



Preparatory Action

“Roma Civil Monitoring – Strengthening capacity and involvement of Roma and pro-Roma civil society in policy monitoring and review”

(Contract no. JUST/2020/RPAA/PR/EQUA/0095)

Guideline for CSOs on preparing monitoring country reports

2nd cycle:

*Focusing on the implementation
of National Roma Strategic Frameworks*

Version 1.2

11 December 2024



Democracy
Institute



The *Roma Civil Monitor 2021-2025* initiative, with the full title “**Preparatory Action – Roma Civil Monitoring – Strengthening capacity and involvement of Roma and pro-Roma civil society in policy monitoring and review**“, is being implemented by a consortium led by the [Democracy Institute](#) of [Central European University](#) (DI/CEU), and including the [European Roma Grassroots Organisations Network](#) (ERGO Network), the [Fundación Secretariado Gitano](#) (FSG) and the [European Roma Rights Centre](#) (ERRC) under a service contract with the [European Commission’s Directorate-General Justice and Consumers](#) (DG Just).

This guideline was prepared by Andrej Salner and Marek Hojsik (Central European University) with contribution of FSG researchers to Chapter 4 on the use of EU funding instruments.

The document was developed within the above-mentioned project financed by the European Commission; however, it exclusively reflects the views of the authors, and the European Commission may not be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.

HISTORY OF CHANGES

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.0	14 Jun 24	First version	
1.1	29 Jul 24	Names of report's chapters modified	6
		Consideration in section 1.2.1 deleted	16
		Section 1.2.3 revised	16
		Name of Chapter 2 modified	18
		Name of Chapter 3 modified	21
		Explication of the selection of problems to be included in the introduction to the chapter instead of a separate sub-chapter	21
		Name of the section 3.X.1.3 modified	22
		Consideration in section 3.X.3.1 deleted	23
		Considerations in section 4.1 revised	25
		Usage of short case studies specified	26
		Annex III – Interview consent example added	33
1.2	10 Dec 24	New monitoring question 1.3.4 concerning National Roma Platforms added	17

CONTENTS

HISTORY OF CHANGES	3
INTRODUCTION	5
RESEARCH AND WRITING PLAN	6
MONITORING CRITERIA	14
CHAPTER 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NRSF	15
1.1. Effectiveness: What are the key developments concerning the NRSF and its implementation?	15
1.2. Synergy: How is NRSF implementation aligned with domestic and EU actions?	16
1.3. Participation: Have Roma been involved in implementing the NRSF and monitoring its implementation?	16
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW BY THEMATIC AREA	18
2.X. [Thematic area sub-chapter]	19
CHAPTER 3: FOCUS ON KEY PROBLEMS AFFECTING ROMA	21
3.X. [Problem area sub-chapter]	21
CHAPTER 4: USE OF EU FUNDING INSTRUMENTS	24
4.1. Effectiveness: How are the conditions for EU funds implementation for Roma equality?	25
4.2. Participation: How is Roma civil society involved in EU funds implementation?	25
FORMAL REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING THE REPORT	26
REFERENCES	27
Annex I: UPDATED LIST OF PROBLEMS AND CONDITIONS IN THEMATIC FIELDS	28
Annex II: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS MATRIX	29
Annex III: EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM	33

INTRODUCTION

Following the conclusion of the first cycle of monitoring in 2022, this guideline was developed to support civil society organisations in 26 EU member states to prepare the **second round of monitoring reports on the National Roma Strategic Frameworks** (NRSF; sometimes referred to as Roma inclusion strategies, social inclusion strategies or integrated sets of measures) that were developed to reflect the 2020-2030 EU Roma Strategic Framework for Equality, Inclusion and Participation (EU Roma Framework) and the Council Recommendations of 12 March 2021 on Roma equality, inclusion and participation.

The purpose of the reports is to provide participatory and inclusive **monitoring of the implementation of NRSFs by civil society actors**. The report provides feedback to national authorities and informs the European Commission's monitoring of NRSF.

Similarly, as in the first monitoring cycle, the emphasis is on producing **concise and practical reports, rather than comprehensive** or academic ones, which would be too long and too complex to be actively used by relevant stakeholders.

This is addressed by selective focus on those areas where monitoring outputs can most realistically impact country actions, leveraging national policies, as well as EC's upcoming monitoring reports, other European initiatives, funding instruments and mechanisms.

The **monitoring focus** for the second round of monitoring shifts in line with the (expected) progress in the implementation of measures stemming from the respective NRSFs:

1. **Key developments** on NRSFs
2. **Overall progress** on implementation of NRSFs
3. Progress in selected number of **key areas** with most potential for impact and barriers hindering expected progress

The **monitoring period**, on which data collection and reporting should focus, is from the time of submission of the previous cycle monitoring report in 2022 to the expected time of completion of data collection in 2024 (or early 2025).

Like in the previous round of monitoring, the guidelines propose a specific research design and methods that reflect the division of Member States into four clusters based on their Roma populations to collect monitoring data using a participatory, unbiased, and evidence-based approach.

The guidelines provide a structure for national monitoring reports, showing how the data that is collected and its analysis can be organised in an effective way.

A lot more input should be reviewed and considered than will actually be quoted or referred to directly in the body of the report. The necessary broader analysis can be partially documented in annexes, which are outside of the body of the main report.

RESEARCH AND WRITING PLAN

Report requirements

The reports are expected to be balanced (recognising the existence of various viewpoints) and evidence-based (relying on collected evidence from research and interviews – see below – rather than solely on the authors' own views and opinions).

A **template** for the reports is provided in separate file. It reflects the structure in the guideline but shortens some of the questions in the headlines into shorter chapter names.

The general outline includes:

- *Executive summary*
- *Introduction*
- *1. Implementation of the NRSF*
- *2. Review by thematic area*
- *3. Focus on key problems affecting Roma*
- *4. Use of EU funding instruments¹*
- *Conclusions and recommendations*
- *Additional findings*
- *References*
- *Annexes*

Within the core chapters there are two-digit sub-chapters and three-digit sections with more specific monitoring questions, providing the structure for the monitoring reports.

Some sub-chapters have sections at the three-digit level and four-digit level and then “Key considerations” – suggested questions to address in the text that may be relevant. These do not need to be answered in every report but rather provide some guidance on issues to consider within the subchapters and sections.

The monitoring questions and key considerations do not, in most cases, represent interview questions to ask respondents directly.

Some general interview questions to collect data are suggested in the Annex II (**Interview Questions Matrix**).

Desk research

The starting point for preparation of the monitoring reports is desk research – a review of:

- findings and recommendations from the previous monitoring cycle (including Annex I with a list of problems),
- the NRSF,
- related action plan (if it exists),
- any policy documents, analyses, evaluations, and reports that have been published since the submission of the previous cycle monitoring report.

Desk research in the second monitoring cycle covers the same areas as the first cycle:

- horizontal policy objectives of the EU Roma Framework (fighting antigypsyism, antidiscrimination, reducing poverty and social exclusion, participation)
- sectoral policy objectives (education, employment, health, housing)

¹ This chapter applies to reports from Cluster 1 countries, those from countries that apply the Thematic Enabling Conditionality 4.5. (Croatia, Italy, Portugal), and other countries, where authors consider it useful and feasible.

- other policy areas identified by RCM as important to Roma equality, inclusion, participation (Roma culture, environmental justice, digital inclusion, social services, child protection and income support).

