

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
1.1	Who Are 'the Roma'? . . . . .	2
1.1.1	Manifold Definitions Reflect Diversity Among Roma . . . . .	2
1.1.2	Ambiguous and Changing Denomination of Roma . . . . .	5
1.1.3	Europe's Largest Minority: Lack of Uniform Status . . . . .	7
1.2	Reflections on the Situation of Roma in Europe . . . . .	12
1.2.1	Particular Vulnerability of Roma: Present-Day Situation . . . . .	12
1.2.2	Roma on the Margins: A Brief Historical Overview . . . . .	19
1.2.3	Roma at Crossroads: Discrimination, Poverty and Gender . . . . .	21
1.2.3.1	Intersection of Discrimination and Poverty . . . . .	21
1.2.3.2	Roma Women: Discrimination, Poverty and Gender . . . . .	23
1.2.4	Exclusion vs Inclusion: Roma Identity at Risk . . . . .	26
1.3	Two Missing Pieces of Roma Inclusion . . . . .	28
1.3.1	Ethnic Data Collection . . . . .	29
1.3.2	Positive Action . . . . .	31
	References . . . . .	33
<b>2</b>	<b>Human Rights and the Roma: Key Concepts</b> . . . . .	<b>43</b>
2.1	Equality and Anti-discrimination . . . . .	43
2.1.1	Closeness of the Two Most Fundamental Human Rights Principles . . . . .	44
2.1.2	Direct and Indirect Discrimination and the Link with Statistics . . . . .	47
2.1.3	Formal and Substantive Equality: From Equality in Law to Equality in Fact . . . . .	50



2.2	Race and Ethnicity . . . . .	52
2.2.1	Controversial and Contested but Not Easily Replaceable Notions . . . . .	53
2.2.2	Overlapping Social Constructs Used to Legitimise Power Relations . . . . .	54
2.2.2.1	Race: Biological Fiction Causing Social Damage . . . . .	54
2.2.2.2	Ethnicity: Social Construct Involving Group Creation and Differentiation . . . . .	56
2.2.2.3	Race and Ethnicity: Interconnected Social Constructs . . . . .	57
2.3	Social Inclusion, Diversity and Pluralism . . . . .	58
2.3.1	Combining Legal and Social Policy Approaches for Successful Integration . . . . .	58
2.3.2	Social Inclusion: A Multi-Dimensional Concept with Varying Meanings . . . . .	59
2.3.3	Promoting Diversity and Countering Assimilation Through Pluralism . . . . .	61
2.4	Minority Rights Protection . . . . .	62
2.4.1	Two-Pillar Structure: General and Minority Specific Protection . . . . .	62
2.4.2	Special Measures to Achieve Full and Effective Equality for Minorities . . . . .	65
2.4.3	Right to Identity and Prohibition of Assimilation As Interrelated Building Blocks . . . . .	67
2.4.4	Securing Minority Rights Through Effective Participation in Public Life . . . . .	70
2.4.5	Respect for Cultural Diversity: Inter-Cultural Dialogue, Awareness-Raising and Mutual Understanding . . . . .	72
2.5	Right to Privacy . . . . .	73
2.5.1	Privacy and Personal Data Protection: Interrelated and Complementary . . . . .	73
2.5.2	Privacy: Relative and Contextual Notion, Focus on Individual Self-determination . . . . .	74
2.5.3	Inclusion of Personal Data Protection in the Right to Privacy . . . . .	78
2.5.4	Interferences with Privacy Must Be Lawful, Necessary and Legitimate . . . . .	80
2.5.4.1	The Legality Principle (1st Condition) . . . . .	81
2.5.4.2	The Necessity Principle (2nd Condition) . . . . .	82
2.5.4.3	The Legitimacy Principle (3rd Condition) . . . . .	83
2.5.5	Positive Obligation to Secure Effective Respect for and Protection of Privacy . . . . .	84



