes would be 453. While this figure could bring a reduction of approximately 4.3% in unemployment among Roma, incomplete data make it possible to conclude only that at least 263 Roma benefited from employment programmes in 2012, with most of the persons included in this figure covered by programmes which do not target Roma explicitly. If all known Romani beneficiaries left unemployment registers as a result of their participation in the active programmes and measures, the Employment Service Agency could take credit for having reduced unemployment among Roma by a modest 2.5%.

## Health

The majority (61.6%) of respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report saw the state as improving Roma's situation in the area of health. As reported in the results of the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011, while access to medical insurance and health insurance is high among Roma, more than two thirds of Roma are not able to afford prescribed medication.

In the absence of official data, available information suggests that the advances of recent years in addressing formal barriers to access to healthcare held stable in 2012. Among respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, the largest proportion (39.6 %) was of the opinion that coverage of Roma by health insurance had not changed over the last two years. However a considerable share (31.5%) of respondents pointed to an increase in the number of Roma with health insurance, with only 5% expressing the view that the number of Roma with health insurance had decreased over the last two years.

Roma feature as an explicit target group in four official programmes of the Ministry of Health adopted in 2012, but data on the implementation of the activities foreseen for Roma under these programmes are lacking. In 2012, as in previous years, information on Roma's access to healthcare and on the overall state of health of the Romani population generally came from research undertaken by local NGOs and international organisations rather than from state institutions. In the absence of data, it is impossible to demonstrate progress.

Evidence of discriminatory treatment of Roma in healthcare institutions is considerable if anecdotal. Although the 2010 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* covers health insurance as well as health protection, as of April 2013 no court in Macedonia had issued any decision (whether related to health or not) on the basis of anti-discrimination legislation, and the Commission for Protection against Discrimination established by the *Law* had yet to take a positive decision on any of the four complaints related to discrimination of Roma in healthcare on the basis of ethnicity.

While Macedonia adopted legislation on patients' rights in 2008, including provisions for local-level monitoring, the extent to which this legislation has succeeded in bringing real accountability for violations of patients' rights is unclear, with available information suggesting that awareness of such rights is low among both patients (including but not limited to Roma) and healthcare service providers. Corruption in healthcare is a problem that is not recognised by the government.

Roma are a target group of awareness-raising activities foreseen in the Ministry of Health's *Programme for Active Health Protection of Mothers and Children* and *Programme for Physical Examinations of Pupils and Students*, but there are no data on the implementation of these activities. Beyond these two programmes, brochures in Romani on healthy lifestyle and healthcare were prepared in 2012 by the Ministry of Health in cooperation with the Institute for Public Health and distributed by Centres for Public Health in municipalities with larger concentrations of Roma.

Coordination among sectors on a systematic, integrated approach to health has been the exception rather than the rule. There is anecdotal evidence that the work of the Romani health mediators in eight municipalities throughout the country contributed to coordination between the healthcare sector and educational institutions in 2012. Still, there is no evidence of increased coordination between the healthcare sector and institutions responsible for housing, employment, or anti-discrimination, with the continuing failure of the National Coordinating Body to fulfil its role contributing to this situation.

Notwithstanding the current lack of publicly available data for the indicators by which the effectiveness of the Romani health mediators' work is to be measured, the first months of project implementation suggest that the project is an example of good practice in the making. Available information suggests that Romani health mediators are increasingly recognised as a resource by state institutions under the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Interior, and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy as well as the Ministry of Health on the one hand and by local Romani communities on the other. However, the employment status of the Romani health mediators provides them with neither insurance nor job security.

## Housing

There are no data available on the number of Roma living in segregated environments in Macedonia, and there have been no measures to promote residential desegregation. As a result, there are also no quantifiable indications as to any change in the number of Roma living in segregated environments in 2012. On the other hand, there are no contradictions between mainstream housing policies and the goal of desegregation, with the country's flagship social housing project allotting housing to Romani families in ethnically mixed apartment buildings throughout the country.

Findings from the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011 suggest that access to water, sanitation, and electricity are relatively unproblematic for the Romani population as a whole.

In much the same way that the prioritisation of larger Romani settlements for infrastructural improvements in the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* risks reinforcing existing spatial separation between Roma and non-Roma, so has funding made in 2012 (as in previous years) on the basis of agreements between municipalities and the Minister without Portfolio improved access to public utilities and social services infrastructure without addressing *de facto* residential segregation. Survey respondents reported no change in local infrastructure conditions over the last two years.

Since 2008, the "Project for Housing of Socially Vulnerable Groups F/P 1674" of the Ministry of Transport and Communications has targeted Roma explicitly while also including Roma in other (i.e., non-ethnic) categories for the allocation of government-subsidised social housing in ethnically mixed apartment buildings. Of the 220 apartments completed in 2012, 199 were allocated (in early 2013), with 33 (16.6%) allocated to Roma.

Although the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* calls for coordination in efforts to improve the housing situation of Roma with efforts in the Decade priority areas of employment and education, no steps have been taken to broaden the scope of housing interventions, urban planning, and rural development to make them parts of a comprehensive, cross-sectoral approach.

While 14 municipalities have drafted and adopted local action plans for Roma in the priority area of housing, there is no consistent relationship between the local action plans and the national action plan for housing adopted in the framework of the Decade. On the other hand, seven local infrastructure projects were funded in 2012 on the basis of a Memorandum of Cooperation between municipal authorities and the central government, as represented by the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia. A donor conference organised in April 2012 by the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia to solicit financing for a project of the Municipality of Kočani to construct collective accommodation for the relocation of 42 Romani families from abandoned army barracks was not successful.

The small proportion of applications resolved to date under the 2011 *Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures* leaves open questions about the real prospects for legalisation of illegal dwellings inhabited by Roma (and by others). Even at this point, however, it can be expected that a considerable (if unknown) number of Roma will be left effectively homeless following the rejection of their applications for legalisation and demolition of their dwellings as provided by the Law. Despite the recommendation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*, no plan exists for offering alternative accommodation to the displaced owners of demolished illegal dwellings.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations which make up this chapter are based on the analysis of policy developments related to Roma in Macedonia in Chapters I-VI of this report. For the purpose of providing clear guidelines for action to address gaps apparent from the analysis, a comprehensive list of longer-term recommendations is supplemented with two key short-term recommendations.

### Structural requirements

- *Consolidate coordination of the Strategy and Decade.* Responsibilities for coordination of activities related to implementation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the Decade of Roma Inclusion should be clarified and simplified by making a single institution responsible for coordination between the government and international institutions, among national institutions at the national level, and between national and local levels in relation to implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and the Decade. Consistent with the structure of the Decade, responsibility for all three types of coordination should be vested in the National Coordinator for the Decade, who should communicate on a regular basis with the Secretariat of the Decade of Roma Inclusion as the institution responsible for international policy coordination in relation to Roma. The National Coordinator should have a status equivalent to minister or deputy minister, as well as a budget set at a level sufficient to fund the measures foreseen at minimum in the national action plans, with all major budgetary sources for measures foreseen in the national action plans concentrated in this institution.
- *Revive and restructure the National Coordinating Body.* The sustained involvement of Romani NGOs in coordinating and overseeing implementation of the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion should be secured by putting the National Coordinating Body back into operation. To this end, the National Coordinating Body should be redefined as a structure managed by the institution responsible for overall coordination of the 2004 *Strategy* and Decade to perform the following functions:
  - Providing a regular forum for the exchange of information and coordination on implementation of activities in the framework of the Decade and the 2004 *Strategy*, both among government institutions, and between government institutions and NGOs;
  - Providing advice on the additional measures needed to secure implementation of the national action plans;
  - Drafting resolutions on issues of interest to the Romani population for the attention of the government and the general public; and
  - Informing the general public, on at least an annual basis, of action taken at central and local levels towards the implementation of the 2004 *Strategy*, and the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion.

The membership of the National Coordinating Body should also be redefined to consist of heads of sector from the following ministries: Culture; Economy; Education and Science; Finance; Foreign Affairs; Health; Interior; Justice; Labour and Social Policy; Local Self-Government; Transport and Communications. The Agency for Realization of the Rights of the Communities, the National Employment Agency, the Office of the



Ombudsman, the Secretariat for Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, and the State Statistical Office should also be represented in the National Coordinating Body. Additionally, the National Coordinating Body should include a representative of the Association of the Units of Local Self-Government, as well as three representatives of Romani NGOs: one each from Central, Eastern and Western Macedonia.

- *Build monitoring and evaluation into the policy process.* Future policy toward Roma at both central and local levels should be based on quantitative and qualitative needs assessment, which should secure the input of Romani women to the same degree as that of Romani men. As an integral part of this assessment, an overview of all completed and ongoing projects (whether implemented by official institutions or by NGOs) should be compiled for each Decade priority area with a view to promoting a clear and efficient division of labour. The design of measures should include clear provisions for reporting, with standard templates developed to facilitate gathering of quantitative data on budget expenditures, and the number of beneficiaries, as well as qualitative assessment of implementation with suggestions for additional measures which may prove necessary. Ethnically disaggregated data relevant for monitoring implementation of all measures contained in all Decade Action Plans should be collected and maintained in conformity with EU standards on data protection. The role of the State Statistical Office in relation to monitoring implementation of the Decade Action Plans should be defined clearly and funded accordingly. Ongoing monitoring of implementation by relevant authorities should be supplemented by periodic external evaluations, with revisions of existing measures and/or the design of new measures taking into account the findings of both types of activities and including indicators to allow measurement not only of whether services were delivered, but also of the quality of the delivered services. The information gathered through monitoring and evaluation activities should be made easily accessible to the general public.
- *Secure adequate funding for relevant governmental and non-governmental initiatives.* Government dependence on NGOs as a source of funding should be eliminated through the establishment of a uniform budgeting process for funding all measures adopted in connection with the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the Decade of Roma Inclusion, at both central and local levels. Funding levels need not necessarily be similar across all areas, but should be set according to the real needs associated with implementation of the adopted measures, which can be expected to differ depending on the measures themselves. Additionally, training on applying for IPA funding should be provided for Romani NGOs.
- *Update the Decade Action Plans.* Taking into account that the national action plans in the four priority areas of the Decade expired at the end of 2011, revised action plans should be drafted to organise and focus efforts aimed at improving the educational, employment, health, and housing situations of the Romani population. The situation of Romani women should be given the same level of priority as the four Decade priority areas by undertaking the revision of the national action plan for Romani women together with revision of the national action plans for education, employment, health, and housing. A single institution should be designated responsible for overseeing implementation of the national action plan for Romani women, with funding allocated accordingly from the state budget.
  - Consistent with the previous recommendation, the revised national action plans should take into account IPA funding priorities for the period covered. Insofar as two previous rounds of implementation of Decade Action Plans arguably mean that the institutions tasked with implementation are best positioned to assess their own capacity to implement measures proposed for inclusion in the revised action plans, consultation with actors outside these institutions should be undertaken only on the basis of advanced drafts of the respective action plans. The input received at this stage should be used in finalising the action plans.
- *Establish routine coordination within key institutions.* Following the example of the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, internal working groups for implementation of the respective Decade Action Plans should be formed within the Ministries of Education and Science, Health, and Transport and Communications, as well as within the Employment Service Agency and the State Statistical Office. Implementation of a national action plan should not be the sole responsibility of a single individual in any institution.
- *Employ key staff on a long-term basis.* In order to secure consistent realisation of key state-financed initiatives for the integration of Roma, the staff of Romani Information Centres, the Roma engaged

- to create a more Romani-friendly environment in pre-school facilities in the framework of the project "Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Pre-Schools," and Romani health mediators should be provided with contracts of indefinite duration.
- *Ensure calibration between mainstream and targeted policies.* Exceptions to the observed tendency for targeting by ethnicity to complement mainstream policies in Macedonia should be addressed as a matter of priority for their potential to affect negatively the relatively good relations between Roma and non-Roma in the country. Awareness of *de facto* segregation as a negative phenomenon for both Roma and non-Roma should be raised among authorities at both central and local levels and related explicitly to construction projects undertaken to date which effectively preserve or promote physical separation between Roma and non-Roma, with the "Project for Housing of Socially Vulnerable Groups F/P 1674" presented as an alternative model for replication.
  - *Improve coordination among local-level mechanisms for implementation of the 2004 Strategy and the national action plans.* As discussed in Chapter I.3, unclear divisions of responsibilities at the central level have resulted in parallel facilities at the municipal level, in the form of Memoranda of Cooperation between municipalities and the central government on the one hand, and local action plans on the other. Not only has this situation sometimes fostered confusion within a given municipality, but it also complicates coordination and learning across municipalities by creating incentives for different municipalities to address similar needs of local Roma with incommensurable measures coordinated at a central level by institutions whose formal relations remain unclear more than four years after their creation.
  - *Clarify relations between central and local initiatives.* Policy set at the municipal level should clearly reflect national priorities. Designed on the basis of an assessment of local needs, municipal-level policy should explicitly relate the assessed needs to national as well as local measures, with any differences between national and municipal priorities reflecting the specific needs of local Roma.
  - *Access available funding for Roma.* In the interest of securing financial support for the implementation of local-level measures aimed at the integration of Roma, municipalities should allot quantitatively and qualitatively sufficient human resources to prepare projects and participate in tenders organised under IPA, including but not limited to, calls for proposals for cross-border cooperation.
  - *Scale up mediation.* Taking into account the outstanding need of many Roma for support in interactions with official institutions, the project for Romani health mediators should be consolidated and reinforced financially and institutionally as well as expanded geographically on the basis of its successes to date in raising awareness not only about health, but also about legal rights and obligations; providing protection against discrimination; and promoting coordination among sectors. At the same time, in order to avoid a loss of focus among Romani health mediators while contributing to improving working relations between Romani communities and official institutions, an integrated approach should be adopted in which multiple mediators trained in education, health, and/or practical law can work together in multidisciplinary teams alongside representatives of relevant institutions.

## Anti-discrimination

- *Promote public awareness of (anti-)discrimination.* Macedonian authorities should develop and implement an information campaign aimed at the entire population focused on the *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination*, the Commission for Protection against Discrimination, the Office of the Ombudsman, and the relations among them. This should aim to increase recognition among both Roma and non-Roma of discrimination as a problem as well as to disseminate practical knowledge about mechanisms for remedying discrimination.
- *Improve access to protection against discrimination.* The capacity of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination should be reinforced in order to enable it to process complaints in a timely fashion and to serve as a resource for screening governmental policies targeting Roma. Particularly important for realisation of the latter objective, as well as for the accessibility to Roma of the country's main anti-discrimination body is the appointment of a qualified Romani individual as a full member of the Commission.
- *Maintain official attention on personal documentation.* Drawing on the momentum gained with adoption of the *Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection*

in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014, completion of the situation analysis foreseen in that Strategy and the initial resolution of 7% of identified cases of Roma without complete personal documentation, the Macedonian government should accelerate the implementation of relevant measures contained in this Strategy with the goal of reducing to zero the number of Roma without complete personal documentation in the next few years.

## Education

- *Address the overrepresentation of Roma in special education.* The useful preliminary research undertaken to date by the Office of the Ombudsman and the Ministry of Education and Science should be followed up with an exhaustive quantitative assessment of the enrolment of non-disabled Romani (and other) children in schools and classes for children with mental disability. The findings of this assessment should in turn serve as a basis for measures to prevent such inappropriate enrolment in future, as well as for measures to enable the (re-)integration in schools and classes with a standard curriculum of children so categorised. New placements in special education should be frozen, pending the introduction of measures to prevent inappropriate enrolment.
- *Promote educational integration.* Segregated schools and classes should be abolished and the creation of new ones prevented. With due regard for the unique situation of Šuto Orizari as a Romani-majority municipality, local authorities there should initiate efforts to promote ethnic mixing in educational facilities. At the level of pre-school education, the municipality should improve conditions in the local kindergarten and encourage non-Romani as well as Romani parents from Šuto Orizari to enrol their children there. Local authorities should also initiate a process of reconciliation between Roma and Albanians in Primary School "26-ti Juli" with a view to promoting a more even distribution of Romani and Albanian pupils in the municipality's two primary schools. Perhaps most pressing, however, is the secondary school under construction, where local authorities have both an opportunity and a responsibility to ensure that the facility is completed, equipped, and staffed in such a way as to provide quality education for inhabitants of the municipality, while at the same time promoting integration by attracting members of other ethnic communities.
- *Make pre-school education accessible.* In all localities inhabited by disadvantaged, Romani-speaking Roma, free-of-charge pre-school education should be provided for a minimum of two years in ethnically mixed public pre-school facilities. Expanding access in this way requires in turn that both the quantity and the quality of such facilities be increased.
- *Prevent dropout in primary education.* The current gap in educational support for Roma between pre-school and secondary school should be filled by providing disadvantaged Romani families with assistance in supporting children's education through measures potentially including but not necessarily limited to the provision of clothing, food, and/or school supplies; after-school instruction; and in-home advisory services.
- *Promote intercultural education.* Integration between Romani and non-Romani children should be encouraged in general education and teacher training curricula. Attention to Roma as an integral part of the history of culture of Macedonia should be increased, with teaching modules on Romani language and culture further developed for delivery to non-Romani as well as Romani pupils.
- *Create a cadre of qualified Romani teachers.* Incentives should be introduced to increase the number of Roma enrolling in and completing teacher preparation programmes. Types of incentives for this purpose might include scholarships and/or guaranteed employment upon successful completion of studies.

## Employment

- *Map the employment situation of the Romani population.* As a basis for the design of appropriately targeted programmes to reduce the level of unemployment among Roma, as well as for the dissemination of accessible information about such programmes, research should be conducted throughout the country with coordination at central level to ascertain the needs of potential Romani beneficiaries of employment programmes. As part of this research, analysis should be undertaken to identify the key barriers faced by Roma in the priority area of employment.



- *Individualise employment support.* Measures targeting unemployed Roma should take into account not only the general employment needs of the Romani population as a whole (to be ascertained through the mapping described in the short-term recommendations above), but also the experiences, needs, and skills of the individual. Relevant experience from other countries participating in the Decade of Roma Inclusion (e.g., Bulgaria, Spain) should be taken into account.
- *Support formalisation of informal employment.* Legitimate income-generating activities, which are currently part of the 'grey' economy, should be brought into the formal sector in such a way as to secure rights and benefits for labourers as well as tax revenues for the state. In particular need of attention is the situation of Romani women informally employed on a long-term basis as domestic help, with the business association offering a potentially viable means of formalisation.

## Health

- *Map the health situation of the Romani population.* Insofar as data on the health situation of the Romani population are indispensable for the design of appropriate measures to improve health among Roma, centrally coordinated research should be conducted throughout the country in order to ascertain the needs of potential Romani beneficiaries of health programmes. Such research should pay particular attention to barriers faced by Roma in accessing healthcare, as well as to relevant social determinants of health that may contribute to the inequalities faced by Roma. With their experience in local Romani communities, Romani health mediators can serve as an important resource in this endeavour.
- *Improve realisation of patients' rights.* Implementation of the Law on Protection of Patients' Rights should be promoted by providing healthcare workers with training on patients' rights and communication with patients from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds, by providing patients (including but not limited to Roma) with easily digestible, practical information on their rights, and by establishing municipal Commissions for Promoting Patients' Rights. Once established, these Commissions should also be supported in performing their monitoring role with a view to ensuring that Roma have access to rights enforcements mechanisms on an equal footing with non-Roma.

## Housing

- *Prevent illegal dwellings from resulting in homelessness.* Persons whose application for legalisation of their dwelling is rejected under the Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures should be offered alternative accommodation to offset the demolition of illegal structures.
- *Link housing to employment.* Integrating social housing programmes targeting Roma with programmes addressing the needs of Roma in the area of employment not only increases the likelihood that beneficiaries will pay their rent, but also contributes significantly to the maintenance of a physical environment conducive to education and health in both the short and long term.
- *Increase attention to the trafficking of Roma.* In order to ground future policy or to justify the lack of such policy, Macedonian authorities should undertake an analysis of human trafficking which explicitly looks at the degree to which Roma in general, and Romani adolescent girls in particular, are involved as victims. To the extent that the analysis reveals that Roma are overrepresented among victims of human trafficking, such overrepresentation should be addressed as an integral part of broader measures designed to address human trafficking in general.
- *Promote residential integration.* Consistent with the good practice of the "Project for Housing of Socially Vulnerable Groups F/P 1674" in relation to the allocation of social housing to Romani families in ethnically mixed apartment buildings, any relocation of the inhabitants of illegal and/or unsafe Romani settlements should distribute the households displaced from such settlements among multiple, ethnically mixed locations on the territory of the locality where the settlements were located.

## Key recommendations for immediate action

### *Short-term recommendation to the EU*

*Increase attention to the situation of Roma in the accession countries.* The two previous rounds of accession to the EU demonstrate both the potential for the accession process to prompt the governments of candidate states to improve the situation of Roma and the inadequacy of the measures taken to bring about and sustain the integration of Roma during and after the conclusion of the accession process. With this in mind, the EU should make the treatment of Roma a genuine litmus test of readiness for accession, devoting a separate, detailed section of annual progress reports to developments in the situation of Roma.

### *Short-term recommendation to the EU and national authorities*

*Avoid criminalisation of Roma.* The right to freedom of movement should be respected for Roma as for all other citizens of the Republic of Macedonia, with ethnic profiling by Macedonian border police discontinued immediately. At the same time, the member states of the EU must ensure that data on migrants are collected, administered, and shared responsibly, avoiding presentation of Roma as the largest group of migrants.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>CCT</b>	Conditional cash transfer
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>EIDHR</b>	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
<b>ERRC</b>	European Roma Rights Centre
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>IPA</b>	Instrument for Pre-Accession
<b>LAP</b>	Local action plan
<b>MHC</b>	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia
<b>MtM</b>	Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental organisation
<b>NRC</b>	National Roma Centrum
<b>NRIS</b>	National Roma Integration Strategies
<b>OSCE</b>	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
<b>OSCE HCNM</b>	OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities
<b>REF</b>	Roma Education Fund
<b>RIC</b>	Romani Information Centre
<b>RIO</b>	Roma Initiatives Programme
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development

# INTRODUCTION

## Purpose and structure of the report

The civil society coalition from the Republic of Macedonia views the current project as continuing and extending the monitoring and advocacy efforts of the Decade Watch team in the country. In its work on Decade Watch over the several years preceding the current civil society monitoring, with the support of the Open Society Institute and the World Bank, the team introduced a number of innovative approaches, including perhaps most notably monitoring from the perspective of the Romani population. The Decade Watch process in Macedonia accordingly produced quality monitoring and advocacy efforts with relatively good results. The quality of the Decade Watch's products in Macedonia notwithstanding, even in the eighth year of implementing the *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, the Macedonian government has not made good on many of its concrete commitments toward overcoming the existing gap between Romani and non-Romani populations.

Following a description of the methodology used in collecting information for use in the report, the document treats the areas of education, employment, healthcare, housing, anti-discrimination and structural requirements in turn. For each area, the report offers an assessment of the implementation of existing policies and the development of new policies in 2012, placing observations for this short period into the broader context of the approximately eight years elapsed since the adoption of the *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*. The report also looks at the relevant activities implemented at the local level and attempts to provide a brief assessment of their impact. Following the thematic chapters, the report offers a case study in each area except structural requirements, with the case study on education focusing on enrolment procedures for schools for children with mental disabilities, the case study on employment examining active programmes and measures for employment, the case study on healthcare offering a preliminary look at the project for Romani health mediators, the case study on housing attending to the legalisation of illegal dwellings, and the case study on anti-discrimination assessing the effects on Roma of the 2010 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination*.

## Methodology

The methods of data collection used in preparing this report included desk research, interviews, focus groups, and a survey.<sup>1</sup> As a first step in the research process, official documents and recent research relating directly to the four priority areas of the Decade, anti-discrimination, and structural requirements for coordinating implementation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the five national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade (i.e., education, employment, health, housing, and the status of the Romani woman) were examined. In addition to providing the basis for an overview of relevant policies and a preliminary inventory of available data on implementation, this examination was used to frame the interviews, focus group, and survey undertaken in preparing the report.

1 Additionally, feedback was gathered on the findings and recommendations of a draft of this report through consultative meetings organised in local Romani communities.

