

THE HOUSING DIMENSION OF THE SOCIAL INCLUSION POLICIES FOR THE ROMA IN THE NEW MEMBER STATES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION. A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE BULGARIA, THE CZECH REPUBLIC, SLOVAKIA, BULGARIA, HUNGARY AND ROMANIA

Cristina Rat, Sociology Department, Babes-Bolyai University

The manuscript was completed within the research project The Racialization and Spacialization of Social Exclusion IDEI grant of the Romanian Government; director: Eniko Vincze, Babes-Bolyai University, 2012-2014.

„The EU's Europe 2020 strategy for a new growth path – smart, sustainable and inclusive growth – leaves no room for the persistent economic and social marginalisation of what constitutes Europe's largest minority. Determined action, in active dialogue with the Roma, is needed both at national and EU level. While primary responsibility for that action rests with public authorities, it remains a challenge given that the social and economic integration of Roma is a two-way process which requires a change of mindsets of the majority of the people as well as of members of the Roma communities.

First of all, Member States need to ensure that Roma are not discriminated against but treated like any other EU citizens with equal access to all fundamental rights as enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. In addition, action is needed to break the vicious cycle of poverty moving from one generation to the next” (EC, COM(2011) 173 final, p.2)¹.

The launching of the *EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies* in 2011 represented a turning point in the European Commission's approach concerning the role of the EU in ensuring the rights of the Roma, defined as a European minority facing the risks of discrimination, poverty and social inclusion. Unlike previous programs dedicated to Roma inclusion, such as the *Decade of Roma Inclusion*², the *EU Framework Strategy* addresses requirements (although by means of “soft” pressures) to older and new member states alike. In the case of Romania, the design of the national strategy (with its first version openly criticized³ by EC Commissioner Laszlo Andor³) represents an ex-ante condition for Romania in accessing EU funding for the 2014-2020 programmatic period.

¹ Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0173:en:NOT> (accessed: 14.10.2013).

² www.romadecade.org (accessed: 14.10.2013).

³ Andor, Laszlo (2013) Urgent action for Roma integration (press release). Speech 579/13, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, 26.06.2013.

The present paper comparatively analysis **the housing dimension of Roma social inclusion strategies** formulated by five new EU member states: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Romania. It synthesises the main critiques received by these national strategies from the EC (2012), the European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC, 2013) and the Civil Society Monitoring Reports, commissioned by the Open Society Foundations (OSF, 2013). Housing is defined as a key dimension of inclusion, along with education, employment, and access to health care services. The analysis below looks at **three sub-dimensions of the housing problem: (1) the right to housing and policies for social housing, (2) protection against forced evictions and (3) spatial desegregation**. For each country, it also presents the main recommendations of the EC (2012) on the national Roma inclusion strategies.

Bulgaria

Right to housing and policies for social housing

The Bulgarian National Programme for Improving the Living Conditions of the Roma stopped in 2009 due to the financial crisis, and the housing component of the program, crucial to compensate for the small stock of public housing (less than 3% of the housing stock), was abandoned. Similarly to Romania, the *EC Services on the Development of Partnership Agreement and Programmes* explicitly recommend the Bulgarian government to commence integrated programs for the Roma, that simultaneously address the four areas of inclusion: education, employment, social and healthcare services, and housing (see Dimitrov, Grigorova and Decheva, 2013: 46).

Protection against forced evictions

Legal protection against forced evictions is weak. Amnesty International⁴ reports only for 2013 on two cases when the European Court of Justice (April) and the UN Human Rights Committee (November) ruled against Bulgarian local authorities who intended to forcibly evict impoverished Roma families with children who were threatened with eviction and demolition of their homes, built illegally on public or private land properties. Such cases do not constitute seldom occurrences, but they rather reflect a general attitude of Bulgarian authorities towards poor, improvised Roma settlements, as the mayor of the capital city of Sofia declared in July the same year: “illegal dwellings must be pulled down, people who come from other parts of the country should be sent back” (*Standard*, 26th of July 2013, cited by Amnesty International, 2013 Report on Bulgaria). These

⁴ Amnesty International, 2013, <http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/bulgaria/report-2013> (Accessed: 14.10.2013).

phenomena are not new either: see, for example, the case from September 2009, documented by the ERRC⁵.