2.6	Personal Data Protection . . . . .	86
2.6.1	A Regulatory Human Right Protected at International and European Level . . . . .	87
2.6.2	Personal Data Protection at the Council of Europe Level . . . . .	88
2.6.2.1	Convention 108: An International Privacy and Data Protection Landmark . . . . .	88
2.6.2.2	From Convention 108 to Convention 108+ . . . . .	90
2.6.3	Personal Data Protection at the European Union Level . . . . .	92
2.6.3.1	Directive 95: Coordinating National Data Protection Legislation . . . . .	93
2.6.3.2	GDPR Replaces Directive 95 . . . . .	95
2.6.4	Three Key Distinctions: Anonymous, Personal and Sensitive Data . . . . .	98
2.6.5	Role of Supervisory Bodies and Data Protection Authorities . . . . .	100
2.6.5.1	Supervisory Bodies: Consultation, Monitoring and Guidance . . . . .	100
2.6.5.2	Data Protection Authorities: Advise, Investigate, Intervene and Cooperate . . . . .	102
2.6.6	Lisbon: Introduction of a Separate Right to Data Protection in EU Law . . . . .	104
2.7	Socio-Economic Rights: Education, Housing, Work and Health . . . . .	106
2.7.1	Socio-Economic Rights: Essential Part of the International Human Rights Corpus . . . . .	106
2.7.2	Right to Education: Promoting Pluralism and Equal Opportunities . . . . .	110
2.7.2.1	Education As a Basic Human Right . . . . .	111
2.7.2.2	Right to Receive Education: Removing All Barriers . . . . .	112
2.7.2.3	The Role of Education in Minority Protection and Empowerment . . . . .	113
2.7.3	Right to Housing: Facilitating Different Lifestyle to Protect Cultural Identity . . . . .	116
2.7.3.1	Housing Rights: Various Components Following General Interpretation . . . . .	117
2.7.3.2	The Right to Housing and Barriers to Itinerant Lifestyles . . . . .	119
2.7.3.3	ECtHR Case Law on Housing: Limited Protection of Minority Lifestyle . . . . .	119
2.7.4	Right to Work: Fulfilling Economic, Social and Developmental Needs . . . . .	126



2.7.5	Right to Health: Focus on Individual Well-Being, Public Health and Health Care . . . . .	129
2.7.5.1	Health As a Human Rights Issue . . . . .	129
2.7.5.2	Various Interpretations of the Right to Health . . . . .	130
2.7.5.3	Realising the Right to Health: Guidelines . . . . .	131
2.7.5.4	Right to Health: States' Obligations . . . . .	132
	References . . . . .	134

## Part I Ethnic Data Collection

<b>3</b>	<b>Ethnic Data Collection: Key Elements, Rules and Principles . . . . .</b>	<b>155</b>
3.1	International and European Views on Ethnic Data Collection . . . . .	156
3.1.1	Lack of an Explicit Legal Obligation to Collect Ethnic Data . . . . .	156
3.1.2	Ethnic Data Collection Strongly Encouraged for Equality and Anti-discrimination Purposes . . . . .	158
3.2	Defining Racial and Ethnic Origin for Data Collection Purposes . . . . .	164
3.2.1	Context-Dependent Character Hinders Objective Construction of Racial Origin . . . . .	165
3.2.2	Context-Dependency and Variability of Ethnicity Produces Heterogeneity . . . . .	166
3.2.3	Determination of Ethnic Origin Involves Both Objective and Subjective Criteria . . . . .	169
3.3	Two Sets of Core Data Protection Rules: Brief Overview . . . . .	170
3.4	General Data Protection Rules Applying to All Sorts of Personal Data . . . . .	174
3.4.1	Lawful Processing with or Without Consent from Data Subjects (1st Rule) . . . . .	174
3.4.1.1	Consent: Towards a Uniform Interpretation . . . . .	175
3.4.1.2	Personal Data Processing Without Consent: Numerous Options . . . . .	179
3.4.2	Fairness Can Be Explicit and Implicit and Requires Ethical Data Practices (2nd Rule) . . . . .	181
3.4.3	Transparency by Giving Information and Control to Data Subjects (3rd Rule) . . . . .	183
3.4.3.1	Informing Data Subjects on Data Processing to Establish Trust . . . . .	183
3.4.3.2	Data Subjects' Control: Right to Rectification, Erasure, Restriction, Portability and Object . . . . .	188
3.4.4	Purpose Limitation Implies Data Processing for Explicit, Specified and Legitimate Purposes (4th Rule) . . . . .	196



