



**Transition Assistance and Institutional Building
(IPA Component I) National Programme 2011**



Local Integration of Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and Minority Groups

Contract No.: 12-8715/1

**REPORT ON STATE OF SERVICE DELIVERY WITHIN
LOCAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTITUTIONS
Final – 15 September 2016**

Date 15/09/2016



This project is funded by
the European Union

The project is implemented
in a consortium led by





This project is funded by the European Union
LOCAL INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES,
INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS
AND MINORITY GROUPS



REPORT ON STATE OF SERVICE DELIVERY WITHIN LOCAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTITUTIONS

Final – 15 September 2016



This project is funded by the European Union
LOCAL INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES,
INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS
AND MINORITY GROUPS



The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of EPTISA and its consortium partners and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.



DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Project Name:	Local Integration of Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and Minority Groups
Reference No:	EuropeAid/136616/IH/SER/MK
Contracting Authority:	Central Financing and Contracting Department, Ministry of Finance, Republic of Macedonia
Beneficiaries:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP); • Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio; • Secretariat for European Affairs (SEA) • Roma Information Centres (RICs); • National Coordinative Body for Implementation of Strategy and Decade for Roma; • Local self-government units; • Employment Service Agency; • Civil society organizations active in the field of Roma issues, refugees and internally displaced persons.
Consultant:	Eptisa in consortium with CARE, MCIC and Roma Education Fund
Report:	Report on state of service delivery within local public administration institutions
Project activity:	Activity 2.1 – Analysis of the current state of service delivery of the local public administration institutions (such as, infrastructure, housing, social inclusion, employment, health, education, etc.) and identifying the priorities for urgent action at the local level, as well recommendations for improvement of service delivery
Project output #:¹	18. Report on state of service delivery within local public administration institutions

¹ As per the numbering of outputs made in Chapter 12 of the project's Inception Report



PROJECT SYNOPSIS

Programme Name:	Transition Assistance and Institutional Building (IPA Component I)		
Project Name:	Local Integration of Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and Minority Groups		
Reference No:	EuropeAid/136616/IH/SER/MK		
Contract Number:	12-8715/1		
Project Duration:	18 months		
Project Commencement Date:	11 January 2016		
Project End Date:	11 July 2017		
Name:	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP)	Central Financing and Contracting Department (CFCD), Ministry of Finance	EPTISA SOUTHEAST EUROPE doo
Role:	<i>Beneficiary</i>	<i>Contracting Authority</i>	<i>Contractor</i>
Address:	Dame Gruev 14	Dame Gruev 12	Orce Nikolov 74
Telephone:	+389 2 311 0700	+389 2 3255 404	+389 2 311 99 07
Fax:	+389 2 311 0700	+389 2 3255 374	+389 2 311 99 89
E-mail:	GMustafova@mtsp.gov.mk	Radica.Koceva@finance.gov.mk	bpetak@eptisa.com
Contact Person:	Gjulten Mustafova	Radica Koceva	Bojan Petak
Overall Objective:	To enhance the state administration and implementation capacities for further strengthening and supporting the local integration process and inclusion of the residential and / or non-residential displaced persons (refugees and internally displaced) and minority groups (Roma), as well increasing the sustainability of their reliance.		
Purpose:	To contribute in supporting the process of residential and / or non-residential displaced persons in their access for provision of comprehensive state administration services, increase self-reliance via participation and inclusion of the displaced persons in the society, as well as improve the quality of life and access to rights and services for social inclusion of the Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian communities in the country.		
Expected Results:	<p><u>Component 1: Support to the implementation of national and local public policies for Roma inclusion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implemented training plan for capacity building of relevant institutions on the Local Action Plans (LAPs) within the implementation of the Roma Strategy and Decade; ○ Enhanced capacity for all the relevant stakeholders for implementation of Roma Strategy and Decade and memorandum for cooperation with the municipalities; ○ Local Action Plans for Roma implemented. <p><u>Component 2: Institutional Capacity Building and Access to Labour Market for refugees and IDPs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased capacity of state institutions and policy makers to deliver integration policies and facilitate access to services; ○ Achieved economic sustainability; ○ Increased employability; ○ Gained experience and best practices in the area of refugee integration. 		



Key Activities:	<p>Component I: Support to the implementation of national and local public policies for Roma inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Activity 1: Supporting the national institutional structure of the Strategy for Roma and Decade of Roma Inclusion;○ Activity 2: Supporting the local institutional structure for creation and implementation of Roma policies; <p>Component 2: Institutional Capacity Building and Access to Labour Market for refugees and IDPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Activity 3: Institutional capacity building and access to labour market for refugees and IDPs.
Key Stakeholders:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Unit for Implementation of the Strategy and Decade for Roma (UISDR), MLSP● Unit for Migration, Asylum, and Humanitarian Aid (UMAHA), MLSP
Target Groups:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● MLSP (UISDR and UMAHA)● Cabinet of the Minister without Portfolio● National Coordinating Body for Implementation of Strategy and Decade for Roma● Local self-government units● Employment Service Agency● Civil society organizations active in the field of Roma issues, refugees and internally displaced persons



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
1. INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 Purpose of report	11
1.2 Methodology	12
2. STATE OF SERVICE DELIVERY	13
2.1 Education.....	13
2.1.1 Preschool education	13
2.1.2 Primary education	14
2.1.3 Special education	15
2.2 Employment	16
2.2.1 Attention to Roma in government policies and programmes	16
2.2.2 Unemployment in the pilot municipalities.....	16
2.2.3 Engagement of relevant institutions.....	20
2.2.4 Main sources of income	21
2.2.5 Barriers hindering the employment of Roma.....	21
2.2.5.1 Low levels of education and vocational training.....	21
2.2.5.2 Discrimination by potential employers.....	22
2.2.5.3 Lack of access to information about employment opportunities.....	22
2.2.6 Obstacles particularly affecting Roma women	23
2.2.6.1 Patriarchal values.....	23
2.2.6.2 Access to child care services	23
2.3 Health	23
2.3.1 Health situation of the Roma population	23
2.3.1.1 Health situation of Roma women and children	24
2.3.2 Relations between local public health institutions and Roma communities.....	25
2.3.3 Initiatives affecting the health situation of the local Roma community	25
2.4 Housing and infrastructure	26
2.4.1 Conditions in Roma settlements	26
2.4.2 Legal status	26
2.4.3 Relevant initiatives.....	27
3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28



3.1	Conclusions	28
3.1.1	Education	28
3.1.2	Employment	28
3.1.3	Health	28
3.1.4	Housing and infrastructure	29
3.2	Recommendations	29
3.2.1	Education	29
3.2.2	Employment	30
3.2.3	Health	31
3.2.4	Housing and infrastructure	31
3.2.5	General recommendations	32
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	33
	ANNEX 1: RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	36
	ANNEX 2: STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED	38



This project is funded by the European Union
LOCAL INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES,
INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS
AND MINORITY GROUPS



ABBREVIATIONS

CSO	Civil Society Organization
ESA	Employment Service Agency
EU	European Union
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IT	Information technology
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
RIC	Roma Information Centre
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context

An analysis of the current state of service delivery of the local public administration institutions was carried out in the following 12 municipalities: Berovo, Bitola, Chair, Delchevo, Gostivar, Kochani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Shtip, Shuto Orizari, Tetovo and Vinica.

Key findings

- The state of service delivery of the local public administration institutions varies both by thematic area and by municipality.
- There is broad consensus that progress in the area of education has outstripped advances in other areas where the inclusion of Roma is concerned, yet challenges persist at all levels.
- In the 12 municipalities as elsewhere, the majority of unemployed Roma registered with the Employment Service Agency has not completed primary education, such that they are not eligible for employment and self-employment measures offered in the framework of programmes of the Employment Service Agency
- Although most Roma have health insurance, access to health care is often limited by poverty.
- The level of investment required to bring improvements in Roma's housing situation means that housing problems are often viewed as intractable in the pilot municipalities, with conditions in segregated settlements generally worse than in integrated neighbourhoods.

