



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Swiss Cooperation Program Serbia

Social Inclusion (SI)

Tirana, May/June 2016



Development Outcomes

- **SI in Serbia: priority topic, mandatory for EU integration** (increasing employ/standard of living and coverage of social transfers, pose a priority for sustainable development)
- **SIPRU, monitored through Nat Report on SI – II Oct 2014);**
- **High Relevance for Serbia,** compared to social and economic realities , huge reg disparities, low social transfers, mater. deprivation, increased of poverty at working population (24 – 45) & age 14 – 28, poverty rate 9%, at risk 25.6%; cross-sectoral (in lead Minsitry of Labour, Social Welfare)
- **SI in SCO Belgrade CS 2014 – 2017: Goal ,Outcome 2&4 (Governance), Outcome 1 (Economy):**
 - Decentralisation and SI reform (OS 2); *Increased quality of and access to mun.services for citizens/vulner groups (OS 4); increased youth employability/vulnerable (OS 1)*
- ✓ **Implementation Priorities: ESRP, ERP Competitiveness , Roma Strategy 2015 - 2025 , Youth strategy 2020 , Gender Equality 2020 , Regional development strategy 2020, migration , system solutionst** and transfer of affordable practice and models from national to local level and vice versa



Results OS

- EU accession criteria for the accession negotiation chapters relating to SI successfully fulfilled
- Evidence based policy substantially improved – gender/youth/inclusive education
- Coord, M&R on SI policies have been further enhanced
- Social inclusion at the local level has been improved:
- Social inclusion funds available to Serbia have increased:
- direct community services to over 15'000 beneficiaries annually in over 85 municipalities (ECD, PPP, primary, secondary, adult educat, skills development , institutionalisation of practises etc)





Implications/Outlook

- ***Implications for portfolio development:***
 - Learn from existing successes, best practice & system building – ECD, prevention of drop outs in high schools;
 - Explore new ideas: inclusive employment , skills/business/dual , access to justice (women/Roma, rural), **active inclusion** - to facilitate the transition from the social welfare consumption to employment opportunities.
- ***Steering/adjustments:*** ESRP, VET reforms, high school affirmative actions; new Roma Decade 20205 and strategy support to increase impact; new SDC theme



But then.....

- **Broad or narrow? General vulnerability/specific groups? One sector – few/all? If too broad, risk of dilute /tick the box; if too narrow – „local/project inclusion“, insufficient resources vs. goal; to „become“ transversal theme – what is sufficient „rate of appearance“ to be a theme?**
- **Targets: SI/Roma or SI & Roma inclusion; SI/gender or SI&gender**
- **Age groups : is age group per se vulnerability factor (ECD, elderly)? What about unemployed, youth, others – is this then SI or employment/economy? What is the thin line between, if any?**
- **Governance domain logic/ Economic domain logic, or the third: Justice&human rights, social development , HRSD or overall frame logic? Which is the last one?**
- **SI as social protection/benefits activities vs. active inclusion to active employment/access**
- **Big questions: How we monitor ?CS LF are fine, operational tool – what is reality, does country has the same logic, plans, data?**



And still.....

- **PARADOX:** fine results, programme highly relevant and highly contributed to SI ... and then increase of poverty, decrease of accesses although increase of social benefits, increase of vulnerability (children, elderly, rural, women...)
- Are we doing something wrong? Better analysis? Direct involvement in community services or „brokering“ transformations?
- And – or; And/or



“Thank you” & Discussion

