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# **Report on the results of social service delivery system monitoring in Ukraine**
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# Introduction

Monitoring of the social services system in Ukraine is a task of the NGO "Bureau of social and political development" as part of the project **"Advanced Reform, Advanced Civil Society",** jointly implemented by the Centre for Armavir NGOs Development (Armenia), NGI "Dialogue of Generations" (Georgia) and SCO "Bureau of social and political development" (Ukraine) with the support of the Secretariat of the Forum Civil Society Eastern Partnership. The report is based on a review of the legal support of social services rendering process and also on opinions of experts that are developing the relevant regulations or are providing social services themselves, as well as on the seminar for NGOs and on focus group for stakeholders.

Altogether there were interviewed 14 experts: 3 - representatives of the central authorities, 4 - from international and national organizations, 4 - service providers and 3 - from scientific institutions. The seminar was attended by representatives of two NGOs, the focus groups – by 12 experts from all the stakeholders.

The purpose of the survey, workshop and focus group was to find out how the process of social services reforming in Ukraine is organized and how it relates to decentralization, that is being implemented in the country, how is the redistribution of functions and powers being made.

# Content and social services providers

Social policy of any state is aimed at social protection of various social and demographic groups of citizens, especially those in difficult life circumstances. Effective social protection - is not only governmentally guaranteed social benefits, but at first place - developed network of social services rendering that are to be provided with taking into account all the peculiarities and needs of different categories of customers. An important role is granted to social services as a process of material conditions of the population improving , in particular Poverty Reduction Strategy (approved by the Cabinet of Ministers at March 16, 2016 Number 161-p) as one of the important work directions defines "Minimization of the risk of poverty and social exclusion of the most vulnerable strata" and among as one of the tasks is mentioned the one "to increase the accessibility and quality of social services for vulnerable people".

According to the Law "On Social Service” - social services can be defined as a set of assistance measures aimed at solving life problems and provided to certain social groups in difficult life circumstances not able to overcome them without external help.The Law "On social services" identified 8 social services types: life conditions/welfare, psychological, socio-educational, socio-medical, socio-economic, legal services, informational and employment services. However, such a types division of social services has been criticized for a long time by the experts and currently there is registered a draft bill on the new wording of the law, in which the approach to classification of social services would be changed.

Due to the imperfection of the basic Law, Order of the Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine (№ 537 from 03.09.2012) approved a "list of social services provided to individuals who are in difficult circumstances and are not able to overcome them." The list of services radically differs from the list proposed in the Law, and includes the following:

• Home care (stationary and day type);

• Supported accommodation

• Palliative / hospice Care

• The service of arranging the family upbringing care

• Service of social adaptation

• Service of social integration and reintegration

• Service of habilitation

• Social rehabilitation services (including services of social and psychological rehabilitation)

• Asylum arrangement

• Crisis intervention and emergency

• Counselling providing

• Social support / patronage (including social support for employment and at the workplace)

• Interest representation

• Intercession (mediation)

• Social problems prevention

Since the approval of the above mentioned list among the experts do not cease debate on the proposed set of services. First of all, raised the questions of different complexity services and facilities include some other services. Thus, the service of social support could include counseling and interests’ representation, social adaptation, and others. In this case, the specialists that directly provide services face the question of their accounting: to consider our work as 1 bulky or 10 simple services?

The second problem of this list is that often the services referred in the law regulations to a particular institution (and particularly the law regulations is a decisive instrument for institutions’ workers) do not comply with this list. For example, for the local centers for single disabled citizens the household services are typical (cleaning, cooking, grocery shopping, digging gardens, etc.), while the services of social service centers correspond to the content of social work. In addition, the above list of services is not a minimal list of social services that would ensure the most basic needs of people who find themselves in difficulty, and which would be guaranteed by the state in any economic situation, regardless of the area of ​​residence of citizens. So, today, in each case, the list, the contents, and the volume of social services are determined by the social worker, which was applied to by a person, taking into consideration, on the one hand – person’s health, individual needs, individual rehabilitation program and other objective factors, resulting in difficult life circumstances, and on the other hand, based on the other - the capacity of institutions to meet those needs, which mainly is quite limited (especially regarding dwelling and employment).

Social services are provided by different actors (including various forms of ownership), but mostly by the state or municipal social service institutions, whose activities are coordinated by the relevant central and local executive bodies and local authorities, and are funded from the state and local budgets as well as from other sources stipulated by law.