Spatial desegregation

Segregation affects a large segment of the Roma population, not only in the field of housing, but also in that of education. In the absence of a financially supported national strategy for social housing, residential desegregation may hardly occur. Spatial isolation is deepened by the lack of adequate, affordable public transportation system, especially in rural areas. *The Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Roma Inclusion Strategy in Bulgaria* highlights that lack of public transportation in the rural areas constitutes an important barrier to social inclusion and a risk-factor, as people often have to rely on informal transportation services (Dimitrov, Grigorova and Decheva, 2013: 47).

EU Recommendations to the housing dimension of national Roma inclusion strategy:

- *“The quantification of the scope of actions should be developed and be supported by appropriate funding.*
- *Municipalities are expected to make needs assessments and prepare action plans for the improvement of the housing conditions of Roma, but no measure is specified in order to ensure deliver.*
- *Desegregation in housing should be addressed along with desegregation in education and labour market integration” (EC on BG, 2012: 2).*

The Czech Republic

Right to housing and policies for social housing

The ERRC (2013) criticized the Czech government for lacking a “conceptual and systemic” approach on social housing, and for leaving the responsibility of financing and managing social housing at the level of municipalities, who prefer to finance municipal housing, rented at a higher rate. The report also warns about the risks of expanding private residential hostels, where tenants have short-time contracts and their legal protection is frail (ERRC, 2013: 33). However, the UNDP/WB/EC survey shows that, as a percentage, the Roma minority in the Czech Republic benefits most from public housing, as 54% of the Roma living in urban areas reside in municipal/state housing. The closest to this proportion, from CEE countries, is Hungary with 21%, while the rest of countries included in this analysis have around 10% or less of the Roma families benefiting from municipal/state housing (see Table 2).

⁵ European Roma Rights Centre, 9th of September 2009. <http://www.errc.org/article/errc-urges-bulgarian-authorities-to-act-against-forced-evictions/3054> (Accessed: 14.10.2013).

Protection against forced evictions

Following the 2006 Building Act, all dwellings constructed without authorisation, regardless of owning or not the land it was built upon, can be demolished in case that local authorities decide so. The law put under the risk of eviction several Roma families from deprived settlements (ERRC, 2013: 33). The latest documented case by Amnesty International happened in the city of Ostrava, in August 2012⁶.

Spatial desegregation

Desegregation is less discussed in the Czech Republic in the housing context, but it is addressed more explicitly in the field of education.

EU Recommendations to the housing dimension of national Roma inclusion strategy:

- *“The strategy could be further improved by concrete measures to provide non-discriminatory access to housing, including good quality social housing.*

The implementation of measures should be underpinned by legal steps in the area of protection of Roma households against unlawful practices in the property market” (EC on CZ, 2012: 2).

Slovakia

Right to housing and policies for social housing

According to the *Slovak Anti-Poverty Network*, cited by the ERRC in their country profile for 2013 (ERRC, 2013: 17) the protection of the right to housing is the least developed component of Slovak public policies. As the UNDP/WB/EC 2011 survey also indicates (see Tables 1-8) segregation and poor quality housing affect large segments of the Roma minority, and the differences between Roma and non-Roma are significant. The *Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Roma Inclusion Strategy in Slovakia* (Lajcakova, 2013) stresses that, according to the same survey, the Roma who changed their address during the last 5 years usually moved from integrated houses towards segregated, poor areas. Moreover, these out-migrations from towns and villages constituted more than half of all entries to segregated settlements. This finding is contradictory to the shared expectation that most of the newcomers to marginalized settlements should come from even more deprived and more distant areas. Similarly to other post-socialist countries, new public social housing has been barely

⁶ Amnesty International, 5th of August 2012, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/news/czech-republic-roma-families-imminent-risk-forced-eviction-2012-08-03> (accessed: 14.10.2012).

built since 1990 and the ERRC report indicated a 21% decline of constructing new buildings commissioned by municipalities. *Good practice*: some municipalities bought the land on which the houses of impoverished Roma communities were located, parcelled the land and rented/sold it to the Roma families, so that they can legalize their residence (Lajcakova, 2013: 78). Nonetheless, as mentioned before, these families needed also to legalize their dwellings by obtaining post-factum construction permits.

Protection against forced evictions

According to the ERRC, legal protection against evictions is low. After the 2001 *Act on Waste (223/2001)* several Roma settlements were demolished, arguing that they constitute “dumping ground” and sources of pollution (Lajcakova, 2013: 78). Moreover, all houses built without authorisation (even on one’s own land) can be demolished following the decision of the local Building Office (ERRC, 2013: 17-18). Owners of such houses need to legalize the dwelling in a timeframe set by the Building Office, which requires around 30 different authorisations. According to the ERRC (2013), Roma from impoverished settlements hardly have the resources to carry out these post-factum legalizations, and even less to sue in court against the decision of the Building Office.