3.4.5	Data Minimisation Demands Adequate, Relevant and Limited Data (5th Rule) . . . . .	199
3.4.6	Data Accuracy Calls for Erasure or Rectification of Inaccurate Data (6th Rule) . . . . .	200
3.4.7	Data Erasure or Anonymisation to Limit Personal Data Storage (7th Rule) . . . . .	201
3.4.8	Integrity and Confidentiality Through Appropriate Security Measures (8th Rule) . . . . .	202
3.4.9	Accountability Through Documentation, Data Protection Impact Assessments and Prior Notification (9th Rule) . . . . .	206
3.4.9.1	Documentation of Personal Data Processing Mandatory . . . . .	207
3.4.9.2	Data Protection Impact Assessments Prior to Data Processing . . . . .	208
3.4.9.3	Prior Consultation Mandatory in Certain Situations . . . . .	211
3.5	Special Data Protection Rules Applying to Sensitive Categories . . . . .	212
3.5.1	Convention 108(+): Special Categories of Data Require Appropriate Safeguards . . . . .	213
3.5.2	GDPR: Various Exceptions to the Initial Prohibition of Sensitive Data Processing . . . . .	216
3.5.3	Sensitive Data Processing for Profiling Purposes in the Police Sector . . . . .	221
3.6	Protection of Personal Data Through the Right to Private Life . . . . .	223
3.6.1	Legality, Necessity and Legitimacy for Personal Data Protection Interferences . . . . .	224
3.6.2	Positive Obligations Regarding Information, Rectification, Elimination and Safety . . . . .	227
3.7	Five Operational and Organisational Principles for Sensitive Data Processing . . . . .	230
3.7.1	Professional Secrecy and Confidentiality of Data Processing (1st Principle) . . . . .	231
3.7.2	Political Independency of Data Collectors Helps Prevent Misuse (2nd Principle) . . . . .	235
3.7.3	Securing Ethical Norms and Standards Through Codes of Conduct and Ethical Committees (3rd Principle) . . . . .	235
3.7.4	Trained Staff and Management Involvement to Avoid Mistakes (4th Principle) . . . . .	238
3.7.5	Active and Meaningful Involvement and Awareness-Raising (5th Principle) . . . . .	239
3.8	Conclusion . . . . .	241
	References . . . . .	244



<b>4</b>	<b>Ethnic Data Collection: Benefits, Risks, Data Sources and Methods</b> . . . . .	259
4.1	Five Main Benefits of Collecting Ethnically Disaggregated Data for Equality and Anti-Discrimination Purposes . . . . .	260
4.1.1	Acquiring Information on Social and Economic Integration Levels (1st Benefit) . . . . .	260
4.1.2	Uncovering Discrimination and Identifying Good Practices (2nd Benefit) . . . . .	262
4.1.3	Awareness-Raising Among Majority and Empowerment of Minority (3rd Benefit) . . . . .	265
4.1.4	Implementing, Monitoring and Evaluating Policies (4th Benefit) . . . . .	266
4.1.5	Supporting Indirect Discrimination Claims in Legal Proceedings (5th Benefit) . . . . .	268
4.2	Five Main Risks and Fears Surrounding Ethnic Data Collection Practices . . . . .	271
4.2.1	Exposure of Bad Government Policies and Insufficient Measures (1st Risk/Fear) . . . . .	271
4.2.2	Instigation of Ethnic Conflict and Stigmatisation (2nd Risk/Fear) . . . . .	273
4.2.3	Misuse of Sensitive Data to Discriminate Against Ethnic Groups (3rd Risk/Fear) . . . . .	274
4.2.4	Discriminatory Ethnic Profiling by Public Bodies (4th Risk/Fear) . . . . .	276
4.2.5	Violation of Privacy and Data Protection Rules (5th Risk/Fear) . . . . .	277
4.3	Four Complementary Data Sources of Ethnic Data Collection . . . . .	278
4.3.1	Official Statistics: Official Demographic, Economic and Social Sources (1st Source) . . . . .	279
4.3.1.1	Advantages of Official Data . . . . .	280
4.3.1.2	Disadvantages of Official Data . . . . .	280
4.3.1.3	Combining Official and Non-official Data to Overcome Limitations . . . . .	282
4.3.2	Research Data: Discrimination Testing, Interviews and Surveys (2nd Source) . . . . .	284
4.3.2.1	Advantages of Research Data . . . . .	285
4.3.2.2	Disadvantages of Research Data . . . . .	286
4.3.3	Ethnic Monitoring in Employment and Service Delivery (3rd Source) . . . . .	289
4.3.3.1	Advantages of Ethnic Monitoring . . . . .	290
4.3.3.2	Disadvantages of Ethnic Monitoring . . . . .	291