Recommendations:

Education

1. Expand access to pre-school education, establishing additional facilities as needed.
2. Combat the effects of poverty on education through targeted after-school programmes.
3. Continue reducing the number of Roma in special education.
4. Research and address discrimination in education.

Employment

5. Increase access to basic qualifications, facilitating completion of primary education for adults and introducing certification programmes for recognition of skills.
6. Promote social entrepreneurship through adoption of relevant legislation.
7. Improve targeting and outreach in relation to employment measures.

Health

8. Ensure availability of gynaecological services sufficient to meet objective demand.
9. Integrate Roma health mediators into the health system administration.
10. Sanction and prevent discrimination in healthcare services.

Housing and infrastructure

11. Assess prospects for legalizing Roma settlements as a basis for targeted measures.
12. Monitor the process of housing legalization and provide remedies where needed.
13. Promote residential integration through concrete housing measures and awareness raising.

General recommendations

14. Increase availability of ethnically disaggregated data.
15. Bring national-level policies for Roma to local level through adoption of local action plans.
16. Establish local coordinating bodies as foreseen in the Strategy for Roma 2014-2020.
17. Eliminate parallel facilities for Roma and municipal level.
18. Promote the continued development of Roma Information Centres.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to present the results of an analysis of the current state of service delivery of the local public administration institutions in 12 municipalities: Berovo, Bitola, Chair, Delchevo, Gostivar, Kochani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Shtip, Shuto Orizari, Tetovo and Vinica.² Focusing on the areas of education, employment, health, and housing and infrastructure while treating to issues of gender as cross-cutting, the report provides a narrative overview drawing on field research in the selected municipalities as well as available statistical data. Additionally, the main section of the report includes thematic tables of relevant data for all municipalities not only for the purpose of comparison among municipalities on the selected indicators, but also as a contribution to the assessment of the availability of such data. This overview serves in turn as the basis for identifying priorities for urgent action at the local level in the areas covered. These priorities further ground a set of recommendations on steps to be taken to improve service delivery with an eye to increasing the social inclusion of Roma at the local level.

The report and the findings of the analysis on which it is based are also intended to lay the analytical foundations for later activities to be undertaken in municipalities covered by the analysis. First, the recommendations generated on this basis of this analysis will be presented in a policy advice paper to be distributed to relevant municipal representatives in advance of a series of workshops focusing on approaches to the design and implementation of local policies targeting Roma. At least some of the participants in these workshops are expected also to become members of the local coordinating bodies to be established in the selected municipalities in the framework of the project for the purpose of improving cross-sectoral coordination and establishing a mechanism for networking to address and assist in coping with the challenges facing the Roma population in social inclusion at the local level. These bodies will in turn play a leading role in developing new local action plans (LAPs) for Roma in line with the Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2014-2020 and the corresponding National Action Plans (see Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika 2014; 2015; 2016a; 2016b; 2016c; 2016d).

This report (Output 18) contributes to the implementation of Activity 2.1 (“Analysis of the current state of service delivery of the local public administration institutions (such as, infrastructure, housing, social inclusion, employment, health, education, etc.) and identifying the priorities for urgent action at the local level, as well recommendations for improvement of service delivery”). The other output under this Activity (EPTISA 2016b) provides detailed information on the selection criteria, their application, and the results of the application of these criteria for the purpose of identifying the 12 municipalities listed above and the corresponding Roma communities to be targeted for the creation and implementation of Roma policies.

² For information on the criteria used in the selection of municipalities for inclusion in the project and the current analysis, see EPTISA (2016c).

1.2 Methodology

The information contained in this report was gathered using both primary and secondary research. The scope of the secondary research was limited by the virtual absence of analyses of local-level service delivery in Macedonia³ and the fact that the LAPs for Roma adopted to date had expired in all municipalities except Gostivar and Kumanovo without being replaced.⁴ While the secondary research also included a review of the regional development programmes for the five planning regions in which the 12 pilot municipalities are located, the two programmes in which Roma received mention had also expired by 2014.⁵ As a result, the secondary research drew mostly on reports and policy documents focusing primarily on the national level. This limitation of the secondary research lends particular importance to the primary research conducted for the purposes of the analysis.

The primary research conducted in the framework of this analysis consisted of 28 semi-structured interviews with a total of 48 stakeholders in 12 municipalities and 11 focus groups in as many municipalities.⁶ The main categories of interlocutors for the interviews included representatives of local administration in the areas of education, employment, health, and housing and infrastructure; the employees of Roma Information Centres (RICs); and representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs).⁷ Focus groups, on the other hand, were used to probe the views of a total of 108 Roma on the situation of their local communities in the areas of education, employment, health, and housing and infrastructure.

³ An important exception in this regard is Maja Gerovska Mitev's *Holistic Analysis of Development Challenges in the Four Pilot Municipalities: Kumanovo, Tetovo, Prilep and Suto Orizari and Provision of the Missing Baseline Data that Will Assist Local Authorities to Set Relevant Targets in the Local Roma Action Plans* (Gerovska Mitev 2013). As the title suggests, however, the analysis covers only four municipalities.

⁴ For the LAPs in force as of 2016, see Opština Gostivar (2012) and Opština Kumanovo (2012). An overview discussion of the approaches taken to local policies for Roma in Macedonia to date is provided in EPTISA (2016a).

⁵ The two regional development programmes in which Roma receive mention are the *Program for Development of the North-Eastern Planning Region 2009-2014* (IDEA O.K. 2009) and the *Development Program of Polog Planning Region 2009-2013* (Centre for Development of Polog Planning Region 2010). There is no reference to Roma in the corresponding programmes for Eastern, Pelagonia, or Skopje planning regions (see Centar za razvoj na Istočniot planski region 2014; Centar za razvoj na Pelagonskiot planski region 2014; Sovet za razvoj na Skopski planski region 2010), or in the *Strategy for Regional Development of the Republic of Macedonia 2009-2019* (Sobranie na Republika Makedonija 2009).

⁶ Whereas interviews were conducted in Berovo, Bitola, Chair, Delchevo, Gostivar, Kochani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Shtip, Shuto Orizari, Tetovo and Vinica, focus groups were held in all municipalities except Tetovo.

⁷ For a list of stakeholders interviewed in preparing this report, please see Annex 2.

2. STATE OF SERVICE DELIVERY

This section provides an analysis of the situation in the 12 pilot municipalities in the thematic areas of education, employment, health, and housing and infrastructure. In each sub-section, documentary research is supplemented with findings from the field research conducted in preparing this report. While no claim can be made to exhaustiveness, an observation made in the course of research on four municipalities in 2013 applies similarly to the 12 municipalities covered by the present report: “Providing holistic analysis on vulnerable Roma population and their challenges is impossible due to lack of official data based on ethnic affiliation” (Gerovska Mitev 2013: 29)

2.1 Education

Among the representatives of institutions and CSOs, as well as among the members of local Roma communities participating in the interviews and focus groups conducted in preparing this report, there was broad consensus that progress in the area of education has outstripped advanced in other areas where the inclusion of Roma is concerned. Nonetheless, challenges still exist, particularly at the level of primary education. At this level, Roma children encounter specific difficulties that affect enrolment and attendance rates, quality of education and enrolment to secondary school. Despite the pressures introduced through the legal regulations for compulsory primary and secondary education, the right to employment and social assistance, many Roma children still remain outside the educational process.

One factor in explaining this state of affairs is the expenses which parents are expected to cover (e.g., textbooks, bus tickets, learning materials, uniforms for some schools, practical work). Also contributing are space constraints in many Roma households, as a result of which Roma children from primary and secondary school lack an appropriate place for completing homework assignments. A further problem is child labour, with some parents expecting children to participate in income-generating activities, sometimes during school hours. Finally, some Roma parents do not see the completion of secondary education as leading to employment, leading them to channel their children into crafts or professions (ex. playing instruments) based on apprenticeship rather than formal education.