Spatial desegregation

Both the ERRC, and the Civil Society Monitoring report stresses that the only official regulation that contains the principle of desegregation in the field of housing is the *Proposal of Implementation Mechanism for Pilot Approach to Using EU Structural Funds for Housing Infrastructure, 2014-2020*.

Following the decentralisation from 2004, Regional Roma Self-Governments were established, with the role to help local and regional authorities to develop strategies and action plans for Roma inclusion. According to the Civil Society Monitoring Report, 145 municipalities designed *Strategies for a Comprehensive Approach* by 2013, but many of these actually do not include the domain of housing. Nonetheless, there are some examples of success: in Spišský Hrhov, the local Roma community was involved in the process of local-level planning and decision-making, with the facilitation of an NGO, leading to good results for all stakeholders (Lajcakova, 2013: 82).

EU Recommendations to the housing dimension of national Roma inclusion strategy:

- *“Concrete, more ambitious and integrated measures to provide non-discriminatory access to housing*
- *The link between the goals and the process to reach them needs to be strengthened.*

- *The issue of eligibility for housing support for people with temporary residence in shelters or in undocumented dwellings should be addressed” (EC on SK, 2012: 2).*

Hungary

Right to housing and policies for social housing

Public housing for rent, similarly to Bulgaria, constitutes only 3% of the housing stock, and its quality is rather poor: almost half of the apartments are one-room, and one-fourth substandard; given that these apartments are connected to municipal heating systems, the heating costs during the winter are higher than in private houses. The government did not introduce the housing-maintenance subsidies envisaged in the previous social inclusion strategy, instead price-regulating mechanisms were introduced for energy, water and sewage, with universal coverage, yet with little real impact on the welfare of the poorest, as they cannot afford to pay for these services even at the lowered cost (Balogh et al., 2013: 88-90). The rehabilitation of deprived neighbourhoods was carried out with the financial support of the *Regional Operational Programmes (ROP)*, and remaining funds were directed towards consolidating the social dimension of projects.

In the national strategy for economic recovery (the New Széchenyi Plan), the construction sector is seen as crucial for creating jobs and strengthening the economy. However, the *Home Creation Programme* (that it accompanies) serves mainly the interest of the middle class, as homes built within the national program can be then sold to the renters, similarly to the case of ANL housing in RO. The “elimination of ghettos” is also mentioned in the plan, but no methodological guidelines are provided, which creates suspicion about the actual implementation.

Protection against forced evictions

The *Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Roma Inclusion Strategy in Hungary* does not mention the problem of eviction as being prominent in Hungary. The last warning report on evictions in Hungary issued by the ERRC dates back in 2004⁷, the year of EU integration. However, the security of Roma families was seriously undermined during the last three years, as several cases of violence against the Roma were reported in different parts of Hungary⁸.

Spatial desegregation

⁷ European Roma Rights Centre, 7th of February 2004, <http://www.errc.org/article/forced-eviction-of-one-romani-community-stopped-while-others-continue-in-hungary/1362> (accessed: 14th October 2013).

⁸ See, for example, ERRC, 15th of June 2012, <http://www.errc.org/article/attacks-against-roma-in-hungary-the-czech-republic-and-the-slovak-republic/3042> (accessed: 14th October 2013); Amnesty International, 5th of August 2013, <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/hungary-roma-trial-verdict-2013-08-06> (accessed: 14th October 2013).

For the 2014-2020 programming period, municipalities that intended to apply for EU funding for urban regeneration were requested to develop *Integrated Urban Development Strategies*, following a national manual⁹, and, within them, *Desegregation Plans* ought to be designed. The manual contains explicit reference to deprived neighbourhoods inhabited mostly by Roma, and argues that these neighbourhoods can be rehabilitated using EU funding only in case that their maintenance is desirable on the long run, and segregation is not reinforced; the manual also warns that the elimination of slum areas cannot be done with EU financing (*Varosfejlesztési kezikönyv*, 2013: 14-15). In the first half of 2013, municipalities from three regions were asked, within a pilot project, to issue a plan for the desegregation of isolated, deprived areas, many of them inhabited by Roma. According to Balogh et.all (2013), 26 applications were submitted by different authorities. The results cannot be evaluated yet.

EU Recommendations to the housing dimension of national Roma inclusion strategy:

“More attention should be given the social housing” (EC on HU, 2012: 3).