4.3.4	Complaints and Crime Data Held by Various Bodies (4th Source) . . . . .	292
4.3.4.1	Advantages of Complaints and Crime Data . . .	292
4.3.4.2	Disadvantages of Complaints and Crime Data . . . . .	293
4.4	Choosing Ethnic Categories for Ethnical Classification Purposes (1st Method) . . . . .	294
4.4.1	Choosing Ethnic Categories on the Basis of Objective and/or Subjective Criteria . . . . .	295
4.4.2	Ethnic Classification as a Complex, Context-Dependent and Evolving Process . . . . .	297
4.4.3	Wide Variety in Terminology, Categories and Answer Formats Used . . . . .	300
4.5	Ethnically Identifying with One or Multiple Ethnic Categories (2nd Method) . . . . .	306
4.5.1	Four Approaches to Ethnical Identification . . . . .	307
4.5.2	Self-Identification (1st Approach): Benefits and Restrictions . . . . .	308
4.5.2.1	Preference for Self-Identification: Respecting Personal Autonomy . . . . .	309
4.5.2.2	Shortcomings of Self-Identification: Under- and Over-Reporting . . . . .	310
4.5.3	Alternative or Supplementary Approaches for Equality and Anti-Discrimination Purposes . . . . .	312
4.5.4	Objective Criteria (Second Approach) Are Inadequate Proxies for Ethnicity in Most Contexts . . . . .	314
4.6	Conclusion . . . . .	319
	References . . . . .	320
<b>5</b>	<b>Challenges to Collecting Ethnic Data on the Roma Minority in Europe</b> . . . . .	<b>333</b>
5.1	Large Quantitative and Qualitative Data Gaps on Roma Communities in Europe . . . . .	334
5.1.1	International and European Calls for Data on Roma . . . . .	335
5.1.2	. . . Remain Largely Unanswered . . . . .	337
5.1.3	Multiple Reasons for the Widespread Lack of (Reliable) Ethnic Data on Roma . . . . .	341
5.1.4	Insufficient Regard for the Gender Dimension Risks Overlooking Intersectionality . . . . .	346
5.2	Multifarious Data Sources on Roma . . . . .	349
5.2.1	Limitations of Official Statistics: Absent, Outdated or Unreliable (1st Source) . . . . .	350
5.2.2	Added Value of Surveys, Research and Discrimination Testing (2nd Source) . . . . .	354



5.2.3	Unreliable Complaints Data and Over-Representation in Crime Data (3rd Source) . . . . .	359
5.2.4	Significance of International and European Monitoring and Litigation (4th Source) . . . . .	362
5.3	Challenges to the Construction of Ethnic Categories for Roma (1st Method) . . . . .	368
5.3.1	Complex and Fluid Nature of Roma Identities Influences Ethnical Classification . . . . .	369
5.3.2	Importance of Open-Ended Categories, Multiple Affiliations and Re-classifications . . . . .	371
5.4	Appropriateness of Ethnical Identification Approaches for Roma (2nd Method) . . . . .	374
5.4.1	Roma Reluctance Towards Self-identification Affects Data Use (1st Approach) . . . . .	375
5.4.2	Proxies for Roma Ethnicity Produce Insufficient Data (2nd Approach) . . . . .	378
5.4.3	Visual Observation Leads to Biased Picture on Roma (3rd Approach) . . . . .	380
5.4.4	Roma Not Better Placed to Observe Roma Identity of Others (4th Approach) . . . . .	382
5.4.5	Combining Different Ethnical Identification Approaches for More Accurate Results (5th Approach) . . . . .	384
5.5	Methodological Challenges to Conducting Surveys on Roma Populations . . . . .	387
5.5.1	Sampling Frames Risk Under- or Over-Representing Certain Roma Communities (1st Challenge) . . . . .	388
5.5.2	Small Sampling Sizes Affect Quality of Data on Roma Populations (2nd Challenge) . . . . .	390
5.5.3	Context-Dependency of Sampling Design to Select Eligible Households (3rd Challenge) . . . . .	391
5.5.3.1	Simple Random Sampling in Segregated and Compact Areas . . . . .	392
5.5.3.2	Focused Enumeration Sampling in Mixed Areas . . . . .	393
5.5.4	Type of Interview, Interviewers and Questions Asked Affects Data Quality (4th Challenge) . . . . .	394
5.5.5	Time and Budget Restrictions Force Making of Methodological Choices (5th Challenge) . . . . .	396
5.6	Four Factors Impacting the Analysis of Data Sets on Roma Populations . . . . .	397
5.6.1	Individual and Political Biases Limit Qualitative Research on Roma (1st Factor) . . . . .	398
5.6.2	Terminological and Methodological Choices Impact on Data Comparability (2nd Factor) . . . . .	398