Whereas the bulk of the desk research undertaken in preparing this report preceded the interviews, focus groups, and survey, these three forms of field research were carried out in parallel. A total of ten semi-structured interviews were conducted. With the exception of one interview held with an expert undertaking research in the framework of the EU-funded project of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights “Best Practices for Roma Integration”<sup>2</sup> on implementation of the 2011 *Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures* for Chapter VI of this report, the aim of the interviews was to gather detailed information from persons with experience in generating and/or implementing the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade. Most of the persons targeted for participation in interviews were accordingly either representatives of official institutions responsible for implementation and/or monitoring implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and action plans, or representatives of Romani political parties. While the names and affiliations of interviewed persons are given in Annex 2, thanks for data provided in written form are due here to Lenče Bajkova of the Ministry of Transport and Communications and to Jaše Sefer of the Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia, Neždet Mustafa. At the same time, it is important to record the refusal of requests for interviews with the Office of the Ombudsman and the State Statistical Office; whereas the former directed the attention of the relevant members of the civil society coalition to existing published materials, the latter responded to the request for an interview with a general explanation of its role which may be indicative of a low level of participation in activities related to the 2004 *Strategy* and the Decade Action Plans.

In order to gather qualitative information from stakeholders involved in and/or affected by local-level implementation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade, the civil society coalition organised and held three focus groups. Whereas the first of these brought together seven representatives of Romani non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to discuss a broad range of issues related to the implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and national action plans, the second and third focus groups concentrated on various aspects of the situation of Roma in the area of education, with six Romani parents comprising the second focus group and eight representatives of relevant service providers forming the third. The names of the focus group participants are given, along with other basic information about the individuals in Annex 2.

With a view to supplementing the overall emphasis of official institutions on total inputs and numbers of beneficiaries, a national survey was undertaken to gather information on developments in the daily life of members of local Romani communities throughout the country that may be related to the implementation (or non-implementation) of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. For this purpose, the civil society coalition drew on the design of the surveys undertaken in the framework of Decade Watch, with adjustments to the design of that survey reflecting both the experiences of members of the coalition in carrying out the Decade Watch surveys, and the requirements outlined in the template for the civil society monitoring reports.

In contrast to the official approach, which focuses primarily on quantitative monitoring of official institutions and the Romani population from the perspective of those institutions, the approach developed by and for Romani civil society for Decade Watch emphasises a qualitative assessment of official institutions, the Romani population, and the general public *from the perspective of the Romani population*. In practical terms, this means asking Roma about their views on the appropriateness and effectiveness of specific measures which target them, as well as on what the 2004 *Strategy* and Decade as a whole could and should do for them.

The survey questions were formulated in such a way as to attempt to exhaust the possible responses to a given question while still leaving space as appropriate for alternative responses. Where possible, questions about attitudes and behaviours were structured in such a way as allow scaling (e.g., in the form of statements to which survey participants are asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement).

2 OSCE/ODIHR, *Best Practices for Roma Integration*, see <http://www.bpri-odihr.org/home.html>.

The selection of individual survey participants in each municipality was conducted by entering each second dwelling in a targeted settlement and identifying the adult household member with the most recent birthday among all present household members. This was done with a view to ensuring that the results of the survey are representative from the standpoint of age, employment status, gender, and level of education. Finally, the fact that the survey includes many of the same questions used in the Decade Watch surveys in a similar design offers possibilities for comparisons over time.

The size of the survey sample was derived from the most recent available (2002) census data, according to which the 53 879 Roma in Macedonia account for 2.66% of the country's total population. In the capital Skopje, where nearly half the country's Romani population is concentrated, the survey was conducted in the four municipalities in which the number of Roma is largest: Čair, Gazi Baba, Gjorče Petrov, and Šuto Orizari. Also included were the eight municipalities outside Skopje in which Roma number more than 1 500 persons: Bitola, Gostivar, Kičevo, Kočani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Štip, and Tetovo. Finally, the survey covered five municipalities where Roma's numbers are small relative to the Romani population of the country as a whole but the proportion of Roma within the local population is greater than the proportion of Roma within the country as a whole: Berovo, Debar, Delčevo, Pehčevo, and Vinica.

As shown in the table below, the total sample size is 540, representing 1% of the total number of Roma in the country. With the exception of the municipalities of Berovo, Delčevo, and Pehčevo, the number of responses gathered in each municipality amounts to between 1 and 1.3% of the local Romani population.

Table 1. Survey sample

Territorial unit	POPULATION SIZE		PROPORTION OF ROMA		SAMPLE	
	Total	Roma	Out of the total population of unit	Out of the total Romani population of Macedonia	Number of responses	Out of the Romani population of unit
<b>Republic of Macedonia</b>	2,022,547	53,879	2.66%	100.00%	540	1.00%
<b>Skopje</b>	506,926	23,475	4.63%	43.57%	229	0.98%
<b>Šuto Orizari</b>	22,017	13,342	60.60%	24.76%	152	1.14%
Čair	64,773	3,083	4.76%	5.72%	36	1.17%
Gazi Baba	72,617	2,082	2.87%	3.86%	26	1.25%
Gjorče Petrov	41,634	1,249	3.00%	2.32%	15	1.20%
<b>Prilep</b>	76,768	4,433	5.77%	8.23%	51	1.15%
<b>Kumanovo</b>	105,484	4,256	4.03%	7.90%	51	1.20%
<b>Bitola</b>	95,385	2,613	2.74%	4.85%	31	1.19%
<b>Tetovo</b>	86,580	2,357	2.72%	4.37%	28	1.19%
<b>Gostivar</b>	81,042	2,237	2.76%	4.15%	27	1.21%
<b>Štip</b>	47,796	2,195	4.59%	4.07%	25	1.14%
<b>Kočani</b>	38,092	1,951	5.12%	3.62%	23	1.18%
<b>Kičevo</b>	30,138	1,630	5.41%	3.03%	20	1.23%
<b>Vinica</b>	19,938	1,230	6.17%	2.28%	15	1.22%
<b>Debar</b>	19,542	1,080	5.53%	2.00%	13	1.20%
<b>Delčevo</b>	17,505	651	3.72%	1.21%	15	2.30%
<b>Berovo</b>	13,941	459	3.29%	0.85%	9	1.96%
<b>Pehčevo</b>	5,517	390	7.07%	0.72%	3	0.77%

Source: State Statistical Office, Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of Macedonia 2011 (Skopje: State Statistical Office, 2011)



# 1. STRUCTURAL REQUIREMENTS

## 1.1 Institutional arrangements for coordination

Since 2008, responsibility for coordinating work at the central level on the inclusion of Roma has been split between two institutions, the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, and the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia.

Created in 2008 and operating in late 2012 with a staff of two (both qualified Roma hired through an open competition)<sup>3</sup> within the Sector for Coordination and Technical Assistance of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (which is headed by a third Romani individual), the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion has the following responsibilities:

- Informing government and the general public about activities undertaken by the ministries for implementation of the national action plans;
- Overseeing and informing the government about implementation of the 2004 Strategy and the Decade at local level;
- Meetings and continual cooperation with Romani NGOs in addressing problems encountered in implementing the 2004 Strategy and the Decade;
- Coordinating and providing information on the work of the Romani Information Centres (discussed below, in Chapter I.2);
- Collecting data for the preparation of a database containing information important for the 2004 Strategy and the Decade;
- Planning, monitoring, and evaluating all events related to the 2004 Strategy and the Decade;
- Preparing informational documents and analyses on activities for the implementation of the 2004 Strategy and the Decade, as well as preparing projects for attracting foreign donations; and
- Cooperation with and administrative and technical support to the National Coordinating Body (discussed below, in Chapter I.2) and its members.<sup>4</sup>

Whereas responsibility for coordination of activities related to implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and the Decade had resided within the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy since the beginning of the Decade in 2005, the appointment of a Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia as a result of an agreement between the head of a Romani political party and the ethnic Macedonian political party which led the electoral that won the parliamentary

3 The staff of the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion received focused training in 2011 and 2012 through the IPA-funded project "Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy." The Unit shares office space in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy with the staff of the project "Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Preschools." These staff members, one Romani person and one non-Romani person, are employed on a temporary basis.

4 Vlada na Republika Makedonija, *Zapisek od Osumnaesettata sednica na Vladata na Republika Makedonija, održana na 7.10.2008 godina* [Transcript of the Eighteenth Session of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia, Held on 7.10.2008] (Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija, 2008), point 28; Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od "Dekadata za vključivanje na Romite 2005-2015" i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011* [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009), p.18; Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Pravilnik za vnatrešna organizacija na Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika* [Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2010), Article 12.

elections of 2008 amounted to the creation of an entirely new government institution. With a five-member Cabinet consisting of Roma with various levels of qualification hired through an open competition,<sup>5</sup> the Minister without Portfolio – himself Roma – is tasked with:

- Receiving reports every four months from the Unit on the level of implementation of all government projects in the framework of the Decade and the 2004 *Strategy*;
- Being informed and consulted by line ministries and municipal authorities on planned and ongoing programmes and activities related to the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade and the 2004 *Strategy*;
- Regularly informing media about progress in relation to the Decade and the 2004 *Strategy*;
- Informing the government every four months on activities undertaken under the preceding points; and, since 2011, with
- Receiving quarterly reports from line ministries on implementation of the Decade and the 2004 *Strategy*.<sup>6</sup>

Notwithstanding a degree of confusion resulting from the division of responsibilities for coordinating work at the central level on Roma inclusion between two institutions, responsibility for day-to-day coordination has remained with the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy even after the creation of the position of the Minister without Portfolio. An important reason for this is financial: whereas the Unit is funded from the budget of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy as well as from the donor-funded projects which it implements (including but not limited to projects funded by the EU), the Minister without Portfolio lacks a budget of its own, to date leveraging only funding from the Ministry of Transport and Communications for infrastructural projects in and around Romani settlements.<sup>7</sup> Interviewed stakeholders not affiliated with either of these institutions most frequently assessed coordination between the Unit and the Minister without Portfolio, as well as coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and other relevant organs, as poor. Assessments of the work of the Unit in coordinating among line ministries were more positive, with the head of the Sector for Coordination and Technical Assistance of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy enjoying a reputation as a competent professional among her non-Romani colleagues, as well as among Roma.

## 1.2 Involvement of local authorities and civil society

Although the 2004 draft *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* was initially criticised for not involving Roma in the drafting process, consultation on the draft resulted in the incorporation of input from Romani activists in the version adopted by parliament. The original and revised national action plans in the areas of education, employment, health, and housing were drafted in a participatory process led by international organisations, and including civil society in general and Romani NGOs in particular, while the original and revised national action plans for the cross-cutting Decade theme of gender equality among Roma were produced on the initiative of Romani actors in civil society. Local authorities were not involved in any of these drafting processes, but some municipalities have adopted local action plans as local-level adaptations of the action plans adopted at the central level (dealt with below, in Chapter 1.3).

- 
- 5 Like the staff of the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion, members of the Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio received focused training in 2011 and 2012 through the IPA-funded project “Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy.”
- 6 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od “Dekadata za vklučuvanje na Romite 2005-2015” i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011* [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009), p.17; Vlada na Republika Makedonija, *Izvadok od Nacrt-zapisnokot od Dveste i četvrtata sednica na Vladata na Republika Makedonija, održana na 12.01.2011 godina* [Excerpt from the Draft Transcript of the Two Hundred Fourth Session of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia, Held on 12.01.2011] (Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija, 2011), point 108.
- 7 See Government of the Republic of Macedonia, *Information on the Conclusion of Memorandum for Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia Represented by the Minister without Portfolio Nezdet Mustafa, the National Coordinator of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and the Roma Strategy in Republic of Macedonia and the Municipalities* (Skopje: Government of the Republic of Macedonia, 2009).



Local authorities have been involved in implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and the national action plans through the elaboration of local action plans, the signing of Memoranda of Cooperation with the central government, and the provision of space for Romani Information Centres. Of the 17 municipalities that have adopted local action plans since 2005, ten revised or drafted for the first time local action plans between late 2011 and mid 2012 in the framework of the IPA-funded project “Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy.”<sup>8</sup> An additional 19 municipalities have signed a Memorandum with the central government, as represented by the Minister without Portfolio, for the co-funding of projects “relating to the Decade and the Strategy.”<sup>9</sup> Romani Information Centres, with a mission of contributing to the implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and the Decade by linking local and national levels have been established in ten municipalities through an initiative of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (which provides funding for the Centres’ operations), in cooperation with local authorities and local Romani NGOs.<sup>10</sup> However there has been a lack of clarity in relation to criteria for selection of the Centres’ staff and the staff’s concrete responsibilities, as well as about the Centres’ mandate more broadly. Also problematic for the operation of the Centres has been the employment of responsible staff on a temporary basis through private employment agencies.

Civil society involvement in implementing the 2004 *Strategy* and the national action plans has been both more extensive and more consistent than that of local authorities. In addition to taking an active role in the processes of drafting local action plans and in the operation of Romani Information Centres, Romani NGOs have been tasked with the implementation of many of the measures foreseen in the national action plans, and have participated accordingly. While cooperation between NGOs and authorities is generally to be welcomed, the extent to which the implementation of government priorities has relied on the NGO sector, combined with the reduced availability of funding for NGO activities from sources other than the state brings with it the risk that advocacy as well as service NGOs lose their independence, while freeing the state of obligations to its citizens.<sup>11</sup>

Representatives of Romani NGOs have also participated in the National Coordinating Body since its establishment at the beginning of the Decade, with the chief roles of this institution to ensure effective coordination between governmental and non-governmental actors and to oversee implementation of the national action plans.<sup>12</sup> It should be noted, however, that the National Coordinating Body has been largely inactive since 2008, with the stakeholders interviewed in preparing this report generally of the opinion that the Body has not been effective. In similar fashion, the tasks assigned to Romani Information Centres include monitoring local-level implementation of the 2004 *Strategy*, but there is no evidence that they have performed this role.

### 1.3 Coordination between central and local levels

The 2004 Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia notes that “the success of the Strategy is primarily conditioned by its practical realisation at a local level.”<sup>13</sup> However, despite the existence of initiatives (dis-

8 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, LAP Revision/Development Process Finalized, Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy no. 5: 2, available at [http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik\\_eng.pdf](http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik_eng.pdf).

9 Government of the Republic of Macedonia, Information on the Conclusion of Memorandum for Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia Represented by the Minister without Portfolio Nezdet Mustafa, the National Coordinator of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and the Roma Strategy in Republic of Macedonia and the Municipalities (Skopje: Government of the Republic of Macedonia, 2009).

10 See Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, Programa za работа i akcionen plan na Romските informativni centri – RIC za periodot 2010-2012 godina [Work Programme and Action Plan of the Roma Information Centres – RIC for the Period 2010-2012] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009).

11 For a detailed discussion of this risk based on recent survey data, see Angéla Kóczé, Civil Society, Civil Involvement and Social Inclusion of the Roma (Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme, 2012), p. 40.

12 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od “Dekadata za vklučuvanje na Romite 2005-2015” i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011 [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009).

13 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.4.

cussed above, in Chapter I.2) designed to promote coordination among the different layers of governance involved in the implementation of the 2004 Strategy and the national action plans, evidence of successful coordination is sparse. In the case of local action plans, the lack of a unified approach to their development and the absence of references in these documents to specific provisions of the corresponding national action plans suggest that coordination has been limited to agreement on common objectives. Similarly, while the text of the Memorandum of Cooperation between municipalities and the central government contains references to both 2004 the Strategy and the Decade, the absence of formal criteria for evaluating project proposals submitted by municipalities for funding on the basis of such a Memorandum of Cooperation means the projects supported through this facility can provide at most indirect evidence of coordination between central and local levels in implementing the 2004 *Strategy* and the national action plans. Moreover, the lack of coordination between these two mechanisms is problematic also from the standpoint of coordination between the central and local levels. Finally, the objectives of Romani Information Centres include the establishment of structures for cooperation with municipal institutions for issues related to the 2004 *Strategy* and the Decade,<sup>14</sup> but implementation of this objective has been extremely limited. There have also been reports of the misuse of Romani Information Centres for political purposes.

## 1.4 Discrepancies between mainstream and targeted policies

Targeted policies for Roma are relatively new in Macedonia, beginning with the drafting and adoption of the *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* in 2004 in preparation for the Decade of Roma Inclusion. Prior to the adoption of the 2004 *Strategy*, Roma had on the one hand been recognised as a minority with legitimate claims to preservation of its identity, while on the other hand Roma's needs as a population disadvantaged relative to the general population were largely neglected. While the 2004 *Strategy* is explicit in targeting Roma, however, it does so in a non-exclusive way, recommending "that all measures and policies undertaken at a local level for the Roma, when there are also other groups of population in the same or similar situation, are applied also to these categories of population."<sup>15</sup>

Overall, the introduction of targeting by ethnicity has served to complement mainstream policies, with targeting bringing increased attention to the particularly disadvantaged situation of the Romani population. A positive example in this regard is the "Project for Housing of Socially Vulnerable Groups F/P 1674" of the Ministry of Transport and Communications, which defines Roma as one of the groups eligible to receive subsidised apartments in ethnically mixed buildings. Similarly, a programme of the national Employment Service Agency entitled "Active Measures for Employment" includes Roma as an explicit (but not the sole) target group.<sup>16</sup> A third positive example of targeting complementing mainstreaming is "Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Pre-Schools," a project led by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy which explicitly aims at creating mixed pre-school groups, in which Roma and non-Roma learn together in the presence of Romani and non-Romani staff.

If the introduction of targeting of Roma in Macedonia has generally complemented mainstreaming, some targeted policies have also produced discrepancies with mainstreaming. To date, the largest number of targeted policies in this category has been supported as projects financed on the basis of a Memorandum of Cooperation between a municipality and the central government for the purpose of improving infrastructure in *de facto* segregated Romani settlements. Attention to the ongoing construction of a secondary school in Šuto Orizari is also needed to ensure that the facility is completed, equipped, and staffed in such a way as to provide quality education for inhabitants of the municipality while at the same time promoting integration by attracting members of other ethnic communities.

14 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, Proekt: Romski informativni centri [Project: Romani Information Centres] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2008).

15 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.4.

16 See Agencija za vrabotuvanje na Republika Makedonija, "Aktivni merki [Active Measures]," available online at <http://www.zvrm.gov.mk/?ItemID=9ED2C0A22A9107498F0DCADF2A19D3B>.

## 1.5 Monitoring and evaluation

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* places considerable emphasis on monitoring and evaluation, providing mid- and long-term indicators for assessing progress toward specific priorities.<sup>17</sup> Consistent with this emphasis, the document containing the revised national action plans for education, employment, health, and housing assigns responsibility for monitoring implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and national action plans to the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion, also tasking the Unit with establishing and maintaining a database on issues related to the Romani population.<sup>18</sup> However it is not elaborated how the Unit should approach its tasks related to monitoring and evaluation.

In practice, despite the inclusion of concrete indicators for most measures of all five national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade, monitoring and evaluation are generally absent; while the Unit collects data on the activities of line ministries towards the implementation of the 2004 *Strategy* and the national plans, there is no unified database containing information important for adapting and revising strategies as necessary. Moreover, the reports submitted by line ministries on the implementation of the national action plans do not refer to specific measures within those plans. To date, the most comprehensive review of policy implementation in relation to Roma in Macedonia has been a two-day workshop organised in the framework of the IPA-funded project “Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy.” In the absence of robust mechanisms for assessing policy implementation, however, the review drew on available data from various sources and was impeded by the absence of any ethnically disaggregated data directly related to measures foreseen in the national action plan for health. Finally, the findings of the review have not been applied, as the Decade Action Plans for education, employment, health, and housing expired at the end of 2011 and have not been replaced or updated.

## 1.6 Budgeting to date

It is perhaps neither surprising nor unacceptable that the 2004 *Strategy* for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia does not contain a detailed financial construction, but instead makes note of the need for financing beyond that available from the state budget. On the other hand, the absence of a uniform budgeting process for funding the measures contained in the national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion has been a barrier to implementation. Budgetary allocations at the central level have been largely *ad hoc*, with last-minute budget proposals submitted by line ministries often reduced radically and without explanation by the Ministry of Finance. Funding for implementation of local action plans has also been problematic, in large part because incomplete fiscal decentralisation has often resulted in municipalities waiting for funds from line ministries.

Planning the allocation of funds for the inclusion of Roma in the 2014-2020 period has been left to the relevant line ministries. As a result, allocations have been largely dependent on the presence within the respective ministries’ IPA structures of individual employees who have an overview of and/or access to advice about Roma’s needs.

Overall, funding for the implementation of action plans adopted at the both central and local level has been inadequate to date, and prospects for improvement in the period 2014-2020 are at best unclear. Furthermore, while two EU-funded calls for proposals with elements of strengthening the capacity of NGOs

17 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004).

18 See Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od “Dekadata za vključvanje na Romite 2005-2015” i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011 [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009); also Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Pravilnik za vnatrešna organizacija na Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika [Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2010).

and explicit reference to activities with Roma were concluded in 2012,<sup>19</sup> funds were not awarded to any Romani NGOs under either call.

## 1.7 Long-term financial commitment

To date, there have been no signs of a clear commitment to securing financing of all measures contained in any of the five national action plans adopted in the framework of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, let alone of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* with its ten priority areas. The long-term viability of policies for the inclusion of Roma in Macedonia therefore depends on the attainment of a degree of financial sustainability thus far lacking.

Also problematic in this regard has been the behaviour of international donors in Macedonia. On the one hand, the ongoing withdrawal of actors in this category points to unrealistic expectations placed on a country still far from having successfully transformed its economy. On the other hand, there has been a tendency among international donors to support short-term projects, while requesting evidence of impact that can be realistically expected only in the medium to long term.

As a result of this situation, NGOs (including but not limited to Romani NGOs) in Macedonia are often caught in the funding vacuum formed between domestic institutions, which claim dependency on external financing, and international donors which emphasise financial participation by domestic institutions.

## 1.8 Accessibility of EU funds

Beyond a non-binding commitment from the Ministry of Local Self-Government to cover the 5% financial participation required by a call under the IPA 2009/2010/2011 Cross-border Programme between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Albania,<sup>20</sup> the only concrete step taken by the Macedonian government to facilitate access to EU funds for small projects and NGOs unable to provide matching funds or to advance project funding in anticipation of reimbursement has been the small grants facility of the IPA-funded project "Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy." Through this facility, 12 small projects aimed at contributing to implementation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* via local action plans were financed as cooperative efforts between municipal authorities and Romani NGOs.<sup>21</sup> Overall, however, Romani NGOs have been reluctant to apply for IPA funding due to the associated administrative and financial demands. As a result, Romani NGOs have more often featured as junior partners in applications led by larger, more established non-Romani organisations. Moreover, the fact that all applications for EU funding submitted to date by Romani NGOs in Macedonia have been unsuccessful carries with it the risk that these NGOs will be discouraged from attempting to access such funding in future.

19 Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, EuropeAid/132-767/L/ACT/MK: Strengthening the Role of Civil Society in Promoting Human Rights and Democratic Reform (Skopje: Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 2012); Ministry of Finance, EuropeAid/133-337/L/ACT/MK: Support to Enhancement Sustainability and Development of an Active Civil Society (Skopje: Ministry of Finance 2011).

20 See Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, EuropeAid/132192/L/ACT/MK: IPA 2009/2010/2011 Cross-border Programme between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Albania (Skopje: Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 2012).

21 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Successfully Completed the Joint Implementation of LAP Priority Measures, *Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy* no. 5: 3, available at [http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik\\_eng.pdf](http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik_eng.pdf).

## 2. ANTI-DISCRIMINATION

### 2.1 Registration and identity documents

While the problems faced by Roma related to lack of registration and identity documents received attention even in the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*,<sup>22</sup> to date concrete efforts to ensure that all Roma are registered have been undertaken primarily by actors in the non-governmental sector. The *Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014*, however, marks an increase in official attention to the issue of personal documentation, setting goals including mapping the situation by the end of 2012 and providing the technical and financial assistance necessary to reduce the ascertained number of Roma without complete personal documentation by 10% for each year of this Strategy's implementation.<sup>23</sup> Toward realisation of these goals, authorities identified 440 persons with incomplete personal documentation, following up to reduce this number by 31 persons as of March 2013.<sup>24</sup> Responses to the survey conducted on a representative sample of Roma in preparing this report may reflect the ongoing change in this regard, with 41.5% supporting the view that the government has not done anything to register persons without personal documentation while a slightly larger share (46.2%) pointed to some degree of improvement as a result of government action.<sup>25</sup>

### 2.2 Raising public awareness

Although in Macedonia, as in other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Roma constitute the group most likely to fall victim to discrimination and racism, studies of public opinion conducted in Macedonia since the mid 1990s point to lower levels of discrimination and racism in Macedonia than in other countries of the region.<sup>26</sup> Thus, while an overwhelming majority (83.5%) of participants in a poll conducted on a representative sample of the country's inhabitants in 2007 indicated that marriage between themselves or a member of their family and a Romani person would be unacceptable, a smaller majority (52.6%) stated a willingness to accept Roma as neighbours.<sup>27</sup> More recently, the survey conducted in

22 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004).