2.1.1 Preschool education

Covering all pilot municipalities, the project “Inclusion of Roma Children in Public Pre-Schools” generally received high marks from participants in the focus groups and interviews held in preparing this report. The project, which is implemented by municipal authorities in partnership with the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP) and supported by the Roma Education Fund, has led to an increase in enrolment rates among Roma children, from 1.5 percent in 2005 to four percent in 2015.

Although this is a significant increase, the percentage of Roma children that are included in preschool institutions remains more than six times lower than the national average of around 26 percent. Given the proven benefits of early education for children from marginalized and vulnerable communities (see, for example, Barnett 1995; Dahlberg, Moss & Pence 1999), the continuing low enrolment rates among Roma at this level of education are problematic.

Beyond the high overall level of satisfaction with the implementation and results of the pre-school project, the field research undertaken in preparing this report revealed outstanding needs including full institutionalization to secure sustainability; increasing enrolment in pre-school education among Roma; and ensuring that transportation is provided also in the summer months to maximize the benefits of kindergarten for children.

2.1.2 Primary education

While nine years of primary education are compulsory for all citizens, the information gathered in the course of the field research suggests that this requirement is often not enforced. Stakeholders participating in the focus groups and interviews held in preparing this report pointed to primary education as the most fragile part of the educational process of Roma children. More specifically, in almost all municipalities it was reported (mostly but not exclusively by representatives of Roma CSOs) that the dropout rate of Roma children is highest in the primary schools.

Table 1 below provides data on enrolment in and completion of primary education among Roma in the 12 pilot municipalities. As shown in the table, girls account for close to half of all Roma enrolled in primary education in all municipalities except for Gostivar, where they constitute over 60 percent of all enrolled Roma children. At the same time, trends in participation of Roma girls relative to Roma boys in the course of primary education vary among the pilot municipalities. More specifically, whereas sizeable increases are apparent in Berovo, Bitola, Chair, Delchevo, and Shtip, considerable drops in the presence of Roma girls between enrolment and completion of primary education are observable in Gostivar, Kochani, Prilep, and Vinica.

The main factors in high dropout rates among Roma are related to poverty. The direct costs of participation in education (e.g., books, school supplies, and clothing) are often beyond what Roma families can afford. Additionally, poor housing conditions mean that many Roma households lack a suitable place for completion of homework assignments. Further, in many families living in poverty children are expected to contribute to family earnings and/or to care for younger siblings, with seasonal work (e.g., picking crops, collecting recyclables) causing some parents to withdraw their children from school before the end of the school year. Given the role of poverty in explaining low participation in education among Roma, the imposition of the fines foreseen in legislation for truancy is not an effective way of ensuring compliance. On the positive side, a pilot project involving after-school tutoring with ethnically mixed groups in the later years of primary education and implemented as a cooperative effort of the Ministry of Education and Science on the one hand and Roma CSOs on the other with support from the Roma Education Fund shows promise for reducing dropout rates.

Table 1. Roma’s participation in primary education in selected municipalities (2014-2015 school year)

MUNICIPALITY	ENROLMENT		COMPLETION	
	Total Roma	Of which girls	Total Roma	Of which girls
Berovo	62	50%	4	75%
Bitola	529	47%	23	65%
Chair	584	50%	41	59%
Delchevo	86	52%	10	70%
Gostivar	340	61%	38	50%
Kochani	250	45%	19	32%
Kumanovo	360	48%	23	43%
Prilep	764	48%	44	36%
Shtip	409	48%	24	58%
Shuto Orizari	2479	48%	164	46%
Tetovo	267	48%	18	50%
Vinica	177	54%	12	42%

Source: State Statistical Office

Another barrier to Roma children’s education is discrimination. Discrimination against Roma in education usually takes the form of vulgar behaviour and verbal insults, appearing more rarely in the form of refusal to provide services. The focus groups with local community members organized in preparing this report revealed discriminatory practices such as placement of Roma children in separate classes from non-Roma and “white flight”, by which ethnic Macedonian parents withdraw their children from the school with a majority of Roma pupils. Available information suggests that discrimination against Roma in education is seldom reported.

Some practices common in local Roma communities also exert a negative influence on Roma children’s education. Closely related to poverty, low levels of education among Roma parents sometimes lead to unfavourable perceptions of the benefits of education for their children. Perhaps more troubling is the apparent increasing frequency of underage marriages, with cases of Roma girls effectively sold as brides at the age of 12 or 13 reported by representatives of CSOs in Bitola, Kumanovo, Shuto Orizari, and Shtip. Meetings with representatives of health institutions revealed cases of 16 year-old Roma girls with as many as four children. To date, initiatives to report on and combat underage marriage have come exclusively from CSOs.

2.1.3 Special education

Placement of Roma in special education for children with mental disability without appropriate assessment was noted in Chair and Shuto Orizari.⁸ Whereas enrolment in special education requires that special needs be diagnosed and categorized by an expert commission, this requirement is often ignored. Additionally, when testing takes place, it is usually conducted in a language which is not

⁸ Previous research yielded similar findings for a larger number of municipalities, including (but not limited to) Bitola, Delchevo, Kochani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Shtip, and Vinica. See Misijata na OBSE vo Skopje and Komisija za zaštita od diskriminacija (2014).

the first language of the Roma child. As a result, non-disabled Roma children are sometimes placed in education which is not only ill-suited to their abilities, but also stigmatizing in the present and limiting for future education and employment.

2.2 Employment

2.2.1 Attention to Roma in government policies and programmes

Notwithstanding slight improvements in recent years, Roma people still have an unemployment rate which is almost double compared to the national average and even higher among Roma women (Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika 2014). Taking this situation into account, the National Strategy for Roma 2014-2020 includes among its key priorities improving employability and reducing unemployment among Roma.

Although the National Strategy for Employment 2016-2020 does not recognize Roma as a vulnerable group that needs to be addressed with specific measures (Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika 2015b), Roma are targeted explicitly in two measures of the 2016 Operational Plan for Employment: Service 6.7 “Activation of persons at risk for social exclusion” and in the measure 3.2 “On-the-job training with subsidized employment” (Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika 2016d). As will be elaborated below, however, the requirement of completed primary education for participation in any of the measures within the Operational Plan for Employment effectively excludes many Roma. Thus, in 2015 Roma accounted for approximately three percent of all beneficiaries of government employment programmes, with Roma women underrepresented relative to Roma men by a ratio of more than two to one (EPTISA 2016a: 15).

2.2.2 Unemployment in the pilot municipalities

Tables 2 and 3 below provide information on unemployed Roma in each of the 12 pilot municipalities, broken down by level of education and gender. The data presented in Table 1 correspond to unemployed persons who have registered with the Employment Service Agency (ESA) as active job-seekers, a status which on the one hand allows them access to the active labour market measures offered through the ESA and on the other hand requires them to report to ESA or the local Employment Centre on a monthly basis to prove that they are actively looking for work. By way of contrast, Table 3 contains data on “other” job-seekers, who check in every six months and cannot participate in active labour market measures.⁹

Taken together, the data in the two tables point to two immediate causes for concern. The first one is that the majority of the registered unemployed Roma has not completed primary education, which practically leaves them out of all available programmes and measures for employment/self-

⁹ For more detailed information on the administrative division of the unemployed into active and “other” job seekers and on how this division has affected Roma, see EPTISA (2016b).

employment. The second one is that there is a significant gender gap in the number of registered unemployed Roma women, again meaning that a considerably larger share of Roma women is not eligible for the existing government measures.