5.6.3	Large Heterogeneity Among Roma Limits Data Representativeness (3rd Factor) . . . . .	401
5.6.4	Dissemination of Data on Roma May Not Promote Anti-Gypsyism (4th Factor) . . . . .	403
5.7	Restricted Interpretation and Violation of Privacy and Data Protection Rules . . . . .	404
5.7.1	Strict Consent Rules Hinder Data Collection for Equality and Anti-discrimination Purposes . . . . .	404
5.7.2	Clear Communication and Strong Data Security Help to Build Trust . . . . .	406
5.7.3	Close Co-operation Between Experts to Enhance Data Quality and Security . . . . .	409
5.8	Ethnic Data Collection on Roma: Three Key Principles . . . . .	410
5.8.1	Awareness-Raising Among Roma and Non-Roma Communities (1st Principle) . . . . .	411
5.8.2	Active Participation of Roma, Non-Roma and Local Authorities (2nd Principle) . . . . .	416
5.8.3	Genuine Political Will (3rd Principle) . . . . .	421
5.9	Conclusion . . . . .	422
	References . . . . .	425

## Part II Positive Action

6	<b>Positive Action and the Link with Ethnic Data</b> . . . . .	441
6.1	Positive Action: A Much-Debated Human Rights Instrument . . . . .	442
6.1.1	Varying Understandings of the Notion Positive Action . . . . .	442
6.1.2	Proportional and Temporary Group-Based Measures . . . . .	446
6.1.2.1	Group-Based Measures (1st Key Element) . . . . .	446
6.1.2.2	Proportional Measures (2nd Key Element) . . . . .	447
6.1.2.3	Temporary Measures (3rd Key Element) . . . . .	448
6.1.3	Positive Action Connected to but Differs from Other Concepts and Instruments . . . . .	450
6.1.3.1	Indirect Discrimination (1st Distinction) . . . . .	450
6.1.3.2	Reasonable Accommodation (2nd Distinction) . . . . .	451
6.1.3.3	Genuine Occupational Requirements (3rd Distinction) . . . . .	452
6.1.3.4	Equality Mainstreaming (4th Distinction) . . . . .	453
6.1.3.5	Equality Impact Assessments (5th Distinction) . . . . .	456
6.1.4	Complementing the Traditional Approach to Equality and Its Limitations . . . . .	459
6.1.5	Coming Back to the Controversy: Derogation or Aspect of Equality? . . . . .	462
6.1.5.1	EU: Positive Action as an Exception of Equality . . . . .	463
6.1.5.2	UN: Positive Action as an Aspect of Equality . . . . .	464