For Chapter 4 focusing on the use of EU funding instruments for Roma equality, inclusion and participation, relevant materials include possible national operational programmes, along with the analysis of calls for proposals/resolutions and of approved projects.

The extent of the required desk research depends on the Cluster the country belongs to – we do not give specific guidelines here, as in general, the availability of relevant current documents will reflect the clustering of countries in terms of Roma populations and the extent of significant problems.

If a member state still does not have a dedicated national Roma strategy or an action plan, the RCM reports should try to assess the relevant set of policy measures that the member state has been implementing as a response to the EU Roma Framework and the Council Recommendations.

Participatory observation

As many CSOs participating in the RCM initiative are intensively involved in different policy processes and structures (they participate in consultations with public authorities, meetings, workshops, seminars and trainings on the topics directly or indirectly related to the topics of this guidelines), provide services to Roma at the local level or organise and empower local communities, their own experience from the grassroots level is a valuable source of information on the needs and interests of Roma, on how national policies work in practice (how they reach and impact on Roma), what barriers Roma face in accessing public services, how effective are safeguards against discrimination and racism, what is the view of target groups on public policies.

Such experiences should not be discounted as “anecdotal evidence” but instead should be treated as valuable qualitative insight into the needs that should be addressed by NRSF, and effectiveness of the existing policies as implemented at the local level.

If available, information from authors’ or CSOs’ own experience at grassroots level can be used as input in Chapter 3, which focuses in depth on selected problems. Otherwise, this chapter should be based on experience of clearly identified stakeholders or Roma themselves, interviewed by the authors of the RCM report.

However, the authors of the report should always indicate that a statement is based on experience of specific CSOs from specific localities, and how widespread the problem/situation described is: if it happens only rarely, the strength of the argument is lower, yet it can indicate specific problems/situations ignored by public policies, which can have serious and long-term effects on people’s lives. On the other hand, a problem/situation can occur frequently and despite not having significant effects, it may indicate a systemic gap or failure of public policy. In both cases, the failure described can indicate that even well-intended policies do not fully recognise the conditions of marginalised communities, the mechanisms of exclusion, or their implementation misses important elements to make them accessible and effective for marginalised target groups.

Qualitative research

Qualitative research for purposes of second cycle of monitoring follows up on a subsection of key informant interviews carried out in the previous round. Where appropriate, respondents can be substituted, or new ones added.

The interviews carried out are in depth - in person, over video or over telephone. The first two options are more effective in collecting quality information.

We provide a basic interview guide, which is developed to be adapted to all types of respondents.

You only use those portions and questions, which are relevant to the given respondent.

Key informant interviews

Review the list of stakeholders contacted in the previous cycle and the newly added respondents and adapt the interview guide. Ideally, use the questions provided to compile specific questions for each respondent ahead of the interview.

Ask to record all interviews but assure that the recording is done solely for research purposes and will not be made public. If possible, compose a team to work on these together.

Prepare a consent statement (example is provided in Annex III to this document; you can adjust it to your needs and national legislation requirements) and ask each interviewee to sign it. Keep the signed consent statements in your file.

The following are considered minimum recommendations for the categories and numbers of respondents to contact for key informant interviews.

Type of respondent	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Notes
Public authority in charge of NRSF	1				It is ideal to start with walkthrough at management level.
Public authorities with responsibility in key areas	1 for each area covered by Chapter 1			1	Sectoral ministries and others. One authority may be responsible for several policy fields.
Public authorities in the area of EU funds	2	at least 1 for countries with TEC 4.5 (IT, PT, HR) or where authors decide to write the chapter on EU funding			ESF+ and ERDF Managing Authorities, other authorities managing other funds
National equality body	1				
Regional/local authorities in regions selected for in depth look in Chapter 3	at least 4	at least 2	0		Follow up on earlier monitoring cycle interviews as appropriate. Group interviews, focus groups, round tables and others can be used.
Public authorities in charge of statistics (involved in FRA working group)	1			0	Follow up on earlier interviews as appropriate.
Roma civil society and activists as broad representation as	at least 6	at least 3	at least 2	at least 1	Follow up on earlier interviews as appropriate. This is the most

possible, incl. different groups falling under the umbrella term “Roma”, new Roma minorities such as EU-mobile, as well as representing minorities among Roma (women, youth, LGBT)					important input to be provided by the overall RCM coalition and ideally including CSOs beyond the coalition. Group interviews, focus groups, round tables and other formats can be used.
Academia, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats	1 for each area	at least 1 for each area with critical problems		1	One expert may have expertise in several policy fields.

Group interviews and focus groups

You can use group interviews or simple focus groups (also carried out online) to gather information, validate findings and preliminary conclusions.

A group interview simply involves interviewing several respondents at the same time. Again, like with individual key informant interviews, this is better carried out with two interviewers working together. Group interviews work best if the respondents have similar backgrounds and are not at different levels of hierarchy (for example, interviewing a manager together with one or more of the staff reporting to them may limit the staff in voicing their views openly or let the manager dominate the conversation).

Focus group is a similar instrument but is more defined in its format. Usually there are up to 8-10 participants who should be of similar backgrounds. A focus group provides extra benefits compared with individual interviews by allowing participants to discuss and respond to each other’s statements. It requires a moderator who has experience in facilitating discussions and preventing the most vocal individuals from dominating the conversation. Someone with basic meeting facilitation skills can run a focus group without extensive previous experience and gain some of the benefits of this format.

An in-person focus group is suitable for discussions where the participants are in the same location (e.g., a focus group with mothers of school age children in a single school). It also requires space, refreshments, recording equipment. Usually, maximum number of participants is 8-10.

An online focus group can be carried out using Zoom or other video conferencing software. The advantage over a live focus group is the much lower cost in terms of room rentals, refreshments and especially transportation of participants. A suitable number of participants is somewhat lower (5-6) due to higher complexity of moderating a group without face-to-face contact. Zoom allows recording. Ideally, there are two interviewers – one serving as moderator and the other providing technical support, feeding the moderator additional questions over text chat or stepping in when appropriate. A disadvantage of online focus groups is that some sections of the population have limited access to technology or digital skills and may therefore be impossible to include.

Triangulation

The triangulation technique helps provide evidence-based assessments by cross-checking conflicting information or information provided by respondents who may have specific agendas or interests in presenting certain issues in a positive or negative light.

For example, if central authorities say the measures are implemented effectively while CSOs say the opposite, seek a third source of information or respondent, if possible, from a third stakeholder group (e.g., local government, regional government).

Case studies

To illustrate the problems and strengthen the validity and credibility of the monitoring report, short case studies can be included as text boxes within the chapters. This applies in particular to Chapter 3, where case studies are strongly recommended, to illustrate the problems covered.

Case studies can focus on implementation in a specific locality, in specific institutions or for specific groups of people.

Case studies give indication of effects of policies, programmes, or projects from the NRSF on Roma. They take advantage of the grassroots coalitions and organisations' local presence. In addition, they can draw on information from interviews or focus groups, published analyses and media reports.

If used, the short case studies may not necessarily focus on the most negative or problematic examples such as the localities or communities presenting complex ongoing interconnected problems. They may also cover examples illustrating the overall progress (or lack thereof). In addition to text, case studies may, where appropriate, also contain tables, graphs, maps, direct quotes, or pictures.

The case studies should state at the beginning what they intend to illustrate, reflect on the representativeness of the case study, discuss connections to the NRSF implementation and EU policies.

