

ORESANSKA Ingrid (REGIO)

From: BENCATOVA Martina (REGIO)
Sent: 23 October 2012 18:19
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: Wednesday, October 10, 2012 7:31 PM
To: 'marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk'; miroslav.hrudkay@build.gov.sk; Pícha Emil (emil.picha@build.gov.sk)
Cc: TODD Christopher (REGIO); ORTH Martin (EMPL); URMOS Andor (REGIO); KOLARIKOVA Jana (REGIO); WALKER Colin (REGIO)
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

From: Ďubjaková Marcela [<mailto:marcela.dubjakova@build.gov.sk>]

Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2012 2:21 PM

To: monika.matyasova@vlada.gov.sk; ladislav.simko@vlada.gov.sk; milada.misicova@vlada.gov.sk; michal.blasko@vlada.gov.sk; juraj.gmterko@mindop.sk; pavol.minarovych@mindop.sk; robert.felcan@mindop.sk; elena.szolgayova@mindop.sk; miroslav.mihal@minedu.sk; roderik.klinda@minedu.sk; martin.huska@enviro.gov.sk; mirka.hruskova@enviro.gov.sk; vladimir.poljak@enviro.gov.sk; marcekova@mhsr.sk; jana.savelova@culture.gov.sk; eva.sirotova@hazz.minv.sk; albert.nemeth@employment.gov.sk; olga.pietruchova@employment.gov.sk; marcela.zubriczka@mfsr.sk; marta.skalosova@vucbb.sk; lenka.iurkova@vucke.sk; predseda@unsk.sk; svetlana.pavlovicova@vucpo.sk; predseda@tsk.sk; cipar.marian@trnava-vuc.sk; predseda@zask.sk; muska@zmos.sk; jassova@zmos.sk; slavik@fns.uniba.sk; rusnakbb@mail.t-com.sk; ivankuhn@institute.sk; romabusines@pobox.sk; ludovit.hajduk@azet.sk; martin.barbaric@land.gov.sk; Pabišová Iveta; Hrkčková Eva; Turzová Mária; lubomir.jahnatek@land.gov.sk

Cc: spnemocnenecrk@vlada.gov.sk; emilia.palkova@culture.gov.sk; Kristian.Kovacs@employment.gov.sk; marek.vanko@mfsr.sk; judita.opalkova@land.gov.sk; lukac@zsps.sk; martina.bencatova@ec.europa.eu; richard.broos@mzv.sk; Hrudkay Miroslav; Maruniak Vladimír; Jakubecová Adriana

Subject: Výzva na hlasovanie písomnou 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 písomnou 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.

Ďakujeme za spoluprácu.

S pozdravom

Sekretariát MV pre ROP



Ministerstvo pôdohospodárstva a rozvoja vidieka SR
Dobrovičova 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
inforop@build.gov.sk