6.2	Broad Spectrum of Positive Action Measures: Six Factors	
	Creating Diversity . . . . .	465
6.2.1	Discrimination Grounds, Beneficiaries, Fields, Nature and Implementation . . . . .	466
6.2.1.1	Positive Action May Be Based on One or Multiple Discrimination Grounds (1st Factor) . . . . .	466
6.2.1.2	Positive Action Schemes May Benefit Different Groups (2nd Factor) . . . . .	469
6.2.1.3	Measures May Apply in One or Multiple Areas of Life (3rd Factor) . . . . .	469
6.2.1.4	Adoption of Positive Action May Be Voluntary or Mandatory (4th Factor) . . . . .	470
6.2.1.5	Different Actors May Implement Measures at Different Levels in Different Ways (5th Factor) . . . . .	470
6.2.2	Two Types (6th Factor): Positive Action Embraces Soft and Strong Measures . . . . .	472
6.2.3	Four Soft Measures That Do Not Provide Preferential Treatment (1st Type) . . . . .	474
6.2.3.1	Eradication of Discrimination (1st Soft Measure) . . . . .	475
6.2.3.2	Facially Neutral but Purposefully Inclusive Policies (2nd Soft Measure) . . . . .	476
6.2.3.3	Group Outreach (3rd Soft Measure) . . . . .	477
6.2.3.4	Facially Biased Diversity Policies (4th Soft Measure) . . . . .	478
6.2.4	Three Strong Measures That Involve Preferential Treatment (2nd Type) . . . . .	479
6.2.4.1	Individual Outreach (1st Strong Measure) . . . . .	480
6.2.4.2	Preferential Treatment (2nd Strong Measure) . . . . .	481
6.2.4.3	Redefinition of Merit (3rd Strong Measure) . . . . .	484
6.3	Four Prerequisites for Positive Action Schemes . . . . .	484
6.3.1	Analytical, Legal and Regulatory Framework (1st Premise) . . . . .	485
6.3.2	Awareness-Raising Among and Active Participation of All Relevant Stakeholders (2nd Premise) . . . . .	486
6.3.3	Political Will and Funding (3rd Premise) . . . . .	487
6.3.4	Availability of Ethnically Disaggregated Data (4th Premise) . . . . .	488
6.3.4.1	The Close Connection Between Positive Action and Ethnic Data . . . . .	490
6.3.4.2	Data Needs Depend on Type and Aim of Positive Action . . . . .	492



6.4	Five Main Justifications and Aims of Positive Action . . . . .	494
6.4.1	Remedy Discrimination Through Compensation (1st Aim) . . . . .	495
6.4.2	Enhance Culture by Promoting Diversity (2nd Aim) . . . . .	497
6.4.3	Focus on Society Through Social Inclusion and Cohesion (3rd Aim) . . . . .	501
6.4.4	Pedagogical Focus on Generating Role Models (4th Aim) . . . . .	502
6.4.5	Encouraging the Economy Through Balanced Growth (5th Aim) . . . . .	503
6.5	Potential Side Effects and Limitations of Positive Action Schemes . . . . .	504
6.5.1	Impacts on (Persons Belonging to) the Target Group (1st Effect) . . . . .	504
6.5.1.1	Impugning Qualifications and Merit . . . . .	505
6.5.1.2	Affecting Morale, Dignity and Self-esteem . . . . .	505
6.5.1.3	Over- and Under-Inclusiveness of Positive Action . . . . .	507
6.5.2	Perceptions by (Members of) Non-targeted Groups (2nd Effect) . . . . .	508
6.5.3	Implications for Society as a Whole (3rd Effect) . . . . .	509
6.6	Conclusion . . . . .	512
	References . . . . .	514
<b>7</b>	<b>International Framework on Positive Action . . . . .</b>	<b>525</b>
7.1	Analysing the International and European Framework on Positive Action: Three Questions . . . . .	526
7.2	UN: Context Dependency of Optional or Mandatory Nature Positive Action . . . . .	528
7.2.1	ICERD: Positive Action Obligatory When Circumstances So Warrant . . . . .	530
7.2.2	CEDAW: Special Measures May Be Necessary and Appropriate for Full Equality . . . . .	532
7.2.3	ICCPR: Positive Action Required When General Conditions Impair Human Rights . . . . .	533
7.2.4	ICESCR: General Obligation for States to Adopt Positive Action Since 2009 . . . . .	534
7.3	Treaty-Monitoring Bodies: Reasonable, Objective and Proportional Justification . . . . .	535
7.3.1	Focus on Positive Action Pursuing Remedial and Cultural Goals at UN Level . . . . .	535
7.3.2	Case-by-Case Consideration of the Proportionality Requirement by UN Bodies . . . . .	536
7.3.3	UN Bodies Prohibit the Maintenance of Permanent, Separate Standards . . . . .	537



