

A RES(2012)1295367  
466 8867

## **ORESANSKA Ingrid (REGIO)**

**From:** BENCATOVA Martina (REGIO)  
**Sent:** 23 October 2012 18:18  
**To:** ORESANSKA Ingrid (REGIO)  
**Subject:** FW: Selection criteria for de-institutionalisation pilots - submitted per rollam for approval of MC ROP

Prosim o Ares; link s Ares(2012)1251116 - 23/10/2012

---

**From:** BENCATOVA Martina (REGIO)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2012 6:09 PM  
**To:** 'Hrudkay Miroslav'  
**Cc:** Pícha Emil; Hrčková Eva; Bruncko Ján; Ďubjaková Marcela; TODD Christopher (REGIO); ORTH Martin (EMPL); URMOS Andor (REGIO); KOLARIKOVA Jana (REGIO); WALKER Colin (REGIO); FECENKO Ivan (REGIO)  
**Subject:** RE: Selection criteria for de-institutionalisation pilots - submitted per rollam for approval of MC ROP

Dear Mr Hrudkay

Thank you for your additional information provided in relation to **selection of DI – pilots**.

However, it is still not clear who and how will assess the quality of the DI pilots as such. In this respect, it is not sufficient just to make the general reference to the compliance with the national documents.

As you mention, the pilot projects shall be supported from ESF as well as ERDF to combine investments in human and physical capital. As the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family is the lead ministry in the DI process at the national level and at the same time, there is a national project co-financed by ESF in this field under the responsibility of this Ministry, we have asked directly DG EMPL F4 to look into the state of play concerning the preparation of DI pilots at this Ministry, including the selection process. In this respect, DG EMPL F4 has already contacted the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family asking for more information.

Excellent quality of the individual DI plans is a crucial pre-condition for the success of subsequent ERDF investments.

Therefore, first of all, it needs to be clarified, who and how will evaluate the quality of individual DI projects/plans as whole. Only afterwards, it is possible to solve/tune the selection of DI projects (ERDF investment part) financed by ROP.

Concerning your question raised on the programme revision in relation to the **amendment of the beneficiaries under TA of ROP (+Public Procurement Office – to reinforce the administrative capacity in public procurement verifications)**, we would like to stress that in general:

- All the elements of the OP and/or the Commission decision on the OP are of the same legal value
- Therefore, any change in the text of the OP or in the Commission decision on the OP requires a formal modifying decision in accordance with Article 33 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006
- It is up to the Member State to decide the most appropriate moment for the submission of the formal proposal for programme revision, depending on the urgency

Based on the information provided, it seems that in this case, there should not be a problem to postpone such kind of modification for later on. In the meantime, the approval of this amendment by the monitoring committee would be sufficient.

Best regards and wishing you a nice day

=====

Martina Benčatová  
DG REGIO F.4 (Slovakia Unit)  
tel.: +32-2-29 893 13  
fax: +32-2-29 941 37  
e-mail: [martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu](mailto:martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu)

---

**From:** Hrudkay Miroslav [<mailto:miroslav.hrudkay@build.gov.sk>]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2012 4:20 PM  
**To:** BENCATOVA Martina (REGIO)  
**Cc:** Pícha Emil; Hrčková Eva; Bruncko Ján; Ďubjaková Marcela  
**Subject:** RE: Selection criteria for de-institutionalisation pilots - submitted per rollam for approval of MC ROP  
**Importance:** High

dobrý deň,

dăkujeme za reakciu k hodnotiacim kritériám. V súvislosti s pripravovanou výzvou zameranou na deinštitucionalizáciu si Vám dovoľujeme oznámiť nasledovné skutočnosti na objasnenie samotnej výzvy a zvolenia hodnotiacich kritérií.