We have identified three types of case studies that may be appropriate to different problem area, themes, and countries:

Effects to be illustrated by case study	Format	Examples ²
Effects on a specific location (e.g., a district of a city, or a town, or a cluster of neighbouring villages)	Stand-Alone Local Case Study	Effects of Labour Market Reform on Roma Living in a Specific City How a Specific Programme Has Affected a Region with Significant Roma Population
Effects on a number of units (e.g., institutions, organisations, firms)	Institutional Case Study	Effects on New Measures Introduced in Primary Schools Practical Effects of an Intervention at Selected Hospitals
Effects on a specific group of people (e.g., cross-sectional groups)	Case study covering a location-specific sub-group or a group of people across locations	Healthcare Availability for Travellers After Changes in National Health System Effects of Reforms on Roma School Assistants at Various Schools

Interview guide

² These examples are included only to illustrate the specific category of case studies.

Ideally, interviews should be carried out by a team of interviewers. This allows a division of roles and also to better capture information and subtext.

Interview questions are not the same as monitoring questions above because many monitoring questions are composed of sub-questions that need to be asked to arrive at a balanced and complex assessment of the given topic.

At the start of the interviews, you should introduce the RCM and the monitoring to the respondent and explain briefly, how the information collected will be used. It is usually effective to explain to the respondent that the information they will provide can help make the implementation of the NRSF more effective. Ask the respondent's permission to record the interview and explain how the recording will be used (to make sure we do not miss any of the information they provide, only accessible to the researchers and not to be shared with anyone else).

Include a consent statement either in the recording or in writing (example is provided in Annex III of this guideline).

You should start by asking respondents broad and open-ended questions (ones that are not easily answered with a yes/no answer), inviting the respondent to formulate their views in their own words and share the way they prioritise the different problems or topics.

Later, you can follow up within each of the areas and where the respondent has not provided all the information required.

One of the interviewers should focus on taking notes while the other asks questions.

In **Annex II (Interview Questions Matrix)** we provide a table in the following format, which serves as an interview guide for interviews with different groups of stakeholders. Questions are grouped in logical sets by topics – you can choose to use or not use a certain set depending on the expertise of the respondent:

Question	Additional Questions (probes)	What respondents should the question be asked of?	What parts of the monitoring report does it inform?
----------	-------------------------------	---	---

Column 1 contains a broad starting question, which you can ask the respondent to solicit a longer answer. You can then use Additional Questions (sometimes referred to in qualitative research as probing questions or probes) to ask additional information on aspects of the question, which the respondent did not cover in their answer.

Column 3 next to each question indicates, which groups of respondents the question applies to - Roma contact point, government officials, Roma CSOs, experts, etc.

Finally, column 4 indicates, which monitoring criteria and monitoring questions the interview question helps answer.

Other data gathering instruments

Additional instruments you can consider using to collect information include questionnaires or online surveys.

You can compose a questionnaire to send out to additional respondents. Response rates for email questionnaires are often very low so this approach requires careful drafting of a questionnaire (not too long, not requiring long written responses but asking either for short lists or assessments on scales or prioritisation of pre-defined items) and selection of recipients (ideally ones who you can follow up with by phone or online chat to encourage them to provide answers).

Nonetheless they are a good way to increase participation and representativeness of the monitoring report when capacity limitations do not allow for further individual or group interviews.

Research ethics and protection of personal data

The development of the RCM country reports should follow ethical standards, which safeguard the credibility of the reports produced and of the whole RCM project and serve to protect the reports' authors and their information sources.

The overall **responsibility for ethical standards in research and reporting, and protection of personal data within the RCM project rests with authors of the RCM reports**, which are subcontracted by the CEU. The CEU provides them with general guidance and can provide specific advice upon request.

Authors of the RCM country reports should respect the principles of integrity, honesty and openness and a commitment to intellectual honesty and personal responsibility. Research should also aim to benefit society and minimise social harm, for example by reproducing or strengthening negative stereotypes.

Conflict of interests

Authors of the RCM monitoring reports or NGOs participating in their development can find themselves in situations, which could be interpreted as possible conflict of interest. This can occur in at least two typical situations:

1. They report on policy documents (NRSF), policies, programmes, or initiatives that they themselves have developed, or report on authorities they depend on for funding or other support. In such cases they can be suspected of being positively biased.
2. They report on authorities with which they are in legal, political, or expert dispute, or which rejected their request for funding. In such cases they can be suspected of being negatively biased.

To prevent such accusations and the credibility of the whole report being contested, it is useful that authors or CSOs engaged in developing reports openly declare and describe (e. g., in a footnote) their relation to the authority or policy (positive or negative), which is the subject of reporting, and make sure that their statements are sustained by unbiased evidence (such as statistical or other publicly available data), proper references to third-party resources (e. g. publicly available studies, information from media) or third-party opinions (unbiased experts). It is always useful to give authorities, with which the authors may be in conflict, a possibility to explain their position (and express your different opinion or demonstrate that the authority's claim is false if you have necessary evidence or arguments).

Protection of the individuals involved and informed consent

Research involving individuals must be undertaken to gain knowledge. Prior to, during and following the completion of research activities, researchers are expected to consider the ethical implications of their research and any of its consequences for the participants involved. In the case of the RCM project, the harm to participants may arise from possible negative professional or personal consequences for providing information to the RCM reports (such as sanctions for sharing internal information/knowledge or providing personal opinions in case of public authorities).

Before conducting research involving people (e. g., interviews), respondents must be informed that the interaction is part of a research aimed at development of the RCM country reports, understand the nature of the research and consent to providing information. In case where consent is possible only after the researched situation is over (for example: using information obtained in the past; or at events not organised within the RCM project, which however provided information relevant for developing the RCM country report), the researchers should obtain consent of informants before using the information acquired in the RCM country report. Ideally, consent should be obtained in writing (by e-mail) but where this is not possible, oral consent should be obtained and so documented.

Giving consent is not always a one-off event and participants have the right to change their minds and withdraw consent at any time. However, if the withdrawal of consent occurs at a time when it affects the ability to finalise the research (for instance, shortly before submission of the draft report), the withdrawal should result only in the deletion of all personally identifiable data of the participant.

Personal data

Authors must be committed to protecting and respecting the privacy of individuals and safeguarding their personal information, particularly personal data, i.e., any information relating to an identified or identifiable individual – such as

the name, or other indirect identifiers (for example the professional position, which would allow the identification of the person).

Personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade-union membership, as well as data concerning health or data concerning a natural person's sex life or sexual orientation are considered special categories of personal data, can be collected, and used only for legitimate purpose and explicit written consent for collecting, storing, and using such special personal data must be requested. The written consent is not necessary if information concerning the special personal data is quoted from publicly available sources, which are properly referenced in the RCM country reports (e. g., quote from a press article where a person reveals his/her political opinion or ethnic origin).

The collection, storage, disclosure, and use of personal data by researchers must comply with all legislation relating to data protection and arrangements must be put in place by researchers to carefully protect the confidentiality of participants and their data. Details that would allow individuals to be identified must not be published or made available to anybody not involved in the research unless explicit consent is given by the individuals concerned. The consent should be ideally written (e. g., by e-mail) and the authors should keep the proof of consent in case of possible disputes.

Anonymity

The RCM country report should guarantee confidentiality and anonymity if a participant requests them. Guarantee of anonymity can help the RCM country report authors in accessing important information, for example, about the decision-making of authorities. Even in such cases the authors should properly reference the source of information with respecting the anonymity (e. g., by indicating “representative of X [authority]”).