Romania

Right to housing and policies for social housing

The legal framework for granting social housing is set by the Law on Housing 114/1996, ammended by Law 145/1999, and the Law on Combating Social Marginalization 116/2002. Although the main responsibilities for alleviating poverty and promoting social inclusion belong to the Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Protection (re-named in 2013 as the Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Protection and Elderly), the competences in the field of social housing reside at other ministries (Ministry of Regional Development and party the Ministry of Transport) and at local authorities. The only *National Program* in the field of social housing is the *ANL Program* of the *National Agency for Housing*, which only targets young persons below the age of 35, most importantly those leaving institutions of public child care and those with high level of education and secure income. Once receiving a rent in an ANL house, they are entitled to buy the home after five years of living there. „Regular social housing” and „emergency housing” remain at the sole competence (planning, financing, administration, etc.) of local authorities, that most often have little incentives to prioritize social housing. National laws only indicate some general principles for granting social housing (for example, the prioritization of young families below 35 years old, of persons leaving the state child care institutions), but the precise eligibility criteria, the settling of priorities, belong to municipalities.

⁹ Hungarian Government, Urban Development Manual, www.nfu.hu/download/38840/S_7_Varosfejlesztesi_kezikonyv.pdf (accessed: 14th October 2013).

According to the UNDP/WB/EC 2011 survey, only 10.8% of Roma families from urban areas rent municipal/state apartments, and less than 1% do so in rural areas.

Although housing deprivation is an important dimension of the risk of poverty and social exclusion, discussed as such and highlighted in the report *Getting out of Poverty. Publication of the European Commission at the Closing Conference of the European Year of Combatting Poverty and Social Exclusion* (European Commission, 2010) and also in the *EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies* (2011), in Romania the *Social Inclusion Unit* within the *Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Protection* has almost no competences in the field of social housing. Moreover, at the local level, social housing is not necessarily managed by the municipal welfare offices, but often by other departments or contracted out to private management companies.

Protection against forced evictions

The Romanian legislation has not incorporated yet fully all European regulations aimed at protection against forced evictions. During the last years, several evictions took place, mostly due to an inadequate interpretation of the principals and scopes of urban regeneration: Miercurea-Ciuc, 2004; Cluj-Napoca, 2010; Baia Mare, 2013; Eforie Suc, 2013, to mention just a few. These cases were documented by GLOC¹⁰, ERRC¹¹, and Amnesty International¹².

Spatial desegregation

There are no systematic evaluations of the scale of spatial segregation in the case of impoverished Roma communities, neither systematic de-segregation policies implemented at the national or the local level. Urban regeneration and relocation projects often reinforce spatial segregation. The *National Roma Inclusion Strategy* does not provide reliable instruments to address this problem.

EU Recommendations to the housing dimension of national Roma inclusion strategy:

“The strategy does not appropriately address access to (social) housing. Detailing a calendar, targets, indicators, and budget are needed to secure the effective implementation. The strategy could be improved by identifying areas with extremely poor communities and defining targeted measures to address the specificities of the situations” (EC on RO, 2012: 2).

¹⁰ Working Group of Civil Society Organizations, Cluj-Napoca, www.gloc.ro (accessed: 14.10.2013).

¹¹ <http://www.errc.org/article/romania-eviction-leaves-100-people-homeless-in-dangerous-conditions-%E2%80%93-authorities-must-act-urgently/4204> (accessed: 14.10.2013).

¹² <http://www.amnesty.org/actions/end-forced-evictions-in-romania> (accessed: 14.10.2013).

**NATIONAL CONDITIONS AND POLICY OUTCOMES IN NEW MEMBER STATES
FROM CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE**

The second part of the paper employs the 2011 UNDP/WB/EC Pilot Roma Survey dataset in order to analyse similarities and differences between the spatial marginalization and housing condition of Roma and non-Roma living in their proximity in five new EU member states from Central and Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Romania. The indicators investigated in this study can be interpreted as consequences of complex, historically embedded social and economic conditions, but also as outcomes of former and current social policies.

The dataset contains, for each 12 countries, 750 Roma and 350 non-Roma households living in or close to Roma communities, and can be downloaded at:

<http://europeandcis.undp.org/data/show/D69F01FE-F203-1EE9-B45121B12A557E1B>.

Indicators used to compare Roma and non-Roma households from urban and rural areas in the 5 CEE countries:

- Type of dwelling (external evaluation by the field researcher/interviewer)
- Ownership of dwelling
- Number of rooms per household member
- Number of square meters of the house per household members
- Distance to the nearest bus stop from the house
- Distance to the nearest primary school from the house
- Existence of sewage or waste water tank
- Perception of the neighbourhood having been changed in the last 5 years (or since living there)

The statistics are based on original research and the SPSS syntax file designed for producing them is available in the Appendix.