23 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Strategija za intenziviranje na socijalnata inkluzija na Romite vo sistemot na socijalnata zaštita vo Republika Makedonija za periodot 2012-2014 g.* [Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), p. 16.

24 While the steps taken by authorities to reduce the number of Roma without complete personal documentation are to be welcomed, prior work in this area by NGOs suggests that the official figure may underestimate the magnitude of the problem to be addressed; in the Skopje municipality of Šuto Orizari alone, for example, the NGO Ambrela assisted 451 persons to secure an identity card in 2011.

25 Responses in relation to local government action to register persons without documentation were less positive, with 65.2% indicating a lack of action while a total of 21.7% indicated some level of improvement.

26 See, for example, Krasimir Kanev, "Dynamics of Inter-Ethnic Tensions in Bulgaria and the Balkans," *Balkan Forum* 4 (1996): 213-252, at pp. 242-243; Lažar Aloui, Violeta Petroska-Beška, and Mirjana Najčevska, *Situation Analysis of Roma Women and Children* (Skopje: UNICEF, 1999), p. 9; Mirjana Najčevska, "Srednoto obrazovanie kako faktor na megjuetničkata (ne)tolerancija [Secondary Education as a Factor in Interethnic (In)Tolerance]," in Mirjana Najčevska and Nataša Gaber (eds.), *Izvorite i faktorite na megjuetničkata (ne)tolerancija vo procesite na obrazovanieto [Sources and Factors of Interethnic (In) Tolerance in Processes of Education]* (Skopje: Institut za sociološki i političko-pravni istražuvanja, 2001), pp. 43, 48; World Bank, *Decade of the Roma: Non-Roma Groups Focus Groups Discussion Macedonia* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2005); Emilija Simoska et al., *Kolku e inkluzivno makedonskoto opštество [How Inclusive Is Macedonian Society]* (Skopje: Fondacija institut otvoreno opštество – Makedonija, 2008); Sašo Klekovski, *Megjuetničkite odnosi vo Makedonija [Interethnic Relations in Macedonia]* (Skopje: Makedonski centar za megjunarodna sorabotka, 2011).

27 Emilija Simoska et al., *Kolku e inkluzivno makedonskoto opštество [How Inclusive Is Macedonian Society]* (Skopje: Fondacija institut otvoreno opštество – Makedonija, 2008), pp. 22, 37.



preparing this report pointed to relative stability in non-Roma's opinions about their Romani neighbourhoods, with a majority (57.2%) of respondents reporting unchanged relations over the last two years while 24% reported that relations had worsened over the same period. With regard to the workplace, whereas a scant majority of respondents characterised the attitude of non-Romani employers and co-workers toward Romani job seekers as unchanged over the last two years, more than a third (36.6%) pointed to deterioration in this regard.

Among the few efforts to raise awareness and build public understanding of the benefits for the entire society of the integration of Roma is the public information campaign conducted in the framework of the Macedonian Presidency of the Decade of Roma Inclusion, which included billboards in Skopje publicising the Decade. Official efforts to promote rights awareness among Romani citizens have also been few, with stakeholders from both governmental and NGO sectors participating in the field research conducted in preparing this report pointing to insufficient awareness of rights in general and recognition of discrimination in particular as a problem for addressing discrimination against Roma in the country. Roma participating in the survey conducted for the report generally viewed the state as not doing anything to reduce stereotypes and prejudices (69.3%) or to prevent and offer protection from discrimination (67.6%).<sup>28</sup>

On the other hand, high-level officials have consistently served as role models in promoting respect towards Roma, with Prime Minister Nikola Gruevski and Minister of Labour and Social Policy Spiro Ristovski (among others) referring to the Romani population as an integral part of Macedonian society in speeches delivered at events organised during Macedonia's Decade Presidency. Also significant in this regard is the presence in the Macedonian government of the Romani Minister without Portfolio, Neždet Mustafa.

### 2.3 Addressing institutional discrimination

The results of the survey conducted for the purposes of this report suggest that whereas attitudes of non-Romani teachers toward Roma in education have not changed significantly over the last two years, relations between Romani and non-Romani pupils and students show signs of improvement, particularly in primary and higher education. The findings of the survey in the area of health were less positive, with a scant majority (53%) reporting that attitudes of non-Romani healthcare workers had remained the same over the last two years while 31.6% pointed to deterioration in this regard.

Attention to institutional racism and discrimination in 2012 was concentrated in the priority areas of education and health. In the area of education, official attention to the procedures for enrolment of children in special education increased as the Ministry of Education registered cases of children enrolled in special education without appropriate documentation, and initiated a discussion of possibilities for modifying enrolment procedures in such a way as to prevent abuses, as well as unintentional inconsistencies in assessment. In the area of health, 15 Romani health mediators began work in May 2012 in the framework of a national project to link public healthcare institutions with local NGOs and Romani Information Centres. Based in municipal health centres, the mediators' presence can be expected to contribute to a reduction in the processes, attitudes and behaviour in those institutions which amount to discrimination.

An example of backsliding in the area of institutional discrimination comes in the form of ethnic profiling by Macedonian border police. According to the Macedonian Minister of Interior, Gordana Jankulovska, checks at the border are performed on the basis of a "method of risk analysis." Accordingly, the Macedonian authorities have developed a profile of so-called false asylum seekers or potential asylum seekers on the basis of the information they receive from EU member states, some of which may inaccurately present Roma as the largest group of migrants. This profile is regularly updated and communicated to all the

28 Survey respondents expressed similar views of the (in)action of local governments in these areas, with 73.1% reporting that their municipality has not done anything to reduce stereotypes and prejudices while 71.1% stated that the municipality has done nothing in the area of prevention of and protection from discrimination.

centres dealing with border control, which make use of it in the performance of their checks.<sup>29</sup> Available information suggests that the frequency with which Roma with Macedonian citizenship has been turned back at the border appears to have drastically increased in 2012.<sup>30</sup>

## 2.4 The Commission for Protection against Discrimination

Formed in early 2011 in accordance with the 2010 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination*,<sup>31</sup> the Commission for Protection against Discrimination provides legal assistance to individual complainants and conducts independent investigations of anti-discrimination cases based on ethnicity, but cannot impose sanctions and does not always process complaints within the mandatory three-month limit. Although the Commission is funded from the state budget, the level of this funding leaves the Commission in the position of having to secure additional funding for activities beyond its weekly meetings. The Commission has not thus far played a role in screening governmental strategies, action plans, or programmes targeting Roma.

While the Commission began in early 2013 to cooperate with NGOs to raise awareness among Roma about discrimination and available remedies and a Romani individual (paid from the budget of the EU-funded project of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights “Best Practices for Roma Integration”) has provided technical support to the Commission since December 2012, views on the Commission expressed by representatives of Romani NGOs participating in a focus group organised in preparing this report were predominantly negative. Problems raised by focus group participants included the absence of Roma in an otherwise multi-ethnic body<sup>32</sup> and the anticipated rejection by the Commission of a pending (and overdue) complaint filed in relation to an incident involving an allegedly discriminatory restriction of the freedom of movement. Of the 158 complaints received by the Commission for Protection against Discrimination from its formation through mid April 2013, a total of 16 concerned discrimination against Roma, with half of these among the 85 complaints processed to date. The first positive resolution by the Commission of a complaint concerning discrimination against Roma came in April 2013 and resulted in a decision by the Ministry of Education and Science to discontinue use of a text referring to “Gypsies” (Cigani) in a fourth-grade Macedonian language textbook.

## 2.5 Implementation of European standards in anti-discrimination

The last judgment of the European Court of Human Rights related to Roma in Macedonia was passed in 2008.<sup>33</sup> Like two previous judgments related to Roma in Macedonia, this one was related to the failure of authorities to conduct an effective investigation into allegations of police brutality against Romani citizens.<sup>34</sup> Implementation of these judgments had concluded before 2012.

29 See Chachipe, *Selective Freedom: The Visa Liberalisation and Restrictions on the Right to Travel in the Balkans* (Bérelange: Chachipe, 2012).

30 See, for example, Ljubica Grozdanovska Dimiškovska, “Racial Profiling on Macedonia’s Borders,” available at <http://www.to1.org/client/article/23232-macedonia-roma-profiling-eu.html>; Roma Center Skopje, *Submission to CEDAW: Commentary on the Realization of the Romani Women Rights with Focus on the 2006 CEDAW Committee Recommendation No. 28* (Skopje: Roma Center Skopje, 2013).

31 Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination, *Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia* 50/2010, Chapter 4.

32 The Commission for Prevention and Protection against Discrimination consists of four ethnic Macedonians, two ethnic Albanians, and one Vlach. Four of the Commission’s members are women.

33 See European Court of Human Rights, *Case of Sulejmanov v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* (Application no. 69875/01) (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2008), available at <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-86022>.

34 The two other cases were *Dzeladinov and Others v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Jasar v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*. See European Court of Human Rights, *Case of Dzeladinov and Others v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* (Application no. 13252/02) (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2008), available at <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-85828>; European Court of Human Rights, *Case of Jasar v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* (Application no. 69908/01) (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2007), available at <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-79411>; See also European Court of Human Rights, *European Convention on Human Rights* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002), Article 3.

While the 2010 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* allows for collective complaints with the consent of the injured party,<sup>35</sup> there are several issues of non-compliance with the EU Race Directive and the Employment Equality Directive, including perhaps most notably the (non-)use of statistics as evidence in indirect discrimination cases.<sup>36</sup> Another important shortcoming is that the *Law* does not address segregation as a special form of discrimination.

The independence and impartiality of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination are questionable given that three of the seven members are employed in state institutions. The current president of the Commission serves as advisor in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, with another member also employed in that ministry and a third employed in the parliament.<sup>37</sup>

## 2.6 Protecting the rights of Romani children

Official efforts for the protection of Romani children as a particularly vulnerable group were confined in 2012 to the right to education. At the level of preschool education, the project “Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Preschools” continued implementation in 18 municipalities as a cooperative effort of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, the Ministry of Education and Science, public preschools, and Romani NGOs, with financial support from the Roma Education Fund. At the level of primary education, the enrolment of non-disabled Romani children in schools and classes for children with mental disability received attention as a problem from the Office of the Ombudsman and from the Ministry of Education and Science, but has not yet been addressed through institutional change. Finally, at the level of secondary education – mandatory in Macedonia since 2009 – a conditional cash transfer (CCT) programme, designed and implemented by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and financed with a loan from the World Bank, provides a monthly benefit of 1 000 Macedonian denars (approximately EUR 16) to households which receive social assistance for each child enrolled in secondary education who meets attendance requirements. In the 2011-2012 school year, Roma accounted for 10.2% of all CCT beneficiaries.<sup>38</sup>

## 2.7 Addressing multiple discrimination against Romani women

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* identifies Romani women and their specific problems as a priority area and accordingly devotes several pages to analysis of the complex marginalisation of Romani women as well as to recommendations on how multiple discrimination against Romani women can be addressed.<sup>39</sup> However, the absence of a clear fit between the *National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women* and the national action plans adopted in the areas of education, employment, health, and housing combined with the lack of evidence of implementation of the former suggests that there has been little, if any, progress toward enabling Romani women to exercise their rights.<sup>40</sup>

35 Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination, *Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia* 50/2010, Article 41.

36 European Roma Rights Centre, *Macedonia: EU Enlargement Programme 2012 ERRC Report* (Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre, 2012); Biljana Kotevska, *Executive Summary: Country Report Macedonia (FYR) 2011 on Measures to Combat Discrimination* (Brussels: European Network of Legal Experts in the Non-Discrimination Field, 2012).

37 See Komisija za zaštita od diskriminacija, “Členovi [Members],” available online at <http://www.kzd.mk/mk/za-kzd/clenovi>.

38 Vlada na Republika Makedonija, *Izveštaj na Vladata na Republika Makedonija do Evropskata Komisija za statusot na realizacija na aktivnostite od patokazot za realizacija na prioritetnite celi usvoeni na Pristapniot dijalog na visoko nivo [Report of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia to the European Commission on the Status of Realisation of Activities from the Roadmap for Realisation of the Priority Goals Adopted at the High-Level Accession Dialogue]* (Skopje, Vlada na Republika Makedonija, 2012), p. 22.

39 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.9.

40 See Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od “Dekadata za vklučuvanje na Romite 2005-2015” i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011 [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009); Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Nacionalen akciski plan za unapreduvanje na opštественata položba na Romkite vo R. Makedonija 2011-2013 [National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women in the Republic of Macedonia 2011-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2010).



This view is supported by the findings of the survey conducted in preparing this report: 63.7% reported a lack of action by the central government and 76.1% pointed to inaction by local government to improve the situation of Romani women.

## 2.8 Tackling human trafficking

Despite indications that Romani girls and women resident in the Čičino Selo shelter on the outskirts of Skopje may fall victim to trafficking, this issue has not received attention from the Macedonian government as a problem particularly affecting Roma. While it may be the case that Roma in Macedonia do not often fall victim to human trafficking, their overall vulnerable position points to the importance of ethnically disaggregated data in this area.



## 3. EDUCATION

### 3.1 School desegregation

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* makes note of segregation as a factor in low rates of educational attainment among Roma and recommends standardisation of protection mechanisms against discrimination in education in general and segregation in particular.<sup>41</sup> While available information suggests that segregated schools and classes for Roma are the exception rather than the rule, data on the share of children in segregated education are not available and there has been no visible progress in addressing this phenomenon since the intervention of the (Romani) head of the Directorate for Promotion and Development of Education in the Languages of Minorities in 2010 to abolish segregated classes in a primary school in Bitola, with a complaint concerning the purposeful concentration of Romani children in Primary School "Gjorgji Sugarev" in Bitola and submitted to the Commission for Protection against Discrimination in April 2011 not processed as of mid-April 2013. Approximately two thirds (67.2 %) of respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report expressed agreement with the view that punishing educational institutions that segregate Roma can contribute significantly to joint learning and friendship between Romani and non-Romani pupils. Concerns about segregation were voiced also by some of the Romani parents from the Skopje municipality of Šuto Orizari participating in a focus group on education organised in preparing this report.

As a Romani-majority municipality, Šuto Orizari constitutes a special case. There, the public pre-school facility is attended predominantly by Roma,<sup>42</sup> not only because Roma form the local majority, but also because non-Romani (mostly Albanian) parents enrol their children in other pre-schools. In separate focus groups on education organised in preparing this report, pre-school staff and Romani parents from Šuto Orizari drew attention to the poor material conditions in the pre-school facility, including perhaps most notably the lack of heating. At the level of primary education, most Romani parents in Šuto Orizari have enrolled their children in Primary School "Brakja Ramiz i Hamid" since a 2006 fight between Albanian and Romani pupils and parents at the municipality's other primary school, "26-ti Juli." An extension of the Primary School "Brakja Ramiz i Hamid" has been planned for 2012-2013, with a view to meeting the increased demand. Construction of a secondary school in Šuto Orizari has been ongoing for several years. Attention is needed to ensure that this facility is completed, equipped, and staffed in such a way as to provide quality education for inhabitants of the municipality while at the same time promoting integration by attracting members of other ethnic communities.

### 3.2 Ethnically inclusive education

Although the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* does not refer to inclusive education as such, recommended measures in this category include teacher training, language preparation, and courses to promote integration among both Romani and non-Romani children.<sup>43</sup>

41 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Sections II.3.2, II.3.3.4.

42 According to the staff of the pre-school facility in Šuto Orizari, all but several of the 150 children enrolled there are Roma. Here, it is important to note that the material conditions in the facility as well as of the families of the enrolled children combine to keep daily attendance well below the total number of children enrolled.

43 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.3.2.2

In 2012, separate projects implemented in various localities in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Science to promote inclusive education were supported by the EU Delegation, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, OSCE, Pestalozzi Children's Foundation, Roma Education Fund, UNESCO, UNICEF, and USAID. Notwithstanding the 2009 adoption of a policy paper initiating a government strategy to promote interethnic interaction in education,<sup>44</sup> however, there is still no overarching policy on ethnically inclusive education in Macedonia.

The elective subject "Romani Language and Culture" was offered in 11 primary schools in five municipalities (including four schools in two municipalities in Skopje) in the 2011-2012 school year. While the very fact that the subject is offered can be seen as a step toward inclusive education, the subject is offered in only approximately 3% of all primary schools in the country, and the materials developed for the subject lack attention to interculturalism except at the level of goals and objectives.<sup>45</sup> Additionally, 44.1% of respondents to the survey conducted for the purposes of this report were of the opinion that content on Roma in the subject matter taught in schools is sparse, with another 30.2% apparently unable to provide a response to this question. In April 2013, the resolution by the Commission for Protection against Discrimination of a complaint concerning references to "Gypsies" (Cigani) in a fourth-grade Macedonian language textbook resulted in a decision by the Ministry of Education and Science to discontinue use of the offending text.

### 3.3 Addressing discrimination in education

No measures were taken over the past year to address discrimination in access to education and the discriminatory treatment of Romani pupils in school, with three apparent cases of ethnically based violence against Roma in Primary School "Strašo Pindžur" in the Skopje municipality of Gjørče Petrov not adequately investigated.<sup>46</sup> While the Ministry of Education Science in cooperation with the Romani NGO National Roma Centrum published a *Manual for Prevention and Protection against Discrimination in the Educational System in Republic of Macedonia* in 2010, there were no activities organised around this publication in 2012.<sup>47</sup> A majority (61.3%) of respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report indicated that the attitudes toward Roma of non-Romani teachers had not changed over the last two years. Romani parents from Šuto Orizari participating in a focus group on education organised in preparing this report expressed concerns about the behaviour of teaching staff toward children and parents in the municipality's pre-school and primary schools.

### 3.4 Preventing wrongful placement in special education

The *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* points to the need for strict state controls "so as to prevent physically and psychologically healthy Roma children attending classes for children with special needs."<sup>48</sup> Following on a 2010 report of the Office of the Ombudsman based on visits to several special

44 Ministry of Education and Science and OSCE HCNM, *Steps Toward Integrated Education in the Education System of the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science, 2009)

45 See Ministry of Education and Science, *Curriculum for Sixth Grade: Language and Culture of Roma* (Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science, 2007).

46 See Plusinfo, "Ušte edno Romče izede kjotek vo OU 'Strašo Pindžur' vo Gjørče Petrov [Another Young Rom Beaten in Primary School 'Strašo Pindžur' in Gjørče Petrov]" webpage available at <http://www.plusinfo.mk/vest/71423/Ushte-edno-Romche-izede-kjotek-vo-OU-Strasho-Pingzur-vo-Gjorche-Petrov>; Plusinfo, "Šlakanici letaat vo OU 'Strašo Pindžur' kako od šega [Punches Fly in Primary School 'Strašo Pindžur' Like in a Prank," webpage available at <http://www.plusinfo.mk/vest/72413/Šlakanici-letaat-vo-OU-Strasho-Pingzur-kako-od-shega>.

47 See Ministry of Education and Science, *Manual for Prevention and Protection against Discrimination in the Educational System in Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science, 2010).

48 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.3.3.4

schools which found Roma overrepresented in some of the schools covered,<sup>49</sup> research conducted in 2011 by the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) and the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia (MHC) found that Romani children accounted for over 46% of children in a selection of special schools and classes for children with mental disabilities,<sup>50</sup> pointing to a significant overrepresentation relative to Roma's share in Macedonia's general population (less than 3% according to the last census, around 10% according to liberal estimates). While official data indicating growth or reduction from year to year in the number of Roma enrolled in special education are not available, some representatives of Romani NGOs participating in a focus group organised in preparing this report pointed to a falling trend.

Following through on the findings of this research and of additional research conducted in 2012 by ERRC and the Kumanovo-based NGO National Roma Centrum,<sup>51</sup> the Ministry of Education and Science took action by registering cases of children enrolled in special education without appropriate documentation and initiating a discussion of possibilities for modifying enrolment procedures in such a way as to prevent abuse by special education institutions and Romani parents.

### 3.5 Promoting completion of compulsory education

Since the 2008-2009 school year, secondary as well as primary education has been compulsory in Macedonia. While there have been no government initiatives to ensure that Romani (or other) children complete primary education and there is no official strategic document to tackle early school leaving, a scholarship programme for supporting Romani students in secondary education has been in place since the 2005-2006 school year.<sup>52</sup> Additionally, a conditional cash transfer (CCT) was introduced in the 2010-2011 school year to promote completion of secondary education among children from families receiving state social financial assistance.<sup>53</sup> Finally, the Macedonian government has arranged for the waiving of administrative fees for the certificate of immunisation necessary for enrolment in primary education, also providing free textbooks,<sup>54</sup> transportation, and dormitory accommodation for Roma in secondary education.

The Ministry of Education and Science collects and publicises data on Romani enrolment in primary and secondary education. As shown in the table below, while the data suggest that the introduction of compulsory secondary education has increased Roma's participation at this level, they do not provide a basis for clear conclusions on how making secondary education compulsory has affected Roma's participation in primary education or about the effects of CCT or scholarship programmes.

49 *Naroden pravobranitelj, Informacija na Narodniot pravobranitelj po posetata na posebnite osnovni učilišta „Zlatan Sremac“ i „Idnina“ – Skopje, „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“ – Novo Selo i Državnoto sredno učilište za obrazovanie i rehabilitacija „Sv. Naum Ohridski“ – Skopje i „Iskra“ – Štip [Ombudsman's Information Following the Visit to the Special Primary Schools "Zlatan Sremac" and "Idnina" – Skopje, "Sv. Kliment Ohridski" – Novo Selo and the State Secondary School for Education and Rehabilitation "Sv. Naum Ohridski" – Skopje and "Iskra" – Štip]* (Skopje: Naroden pravobranitelj, 2010).

50 Estimates based on official data from 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years suggest that Roma accounted for 36% of all children in special primary education and 28% of all persons enrolled in special secondary education. See Roma Education Fund, *Country Assessment: Macedonia* (Budapest: Roma Education Fund, 2012), p.22.

51 See European Roma Rights Centre and National Roma Centrum, *Fact Sheet: Overrepresentation of Romani Children in Special Education in Macedonia* (Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre, 2012).

52 Implemented by the Foundation Open Society Institute Macedonia from 2005 to 2009, the programme has been administered by the Directorate for Promotion and Development of Education in the Languages of Minorities of the Ministry of Education and Science since the 2009-2010 school year. The Roma Education Fund has provided funding for the programme since 2005.

53 In the 2011-2012 school year, Roma accounted for 10.2% of CCT beneficiaries.

54 The free textbooks scheme has been criticised for not also covering required workbooks, which must still be purchased.

Table 2. Roma enrolled in primary education 2007-2012

School year	Boys	Girls	Total
2007-2008	5,268	4,882	10,150
2008-2009	5,421	5,130	10,571
2009-2010	5,528	5,225	10,753
2010-2011	5,410	5,103	10,513
2011-2012	5,103	4,821	9,924

Source: Ministry of Education and Science

Table 3. Roma enrolled in secondary education 2007-2012

School year	Boys	Girls	Total
2007-2008	831	641	1,472
2008-2009	930	546	1,476
2009-2010	1,054	900	1,954
2010-2011	918	780	1,698
2011-2012	974	749	1,723

Source: Ministry of Education and Science

Nevertheless, the findings of the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011 suggest that enrolment rates among Roma continue to lag well behind those of non-Roma, at 74% versus 90% in primary education and 27% versus 65% in secondary education.<sup>55</sup>

### 3.6 Increasing participation in pre-school education

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* calls for an increase in the capacity of pre-school facilities in order to introduce two years of mandatory pre-school education and provide Romani children with adequate preparation “as a policy, not as the result of isolated projects.”<sup>56</sup> While no such requirement has been introduced, since the 2007-2008 school year the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy has led the project “Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Pre-Schools.” In the 2011-2012 school year, the project covered 380 children in 18 pre-school facilities in 18 municipalities. Notwithstanding the significance of the project, the Roma engaged through the project to create a more Romani-friendly environment in the included pre-school facilities have not so far been employed on a long-term basis and have not been paid consistently for their work.

Of the respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, nearly three quarters (74.3%) indicated that participation of Romani children in pre-school education had increased over the last two years. The projects “Inclusion of Romani Children in Public Pre-Schools” and “A Good Start” (led by the Roma Education Fund with EU funding) have also contributed to increasing the involvement of parents in pre-school education. As is the case in primary and secondary education, however, Roma participate in pre-school education at a lower rate than do their non-Romani neighbours (16% versus 25%).<sup>57</sup>

55 United Nations Development Programme, “Data on Roma,” available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>.