1. Hodnotiace kritéria zamerané na súlad s vnútrostátnymi dokumentmi, ktoré sa týkajú deinštitucionalizácie, hodnotia vo svojej podstate splnenie samotnej podmienky oprávnenosti žiadateľa, t.j. žiadatelia musia predložiť písomné súhlasné vyjadrenie Ministerstva práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny SR, ktoré po odbornej stránke zhodnotí súlad zamerania žiadosti o poskytnutie nenávratného finančného príspevku žiadateľa s vnútrostátnymi dokumentmi (platná legislatíva, Stratégia deinštitucionalizácie systému sociálnych služieb a náhradnej starostlivosti v Slovenskej republike; Národný akčný plán prechodu z inštitucionálnej na komunitnú starostlivosť v systéme sociálnych služieb na roky 2012 – 2015; Koncepcia zabezpečovania výkonu súdnych rozhodnutí v detských domovoch na roky 2012 – 2015 s výhľadom do roku 2020, Plán transformácie a deinštitucionalizácie náhradnej starostlivosti), ktoré ustanovujú jednotlivé zásady, princípy a konkrétnne kroky pre úspešné zrealizovanie deinštitucionalizácie systému sociálnych služieb a sociálnoprávnej ochrany detí a sociálnej kurately – žiadosť o poskytnutie nenávratného finančného príspevku, ktorá nebude v súlade so strategickými, koncepcnými zámermi alebo zákonými podmienkami, nedostane súhlasné vyjadrenie MPSVR SR, a tým nesplní už podmienky formálnej kontroly v rámci konania o žiadosti a samotná žiadosť bude vylúčená z ďalšieho hodnotiaceho procesu (t.j. nebude predmetom odborného hodnotenia).

2. V oblasti sociálnych služieb je výzva zameraná na implementáciu pilotných projektov na prípravu a realizáciu podmienok výstavby domov/domácností pre podporované bývanie a rekonštrukciu vhodných objektov pre požadované komunitné služby. V oblasti sociálnoprávnej ochrany detí a sociálnej kurately je výzva zameraná na podporu pokračujúceho procesu deinštitucionalizácie náhradnej starostlivosti – najmä prípravou a realizáciou podmienok výstavby rodinných domov pre samostatné skupiny a rekonštrukciou vhodných domov pre dosiahnutie komunitnej úrovne. Výzva nie je zameraná na podporu existujúcich objektov zariadení ale na podporu služieb/opatrení komunitného typu, resp. na komunitnej úrovni.

3. V rámci národných projektov financovaných z ESF sa podporujú aktivity o.i. zamerané na školenie manažmentu a personálu, na prípravu prijímateľov služieb transformujúcich sa zariadení, aby zvládli prechod do nového prostredia, na koordinačné, poradenské a supervízne aktivity, na monitoring a hodnotenie výsledkov. Komplementarita je zabezpečená, nakoľko projekty financované z ESF sú zamerané na investície do ľudského kapitálu a projekty financované z ERDF sú zamerané na investície do samotnej infraštruktúry poskytovateľov sociálnych služieb/ infraštruktúry sociálnoprávnej ochrany detí a sociálnej kurately.

4. Bol zriadený Výbor expertov pre deinštitucionalizáciu, ktorého úlohou je o.i. monitoring, evaluácia a zhodnotenie procesu deinštitucionalizácie. Zároveň, je uznesením vlády SR uložená ministroví práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny úloha predložiť na rokovanie vlády informáciu o plnení opatrení a úloh vyplývajúcich zo stratégie deinštitucionalizácie systému sociálnych služieb a náhradnej starostlivosti v SR k 31.decembru príslušného roka.

5. Celý proces nastavovania jednotlivých parametrov výzvy zameranej na deinštitucionalizáciu je konzultovaný aj so zodpovednými zamestnancami Ministerstva práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny SR (ako gestorom na národnej úrovni), nakoľko proces deinštitucionalizácie je pomerne komplexná problematika.