In general, the social protection system is not interested in the withdrawal people out of difficult life circumstances (rehabilitation, adaptation) or in preventing social groups getting in difficult life circumstances (prevention). Support of people trapped in difficult circumstances ensures the functioning of these institutions, ensures a flow of significant amount of materials and financial support that goes through the institutions heads, directors of divisions and departments of social protection at the local level. Each provider who operates in these "different areas" of social services provision is trying to keep stable funding of their own institutions and is lobbying for changes in legislation that aim to ensure the interests of suppliers rather than the recipients of social services. That's why de-institutionalization is such an acute issue at the moment. For decades it has been declared as a priority, but effective steps for its implementation have still not been made: the system resists in all possible ways. Its workers fear losing their jobs, and because of the widespread practice of placing the stationary institutions in small inhabited settlement, localities, including rural areas, the dissolution of institutions is indeed a threat for workers to stay unemployed.

The most actively the system institutions for children are being discussed. As a positive shift in this context can be considered the scheduled by the Implementation of the National strategy in the field of human rights for the period up to 2020 Plan (Annex to the decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine as of November 23, 2015 No. 1393-R) for the 4th quarter of 2017 "The Approval of the National program implementation for the period up to 2025, which contains a clear practical definition of the term and the necessary resources to conduct piecemeal reforms, aimed at stopping the education of children in institutions and the development of services to support families with children on the ground." But, in fact, the issue of providing care in the community for adults and de-institutionalization of the corresponding institutions is not less important.

However, creation of the necessary for deinstitutionalization conditions at the community level – is a complex task, as nowadays at the level of territorial communities there are not implemented effective mechanisms for strategic forecasting and planning, provision of social services with meeting of people’s needs, mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the quality of social services, independent monitoring, social services performance assessment, sanctions for violation of social services provision standards and for poor quality of social services.. As a result, the available social services are not focused on the prevention of difficult life circumstances occurrence, do not form people’s reintegration into society skills, resulting in the retention of a significant number of such persons in residential institutions. But besides the technological problems of organizing the process of social services provision there is another extremely important factor - the lack of local funds needed to provide services.

# Social services funding

In case of a need to purchase something (including social services) the first to arise is a question of clear understanding of the subject of the procurement. The task formulated as "to clearly define the meaning of social services" was asked during the course of their standardization. Currently the vast majority of social services defined by the List of social services of the Ministry of social policy, is standardized. However, the services prescribed in the standards are very variable, which complicates the calculation of their cost. If rely on the “Order of development of the state standard of social services” (Order of the Ministry of social policy № 282 as of 16.05.2012), the objectives of the Standards are the following:

• organization of social services rendering;

• evaluation, monitoring and quality control of social services;

• determination of tariff rates to be paid for social services provision.

As you can see, speaking on calculation of the cost of social services, we are talking only about paid services, so for the moment the developers of the Standards did not have a task of determining the cost of basic services for further budget procurement. Accordingly, approved Standards are not focused on calculation of the cost of services that are being standardized. However, without regulation of social services financing issues it is hardly possible to hope that their quantity and quality will meet the needs of the population.

Today there are approved methodological recommendations on calculation of social services costs (approved by Order of Ministry of social policy № 1186 as of 07.12.2015), but they don't connect the process of calculating the cost of services with the existing standards. In the course of social order, in particular when determining the conditions of tenders and tender evaluation of entities providing social services" the calculation of the cost of social services is offered to be done according to these methodological recommendations. Despite the absence of a minimum guaranteed package of social services, and the prevalence of the phenomenon of budget deficits and the need for involving of quite a high qualification specialist to do the calculations proposed in the recommendations, it is possible to predict that the use of this document is unlikely to become a common practice in the local budgeting.

Overall, Ukraine’s budget system functions on the basis of the “precedent” principle. Funds allocated in the previous fiscal year are planned for the following fiscal year with a slight adjustment for the projected inflation rate. This approach also complicates the realistic planning of social policy priorities and allocation of funds for social services. As a result, funds for social services are spent to maintain social welfare institutions, with 90% of their budgets spent on utilities and salaries, which is ineffective. Furthermore, there is a contradiction between the government’s trying to cut national budget expenditures and social service providers’ efforts to increase these expenditures.

At present, social services are financed through several mechanisms:

* Subvention-based financing of social service institutions (primarily, residential ones); their maintenance is financed through national budget protected expenditure items;
* Financing of social service institutions from local budgets (heavy dependence on local budgets, territorial have a different number of institutions and specialists, which is why territorial are covered with social services differently);
* social service (commissioning) procurement: procurement of social service using budget funds (primarily from private social service providers) – which occurs episodically in Ukraine, depending on the financial capacity of a territory and understanding of this mechanisms by local governments;
* the “money follows the patient” principle, which has been applied in Ukraine to orphans and children deprived of parental care (in fact, the principle has only been proclaimed, as funds are not redistributed from the amount planned for the maintenance of residential institutions for children; instead an additional subvention is allocated);
* financing of the approved list of non-governmental organizations (including national level), which provide social services as part of their activity;
* financing of non-governmental organizations through competitive bidding (at local level), whose projects may include social service delivery;
* international business and public grants and charitable funding for social service providers (primarily, private ones).