56 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.3.3.1.

57 United Nations Development Programme, “Data on Roma,” available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>.

### 3.7 Progress in vocational training, parental awareness, teacher training, and school mediation

Initiatives to promote vocational training in 2012 were undertaken in Kumanovo with funding from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in Tetovo as a cooperative effort between the NGO Roma Democratic Development Association “Sonce” and the local Workers’ University.<sup>58</sup> Separate projects implemented in various localities in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Science in 2012 to improve teacher training were supported by OSCE, Pestalozzi Children’s Foundation, UNESCO, UNICEF, and USAID. While the training of Romani school mediators is expected to take place in the first half of 2013 in the framework of the IPA-funded project “Supporting Integration of Ethnic Communities in the Educational System,” a relevant activity continued from previous years is the mentoring offered to all Roma in secondary education. In addition to providing extracurricular instruction (usually in mathematics), mentors provide students with general academic counselling and meet regularly with parents. As mentioned in Chapter III.5, further support measures continued from previous years in the absence of a strategic document to tackle early school leaving include the provision of free textbooks, transportation, and dormitory accommodation for Roma in secondary education.

### 3.8 Use of ethnic quotas in public universities

A system of affirmative action based on ethnically defined admissions quotas in public institutions of higher education has been in place since the late 1990s. The extent to which these quotas are accessed by Roma is unclear in the absence of monitoring, with Romani students and NGOs reporting that non-Roma frequently declare Romani ethnicity in order to gain easier admission to higher education.

58 Courses offered in the approximately 20 Workers’ Universities (*robotnički univerziteti*) located throughout the country are generally related to vocational education for adults.

## 4. EMPLOYMENT

### 4.1 Job search assistance

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* includes three types of subsidised employment programmes: a general programme, a programme for persons with disability, and a pilot programme for 15 unemployed persons. The general programme targets 600 unemployed persons, of which up to 100 persons are to be selected from vulnerable groups including but not limited to Roma.<sup>59</sup> Participants in this programme from vulnerable groups receive a monthly gross salary of approximately EUR 227 (14,000 Macedonian denars) paid by the state for a period of six months, with employers receiving a monthly subsidy of approximately EUR 50 (3,000 Macedonian denars) and contractually obligated to employ either the participant or another registered unemployed person for the subsequent 12 months. Of the 81 Roma who applied for the general subsidised employment programme, 31 were accepted. Neither the programme for persons with disability nor the pilot programme targets Roma.<sup>60</sup>

Outside of the subsidised employment programmes, Local Employment Centres continued to offer information, advice, and training to Roma as to all registered unemployed persons; Roma are not an explicit target group of these activities.

### 4.2 Transitional public work schemes

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* calls for the inclusion of Roma in construction and seasonal work programmes.<sup>61</sup> Following a two-year interruption in public work schemes, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* includes a pilot programme of local-level public work for 20 unemployed persons, with a public work programme targeting 2,000 unemployed persons introduced in mid 2012.<sup>62</sup> Targeting persons with lower levels of employability and explicitly including Roma, the pilot programme involves participants in delivering services in the area of social protection on a part-time basis for a period of five months with a monthly salary of approximately EUR 100 (6,000 Macedonian denars) aiming that through this work, participants will gain skills that will make them more competitive on the labour market. The larger programme does not target Roma explicitly, defining its target group as long-term unemployed, persons with low levels of qualification, and persons older than 55. Participants in this programme receive a monthly salary of approximately EUR 124 (7,600 Macedonian denars), plus health and accident insurance for a period of no longer than six months.

59 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vработuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 10-11.

60 *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12, 24-25.

61 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.2.3.1.

62 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vработuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 25-27; Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Operativniot plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vработuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Modification and Amendment of the Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2012), pp. 10-12.



Whereas no data are available on the number of Roma participating in the pilot programme, the larger public work programme had registered 141 Romani beneficiaries as of late October 2012. Among respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, 82.3% indicated that the availability of public work had remained the same or dropped over the previous two years.

While measures based in the 2001 *Framework Agreement* and aimed at ensuring that the ethnic composition of public administration reflects the ethnic composition of the population<sup>63</sup> contributed to a six-fold increase in the percentage of public administration positions filled by Roma between 2000 and 2010, in 2012 Roma remained significantly underrepresented relative to their official share of the total population. Consistent with this, 83.9% of respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report saw employment opportunities in the public sector as the same or reduced over the previous two years.

### 4.3 First work experience programmes

According to the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011, while the unemployment rate among Roma between the ages of 15 and 24 is slightly higher than the corresponding rate among their non-Romani peers (71% versus 61%), Roma are slightly more likely than non-Roma in the same age range to have employment experience (12% versus 8%).<sup>64</sup>

Roma constitute a target group of the traineeship programme included in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013*. The programme does not include a quota for Roma, but targets a total of 233 registered unemployed persons below the age of 27.<sup>65</sup> Participants in the programme receive approximately EUR 81 (5,000 Macedonian denars) per month as well as health and accident insurance for a period of three months, in the course of which participants are expected to gain knowledge and skills to boost their employability. No data are available on the coverage of Roma by this programme.

### 4.4 Eliminating barriers to the labour market

The *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* includes three training programmes aimed at equipping unemployed persons with skills in short supply relative to labour market demand, in order to facilitate successful (re)entry to the labour market.<sup>66</sup> An on-the-job training programme with a capacity of 530 persons provides individual participants with a monthly financial benefit of approximately EUR 72 (4,400 Macedonian denars) for a period of up to three months, with participating employers obligated to hire at least half of programme participants. A programme for advanced training in information technologies targets 164 persons for certification courses of two to four months duration. Finally, a third programme provides 216 persons with training in specified occupations for a period of three months, followed by a month-long practice period. Participants in this programme receive a monthly financial benefit of approximately EUR 77 (4,700 Macedonian denars) to cover meals and transport, as well as insurance for personal accident or illness related to work. While none of the three programmes explicitly target Roma, 105 Roma applied for the third programme and 22 were accepted. An additional 62 Roma were trained in the framework of IPA-funded programmes in 2012.<sup>67</sup>

63 "Framework Agreement," webpage available at [http://faq.macedonia.org/politics/framework\\_agreement.pdf](http://faq.macedonia.org/politics/framework_agreement.pdf), Article 4.2.

64 United Nations Development Programme, "Data on Roma," available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>.

65 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 14-15.

66 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 16-21.

67 Information provided by the Employment Service Agency.



Respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report were most likely to indicate that opportunities to gain occupational qualifications had remained the same over the last two years (42.4% of respondents), with a slightly smaller proportion of respondents (37.3%) reporting a reduction in such opportunities over the same period. Whereas approximately half (50.4%) of respondents indicated a lack of change in attitude toward Roma on the part of non-Romani employers and co-workers, a sizeable minority (36.6%) pointed to deterioration in this regard. As discussed in Chapter II.2, efforts to raise awareness and build public understanding of the benefits for the entire society of the integration of Roma have been few. On the other hand, the fact that 87.4% of unemployed Roma have completed primary education or lower<sup>68</sup> suggests that high unemployment among Roma is more a product of structural discrimination than of discrimination by individual employers.<sup>69</sup>

While the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* recommends the development of special programmes to boost employment and self-employment among Romani women,<sup>70</sup> the only measures taken to date to address the particular challenges faced by Romani women were targeted courses in 2011, with data collected in 2012 by Local Employment Centres in ten municipalities located throughout the country suggesting that Romani women's take-up of active employment measures is low.<sup>71</sup> Similarly, the 2004 *Strategy* notes the need to make occupational training available to Romani youth (as well as to Romani women). As mentioned in Chapter IV.3, Roma constitute a target group of the traineeship programme included in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013*.

#### 4.5 Support for self-employment and entrepreneurship

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's portfolio of active employment measures for 2012 includes a self-employment programme targeting 900 unemployed persons and a pilot programme combining training in occupations for which demand exceeds supply with additional support for self-employment for ten unemployed persons, as well as training for 2,000 unemployed persons on skills for starting and running a business.<sup>72</sup> The self-employment programme includes training in entrepreneurial skills, support in preparing a business plan, assistance in registering a business, and a subsidy for launching a business. None of these programmes specifically targets Roma, with the number of Roma benefiting from them small (i.e., under 100) in 2012 as in previous years. Among respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, more than three quarters pointed to stagnation or reduction in opportunities to open a business, whether inside the home (82.4%) or outside (83.7%).

With the exception of a brief mention in the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*,<sup>73</sup> the situation of Romani women informally employed on a long-term basis as domestic help in non-Romani households has not been the object of official attention, leaving this form of self-employment in the grey economy.

68 According to the Employment Service Agency, of the 10 625 Roma who were unemployed as of 31 August 2012, 9 281 lacked (formal) occupational qualifications.

69 Also see Niall O'Higgins, *Roma and Non-Roma in the Labour Market in Central and South Eastern Europe* (Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme, 2012), p. 43.

70 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.2.3.2.

71 See Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Godišen izveštaj za i implementacija na Nacionalniot akciski plan za unapreduvanje na opštestvenata sostojba na Romkite vo Republika Makedonija 2011-2013 za 2012 godina* [Annual Report for 2012 on Implementation of the National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women 2011-2013] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2012).

72 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina* [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 10-12; Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Operativniot plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina* [Modification and Amendment of the Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2012), pp. 1-2.

73 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.9.2.

## 4.6 Addressing rural poverty

Although Roma live in 64 of Macedonia's 85 municipalities, they are concentrated in cities, such that the city of Skopje together with ten urban municipalities located throughout the country account for 88.1% of the total Romani population. While this means that the numbers of Roma – impoverished or not – living in rural areas is relatively small, Roma nonetheless feature as a target group of the agricultural subsidy programme included in the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy's Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013. Rather than aiming at increasing participant's labour market mobility, however, the programme targets 100 (unemployed) recipients of social financial assistance for registration as individual farmers.<sup>74</sup> No data are available on the participation of Roma in this programme.

74 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina* [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 12-14.

## 5. HEALTHCARE

### 5.1 Extension of services to Roma

The *Law on Health Protection* guarantees quality healthcare to all citizens with respect for their moral, cultural, religious and philosophical convictions, also guaranteeing the right to information necessary for maintaining one's health.<sup>75</sup> Toward realisation of these rights, amendments to the *Law on Health Insurance* have significantly facilitated access to health insurance for various vulnerable categories of citizens, including (but not limited) to long-term unemployed persons not eligible for social financial assistance.<sup>76</sup> Among respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, a majority (61.6%) saw the state as improving Roma's situation in the area of health.

The findings of the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011 suggest that access to both medical insurance and health services is high, with 92 and 93% (respectively) of Romani respondents reporting such access.<sup>77</sup> Reported vaccination rates among children aged 0-6 were similarly high, at 93% (albeit lower than the 99% rate reported by non-Roma living in proximity to Romani settlements). According to the same survey, access to essential drugs is more problematic: 68% of Romani respondents reported that they were unable to afford prescribed medication, as compared with 32% of their non-Romani neighbours.

### 5.2 Addressing formal barriers to access

In the absence of official data, available information suggests that considerable progress has been made in addressing formal barriers to access to healthcare since the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* made note of administrative and educational requirements for access to health insurance as a problem, and recommended that basic health care be provided free of charge for "all vulnerable categories of population, including the Roma."<sup>78</sup> As noted in Chapter V.1, legislation on state-provided health insurance was amended in 2009, apparently resulting in increased access among Roma.<sup>79</sup> In 2009 a joint decision of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education and Science also waived administrative fees for immunisation certificates needed for enrolment in the first year of primary education. Among respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report, while the largest proportion (39.6%) was of the opinion that coverage of Roma by health insurance had not changed over the last two years, a considerable share (31.5%) of respondents pointed to an increase in the number of Roma with health insurance, with only 5% expressing the view that the number of Roma with health insurance had decreased over the last two years.

75 Zakon za zdravstvenata zaštita [Law on Health Protection], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 43/2012, Article 4.

76 Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za zdravstveno osiguruvanje [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Health Insurance], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 6/2009, Article 1; cf. Zakonot za zdravstveno osiguruvanje [Law on Health Insurance], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 25/2000, Article 5.

77 United Nations Development Programme, "Data on Roma," available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>. The corresponding figures for non-Roma living in proximity to Romani settlements are 97 and 95% (respectively).

78 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.4.3. Emphasis removed.

79 See Elena Kjosveska et al., *Informacija za zdravstvenata sostojba i zdravstvenata zaštita na Romite vo Republika Makedonija 2012* [Information on the State of Health and Health Protection of Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2012] (Skopje: Institut za javno zdravje na Republika Makedonija, 2012), p. 32.

### 5.3 Improving access to services

Roma feature as an explicit (but never as the sole) target group in four official programmes of the Ministry of Health adopted in 2012:

- In line with the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia's* call for “special measures” to address the particular challenges faced by Romani women in the area of healthcare, the *Programme for Active Health Protection of Mothers and Children* includes provisions for additional visits (beyond the stated norm of five) by nurses from the mobile health service (*patronažna služba*), along with various educational activities with families in Romani communities;<sup>80</sup>
- The *Programme for Compulsory Immunisation of the Population* targets Roma with efforts to increase vaccination rates through field work and home visits, as well as official summonses;<sup>81</sup>
- The *Programme for Physical Examinations of Pupils and Students* plans informational workshops with parents in Romani communities on the importance of immunisation and prevention of risk behaviours, designates Romani neighbourhoods as loci for cooperation with non-governmental sector in promoting adolescent health, and calls for informational field visits to Romani neighbourhoods and health education for out-of-school Romani children and youth;<sup>82</sup> and
- The national programme for the prevention of tuberculosis identifies Roma as a population with higher rates of tuberculosis than the national average and calls for 1,000 X-ray screenings of Roma in the regions of Strumica and Štip.<sup>83</sup>

Data on the implementation of the activities foreseen for Roma under the four programmes are lacking. Measures undertaken outside these programmes in 2012 include the training of (an unspecified number of) nurses from mobile health services to work with vulnerable groups, the re-opening of the gynaecological clinic in the health centre in the municipality of Šuto Orizari,<sup>84</sup> and the deployment of 15 Romani health mediators in eight municipalities throughout the country.

In relation to the availability of data to measure the scale and progress of interventions aimed at improving access to healthcare services among Roma, the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* recommends the formation of a committee within the Ministry of Health to monitor the health status of the Romani population and implementation of relevant policies.<sup>85</sup> The *Strategy* also calls for the collection of ethnically disaggregated data for the standard indicators adopted by the Institute for Health Protection. To date, however, information on Roma's access to healthcare and on the state of health of the Romani population in general has generally come from research undertaken by local NGOs and international organisations rather than from state institutions, with even the official publication *Information on the State of Health and Health Protection of Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2012* relying in large part on extra-institutional research findings.<sup>86</sup> Legislation passed in 2009 requires that ethnicity be recorded in personal medical documentation beginning from 2013, but this practice had not started as of April 2013.<sup>87</sup> In the meantime, the

- 
- 80 Programa za aktivna zdravstvena zaštita na majkite i decata vo Republika Makedonija vo 2012 godina [Programme for Active Health Protection of Mothers and Children in the Republic of Macedonia in 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Sections II.1, II.2.
- 81 Programa za zadolžitelna imunizacija na naselenieto vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Compulsory Immunization of the Population in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Section IV.
- 82 Programa za sistematski pregledi na učenicite i studentite vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Physical Examinations of Pupils and Students in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Sections III.3, III.4, VIII.
- 83 Programa za preventivni merki za sprečuvanje na tuberkulozata kaj naselenieto vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Preventive Measures for Prevention of Tuberculosis within the Population in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Section V.1.
- 84 While the re-opening was undertaken by the Ministry of Health, available information suggests that pressure from NGOs played an important role in bringing this about.
- 85 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.4.3.
- 86 See Elena Kjosveska et al., *Informacija za zdravstvenata sostojba i zdravstvenata zaštita na Romite vo Republika Makedonija 2012* [Information on the State of Health and Health Protection of Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2012] (Skopje: Institut za javno zdravje na Republika Makedonija, 2012).
- 87 Zakon za evidencii vo oblasta na zdravstvoto [Law on Registers in the Area of Healthcare], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 2/2009, Article 6.

*National Annual Programme for Public Health in the Republic of Macedonia* foresees completion by 2012 of a report on the work of the Romani health mediators.<sup>88</sup> As of April 2013, this report had not been completed and the availability of ethnically disaggregated data on the health situation of the Romani population had not increased, but data from 2012 for the indicators identified to serve as a basis for monitoring the work of the Romani health mediators were being processed.

## 5.4 Mechanisms for redress of violations in healthcare

Evidence of discriminatory treatment of Roma in healthcare institutions is considerable, if anecdotal. Representatives of Romani NGOs participating in a focus group organised in preparing this report cited examples of discrimination. The examples ranged from insults, through requiring payment for services which should be provided free of charge, to outright refusal of services. Although no direct line can be drawn from the attitudes of healthcare workers toward Roma to actual discrimination, it is worth noting that 31.6% of respondents to the survey conducted for the purposes of this report pointed to deterioration in such attitudes over the last two years, with 53% indicating a lack of change over the same period.

Consistent with the recommendation contained in the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* that the healthcare sector be explicitly included in anti-discrimination legislation, the 2010 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* covers health insurance as well as health protection.<sup>89</sup> As was discussed in more detail in Chapter II, however, as of April 2013 no court in Macedonia had issued a decision on the basis of anti-discrimination legislation. Moreover, the Commission for Protection against Discrimination established by the *Law* had yet to take a positive decision on any of the four complaints submitted in relation to discrimination of Roma in healthcare on the basis of ethnicity.

## 5.5 Patients' rights

Macedonia adopted legislation on patients' rights in 2008. Among the provisions of this legislation is the establishment of municipal Commissions for Promoting Patients' Rights, the duties of which include monitoring the implementation of such rights.<sup>90</sup> While it appears that most municipalities have formed such a Commission, the extent to which Commissions carry out their monitoring role is unclear. As a result, it is also unclear to what extent the legislation has succeeded in bringing real accountability for violations of patients' rights.

Available information suggests that awareness of patient rights is low among both patients (including but not limited to Roma), and healthcare service providers.<sup>91</sup> In this respect, the recommendation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* that healthcare workers receive training on appropriate communication "respecting [the patient's] dignity, personality and confidentiality"<sup>92</sup> appears to be, at best, in the early stages of implementation.

Official recognition of the prevalence of corruption in healthcare in Macedonia is lacking.

88 Nacionalna godišna programa za javno zdravje vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [National Annual Programme for Public Health in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Section I.1.13.

89 Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination, *Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia* 50/2010, Article 4. Also see Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.4.3.

90 Zakon za zaštita na pravata na pacientite [Law on Protection of Patients' Rights], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 82/2008, Articles 39-43.

91 See, for example, Združenie za emancipacija, solidarnost i ednakvost na ženite na RM, *Programa na rabota na ESE [ESE Work Programme]* (Skopje: Združenie za emancipacija, solidarnost i ednakvost na ženite na RM, 2012), available online at [http://www.esem.org.mk/Root/mak/default\\_mak.asp](http://www.esem.org.mk/Root/mak/default_mak.asp).

92 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.4.3.

## 5.6 Awareness campaigns

As mentioned in Chapter V.3, Roma are a target group of awareness-raising activities foreseen in programmes of the Ministry of Health. Relevant activities outlined in the Programme for Active Health Protection of Mothers and Children include education for families in Romani communities on child health and development, vaccination, and maternal and adolescent health, as well as parents' workshops on early childhood development.<sup>93</sup> Awareness-raising activities targeting Roma in the Programme for Physical Examinations of Pupils and Students are informational workshops with parents in Romani communities on the importance of immunisation and prevention of risk behaviours, informational field visits to Romani neighbourhoods and health education for out-of-school Romani children and youth.<sup>94</sup> Lacking, however, are data on the implementation of any of these activities. Beyond these two programmes, brochures in Romani on healthy lifestyle choices and healthcare were prepared in 2012 by the Ministry of Health, in cooperation with the Institute for Public Health, and distributed by Centres for Public Health in municipalities with larger concentrations of Roma.

## 5.7 Coordination among sectors

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* grounds a call for a multi-sector approach in the area of health policy toward Roma in "the complexity and different aspects of the problems that reflect on health."<sup>95</sup> More specifically, the *Strategy* recommends coordination involving line ministries, local government units, and representatives of the Romani population. Notwithstanding the emphasis in the *Strategy* on a systematic, integrated approach to health, coordination among sectors has been the exception rather than the rule. One such exception was the 2009 joint decision of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education and Science to waive administrative fees for immunisation certificates needed for enrolment in the first year of primary education. There is also anecdotal evidence that the work of the Romani health mediators in eight municipalities throughout the country has contributed to greater coordination between the healthcare sector and educational institutions. On the other hand, there is no evidence of increased coordination between the healthcare sector and institutions responsible for housing, employment, or anti-discrimination in 2012, with the continuing failure of the National Coordinating Body to fulfil its role contributing to this situation.

93 Programa za aktivna zdravstvena zaštita na majkrite i decata vo Republika Makedonija vo 2012 godina [Programme for Active Health Protection of Mothers and Children in the Republic of Macedonia in 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Section II.1.

94 Programa za sistematski pregledi na učenicite i studentite vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Physical Examinations of Pupils and Students in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 8/2012, Sections III.3, III.4, VIII.

95 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.4.3.



## 6. HOUSING

### 6.1 Residential desegregation and non-discriminatory access to housing

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* calls for “plans for urbanisation to respect the principles of non-discrimination and anti-segregation.”<sup>96</sup> Marking an apparent change from the conclusions of previous research, the 2011 Roma regional survey found that for the vast majority of Roma material conditions trump any preference for living in a neighbourhood with other Roma: 91% of respondents indicated that they would rather live in better conditions surrounded by the majority population than live in worse conditions with other Roma.<sup>97</sup>

There are no data available on the number of Roma living in segregated environments in Macedonia, and there have been no measures to promote residential desegregation. As a result, there are also no quantifiable indications as to any change in the number of Roma living in segregated environments in 2012. On the other hand, there are no contradictions between mainstream housing policies and the goal of desegregation, with the country’s flagship social housing project (discussed in more detail in Chapter VI.3) allotting housing to Romani families in ethnically mixed apartment buildings throughout the country.

### 6.2 Improving access to public utilities and social services infrastructure

The tension between residential desegregation and improving infrastructure in Romani settlements is apparent in both the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* and subsequent policy. In much the same way that the Strategy’s prioritisation of larger Romani settlements for infrastructural improvements<sup>98</sup> risks reinforcing existing spatial separation between Roma and non-Roma, so have funding allotments made on the basis of Memoranda of Cooperation between municipalities and the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia arguably improved access to public utilities and social services infrastructure without addressing *de facto* residential segregation.<sup>99</sup> Projects so funded in 2012 amounted to approximately EUR 163,000 (10 million Macedonian denars) for improving infrastructure (including sewage, streets, and a supporting wall) in Romani settlements located in Bitola, Gazi Baba (Skopje), Kočani, Prilep, Štip, Veles, and Vinica.<sup>100</sup>

96 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.3.

97 United Nations Development Programme, “Data on Roma,” available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B1>; cf. Ilija Aceski, *Skopje: Vizija i realnost [Skopje: Vision and Reality]* (Skopje: Filozofski fakultet, 1996), pp. 47, 128, 228 fn 18; Project on Ethnic Relations, *The Romani “Mahalas” (Neighborhoods) of Southeastern Europe: Politics, Poverty, and Ethnic Unrest* (Princeton: Project on Ethnic Relations, 2003), p. 15.

98 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.3.

99 See Government of the Republic of Macedonia, *Information on the Conclusion of Memorandum for Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia Represented by the Minister without Portfolio Neždet Mustafa, the National Coordinator of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and the Roma Strategy in Republic of Macedonia and the Municipalities* (Skopje: Government of the Republic of Macedonia, 2009).

100 Vlada na Republika Makedonija, *Otčet na rabotenjeto na Vladata na Republika Makedonija 2011-2012 [Report on the Work of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia 2011-2012]* (Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija, 2012), p. 35.

The survey conducted for the purposes of this report included seven questions concerning changes in the condition of infrastructure in the relevant municipality, covering streets, streetlights, sewage, electricity, water supply, green spaces, and public facilities. Whereas the largest share of responses for all of these questions indicated a lack of change over the last two years, only in the cases of streets and public facilities was the second most common response that conditions had improved. At the same time, findings from the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011 suggest that access to water, sanitation, and electricity are relatively unproblematic for the Romani population as a whole:

- 3% of Romani households lack access to piped water inside the dwelling or in the yard (as compared with none of the non-Romani households located near Romani settlements);
- 10% of Romani households lack an indoor bathroom or toilet (as compared with 2% of nearby non-Romani households); and
- 97% of Romani households have access to electricity (versus 95% of nearby non-Romani households).