MONITORING CRITERIA

Monitoring reports will be based on three key monitoring criteria – **effectiveness, synergy and participation**. In this document, the criteria are applied appropriately (not necessarily in the same order) in the proposed chapters.

Each criterion is further elaborated in monitoring questions and questions further contain additional so-called key considerations – sub-questions or issues to consider in answering it. Among them you should only address those that are relevant to your country situation. Those that do not apply do not need to be answered or included in the structure of country monitoring reports.

The **effectiveness** criterion focuses on the fulfilment of the objectives set out by the NRSF, as well as the expectations of the NRSF in terms of its effects on Roma set out by the [2020-2030 EU Roma strategic Framework for Equality, Inclusion and Participation](#) (EU Roma Framework) and the [Council Recommendations on of 12 March 2021 on Roma equality, inclusion and participation](#). **Effectiveness covers effects across the target population.**

The **synergy** criterion focuses on the **interaction of national actions set out in the NRSF and, if applicable, subsequent action plans or other relevant policy documents with mainstream national and European policies and actions**. It is similar to alignment addressed in the previous monitoring cycle but looks at the practical implementation of aligned actions synergically (or not).

The **participation** criterion addresses participation **of Roma in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the NRSF**. Participation of different parts of the Roma community, including cross-sectional representation is required by the EU framework.

Criteria are applicable to all clusters of EU countries, but the depth of assessment will vary.

All reports should seek to answer the monitoring questions, but the depth and length of responses will differ significantly depending on the Cluster the country belongs to and also the specific problems relevant to Roma living in the country.

CHAPTER 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NRSF

This section is to provide a brief but systematic overview of changes in the NRSF and across all areas addressed directly by the NRSF.

1.1. Effectiveness: What are the key developments concerning the NRSF and its implementation?

1.1.1. *Have any changes been made in the NRSF and/or actions plans?*

Since the previous cycle of RCM2 monitoring, various countries have developed their NRSFs, Action Plans or possibly made other updates.

It is useful to review these changes (if any) to provide a background for further assessment of implementation.

Depending on the state of the NRSF at the time of previous cycle, it may be useful to comment on processes related to these key NRSF developments.

Key considerations:

- What, if any, changes have been made to the NRSF?
- Has an action plan been developed or is it under development?
- Has the EC recommended any changes to the NRSF and how have these been implemented?
- Has the NRSF been referenced and reflected in any subsequent government strategies, plans, policies, legislation relevant to areas of NRSF?
- If the framework or Action Plan has been developed, how would the original monitoring criteria of Roma participation (1.1-1.5 in RCM2 first cycle guideline) apply to the new or updated material?³

1.1.2. *What is the progress of NRSF implementation?*

This part should reflect the structure of the NRSF and review the implementation of any planned actions. This is to be a high-level review, focusing on the main developments, rather than doing an item-by-item review.

Depending on the expected state of implementation, this part may be brief if there are few activities planned in the NRSF for the current period.

Key considerations:

- Have the actions planned in the NRSF been implemented in accordance with the plan, government promises or statements?
- Are there any identifiable or anticipated delays to originally planned activities?

1.1.3. *What monitoring mechanisms have been employed and how effectively?*

Is there a monitoring mechanism in place in a formalised way or some informal arrangements?

Key considerations:

³ These criteria were:

- 1.1. Was the NRSF prepared in a participative way, and does it clearly reflect the views and priorities perceived and identified by the Roma themselves?
- 1.2. Are Roma included as active participants in the implementation of the NRSF and in the monitoring and evaluation process? Is there a plan to engage more Roma professionals as mediators?
- 1.3. Is there an established system of consultation with Roma and pro-Roma civil society and other relevant stakeholders for the purpose of policymaking and implementation, including specifically for the NRSF?
- 1.4. Does the NRSF create systematic opportunities for the empowerment of Roma at the local level?
- 1.5. Are there specific measures in the NRSF aimed at building the capacity of Roma civil society?

- Is there an appropriate/sufficient monitoring setup?
- Have the planned monitoring activities started taking place and are they taking place as scheduled?

1.1.4. *Have planned data collection activities been implemented or are they under preparation?*

In many cases the NRSF expected introduction of new data collection, adjustments to various data collection activities by government and other actors, collection of baseline data.

Key considerations:

- Have appropriate baselines been collected?
- Have preparations started for data collection activities envisioned in the NRSF?

1.2. Synergy: How is NRSF implementation aligned with domestic and EU actions?

NRSFs are expected to operate in conjunction with all relevant domestic policy processes. There should be institutional alignment, relevant policies, strategies, and plans should work in line with the framework and key policies should be mainstreamed.

The NRSF includes provisions for creating missing policies or updating existing policies and the relevant authorities should be aware of these.

1.2.1. *Have new strategies, policies or plans been developed in relevant areas and do they reflect the NRSF?*

We are looking for changes in general policies not necessarily formally linked to the NRSF but with impact on achievement of the NRSF's objectives.

1.2.2. *Are measures implemented in alignment with EU actions?*

Progress on actions outlined in the NRSF in actions such as the European Semester or the Resilience and Recovery Plans.

1.2.3. *Are key concerns from previous monitoring and assessments addressed in implementation?*

Review key recommendations contained in RCM2 first cycle report, in EC assessment, as well as any other relevant assessments by civil society, academics or experts. Review whether and how their findings and recommendations are being addressed.

1.3. Participation: Have Roma been involved in implementing the NRSF and monitoring its implementation?

1.3.1. *Have Roma CSOs been involved in implementation or are they on track to be involved when implementation proceeds?*

In addition to monitoring and evaluation, Roma can and should play a role in implementation as partners (civil society organisations contracted to carry out measures or cooperating on implementation in other ways).

Key consideration:

- Are representatives of Roma civil society organisations informed of the implementation details?

1.3.2. *Are Roma part of teams in public institutions involved in the implementation of the NRSF?*

Roma should also be part of teams in public institutions at all levels that are involved in the implementation of the NRSF.

1.3.3. *Are Roma participating in monitoring the implementation of the NRSF?*

Roma should be involved in monitoring the implementation of the NRSF in a representative and meaningful way.

Key considerations:

- Is Roma civil society involved in monitoring in a meaningful way?
- Are the networks formed in participative drafting of the NRSF used in monitoring and evaluating implementation?

Have civil society actors such as non-governmental organisations, social partners and academics/researchers been involved in accordance with the fundamental principles?

1.3.4. Contribution of National Roma Platform to the NRSF implementation?

European Commission provides financing (grants distributed via calls restricted for NRCPs) for establishment and operation of National Roma Platforms (NRP). Platforms' aim is to foster dialogue and consultation between governments, Roma civil society, and stakeholders.

Key considerations:

If your country implements the NRP:

- How the organisation of the NRP has contributed to the NRSF implementation?
- Has it the NRP empowered the NRCP in their task of coordinating and monitoring the NRSF implementation?
- Has the NRP contributed to mobilisation of Roma and pro-Roma civil society and other stakeholders in NRSF implementation?
- Has the NRP strengthen the government's and other stakeholders' accountability in relation to Roma equality, inclusion and participation?
- What have been shortcomings or challenges related to the NRP in your country?

If you country does not implement the NRP or implements it without EC's financial support:

- Why the NRCP did not apply for the EC funding despite very advantageous condition to reach the money?