7.4	UN Bodies Allow the Adoption of Soft and Strong Measures, Including Quotas . . . . .	539
7.4.1	Debate: Equality of Opportunities Versus Equality of Results at UN Level . . . . .	539
7.4.2	Intensity of Measures Depends on Goals Pursued and Needs in Specific Context . . . . .	542
7.5	Conclusion . . . . .	543
	References . . . . .	545
<b>8</b>	<b>European Framework on Positive Action . . . . .</b>	<b>551</b>
8.1	Council of Europe: Uncertainty About the Nature and Scope of Positive Action . . . . .	553
8.1.1	EctHR: Case Law Appears Permissive Towards the Adoption of Positive Action . . . . .	554
8.1.2	ECSR and ACFC: Positive Action Required Under Certain Circumstances . . . . .	559
8.1.2.1	ECSR: Positive Obligation to Take Positive Action . . . . .	559
8.1.2.2	ACFC: Full and Effective Equality Through Positive Action and Awareness-Raising . . . . .	561
8.1.3	Proportionality as a Limit to Positive Action in Europe . . . . .	563
8.1.3.1	ECHR: Margin of Appreciation States to Assess Need for and Extent of Differential Treatment . . . . .	563
8.1.3.2	FCNM: Time and Scope Special Measures Limited What Is Necessary . . . . .	564
8.1.4	Strong Positive Action Measures Appear Acceptable in Certain Contexts . . . . .	565
8.2	European Union: Positive Action as an Optional and Proportional Policy Tool . . . . .	566
8.2.1	Sole Focus EU on Gender Equality in Employment Until 1997 . . . . .	567
8.2.2	Analysing CJEU Case Law on Gender-Based Positive Action in Employment . . . . .	573
8.2.2.1	Overview: Derogatory Approach, Equality of Opportunities and Optional Nature . . . . .	573
8.2.2.2	Kalanke and Marschall: No Automatic Preferences in Recruitment and Promotion . . . . .	576
8.2.2.3	Badeck: Automatic Preferences Allowed in Training and Calls for Interviews . . . . .	580
8.2.2.4	Abrahamsson to Lommers: Proportionality and Substantive Equality . . . . .	583
8.2.2.5	Evaluation: Derogatory Approach Puts Focus on Unclear Proportionality Principle . . . . .	586



8.2.3	Positive Action on Other Discrimination Grounds Permitted Since 2000 . . . . .	591
8.2.4	Future Case Law on Positive Action on Other Grounds Creates Opportunities . . . . .	593
8.3	Conclusion . . . . .	596
	References . . . . .	599
<b>9</b>	<b>Positive Action for the Roma Minority in Europe . . . . .</b>	<b>607</b>
9.1	Diverse Range of Positive Action Needed to Advance Roma Inclusion . . . . .	608
9.1.1	Positive Action: Essential Instrument to Achieve Effective Equality for Roma . . . . .	609
9.1.2	Positive Action Promoting Full Equality for Roma Can Pursue Multifarious Aims . . . . .	611
9.1.2.1	Remedying Structural Disadvantages and Discrimination Faced by Roma (1st Aim) . . . . .	612
9.1.2.2	Promoting Diversity by Increasing Roma Participation (2nd Aim) . . . . .	614
9.1.2.3	Enhancing Social Homogeneity Through Roma Inclusion (3rd Aim) . . . . .	616
9.1.2.4	Promoting Roma Identity and Building Bridges by Roma Role Models and Leaders (4th Aim) . . . . .	617
9.1.2.5	Improving the Economy Through Labour Market Inclusion of Roma (5th Aim) . . . . .	617
9.1.3	Proportionality Allows Both Soft and Strong Measures for Roma . . . . .	618
9.2	Five Challenges Limiting Positive Action for Roma from Reaching Its Full Potential . . . . .	623
9.2.1	Lack of Awareness About Positive Action and Relevance for Roma (1st Challenge) . . . . .	623
9.2.2	Absence of Political Will Limits Use of Positive Action (2nd Challenge) . . . . .	627
9.2.2.1	Empty Political Promises and Anti-Gypsyism by Public Officials at the National Level . . . . .	628
9.2.2.2	EU Could Do More to Increase Adoption of Positive Action for Roma at Member State Level . . . . .	632
9.2.3	Absence of (Reliable) Disaggregated Data on Roma (3rd Challenge) . . . . .	635
9.2.3.1	Need Reliable Data on Roma to Implement, Monitor and Evaluate Positive Action Measures . . . . .	636
9.2.3.2	Identifying Beneficiaries of Preferential Measures for Roma Involves Sensitive Data Processing . . . . .	639



