



Brussels, 15.11.2017  
SWD(2017) 286 final/2

**CORRIGENDUM**

This document corrects document SWD(2017) 286 final of 30.8.2017.  
The values of some indicators are corrected (8.11.2017) on pages 4, 7 and 8.  
The text shall read as follows:

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

**Roma integration indicators scoreboard (2011-2016)**

*Accompanying the document*

**Communication to the European Parliament and the Council**

**Midterm review of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies**

{COM(2017) 458 final}

## COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

### Roma integration indicators scoreboard (2011-2016)

#### *Accompanying the document*

#### Communication to the European Parliament and the Council

#### Midterm review of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies

This scoreboard presents changes in the situation of Roma in nine EU Member States<sup>1</sup> as recorded by two FRA surveys in 2011 and in 2016. In 2016, the Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey ([EU-MIDIS II](#))<sup>2</sup> collected information on the situation of Roma in Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czechia, Greece, Hungary, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. The 2011 Roma survey<sup>3</sup> covered the same countries, apart from Croatia. However, information on the situation in Croatia was collected in the UNDP/World Bank/EC 2011 Regional Roma survey.<sup>4</sup>

The surveys were all carried out using a similar methodology, applying a multi-stage selection of respondents. To optimise the sampling approach, EU-MIDIS II refined the methodology applied in 2011. Despite the similar approaches, the surveys are subject to some **limitations as to their direct comparability**. In 2017, the FRA attempted to address the limitations as to the comparability of the surveys. Given the relative similarity of the unweighted samples of the 2011 and 2016 surveys for the nine Member States, the 2011 sample was weighted to reflect the differences between those two surveys as regards regional coverage and the urban nature of surveyed localities. For Croatia, the same approach was applied to the dataset from the UNDP/World Bank/EC survey.

The scoreboard presents 18 **indicators** in four main thematic areas (education, housing, employment and health) and the cross-cutting area of poverty. It also presents average values for the Member States in question. For 2011, the average does not include Croatia, which at that time was not a Member State. The caveats that need to be considered when analysing values for 2011 and 2016 are provided alongside each indicator.

All sample surveys are affected by sampling error, as the interviews cover only a fraction of the total population. Therefore, **all results presented are point estimates underlying statistical variation**. Small differences of a few percentage points between groups of respondents are to be interpreted within the range of statistical variation and only more substantial divergence between population groups should be considered as evidence of actual differences. A difference of a few percentage points between the 2011 and 2016 values may be assessed as ‘no change’.

---

<sup>1</sup> The distribution and density of Roma populations differ across Member States and a random sampling method as used in EU-MIDIS II is not always possible. Different data collection methods are needed for the countries not covered by the survey and these will be covered by the FRA’s Roma data collection exercise in 2018 (using specific quantitative or qualitative methods).

<sup>2</sup> <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/eumidis-ii-roma-selected-findings>

<sup>3</sup> <http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/roma-pilot-survey>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/rbec/en/home/ourwork/sustainable-development/development-planning-and-inclusive-sustainable-growth/roma-in-central-and-southeast-europe/roma-data.html>

The trends between 2011 and 2016 are visualized graphically. The direction of the arrows in the tables visualises the increase or decrease of indicator's value and the colour reflects the plausability of the change (whether an increase/decrease is desirable or not). For example, increasing the share of children enrolled in compulsory education is desirable (marked in green) whilst increase in the share of youth not in employment, education or training is undesirable (marked in red). Orange "wave" marks no change.

Results based on a small number of responses are statistically less reliable. Therefore, results based on less than 20 to 49 unweighted observations in a group total or based on cells with less than 20 unweighted observations are noted in parentheses. Results based on less than 20 unweighted observations in a group total are not published.