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW BY THEMATIC AREA

This chapter provides a quick review across all main sectoral and horizontal priorities of the NRSFs. The focus will be on problems previously or currently identified as critical or significant in all of these areas (some of these problems will then be analysed in greater detail in the following chapter, Chapter 3.)

First cycle of RCM2 monitoring contained in Annex II **a list of problems and conditions in nine thematic areas** and asked CSOs to assess their significance; whether these problems are identified and sufficiently analysed by the respective NRSF; whether measures to address the problems are present and appropriate; and finally, whether relevant targets are well defined with respect to these problems. These assessments have been included in the country monitoring reports in the first cycle and **can now serve as the basis for assessing** whether and how critical and significant problems have been addressed.

The authors of the second RCM2 reports are asked to take several steps:

1. Firstly, they should **review the Annex II of the previous RCM report** and update it if any problem/condition has evolved since the previous monitoring cycle or new information on these problems/conditions is available. Possible changes affecting these areas include geopolitical changes such as war in Ukraine, economic and social changes including high energy prices, inflation, end of pandemic, or others. For example, if the first monitoring cycle identified a problem as “critical” or “significant”, but the problem at present does not concern a significant part of the Roma population or is not among the top problems to address according to experts, you can update the tables from Annex II of the first monitoring cycle report and change the problem’s relevance to “irrelevant” or “minor”. Or if the gravity of a problem labelled in the first cycle as “irrelevant” or “minor” has increased or new information have been revealed, you can change the relevance to “significant” or “critical”.
2. Then, they should **trim the table**: lines concerning problems/conditions with significance labelled as “irrelevant” or “minor” should be deleted, and the assessment of the NRSF implementation should focus only on problems/conditions that are “critical” or significant”.
3. Finally, provide an account of government’s actions to tackle the critical and significant problems and evaluate these actions by filling the new column named “Details of NRSF implementation relevant to the problem”:
 - a. **record any measures** that the “State”⁴ has introduced since the adoption of the NRSF (whether as part of measures planned in the NRSF or beyond) to address the given problem or condition; also, if in the two years since data collection for the first cycle of monitoring the government has adopted changes in the NRSF or in the planned measures, note them;
 - b. assess the **effectiveness** of each measure: whether the adopted measure effectively tackles the problem in question (i.e., helps Roma and potentially other people facing the given problem). For example, a housing allowance that does not reflect real costs is not likely to help people to get adequate housing in regions with limited job opportunities;
 - c. assess the **outreach** of each measure: whether the measure is likely to reach most or all people who face the given problem. This is important to assess, because some interventions can be geographically limited, such as small-scale or pilot projects implemented only in a limited number of localities (communities/settlements/municipalities/regions), while people living in other places do not benefit from them. Alternatively, some interventions can include conditions or other

⁴ As the RCM is aimed at making the governments accountable, if you refer to or analyse any specific policy or measure, **you should primarily focus on the governmental policies, programmes, and initiatives** (we include here **all governance levels and structures**, which are part of the “State” – central government, regional and local government or self-government, public agencies, and authorities, etc.). However, the reports can also include information on non-state initiatives (non-governmental organisations, charities, churches, private enterprises, etc.), if these **non-state initiatives are systematically supported by the State** (i.e., the government deliberately regulates or finances such initiatives), or if the government reacts to the **non-state initiative by mainstreaming or scaling them up**.

thresholds that exclude a part of the population in need from benefiting from the intervention (for example, housing benefits that are available only to homeowners, while households living in housing that they do not own or in informal housing are not eligible);

- d. assess whether the government **collects data (and data is available)** that allows the monitoring of the problem's development, and therefore enables the evidence-based evaluation of public policies in the given area.

The authors are requested to first update and complete the table “UPDATED LIST OF PROBLEMS AND CONDITIONS IN THEMATIC FIELDS” (Annex I of this guideline), and only then proceed to drafting this chapter. The present chapter should only contain a synthesis of the findings from the updated and completed table, that will also serve as justification for the assessment and conclusions in this chapter.

This chapter will therefore consist of sub-chapters with short assessments for each of those nine problem areas which pose a critical and/or significant problem according to your current assessment.

Planned sub-chapters:

- 2.1. Fighting antigypsyism and discrimination
- 2.2. Education
- 2.3. Employment
- 2.4. Healthcare
- 2.5. Housing, essential services and environmental justice
- 2.6. Income support (social protection)
- 2.7. Social services
- 2.8. Child protection
- 2.9. Promoting (awareness of) Roma arts, culture, and history

The length of these subchapters should be adjusted to the content in the area. If there are no significant or critical issues in a given area, it may simply contain a brief statement to that effect.

In those areas, where there are problems to be addressed in monitoring, a structure for the sub-chapters (2.X.1 – 2.X.3) is offered below.

2.X. [Thematic area sub-chapter]

For each area, summarise whether and how the critical and significant problems you have identified in the previous monitoring cycle have been addressed in the present monitoring period.

This should represent a quick review, summarising the most important aspects in the given thematic area. Rather than follow the order in the tables in Annex I in each subchapter, you can discuss the problems in the order of importance as per your assessment and the views of experts and respondents.

If there are critical or significant problems in the thematic areas, which are not identified in the NRSF, those omissions should also be included in the discussion, including analysis on why these topics have been omitted.

The length of the sub-chapter for each thematic area will depend on:

- the importance of the given area to Roma in the country,
- the extent of problems in the area,

- the extent to which they are addressed by measures in the NRSF being implemented.

2.X.1 Effectiveness: How has the NRSF been implemented in the given thematic area?

For each thematic sub-chapter, this section looks briefly at the government plans and promises regarding the specific problems identified in the updated monitoring as critical or significant.

It notes possible changes to the NRSF or action planning in this area and then looks at actual implementation and its effects relative to the scope of the problem addressed.

Key considerations:

- Have any changes to planned measures been made to the NRSF or Action Plan?
- What measures have been planned or announced by the government in the area?
- Has implementation started on any of these measures in the monitoring period?
- Have the measures noticeably/measurably affected the problems defined?
- Does the reach of the measures correspond to the scope of the problem (e.g., addresses all or most people affected by the problem)?
- Are meaningful data collected in the given thematic area that allow for the evaluation of the public policy?

2.X.2 Effectiveness: Are there critical or significant problems in this area, which the NRSF does not address directly?

The purpose of this section is to identify possible critical and significant problems, which are not recognised or addressed by the NRSF.

Key considerations:

- Are there significant or critical problems, which are omitted completely in the NRSF? Why have these problems been omitted?
- Are NCP and other officials responsible for the NRSF aware of these omitted problems?
- Are there plans to address these problems through the NRSF or other policy mechanisms?

CHAPTER 3: FOCUS ON KEY PROBLEMS AFFECTING ROMA

The introductory part of Chapter 3 explains briefly the choice of problems to focus on in detail. What critical or significant problems or strategic areas can be most effectively addressed using national and European policy mechanisms?

This is the key analytical section with the objective of identifying those problems or areas within the NRSF or outside of it, as recognised by other stakeholders including RCM, where there is greatest potential to make an impact on Roma equality, participation, and inclusion within the relatively short-term (2030) horizon of the NRSF. The number of problems to analyse and therefore the number of sub-chapters in Chapter 3 for different clusters of countries is outlined in the table below.