9.2.4	Lack of Consultation and Participation of Local Communities (4th Challenge) . . . . .	641
9.2.5	Inadequate and Short-Term Funding Limits Long-Term Effects (5th Challenge) . . . . .	643
9.3	Conclusion . . . . .	646
	References . . . . .	648
<b>10</b>	<b>Positive Action for Roma in Four Key Areas . . . . .</b>	<b>657</b>
10.1	Sectorial Bottom-Up Approach for Tailored and Proportionate Measures . . . . .	659
10.2	Education: Examples of Six Positive Action Measures for Roma . . . . .	662
10.3	Housing: The Application of Four Positive Action Measures for Roma . . . . .	667
10.4	Employment: Examples of Six Positive Action Measures for Roma . . . . .	671
10.5	Health: The Application of Two Different Types of Positive Action for Roma . . . . .	676
10.6	Conclusion . . . . .	678
	References . . . . .	680
<b>11</b>	<b>Inter-Cultural Mediation to Enhance Roma Inclusion . . . . .</b>	<b>685</b>
11.1	Background: Increased Attention for Roma Mediation at the European Level . . . . .	687
11.2	Inter-Cultural Mediators Are Not Mediators in the Traditional Sense . . . . .	689
11.3	Four Conditions for Inter-Cultural Mediation in the Roma Context . . . . .	690
11.3.1	Mutual Understanding and Effective Communication Builds Trust (1st Condition) . . . . .	691
11.3.2	Fostering Interaction and Improving Active Co-operation (2nd Condition) . . . . .	693
11.3.3	Impartiality, Neutrality and Respect to Bridge Differences (3rd Condition) . . . . .	694
11.3.4	Active Involvement of Roma in the Development of Mediation (4th Condition) . . . . .	695
11.4	Inter-Cultural Mediation: Proactive Promotion of Roma Inclusion . . . . .	696
11.5	Six Challenges to Inter-Cultural Mediation in the Roma Context . . . . .	698
11.6	Training and Institutional Consolidation of Mediators to Face These Challenges . . . . .	701
11.7	Roma and Inter-Cultural Mediation: Best Practices in Two Areas . . . . .	704
11.7.1	Roma School Mediators Can Improve Educational Opportunities (1st Area) . . . . .	704
11.7.2	Roma Health Mediators Can Increase Accessibility to Healthcare Services (2nd Area) . . . . .	707



11.8	The Importance of Adopting a Gender Approach to Roma Mediation . . . . .	708
11.9	Conclusion . . . . .	709
	References . . . . .	711
<b>12</b>	<b>Final Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . .</b>	<b>715</b>
12.1	Moving Beyond the Controversy . . . . .	716
12.1.1	Ethnic Data Collection on Roma . . . . .	717
12.1.2	Positive Action for Roma . . . . .	719
12.2	Three Key Elements . . . . .	723
12.2.1	Awareness-Raising (1st Element) . . . . .	723
12.2.2	Active Participation (2nd Element) . . . . .	724
12.2.3	Political Will (3rd Element) . . . . .	725
12.3	Final Remarks . . . . .	726
	References . . . . .	727

Larson), an LL.M. in International and European Law (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) and a European Master's Degree in Human Rights and Democratisation (Gastpost Inter-University Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation, now called Global Campus of Human Rights). She obtained the degree of Doctor of Law at VUB in 2017 and remains connected to the Law Faculty's Fundamental Rights and Constitutionalism Research Group as an affiliated fellow. As a legal expert, she is actively involved in various research networks, including the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights' multidisciplinary research network FRANET and the Berkeley Comparative Equality and Anti-Discrimination Law Study Group, which includes scholars, activists, equality body legal professional and private lawyers from around the world. She has been a member of the editorial board of the *Pittsburgh Journal for Human Rights* since 2012. During the 2017-2019 academic year, she was a Fulbright-Belgium scholar at the Francis Bagnoud Center for Health and Human Rights at Harvard University, researching the social and economic conditions of Roma people in the USA. She was also involved in the Law School's Human Rights Journal as an article editor. Previously, she was a visiting researcher at the School of Law of the University of California, Berkeley, as a Hoover Foundation Englefeld Fellow of the Belgian American Educational Foundation (2014-2015). In December 2015, she was elected as a board member of the EEA Forum Association, Europe's leading body of human rights practitioners. She has organised several international conferences and panels on Roma and was closely involved in the external Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020 for the European Commission in 2017-2018.