Roma integration indicators scoreboard 2011-2016 - EDUCATION																															
	BG			CZ			EL			ES			HR			HU			PT			RO			SK			Average			Notes
	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	
Share of children 4-age up to starting compulsory primary education age who attend early childhood education, household members (%)	43	↑	66	29	↔	34	8	↑	28	77	↑	95	13	↑	32	81	↑	91	54	↓	42	46	↓	38	23	↑	34	47	↑	53	Age for starting compulsory primary education as well as for compulsory schooling age valid for a given country in a given year (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2011 and 2015)).
Share of compulsory-schooling-age children attending education, household members, 5-17 (depending on the country) (%)	88	↔	91	93	↑	98	56	↑	69	95	↔	99	84	↑	94	94	↔	98	81	↑	90	81	↔	78	93	↔	94	86	↑	90	Age is calculated on annual basis, hence the figures do not consider earlier or delayed start in primary education of an individual child. Updated value for RO in 2016.
Early leavers from education and training, household members, 18-24 (%)	82	↓	67	72	↓	57	96	↔	92	95	↓	70	71	○	68	78	↓	68	97	↓	90	91	↓	77	80	↓	58	87	↓	68	Share of the population aged 18-24 years having attained at most lower secondary education (ISCED 2011 levels 0, 1 or 2) and not being involved in further education or training.
Share of people who felt being discriminated because of being Roma in the past 5 years, when in contact with school (as parent or student), respondents, 16+ (%)	9	↔	6	33	↓	19	31	↓	20	11	↔	15	17	↑	22	16	↔	15	13	↔	13	15	↓	10	16	↔	16	17	↔	14	
Share of Roma children, 6-15 years old, attending classes where 'all classmates are Roma' as reported by the respondents, household members 6-15 in education (%)	16	↑	29	6	↔	6	8	↔	13	3	↔	4	n.a.	n.a.	22	7	↔	10	3	↑	11	10	↔	10	20	↑	25	10	↑	15	Comparability 2011 and 2016 is limited due to difference in formulation of question.

↑ ↓ - Improvement; ↔ - no change; ↑ ↓ - deterioration.

Roma integration indicators scoreboard 2011-2016 - EMPLOYMENT																															
	BG			CZ			EL			ES			HR			HU			PT			RO			SK			Average			Notes
	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016				
Share of people who self-declared main activity status 'paid work' (including full-time, part-time, ad hoc jobs, self-employment), household members, 16+ (%)	29	↓	23	32	↔	29	40	↔	43	21	↓	16	14	↓	8	25	↑	36	14	↑	34	28	↔	28	20	↔	20	26	↔	25	'Main activity' is asking all household members for their current status in regard to employment. It is distinct from the ILO concept of employment and the one used in the Labour Force Survey (variable MAINSTAT). 'Employment' also includes small amounts of unpaid work in family businesses, as this is for the family's gain.
Share of young persons, 16-24 years old with current main activity neither in employment, education or training, household members (%)	61	↔	65	43	↑	51	61	↔	60	71	↑	77	72	↔	77	38	↑	51	79	↓	52	58	↑	64	44	↑	65	56	↑	63	Based on the self-declared current main activity, excluding those who did any work in the previous four weeks to earn some money.
Share of people who felt being discriminated because of being Roma in the past 5 years, when looking for a job, respondents, 16+ (%)	39	↓	21	71	↓	61	67	↔	63	35	↔	34	37	↑	50	49	↓	33	58	↑	76	33	↔	34	49	↔	53	50	↓	40	
Share of people who felt being discriminated because of being Roma in the past 5 years, when at work, respondents, 16+ (%)	15	↔	11	36	↓	17	30	↑	38	18	↑	23	29	↓	17	17	↓	11	15	↑	40	10	↑	19	9	↑	18	19	↔	17	

↑ ↓ - Improvement; ↔ - no change; ↑ ↓ - deterioration.