Number of selected key problems for deeper analysis:	
Cluster 1	3-4 problems
Cluster 2	2-3 problems
Cluster 3	2 problems
Cluster 4	1 problem

You need to identify priorities among the critical and significant problems as identified in the Annex I updated from the previous cycle of RCM2 monitoring.

These priorities may not necessarily be the most significant problems but rather ones that are significant but can be influenced by policies, programmes, and activities.

The reason for this selection is to maintain a sharp focus on those key problems that Roma face, where civil society monitoring can have the most significant near-term impact. In particular, we are looking for areas where other EU and national instruments can be leveraged – for example, to inform and influence:

- ongoing cases at the Court of Justice of the European Union,
- infringement proceedings at the EC,
- negotiations between the EC and Member States concerning revisions of operational programmes,
- the European Semester,
- other political, policy, legal and other agendas.

Such selectivity may effectively and consciously leave out some highly significant problems concerning Roma in the country if exposing and analysing them in this monitoring report is not likely to contribute to changes benefitting the Roma in the near term.

These priorities are subject to discussion and agreement with the RCM2 team, experts, and the European Commission.

Key considerations:

- Would improvement in a problem (or its resolution, if it is feasible within a horizon of years) lead to measurable improvements in equality, participation and/or inclusion of Roma?
- Does the problem concern a relevant share of the Roma population, compared to other addressable problems?
- Can the problem be measurably impacted by policy instruments, programmes and projects by the national government, EC, civil society?

3.X. [Problem area sub-chapter]

For each sectoral or horizontal problem area, we have a set of sections on Effectiveness, Synergy and Participation. The sub-chapter headings are formulated as questions that need to be answered to guide the development of the monitoring report (but the template for the report uses shorter headings).

Depending on the amount of information, you may simply structure the subchapter on each problem area into three sections (3.X.1. – 3.X.3.) or use the further structure of 4-digit sections.

Depending on the number of problems covered in the Chapter, the same structure can be replicated as 3.2, 3.3, 3.4.

3.X.1. Effectiveness: Is the NRSF effective in addressing critical and significant problems in this area?

Effectiveness criterion concerns the fulfilment of pre-determined objectives.

3.X.1.1 Do the goals of the NRSF in this area remain relevant to the needs of Roma?

Assess the relevance of the NRSF to the needs of Roma drawing on the assessment from the previous monitoring cycle but reflecting new developments in the area at the national level.

Key consideration:

- Have the effects of the pandemic, cost of living crises, war in Ukraine and other factors affected the problems faced by Roma and their needs?

3.X.1.2 Have measures been planned in the area and how, if at all, have they been implemented?

Review measures adopted in the area or their absence and where possible, assess their implementation.

Key considerations:

- Are the measures planned for a specific time? Are they on track to meet this plan?
- Is the scope of the measures sufficient for the extent of the problems being addressed?

3.X.1.3 What are the key barriers and bottlenecks preventing the resolution of problems in this area?

For each of the areas covered we need to analyse what the key barriers and bottlenecks preventing or limiting implementation of measures are. The particular focus is on those levers –measures, policies, institutions – where a change could expedite progress in the given area.

Key considerations:

- Is there political support for measures towards Roma equality, inclusion, and participation in the given area? Are there relevant political champions?
- Are there administrative barriers – rules, institutions – that hinder progress in the area?
- Are there legislative obstacles hindering progress in the area?
- Are there financial barriers on the side of funding from national budgets, use of EU funding or financing from other sources (industry, civil society) that prevent the implementation of measures in the area?
- Are there stakeholders who are blocking or impeding the resolution of problems in the area?

3.X.1.4 How can key barriers and bottlenecks be addressed?

In order to maximise the impact of civil society monitoring, we analyse here how the key barriers and bottlenecks identified in section 3.X.1.3 can be influenced in a realistic way.

Key considerations:

- Are there known effective measures in the national context that can be implemented/scaled up?
- Are there international experiences with certain types of interventions that could be applicable?
- Are there relevant instruments listed in the Council Recommendation, which are not applied in the NRSF?
- Which actors can address the barriers and bottlenecks identified and how can they be involved?

3.X.2. Synergy: Are measures in the area in synergy with other relevant national and EU actions?

This sub-chapter looks at the Synergy criterion in terms of actions by the national government, European Commission, and other policy actors (international organisations, civil society).

3.X.2.1 Are mainstream policies, strategies, measures being adopted or implemented in this area aligned with the NRSF?

Reforms of mainstream policies (education, employment, social inclusion) are expected to facilitate inclusion of Roma.

Key considerations:

- Specifically, what has been done for mainstream policies to reach Roma, help them overcome barriers and benefit from policy measures in these fields?
- Have there been any developments to mainstream policies and institutions? How have these taken into account the needs of Roma?

3.X.2.2 EU Actions

Various EU actions should reflect the identified needs of Roma inclusion, participation and equality as identified in the NRSF and also in the first cycle of RCM2.

3.X.3 Participation: Do Roma participate meaningfully in the implementation of the NRSF?

In the selected area, have Roma, in particular Roma CSOs participated in the implementation? In this section we review in more specific detail the participation of Roma civil society in the area.

We use questions developed in parts 1.2.4 and 1.2.5:

3.X.3.1 Have Roma CSOs been involved in implementation or are they on track to be involved when implementation proceeds?

3.X.3.2 Are Roma part of teams in public institutions involved in the implementation of the NRSF?

CHAPTER 4: USE OF EU FUNDING INSTRUMENTS⁵

This chapter is only relevant for countries from Cluster 1, countries that apply the Thematic Enabling Conditionality 4.5. (TEC) concerning Roma in the EU funds, and other countries where authors of RCM reports consider this chapter useful and feasible.

Roma inclusion and equality began to be an EU concern in 2010 with the launching of the first-ever Roma-specific-related policy instrument, the EU framework for Roma inclusion 2011-2020. In that moment, the most relevant EU financial instrument, the European Social Fund (ESF) Regulations 2007-2013 did not acknowledge explicitly the Roma population as a target group part of its social cohesion approach and, therefore, was not sufficiently aligned with the newly established policy priorities to tackle Roma inequalities.

While this lack of explicit targeting in the ESF Regulation did not prevent some Member States from implementing specific actions to reduce the inequality gap between the Roma and the overall populations (mainly focusing on employment), it did not lead to a general assumption that EU funds, mainly ESF, was a key instrument to invest on most disadvantaged groups, such as the Roma. However, the following European Structural and Investment Funds Regulations for the 2014-2020 programming period represented a substantial improvement over the previous programming period: they opened up a broad range of possibilities for promoting Roma inclusion and equality with the establishment of a specific Investment Priority 9.2 on the 'Socio-economic integration of marginalised communities such as the Roma' under Thematic Objective 9 'Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty' of the ESF. It also established an ex-ante conditionality under ESF/ERDF Thematic Objective 9 requiring that 'A national Roma inclusion strategic policy framework is in place' and the stronger linkages with the political priorities identified in the country-specific recommendations.

In current programming period of ESF+ 2021-2027, a greater step in strengthening the use the fund has been taken with the definition of a specific objective for Roma (j) promoting the socio-economic integration of marginalised communities, such as Roma people, allowing Member States to develop long-term programming and targeted measures on access to health, housing, education, employment and social services for Roma population, as well as specific measures on fighting against discrimination and anti-Gypsyism.

Currently, ESF+'s architecture allows for investing in Roma equality, aligning such investments with the established policy priorities under NRSF. However, the actual programming and, moreover, the access and implementation process of such funds, often has constraints that limit their potential impact.