Table 1. Distribution of households by the type of dwelling (external evaluation by the field researcher/interviewer)
--

	Urban		Rural	
Bulgaria	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
apartment in bloc-of-flats	8.9	16.9	2.5	1.8
new house in good condition	16.8	34.1	13.5	27.8
older house in relatively good condition	55.0	45.2	65.8	69.8
ruined house or slums	18.6	3.8	17.4	0.5
camp/adapted building (accommodation for refugees)				
other: new houses under construction	0.8		0.7	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
The Czech Republic	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
apartment in bloc-of-flats	34.5	39.6	61.0	22.2
new house in good condition	0.7	6.5	1.9	41.7
older house in relatively good condition	46.1	46.7	32.4	36.1
ruined house or slums	13.3	2.7	4.8	
camp/adapted building (accommodation for refugees)	0.2			
other: half were lodging houses, the rest shelters and garages	1.7	1.2		
Missing	3.4	3.4		
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Slovakia	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
apartment in bloc-of-flats	37.8	52.8	4.4	3.4
new house in good condition	1.1	12.7	6.9	22.7
older house in relatively good condition	45.3	30.6	46.1	65.1
ruined house or slums	12.2		38.5	6.9
camp/adapted building (accommodation for refugees)				
other: illegal buildings or extensions	2.0	0.5	0.5	
Missing	1.6	3.3	3.7	1.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Hungary	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
apartment in bloc-of-flats	8.3	9.7	0.4	0.7
new house in good condition	7.8	20.7	8.5	22.0
older house in relatively good condition	43.3	57.9	59.3	67.2
ruined house or slums	40.6	11.8	31.9	10.0
camp/adapted building (accommodation for refugees)				
other (specify)				
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Romania	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma

apartment in bloc-of-flats	13.1	16.2	0.1	
new house in good condition	16.5	24.2	20.0	30.7
older house in relatively good condition	40.5	54.6	47.3	64.7
ruined house or slums	25.6	4.3	31.6	4.6
camp/adapted building (accommodation for refugees)	3.7	0.5		
other: new houses under construction	0.7	0.2	1.1	
	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Table 2. Distribution of households by ownership of dwelling

	Urban		Rural	
	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
Bulgaria				
my family / member of the family	77.0	91.3	90.2	94.4
my relatives	10.8	3.4	5.2	3.8
other person's ownership (not family related)	2.1	1.5	2.4	0.6
municipal/state ownership	6.2	1.9	1.2	1.3
unknown ownership	3.0	0.5	0.6	
Refused	0.7	0.5	0.3	
Missing	0.2	1.0		
	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	Urban		Rural	
	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
The Czech republic				
my family / member of the family	9.8	40.3	19.0	80.0
my relatives	5.4	3.5	9.5	
other person's ownership (not family related)	13.5	11.2	33.3	10.0
municipal/state ownership	54.8	24.4	38.1	10.0
it is a collective center/camp	7.2	16.5		
unknown ownership	1.8	0.3		
other, what?	2.9	1.5		
Refused	0.5	0.9		
don't know	3.7	1.2		
Missing	0.4	0.3		
	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	Urban		Rural	
	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
Slovakia				
my family / member of the family	64.7	76.8	76.1	87.4
my relatives	14.3	8.9	14.1	6.7
other person's ownership (not family related)	2.9	3.6	1.7	0.8
municipal/state ownership	9.7	5.4	1.9	0.4
unknown ownership	1.3		2.5	0.8
Other				0.8
Refused	0.8	2.7	0.8	0.4
don't know	1.7		0.6	
Missing	4.6	2.7	2.3	2.5

	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Hungary	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
my family / member of the family	68.1	85.2	93.6	94.8
my relatives	3.7	2.1	2.9	1.4
other person's ownership (not family related)	5.3	2.8	1.8	1.9
municipal/state ownership	21.9	8.5	0.7	0.9
unknown ownership	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9
Refused	0.3	0.7	0.2	
Missing			0.2	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Romania	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
my family / member of the family	76.8	84.9	92.5	95.1
my relatives	6.3	4.8	4.8	3.9
other person's ownership (not family related)	2.9	4.8	1.4	0.5
municipal/state ownership	10.8	4.8	0.7	0.5
it is a collective center/camp	1.9	0.7	0.2	
unknown ownership	1.0		0.2	
Refused	0.3		0.2	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	Urban			Rural		
	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.
Bulgaria						
Roma	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.8
non-Roma	1.3	1.5	0.9	1.5	1.9	1.2
The Czech Rep.						
Roma	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.4
non-Roma	1.0	1.0	0.6	1.3	1.2	0.4
Slovakia						
Roma	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4
non-Roma	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	0.7
Hungary						
Roma	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.5
non-Roma	1.0	1.1	0.6	1.0	1.3	0.7
Romania						
Roma	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.6
non-Roma	1.0	1.3	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.0