Roma integration indicators scoreboard 2011-2016 - HEALTH																															
	BG			CZ			EL			ES			HR			HU			PT			RO			SK			Average			Notes
	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	
Share of people assessing their health in general as 'Very good' or 'Good', respondents, 16+ (%)	53	↑	70	55	↑	62	67	↑	83	62	↑	73	65	↓	59	49	↑	66	52	↑	70	45	↑	69	60	↑	67	55	↑	68	
Share of people with medical insurance coverage, respondents, 16+ (%)	43	~	45	92	↓	79	46	↑	79	99	~	98	84	~	82	97	↓	86	98	~	96	51	~	54	92	~	95	78	~	74	Share of Roma, aged 16 years or over, who indicate that they are covered by national basic health insurance and/or additional insurance

↑ ↓ - Improvement; ~ - no change; ↑ ↓ - deterioration.

Roma integration indicators scoreboard 2011-2016 - HOUSING																															
	BG			CZ			EL			ES			HR			HU			PT			RO			SK			Average			Notes
	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	
Average number of rooms per person in the household (without kitchen)	0.7	↔	0.7	0.6	↔	0.7	0.5	↔	0.5	0.8	↑	0.9	0.5	↔	0.5	0.6	↔	0.6	0.7	↔	0.8	0.5	↑	0.7	0.5	↔	0.5	0.6	↔	0.7	Updated values for 2011 and 2016 for all countries and Average Updated values affect trend for HR, PT and Average
Share of people living in households without tap water inside the dwelling, household members (%)	38	↓	23	8	↓	2	15	↓	9	2	↔	2	42	↓	34	32	↔	33	13	↔	14	79	↓	68	35	↓	27	29	↔	30	Updated values for 2016 for BG, EL, HU, PT, RO and SK Updated value for 2011 for HR
Share of people living in households having neither toilet, nor shower, nor bathroom inside the dwelling, household members (%)	60	↓	44	10	↓	4	29	↔	29	1	↔	1	42	↔	41	31	↑	38	20	↔	17	84	↓	79	39	↓	29	36	↔	38	Updated values for 2016 for BG, EL, HR, HU, PT and RO Updated value for 2011 for HR Updated values affect trend for HU
Share of people living in households with electricity supply, household members (%)	93	↔	98	94	↔	98	88	↔	89	99	↔	98	92	↔	93	96	↔	97	87	↔	88	87	↑	95	91	↔	94	92	↔	96	Updated values for 2016 for CZ, EL, HR, HU, and PT Updated value for 2011 for HR
Share of people who felt being discriminated because of being Roma in the past 5 years, when looking for housing, respondents, 16+ (%)	(14)	...	(14)	52	↑	65	(42)	...	44	35	↑	45	(19)	...	53	25	↔	22	67	↑	75	(29)	...	(13)	44	↓	30	45	↔	41	... - Trends are not possible to provide in cases of small number of observations (flagged in brackets)

↑ ↓ - Improvement; ↔ - no change; ↑ ↓ - deterioration.

Roma integration indicators scoreboard 2011-2016 - POVERTY																															
	BG			CZ			EL			ES			HR			HU			PT			RO			SK			Average			Notes
	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016	2011	change	2016				
At-risk-of poverty rate (below 60% of median equivalised income after social transfers), household members (%)	86	~	86	80	↓	58	83	↑	96	90	↑	98	92	~	93	80	↓	75	96	n.a.	n.a.	78	↓	70	91	~	87	86	↓	80	At-risk-of-poverty are all persons with an equivalised current monthly disposable household income below the twelfth of the national at-risk-of-poverty threshold 2014 (published by Eurostat). The equivalised disposable income is the total income of a household, after tax and other deductions, divided by the number of household members converted into equalised adults; using the so-called modified OECD equivalence scale (1-0.5-0.3). Updated value for 2011 for HR
Share of persons in households where at least one person had to go hungry to bed at least once in the last month, household members (%)	40	↓	27	31	↓	20	54	↓	48	14	~	17	38	~	38	36	↓	20	40	n.a.	n.a.	61	↓	32	31	~	31	38	↓	27	Updated value for 2011 for HR

↑ ↓ - Improvement; ~ - no change; ↑ ↓ - deterioration.