### 6.3 Social housing

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* contains a general recommendation to construct a larger number of social dwellings.<sup>101</sup> Since 2008, the “Project for Housing of Socially Vulnerable Groups F/P 1674” of the Ministry of Transport and Communications has targeted Roma explicitly while also including Roma in other (i.e., non-ethnic) categories for the allocation of government-subsidised social housing in ethnically mixed apartment buildings. In the framework of this project, which is slated to construct a total of 1,753 apartments from 2008 to 2014 in 26 municipalities throughout the country, construction of 220 apartments was completed in 2012: 51 in Berovo, 78 in Bitola, and 91 in Štip. Of the 220 apartments completed in 2012, 199 were allocated (in early 2013), with 33 (16.6%) allocated to Roma.<sup>102</sup> This brings allocations to Roma through the project to 94 out of a total of 538 allocated apartments, or 17.4%. While the proportion of allocations to Roma is considerable, however, the finding of the survey conducted in preparing this report that 54.8% of respondents see the state as doing nothing for Roma in the area of housing suggests that the absolute numbers of apartments are below the level of demand.

### 6.4 Broadening the scope of housing interventions

Although the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* calls for coordination in efforts to improve the housing situation of Roma with efforts in the Decade priority areas of employment and education,<sup>103</sup> no steps have been taken to broaden the scope of housing interventions, urban planning, and rural development to make them part of a comprehensive, cross-sectoral approach.

### 6.5 Involvement of local authorities and communities

The 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* presents coordination among central institutions, local authorities,<sup>104</sup> and international organisations as a condition for a successful resolution of the housing situation of the Romani population.<sup>105</sup> Since 2005, 14 municipalities have drafted and adopted local action plans for housing, but there is no consistent relationship between the local action plans and the

101 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.3.

102 Of the 51 apartments constructed in the framework of Project F/P 1674 in Berovo, 30 were allocated in early 2013, leaving 21 to be allocated later in the year.

103 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.3.

104 There is no regional level of government in Macedonia.

105 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.3.

national action plan for housing. Further, information on the implementation of the local action plans is not publicly available.

Another housing-related initiative involving local authorities is the Memorandum of Cooperation signed between 21 municipalities and the central government, as represented by the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*. The memorandum calls for increasing levels of co-funding on the part of signatory municipalities while stipulating that the remainder “should be provided with the full support by the Minister without Portfolio from donors’ funds and funds from projects financed by line ministries.”<sup>106</sup> To date, the only projects so supported have received funding from the Ministry of Transport and Communications, with seven such projects funded in 2012 and focusing on infrastructure. There are no formal criteria for evaluating project proposals submitted by municipalities for funding on the basis of a Memorandum of Cooperation.

A less successful instance of coordination between local and central authorities to develop a housing solution in 2012 is the donor conference organised in April by the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*. The event was held to solicit financing for a project of the Municipality of Kočani to construct collective accommodation for the relocation of 42 Romani families from abandoned army barracks. Despite commitments from the municipality and the central government totalling approximately EUR 300,000,<sup>107</sup> the donor conference did not elicit pledges to fill the remaining gap of approximately EUR 210,000, such that the project was not implemented.

106 Government of the Republic of Macedonia, Information on the *Conclusion of Memorandum for Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia Represented by the Minister without Portfolio Neždet Mustafa, the National Coordinator of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and the Roma Strategy in Republic of Macedonia and the Municipalities* (Skopje: Government of the Republic of Macedonia, 2009), Section 3.4.

107 Aleksandar Gicov, “Habitation of Roma Community in Kochani – Possibilities and Solutions,” PowerPoint presentation, April 2012.

## CASE STUDIES

### **Anti-discrimination: The *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination***

Macedonia's *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* was adopted in early 2010.<sup>108</sup> The law prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, race, skin colour, gender, membership of a marginalised group, ethnic origin, language, citizenship, social origin, creed, education, political orientation, personal or social status disability, age, marital status, property status, or health condition.<sup>109</sup> Arguably of particular importance for Roma is the inclusion of membership of a marginalised group among the grounds on which discrimination is explicitly prohibited. Such a group is defined in the *Law* as "a group of individuals that are united by a specific position in the society, which are subject to prejudices, which have special characteristics that make them favourable for certain types of violence have smaller opportunity for realising and protecting their personal rights or are exposed to increased opportunity for further victimisation."<sup>110</sup>

Macedonia's anti-discrimination law covers indirect as well as direct discrimination, such that ostensibly neutral provisions, criteria, and practices which disadvantage some in comparison to others are prohibited, "except when those provisions, criteria or practices result from justified aim, and the contents for achieving that aim are adequate and necessary."<sup>111</sup> Integrally related to the determination of when such exceptions are legitimate is the law's stipulation concerning burden of proof: With the exception of misdemeanours and criminal proceedings, the party accused of discrimination must provide evidence against that submitted by the plaintiff as a basis for the initial claim of discrimination.<sup>112</sup> At the same time, the law provides for affirmative measures aimed at reducing or eliminating inequalities, with marginalised groups mentioned as targets for such measures.<sup>113</sup> Missing from Macedonia's anti-discrimination law, however, is the notion of segregation as a form of discrimination.

The *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* establishes the Commission for Protection against Discrimination as an autonomous body responsible for collecting, directing, and reporting complaints on the basis of the *Law*.<sup>114</sup> With its operations funded from the state budget, the Commission for Protection against Discrimination consists of seven members appointed by parliament to five-year mandates.<sup>115</sup> Taking into account the existence of the Office of the Ombudsman since before the adoption of anti-discrimination legislation,<sup>116</sup> the *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* stipulates that "the Commission cooperates with the Ombudsman for certain cases of discrimination."<sup>117</sup>

Notwithstanding the potential of anti-discrimination legislation in general to serve Roma as a group particularly vulnerable to discrimination, and the promise of Macedonia's *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* in particular in light of its attention to marginalised groups and provisions for affir-

108 *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia 50/2010.*

109 *Ibid.*, Article 3. Not covered, on the other hand, is sexual orientation, with marriage defined in Article 5 as a monogamous relationship between a man and a woman.

110 *Ibid.*, Article 5.

111 *Ibid.*, Article 6.

112 *Ibid.*, Article 38.

113 *Ibid.*, Article 13.

114 *Ibid.*, Articles 16, 24.

115 *Ibid.*, Articles 16-17.

116 See Zakon za narodniot pravobranitel [Law on the Ombudsman], Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija 7/1997; 60/2003.

117 *Ibid.*, Article 33.

ative measures to reduce or eliminate inequalities, available information suggests that the implementation of anti-discrimination legislation in Macedonia has brought few, if any, benefits for the country's Romani population. As of December 2012, no court in Macedonia had issued a decision based on the Law. Moreover, the Commission for Protection against Discrimination's only positive decision to date on a complaint filed by or on behalf of Roma came only in April 2013. It thus appears that anti-discrimination legislation in Macedonia has made at best a modest contribution to date toward bridging the gap between Roma and non-Roma in relation to discrimination.

Among the apparent reasons for the lack of clear impact of Macedonia's anti-discrimination legislation on discrimination against Roma is a low level of awareness within the general population about what constitutes discrimination and about anti-discrimination mechanisms, as is suggested by the absence of domestic jurisprudence drawing on the *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination*. Extending this logic, the ability to identify discrimination as such and to access institutional remedies can be expected to be weaker among Roma than within the general population, as a function of Roma's lower levels of educational attainment. Whatever the causes of the low levels of awareness among Roma in this area, the phenomenon was identified as a problem by representatives of both Romani NGOs and official institutions interviewed in preparing this report, with representatives of Romani NGOs in particular pointing to a lack of information within the Romani population about the existence and role of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination. Further, low levels of awareness among Roma about anti-discrimination mechanisms seem in turn to explain that only 16 complaints have been filed by or on behalf of Roma with the Commission against Discrimination. While this number amounts to over 10% of all (158) complaints filed with the Commission as of mid-April 2013, the interviewed representative of the Commission characterised this number as low in comparison to the frequency with which Roma in Macedonia experience discrimination.<sup>118</sup>

Low levels of awareness about anti-discrimination mechanisms within the population of Macedonia in general, and the country's Romani population in particular, are aggravated by a lack of clarity in the division of labour among institutions tasked with implementation of the *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination*. While the *Law* is clear in designating the Commission for Protection against Discrimination as the main body responsible for coordinating implementation of the Law, less clear is the mandated scope of cooperation with the Office of the Ombudsman, especially insofar as the Commission is tasked with handling all cases of discrimination, while the Office of the Ombudsman deals only with cases of discrimination involving official institutions. Arguably symptomatic of this lack of clarity is the larger number of complaints filed by or on behalf of Roma with the Office of the Ombudsman, in comparison with the number of such complaints filed with the Commission for Protection against Discrimination, despite the more restricted scope of the cases handled by the former.<sup>119</sup> Less clear still is how the Commissions and Coordinators for Equal Opportunities to be established in accordance with the *Law on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men* and accountable to the respective units of local-self government and to the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy can be tasked with coordinating implementation of the *Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination* at the local level, as is currently expected.<sup>120</sup>

Problems of coordination aside, representatives of Romani NGOs participating in a focus group organised in preparing this report were largely critical of the work of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination. Problems mentioned included failure to process complaints within the mandatory three-month limit, the lack of a Romani member of the Commission (which consists of four ethnic Macedonians, two ethnic Albanians, and one Vlach), and the anticipated rejection of a pending (and overdue) complaint filed when a van transporting eight Roma (including the Romani NGO activist in question) to a meeting in Serbia was not allowed to leave Macedonian territory.

118 According to the representative of the Commission against Discrimination interviewed in preparing this report, experiences prompting the filing of complaints to the Commission by or on behalf of Roma include (but are not limited to) non-Romani parents removing their children from schools attended by Roma, non-admission to public places (e.g., swimming pools), restrictions on freedom of movement across state borders, and a fight during an organised cultural event.

119 In comparison with the 16 complaints filed by or on behalf of Roma with the Commission against Discrimination since its formation in early 2011, the Office of the Ombudsman received 87 complaints from or on behalf of Roma in 2011 alone. See *Naroden pravobranitelj, Godišen izveštaj 2011 [Annual Report 2011]* (Skopje: Naroden pravobranitelj, 2012), p. 24.

120 See *Zakon za ednakvi možnosti na ženite i mažite [Law on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men]*, *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 6/2012, Article 14.



## Education: Enrolment procedures for schools for children with mental disability

Complete official data from a single source on the representation of Romani children in schools for children with mental disabilities are lacking. Nonetheless, rough estimates of 36% in special primary education and 28% in special secondary education can be generated by combining the data on overall enrolment in special education from the 2008-2009 school year with the figures on the number of Roma enrolled in special education from the previous year.<sup>121</sup>

The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) and the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia (MHC) conducted exploratory research in early 2011 on the proportion of Roma in special education. Beginning by requesting pupil data disaggregated by ethnicity and information about the enrolment procedures from all special schools and primary schools that have special classes for children with special learning needs, the research continued with visits to several special schools in Kumanovo, Skopje and Veles, where meetings were held with school authorities and parents of enrolled children. Later that year, ERRC and MHC conducted research on a selection of special schools and classes for children with mental disabilities and found that Romani children accounted for 42.5% of all children in special schools, and 52% of the total enrolled in special classes in standard schools. Insofar as Roma account for fewer than 3% of the total population in Macedonia according to the last census, and around 10% according to liberal estimates, both sets of figures point to a significant overrepresentation of Romani children in special education intended for children with mental disabilities.

While the Ministry of Education and Science is responsible for the facilities and curricula used for special schools and classes, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy are also implicated in the administration of special education. Whereas the latter is responsible for the payment of benefits to the families of children in special education and for the Centres for Social Work which issue administrative decisions on categorisation, institutions under the Ministry of Health generally oversee the assessment of children for enrolment in such education.<sup>122</sup> Coordination among the three ministries in matters of special education is limited.

Children are enrolled in special education on the basis of an opinion issued by a categorisation commission, usually consisting of a psychiatrist, a paediatrician, a psychologist, a special educator (*defektolog*) and a social worker. Visits to several special schools by the Office of the Ombudsman in 2010 found on the one hand that categorisation procedures were followed while pointing on the other hand to the potential for inconsistencies and abuses created by the lack of clarity about which institutions may conduct assessments as well as by the failure to take into account the views of teaching staff familiar with the children assessed.<sup>123</sup> The national action plan for education for 2009-2011 foresees the participation in the commissions of qualified, Romani-speaking Roma, but this measure has not yet been implemented.<sup>124</sup>

121 Roma Education Fund, *Country Assessment: Macedonia* (Budapest: Roma Education Fund, 2012), p. 22.

122 As observed by a team from the Office of the Ombudsman during field visits to special schools conducted in early 2010, while assessments in relation to placement in special education are most frequently carried out by the Institute for Mental Health (in Skopje) or other healthcare institutions (outside Skopje), some assessments are performed also by Centres for Social Work, which operate under the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. See *Naroden pravobranitel, Informacija na Narodniot pravobranitel po posetata na posebnite osnovni učilišta „Zlatan Sremac“ i „Idnina“ – Skopje, „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“ – Novo Selo i Državnoto sredno učilište za obrazovanie i rehabilitacija „Sv. Naum Ohridski“ – Skopje i „Iskra“ – Štip* [Ombudsman's Information Following the Visit to the Special Primary Schools "Zlatan Sremac" and "Idnina" – Skopje, "Sv. Kliment Ohridski" – Novo Selo and the State Secondary Schools for Education and Rehabilitation "Sv. Naum Ohridski" – Skopje and "Iskra" – Štip] (Skopje: Naroden pravobranitel, 2010).

123 *Naroden pravobranitel, Informacija na Narodniot pravobranitel po posetata na posebnite osnovni učilišta „Zlatan Sremac“ i „Idnina“ – Skopje, „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“ – Novo Selo i Državnoto sredno učilište za obrazovanie i rehabilitacija „Sv. Naum Ohridski“ – Skopje i „Iskra“ – Štip* [Ombudsman's Information Following the Visit to the Special Primary Schools "Zlatan Sremac" and "Idnina" – Skopje, "Sv. Kliment Ohridski" – Novo Selo and the State Secondary Schools for Education and Rehabilitation "Sv. Naum Ohridski" – Skopje and "Iskra" – Štip] (Skopje: Naroden pravobranitel, 2010).

124 *Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od "Dekadata za vključuvanje na Romite 2005-2015" i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011* [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009), Annex IV, Measure 5.1.



Once enrolled in special education, children learn according to a reduced curriculum. Additionally, there is no requirement that children be re-assessed following the initial assignment to special education. Further, completion of compulsory education in a special school or class considerably reduces the available options for further education, as well as for employment.

A 2012 survey by ERRC and the NGO National Roma Centrum (NRC) revealed a set of problems in the regulatory framework around special education that may contribute to Roma's overrepresentation:

- Contradiction within the *Law on Primary Education*, which contains calls for both the inclusion of children with special educational needs (Article 3) and the segregation of children with such needs in special schools and classes (Article 10);<sup>125</sup>
- Systematic segregation of students with special educational needs in special primary schools and special classes within mainstream primary schools;
- Lack of a legal definition of "special educational needs";
- Imprecise regulations on assessing physical and mental development difficulties and the work of categorisation commissions;<sup>126</sup>
- Imprecise regulation on primary education of students with development difficulties;<sup>127</sup>
- Lack of clear guidance on provision of adequate information to parents and procedures for informed consent;
- Inadequate and biased assessment tools;
- Failure to adopt regulations on the manner and conditions for enrolling students with special educational needs in the primary schools as stipulated in the *Law on Primary Education*;
- Unclear processes and responsibilities for monitoring, recategorisation and class transfer of children with special educational needs, development difficulties or disabilities; and
- Inclusion of asocial and offensive behaviour as grounds for placement in special education intended for children with mental disabilities, regardless of the absence of physical or mental impairment.

Although statements by representatives of Romani NGOs participating in a focus group organised in preparing this report lend support to the Macedonian Minister of Labour and Social Policy's claim that children fake disability in order to get into special schools and receive social benefits, it is also true that the state bears responsibility for ensuring that every child can access inclusive education of the highest standard without discrimination, and that the right not to be subjected to discrimination cannot be waived.<sup>128</sup> The findings of the survey conducted for this report further point to low levels of awareness among Roma

125 Zakon za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 103/2008.

126 See Pravilnik za ocena na specifičnite potrebi na licata so prečki vo fizičkiot ili psihičkiot razvoj [Rulebook for Assessment of the Specific Needs of Persons with Difficulties in Physical or Mental Development], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 30/2000; Zakon za socijalnata zaštita [Law on Social Protection], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 79/2009; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za socijalnata zaštita [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Social Protection], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 36/2011; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakon za socijalnata zaštita [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Social Protection], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 51/2011.

127 See Pravilnik za kriteriumite i načinot na ostvaruvanje na osnovното obrazovanie na učenicite so prečki vo razvojt [Rulebook on the Criteria and Manner of Realisation of Primary Education of Pupils with Developmental Difficulties], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 27/1996; Zakon za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 103/2008; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 33/2010; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 116/2010; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 156/2010; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 18/2011; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 51/2011; Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 6/2012.

128 European Roma Rights Centre and National Roma Centrum, Letter to Mr Spiro Ristovski (Minister of Labour and Social Policy), Mr Pance Krlev (Minister of Education and Science), and Mr Nikola Todorov (Minister of Health), August 2012, available at <http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/file/macedonia-letter-education-august-1-2012-en.pdf>.

about overrepresentation in special education as a problem: More than half (51.5%) of respondents were apparently unable to answer the question whether the number of local children attending a special school is disproportionately large, with most of the remaining respondents evenly split between assessing the situation as one of overrepresentation (23%) and asserting that the enrolment rates correspond to reality (21.9%). This finding may in turn reflect a lack of understanding about the nature of special education, as suggested by the finding of the 2012 survey conducted by ERRC and NRC that 38.6% of Romani parents with children in special education reported not knowing what a special school is, while 45.3% indicating that they do not know the difference between special education and education in a standard class.<sup>129</sup>

The Ministry of Education and Science has taken an important first step by registering cases of children enrolled in special education without appropriate documentation, and initiating a discussion of possibilities for modifying enrolment procedures in such a way as to prevent both unintentional inconsistencies and abuse by special education institutions and Romani parents. Sustained efforts will be necessary to ensure that the overrepresentation of Roma in special education is brought to an end.

## Employment: Active programmes and measures

The UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011 reports an unemployment rate of 53% among Roma aged 15 to 64, compared with 27% among their non-Romani neighbours.<sup>130</sup> The *Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014* promises the creation of a database to provide figures disaggregated by ethnicity and level of education on beneficiaries of social financial assistance, setting a target of including 10% of the total number of unemployed Roma in active measures for employment in 2012.<sup>131</sup>

Roma have been included as an explicit target group of employment programmes administered by the national Employment Service Agency since 2009.<sup>132</sup> These programmes are updated and presented yearly in an operational plan. Whereas operational plans for 2009, 2010, and 2011 devoted a separate chapter to Roma, the *Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013* takes a different approach. Explicitly structured around Europe 2020,<sup>133</sup> this Operational Plan organises its target groups around objectives of smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth, with Roma one of the 18 groups targeted by programmes for inclusive growth.<sup>134</sup>

Keeping in mind that the programmes for smart growth and for sustainable growth are open also to Roma – as to all others – who meet eligibility requirements (e.g., unemployed for more than one year; less than 27 years of age), Roma are targeted specifically only by the programmes for inclusive growth. Programmes in this category include the following:

129 European Roma Rights Centre and National Roma Centrum, *Fact Sheet: Overrepresentation of Romani Children in Special Education in Macedonia* (Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre, 2012), p. 1.

130 United Nations Development Programme, "Data on Roma," available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>.

131 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Strategija za intenziviranje na socijalnata inkluzija na Romite vo sistemot na socijalnata zaštita vo Republika Makedonija za periodot 2012-2014 g.* [Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014] (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), p. 25.

132 See Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2009 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2009]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009); *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2010 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2010]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2010); *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2011 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2011]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011); *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011).

133 See European Commission, "Europe 2020 – The EU Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth," webpage available at [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/structural\\_reforms/europe\\_2020/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/structural_reforms/europe_2020/index_en.htm).

134 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011), pp. 5-6.

- Subsidised employment
- Traineeship
- Agricultural subsidies
- Local-level public work

Despite this targeting, the sparse data that are available suggest that these programmes do not come close to addressing the need of Roma for employment assistance. If all employment programmes targeting Roma had operated at their stated capacity with regard to Romani participants, the total number of Roma benefiting from these programmes in 2012 would be 453. Compared with the 10 625 unemployed Roma,<sup>135</sup> if every Romani beneficiary subsequently left the ranks of the unemployed, unemployment among Roma would be reduced by approximately 4.3%.<sup>136</sup> As shown in the tables below, however, the absence of data on Roma's participation in all but one of the programmes targeting Roma makes it possible to conclude only that at least 263 Roma benefited from the active programmes and measures for employment in 2012, with most of the persons included in this figure covered by programmes which do not target Roma explicitly.<sup>137</sup> If all 263 known Romani beneficiaries left the unemployment registers, as a result of their participation in the active programmes and measures, the Employment Service Agency could take credit for having reduced unemployment among Roma by a modest 2.5%. This finding supports the view prevalent among representatives of Romani NGOs and political parties taking part in the research for this report that coverage of Roma by the active programmes and measures for employment has been insufficient, as well as the view taken by 63.5% of respondents to the survey conducted in preparing this report that the state does nothing for Roma in the area of employment.

Table 4. Participation of Roma in programmes for inclusive growth

Programme	Total capacity	Total applicants	Romani applicants	Total beneficiaries	Romani beneficiaries
Subsidised employment	600 <sup>138</sup>	No data available	81	554	31
Traineeship	233	802	No data available	34	No data available
Agricultural subsidies	100	No data available	No data available	60	No data available
Local-level public work	20	No data available	No data available	20	No data available
Combination programmes	No data available	No data available	No data available	No data available	No data available

135 This figure was provided by the Employment Service Agency and dates from 31 August 2012.

136 If all active programmes and measures had operated at capacity with regard to all categories of participants, the total number of beneficiaries in 2012 would be 8 069. If each beneficiary subsequently left the ranks of the unemployed, the total number of unemployed persons in Macedonia would be reduced by approximately 2.8%. See Državen zavod za statistika, "Pazar na trud [Labour Market]," webpage available at <http://www.stat.gov.mk/OblastOpsto.aspx?id=14>; Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2011).

137 Data collected in 2012 by Local Employment Centres in 10 municipalities located throughout the country suggests that Romani women's take-up of active employment measures is low. See Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Godišen izveštaj za implementacija na Nacionalniot akciski plan za unapreduvanje na opštvenata sostojba na Romkite vo Republika Makedonija 2011-2013 za 2012 godina [Annual Report for 2012 on Implementation of the National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women 2011-2013]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2012).

138 Total includes up to 100 places for persons from vulnerable groups.

Table 5. Participation of Roma in other active programmes and measures for employment

Programme	Total capacity	Total applicants	Romani applicants	Total beneficiaries	Romani beneficiaries
Public work	4,000	No data available	No data available	3,064	141
Self-employment	900	No data available	128	881	21 <sup>139</sup>
Self-employment with crediting	No data available	No data available	25	No data available	5
Training to meet labour market demand	216	No data available	105	183	22
Training to start a business	2, 000	No data available	No data available	No data available	43

## Health: Romani health mediators

Despite the paucity of precise data on their effectiveness, Romani health mediators are widely seen by international organisations as an example of good practice.<sup>140</sup> Similarly, the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* recommends that Romani health mediators be appointed and trained as necessary to facilitate communication between healthcare workers and Romani patients and, in so doing, to increase among Roma “trust in the modern medical treatment.”<sup>141</sup> Consistent with the *Strategy*, the national action plan for health for the period 2009-2011 foresees the identification and preparation of 60 such mediators.<sup>142</sup>

In the two years preceding the launch of the state-funded project for Romani health mediators, the (Macedonian) NGO Association for Health Education and Research HERA trained two Romani health mediators in Šuto Orizari, with support from the Open Society Foundations. On the basis of this experience, HERA also played a central role in the design of the state-funded project. Also part of the preparations for the state-funded project were study visits to functioning Romani health mediator programmes in Bulgaria and Romania.