We should search for these critical aspects and reflect about the actual conditions established in every Member State for the use of EU Funding for tackling Roma priorities in order to assess whether they are suitable for achieving the expected impact.

The aim of this chapter is to identify and critically analyse the contribution of EU funding/funds to the implementation of the selected key topics foreseen in the NRSF. To what extent, the allocation of EU funds for investing such key priorities are/has been clearly planned, what funds in particular (ESF+, ERDF, NextGenerationEU, or other funds) and what is the assessment of the conditions for such implementation: what dimension (national, regional, local), what duration (long-term, short-term...), and what type of involvement of key actors (partnership of public and private stakeholders) is/was in place.

To that end, in addition to reviewing the NRSF, the chapter can draw on EC Communication, possible national operational plans, along with the analysis of calls for proposals/resolutions and of approved projects, complemented by interviews with key public stakeholders regarding their assessment (National Roma Contact Points, ESF+ and ERDF Managing Authorities, other authorities managing other funds).

⁵ This chapter applies to reports from Cluster 1 countries, those from countries that apply the Thematic Enabling Conditionality 4.5. (Croatia, Italy, Portugal), and other countries, where authors consider it useful and feasible.

Topics to relate to the analysis of EU funds include education, employment, housing, gender equality, antigypsyism and antidiscrimination, reducing poverty and exclusion, participation. Long-term effective use of funding instruments of the EU has the potential to significantly contribute to funding measures promoting Roma equality, inclusion, and participation.

Specific relevant public instruments include:

- European Social Fund Plus (ESF+), EU's main instrument for "investing in people"
- European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) designed to strengthen economic, social, and territorial cohesion in the EU,
- NextGenerationEU, the innovation-focused pandemic recovery plan,
- other funds.

In particular, the ERDF tends to be under-analysed in the context of Roma equality. ERDF-funded programming can include focus on Roma – for building of infrastructure, including basic neighbourhood infrastructure such as schools and health facilities or investment in housing.

Depending on the specifics of EU funds framework and programming in each country, there may be advocacy opportunities to influence future programming or even calls for proposals in the current programming period.

4.1. Effectiveness: How are the conditions for EU funds implementation for Roma equality?

This sub-chapter addresses what dimension (national, regional, local), what duration (long-term, short term...), and what type of involvement of key actors (partnership of public and private stakeholders) is taking or has taken place.

Key considerations:

- How is ESF contributing to Roma equality – are specific objectives to influence Roma equality being used, how much money is to be implemented, does it go to support employment?
- How ESF is being planned? Does it correlate with policy priorities?
- How are ESF funds allocated and used? How is the regional component implemented?
- Is ERDF used to contribute to Roma equality?
- How do ERDF investments reflect the needs of Roma?
- How, if at all are other EU funding instruments such as NextGenerationEU allocated towards Roma equality?
- Is there a match between priorities and use of funds? Is there is scope for advocacy?
-

4.2. Participation: How is Roma civil society involved in EU funds implementation?

EU funding allocation for Roma-related priorities should include civil society organisations in general and Roma CSOs in particular in the overall monitoring and follow-up (monitoring committees or other formal structures).

Key considerations:

- Are Roma and pro-Roma CSOs involved in the formal monitoring structures for EU funds?
- Are the formal monitoring structures functional and do Roma CSO representatives have the opportunity for meaningful participation?

FORMAL REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING THE REPORT

The RCM monitoring reports will be publications of the European Union, which requires a high quality of the content but also a unified structure and form. The English version of the report will bear visual identity of EC publication with necessary disclaimers (indicating that despite the fact that the report is a publication of the European Union, it only represents the views of the authors) and information on the RCM2 initiative. You should not modify the template and formatting. After the endorsement of the draft report by the European Commission and before the publication, an ISBN number will be added into the report.

The report should be drafted in line with the EU's [Interinstitutional Style Guide](#). It requires usage of [British English spelling](#), and provides other conventions concerning [numbers and dates](#), [upper and lower cases](#), usage of [italics](#), [abbreviations and symbols](#), and references to [EU](#). You are kindly requested to familiarise yourself with these conventions and use them consistently in your reports.

You are requested to structure your monitoring report in line with the template provided in a separate file. Please, include in your report all chapters (one-digit level) and sections (two-digit level) as in template, as indicated for the Cluster, in which your country is included.

If the assessed category is not relevant for the country situation or data is missing (at present), you can only comment briefly that information was not available to answer the question or make the assessment and explain the reasons.

In each section, begin with the broad assessment answering the key question to enable the reader to see the main conclusions straight away. Follow up with supporting arguments referring to evidence from outside sources or your own research.

The second RCM2 country reports (2024) must be concise, and should not exceed:

for Cluster 1	50 pages
for Cluster 2	40 pages
for Cluster 3	35 pages
for Cluster 4	30 pages

excl. Executive Summary, Additional Findings, References and Annexes.

You are strongly recommended to illustrate the statements in your report with brief case studies in text boxes containing specific examples– this can make the report livelier and more credible. However, choose them carefully and keep them concise (e.g., do not to repeat what is stated in the chapter, but rather complement it), as this may add significant amounts of text toward the page limit. These case studies should be included mainly in the Chapter 3.

REFERENCES

[Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “A Union of equality: EU Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation”.](#)

[Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “Report on the evaluation of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies up to 2020”.](#)

[Commission staff working document “Evaluation of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies up to 2020 accompanying the document Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council ‘Report on the evaluation of the E](#)

[Council recommendation of 12 March 2021 on Roma equality, inclusion and participation \(2021/c 93/01\).](#)

European Network for Roma Inclusion under ESI Funds (2021). [Checklist for the Effective Inclusion of Roma interventions within EU Cohesion Funds programming 2021-2027.](#)

EVALSED. (2013). [The resource for the evaluation of Socio-Economic Development.](#)

Fresno, J., Lajčáková, J., Szira, J., Mačáková, S., Karoly, M. and Rossi, M. (2019). [A meta-evaluation of interventions for Roma inclusion.](#) Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Samset, K., Christensen, T. (2017). [Ex Ante Project Evaluation and the Complexity of Early Decision-Making.](#) Vanclay, R. (2012). [Guidance for the design of qualitative case study evaluation A short report to DG Regio.](#)

[Vademecum The 10 Common Basic Principles on Roma Inclusion.](#) Public Organization Review 17, 1–17.

Van Hout, B. (2020). [Monitoring & reporting on the new EU Roma Framework.](#) Intervention at High-Level Conference: Launch of the Strategic EU Roma Framework for Equality, Inclusion and Participation “Monitoring and reporting to enable policy learning”.

Annex I: UPDATED LIST OF PROBLEMS AND CONDITIONS IN THEMATIC FIELDS

All tables below should be included in each country report (in an Annex). Please note that the last column has been added to the tables used in the previous cycle of monitoring.

Problems and conditions:	Significance:*	Identified by strategy:	Measures to address:	Targets defined:	Details of NRSF implementation relevant to the problem:**
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • irrelevant, • minor problem, • significant problem, • critical problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • irrelevant, • mentioned but not analysed sufficiently, • understood with limitations, • identified and analysed sufficiently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • absent, • present but insufficient, • adequate but with room for improvement • appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • absent, • some targets but not relevant, • adequate but with room for improvement, • relevant targets well defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - measures adopted - effectiveness of measures - reach of measures - data collection

* Exclude those problems/conditions that are irrelevant for your country or represent only a minor problem (unless the situation has changed since the previous RCM report).