Table 2. Roma active job-seekers in the by level of education and gender as of 31 May 2016

Municipality	Total		Without education and incomplete primary		Incomplete secondary		Completed secondary		Higher education		University		MA &PhD	
	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women
Berovo	141	54	104	35	15	6	19	10	0	0	3	3	0	0
Bitola	409	196	390	186	5	2	13	8	0	0	1	0	0	0
Chair	218	98	194	94	12	1	9	2	0	0	3	1	0	0
Delchevo	85	34	66	28	3	0	15	5	0	0	1	1	0	0
Gostivar	417	121	344	101	17	1	52	16	1	1	3	2	0	0
Kochani	272	89	251	84	13	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kumanovo	404	122	349	103	17	4	36	15	0	0	2	0	0	0
Prilep	767	320	726	305	11	5	29	9	0	0	1	1	0	0
Shtip	268	124	251	116	6	1	8	6	0	0	3	1	0	0
Shuto Orizari	1125	404	949	370	105	12	70	22	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tetovo	258	88	199	67	16	2	37	18	2	0	3	1	1	0
Vinica	161	42	151	38	2	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3. Roma “other” job seekers by level of education and gender as of 31 May 2016

Municipality	Total		Without education and incomplete primary		Incomplete secondary		Completed secondary		Higher education		University		MA &PhD	
	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women	total	women
Berovo	48	24	37	20	1	0	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bitola	264	160	253	154	4	2	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chair	232	98	195	83	25	8	11	6	1	1	0	0	0	0
Delchevo	66	38	48	31	5	0	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gostivar	107	46	94	42	7	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kochani	165	90	158	87	4	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kumanovo	177	93	154	87	11	3	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prilep	562	345	550	336	3	3	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shtip	222	102	211	97	5	2	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
Shuto Orizari	714	311	561	249	97	29	55	33	1	0	0	0	0	0
Tetovo	81	24	69	21	3	1	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vinica	77	51	71	49	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4 below provides an overview of the inclusion of Roma in active measures and services in the 12 pilot municipalities. As the data in the table show, the majority of the measures and services accessed relate to support in finding employment and/or trainings. The share of participants actually employed or self-employed through these measures and services is much smaller.

Table 4. Inclusion of Roma in active measures and services in the pilot municipalities

Employment Measures	Total Roma beneficiaries
Motivation trainings	416
Support for job search	108
Community works programme	43
Self-employment and formalization	13
Support for active job search and professional orientation	10
Internship	8
Training for skills that are deficient on the labour market	7
Subsidized employment	6
Professional orientation and career advices	6
Training for known employer	6
Training for skills that are deficient on the labour market with subsidized employment (training)	5
Preparation for work and employment	4
Training for skills that are deficient on the labour market with subsidized employment (subsidy)	3
IT and languages training	1
Self-employment (additional 1 employment)	1
Education for business start-up	/
Programme for subsidized employment of tenant farmers	/

2.2.3 Engagement of relevant institutions

The involvement and active role of local government in addressing the employment situation of Roma varies across the pilot municipalities. In some municipalities, according to interviewed representatives, there is a close cooperation with the Employment Centres and RICs, while in others the situation is perceived to be a matter to be addressed by the Employment Centre only, with the municipality having no competences in this area.

As part of the services for activation of persons living under social risk, local Employment Centres, in cooperation with UNDP-engaged mentors and RICs, have organized informative sessions in order to present the available measures within the Operational Plan and to motivate Roma to take part in those measures. In 2015, informative sessions were organized in Berovo, Bitola, Chair

(Topaana), Delchevo, Gostivar, Kochani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Shtip, Shuto Orizari, Tetovo, and Vinica. Among the concerns raised in relation to the sessions by participants in the field research conducted in preparing this report was the need for more detailed information on relevant measures.

Representatives of local administration and Employment Centres interviewed in preparing this report revealed the salience of stereotypes about Roma in these institutions. The stereotype expressed most frequently was that Roma culture and/or mentality makes Roma more interested in receiving social welfare than in working. Low levels of interest among Roma in the training offered under the Operational Plan were often cited as evidence for this view.

2.2.4 Main sources of income

Available information suggests that most Roma work in low-qualified, low-paying jobs in the informal sector. According to the statements of the Roma community members participating in the focus groups conducted in preparing this report, the number of people engaged in the collection of plastic bottles and scrap metals has been steadily increasing. Another area of informal employments is trade, primarily in Shuto Orizari. The textile industry is also an area where a considerable number of Roma women are employed, particularly in the eastern part of the country. However, the employments in this industry are very often informal and in almost all cases in poor working conditions with wages below the national minimum. This is partially due to the fact that legal requirements for minimum wage do not apply to the textile industry.

In the formal sector, the greatest share is employed in public institutions, including public utility companies. According to one interviewed stakeholder, “these employments are good, but are political hires, meaning that you have to be engaged in political parties to be employed”. This view was shared by many of the young Roma participating in the focus groups organized in preparing this report, who also characterized this state of affairs as demotivating.

2.2.5 Barriers hindering the employment of Roma

Factors contributing to the unfavourable position on the labour market of Roma in general include low levels of education and training; discrimination by potential employers; and insufficient access to information about employment opportunities. For Roma women, these factors are compounded by patriarchal attitudes and by insufficient access to childcare services.

2.2.5.1 Low levels of education and vocational training

Representatives of local institutions interviewed in preparing this report cited lack of qualifications as the primary factor explaining high rates of unemployment among Roma. As discussed above, the views expressed by local officials are broadly supported by official data on Roma’s levels of educational attainment. More specifically, the prevalence of no education and incomplete primary education among unemployed Roma makes the majority ineligible for inclusion in active labour

market measures. Preferential access to such measures for persons with completed secondary education effectively excludes an even larger proportion of unemployed Roma from securing marketable qualifications. On the other hand, the role of discrimination in accounting for unemployment among Roma was highlighted by a representative of a Roma CSO interviewed in preparing this report: “if education is the main obstacle, then why are young Roma with university education also unemployed?”

2.2.5.2 Discrimination by potential employers

Participants in the focus groups organized in preparing this report point to persistent and increasing discrimination against Roma on the labour market (as well as in other areas). Interviewed representatives of CSOs presented similar views, with one stakeholder in this category further pointing to demotivation among Roma job applicants growing out of expectations of discrimination. Cases were reported when a job offer was withdrawn by private employer after learning that the person applying is of Roma background. On a more positive note, some municipalities, for example Delchevo, have organized meetings with local Employment Centres and private sector representatives with an eye to overcoming potential stereotypes and prejudices against employment of Roma.

2.2.5.3 Lack of access to information about employment opportunities

The focus groups organized in preparing this report revealed low levels of awareness among young Roma about the opportunities for training in IT and languages offered by ESA. Such low levels of awareness appear to go a long way toward explaining the extremely low rate of participation in this measure among Roma from the pilot municipalities (see Table 4) despite its relevance. This in turn suggests that the information meetings organized by local Employment Centres have not succeeded in dissemination information about ESA offerings to a sufficiently broad segment of the unemployed population.

Access to information is especially restricted for the many Roma who live in settlements that are isolated and which have had few and/or negative interactions with official institutions. In such settings, information on available support and services is often lacking, as is trust in institutions and organizations based outside the local community. As will be explained in more detail below, Roma women in isolated settlements are particularly likely to encounter difficulties in accessing relevant information, pointing to the need for additional, targeted support for entering the labour market.

Beyond their direct effects on employability, low levels of educational attainment among Roma often make it difficult for Roma to make use of available information. This state of affairs calls for an approach adapted to the target group on the part of the persons tasked with presenting employment-related opportunities. The information gathered in the course of the focus groups conducted in preparing this report, however, suggests that such efforts are rare, with representatives of Employment Centres often using technical vocabulary and not taking sufficient time to present relevant measures to low-educated candidates.

2.2.6 Obstacles particularly affecting Roma women

Whereas women in general face difficulties in accessing the labour market in Macedonia, Roma women are subject to discrimination on the basis of both gender and ethnicity, as illustrated by the data presented earlier in this section. Although the situation of Roma women is regularly noted in the annual progress reports issued by the European Commission, the 2016 Operational Plan for Employment lacks measures targeting Roma women.