	Urban			Rural		
	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.
Bulgaria						
Roma	12.5	17.9	16.9	14.3	19.0	16.4

non-Roma	28.3	33.1	19.1	35.0	39.7	22.8
The Czech Rep.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.
Roma	11.6	13.6	8.3	12.8	23.2	39.7
non-Roma	21.0	25.4	15.4	30.0	33.1	14.8
Slovakia	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.
Roma	12.4	14.8	10.2	11.4	13.2	9.3
non-Roma	22.7	28.6	25.7	21.7	27.7	16.7
Hungary	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.
Roma	15.4	19.8	14.4	17.8	22.8	16.0
non-Roma	30.0	35.5	22.8	37.5	43.9	25.7
Romania	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.	Median	Mean	Std.Dev.
Roma	8.9	12.9	14.5	10.0	13.9	14.4
non-Roma	22.9	29.6	28.3	26.0	34.1	30.1

Table 5. Distance to the nearest bus stop from the house				
	Urban		Rural	
Bulgaria	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	72.1	78.8	70.5	83.2
1-3 km	23.3	17.6	24.6	14.2
3-5 km	4.6	3.6	3.1	0.5
5-10 km			1.5	2.1
over 10 km			0.3	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Czech Rep.	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	76.6	81.0	81.0	75.0
1-3 km	18.1	15.7	19.0	19.4
3-5 km	4.1	3.0		5.6
5-10 km	1.1	0.3		
over 10 km	0.1			
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Slovakia	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	70.3	68.8	72.4	76.8
1-3 km	25.4	24.7	25.0	20.8
3-5 km	4.4	6.5	0.5	0.2
5-10 km			2.0	2.2
over 10 km			0.2	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Hungary	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	69.1	70.4	80.9	82.5
1-3 km	27.7	27.5	17.6	16.4
3-5 km	3.2	2.1	1.6	0.7

3-5 km				0.4
over 10 km				
		100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Romania	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	73.7	71.2	78.6	81.0
1-3 km	19.2	25.1	15.0	13.0
3-5 km	3.6	1.6	1.1	1.0
5-10 km	1.7		1.4	3.3
over 10 km	1.8	2.1	3.9	1.7
	100.0	100.0	100	100

Table 6. Distance to the nearest primary school from the house				
	Urban		Rural	
	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
Bulgaria				
less than 1 km	66.0	68.2	46.9	56.2
1-3 km	29.1	28.7	34.5	23.6
3-5 km	4.1	3.1	8.0	7.1
5-10 km	0.8		5.5	5.2
over 10 km			5.1	7.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Czech Rep.	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	47.4	46.8	58.1	66.7
1-3 km	32.3	38.1	12.4	33.3
3-5 km	16.1	12.9	13.3	
5-10 km	4.1	2.2	14.3	
over 10 km	0.2		1.9	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Slovakia	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	64.3	56.9	49.2	53.7
1-3 km	30.6	40.4	44.4	38.2
3-5 km	3.7	2.7	2.8	4.8
5-10 km	1.0		3.0	2.8
over 10 km	0.4		0.6	0.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Hungary	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	34.2	34.6	47.9	48.6
1-3 km	53.6	58.9	35.6	35.0
3-5 km	10.6	6.5	7.9	5.8
3-5 km	0.6		4.6	7.1
over 10 km	0.9		4.0	3.5

	Urban		Rural	
Romania	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
less than 1 km	64.6	65.5	71.4	70.8
1-3 km	29.5	29.9	28.0	27.8
3-5 km	2.6	2.5	0.3	1.4
5-10 km	0.1			
over 10 km	3.2	2.1	0.2	
	100.0	100.0	100	100