** For each critical or significant problem/condition, record what measures have been adopted, their expected effectiveness and reach, and whether meaningful data is available and being collected.

Annex II: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS MATRIX

Introduction:

Hello, my name is ... and I represent the organisation This is my colleague

We are part of an EU-wide initiative called the Roma Civil Monitor 2021-2025, which is financed by the European Commission and implemented by a consortium led by Central European University (CEU) and involving Roma civil society organisations from all EU Member States.

Our task is to help collect feedback from Roma civil society and a variety of experts and officials to increase the chance that our NRSF will lead to desirable changes.

The European Commission will review our report as one of the inputs when assessing the implementation of the NRSF.

We are interviewing you and people from a variety of public institutions and CSOs who represent different parts of society and diverse groups of Roma to get a realistic picture and reliable information.

We would like to ask for your consent for the recording of this interview only to make sure we do not miss anything important. We will not publish or share this recording anywhere. Is this OK?

Thank you very much!

Which respondents should the question be asked of?	Question	Additional Questions (probing)	What parts of the monitoring report does it inform?
National Roma Contact Point (NRCP)	Could you walk us through the main developments that have happened in connection with the NRSF over the past two years (since the middle of 2022)?	Have there been any changes made to the NRSF? What government strategies, plans, policies or legislation have reflected the measures in the NRSF?	1.1
Effectiveness			
Public authorities with responsibility in key areas Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats Regional and local authorities in key regions Roma CSOs and activists	What is your view of the implementation of the NRSF?	Have the measures adopted noticeably affected the main problems?	1.1, 1.2 2.X.1, 3.X.1

<p>Public authorities with responsibility in key areas</p> <p>Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats</p>	<p>Are you familiar with any planned data collection activities?</p>	<p>Has planned data collection begun?</p>	<p>1.1</p>
<p>NRCP</p> <p>Public authorities with responsibility in key areas</p>	<p>How is the implementation of the NRSF monitored?</p>		<p>1.1</p>
<p>Public authorities with responsibility in key areas</p> <p>Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats</p> <p>Regional and local authorities in key regions</p> <p>Roma CSOs and activists</p>	<p>What are in your view the most critical and significant problems for Roma in this area?</p>	<p>How is the NRSF addressing these problems?</p> <p>What are the key barriers preventing this problem from being resolved?</p> <p>What measures would you recommend implementing to address these problems?</p>	<p>3.1, 3.X.1</p>
<p>Public authorities with responsibility in key areas</p> <p>Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats</p> <p>Regional and local authorities in key regions</p> <p>Roma CSOs and activists</p>	<p>Have there been any changes in these problems due to recent political or social developments?</p>	<p>Has the end of the pandemic, high cost of energy, inflation or war in Ukraine made any difference?</p>	<p>3.X.1</p>
<p>Public authorities with responsibility in key areas</p> <p>Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats</p> <p>Regional and local authorities in key regions</p> <p>Roma CSOs and activists</p>	<p>I want to list some problems identified through our research in your area and get your views on how significant those problems are.</p> <p>(Use a short list of critical and significant problems in the area or area of</p>	<p>Are there any important developments in this area we should look at in detail?</p>	<p>Annex I</p> <p>2.X.1</p>

	focus of the respondent based on tables in Annex I).		
Public authorities with responsibility in key areas Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats Regional and local authorities in key regions Roma CSOs and activists	Are there any critical problems in this area that were missing on this list?	Why do you think the NRSF does not address this problem?	2.X.2
Public authorities with responsibility in the area of EU funds Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats	How are EU funds used to support equality of Roma?	How is ESF contributing to Roma equality? Is ERDF or other programmes user for Roma equality?	4.1
Synergy			
Roma CSOs and activists Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats	In areas of the NRSF you are familiar with, have any new strategies, policies or plans been developed over the past two years?	Do mainstream strategies, policies and plans incorporate Roma problems identified in the NRSF?	1.2, 3.X.2
NRCP	Has the EC asked or recommended any changes to the NRSF?	Have these changes been adopted?	1.2
Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats	Are there any relevant EU actions in this area?	Are these aligned with the NRSF?	3.X.2
Participation			
Roma CSOs and activists Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats	Have Roma and pro-Roma organisations/Has your organisation or other relevant Roma or pro-Roma civil society organisations been involved in	Are you well informed of the details of current or planned implementation of the NRSF?	1.3, 3.X.3

	implementation of any NRSF actions?		
Roma CSOs and activists Academics, experts, analysts, international organisations, donors, diplomats	Have Roma and pro-Roma organisations/ Has your organisation or other relevant Roma or pro-Roma civil society organisations been involved in some form of official monitoring of the NRSF implementation?		1.3
Roma CSOs and activists Public authorities with responsibility in key areas	Are there Roma involved in the teams at public institutions working on implementing the NRSF?		3.X.3
Roma CSOs and activists Public authorities with responsibility in the area of EU funds	Have Roma and pro-Roma organisations been involved in the implementation of EU funds?		4.2
All respondents	Is there anything we have not asked about that you feel is worth adding regarding the implementation of the NRSF?	Are there any other interviews you think we should do to get a better understanding of this topic? Are there any documents you recommend reviewing? If we come across additional questions, may we follow up with you by email or telephone?	

Annex III: EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

Consent form for Interview participation in Roma Civil Monitor (RCM) report on Implementation of the National Roma Strategic Framework (NRSF)

Introduction

My name is [interviewer's name], and I am a representative of [local CSO or CSO coalition name], participating in the Roma Civil Monitor (RCM) initiative. This initiative is funded by the European Commission (EC) and coordinated by Central European University (CEU) in consortium with ERGO Network, Fundación Secretariado Gitano (FSG), and European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC).

You are invited to participate in an interview for the preparation of a civil society shadow report on the implementation of the National Roma Strategic Framework (NRSF) in [name of the country]. Your insights and experiences are crucial for this initiative.

Purpose of the Interview

The purpose of this interview is to gather information about the implementation of the NRSF from various perspectives. The information provided will contribute to a comprehensive analysis and help improve policy and advocacy efforts.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. You may choose to participate or decline without any consequences. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw at any time without providing a reason.

Confidentiality

By default, your identity will be included in the report. However, if you prefer to remain anonymous, please indicate your preference below, and your data will be anonymised, and securely stored. You may prefer to be identified only by your institution (e.g., “representative of Ministry of Education”) or more generically by your institution's sector (e.g., “representative of a ministry”). You can indicate your preference below.

Interview Procedure

The interview will last approximately [insert duration].

Questions will cover your experiences, observations, and opinions regarding the implementation of the NRSF.

With your permission, the interview will be audio-recorded to ensure accuracy in data collection. The recordings will be transcribed and, if desired, anonymised.

Risks and Benefits

There are no foreseeable risks associated with participating in this interview. While there is no direct benefit to you, your contribution will significantly aid in the betterment of Roma policies and practices.

Consent

By signing this form, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the information provided above, and you agree to participate in the interview. Please indicate your preference regarding anonymity below.

Participant's Statement:

I have read the information provided above, and I understand the nature and purpose of this interview. I voluntarily agree to participate and consent to the interview being audio-recorded.

I consent to my identity being disclosed in the report:

Yes

No – please, indicate how to identify you: _____

Participant's Name: _____

Participant's Signature: _____

Date: _____