2.2.6.1 Patriarchal values

The focus groups organized in preparing this report suggested higher levels of marginalization among Roma women in more isolated settlements, such as those located in Bitola, Kumanovo, and Shuto Orizari. More specifically, many young mothers did not express any interest in employment, assuming the prescribed, household-confined role. The situation is markedly different in municipalities characterized by residential integration of Roma and non-Roma, as in Berovo and Delchevo. When asked how they would react if their teenage daughters told them that they did not want to get married and have children until they finish school and find employment, Roma women participating in focus groups held in these municipalities were emphatic in their responses that their daughters will have to finish school before they will be permitted to marry.

2.2.6.2 Access to child care services

Overall access to child care services in Macedonia is low, with existing capacity sufficient for approximately 20% of children of preschool age. Although 18 municipalities (including all 12 pilot municipalities) in partnership with the Ministry of Labour and Social Policies are implementing the project on inclusion of Roma children in preschool education, the findings of the focus groups conducted in preparing this report indicate that these project activities are not sufficient to address all needs. One young Roma mother participating in a focus group in Bitola reported receiving the following response from the local public pre-school: “There is no available place in the kindergarten for a mother that is not working. Why do you need kindergarten? Go get a job and then come back to enrol your child in the kindergarten.”

2.3 Health

2.3.1 Health situation of the Roma population

Even in the absence of consistent documentation over time, it is clear that the health situation of Roma in Macedonia is considerably worse than that of the general population (see, for example, Eminova and Milevska-Kostova 2008; Eminova, Janeva & Petroska-Beška 2011; Abdikeeva 2013). Most recently, the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (2016: Points 47 and 49) expressed concern about “limited access to health-care services,

particularly for Roma” and about “the acute shortage of gynaecologists, particularly in rural areas and areas with a predominantly Roma population.” Infant mortality is higher among Roma than among non-Roma, with Roma’s life expectancy 10 years lower than the national average. Immunization rates are lower among Roma than among non-Roma, while chronic non-communicable diseases are more common among Roma than among non-Roma. A comparison between the national strategies for Roma drafted in 2004 and 2014 suggests that Roma face the same health problems even after a decade of strategy implementation.

Access to health care among Roma is often limited by poverty. As stated by one representative of a Roma CSO participating in a focus group, “access to health services is not easy for poor families, and most of Roma families are indeed poor families.” If access to health care is a problem, poor living conditions make such access all the more important insofar as they adversely affect health as a result of inadequate sanitation, ventilation, and/or space.

The information gathered in the course of the field work conducted in preparing this report suggests that most Roma have health insurance; according to representatives of Roma CSOs participating in the research, health insurance coverage among Roma has improved significantly in recent years and continues to improve. Stakeholders from this category further explained that most Roma who do not have health insurance often live in slums or temporary dwellings. While increases in health insurance coverage are a positive development, Roma focus group participants demonstrated awareness that health insurance is a necessary but not sufficient condition for access to health services, recounting difficulties in accessing free-of-charge prescription medication while noting that non-Roma also encounter similar problems. An important difference in this regard, however, is that Roma are less likely to be able to pay for medication and services not available free of charge.

2.3.1.1 Health situation of Roma women and children

Access to professional pre-natal care is problematic for many Roma women. This is particularly the case in Shuto Orizari, where there is not even one gynaecologist on the territory of the whole municipality. The municipalities of Bitola and Prilep also lack a sufficient number of gynaecologists to ensure the realization of reproductive and health rights for all Roma women. At the same time, early marriages and childbearing among Roma make for a pressing need for reproductive health care. The interviews and focus groups held in preparing this report, however, suggested that there is little coordination among institutions in addressing the phenomenon of early marriages among Roma, with the practice sometimes tolerated as a feature of Roma tradition. The field research also identified unequal treatment by health care workers and lack of information about rights to health care as some of the most significant barriers faced by Roma women.

Roma children below the age of 5 show signs of stunting with a significantly higher prevalence than the national average (16.6% against 8.7%) (Eminova, Janeva & Petroska-Beška 2011). Moreover, as mentioned above, Roma children are less likely to be immunized than non-Roma children: Thirty-four percent of Roma children did not receive all of the eight recommended

vaccines as compared with 12% of Macedonian children, despite the fact that the national immunization programme provides access to vaccination services for all children, free of charge.¹⁰ According to health workers and Roma CSOs participating in the field research undertaken in preparing this report, the situation with the immunization has improved in recent years, but remains problematic among families which migrate, as well as among families living in improvised housing.

2.3.2 Relations between local public health institutions and Roma communities

While interviewed health workers were generally sceptical about the existence of discrimination against Roma in the area of health care, participants in the focus groups organized in preparing this report reported that discriminatory practices persist. The findings of the focus groups are broadly supported by reports produced by other actors (see, for example, Rorke 2016). Another apparent indication of social distance on the part of health care workers is the absence of a gynaecological practice in Shuto Orizari. The focus groups also revealed cases in which Roma patients were not issued discharge letters or had their health cards taken because of outstanding debts to the clinics which treated them (see also Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia 2014).

2.3.3 Initiatives affecting the health situation of the local Roma community

Receiving frequent positive mention in the pilot municipalities was the project for Roma health mediators, which began in 2013 as a CSO initiative in partnership with the Ministry of Health and currently operates in 10 municipalities. Participants in the interviews conducted in preparing this report noted that mediators have been particularly successful in detecting children who have received all mandatory vaccines, facilitating access to health insurance, and providing information on free services available through the preventive and curative programmes of the Ministry of Health. Expansion of the project is planned to increase both the numbers of Roma health mediators and the number of municipalities in which they operate.

Mentioned less frequently but in a similarly positive light among participants in the interviews and focus groups conducted in preparing this report is the medical scholarship programme for Roma enrolled in medical secondary schools and universities in Macedonia. The importance of this programme was pointed out most clearly in Gostivar, with statement by representatives of municipal administration in broad agreement with the explanation given by a participant in the focus group held with members of the local Roma community: “Our access to health services, the way that we are treated in the health institution, is much improved since we have a Roma doctor. It’s just that you have someone you can rely on.”

¹⁰ Immunization against tuberculosis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, measles, rubella and mumps as well as polio is compulsory, with compulsory vaccination against Hepatitis B introduced in 2005 and for Haemophilus Influenza B in 2008.

2.4 Housing and infrastructure

2.4.1 Conditions in Roma settlements

Interviewed representatives of the pilot municipalities generally characterized housing as the most intractable problem facing Roma communities. The main reason given for this view is the level of investment required to change the situation. Whereas the housing conditions of Roma in smaller municipalities tend to differ relatively little from those of non-Roma due to integrated residence patterns, most Roma in the bigger cities live in segregated settlements. While the Skopje municipality of Shuto Orizari may be the largest segregated Roma settlement in the world, large segregated settlements with poor conditions exist also in Bitola, Gostivar, Kumanovo, and Prilep.

While conditions vary across and within settlements, segregated settlements in general are characterized by substandard housing conditions and limited access to services. More specifically, Roma households tend to be characterized by insufficient living space per inhabitant. Additionally, a sizeable minority of dwellings lack an indoor toilet or bathroom (see Nacionalen romski centar 2015: 52).

2.4.2 Legal status

Inhabitants of Roma settlements often lack documentation establishing ownership of their dwellings and/or of the land on which they are built. This lack of legal security means that they are in principle subject to forced eviction. In order to enable Roma families to benefit from the Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures of 2011, RICs and Roma CSOs on local level have provided support in preparing the administrative documents and requests to local authorities. Additionally, fees for the geodetic reports required for legalization applications are waived for recipients of social welfare (regardless of ethnicity).

According to interviewed representatives of RICs, the support provided in the application process resulted in a large number of applications for legalization. By way of contrast, a survey conducted by the CSO National Roma Centrum in 2015 found that while nearly three quarters of Roma who own their dwellings had applied for legalization, fewer than one in four reported receiving support in the application process (Nacionalen romski centar 2015: 53). Notable exceptions in this regard are Kochani, Kumanovo, and Shtip, where majorities of respondents reported receiving support in the process.¹¹ On the other hand, some of the lowest levels of assistance were reported in Bitola (5%), Chair-Topaana (1.6%), and Shuto Orizari (8.2%). Among the municipalities participating in the survey, Gostivar, Kochani, Prilep, Shtip, and Vinica had responded to at least half of applications, whereas response rates in Bitola, Kumanovo, and Shuto Orizari were under 30 percent (Nacionalen romski centar 2015: 56).

