

Making the most of EU funds

*Compendium of good practice EU funded
projects for Roma people*

Brian Harvey,

Project for Open Society Institute,

Sofia, Bulgaria, June 2007

Why this, now?

- ▶ We need to know *What works?*
- ▶ So as to replicate, scale up, extend
- ▶ We need to avoid what does *not* work
- ▶ Identify role for funders alongside EU
- ▶ Funding guide also done

Method

Requests for good practice from Commission,
Roma networks, others funders (e.g. UNDP)

Identify good practice using international standards

Request for evaluative material

Good practice: funds

- ▶ EQUAL
- ▶ European Social Fund (ESF)
- ▶ European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)
- ▶ Social Exclusion Programme (SEP)
- ▶ Community Programme against Discrimination
- ▶ Culture programme
- ▶ Health programme
- ▶ *Leonardo*
- ▶ PHARE
- ▶ CARDS
- ▶ European Initiative Democracy & Human Rights (EIDHR)

47 examples

► Main countries

- Romania, Bulgaria, Czech Rep, Slovakia, Hungary
- Neighbouring states, principally FYROM
- Fewer in EU15. Best represented: Spain

► Limited range of programmes

- EQUAL
- Then ESF, PHARE, CARDS
- None URBAN, cross-border

► Very few published outcomes.

Case study comments

- ▶ A lot of labour market training, social service development
- ▶ Minority tackle 'hard' issues
- ▶ Some leave a legacy
- ▶ Some leave a added value (social economy)
- ▶ Few build organizational capacity, leaders
- ▶ Most are single-phase
- ▶ Few offer learning points, self-analysis
- ▶ Different approaches to labour market
- ▶ Gender issues in a small number
- ▶ Some address broader EU agenda e.g. environment, energy
- ▶ Innovation most apparent in EQUAL
- ▶ Use of cultural mediators in several projects

Evaluations

- ▶ Several PHARE evaluations now available
- ▶ Consistent criticisms:
 - Insufficient scale for problem
 - Too short time scales, spread too wide & thin
 - Top-down, isolated interventions, lacking Roma participation, rushed preparation
 - High entry, continuation barriers
 - Lack sustainability
 - No connexion to govt policy or institutions
 - Mono-dimensionality

But evaluations show *What works*

- ▶ When part of broader policy framework
- ▶ With institutional support from government
- ▶ Bottom up, participatory, partnership approach
- ▶ Significant scale, building capacity
- ▶ Global grants (CZ, SK), Intermediary Funding Bodies (IFBs), technical assistance (HU) work
- ▶ Multidimensionality works
- ▶ Focus on issues, addressing inequalities of power
- ▶ Evaluation, dissemination
- ▶ Linked to wider national, European networks

Good and bad funding programmes

▶ Good: EIDHR

- Rights-based approach

▶ Good: EQUAL

- Partnership, empowerment, focus, discrimination & gender, innovation, trans-nationality, *scale* (€1m/project), linkages

▶ CARDS

- Innovation, 'hard' issues, focus, legacy

▶ SEP: serious problems of visibility, dissemination, raising strategic issues

▶ Programme against discrimination *was* successfully re-focussed around judicial, administrative, political system

Problems of programme management

- ▶ No system of collective analysis of lessons arising for Roma programmes
- ▶ No place or system where lessons can be heard, absorbed (HLG? ISG? Capacity? Authority?)
- ▶ Lessons have *not* been learned:

EQUAL, to be abandoned

SEP outcomes not improved, despite 2005 evaluation

Striking a balance report on funding?

Social economy downgraded

Global grants, technical assistance, IFBs in 2007-2013?

Problem of programme values

► Current programming values:

- One-shot applications
- Technical compliance
- High level administrative skills
- Compliance as supreme administrative attribute
- Quantitative monitoring
- Ability to withstand cash-flow, delay, uncertainty

► Instead, we need:

- Two-stage application process
- More *qualitative* monitoring, evaluation, dissemination with proportionate accounting

Conclusion: What is good practice?

- ▶ Adequate preparation time
- ▶ Roma community as stakeholders
- ▶ Bottom-up, empowering approach
- ▶ Partnership
- ▶ Multidimensionality
- ▶ Policy and thematic focus
- ▶ Institutional linkages
- ▶ Evaluation
- ▶ Dissemination
- ▶ National networks, transnationality
- ▶ Innovation

And...

What is good practice? (2)

- ▶ Address root causes
- ▶ Deal with harder political issues as well as softer social ones
- ▶ Rights-based approach
- ▶ Leaving a legacy
- ▶ Capacity-building
- ▶ Leadership development

Bad practice

- ▶ Rushed preparation to meet deadlines
- ▶ Absence of, or only token consultation
- ▶ Top down approach
- ▶ Lack of NGO-government mix
- ▶ Mono-dimensionality
- ▶ Lack of policy dimensions
- ▶ Lack of connexions to government
- ▶ No evaluation, dissemination
- ▶ Absence of new thinking
- ▶ Isolation from rest of country, Europe, not networked
- ▶ Focus on 'soft' issues, no rights base
- ▶ Addressing symptoms, not causes
- ▶ No legacy
- ▶ No leadership, capacity development

General conclusions

- Good programme design = good projects
- Programmes get the projects they deserve
- Culture of programme design and subsequent operation *does* matter
- Bad procedures drive out those community-based organizations most likely to deliver good projects
- We need to find ways of bringing in those most likely to deliver good practice

This means...(1)

- ▶ Reduce entry barriers. Instead, initial phases which value consultation, preparation, bottom-up approach, Roma involvement
- ▶ Reduce operational barriers esp. nature of financial compliance
- ▶ *Scale* for sufficient size (e.g. EQUAL), *length* (5 to 7 years). *Should* be possible in FP 2007-2013.
- ▶ Make policy demands on participants e.g. analyze, report, bring issues into heart of political system

This means...(2)

- ▶ Supervisory systems to ensure outcomes are disseminated
- ▶ Explain to member states what is expected of them, so policies can be uploaded
- ▶ System to identify, incentivize good practice (Roma Education Fund does this)
- ▶ Use the technical systems which promote good practice: global grants, IFBs, technical assistance

Finally, for other funders

- ▶ Role for helping with proposals, build NGO capacity, dissemination, ineligible spending, cash flow crises, leadership etc
- ▶ But: leaves programmes unreformed
- ▶ So, consider supporting Roma groups to:
 - Analyze, evaluate EU funding systems
 - Empower as a voice of critical opinion
 - Develop capacity to work with govt, EU to improve programme design & operation

▶ *Thank you!*