For more than 6 years, EURoma partners have been working together in the exchange of information and projects, mutual learning and elaboration of tools and documents in order to make a better use and increase the impact of Structural Funds on Roma population.

With a view to analysing the work of the Network up to now and to assess the value of such a Network in the future European Structural and Investment Funds programming period, the EURoma Technical Secretariat invited Network partners as well as other relevant stakeholders to share their views (through a questionnaire) on three main topics:

1. Network objectives, activities and results
2. Network composition and functioning
3. The future of the Network and potential challenges

This document includes an analysis of the feedback gathered from respondents, both from the quantitative answers and the additional comments. Annex I provides a detailed overview of the quantitative results.
Analysis of the EURoma network Assessment Questionnaire

 Nº respondents: 19

Respondents: 47% MA; 32% NRCP; 21% Other (international organisms, EC...)

1. Network objectives, activities and results

All respondents agreed on the pertinence of EURoma whose main goal is the promotion of the use of Structural Funds to enhance effectiveness of policies targeting Roma and promoting social inclusion. Indeed EURoma is perceived to serve to better coordinate policies and programmes among MS and also to improve the relationship between MS and EC.

The achievement of EURoma´s objective of promoting a more efficient use of the Structural Funds for Roma inclusion was been widely acknowledged (78%). Some of the reasons behind it is assigned to its focus to involve all stakeholders related to Roma inclusion (MA´s and NRCP); to the presence of the EC in the meetings and the increase of their knowledge on Roma as a result of it; to having covered all sectors related to Roma inclusion and to the visibility efforts and search for political commitment, among others.

For over 70% of partners, EURoma is considered to be useful to identify and respond to concerns, needs and shortcomings of the partners through time. However it is also underlined the difficulty of providing individual responses to the specificity of each MS and for those questions more related to implementation (not so much of concern of current partners).

The assessment of the working lines of EURoma has been very positive raging from the top evaluation of: regular meetings including exchange of information among partners; generation of knowledge (throughout the elaboration of key documents); to a less positive evaluation of dissemination of information (website, newsletter, events...) and timely information on the developments of the EU agenda.

The network outputs have been mostly considered very useful for the partners´ responsibilities and tasks and have specifically served as a reference for the programming period 2014-2020. For over 60% of participants, these outputs have served as tools to reach other stakeholders at national level. Translation of the documents, whenever it happened at national level, has clearly served to make them more accessible and increase their impact. These documents are overall considered to be mainly useful to foster mutual learning and coordination between national EURoma Members (ESF/ERDF MA and NRCP) (95%); to put Roma inclusion in the agenda of Mas, to increase their knowledge on Roma inclusion and to provide experiences, approaches or methodologies (for almost 90% of participants). For around 80%, it has increased the knowledge at national level on, on Structural Funds among those responsible for Roma inclusion and also about EU priorities and guidelines on Roma inclusion/Structural funds. It has also served to agree on common criteria and principles for effective Roma inclusion. “Guides are helpful, particularly to actors who were earlier less exposed to the issue of Roma and ESI funds”.
Where EURoma seems to have had a little less impact is in providing guidelines and orientations in the design and approach of projects, in the criteria for calls for proposals, implementation processes and establishment of partnerships. This aspect could certainly be improved in the future as a key element for achieving greater impact of the network. Another future improvement would be to increase the involvement of partners in the drafting of common documents.

The key questions of whether member’s participation in the network has fed into the work of the institutions they represent, is considered to be a positive one for the majority of the participants (accounting for nearly 80%). However, for over 20% of the respondents this effect has not been much. This is an essential question for the future search of impact of EURoma: to be able to create the needed mechanisms as to guarantee that institutions learn from their participation in the network activities and outcomes, effectively transferring knowledge within the intuitions and among them, going beyond the individual persons attending the meetings.