Ešte by som sa chcel spýtať ohľadom zmeny ROP v prípade doplnenia prijímateľa v rámci prioritnej osi 6. Technická pomoc, uvedeným prijímateľom by mal byť Úrad pre verejné obstarávanie (z dôvodu posilnenia administratívnych kapacít pre overovanie verejného obstarávania). Je možné takého doplnenie pokladať za technickú zmenu operačného programu a následne v rámci plánovanej revízie ju zahrnieme do úprav alebo to nie je technická zmena a je potrebné postupovať štandardným procesom pre revíziu? Ďakujem

S pozdravom

*Ing. Miroslav Hrudkay  
oddelenie riadenia programov  
odbor realizácie programov regionálneho rozvoja  
Agentúra na podporu regionálneho rozvoja*

---

**From:** Martina.BENCATOVA@ec.europa.eu [mailto:[Martina.BENCATOVA@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Martina.BENCATOVA@ec.europa.eu)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 10, 2012 7:31 PM  
**To:** Dubjaková Marcela; Hrudkay Miroslav; Pícha Emil  
**Cc:** Christopher.Todd@ec.europa.eu; Martin.ORTH@ec.europa.eu; Andor.URMOS@ec.europa.eu; Jana.KOLARIKOVA@ec.europa.eu; Colin-Andrew.Walker@ec.europa.eu  
**Subject:** Selection criteria for de-institutionalisation pilots - submitted per rollam for approval of MC ROP

Dear colleagues,

From the Commission services' point of view, the proposed selection criteria are very general, in particular in relation to the assessment of the quality of the transformation. In fact, the selection criteria do not include assessment of what is "behind" transformation and if the services funded do not segregate or exclude people from society (e.g. congregated vs. dispersed living units, details below).

From the project contents point of view, the selection criteria only refers to:

- the fact, if the project is related to the transformation of existing facility and if there is a complementarity with the national project under the OP Employment and social inclusion (the only criterion for disqualification); and then
- Assessment of type, form of facility: in children infrastructure, if the project aims to transform the children homes established as centres of children to homes of children; in the area of social services: referring to max. 6 people in one housing unit and max. 3 housing units in one object with max. capacity of 18 places (not as disqualifying criterion).
- Compliance of the project with the Plan for de-institutionalisation of foster care (in case of children infrastructure) and compliance with the Regional strategy for social services development (in case of infrastructure for social services)

For example, the following qualitative elements does not seem to be covered by the selection criteria:

- The selection criteria does not ensure that the action proposed is part of a wider national or regional strategy for the transition from institutional to community-based care (the criterion refers only to national Plan for de-institutionalisation of foster care – but not as disqualifying

criterion; in case of if the regional strategies – it is not clear if they are already in compliance with the de-institutionalisation trends)

- In the absence of such a document, will the action proposed contribute to framing a strategy for transition from institutional to community-based care?
- Is the action proposed based on the real needs of the population in a certain region? This could be in the form of the number of individuals in institutional care, number of individuals without the necessary support in the community etc. There should also be an explanation why a particular region/institution was chosen for this specific investment, and any action should be based on a comprehensive needs assessment.
- Concerning the *target groups*, how the action proposed will improve the quality of life of the end beneficiaries of the action?
- how the action proposed will facilitate social inclusion of the end beneficiaries?
- Does the action proposed ensure that no group of individuals will be excluded from support because of the type of their impairment (for example, because they have mental health problems or because of the complexity of their support needs) or for any other reason?
- In case of children, does the action make clear that the benefit will apply equally to children with and without disabilities?
- Concerning the legal and regulatory framework, what about quality standards that the proposed action should satisfy (such as, which quality framework will be used to establish that services supported are of high quality and to enable quality monitoring)?
- If the aim of the action is to develop *living units*, are there safeguards to ensure that they will facilitate independent living or, in the case of children, family-like care?
- The selection criteria do not ensure that the action proposed does not aim to develop congregated living units for any group of people (to be avoided), but that they are dispersed and located in ordinary communities.
- The selection criteria do not ensure that the action proposed does not aim to develop living units on the grounds of any of the existing long-stay residential institutions.
- Are there sufficient safeguards that the institution building that will be closed will not be converted into another type of residential service?
- The selection criteria do not ensure that the action proposed does not aim to link the housing to the support provided, i.e. that individuals will not be obliged to choose a particular living arrangement because that is where they will receive support.
- If the proposed action allows the building of group homes for children, it should be clear that this must be in the best interest of children and used as a temporary or last resort (e.g. after all efforts have been deployed to integrate children into biological or foster families). Are there safeguards that such group homes will provide family-like care and that they will be located in ordinary communities? Are there other actions foreseen which would ensure that children who will be living in the group homes will be able to access mainstream services in the community (such as local schools)?