As stated in the 2011 *Framework for Systematic Integration, Monitoring, and Evaluation*, the main aim of the Romani health mediators is to facilitate Roma’s access to the healthcare system through improved communication between Roma and healthcare workers; assistance in securing necessary personal documents and documentation needed for health insurance; and activities promoting health at individual and community levels.<sup>143</sup>

The activities of the Romani health mediators are organised around four objectives:

- Improving Roma’s access to health services;
- Raising the level of awareness about healthy lifestyles;
- Increasing use of preventive healthcare services; and
- Increasing use of social protection services.<sup>144</sup>

139 Total reflects the number of Roma who completed the training offered in the framework of this programme. Out of this total, 13 persons also received a grant for starting a business.

140 Elena Kjosveska et al., *Informacija za zdravstvenata sostojba i zdravstvenata zaštita na Romite vo Republika Makedonija 2012 [Information on the State of Health and Health Protection of Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2012]* (Skopje: Institut za javno zdravje na Republika Makedonija, 2012), p. 42.

141 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section II.4.3.

142 Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, *Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od “Dekadata za vklučuvanje na Romite 2005-2015” i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011 [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika, 2009), Annex I, Measure 4.2.

143 Brankica Mladenovikj, *Romski zdravstveni medijatori vo javno-zdravstveniot sistem na Republika Makedonija – Ramka za sistemsko vklučuvanje, sledenje i evaluacija [Romani Health Mediators in the Republic of Macedonia’s Public Health System: Framework for Systematic Integration, Monitoring, and Evaluation]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za zdravstvo, 2011), p. 4.

144 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Consistent with their job title, Romani health mediators are based in municipal public health centres, where they are expected to work in cooperation with nurses in the mobile health service, as well as with doctors. Taking into account the close ties between healthcare and social protection (as reflected also in the objectives of the mediators' activities), Romani health mediators work together also with social work and educational institutions, Romani Information Centres, and NGOs. Additionally, the mediators are tasked with maintaining contacts with local media.

On the basis of a strategic framework prepared in 2010 and adopted by the Macedonian government in 2011, the state Vocational and Educational Training Centre prepared a specialised training programme, which was approved by the Ministry of Education and Science in 2011. With financing from the Foundation Open Society Macedonia, among others, the training programme was administered to 20 candidates in the summer of 2011. From the 20 candidates, a committee consisting of representatives of the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, the Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio for the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*, and the Association for Health Education and Research HERA selected 16 persons in late 2011 to serve as Romani health mediators.<sup>145</sup> In May 2012, 15 mediators began work in eight municipalities throughout the country: three in Štip; two each in Gostivar, Karpoš (Skopje), Kočani, Šuto Orizari (Skopje), and Tetovo; and one Romani health mediator each in Bitola and Prilep.<sup>146</sup>

In contrast to the situation in some countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the salary of Romani health mediators in Macedonia is set at a level associated with completed higher education.<sup>147</sup> On the other hand, the fact that Romani health mediators are engaged on the basis of a fixed-duration services contract means that they are not provided with health and pension insurance. Moreover, the Ministry of Health allotted funding for the salaries of only seven Romani health mediators in 2012, with the others covered by the Foundation Open Society Macedonia. While the Ministry of Health was to take over financial responsibility for all Romani health mediators' salaries in 2013, as of mid April 2013 the Minister of Health had apparently signed the mediators' contracts, but none of the mediators had received a new contract or received payment for work performed after December 2012, and it was unclear whether retroactive payment was forthcoming. Finally, Romani health mediators have faced logistical problems ranging from inadequate and/or poorly equipped office space, to insufficient funding for transport.

The 2011 Framework for Systematic Integration, Monitoring, and Evaluation includes the following list of indicators to serve as a basis for monitoring the functionality of the project:

- Number of Roma who have registered with a doctor as a result of the intervention of a Romani health mediator;
- Number of Roma who possess personal documentation;
- Number of Roma informed about how to realise their right to hospital services;
- Number of Roma carrying out prescribed therapy and appearing regularly for check-up examinations;
- Number of Roma informed through individual and group activities about healthy lifestyles;
- Number of fully vaccinated Romani children;
- Number of adults completing preventive examinations;
- Number of persons who secure health-related documents for social protection;
- Number of persons who possess health-related documents/health insurance;

145 Ministerstvo za zdravstvo, *Zapisnik od sastanokot na Komisijata za izbor na romski zdravstveni medijatori od redot na licata koj ja postevuale i uspešno ja završile obukata za romski zdravstven medijator, utvrđena od Ministerstvoto za zdravstvo so Rešenje br. 07-10624/1 od 04.11.2011 godina, održana na 11.11.2011 vo prostorijite na Ministerstvoto za zdravstvo [Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission for Selection of Romani Health Mediators from the Persons Who Attended and Successfully Completed the Training for Romani Health Mediator, Established by the Ministry of Health by Decision No. 07-10624/1 of 04.11.2011, Held on 11.11.2011 in the Premises of the Ministry of Health]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za zdravstvo, 2011).

146 Ministerstvo za zdravstvo, "Romski zdravstveni medijatori [Romani Health Mediators]," webpage available at <http://mz.gov.mk/romski-zdravstveni-medijatori-2/>.

147 The salary level of Romani health mediators is the same as that of a junior associate within the state administration. See Zakon za državne službenici [Law on Civil Servants], *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 76/2010, Article 6.



- Number of persons referred to appropriate institutions; and
- Number of persons accompanied to service institutions.<sup>148</sup>

Raw data relating to these indicators are delivered by the Romani health mediators in monthly reports, and processed by the Institute for Public Health for entry in an electronic database and reporting on a quarterly basis to the Ministry of Health, the National Coordinator for the Decade, and the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion, “as well as to all interested parties.”<sup>149</sup> As of April 2013, data for these indicators from the work of the Romani health mediators in 2012 were still being processed.

Notwithstanding the current lack of publicly available data for the indicators by which the effectiveness of the Romani health mediators’ work is to be measured, the project was generally welcomed by representatives of Romani NGOs participating in a focus group organised in preparing this report as well as by persons interviewed, with the exception of one representative of a Romani political party who characterised the initiative as a publicity stunt. Overall, the first months of project implementation suggest that the project is an example of good practice in the making, with Romani health mediators increasingly recognised as a resource by state institutions under the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Interior, and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy as well as the Ministry of Health on the one hand, and by local Romani communities on the other. To the extent that the next months confirm this with concrete data on the indicators listed in the *Framework for Systematic Integration, Monitoring, and Evaluation*, it will be crucial to secure stable funding for continuation of the mediators’ work, as well as for the expansion of the project to other municipalities with sizeable Romani populations.

## Housing: Legalisation of illegal dwellings

Estimating that 70% of Roma lack ownership documentation for their dwellings, the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* includes the legalisation of illegal dwellings inhabited by Roma as a specific priority.<sup>150</sup> Additionally, the Strategy recommends in general that measures leading to homelessness and in particular that forced eviction be avoided wherever possible, with necessary evictions offset by providing a choice of alternative accommodations.<sup>151</sup>

The *Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures* was adopted in 2011 and is slated to conclude implementation in early 2017.<sup>152</sup> Designed to bring about the legalisation of illegal construction that is compatible with urban planning priorities<sup>153</sup> and was completed before the legislation came into force (early 2011), the Law contains detailed information on the application process. In the simplest case, an application for legalisation must include the following:

- Certification of (Macedonian) citizenship, or a copy of the identity card of the applicant (in this case also the owner of the dwelling to be legalized);
- Proof of connection to or bills from public utilities or, in the absence of such connections, a notarised statement that the dwelling was constructed before adoption of the Law;
- A geodetic report establishing the parameters of the dwelling to be legalized; and
- The deed to the land on which the dwelling stands, or other documentation establishing that the applicant has the legal right to use the land.<sup>154</sup>

148 Brankica Mladenovikj, *Romski zdravstveni medijatori vo javno-zdravstveniot sistem na Republika Makedonija – Ramka za sistemsko vključvanje, sledenje i evaluacija [Romani Health Mediators in the Republic of Macedonia’s Public Health System: Framework for Systematic Integration, Monitoring, and Evaluation]* (Skopje: Ministerstvo za zdravstvo, 2011), p. 8.

149 *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

150 Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia* (Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2004), Section I.3.

151 *Ibid.*, Section I.3.

152 *Zakon za postapuvanje so bespravno izgradeni objekti [Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures]*, Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija 23/2011, Article 33.

153 *Ibid.*, Article 12.

154 *Ibid.*, Article 6.



The official timeframe for decisions on legalisation is six months after the submission of a complete application.<sup>155</sup> In case of a positive decision, applicants pay a fee of approximately one euro (61 Macedonian denars) per square meter of the dwelling to be legalized, with the fee to be paid within 10 working days or in monthly instalments but waived for recipients of social financial assistance.<sup>156</sup> Illegal dwellings for which an application for legalisation is rejected, on the other hand, are subject to demolition.<sup>157</sup>

In light of the large proportion of illegal construction among the dwellings inhabited by Romani families, the *Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures* appears promising from the standpoint of regulating Roma's (and others') claims on their homes. An assessment carried out in early 2013 in the framework of the EU-funded project of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights "Best Practices for Roma Integration" identified a set of problems encountered by Roma in applying to legalize illegal dwellings.<sup>158</sup> As discussed in Chapter II.1, personal documentation remains a problem for many Roma in Macedonia, such that some who would legalize their dwellings lack the legal standing needed to initiate the process.<sup>159</sup> While available information suggests that proof of connection to public utilities is not generally a problem, the requirement of a geodetic report imposes a financial burden which is in some cases beyond what applicants can bear. Another common problem is procuring documentation establishing that the applicant has the legal right to use the land on which an illegal dwelling stands, as the formalisation of previously informal (and sometimes contested) property relations imposes further administrative and financial demands. Compounding these more technical problems are low levels of awareness among Roma about the possibility of legalisation in general, as well as about the specific requirements of the process.

Beyond any problems presented by the fulfilment of the application requirements by individual applicants, there have been reports of abuses in implementation of the law by municipal authorities, including but not limited to favouring members of one political party while requiring sums of money beyond the prescribed fees to complete the necessary procedures for others. Additionally, the general requirement of compatibility with urban planning priorities makes considerable portions of some Romani settlements (including an estimated 80% of the Romani-majority municipality of Šuto Orizari) ineligible for legalisation in the absence of changes to existing legislation.

As a result of the volume of applications submitted and of the wide range of variation in municipalities' capacity to process the applications, fewer than 13% of the total of 354 169 applications for legalisation submitted under the *Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures* had been resolved as of February 2013, with 42 997 applications approved and 497 rejected.<sup>160</sup> While around 19% of submitted applications (67 172) were in process, in nearly two thirds of all cases (66.1%, or 234 132) processing had been suspended pending completion of application packages, with a deadline of June 2014 imposed for the submission of geodetic reports.

Whereas 36.7% of respondents to the survey conducted for the purposes of this report indicated that the situation with regard to the legalisation of dwellings inhabited by Roma had improved over the last two years, exactly half of respondents pointed to a lack of change in the same period, while 10.6% expressed the view that the situation had deteriorated. Notwithstanding the positive assessment of the situation by a sizeable minority of survey respondents, however, the small proportion of applications for legalisation resolved to date leaves open questions about the real prospects for legalisation of illegal dwellings inhabited by Roma (and by others). Even at this point, however, findings of the UNDP/World Bank/EC Regional Roma Survey 2011 as well as of case studies conducted in Bitola and Šuto Orizari in 2012 provide ample grounds

155 *Ibid.*, Article 11.

156 *Ibid.*, Article 20.

157 *Ibid.*, Article 24.

158 Unless otherwise indicated, the information presented in this and the following paragraph was provided by Biljana Lubarovska on the basis of the assessment she conducted as consultant to the project "Best Practices for Roma Integration."

159 See also Tatjana Perić, *The Housing Situation of Roma Communities: Regional Roma Survey 2011* (Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme, 2012), p. 42.

160 The figures given in this paragraph were provided by Biljana Lubarovska from a press conference organised by the Ministry of Transport and Communications which she attended as consultant to the project "Best Practices for Roma Integration" in Skopje on 22 February 2013.

for the expectation that a considerable (if unknown) number of Roma will be left effectively homeless following rejection of their applications for legalisation.<sup>161</sup> Despite the recommendation of the 2004 *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*, no plan exists for offering alternative accommodation to the displaced owners of demolished illegal dwellings.

---

161 See Centar za regionalni istraživanja i saradotka "Studiorum," *Studija na slučaj Opština Bitola* [Case Study Municipality of Bitola] (Skopje: Habitat-Makedonija, 2013); Centar za regionalni istraživanja i saradotka "Studiorum," *Studija na slučaj Opština Šuto Orizari* [Case Study Municipality of Šuto Orizari] (Skopje: Habitat-Makedonija, 2013); United Nations Development Programme, "Data on Roma," available online at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B1>.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aceski, Ilija. 1996. *Skopje: Vizija i realnost [Skopje: Vision and Reality]*. Skopje: Filozofski fakultet
- Agencija za vrabotuvanje na Republika Makedonija. 2012. "Aktivni merki [Active Measures]." Web page [accessed 18 December 2012]. Available at <http://www.zvrm.gov.mk/?ItemID=9ED2C0A22A9107498F0DCADFD2A19D3B>
- Aloui, Lazhar, Violeta Petroska-Beshka, and Mirjana Najchevska. 1999. *Situation Analysis of Roma Women and Children*. Skopje: UNICEF
- Asocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istraživanje HERA. 2012. *Romski zdravstven medijator (Bilten br. 1) [Romani Health Mediator (Newsletter No. 1)]*. Skopje: Asocijacija za zdravstvena edukacija i istraživanje HERA
- Atanasoska-Manasieva, Milena, and Zoran Gera Madžoski. 4 December 2012. "Obrazovanje na pripadnicite pod 20 otsto: Gostivar ima romski srednoškolski klas [Education of Members Below 20%: Gostivar Has a Romani Secondary School Class]." *Dnevnik*
- Bojadzieva, Aleksandra, Ed. 2009. *MK Decade Watch 2008: Roma Activists Assess the Progress of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015*. Skopje: Koma
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ed. 2010. *MK Decade Watch 2010: Roma Activists Assess the Progress of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015*. Skopje: Initiative for Social Change – InSoC
- Centar za regionalni istraživanja i saradotka "Studiorum". 2013. *Studija na slučaj Opština Bitola [Case Study Municipality of Bitola]*. Skopje: Habitat-Makedonija
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. *Studija na slučaj Opština Šuto Orizari [Case Study Municipality of Šuto Orizari]*. Skopje: Habitat-Makedonija
- Chachipe. 2012. *Selective Freedom: The Visa Liberalisation and Restrictions on the Right to Travel in the Balkans*. Béréldange: Chachipe
- Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. 2012. *EuropeAid/132-767/L/ACT/MK: Strengthening the Role of Civil Society in Promoting Human Rights and Democratic Reform*. Skopje: Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *EuropeAid/132192/L/ACT/MK: IPA 2009/2010/2011 Cross-border Programme between the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Albania*. Skopje: Delegation of the European Union to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- DeMarchi, Giorgia. 2010. *Status Report: Implementation of the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti within the OSCE Area*. Skopje: OSCE Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje and Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
- Državen zavod za statistika. 2012. "Pazar na trud [Labour Market]." Web page [accessed 22 April 2013]. Available at <http://www.stat.gov.mk/OblastOpsto.aspx?id=14>
- Eminova, Enisa, Nadica Janeva, and Violeta Petroska-Beška. 2011. *Roma Early Childhood Inclusion: Macedonian Report*. Budapest: Open Society Foundations, Roma Education Fund, and UNICEF
- Eminova, Enisa, and Neda Milevska-Kostova. 2008. *Report on the Condition of Housing and Health in Roma Community in Republic of Macedonia*. Gostivar: Humanitarian and Charitable Roma Association "Mesečina"

- European Commission. 2009. *Vademecum: The 10 Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. "Europe 2020 – The EU Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth." Web page [accessed 13 February 2013]. Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/structural\\_reforms/europe\\_2020/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/structural_reforms/europe_2020/index_en.htm)
- European Court of Human Rights. 2002. *European Convention on Human Rights*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Case of Jasar v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Application no. 69908/01)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Case of Dzeladinov and Others v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Application no. 13252/02)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Case of Sulejmanov v. the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Application no. 69875/01)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- European Roma Rights Centre. 2012. *Macedonia: EU Enlargement Programme 2012 ERRC Report*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. *Parallel Report by the European Roma Rights Centre Concerning Macedonia for Consideration by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women at Its 54<sup>th</sup> Session (11 February-1 March 2013)*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre
- European Roma Rights Centre and National Roma Centrum. 2012. *Fact Sheet: Overrepresentation of Romani Children in Special Education in Macedonia*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Letter to Mr Spiro Ristovski (Minister of Labour and Social Policy), Mr Pance Kralev (Minister of Education and Science), and Mr Nikola Todorov (Minister of Health)*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre
- Framework Agreement. 2001. "Framework Agreement." Web page [accessed 23 February 2013]. Available at [http://faq.macedonia.org/politics/framework\\_agreement.pdf](http://faq.macedonia.org/politics/framework_agreement.pdf)
- Gicov, Aleksandar. 2012. *Habitation of Roma Community in Kochani – Possibilities and Solutions*. PowerPoint presentation
- Government of the Republic of Macedonia. 2009. *Information on the Conclusion of Memorandum for Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia Represented by the Minister without Portfolio Nezdet Mustafa, the National Coordinator of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and the Roma Strategy in Republic of Macedonia and the Municipalities*. Skopje: Government of the Republic of Macedonia
- Grozdanovska Dimiškovska, Ljubica. 2012. "Racial Profiling on Macedonia's Borders?" Web page [accessed 18 December 2012]. Available at <http://www.tol.org/client/article/23232-macedonia-roma-profiling-eu.html>
- Ivanov, Andrey, Jaroslav Kling, and Justin Kagin. 2012. *Integrated Household Surveys Among Roma Populations: One Possible Approach to Sampling Used in the UNDP-World Bank-EC Regional Roma Survey 2011*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme
- Kanev, Krasimir. 1996. Dynamics of Inter-Ethnic Tensions in Bulgaria and the Balkans. *Balkan Forum* 4, no. 2: 213-52
- Kjosevska, Elena, Stefanka Pereva, Nadica Taševa, and Elena Stojanovska. 2012. *Informacija za zdravstvenata sostojba i zdravstvenata zaštita na Romite vo Republika Makedonija 2012 [Information on the State of Health and Health Protection of Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2012]*. Skopje: Institut za javno zdravje na Republika Makedonija
- Klekovski, Sašo. 2011. *Megjuetničkite odnosi vo Makedonija [Interethnic Relations in Macedonia]*. Skopje: Makedonski centar za megjunarodna sorabotka
- Komisija za zaštita od diskriminacija. 2012. "Členovi [Members]." Web page [accessed 6 January 2013]. Available at <http://www.kzd.mk/mk/za-kzd/clenovi>
- Kotevska, Biljana. 2012. *Executive Summary: Country Report Macedonia (FYR) 2011 on Measures to Combat Discrimination*. Brussels: European Network of Legal Experts in the Non-Discrimination Field

Kóczé, Angéla. 2012. *Civil Society, Civil Involvement and Social Inclusion of the Roma*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme

Ministerstvo za nadvorešni raboti. 2013. *Zaednički osnoven dokument [Common Core Document]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za nadvorešni raboti

Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika. 2008. *Proekt: Romski informativni centri [Project: Romani Information Centres]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2009. *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2009 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2009]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2009. *Programa za rabota i akcionen plan na Romskite informativni centri – RIC za periodot 2010-2012 godina [Work Programme and Action Plan of the Roma Information Centres – RIC for the Period 2010-2012]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2009. *Revizija na Nacionalnite akciski planovi od “Dekadata za vklučuvanje na Romite 2005-2015” i Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija za period 2009-2011 [Revision of the National Action Plans of the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 and Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2009-2011]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Nacionalen akciski plan za unapreduvanje na opštественata položba na Romkite vo R. Makedonija 2011-2013 [National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women in the Republic of Macedonia 2011-2013]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2010 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2010]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Pravilnik za vnatrešna organizacija na Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika [Regulation on the Internal Organisation of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2011 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2011]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *Operativen plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *Strategija za intenziviranje na socijalnata inkluzija na Romite vo sistemot na socijalnata zaštita vo Republika Makedonija za periodot 2012-2014 g. [Strategy for Intensifying the Social Inclusion of Roma in the System of Social Protection in the Republic of Macedonia for the Period 2012-2014]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Godišen izveštaj za implementacija na Nacionalniot akciski plan za unapreduvanje na opštественata sostojba na Romkite vo Republika Makedonija 2011-2013 za 2012 godina [Annual Report for 2012 on Implementation of the National Action Plan for Advancement of the Societal Position of Romani Women 2011-2013]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Operativniot plan za aktivnite programi i merki za vrabotuvanje za 2012-2013 godina [Modification and Amendment of the Operational Plan for Active Programmes and Measures for Employment for 2012-2013]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika

Ministerstvo za zdravstvo. 2011. *Zapisnik od sostanokot na Komisijata za izbor na romski zdravstveni medijatori od redot na licata koi ja posetuvale i uspešnoš ja završile obukata za romski zdravstven medijator; utvrdena od Ministerstvoto za zdravstvo so Rešenje br. 07-10624/1 od 04.11.2011 godina, održana na 11.11.2011 vo prostorite na Ministerstvoto za zdravstvo [Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission for Selection of Romani Health Mediators from the Persons Who Attended and Successfully Completed the Training for Romani Health Mediator; Established by the Ministry of Health by Decision No. 07-10624/1 of 04.11.2011, Held on 11.11.2011 in the Premises of the Ministry of Health]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za zdravstvo

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. “Romski zdravstveni medijatori [Romani Health Mediators].” Web page [accessed 15 February 2013]. Available at <http://mz.gov.mk/romski-zdravstveni-medijatori-2/>



- Ministry of Education and Science. 2007. *Curriculum for Sixth Grade: Language and Culture of Roma*. Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Manual for Prevention and Protection against Discrimination in the Educational System in Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science
- Ministry of Education and Science and OSCE HCNM. 2009. *Steps Toward Integrated Education in the Education System of the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science
- Ministry of Finance. 2011. *EuropeAid/133-337/L/ACT/MK: Support to Enhancement Sustainability and Development of an Active Civil Society*. Skopje: Ministry of Finance
- Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. 2004. *Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *Roma Strategy Assessment Report: Summary*. Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. LAP Revision/Development Process Finalized. *Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy*, no. 5: 2. Available at [http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik\\_eng.pdf](http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik_eng.pdf)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Roma Information Centres Assessment Report: Key Points*. Skopje: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Successfully Completed the Joint Implementation of LAP Priority Measures. *Support to the Implementation of the Roma Strategy*, no. 5: 3. Available at [http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik\\_eng.pdf](http://www.mtsp.gov.mk/WBStorage/Files/petvesnik_eng.pdf)
- Mišev, Stojan. 2012. *Analiza na sostojbata vo oblata na domuvanjeto na Romite vo Šuto Orizari [Situation Analysis in the Area of Housing of Roma in Šuto Orizari]*. Skopje: Habitat for Humanity Makedonija
- Mladenovikj, Brankica. 2011. *Romski zdravstveni medijatori vo javno-zdravstveniot sistem na Republika Makedonija Ramka za sistemsko vključuvanje, sledenje i evaluacija [Romani Health Mediators in the Republic of Macedonia's Public Health System: Framework for Systematic Integration, Monitoring, and Evaluation]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za zdravstvo
- Najčevska, Mirjana. 2001. Srednoto obrazovanie kako faktor na megjuetničkata (ne)tolerancija [Secondary Education as a Factor in Interethnic (In)Tolerance]. *Izvorite i faktorite na megjuetničkata (ne)tolerancija vo procesite na obrazovaniето [Sources and Factors of Interethnic (In)Tolerance in the Processes of Education]*. Eds. Mirjana Najčevska and Nataša Gaber. Skopje: Institut za sociološki i političko-pravni istražuvanja
- Naroden pravobranitel. 2010. *Informacija na Narodniot pravobranitel po posetata na posebnite osnovni učilišta „Zlatan Sremac“ i „Idnina“ Skopje, „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“ Novo Selo i Državnoto sredno učilište za obrazovanie i rehabilitacija „Sv. Naum Ohridski“ Skopje i „Iskra“ Štip [Ombudsman's Information Following the Visit to the Special Primary Schools “Zlatan Sremac” and “Idnina” Skopje, “Sv. Kliment Ohridski” Novo Selo and the State Secondary School for Education and Rehabilitation “Sv. Naum Ohridski” Skopje and “Iskra” Štip]*. Skopje: Naroden pravobranitel
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Godišen izveštaj 2011 [Annual Report 2011]*. Skopje: Naroden pravobranitel
- O'Higgins, Niall. 2012. *Roma and Non-Roma in the Labour Market in Central and South Eastern Europe*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme
- Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia. 2010. Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination. *Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia*, no. 50
- Official Journal of the European Communities. 2000. Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 Implementing the Principle of Equal Treatment between Persons Irrespective of Racial or Ethnic Origin. *Official Journal of the European Communities*, no. 180
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 Establishing a General Framework for Equal Treatment in Employment and Occupation. *Official Journal of the European Communities*, no. 303
- Pavlovski, Borjan. 2008. *Zdravjeto, zdravstvena zaštita i vlijanijata vrz zdravjeto kaj Romite vo Republika Makedonija [Health, Health Protection and Influences on Health among Roma in the Republic of Macedonia]*. Skopje: Zduženje za emancipacija, solidarnost i ednakvost na ženite vo Republika Makedonija – ESE