Very much related to this aspect is the indirect benefit that the participation in EURoma has had in other third actors (other ministries, regional or local administrations, NGOs...), which may be difficult to be assessed. Even though over 60% of respondents believe in its positive impact, for almost 40% this impact has been limited. Again, this can be considered a missing element during this EURoma period and be a matter for improvement in the future.

The overall assessment of whether EURoma learnings have been taken into consideration in the planning process of 2014-2020 ESIF in the member’s respective MAs accounts positively for 66% of total respondents. Many EURoma members seem to have participated directly in the elaboration of OPs for the next programming period and for many certain key network documents, such as “Tackling Roma Needs” have been used as a reference in drafting ESF interventions and have been present throughout the planning process. “It has helped to formulate the problems and the proposed solutions (...) lessons on integrated approach in the context of my country”. Indeed, it is underlined its impact in the planning of the National Roma Strategies and the programming period 2014-2020. However, for 33% of respondents this impact of EURoma learnings into the planning process has not been much. This aspect may be solved by combining different profiles of EURoma participants, combining those with technical competences with those with influence in the decision-making processes in their own countries.

2. Network composition and functioning

The majority of respondents believe that the composition of the network is adequate to fulfill EURoma’s goals. In fact, it is underlined the positive impact of the composition of the network participants profiles, that has served to increase the relationship between public bodies responsible for Roma issues and Structural Funds. There are some references to include the participation of Roma organisations in the network as well as to the need to open the door to regional Mas, given the strong decentralization of some countries. References to the involvement of local administrations as those in charge of the implementation of programmes (as opposed to the lack of implementing competences of MAs) are also mentioned. A greater involvement of decision makers also needs to be taken into consideration for the future.
Regarding the geographical coverage of 12 MS, a wide majority would leave it as it is while around 20% would widen it up. Special mention is done to the Western Balkan countries and other EU MS not present.

There is almost total agreement on the usefulness of the frequency of meetings (2 per year), of the topics addressed in the meetings and of the contribution done by the external participants invited to EURoma meetings. Higher involvement of Roma representatives would be ideal.

As regards the assessment of the specific working model of the network, some respondents refer to the need to organise smaller groups to discuss since plenary session often fail short in fostering debate.

Despite positive opinions about EURoma’s website and newsletter/flashes, there seems to be scope for improvement, mainly referring to having a more regular update of general and country information. In this regard, EURoma participants need to assume this task to feed the web to a greater extend. Dissemination tools need to be designed in a more modern-fashion way and should be issued on a more regular basis.

Regarding the assessment of the Technical Secretariat, it is worth mentioning that 100% of the respondents agreed that its leadership to boost EURoma’s objectives and activities, elaboration of documents, bilateral relationship with partners and co-organisation, coordination and facilitation of meetings and activities has been very good/good. In sum, there seems to be a generalised perception about the high professional performance of the members of the Technical Secretariat, carried out by the Fundación Secretariado Gitano. Still, there is some scope for improvement in their tasks like in the relationship with other stakeholders, experts or networks and the dissemination of information (according to 6% of the respondents).

3. The future of the Network and potential challenges

All respondents show their interest to join EURoma in the 2014-2020 programing period: 33% of them, however, consider their participation most probable and the rest for sure.

The possible continuation of EURoma network in the programming period 2014-2020 is seen undoubtedly as a contribution to strengthen the priorities established in the ESIF Regulations as regards Roma inclusion. In fact, “… the knowledge and know-how gained over the 2007-2013 period will put all members of the up-coming/potential network in a better position to achieve the objectives of the 2014-2020 ESF regulation (among others)”. It would be a very good “… opportunity to rethink and further the use of SF”.

Some respondents claim how EURoma should continue to play a role at EU level while shifting the focus to supporting MS (NRCPs) to have a more active role at national level. However, these combination of tasks between EU work and providing support to MS need to be balanced avoiding focusing too much on individual issues of MS and rather creating common strategies, tools and mechanisms. “EURoma can be more useful in working out common strategies and share good practices than to tackle individual issues of each country”. “(It should) work out a common vision of how Roma issues should be treated, which tools can be the most effective ones, how to use EU funds in the most effective ways…”.
Regarding the future working lines, some opinions refer to the need to increase the exchange of experiences and practices and to scale up the results and findings of the 2007-2013 period.