¹¹ The municipalities included in the National Roma Centrum survey were Bitola, Chair (Topaana) Gjorche Petrov, Gostivar, Kichevo, Kochani, Kumanovo, Prilep, Tetovo, Shtip, Shuto Orizari, and Vinica (Nacionalen romski centar 2015: 9).

Available information suggests that Roma living in informal settlements have generally not applied for legalization, leaving them in a particularly vulnerable position. Moreover, the fees associated with applications for legalization are often prohibitive for Roma families not eligible for relevant waivers.

2.4.3 Relevant initiatives

According to the official information received from the Ministry of Transport and Communications, within the current project for social housing, until now 118 Roma families have been allotted social housing rental units, with Roma accounting for approximately 17 percent of all beneficiaries. The pilot municipalities in which Roma have benefited from this programme are Berovo, Bitola, Kochani, and Shtip.

Of the 12 pilot municipalities, all except Chair and Shuto Orizari are signatories to a valid Memorandum of Cooperation with the central government as represented by the Minister without Portfolio appointed in 2008 as national coordinator of the Decade of Roma Inclusion (which ended in 2015) and the Strategy for Roma (see Government of the Republic of Macedonia 2009). To date, projects supported on the basis of a Memorandum of Cooperation have focused on infrastructure and have been financed from the budget of the Ministry of Transport and Communications. While the implementation of projects on the basis of a Memorandum of Cooperation has led to improvements in infrastructure (usually roads), the interviews and focus groups conducted in preparing this report pointed to instances in which the neighbourhoods benefiting from the improvements were inhabited mostly by non-Roma.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Conclusions

The state of service delivery of the local public administration institutions varies both by thematic area and by municipality.

3.1.1 Education

There is broad consensus that progress in the area of education has outstripped advances in other areas where the inclusion of Roma is concerned. At the same time, challenges persist at all levels. At the level of preschool education, despite significant advances resulting from a project implemented by municipal authorities in partnership with MLSP and supported by the Roma education fund, enrolment rates among Roma remain more than six times lower than the national average and the prospects for sustaining the gains made to date are uncertain as a result of incomplete institutionalization of relevant programmes. In primary education, there is considerable dropout among Roma, due to a combination of poverty, discrimination, and in some municipalities, underage marriages. Inappropriate placement of Roma in special education for children with mental disability was also noted in Chair and Shuto Orizari.

3.1.2 Employment

Improvements in the area of employment have been more modest than those in education, with the unemployment rate among Roma almost double the national average and even higher among Roma women. In the 12 pilot municipalities as elsewhere, the majority of registered unemployed Roma has not completed primary education, such that they are not eligible for employment and self-employment measures offered in the framework of ESA programmes. The field research conducted in preparing this report suggests that discrimination also plays an increasingly important role, with cases reported when a job offer was withdrawn by a private employer after learning that the applicant for the job is a Rom. Factors particularly affecting access to the labour market for Roma women include patriarchal values observed in some relatively isolated settlements (e.g., in Bitola, Kumanovo, and Shuto Orizari) and low access to child care services throughout the country.

3.1.3 Health

Although most Roma have health insurance, access to health care is often limited by poverty. Access to professional pre-natal care is a problem for many Roma women, with insufficient numbers of gynaecologists noted in Bitola, Prilep, and Shuto Orizari. Closely related to this, there is little coordination among institutions in addressing the phenomenon of early marriages among Roma. While reports of discrimination against Roma in the area of health care remain common, the Roma health mediation programme under the Ministry of Health has received high marks for

increasing vaccination rates, facilitating access to health insurance, and providing information on free services offered by the Ministry of Health.

3.1.4 Housing and infrastructure

The level of investment required to bring improvements in Roma's housing situation means that housing problems are often viewed as intractable in the pilot municipalities. Conditions in segregated settlements such as those that exist in Bitola, Gostivar, Kumanovo, Prilep, and Shuto Orizari tend to be worse than those of Roma households located in integrated neighbourhoods. Inhabitants of Roma settlements also often lack documentation establishing ownership of their dwellings and/or of the land on which they are built, with progress in implementation the Law on Procedure for Illegally Built Structures varying widely across the pilot municipalities. Roma account for approximately 17 percent of all beneficiaries of the social housing project administered by the Ministry of Transport and Communications. Pilot municipalities covered by the project are Berovo, Bitola, Kochani, and Shtip. Additionally, all pilot municipalities except Chair and Shuto Orizari are signatories to a valid Memorandum of Cooperation with the central government as represented by the Minister without Portfolio, with projects financed on the basis of such memoranda usually focusing on roads, but not always on Roma neighbourhoods.

3.2 Recommendations

Organized thematically, the recommendations below outline steps to be taken to improve service delivery with an eye to increasing the social inclusion of Roma in the pilot municipalities. Following the recommendations in the areas of education, employment, health, and housing and infrastructure, which draw directly from the situation analysis in the corresponding areas, a set of general recommendations takes a more synthetic approach.

3.2.1 Education

1. *Expand access to pre-school education.* Taking into account the importance of pre-school education for children from marginalized and vulnerable communities and Roma's low enrolment rates relative to the national average, additional facilities should be established where objective demand exceeds the current supply with an eye to providing at least one year of free-of-charge pre-school education in ethnically mixed groups. Transportation should also be provided throughout the calendar year.
2. *Provide educational support beyond school hours.* As the recent pilot project with tutoring in the late years of primary education suggests, the effects of poverty on participation in education can be reduced through after-school programmes for assistance in completing homework assignments and remedial instruction in key subjects. Combining these forms of support with a hot meal should be considered as an additional way to reduce the effects of

poverty on educational participation with its potential contribution to improving concentration while serving as an incentive for both parents and children.

3. *Continue reducing the number of Roma in special education.* Ongoing efforts aimed at making testing processes more culturally sensitive (e.g., through inclusion of qualified Roma in expert commissions) and at re-integrating in standard education children inappropriately assigned to special education should be complemented with reconsideration of the system of financial and material incentives for enrolment in special education. Additionally, outreach is needed to raise awareness among Roma families about the educational and career disadvantages of enrolling non-disabled children in schools for children with special educational needs.
4. *Research and address discrimination in education.* The frequency of segregation and other more and less subtle forms of discrimination in education should be documented systematically as a basis for designing appropriate measures to address them. In addition to attending to issues of discrimination against Roma on the part of non-Roma, attention should be paid to gender-based differences in rates of completion of compulsory education, treating underage marriages as violations of the rights of Roma girls.

3.2.2 Employment

5. *Increase access to basic qualifications.* Access to the labour market and to the employment measures offered by the Employment Service Agency should be improved by facilitating completion of primary education among adults. Additionally, certification programmes for recognition of skills gained through non-formal education should be introduced. Taking into account the gender gap in relation to employment, particular emphasis should be placed on the participation of women in the proposed measures, with measures to be adopted in this direction including (but not limited to) providing access to childcare services.
6. *Promote social entrepreneurship.* Taking into account Roma's marginal position on the labour market and in society in general, social enterprises with their roots in principles such as equality and non-discrimination, increasing the employment rate, and solidarity appear to have considerable (if unknown) potential to improve employment rates among Roma. The adoption of legislation in this area is therefore to be recommended. In the meantime, coordinated outreach by Roma CSOs to existing firms has shown potential to break down barriers between non-Roma employers and potential Roma employees.
7. *Improve targeting and outreach in relation to employment measures.* Operational Plans for Employment should include measures based on a thorough assessment of the specific needs and skills of unemployed Roma, with digestible information on such measures disseminated via print and broadcast media, as well as in presentations at community level. Consideration should also be given to expanding and institutionalizing the employment coaching and mentoring programme piloted by UNDP.