Concerning the access to other services,

- are there sufficient safeguards that services will not be provided in a segregating setting?
- are there sufficient safeguards in place to ensure that no "parallel" services will be developed, but that the proposed action will facilitate access of the relevant groups to mainstream services (such as employment, education, health etc.)? This does not mean that specialised services should not be developed.
- are there sufficient safeguards that services will not exclude any particular group because of their impairment? For example, if the action proposes to fund a personal assistance service, access should not be denied to people with intellectual disabilities or people with mental health problems.
- Does the proposed action foresee investment in management and coordination? For example, if the action is aimed at closure of long-stay residential institutions and the development of alternative services in the community, is it clear that a part of the investment must go towards the management of closure?
- Is there support foreseen for training or re-training of staff to work in the new services?
- It is not clear how the action proposed will be funded once the investment is spent, i.e. is it shown that the action is sustainable beyond the course of EU funding?

- It is not clear how the proposed action will meaningfully involve users of services, and their representative organisations and families where relevant, in the design of the service funded, in line with the partnership principle.
- Is there a provision for regular monitoring and evaluation in the proposed action?
- It is not clear how users of services, and their representative organisations and families where relevant, will be meaningfully involved in monitoring and evaluation of the services funded.

Best regards

=====

Martina Benčatová  
DG REGIO F.4 (Slovakia Unit)  
tel.: +32-2-29 893 13  
fax: +32-2-29 941 37  
e-mail: [martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu](mailto:martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu)

**From:** Ďubjaková Marcela [mailto:[marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk](mailto:marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2012 2:21 PM  
**To:** [monika.matyasova@vlada.gov.sk](mailto:monika.matyasova@vlada.gov.sk); [ladislav.simko@vlada.gov.sk](mailto:ladislav.simko@vlada.gov.sk); [milada.misicova@vlada.gov.sk](mailto:milada.misicova@vlada.gov.sk); [michal.blasko@vlada.gov.sk](mailto:michal.blasko@vlada.gov.sk); [juraj.gmiterko@mindop.sk](mailto:juraj.gmiterko@mindop.sk); [pavol.minarovych@mindop.sk](mailto:pavol.minarovych@mindop.sk); [robert.felcan@mindop.sk](mailto:robert.felcan@mindop.sk); [elena.szolgayova@mindop.sk](mailto:elena.szolgayova@mindop.sk); [miroslav.mihal@minedu.sk](mailto:miroslav.mihal@minedu.sk); [roderik.klinda@minedu.sk](mailto:roderik.klinda@minedu.sk); [martin.huska@enviro.gov.sk](mailto:martin.huska@enviro.gov.sk); [mirka.hruskova@enviro.gov.sk](mailto:mirka.hruskova@enviro.gov.sk); [vladimir.poljak@enviro.gov.sk](mailto:vladimir.poljak@enviro.gov.sk); [marcekova@mhsr.sk](mailto:marcekova@mhsr.sk); [jana.savelova@culture.gov.sk](mailto:jana.savelova@culture.gov.sk); [eva.sirotova@hazz.minv.sk](mailto:eva.sirotova@hazz.minv.sk); [albert.nemeth@employment.gov.sk](mailto:albert.nemeth@employment.gov.sk); [olga.pietruchova@employment.gov.sk](mailto:olga.pietruchova@employment.gov.sk); [marcela.zubriczka@mfsr.sk](mailto:marcela.zubriczka@mfsr.sk); [marta.skalosova@vucbb.sk](mailto:marta.skalosova@vucbb.sk); [lenka.jurkova@vucke.sk](mailto:lenka.jurkova@vucke.sk); [predseda@unsk.sk](mailto:predseda@unsk.sk); [svetlana.pavlovicova@vucpo.sk](mailto:svetlana.pavlovicova@vucpo.sk); [predseda@tsk.sk](mailto:predseda@tsk.sk); [cipar.marian@trnavavuc.sk](mailto:cipar.marian@trnavavuc.sk); [predseda@zask.sk](mailto:predseda@zask.sk); [muska@zmos.sk](mailto:muska@zmos.sk); [jassova@zmos.sk](mailto:jassova@zmos.sk); [slavik@fns.uniba.sk](mailto:slavik@fns.uniba.sk); [rusnakbb@mail.t-com.sk](mailto:rusnakbb@mail.t-com.sk); [ivankuhn@institute.sk](mailto:ivankuhn@institute.sk); [romabusiness@pobox.sk](mailto:romabusiness@pobox.sk); [ludovit.hajduk@azet.sk](mailto:ludovit.hajduk@azet.sk); [martin.barbaric@land.gov.sk](mailto:martin.barbaric@land.gov.sk); Pabišová Iveta; Hrčková Eva; Turzová Mária; [lubomir.jahnatek@land.gov.sk](mailto:lubomir.jahnatek@land.gov.sk)  
**Cc:** [splnomocnenecrk@vlada.gov.sk](mailto:splnomocnenecrk@vlada.gov.sk); [emilia.palkova@culture.gov.sk](mailto:emilia.palkova@culture.gov.sk); [Kristian.Kovacs@employment.gov.sk](mailto:Kristian.Kovacs@employment.gov.sk); [marek.vanko@mfsr.sk](mailto:marek.vanko@mfsr.sk); [judita.opalkova@land.gov.sk](mailto:judita.opalkova@land.gov.sk); [Iukac@zsps.sk](mailto:Iukac@zsps.sk); [martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu](mailto:martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu); [richard.broos@mzv.sk](mailto:richard.broos@mzv.sk); Hrudkay Miroslav; Maruniak Vladimír; Jakubecová Adriana  
**Subject:** Výzva na hlasovanie písomnej procedúrou pre členov Monitorovacieho výboru pre ROP