- Perić, Tatjana. 2012. *The Housing Situation of Roma Communities: Regional Roma Survey 2011*. Bratislava: United Nations Development Programme
- Plusinfo. 2012. “Šlakanici letaat vo OU ‘Strašo Pindžur’ kako od šega [Punches Fly in Primary School ‘Strašo Pindžur’ Like in a Prank].” Web page [accessed 24 April 2013]. Available at <http://www.plusinfo.mk/vest/72413/Shlakanici-letaat-vo-OU-Strasho-Pingzur-kako-od-shega>
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. “Ušte edno Romče izede kjotek vo OU ‘Strašo Pindžur’ vo Gjorče Petrov [Another Young Rom Beaten in Primary School ‘Strašo Pindžur’ in Gjorče Petrov].” Web page [accessed 24 April 2013]. Available at <http://www.plusinfo.mk/vest/71423/Ushte-edno-Romche-izede-kjotek-vo-OU-Strasho-Pingzur-vo-Gjorche-Petrov>
- Project on Ethnic Relations. 2003. *The Romani “Mahalas” (Neighborhoods) of Southeastern Europe: Politics, Poverty and Ethnic Unrest*. Princeton: Project on Ethnic Relations
- Redžepi, Nadir. 2007. *Romani Community in the Republic of Macedonia: Situation and Challenges in Education and Employment*. Gostivar: Humanitarian and Charitable Roma Association “Mesečina”
- Roma Center Skopje. 2013. *Submission to CEDAW: Commentary on the Realisation of the Romani Women Rights with Focus on the 2006 CEDAW Committee Recommendation No. 28*. Skopje: Roma Center Skopje
- Roma Education Fund. 2012. *Country Assessment: Macedonia*. Budapest: Roma Education Fund
- Romani Expert Groups for Romani Integration. 2005. *Roms on Integration: Analyses and Recommendations*. Skopje: European Centre for Minority Issues
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. *Roms on Integration II: Analyses and Recommendations*. Skopje: European Centre for Minority Issues
- Schaaf, Marta. 2011. *Roma Health Mediators: Successes and Challenges*. New York: Open Society Foundations
- Simoska, Emilija, Nataša Gaber, Aneta Jovevska, Petar Atanasov, and Klime Babunski. 2008. *Kolku e inkluzivno makedonskoto opštество [How Inclusive Is Macedonian Society]*. Skopje: Fondacija Institut otvoreno opštество – Makedonija
- Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija. 1991. Ustav na Republika Makedonija [Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 52
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Pravilnik za kriteriumite i načinot na ostvaruvanje na osnovnoto obrazovanie na učenicite so prečki vo razvojt [Rulebook on the Criteria and Manner of Realization of Primary Education of Pupils with Developmental Difficulties]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 27
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. Zakon za narodniot pravobranitel [Law on the Ombudsman]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 7
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. Pravilnik za ocena na specifičnite potrebi na licata so prečki vo fizičkiot ili psihičkiot razvoj [Rulebook for Assessment of the Specific Needs of Persons with Difficulties in Physical or Mental Development]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 30
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. Zakon za zdravstveno osiguruvanje [Law on Health Insurance]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 25
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. Amandmani IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII i XVIII na Ustavot na Republika Makedonija [Amendments IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII and XVIII to the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 91
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. Zakon za narodniot pravobranitel [Law on the Ombudsman]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 60
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Zakon za osnovnoto obrazovanie [Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 103
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. Zakon za zaštita na pravata na pacientite [Law Protection of Patients’ Rights]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 82

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Zakon za evidencii vo oblata na zdravstvoto [Law on Registers in the Area of Healthcare]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 2
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za zdravstveno osiguruvanje [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Health Insurance]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 6
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Zakon za socijalnata zaštita [Law on Social Protection]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 79
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Zakon za državnite službenici [Law on Civil Servants]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 76
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 33
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 116
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 156
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 18
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 51
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za socijalnata zaštita [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Social Protection]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 36
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za socijalnata zaštita [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Social Protection]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 51
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. Zakon za postapuvanje so bespravno izgradeni objekti [Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 23
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Nacionalna godišna programa za javno zdravje vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [National Annual Programme for Public Health in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 8
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Programa za aktivna zdravstvena zaštita na majkite i decata vo Republika Makedonija vo 2012 godina [Programme for Active Health Protection of Mothers and Children in the Republic of Macedonia in 2012]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 8
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Programa za preventivni merki za sprečuvanje na tuberkulozata kaj naselenieto vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Preventive Measures for Prevention of Tuberculosis within the Population in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 8
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Programa za sistematski pregledi na učenicite i studentite vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Physical Examinations of Pupils and Students in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 8
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Programa za zadolžitelna imunizacija na naselenieto vo Republika Makedonija za 2012 godina [Programme for Compulsory Immunization of the Population in the Republic of Macedonia for 2012]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 8
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Zakon za ednakvi možnosti na ženite i mažite [Law on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 6
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Primary Education]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 6
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za postapuvanje so bespravno izgradeni objekti [Law on Modification and Amendment of the Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 155

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Zakon za zdravstvena zaštita [Law on Health Protection]. *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, no. 43
- Spasovski, Ognen, Safet Ballazhi, and Eben Friedman. 2010. *Mapping Policies and Practices for the Preparation of Teachers for Inclusive Education in Context of Social and Cultural Diversity: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Country Report*. Turin: European Training Foundation
- State Statistical Office. 2011. *Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of Macedonia 2011*. Skopje: State Statistical Office
- Stojanoska, Biljana. 2012. Pridonesot na IPA fondovite za razvojot na čovečki kapital vo Republika Makedonija [The Contribution of IPA Funds to the Development of Human Capital in the Republic of Macedonia]. *Koristenje na fondovite na EU vo Republika Makedonija: Efikasnost, vlijanie i apsorpcionen kapacitet [Use of EU Funds in the Republic of Macedonia: Efficiency, Influence and Absorption Capacity]*. Skopje: European Policy Initiative and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
- Taseva, Emilija. 2012. IPA komponenta I za evropski institucii za garantiranje na demokratija, vladeenje na pravoto, čovekovi prava, zaštita na malcinstva [IPA Component I for European Institutions for Guaranteeing Democracy, Rule of Law, Human Rights, Protection of Minorities]. *Koristenje na fondovite na EU vo Republika Makedonija: Efikasnost, vlijanie i apsorpcionen kapacitet [Use of EU Funds in the Republic of Macedonia: Efficiency, Influence and Absorption Capacity]*. Skopje: European Policy Initiative and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
- United Nations Development Programme. 2011. "Data on Roma." Web page [accessed 29 November 2012]. Available at <http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>
- Vlada na Republika Makedonija. 2008. *Zapisnik od Osumnaessettata sednica na Vladata na Republika Makedonija, održana na 7.10.2008 godina [Transcript of the Eighteenth Session of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia, Held on 7.10.2008]*. Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. *Izvadok od Nacrt-zapisnokot od Dveste i četvrtata sednica na Vladata na Republika Makedonija, održana na 12.01.2011 godina [Excerpt from the Draft Transcript of the Two Hundred Fourth Session of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia, Held on 12.01.2011]*. Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Izveštaj na Vladata na Republika Makedonija do Evropskata Komisija za statusot na realizacija na aktivnostite od patokazot za realizacija na prioritentnite celi usvoeni na Pristapniot dijalog na visoko nivo [Report of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia to the European Commission on the Status of Realisation of Activities from the Roadmap for Realization of the Priority Goals Adopted at the High-Level Accession Dialogue]*. Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. *Otčet na rabotenjeto na Vladata na Republika Makedonija 2011-2012 [Report on the Work of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia 2011-2012]*. Skopje: Vlada na Republika Makedonija
- White, Julia M. 2012. *Pitfalls and Bias: Entry Testing and the Overrepresentation of Romani Children in Special Education*. Budapest: Roma Education Fund
- World Bank. 2005. *Decade of the Roma: Non-Roma Groups Focus Groups Discussion Macedonia*. Washington, DC: World Bank
- Združenie za emancipacija, solidarnost i ednakvost na ženite na RM. 2012. *Programa na rabota na ESE [ESE Work Programme]*. Skopje: Združenie za emancipacija, solidarnost i ednakvost na ženite na RM

## ANNEX 1

### Persons interviewed and focus group participants

Table A1.1 Persons interviewed

Name	Affiliation	Date of interview
Čupi, Redžep Ali	Ministry of Education and Science	13 November 2012
Frčkovski, Mladen	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy	18 February 2013 (written responses)
Ibrahimi, Ibrahim	Union of Roma	14 November 2012
Ibraimovski, Samka	Party for Complete Emancipation of the Roma	14 November 2012
Kamberi, Mabera	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy	20 November 2012
Lubarovska, Biljana	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights	4 March 2013
Memedi, Senad	Ministry of Health	12 November 2012
Memedova, Azbija	Roma Center of Skopje	17 December 2012
Minovski, Duško	Commission for Protection against Discrimination	20 November 2012
Saliu, Šaban	Democratic Forces of the Roma	23 November 2012

Table A1.2 Participants in focus group with representatives of Romani NGOs (Skopje, 5 December 2012)

Name	Organisation	City
Abdulov, Zekir	Kham	Delčevo
Iseni, Šaip	Sumnal	Skopje
Kamberovska, Dilbera	Daja	Kumanovo
Kjazimoski, Bilent	Roma SOS	Prilep
Šaban, Songjul	Roma Center of Skopje	Skopje
Šainovski, Sejnur	National Roma Centrum	Kumanovo
Šikovska, Ljatife	Ambrela	Skopje

Table A1.3 Participants in focus group on education with Romani parents (Skopje, 19 February 2013)

Name	Neighborhood	City
Abdi, Mirsada	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Abduli, Ganimet	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Azir, Mereme	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Dehran, Amet	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Iljaz, Elvis	Topaana	Skopje
Ismail, Pakize	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Kerim, Fatima	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Kjamuran, Ismail	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Liman, Mina	Šuto Orizari	Skopje
Memedov, Bernat	Šuto Orizari	Skopje

Table A1.4 Participants in focus group on education with service providers (Skopje, 20 February 2013)

Name	Affiliation	City
Andonakis, Aneta	Special Primary School "Zlatan Sremac"	Skopje
Demir, Ljatif	Bureau for Development of Education	Skopje
Memedov, Azdrijan	Romaverzitas	Skopje
Mitrevska, Roberta	Special Primary School "Zlatan Sremac"	Skopje
Petrovska, Ivana	Pre-School "8-mi April" (Šuto Orizari)	Skopje
Simevska, Violeta	Pre-School "8-mi April" (Šuto Orizari)	Skopje
Velkovska, Irena	Day Centre for Street Children	Skopje
Zakovska, Aleksandra	Day Centre for Street Children	Skopje

## ANNEX 2

### Interview guides

#### *Commission for Protection against Discrimination*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia? (What problems do Roma face in this area? What problems do Romani women face in this area?)
2. What is the relationship between the level of discrimination against Roma and the number of formal complaints submitted by Roma?
3. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
4. What is the relationship between the work of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination on the one hand and the Strategy and national action plans for Roma on the other?
5. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
6. How do you assess the impact of the implementation of the Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination to date on the situation of Roma? (What potential for improvement?)
7. How do you assess the accessibility of the Committee for Protection against discrimination for Roma? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
8. What is the institutional relationship between the Committee for Protection against Discrimination and the Ombudsman? (How do the roles of the two institutions differ? Are citizens sufficiently informed about the roles of the two institutions and the relationship between them?)
9. What are your thoughts on the following measures and their significance for the Roma's situation:
  - Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
  - Active employment measures?
  - Romani health mediators?
  - Law on legalisation?
  - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?

#### *Employment Service Agency*

1. What is the level of unemployment among Roma compared to the total population in the Republic of Macedonia? (To what can this level of unemployment be attributed?)
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. What does the Agency do for increasing employment among Roma?



- Does the agency offer programmes aimed at Roma?
  - a. If so, what are those programmes? Where do they originate? Since when have they been implemented? With what results? (How can we get the documents in which the programmes are presented?)
  - b. If not, why are there no such programmes?
  - c. How are Romani women addressed in the relevant programmes of the Agency (in comparison with Romani men)?
- 4. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
- 5. What are the Agency's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
- 6. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

### *Ministry of Education and Science*


1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia in the area of education? (What problems do Roma face?)
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. What does the Ministry do for the needs of Roma in:
  - Primary education?
  - Secondary education?
  - Higher education?
4. What measures targeting Roma are offered by the Ministry?
  - Where do they originate? Since when have they been implemented? (How can we get the documents in which the measures/policies are presented?)
  - Does the Ministry have specific measures targeting Romani girls and women?
5. What does the Ministry do in order to reduce:
  - Situations in which Romani children learn separated from non-Romani pupils?
  - Enrolment of Roma with average (or above average) intellect in schools for children with disabilities?
6. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plan for education? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement? Availability of data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
7. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
8. What are the Ministry's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
9. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

### Ministry of Health

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia in the area of healthcare? (What problems do Roma generally face in access to healthcare? What problems do Romani women face in access to healthcare?)
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. What does the Ministry of Health do for the needs of the Roma in the area of health? (What does the Ministry do for the needs of Romani women?)
4. Does the Ministry have specific measures and/or policies for Roma in the area of healthcare?
  - If so, what are those measures/policies? Where do they originate? Since when have they been implemented? With what results? (How can we get the documents in which the measures/policies are presented?)
  - If not, why are there no such measures/policies?
5. What data are available on the health situation of the Roma? What data are available regarding the effects on Roma of implemented measures?
6. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plan for health? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement? Availability of data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
7. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
8. What are the Ministry's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
9. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

### Ministry of Labour and Social Policy

1. What is the social and economic situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia? What is the level of unemployment among Roma compared to the total population in the Republic of Macedonia? How many welfare recipients (Roma/total)?
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. What programmes targeting Roma does the Ministry offer (Where do they originate? Since when have they been implemented? How can we get the documents in which the measures/policies are presented?)
4. Why was the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade of Roma Inclusion established? Why within the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy? (What are the advantages and disadvantages of this arrangement?)
5. What is the institutional relationship between the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade on the one hand and the National Coordinator for the Decade (Minister without Portfolio and his Cabinet) on the other?
6. How do you assess the coordination between the Unit and the Minister without Portfolio? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)

- 
- 82
7. How do you assess the coordination between the Unit and other institutions that bear responsibility for the implementation of national action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
  8. Are there plans for a revision of the national action plans? (If yes, when? How will the new national action plans differ from the previous ones?)
  9. What is the relationship between the national action plans for employment, housing, health and education on the one hand and the national action plan for Romani women on the other?
  10. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plans to date? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Differences among individual national action plans? Potential for improvement? Availability data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
  11. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
  12. What are the procedures for financing the measures envisaged in the national action plans? (How effective are these procedures? Why?)
  13. How do you assess the implementation of the *Strategy* and the Decade at the local level to date? What is the relationship between national and local action plans?
  14. What are your thoughts on the following measures and their significance for the Roma's situation:
    - Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
    - Active employment measures?
    - Romani health mediators?
    - Law on legalisation?
    - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?
  15. What are the Ministry's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
  16. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

#### *Ministry of Transport and Communications*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia in the area of housing? (What problems do Roma face?)
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. What does the Ministry do for improving the living conditions of Roma?
  - Does the Ministry have specific measures and/or policies for Roma in the area of housing?
    - a. If so, what are those measures/policies? Where do they originate? Since when have they been implemented? With what results? (How can we get the documents in which the measures/policies are presented?)
    - b. If not, why are there no such programmes?
4. How goes the cooperation between the Ministry and the National Coordinator for the Decade (Minister without Portfolio Neždet Mustafa)?
5. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plan for housing? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement? Availability of data for the indicators in the national action plans?)

6. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the *Strategy* and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
7. How much does the Ministry invest in Šuto Orizari (Do you consider Šuto Orizari a ghetto? Should there be investment in ghettos?)
8. How much and in which ways do you think that the law on legalisation of illegal structures will help Roma?
9. What are the Ministry's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
10. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

#### *National Coordinator for the Decade/Minister without Portfolio*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia?
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. Why was the position of Minister without Portfolio created? Why a minister? Why without portfolio? Positive and negative sides of this arrangement? (Sustainability?)
4. What is the institutional relationship between the National Coordinator for the Decade (Minister without Portfolio and his Cabinet) on the one hand and the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade on the other?
5. How do you assess the coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and the Unit? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
6. How do you assess the coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and other institutions that bear responsibility for the implementation of national action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
7. Are there plans for a revision of the national action plans? (If yes, when? How will the new national action plans differ from the previous ones?)
8. What is the relationship between the national action plans for employment, housing, health and education on the one hand and the national action plan for Romani women on the other?
9. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plans to date? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Differences among individual national action plans? Potential for improvement? Availability data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
10. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the *Strategy* and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
11. What are the procedures for financing the measures envisaged in the national action plans? (How effective are these procedures? Why?)
12. How do you assess the implementation of the *Strategy* and the Decade at the local level to date? What is the relationship between national and local action plans?
13. What are the results to date of the Memorandum of Cooperation between the Minister without Portfolio and certain municipalities?

14. What are your thoughts on the following measures and their significance for the Roma's situation:
- Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
  - Active employment measures?
  - Romani health mediators?
  - Law on legalisation?
  - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?
15. What are the Minister without Portfolio's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
16. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

### *Non-governmental organisations*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia?
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. How do you assess the coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
4. How do you assess the coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and other institutions that bear responsibility for the implementation of national action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
5. How do you assess the coordination between Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade and other institutions that bear responsibility for the implementation of national action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
6. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plans to date? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Differences among individual national action plans? Potential for improvement? Availability data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
7. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
8. Is there a need for a revision of the national action plans? (If so, why? How will the new national action plans differ from the previous ones?)
9. How do you assess the implementation of the Strategy and the Decade at the local level to date? What is the relationship between national and local action plans?
10. How do you assess the processes of developing and implementing local action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Differences by area and/or municipality? Availability of data for the indicators in local action plans?)
11. What is the outlook for the implementation of local action plans? Revision? Expansion to other municipalities?
12. What are the results to date of the Memorandum of Cooperation between the Minister without Portfolio and certain municipalities?
13. What are the local institutions most relevant to the implementation of the Strategy and national action plans? (What are their greatest successes? Challenges?)

14. What are your thoughts on the following measures and their significance for the Roma's situation:
  - Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
  - Active employment measures?
  - Romani health mediators?
  - Law on legalisation?
  - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?
15. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?


### *Ombudsman*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia where human rights are concerned? (What problems do Roma face in this area? What problems do Romani women face in this area?)
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. What is the relationship between the work of the Ombudsman on the one hand and the Strategy and national action plans for Roma on the other?
4. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the *Strategy* and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
5. How do you assess the impact of the implementation of the Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination to date on the situation of Roma? (What potential for improvement?)
6. How do you assess the accessibility of the Ombudsman (as an institution) for Roma? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
7. What is the institutional relationship between the Ombudsman and the Committee for Protection against Discrimination? (How do the roles of the two institutions differ? Are citizens sufficiently informed about the roles of the two institutions and the relationship between them?)
8. What are your thoughts on the following measures and their significance for the Roma's situation:
  - Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
  - Active employment measures?
  - Romani health mediators?
  - Law on legalisation?
  - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?
9. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

### *Romani political parties*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia?
2. Do you see changes – positive or negative – in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. How do you assess the coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and the Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
4. How do you assess the coordination between the Minister without Portfolio and other institutions that bear responsibility for the implementation of national action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)



- 
- 86
5. How do you assess the coordination between Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and the Decade and other institutions that bear responsibility for the implementation of national action plans? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Potential for improvement?)
  6. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plans to date? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Differences among individual national action plans? Potential for improvement? Availability data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
  7. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
  8. Is there a need for a revision of the national action plans? (If so, why? How will the new national action plans differ from the previous ones?)
  9. How do you assess the implementation of the Strategy and the Decade at the local level to date? What is the relationship between national and local action plans?
  10. What are your thoughts on the following measures and their significance for the Roma's situation:
    - Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
    - Active employment measures?
    - Romani health mediators?
    - Law on legalisation?
    - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?
  11. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

#### *State Statistical Office*

1. What is the situation of Roma in comparison with the other residents of the Republic of Macedonia?
2. Do you see changes - positive or negative - in the situation of Roma in the last year? (If yes, to what can these changes be attributed?)
3. How do you assess the implementation of the national action plans to date? (Positive sides? Negative sides? Differences among individual national action plans? Potential for improvement? Availability of data for the indicators in the national action plans?)
4. How do you assess the work of the National Coordinating Body in the implementation of the Strategy and the national action plans for Roma? (Why? What potential for improvement?)
5. What data are available through the State Statistical Office in relation to the significance of the following measures for the Roma's situation:
  - Procedures for enrolment of children in special schools?
  - Active employment measures?
  - Romani health mediators?
  - Law on legalisation?
  - Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination?
6. What are the Office's future plans for addressing the challenges and problems of the Romani population in Macedonia?
7. Do you have any recommendations for the European Commission in relation to Roma?

## ANNEX 3

### Focus group guides

#### *Questions for focus group with representatives of Romani non-governmental organisations*

1. What is the current situation regarding the enrollment of Romani children in special schools? (To what do you attribute the situation? Have you noticed any changes in the past year? (What kind of changes?)
2. To what extent have the active employment measures contributed to reducing unemployment among the Roma? (If there was any contribution, to what do you attribute it? How could active measures be made more effective?)
3. What are your impressions of the implementation of the project for Romani health mediators to date? (What do you think about the design of the project? What is the project's potential to positively influence the health status of the Roma population? What challenges can be expected?)
4. How has the legalisation law affected the situation of the Romani population in the area of housing? (Do you have information about cases in which Roma successfully legalized their previously illegal dwellings? Do you have information about cases in which Roma were left homeless because they were unable to fulfill the conditions for legalisation?)
5. Do you have information on cases in which Roma move out of legal dwellings due to the pressure from certain members of the non-Romani population?
6. To what extent has the Law on Prevention and Protection against Discrimination helped Roma? (To what extent are Roma informed about this law? How often do Roma file complaints on the basis of this law? How does the current ethnic composition of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination influence the implementation of the Law?)
7. How do you assess the general situation of Roma in Macedonia at the moment? (How has the situation of Roma changed in the past year? (If there was any change, to what do you attribute it?) How do you think the situation of Roma will develop in the next 1-2 years?)

#### *Questions for focus group on education with Romani parents*

1. What is the current situation with Romani children in kindergartens? What is the attitude of (non-) Romani staff? What would you change?
2. What is the current situation with Romani children in primary schools? What is happening with children who are outside the education system? Challenges, solutions? What would you change?
3. What is the current situation with Romani children in secondary schools? What would you change? How does compulsory secondary education affect participation and completion rates? How does the conditional cash transfer influence secondary school attendance among Roma?
4. What is happening with the secondary school in Šuto Orizari? (Will it contribute to integration or to segregation?)
5. What is the current situation at the universities? (Do scholarships have a positive/negative impact?) What would you change?
6. To what extent do Roma make use of so-called ethnic admissions quotas at universities? Do you know someone who has been enrolled under such a quota? (Which problems do Roma face when enrolling at university under a quota?)
7. What is the current situation regarding enrollment of Romani children in special schools? Are any check-ups performed? By whom? Where (in schools or in healthcare facilities)? Is some official

document issued for enrolment of a child in a special school? Do you know any child enrolled in such a school/class? What would you change?

