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This scoreboard presents changes in the situation of Roma in nine EU Member States[[1]](#footnote-1) as recorded by two FRA surveys in 2011 and in 2016. In 2016, the [Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey](http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/eumidis-ii-roma-selected-findings) (EU‑MIDIS II)[[2]](#footnote-2) collected information on the situation of Roma in Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czechia, Greece, Hungary, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. The [2011 Roma survey](http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/roma-pilot-survey)[[3]](#footnote-3) 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](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).[[4]](#footnote-4)

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 comparabilityof 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’.
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1. 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). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2016/eumidis-ii-roma-selected-findings> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/roma-pilot-survey> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <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> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)