Vážení členovia Monitorovacieho výboru pre Regionálny operačný program,

v súlade s čl. 5 Rokovacieho poriadku Monitorovacieho výboru pre Regionálny operačný program (ROP) si Vás v mene predsedu Monitorovacieho výboru pre ROP dovoľujeme vyzvať na hlasovanie písomnej procedúrou o nasledovných dvoch bodoch:

1. schválenie hodnotiacich kritérií pre oblasť podpory 2.1a ROP Infraštruktúra sociálnych služieb, sociálnoprávnej ochrany a sociálnej kurately – podpora pilotného prístupu deinštitucionalizácie existujúcich zariadení sociálnych služieb a podpora deinštitucionalizácie existujúcich zariadení sociálnoprávnej ochrany detí a sociálnej kurately,
2. schválenie formálnej zmeny výberových kritérií pre všetky opatrenia v rámci ROP.

Dovoľujeme si Vás požiadať o dodržanie spôsobu a termínu zaslania Vášho stanoviska do **10.10.2012** písomne a zároveň elektronicky na e-mailovú adresu [marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk](mailto:marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk).

Ďakujeme za spoluprácu.

S pozdravom

Sekretariát MV pre ROP



regionálny  
operáčny  
program



Ministerstvo pôdohospodárstva a rozvoja vidieka SR  
Dobrovíčova 12, 812 66 Bratislava  
Agentúra na podporu regionálneho rozvoja  
Odbor realizácie programov regionálneho rozvoja  
Oddelenie riadenia programov  
Prievozská 2/B, 825 25 Bratislava 26  
marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk  
tel: 02/58 317 334, fax: 02/58 317 583  
[www.ropka.sk](http://www.ropka.sk)  
[inforop@build.gov.sk](mailto:inforop@build.gov.sk)

Informacia od ESET NOD32 Antivirus, verzia databazy 7538  
(20121002)

Toto spravu preveril ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.sk>