Some changes in the composition of the network are very much welcome. In fact, around 90% of respondents consider that the future network should combine a technical and a political level, planning and implementation level, for which involving decision-makers in some activities is essential. Having on board more decision-makers from MS should also contribute to achieving greater impact.

Around 90% of respondents agree that EURoma should be opened up to new stakeholders such as Intermediate bodies (IBs), ERDF MAs to a greater extent, among others. An increased participation of NGOs (Roma and non-Roma), regional and even local administrations is also considered to be a positive and necessary advancement for EURoma. The inclusion of some Western Balkan countries should also be envisaged, as well as the remaining EU MS not present so far (France, Germany, UK...), according to 75% of the respondents.

In relation to the working model, some suggestions refer to the possibility to expand the biannual meetings to 3 days to organise open conference with the participation of other relevant stakeholders and/or to take the opportunity to attend a short field trip in the host country to a practice relevant to the topic of the meeting and considered of interest for the rest of participants. By doing this, an exchange platform of relevant practices could be established within EURoma.

Parallel to the biannual meetings, other activities could be organised to deal with specific topics of interest for partners. “Apart from sharing information and dissemination activities... it would be useful to create internship structures in institutions/countries where the most effective progress has been made with the goal of learning from it and implementing it in their home countries”.

Related to future results and outputs, EURoma website could serve as a powerful database with relevant information about the investment of Structural Funds for Roma inclusion in the different MS, facilitating networking. This idea was initially planned but members did not provide enough information to feed the database on a regular basis about relevant projects funded by ESF/ERDF. Given the complexity of such a database, a EURoma data base for the future could rather comprise general and updated information on the state of play of the use of Structural Funds for Roma inclusion in each MS, providing an overall and solid picture of the situation in each MS. More efforts on the part of all members and TS are needed to give light to this expected output of the future network.

Another innovation in the activities for the future could focus on increasing the connection and interlink between the NRSCPs and MAs; in paying special attention to the engagement of municipalities, in drafting brief host country reviews etc..

Other results and outcomes could come from transnational cooperation facilitated by EURoma. However, for many respondents it is still not too clear the allocation of a specific budget for transnational cooperation in the 2014-2020 programming period, where future EURoma network could be included. This is a critical aspect that would need to be solved as soon as possible. Only around 30% of respondents are certain about the existence of such allocation; over 60% cannot yet confirm nor don’t know; 11% confirm they have not. These responses provide an uncertain framework for the continuity of EURoma, especially when taking into consideration the proposals for
the future that would include, among other aspects, the participation of other stakeholders, such as IBs and others, which need to have a budget allocation envisaged.

Parallel to the participation in EURoma meetings and activities, in the future the network could serve “... as a vehicle to promote transnational projects at national, regional or local level. (...).”

The idea that EURoma should have an increased impact at national level in the different participant MS is endorsed by 94% of respondents. One way forward in this regard would directly come from the involvement of higher political level in the network. Indeed, in order to increase this impact at national level, EURoma members’ responsibility is needed: to boost national/regional/local activities in relation to transnational activities, results and outcomes (including translation of key documents into the country language), and to strengthen the still needed collaboration of NRCPs with other key actors. In sum, the greater dissemination of EURoma actions among other stakeholders at national level can be supported by the future network but it certainly also needs from the commitment of the national partners to include such activities as part of their planning and their vision of what it means to be part of EURoma.
**ANNEX 1. QUANTITATIVE RESULTS**

**PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS**

Type of stakeholder

- Managing Authority: 47%
- Public body in charge of Roma policies/National Roma Contact Point: 32%
- Other (European Commission, international organisation, regional/local administration, etc.): 21%

Level of participation in EURoma Network

- Regular: 61%
- Sporadic: 39%
1. NETWORK OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS

1.1. Pertinence of a transnational network such as EURoma whose main goal is to promote the use of the Structural Funds to enhance the effectiveness of policies targeting Roma people and to promote their social inclusion

1.2. To what extent has the Network achieved its objective of promoting a more efficient use of the Structural Funds for Roma inclusion?