8. Do you have any experience with the elective subject “Romani Language and Culture”? (Does it contribute to integration? How important is it for the Roma? What about other cities?)
9. To what extent are Roma included in adult education programmes? Do you know someone in such a programme? (What are the reasons for this situation?) What would you change?

#### *Questions for focus group with representatives of service providers in education*

1. What is the current situation with Romani children in kindergartens? What is happening with projects for inclusion? (Ministry of Labour and Social Policy; Roma Education Fund) What is the attitude of (non-)Romani staff?
2. What will happen if in the next school year there is no support for enrollment of Romani children in pre-school education (kindergarten)?
3. What is the current situation with Romani children in primary schools? What is happening with children who are outside the education system? Challenges, solutions?
4. What is the current situation with Romani children in secondary schools?
5. Are there any statistical data regarding the dropout of children from primary to secondary education? How does compulsory secondary education affect participation and completion rates? How does the conditional cash transfer influence secondary school attendance among Roma?
6. What is happening with the secondary school in Šuto Orizari? (Will it contribute to integration or to segregation?)
7. What is the current situation at the universities? (Do scholarships have a positive/negative impact?) What about ethnic admissions quotas? Problems with quotas? What would you change?
8. What is the current situation in special schools? What is the participation of Romani children in special classes? What would you change?
9. What are your experiences with the elective subject “Romani Language and Culture”? (Does it contribute to integration?) What should be done to make the elective subject more acceptable (also in other cities)?
10. To what extent are Roma included in adult education programmes? What would you change?
11. What would you change in the areas of your work (preschool, primary, secondary, tertiary education, special needs, adult education)?

## ANNEX 4

### Survey questionnaire

#### *Instructions for completing the questionnaire*

In your own words present the following:

1. Introduction of the interviewer: name and surname, member of the Monitoring Team
2. Description of the interview:
  - a. Aim: to understand the Romani community opinion on the issues important for them
  - b. Approach: interview that lasts around one hour, done in a way that I (interviewer) ask the questions and if necessary explain them, and the interviewee answers; answers are noted by the interviewer on paper (this questionnaire)
  - c. Interviewee: household member present at the house that has most recent birthday (at least 14 years old) – question – from all of you, who has the most recent birthday? (this also helps to break the formal atmosphere) – this is necessary for the random choice of the sample – so not always the same member of the household is interviewed
3. Description of the use of collected data:
  - a. Data will be used to make an analysis from which general conclusions will be drawn (for example, how many of the interviewees think that the education has been improved)
  - b. The report will not contain any personal data of the interviewees (only summary data)
  - c. Data will be dealt with consideration and confidentiality, without revealing any personal data about the interviewee
  - d. The report will be published and will be used to insist on improvement of the situation of Roma before the responsible authorities
4. Building trust with the interviewee
  - a. Opinions and views of each individual of the Romani community are very important for the following work and for solving problems faced by Roma – each opinion is important
  - b. Interviewee has the possibility through the questionnaire to initiate positive changes
  - c. Besides the pressure to the authorities, we cannot promise more, but we hope that through our work and the expression of the views of the Romani community, positive changes can start

(The interviewer reads each question – the text of the questions is bold. The text in brackets should not be read – it is for the interviewer. Answer alternatives are read except if noted differently, and except the alternative “I don’t know / no answer.” Answers are noted by ticking the number in the appropriate field or by leaving an empty space if there is no answer or the interviewee does not know, and such option is not foreseen; or by writing on the line foreseen for this purpose)

*Interview – Opinion survey*

<b>Interviewer</b>	
<b>Municipality</b>	
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Starting time</b>	
<b>Ending time</b>	

**1. Ethnicity**

1. Romani

2. Other

*Questions related to employment*

- According to you, possibilities for Roma for acquiring job qualification in the last three years are:** (tick 1 answer) (if there is a need for explanation on ‘acquiring job qualification’, that means that a person acquires skills and ability to do a certain job, for example to use foreign language, has computer skills, can fix household machines, etc; these skills could be acquired through various activities – trainings organised by someone, on-job trainings, through life experience – from relatives and similar, etc)

<b>0.</b>	Don't know / no answer
<b>1.</b>	Considerably reduced
<b>2.</b>	Reduced
<b>3.</b>	Same as three years ago
<b>4.</b>	Increased
<b>5.</b>	Considerably increased

- For each of the following employment opportunities for Roma, provide your opinion on whether it has been reduced, same or increased during the last 5 years:** (tick the appropriate field or do not tick anything if “don't know/no answer”)

		<b>Reduced</b>	<b>Same</b>	<b>Increased</b>
<b>1.</b>	Possibility for employment in the public sector	1.	2.	3.
<b>2.</b>	Possibility for employment in the private sector	1.	2.	3.
<b>3.</b>	Possibility for employment in the civil society sector	1.	2.	3.
<b>4.</b>	Possibility for work on public works	1.	2.	3.
<b>5.</b>	Possibility for temporary/seasonal work	1.	2.	3.
<b>6.</b>	Possibility for establishment own company	1.	2.	3.
<b>7.</b>	Possibility for family business/ home based work	1.	2.	3.
<b>8.</b>	Possibility for work abroad	1.	2.	3.
<b>9.</b>	Possibility for other paid activity (trade, cleaning, etc)	1.	2.	3.

3. **Which way do you think Roma could most appropriately acquire job qualifications?**  
(tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Formal vocational education
2.	Training organised by the public employment agency
3.	Training organised by a civil society organisation
4.	On-job-training in a firm, internship, etc
5.	Other (specify)

4. **Choose not more than three ways that could significantly help the employment of Roma.**

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Employment in the public sector through political negotiations
2.	Financial subsidies from the state for the employers for each Roma employee
3.	Assistance for establishment of own business
4.	Assistance for the work/management of existing businesses
5.	Programmes for job qualification of Roma
6.	Programmes for employing workers abroad
7.	Attraction of foreign investments in/near settlements inhabited with majority of Roma
8.	Sanctioning employers that unfoundedly reject to employ Roma
9.	Other (specify)

5. **The attitude of non-Romani employers and co-workers towards Romani workers in the last 2 years, according to you is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Significantly worsened
2.	Worsened
3.	Same as three years ago
4.	Improved
5.	Significantly improved

6. Can you provide an example (reason) about your opinion?

#### *Questions related to housing*

1. **According to you, how has Roma's situation with housing changed in the last 2 years?**  
(tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Worsened as more Roma have nowhere to live
2.	Worsened as the conditions of the houses are worsened
3.	The situation is the same as 2 years ago
4.	Improved because of the improved living conditions in the houses
5.	Improved as more Roma have their own home



2. **What is your opinion about the situation of infrastructure in your municipality in the last 2 (two) years:** (answer all, tick in the appropriate field)

		Worsened	Same	Improved
1.	Streets and their maintenance	1.	2.	3.
2.	Street lights	1.	2.	3.
3.	Sewage system	1.	2.	3.
4.	Electricity system	1.	2.	3.
5.	Water supply	1.	2.	3.
6.	Parks and greenery	1.	2.	3.
7.	Public facilities (schools, cultural facilities, etc)	1.	2.	3.
8.	Legalisation of dwellings where Roma live	1.	2.	3.
9.	Urban plan adopted	1.	2.	3.

3. **Which way you think the Roma with property documentation problem could overcome this problem?** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	By provision of legal assistance
2.	By relief of property taxes
3.	By making use of the law on legalisation of illegally built structures
4.	Through urban planning of the settlements
5.	Other (specify)

4. **According to you, the issue of property documentation among Roma in the last 2 years has been:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Increased
2.	Unchanged
3.	Reduced

5. **Can you provide an example (reason) about your opinion?**

6. **Choose at most three ways that could significantly improve the housing of Roma.**

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Possibility to purchase house with favourable conditions (low prices)
2.	Provision of accommodation for Roma in houses with low rent rates
3.	Investments for building housing blocks in exchange for the houses
4.	Assistance for renewal and reconstruction of Roma houses
5.	Assistance for maintenance of Roma houses (such as payment of utilities)
6.	Equipping houses of Roma with furniture and other household necessities
7.	Granting public owned building land for Roma to build houses
8.	Assistance for building houses for the Roma that own building land
9.	Other (specify)

7. **According to you, the opinion of non-Roma towards Roma in their neighbourhood, compared with 2 years ago is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Significantly worsened
2.	Worsened
3.	Same
4.	Improved
5.	Significantly improved

#### Questions related to health

1. **What is your opinion about the general health situation among Roma compared with the period 2 years ago?** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Significantly worsened
2.	Worsened
3.	Same as two years ago
4.	Improved
5.	Significantly improved

2. **Do you think that the number of health insured Roma in the last 2 years is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know
1.	Increased
2.	Unchanged
3.	Reduced

3. **Choose at most three ways that could significantly improve the health situation among Roma?**

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Vaccination of all children
2.	Regular systematic health check-ups of children
3.	Regular health check-ups of women
4.	Regular health check-ups of all Roma
5.	Lowering the prices of health services (check-ups, diagnoses, etc.)
6.	Certain health services to be free of charge
7.	Informing Roma about health and prevention of diseases
8.	Sanctioning doctors that unfoundedly refuse to provide service to Roma
9.	Assistance for payment of the prescribed therapy and medicines
10.	Other (specify)

4. **How do you think those Roma that have no health insurance could get insurance?**  
(tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Through legal assistance
2.	Through relieve of conditions for acquiring health insurance
3.	Through relieve from payments related to health insurance
4.	Through introduction of personal health insurance for everyone
5.	Through division of health insurance from other social services
6.	Other (specify)

5. **According to you, how is Roma's attention to their own health compared to 2 years ago:**  
(tick the appropriate field)

	No answer	Lower	Same	Higher	
1.	Through regular health check-ups	0.	1.	2.	3.
2.	Through acquiring health insurance	0.	1.	2.	3.
3.	Through seeking health related information	0.	1.	2.	3.
4.	Through compliance with the prescribed therapy	0.	1.	2.	3.
5.	Other (specify)				

6. **According to you, the number of Roma employed in the health sector compared to 2 years ago is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Through legal assistance
2.	Through relieve of conditions for acquiring health insurance
3.	Through relieve from payments related to health insurance

7. **According to you, how has the attitude of non-Roma in the health sector towards Romani health service clients changed in the last 2 years:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Significantly worsened
2.	Worsened
3.	Same as two years ago
4.	Improved
5.	Significantly improved

#### Questions related to education

1. **The inclusion of Romani children in preschool and preparatory education compared with 2 years ago, according to you is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Increased
2.	Unchanged
3.	Decreased

2. **To whom would you give preference for the continuation of education**

0.	I do not know/no answer
1.	Male children
2.	Female children
3.	Male and female equally

3. **Do you think that the number of children attending special schools in your municipality is high?**

0.	I do not know/no answer
1.	Yes, it does not correspond to the real situation
2.	It corresponds to the real situation
3.	Other/specify

4. **How do you assess the content about Roma in the school?** (tick 1 answer)

0.	I do not know/no answer
1.	There is very little content about Roma in instruction
2.	There is content about Roma but it depicts Roma unrealistically
3.	There is content about Roma and it depicts Roma realistically
4.	There is content but it violates the dignity of Roma
5.	Other (specify)

5. **Choose at most 5 ways that could significantly improve inclusion of Roma in preschool and preparatory education.**

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Free of charge daily stay in kindergarten
2.	Free of charge inclusion in short preparatory education programmes
3.	Support for and organisation of activities with parents
4.	Mixing Romani and non-Romani children in preschool / preparatory education
5.	Provision of preparatory education at home
6.	Assistance for payment of preschool education
7.	Introduction of specific programmes for work with Roma (for example language)
8.	Provision of supplementary needs, such as clothes, materials, transport, etc.
9.	Introduction of content with Romani language and culture in the preschool education
10.	Other (specify)

6. **The inclusion of Romani children in primary education, compared with 2 years ago, according to you is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Increased
2.	Unchanged
3.	Decreased

7. **The inclusion of Romani children in secondary education, compared with three 2 ago, according to you is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Increased
2.	Unchanged
3.	Decreased

8. **Choose at most 3 ways that could significantly improve inclusion of Roma in primary education.**

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Support for and organisation of activities with parents
2.	Support for Roma in mastering curriculum
3.	Mixing Romani and non-Romani children in classrooms and school activities
4.	Introduction of specific programmes for work with Roma (for example language)
5.	Provision of supplementary needs, such as clothes, materials, transport, etc.
6.	Inclusion of Romani teachers in primary education
7.	Introduction of content on Romani language and culture
8.	Inclusion of children from special schools in standard primary education
9.	Other (specify)
10.	Don't know/no answer

9. **Choose at most 3 ways that could significantly improve inclusion of Roma in secondary education.**

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Provision of scholarships for Romani pupils
2.	Support for and organisation of activities with parents
3.	Support for Roma in mastering curriculum
4.	Mixing Romani and non-Romani children in classrooms and school activities
5.	Introduction of specific programmes for work with Roma (for example language)
6.	Provision of supplementary needs, such as clothes, materials, transport, etc.
7.	Inclusion of Romani teachers in secondary education
8.	Introduction of content on Romani language and culture
9.	Inclusion of children from special schools in standard secondary education
10.	Other (specify)
11.	Don't know / no answer

10. **The number of Romani university students, compared with 5 years ago, according to you is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Increased
2.	Unchanged
3.	Reduced

11. Choose at most three ways that could significantly assist Roma in tertiary education.

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Provision of scholarships for Roma
2.	Introduction of subjects on Romani language, history, culture at appropriate study groups
3.	Organisation of additional joint activities for Romani and non-Romani students
4.	Provision of support for Romani students for learning of the educational material
5.	Provision of supplementary needs, such as clothes, accommodation, transport, etc
6.	Provision of preparatory education for enrolment in tertiary education
7.	Opening of study groups on Romani language at some universities (such as teacher training)
8.	Support of the organisation of Romani students (in student unions and similar)
9.	Other (specify)

12. According to you, during the last 2 years, joint education and friendship among Romani and non-Romani students has decreased, same or increased in: (tick the appropriate field)

	No answer	Decreased	Same	Increased
1. Preschool education	0.	1.	2.	3.
2. Primary education	0.	1.	2.	3.
3. Secondary education	0.	1.	2.	3.
4. Tertiary education	0.	1.	2.	3.
5. Special schools	0.	1.	2.	3.

13. Choose at most three ways that could significantly contribute to the joint learning and friendship among Romani and non-Romani students.

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Sanctions of educational institution that separate Romani children from the rest
2.	Introduction of compulsory standards for mixing children in (ethnically) mixed areas
3.	Introduction of bilingual or multilingual education (Macedonian-Romani or Macedonian-Romani-Albanian-English)
4.	Introduction of content for learning about different cultures
5.	Introduction of activities and content that promote tolerance and understanding between Roma and non-Roma
6.	Change of the conditions for enrolment of children in special schools
7.	Encouraging cooperation among schools from Romani and non-Romani settlements
8.	Other (specify)

14. To what extent you agree with the following statement: "Roma themselves are making more efforts to get involved in education during the last 5 years": (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Strongly disagree
2.	Disagree
3.	Agree
4.	Strongly agree



15. According to you, how has the attitude of non-Roma towards Roma in education changed in the last two years: (tick 1 answer)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Significantly worsened
2.	Worsened
3.	Same as three years ago
4.	Improved
5.	Significantly improved

*General questions related to state policies targeting Roma*

1. Assess the behaviour of the state towards Roma in the following fields:

Area	No position	Worsens the situation	Does nothing	Improves the situation slightly	Improves the situation	Significantly improves the situation
Education	0	1	2	3	4	5
Employment	0	1	2	3	4	5
Housing	0	1	2	3	4	5
Health	0	1	2	3	4	5
Reduction of stereotypes and prejudices	0	1	2	3	4	5
Prevention of and protection from discrimination	0	1	2	3	4	5
Improvement of the position of the Romani woman	0	1	2	3	4	5
Overcoming poverty	0	1	2	3	4	5
Registering persons without documentation	0	1	2	3	4	5

2. Assess the behaviour of the municipality towards Roma in the following fields:

Area	No position	Worsens the situation	Does nothing	Improves the situation slightly	Improves the situation	Significantly improves the situation
Education	0	1	2	3	4	5
Employment	0	1	2	3	4	5
Housing	0	1	2	3	4	5
Health	0	1	2	3	4	5
Reduction of stereotypes and prejudices	0	1	2	3	4	5
Prevention of and protection from discrimination	0	1	2	3	4	5
Improvement of the position of the Romani woman	0	1	2	3	4	5
Overcoming poverty	0	1	2	3	4	5
Registering persons without documentation	0	1	2	3	4	5

3. **Do you think that the number of persons without documentation in your municipality is:** (tick 1 answer)

0.	I do not know/no answer
1.	Very low (5 to 15 persons)
2.	Low (15 to 30 persons)
3.	High (30-50 persons)
4.	Very high (over 50 persons)

4. **With which of the following statements do you agree?** (tick 1 answer, do not tick if do not know or no answer):

Statement	Yes	No
I know/have heard about activities of the state for solving problems of Roma	1	2
I know/have heard about activities of the municipality for solving problems of Roma	1	2
I know/have heard about National Roma strategy	1	2
I know/have heard about Decade of Roma inclusion 2005/2015	1	2

5. (If the answer is "YES" to at least one of the statements of the previous question) **Where did you get the information from?** (multiple answers possible)

0.	Don't know/no answer
1.	From media (television, newspapers, radio)
2.	From institutions (schools, social centres, etc)
3.	From the Roma Information Centre in the municipality
4.	From a civil society organisation (NGO)
5.	From a political party
6.	From a written document (reports, laws, studies, books, etc)
7.	From internet
8.	Other (specify)

6. (If the answer to the last statement of question 4 is "YES") **What is the Decade of Roma Inclusion in your opinion?** (multiple answers possible)

0.	Don't know/no answer
1.	Funds/money for projects for Roma
2.	Funds/money for distribution among Roma
3.	Programme of a civil society organisation
4.	Programme of a political party
5.	State policy
6.	Declaration of the state committing to solve Roma's problems
7.	Plan of activities for solving Roma's problems
8.	Similar document to the Ohrid Framework Agreement, but for Roma
9.	Way of including Roma in the institutions of the state and municipalities
10.	Other (specify)

7. (If the answer to the last statement of question 4 is “YES”) **To which of the following the Decade of Roma Inclusion should contribute?** (multiple answers possible)

0.	Don't know/no answer
1.	Improvement of Roma's employment
2.	Improvement of Roma's housing
3.	Improvement of Roma's health
4.	Improvement of Roma's education
5.	Overcoming stereotypes and prejudices towards Roma
6.	Improvement of the relations among Roma and non-Roma
7.	Prevention and protection of Roma from discrimination
8.	Improvement of the equity and equality among Roma men and women
9.	Overcoming poverty among Roma
10.	Inclusion of Roma in decision-making in the state/municipality
11.	Collecting information and data about the Romani community
12.	Improvement of the position of Romani political parties
13.	Increase of the activities of the civil society organisations working with Roma
14.	Cooperation with other states for solution of the issues/problems of Roma
15.	Utilization of the European Union funds for the benefit of Roma
16.	Utilization of other donors' funds for the benefit of Roma
17.	Other (specify)

8. (If the answer to the last statement of question 4 is “YES”) **To which of the following has the Decade of Roma Inclusion contributed during the last 2 years?** (multiple answers possible)

0.	Don't know/no answer
1.	Improvement of Roma's employment
2.	Improvement of Roma's housing
3.	Improvement of Roma's health
4.	Improvement of Roma's education
5.	Overcoming stereotypes and prejudices towards Roma
6.	Improvement of the relations among Roma and non-Roma
7.	Prevention and protection of Roma from discrimination
8.	Improvement of the equity and equality among Roma men and women
9.	Overcoming poverty among Roma
10.	Inclusion of Roma in decision-making in the state/municipality
11.	Collecting information and data about the Romani community
12.	Improvement of the position of Romani political parties
13.	Increase of the activities of the civil society organisations working with Roma
14.	Cooperation with other states for solution of the issues/problems of Roma
15.	Utilization of the European Union funds for the benefit of Roma
16.	Utilization of other donors' funds for the benefit of Roma
17.	Other (specify)

9. **Is there anything that we did not ask you and you would like to share?**

## Demographic questions

1. **Name and Surname**
2. **Address**
3. **Contacts (phone, cell-phone, e-mail, etc)**
4. **Sex (tick the number in front of the answer)**

1. male	2. female
---------	-----------

5. **Age group (how old are you?)**

1. 14-18	2. 19-25
----------	----------

3. 26-30	4. 31-40
----------	----------

5. 41-50	6. 51-65
----------	----------

7. Over 65
------------

6. **Marital status**

1. Single	2. Married
-----------	------------

3. Community with partner	4. Lives separately from partner
---------------------------	----------------------------------

5. Divorced	6. Widowed
-------------	------------

7. **Household status**

1. Number of members of the household
2. Number of children in the household (last generation members)
3. Number of adults (parents, siblings of parents) in the household
4. Number of elderly (grandparents) in the household

8. **How is the household sustaining itself financially at the moment?** (read all the possibilities and tick those stated by the interviewee)

0.	Don't know/no answer	
1.	Social assistance	
2.	Salary from employed member in the household	
3.	Pension	
4.	Scholarship	
5.	Other (specify)	

## 9. Educational status

Education	Finished			Last year								Profession
	Yes	No	Studying	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1. Primary	Yes	No	Studying	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	n/a
2. Secondary	Yes	No	Studying	1		2		3		4		
3. Tertiary	Yes	No	Studying	1		2		3		4		
4. MA	Yes	No	Studying	n/a								
5. PHD	Yes	No	Studying	n/a								

## 10. What is your economic situation? (do not read possibilities – explain and tick all the stated by the interviewee)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Unemployed
2.	Employed (indefinite duration)
3.	Employed (fixed duration)
4.	Other (specify)

## 11. What is your activity in the society? (read the possibilities and tick all stated by the interviewee)

0.	Don't know / no answer
1.	Member of a political party
2.	Not a member of a political party
3.	Member of a civil society organisation
4.	Not a member of a civil society organisation
5.	Other (specify)

This report was prepared by a civil society coalition comprising the following organisations: Initiative for Social Change (Skopje), Humanitarian and Charitable Romani Association “Mesečina” (Gostivar), Roma Democratic Development Association “Sonce” (Tetovo), and Roma Education Centre “Ambrela” (Šuto Orizari – Skopje). The lead researcher of the coalition is Eben Friedman (independent consultant) and the project manager is Gordana Rodić-Kitanovski (independent consultant/Roma Education Centre “Ambrela”).

The authors of the report are: Eben Friedman (independent consultant), Ferdi Ismaili (Roma Democratic Development Association “Sonce”), Gordana Rodić-Kitanovski (independent consultant/Roma Education Centre “Ambrela”), Samet Skenderi (Initiative for Social Change), Ljatife Šikovska (Roma Education Centre “Ambrela”), and Muhamed Toči (Humanitarian and Charitable Romani Association “Mesečina”). The following researchers have been involved in the project: Nedime Alievska, Abduselam Arifi, Martina Asanovski, Džengjs Huseini, Samedin Kananoski, Rabija Mamudovska, Irfan Martez, Aida Mustafovska, Šenaj Osmanov, Sabina Ramadanova, Ljatife Šikovska, Ervin Šikovski, Šukri Toči, and Ferizan Zekirov.

The following organisations have been involved in the advising on the report: the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation, the Central European University’s Department of Public Policy, the European Roma Rights Centre, Habitat for Humanity, the Roma Education Fund, and from the Open Society Foundation: Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma program, the Roma Initiatives Office, and the Roma Health program.

In the pilot year of 2012, the Decade Secretariat decided to support reports from civil society coalitions in seven countries (Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, Spain), and the Roma Initiatives Office commissioned an additional report from the Czech Republic. In addition, the Decade Secretariat made a template public in order to encourage additional civil society actors to monitor the implementation of National Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS) and Decade Action Plans.

In the reports, civil society coalitions supplement or present alternative information to Decade Progress Reports submitted by Participating Governments in the Decade of Roma Inclusion and to any reports submitted by State parties to the European Commission on implementation of their NRIS. These reports are not meant to substitute for quantitative monitoring and evaluation by State authorities but to channel local knowledge into national and European policy processes and reflect on the real social impact of government measures. The civil society reports provide additional data to official ones, proxy data where there are no official data, or alternative interpretation of published data.

The project is coordinated by the Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation in cooperation with Open Society Foundation’s Making the Most of EU Funds for Roma program and the Roma Initiatives Office.



## **Decade of Roma Inclusion Secretariat Foundation**

Teréz körút 46.

1066 Budapest, Hungary

[www.romadecade.org](http://www.romadecade.org)