3.2.3 Health

8. *Ensure availability and accessibility of health services.* The Ministry of Health should step up efforts to ensure that all community-level public health institutions include a number of gynaecologists sufficient to meet the objective demand for their services. The two measures in this direction foreseen in the National Action Plan for Health should be implemented on a priority basis (see Ministerstvo za trudi socijalna politika 2015a, Activities 1.1.4 and 1.1.5). More broadly, persons with low income should be exempted from co-payments for needed medicines.
9. *Strengthen health mediators' position.* Recognizing the central role of Roma health mediators in raising awareness among Roma as well as in improving communication between Roma and healthcare services, Roma health mediators should be integrated in the health system administration. This integration should provide Roma health mediators with full employment contracts (rather than service contracts) which provide contributions for social insurance, as well as pregnancy leave. Additionally, coordination between Roma health mediators and RICs should be improved.
10. *Sanction and prevent discrimination in healthcare services.* Complaints of improper treatment by healthcare workers should be investigated thoroughly and punished as appropriate. Additionally, intercultural competency among healthcare workers should be assessed and addressed as needed through targeted training events.

3.2.4 Housing and infrastructure

11. *Address Roma settlements.* Feasibility studies should be undertaken as a basis for decisions on legalization of Roma settlements located outside areas foreseen as residential in urban plans. Whereas households located in settlements without prospects for legalization should be relocated to state-provided land with conditions for safe and durable residence, the inhabitants of settlements where legalization is possible should be given the option of remaining in the settlement or relocating to an integrated neighbourhood.
12. *Monitor the legalization process.* Mandatory quarterly visits to municipalities by the State Administration Inspectorate should be introduced for the purpose of monitoring decisions on applications for legalization. Persons whose application for legalization 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.
13. *Promote residential integration.* Following the positive example set by the Ministry of Transport and Communications' social housing programme, housing measures targeting Roma should focus on creating ethnically mixed neighbourhoods. Awareness of *de facto* segregation as a negative phenomenon for both Roma and non-Roma should be raised among local (as well as national) authorities and related explicitly to construction projects

undertaken to date which effectively preserve or promote physical separation between Roma and non-Roma.

3.2.5 General recommendations

14. *Increase availability of ethnically disaggregated data.* Bringing improvements in service delivery to increase the social inclusion of Roma requires data about the current state of service delivery where Roma are concerned as compared with other ethnic communities and/or with the general population. With this in mind, current data gaps should be addressed by designing and implementing a plan for data collection. The State Statistical Office has a key role to play in this effort.
15. *Bring national-level policies for Roma to local level.* Local action plans for Roma should be designed on the basis of the National Action Plans adopted in the areas of education, employment, health, housing, and strengthening the position of the Roma woman in society, with differences between national and municipal priorities explained in terms of specific needs of local Roma. The adoption of LAPs should be backed up by a line for Roma inclusion in the municipal budget.
16. *Establish local coordinating bodies.* As foreseen in the Strategy for Roma, local coordinating bodies should be established in municipalities with a sizeable Roma population to move ahead the design and implementation of LAPs, with Roma input into the policy process guaranteed by the inclusion of representatives of RICs and CSOs. These bodies should be supported in their work by both municipal authorities and by MLSP, which should also provide a clear reporting framework which includes attention to fiscal and administrative implications at central and local levels.
17. *Eliminate parallel facilities at municipal level.* The co-existence of memoranda of cooperation between municipalities and the central government on the one hand and LAPs on the other has potential to foster confusion within a given municipality about how the two types of instruments relate to one another. Further, this situation complicates learning across municipalities, which may attempt to address similar needs of local Roma with measures administered at central level by institutions which do not always coordinate with one another.
18. *Promote the continued development of Roma Information Centres.* RICs should be upgraded from a project to a state programme and funded accordingly, with their institutionalization at municipal level supported both administratively and financially with an eye to enabling them to monitor the implementation of relevant initiatives and to transmit information among municipal authorities, state-level institutions, and local Roma populations. Key to this process is providing RIC staff with training in monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdikееva, Alphia. 2013. *Roma Health Rights in Macedonia, Romania, and Serbia: A Baseline for Legal Advocacy*. Budapest: Open Society Foundations.
- Ad Hoc Committee of Experts on Roma Issues. 2012. *Meeting Report*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Barnett, W. Steven. 1995. Long-Term Effects of Early Childhood Programs on Cognitive and School Outcomes. *The Future of Children* 5, no. 3: 25-50.
- Centar za razvoj na Istočniot planski region. 2014. *Programa za razvoj na Istočniot planski region 2015-2019*. Štip: Centar za razvoj na Istočniot planski region.
- Centar za razvoj na Pelagonskiot planski region. 2014. *Programa za razvoj na Pelagonskiot planski region 2015-2019*. Bitola: Centar za razvoj na Pelagonskiot planski region.
- Centre for Development of Polog Planning Region. 2010. *Development Program of Polog Planning Region 2009-2013*. Tetovo: Centre for Development of Polog Planning Region.
- Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. 2016. *Concluding Observations on the Combined Second and Fourth Periodic Reports of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*. Geneva: United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- Dahlberg, Gunilla, Peter Moss, and Alan Pence. 1999. *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: Postmodern Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- Državen zavod za statistika. 2015. *Ustanovi za zgrižuvanje i vospitanie na deca: Detski gradinki-centri za ran detski razvoj*. Skopje: Državen zavod za statistika.
- 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".
- EPTISA. 2016a. *Challenges of Promoting and Implementing Modalities of Employment Programmes for Integrating Roma Citizens, Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons*. Skopje: EPTISA.
- _____. 2016b. *Report on Policies Affecting Roma at National and Local Levels with Recommendations for Improving Legal and Policy Frameworks as well as Availability of Relevant Data*. Skopje: EPTISA.

Report on state of service delivery within local public administration institutions

Local Integration of Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and Minority Groups

- _____. 2016c. *Selection Report on 12 Selected Municipalities*. Skopje: EPTISA.
- European Roma Rights Centre. 2013. *Macedonia: Country Profile 2011-2012*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre.
- Gerovska Mitev, Maja. 2013. *Holistic Analysis of Development Challenges in the Four Pilot Municipalities: Kumanovo, Tetovo, Prilep and Suto Orizari and Provision of the Missing Baseline Data that Will Assist Local Authorities to Set Relevant Targets in the Local Roma Action Plans*. Skopje: United Nations Development Programme.
- 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.
- Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia. 2013. *Between the Implementation and Reality of the National Strategy for Roma Integration*. Skopje: Helsinki Committee for Human Rights of the Republic of Macedonia.
- IDEA O.K., and Balkan Development Solutions. 2009. *Programa za razvoj na Severoistočniot planski region 2009-2014*. Kumanovo: Centar za razvoj na Severoistočniot planski region.
- Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika. 2010. *Nacionalna programa za razvoj na socijalnata zaštita 2011-2021*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2014. *Strategija za Romite vo Republika Makedonija 2014-2020 [Strategy for Roma in the Republic of Macedonia 2014-2020]*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2015a. *Nacionalen akcionen plan za zdravstvo 2015-2020*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2015b. *Nacionalna strategija za vrabotuvanja na Republika Makedonija, 2016-2020*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2016a. *Nacionalen akcionen plan za domuvanje 2016-2020*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2016b. *Nacionalen akcionen plan za obrazovanie 2016-2020*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2016c. *Nacionalen akcionen plan za vrabotuvanje 2016-2020*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- _____. 2016d. *Nacionalen akcionen plan za zajaknuvanje na položbata na romskata žena vo opštествoto 2016-2020*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.