Table 7. Distribution of households by having sewage or waste water tank				
	Urban		Rural	
Bulgaria	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
yes	62.3	87.9	32.9	46.9
no	34.0	11.2	66.2	52.5
refused	0.2	0.5	0.3	
don't know	2.3	0.5	0.6	0.6
missing	1.1			
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Czech Rep.	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
yes	93.6	97.6	95.2	100.0
no	3.3	2.1	4.8	
don't know	2.3			
missing	0.8	0.3		
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Slovakia	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
yes	66.8	88.4	41.5	81.1
no	26.1	7.1	56.4	17.2
refused	2.5	1.8		
don't know	0.8	0.9		
missing	3.8	1.8	2.1	1.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Hungary	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
yes	54.8	72.5	42.9	60.8
no	44.9	26.8	55.8	39.2
refused			0.4	
don't know			0.2	
missing	0.3	0.7	0.7	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Romania	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma

yes	33.3	58.9	7.9	23.5
no	65.7	40.4	91.6	76.0
don't know	0.3		0.2	0.5
Missing	0.6	0.7	0.2	
	100.0	100.0	100	100

Table 8. How has your neighbourhood changed in the last 5 years, or since you have been living here?				
	Urban		Rural	
Bulgaria	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
Improved	16.6	18.4	11.6	10.6
stayed the same	57.0	54.4	65.2	75.6
got worse	24.6	24.8	17.7	11.3
Refused		0.5	0.9	0.6
don't know	1.8	1.9	4.6	1.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
The Czech Republic	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
improved	14.8	15.0	38.1	40.0
stayed the same	50.7	46.8	47.6	40.0
got worse	26.7	32.4	4.8	10.0
Refused	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.0
don't know	7.1	5.6	9.5	10.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Slovakia	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
improved	25.6	27.7	28.8	27.3
stayed the same	35.7	47.3	43.8	42.0
got worse	33.2	19.6	22.4	23.5
Refused	2.5	0.9	0.4	0.8
don't know	2.9	4.5	4.6	6.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Hungary	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
improved	16.6	16.2	14.2	13.2
stayed the same	34.6	34.5	47.3	41.0
got worse	47.8	48.6	36.7	44.8
don't know	1.0	0.7	1.8	0.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Urban		Rural	
Romania	Roma	non-Roma	Roma	non-Roma
improved	32.1	32.9	34.8	37.3
stayed the same	45.4	48.6	50.5	52.9
got worse	20.6	17.8	13.8	9.3

Refused	0.0	0.0	0.5	
don't know	1.9	0.7	0.5	0.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

REFERENCES

1. Amnesty International (2013): *Hungary: Murder Convictions are 'Wake-up Call' over Hate Crimes against Roma*. [disponibil pe: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/hungary-roma-trial-verdict-2013-08-06>][Accesat: 18.09.2013]
2. Balogh L., Berki J., Daróczi G., Ivány B., Koczé A., Moldova Z., Novoszádek N., Farkas Z., Koltai L., Kóródi M., Kőszeghy L., Somogyi E., Szendrey O., Teller N., Wagner J., (2013), *Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Implementation of the National Roma Integration Strategy and Decade Action Plan in 2012 in HUNGARY*, [disponibil pe: http://romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9270_file8_hu_civil-society-monitoring-report_en.pdf][Accesat: 17.09.2013]
3. CE (2012) *National Roma Integration Strategies: a first step in the implementation of the EU Framework*, [disponibil pe: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/swd2012_133_en.pdf][Accesat: 18.09.2013]
4. COE – Council of Europe (2013), *Document prepared by the Support Team of the Special Representative of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe for Roma Issues*, [disponibil pe: <http://hub.coe.int/web/coe-portal/roma/>][Accesat: 18.09.2013]
5. Dimitrov, D, Grigorova V., Decheva J. , (2013), *Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Implementation of the National Roma Integration Strategy and Decade Action Plan in 2012 in BULGARIA*, [disponibil pe: http://www.romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9270_file4_bg_civil-society-monitoring-report_en.pdf][Accesat: 22.09.2013]
6. ERRC- European Roma Rights Center (2012): *Attacks against Roma in Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia*. [disponibil pe: <http://www.errc.org/article/attacks-against-roma-in-hungary-the-czech-republic-and-the-slovak-republic/3042>][Accesat: 15.09.2013]
7. ERRC - European Roma Rights Center (2013): *New ERRC Country Profiles 2011-2012 (Czech Republic, France, Italy, Macedonia, Serbia, Slovakia, Romania, Russia, Turkey and Ukraine)*.
8. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2009), *Data in Focus Report | The Roma*, [disponibil pe: http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/413-EU-MIDIS_ROMA_EN.pdf][Accesat: 15.09.2013]
9. Hotărâre pentru aprobarea Strategiei Guvernului României de incluziune a cetățenilor români aparținând minorității romilor pentru perioada 2012-2020. [disponibil pe: <http://www.anr.gov.ro/docs/MO6bis.pdf>] [Accesat: 5.09.2013]
10. Hurrle J., Felcmanová L, Ripka S., Otáhalová L., Poláčková L, Štěpánková M., Trlifajová L., Pixová M. (2013). *Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Implementation of the National Roma Integration Strategy and Decade Action Plan in 2012 in THE CZECH REPUBLIC*, [disponibil pe: http://romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9270_file6_cr_civil-society-monitoring-report_en.pdf][Accesat: 20.09.2013]
11. Lajčáková J., (2013). *Civil Society Monitoring Report on the Implementation of the National Roma Integration Strategy and Decade Action Plan in 2012 in Slovakia*, [disponibil pe: http://romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9270_file14_sk_civil-society-monitoring-report_en.pdf][Accesat: 20.09.2013]
12. Moisă F., Rostas I.A., Tarnovschi D., Stoian I., Rădulescu D. Andersen T.Ș. (2013), *Raportul societății civile asupra implementării Strategiei Naționale de Integrare a Romilor și a Planului de*