1.3. To what extent has the Network been suitable and useful to identify concerns, needs and shortcomings of the partners through time (since its launch in 2007) and to respond to them?
1.4. How do you value the four main working lines of the Network?

 Regular meetings including exchange of information among partners and debates on key topics

- Slightly useful/Not useful at all: 0%
- Useful: 33%
- Very useful: 67%

 Timely information and analysis on relevant developments on the European agenda as concerns Roma inclusion and/or Structural Funds

- Not useful at all: 0%
- Slightly useful: 18%
- Useful: 29%
- Very useful: 53%

 Generation of knowledge (elaboration of documents, reports, position papers and guides)

- Slightly useful/Not useful at all: 0%
- Useful: 50%
- Very useful: 50%

 Dissemination of information (website, newsletter, participation in events, etc.)

- Not useful at all: 0%
- Slightly useful: 12%
- Useful: 35%
- Very useful: 53%
1.5. Were the outputs elaborated within the Network useful for your job responsibilities and tasks? (see [http://www.euromanet.eu/resource_center/search/29963/index_1.html](http://www.euromanet.eu/resource_center/search/29963/index_1.html))

**Position papers**

- The potential contribution of the Structural Funds to National Roma Integration Strategies (2011)

![Bar chart showing the usefulness of position papers](chart1.png)

- Proposals for the future Regulations 2014-2020 (2011)

![Bar chart showing the usefulness of proposals](chart2.png)

**Reports**

- Brief on ethnic data collection (2009)

![Bar chart showing the usefulness of reports](chart3.png)
Coordination and follow up mechanisms of actions aimed at the Roma population supported by Structural Funds (2010)


Analysis of references to the Structural Funds in National Roma Integration Strategies (2012)

The integrated approach of projects and the combination of EU funds to achieve a higher impact of the interventions for the social inclusion of the Roma community (2013)
Guides


1.6. Have these documents/reports/guides served you as tools at national level to reach other stakeholders?

- Yes: 61%
- No: 39%
1.7. In terms of impact, how would you assess the contribution of the EURoma Network to the following objectives?

뇌 To put Roma inclusion on the agenda of the Managing Authorities

뇌 To increase the knowledge on Roma inclusion among Managing Authorities

뇌 To increase the knowledge on Structural Funds among those responsible for Roma inclusion

뇌 To agree on common criteria and principles for effective Roma inclusion
To provide guidelines and orientations in the design and approach of the projects, the criteria for calls for proposals, the implementation process, the partnerships, etc.

To increase the knowledge at national level about EU priorities and guidelines on Roma inclusion and/or Structural Funds

To provide experiences, approaches or methodologies for a more effective use of the Structural Funds for Roma inclusion

To increase awareness at national level on the situation of Roma and the ways to improve the use of Structural Funds at regional/national level
To foster mutual learning and coordination between national EURoma members (ESF/ERDF MA and NRCP)

1.8. Do you think that EURoma members’ participation has had a trigger effect and the knowledge gained in the context of the Network has fed into the work of the institutions they represent?

1.9. Has their participation indirectly benefited other third actors (other Ministries, regional or local administrations, NGOs, etc...)?

1.10. To what extent do you think that the EURoma learning has been taken into consideration in the planning process of the 2014-2020 ESIF in your country?
2. NETWORK COMPOSITION AND FUNCTIONING

2.1. Do you consider that the composition of the Network, involving as members Managing Authorities of Structural Funds on the one hand and public bodies in charge of Roma issues / National Roma Contact Points on the other, is adequate to fulfill the Network’s objective?