- _____. 2016e. *Operativen plan za aktivni programi i merki za vrabotuvanje i uslugi na pazarot na trudot za 2016 godina*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za trud i socijalna politika.
- Misijata na OBSE vo Skopje, and Komisija za zaštita od diskriminacija. 2014. *Segregacija na decata Romi vo obrazovniot proces*. Skopje: Misijata na OBSE vo Skopje i Komisija za zaštita od diskriminacija.
- Nacionalen romski centar. 2015. *Izveštaj za Anketata za procenka na sostojbite vo oblasta na vrabotuvanjeto, domuvanjeto, obrazovaniето i zdravstvoto vo romskata zaednica na Republika Makedonija*. Kumanovo: Nacionalen romski centar.
- Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia. 2014. *Annual Report on the Level of Respect, Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Freedoms*. Skopje: Ombudsman of the Republic of Macedonia.
- Opština Gostivar. 2012. *Akciski plan za domuvanje 2012-2017*. Gostivar: Opština Gostivar.
- Opština Kumanovo. 2012. *Nacrt - lokalni plan za akcija za implementacija na Dekadata na Romite vo Kumanovo za periodot 2012-2016 g.* Kumanovo: Opština Kumanovo.
- Rorke, Bernard. 2016. "Childbirth in Macedonia: Racist Abuse, Slapped Faces and Slashed Budgets." Web page [accessed 25 August 2016]. Available at <http://www.errc.org/blog/childbirth-in-macedonia-racist-abuse-slapped-faces-and-slashed-budgets/114>.
- Schaaf, Marta. 2011. *Roma Health Mediators: Successes and Challenges*. New York: Open Society Foundations.
- Sobranie na Republika Makedonija. 2009. *Strategija za regionalni razvoj na Republika Makedonija 2009-2019 godina*. Skopje : Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija.
- Sovet za razvoj na Skopski planski region. 2010. *Programa za razvoj na Skopski planski region*. Skopje.
- State Statistical Office. 2016. *Primary, Lower Secondary and Upper Secondary Schools at the end of the School Year 2014/2015*. Skopje: State Statistical Office.

ANNEX 1: RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Interview guides

Education

1. Do Romani children attend pre-school education? (Why?)
2. Do Romani children attend primary education? (Why?)
3. How common is dropout among Roma in primary education? (Why?)
4. Do Romani children attend secondary education? (Why?)
5. Do Romani children complete secondary education? (Why?)
6. Which recent/ongoing initiatives implemented in this municipality have affected the educational situation of the local Romani community? (How?)

Employment

1. How are relations between the Centre for Employment and the Romani community?
2. What are Roma's main sources of income?
3. Which recent/ongoing initiatives implemented in this municipality have affected the employment situation of the local Romani community? (How?)

Health

1. What is the health situation of the Romani community? What, if anything, has changed in recent years?
2. How are relations between the local public health institution and the Romani community?
3. Which recent/ongoing initiatives implemented in this municipality have affected the health situation of the local Romani community? (How?)

Housing

1. How are living conditions in Romani settlements? What, if anything, has changed in recent years?
2. How do living conditions in Romani settlements differ from the living conditions of local non-Roma?
3. Which recent/ongoing initiatives implemented in this municipality have affected the access of the local Romani community to housing and infrastructure? (How?)

Questions for focus groups with local Roma

Education

1. How common is it for Romani children to attend pre-school education? Why?
2. How common is it for Romani children to attend primary education?
 - a. What kinds of problems do they have in enrolling?
 - b. How are relations between the school and the Romani community?
 - c. How common is it for Roma to drop out of primary school? Why?
3. How common is it for Romani children to attend secondary education?
 - a. What kinds of problems do they have in enrolling?
 - b. How are relations between the school and the Romani community?
 - c. How common is it for Roma to drop out of secondary school? Why?

Employment

4. How are relations between the Centre for Employment and the Romani community? (Why?)
5. What are Roma's main sources of income?

Health

6. Where do you go when you need a doctor?
 - a. How far do you have to travel?
 - b. How do you get there?
 - c. How do healthcare workers treat you?
7. How are relations between the local public health institution and the Romani community?
 - d. What, if anything, has changed in recent years?

Housing

8. What has changed in your neighbourhood in recent years? (How did the changes come about? How much do the changes affect you?)

ANNEX 2: STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

Name (Last, First)	Organization/Institution	Date	Municipality
Abdulova Zera	Kindergarten Veseli Cvetovi Delchevo	03.06.2016	Delchevo
Ajdini Sami	Municipality of Prilep	11.05.2016	Prilep
Ali Chupi Redzhep	Ministry of Education and Science	06.05.2016	n/a
Angelevska Anita	Municipality of Bitola	12.05.2016	Bitola
Asani Fadil	Municipality of Gostivar	13.05.2016	Gostivar
Avramovska Zorica	Municipality of Tetovo	18.05.2016	Tetovo
Bajram Azemovska Fatma	NGO Sumnal	12.05.2016	Bitola
Balas Ruzdi	Health institution	06.05.2016	Chair
Bezitovski Bezit	Roma Health Mediator	03.06.2016	Delchevo
Darlista Nuhi	Municipality of Chair	05.05.2016	Chair
Elezi Valjon	Municipality of Kumanovo	21.06.2016	Kumanovo
Fejzov Erhan	Municipality of Shuto Orizari	24.06.2016	Shuto Orizari
Fida Ermira	Municipality of Tetovo	18.05.2016	Tetovo
Gegoska Mirjana	Municipality of Prilep	11.05.2016	Prilep
Gorgjieva Anika	Municipality of Kochani	19.05.2016	Kochani
Ivanovska Vineta	Municipality of Prilep	11.05.2016	Prilep
Jasharovski Ahmet	NGO Drom	21.06.2016	Kumanovo
Krstevska Zaga	Health institution	06.05.2016	Shuto Orizari
Lamovska Senada	Cabinet of Minister without Portfolio Nezhdet Mustafa	05.05.2016	n/a
Matrakovski Marjan	Municipality of Prilep	11.05.2016	Prilep
Memedi Senad	Ministry of Health	01.07.2016	n/a
Memedova Dzhulieta	Municipality of Delchevo	03.06.2016	Delchevo
Memedova Senada	RIC Shtip	20.05.2016	Shtip
Memedova Shazija	RIC Delchevo	03.06.2016	Delchevo
Muca Nergis	Centre for Social Affairs	05.05.2016	Chair
Muslievski Merdan	RIC Kumanovo	19.05.2016	Kumanovo
Nalevska Violeta	Municipality of Bitola	12.05.2016	Bitola
NedzhipovJalcin	Municipality of Kochani	19.05.2016	Kochani
Nesovska Elena	NVO Sumnal	21.06.2016	Chair
Osmani Dashmir	Municipality of Gostivar	13.05.2016	Gostivar
Osmanov Demir	Municipality of Vinica	16.06.2016	Vinica
Peovski Gjorgi	Municipality of Berovo	07.06.2016	Berovo
Prcoovski Ivanco	Centre for Social Affairs Delchevo	03.06.2016	Delchevo
Radevska Radmila	Municipality of Tetovo	18.05.2016	Tetovo
Rendzhova Verica	Municipality of Shtip	20.05.2016	Shtip
Saidov Mustafa	Municipality of Kochani	19.05.2016	Kochani
Saiti Pajtim	Municipality of Gostivar	13.05.2016	Gostivar

Report on state of service delivery within local public administration institutions

Local Integration of Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and Minority Groups

Name (Last, First)	Organization/Institution	Date	Municipality
Salih Buki Narel	Municipality of Chair	05.05.2016	Chair
Saliou Ibrahim	RIC Vinica	16.06.2016	Vinica
Selman Nadire	Municipality of Shuto Orizari	24.06.2016	Shuto Orizari
Shikovska Ljatife	NGO Ambrela	29.06.2016	Shuto Orizari
Sopovska Darinka	Centre for Social Affairs Berovo	07.06.2016	Berovo
Stefanovska Krasimira	Municipality of Kumanovo	19.05.2016	Kumanovo
Tochi Muhamed	NGO Mesechina	13.05.2016	Gostivar
Trajanova Daniela	Employment Centre Delchevo	03.06.2016	Delchevo
Trencovska Marija	Employment Centre Berovo	07.06.2016	Berovo
Zekirova Firdeska	RIC Berovo	07.06.2016	Berovo
Zilbeari Vedat	Employment Centre Skopje	26.04.2016	Chair and Shuto Orizari