Acțiune al Deceniului în ROMÂNIA în 2012, [disponibil pe: http://www.romadecade.org/cms/upload/file/9270_file25_ro_civil-society-monitoring-report_ro.pdf][Accesat: 6.09.2013]

13. National strategic framework for Roma (2011) document elaborat de Ministerul MUNCII și Securității Sociale al Greciei. [disponibil pe: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/roma_greece_strategy_en.pdf][Accesat: 19.09.2013]
14. Strategy of the Slovak Republic for Integration of Roma until 2020, adopted by Government Resolution 1/2012 on 11 January 2012) [disponibil pe: <http://www.rokovania.sk/Rokovanie.aspx/BodRokovaniaDetail?idMaterial=20646>][Accesat: 18.09.2013].
15. Strategy of the government of Romania for the inclusion of the romanian citizens belonging to roma minority for the period 2012 – 2020 [disponibil pe: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/roma_romania_strategy_en.pdf][Accesat: 22.09.2013].
16. UNDP/WB/EC Regional Roma Survey și FRA Pilot Roma Survey (2011), [disponibil pe: http://issuu.com/undp_in_europe_cis/docs/roma_at_a_glance_web/1#download][Accesat: 7.09.2013]

APPENDIX: SPSS Syntax

```
/******SYNTAX FOR THE 2011 UNDP/WB/EC Dataset******/
```

```
RECODE
```

```
  m7
```

```
(4=2) (5=2) (1 thru 3=1) (ELSE=SYSMIS) INTO location.
```

```
EXECUTE .
```

```
VAR LAB location 'Location of residence'.
```

```
COMPUTE rooms=q41/m8.
```

```
VAR LAB rooms 'Number of rooms per household members'.
```

```
EXE.
```

```
COMPUTE space=q42/m8.
```

```
VAR LAB space 'Square meters per household members in the home'.
```

```
EXE.
```

```
/******There were 34 houses in unregulated arias in Hungary. They were included in the rural area, as in the other countries there were no cases of unregulated arias reported******/
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
  /TABLES=m7a BY m2 BY location BY country
```

```
  /FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES
```

```
  /CELLS= COLUMN .
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
  /TABLES= m7aothc BY m2 BY location BY country
```

```
  /FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES
```

```
  /CELLS= COUNT.
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
  /TABLES= q16 BY m2 BY location BY country
```

```
  /FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES
```

```
  /CELLS= COLUMN.
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
  /TABLES= q43 BY m2 BY location BY country
```

```
  /FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES
```

```
  /CELLS= COLUMN.
```

```
MEANS
```

```
  TABLES= rooms BY country BY location BY m2
```

```
  /CELLS MEDIAN MEAN STDDEV COUNT .
```

```
MEANS
```

```
  TABLES= space BY country BY location BY m2
```

```
  /CELLS MEDIAN MEAN STDDEV COUNT .
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
  /TABLES= m11f BY m2 BY location BY country
```

```
  /FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES
```

```
  /CELLS= COLUMN.
```

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
/TABLES= m11h BY m2 BY location BY country  
/FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES  
/CELLS= COLUMN.
```

CROSSTABS

```
/TABLES= q411_4 BY m2 BY location BY country  
/FORMAT= AVALUE TABLES  
/CELLS= COLUMN.
```