![Pie chart showing responses to the question on network composition.]

- Yes: 67%
- No: 33%

2.2. How do you value the geographical coverage of the Network, which currently includes formally 12 EU Member States (Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria) and some others recently invited (Belgium, Croatia, etc.)?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question on geographical coverage.]

- Adequate: 78%
- I would widen it up: 22%
- Too many countries: 0%

2.3. How do you assess the frequency of the regular meetings of partners (2 per year)

![Bar chart showing responses to the question on meeting frequency.]

- Adequate: 94%
- Excessive: 6%
- Low: 0%
2.4. In your opinion, have the topics addressed in the meetings and its outputs (employment, education, ethnic data gathering, partnership, local involvement, National Roma Integration Strategies, programming, models of implementation, coordination models, evaluation and follow up, integrated approach, etc.) been useful for your job responsibilities, duties and your needs at national level?

2.5. Have the external participants invited to EURoma activities contributed to enrich the debate and have provided relevant and key information for the topics addressed (EC, UNDP, WB, COE, regional / local authorities, NGO, Equality bodies, consultants)?

2.6. In general terms, do you consider the working model of the network (2 days meetings in plenary twice a year focus on a specific topic and country monograph, together with the elaboration of regular documents) useful and adequate for its objectives?
2.7. Do you think that EURoma is a visible and well-known network at European level as a result of its work and dissemination actions?

![Bar chart showing percentage of responses to visibility of EURoma](chart1.png)

2.8. What is your opinion about EURoma´s website [www.euromanet.eu](http://www.euromanet.eu) in terms of contents, accessibility, usefulness...?

![Pie chart showing percentage of responses to website](chart2.png)

2.9. What is your opinion about EURoma´s newsletters/flashes in terms of content, usefulness and frequency?

![Pie chart showing percentage of responses to newsletters](chart3.png)
2.10. Assessment of the work carried out by the Technical Secretariat (Fundación Secretariado Gitano) in the following fields?

- Leadership and boost of EURoma’s objectives and activities
  - 76% Very good
  - 24% Good
  - 0% Poor/Very poor

- Co-organisation, coordination and facilitation of activities and working sessions
  - 76% Very good
  - 24% Good
  - 0% Poor/Very poor

- Elaboration of documents
  - 78% Very good
  - 22% Good
  - 0% Poor/Very poor

- Influencing stakeholders: relationship with other stakeholders or experts, other networks
  - 59% Very good
  - 35% Good
  - 6% Poor
  - 0% Very poor
3. THE FUTURE OF THE NETWORK AND POTENTIAL CHALLENGES

3.1. Do you consider that the continuation of EURoma network in the programming period 2014-2020 will contribute to strengthen the priorities established in the ESIF Regulations as regards Roma inclusion?
3.2. In your opinion, would your country / administration be interested in joining a transnational network such as EURoma, whose main goal is to promote a more efficient use of the ESIF for Roma inclusion, in the 2014-2020 programming period?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question]

Most probably no: 0%
No: 0%
Most probably yes: 33%
Yes: 67%

3.3. Has your country / administration already foreseen the allocation of a specific budget for transnational cooperation in the 2014-2020 programming period, where the participation in the future EURoma network could be included?

![Pie chart showing responses to the question]

- Yes: 28%
- No: 11%
- Not yet: 33%
- Don't know: 28%

3.4. EURoma Network has involved technical staff representing Managing Authorities and public bodies in charge of Roma issues / NRCP. Do you consider that the future Network should combine technical and political level, involving in some activities decision-makers?

![Pie chart showing responses to the question]

- Yes: 89%
- No: 11%
3.5. Would you be interested in opening up the network to other stakeholders (for example, IBs, ERDF MA to a greater extend, beneficiaries…) or other countries?

3.6. Do you think that EURoma should have an increased impact at national level in the different network countries?