These mechanisms work separately, which renders social serviced financing in Ukraine devoid of a common logic. At the same time, there’s a cumbersome regulatory framework for implementing most of these mechanisms, which is complicated for social service providers, who pay for these services, to use.

The issue concerning social service funding is who is to pay for these services. Under Article 34 of Law of Ukraine #**936-VIII** (of 01.26.2016), para. 2-1 (“On amendments to selected legislation of Ukraine to improve social protection of children and support families with children”), the provision of social service for persons and families in difficult life circumstances who need outside assistance (including as a result of disability) is delegated authority. The provision of social services for socially deviant persons as a result of their lifestyle (the homeless, ex-prisoners, people with chemical dependencies) has for 2 years now been financed from local budgets (since the termination of national budget allocations for centers of social services for families, children and youth). However, there is no basic guaranteed package of social services, which is to be financed irrespective of a territorial (local) economic situation.

Ukraine’s local government and territorial administration reform concept (the Cabinet of Ministers’ directive #333-p of April 1, 2013) empowers basic level local governments to ensure the provision of social assistance (not services) through territorial centers. Basic level territorial divisions of central executive authorities are expected to provide social protection (pensions, subsidies, compensations, exemptions). Under the Concept, local (raion level) governments are basically responsible for the fostering and education of children at general residential schools. The Concept does not define an entity responsible for the provision of social services for the population at different levels.

At the same time, in addition to the term “social services” the Concept introduces “public services” (administrative, social and other services in corresponding territories). Concept implementation stage 2 (2015-2017) is intended to unify and standardize public services provided by local governments and executive authorities to maximize access to services and ensure adequate funding at legislative level. Concept implementation in terms of public service delivery is expected to:

* ensure accessibility and improve the quality of public services;
* introduce a mechanism for local state administrations and communities to oversee the provision public services by local governments and territorial bodies of central executive authorities;
* introduce standards of quality of social services provided to the population by basic and regional level local governments, as well as service quality assessment criteria.

As part of the Concept, an action plan was approved to implement the local government and territorial administration reform concept (the Cabinet of Ministers’ directive #688-p of September 22, 2016). This document directs central executive authorities (the Ministry of Social Policy is not mentioned separately), including national associations of local governments, to approve a descriptive and financial basis for social standards for each of the powers delegated to local governments per average administrative territory, and define a minimum and maximum value of these standards based on available financial resources. The implementation deadline for this task is October 2016. Another objectives of the Plan to be achieved by the end of 2016 is to make changes to the documents that regulate the application of sectorial service provision norms and standards. The Ministry of Social Policy is mentioned as one of the implementers under this objective.

In addition to the above-mentioned Concept, the term “public services” can be found in the National regional development strategy for the period until 2020 (approved by Cabinet directive #385 on August 6, 2014). Goal 3 of this Strategy reads as “Effective governance in regional development” contains the following public service objectives:

* define a substantiated territorial basis for the activity of local governments and executive authorities, which will make it possible to ensure accessibility and quality of public services provided by these bodies;
* ensure accessibility and quality of public services;

Of special mention is the Territorial community capacity building methodology (approved by Cabinet directive #214 on April 8, 2015). The Methodology offers a format for the United territorial community certificate, which will not contain information about social service provision in the community.

As part of the decentralization reform, the Ministry of Social Policy (MSP) approved the “Guidelines on the execution of own (self-government) powers of a united territorial community in the area of social protection of population” (MSP order #26 of 01.19.2016). Its Annex 2 contains a **“Tentative list of social support services** **to be provided by structural divisions of raion state administrations”**, which includes **84 services**. Based on these recommendations, the MSP sent out a letter to local authorities concerning the activity of united territorial communities. In response, First Deputy Minister of Regional Development, Construction and Housing of Ukraine wrote that the proposal to delegate new powers to local governments should be implemented only through amendments to legislation, and should include information about mandatory transfer of requisite financial and material resources to local governments. Therefore, it is evident that local communities are not ready to assume powers delegated to them.

As you can see, there’s a conflict of interest between the desire to expand the package of services and the desire to reduce expenditures. The social service delivery regulatory framework is aimed at expanding the state’s social guarantees, however, when it comes to funding services, financial realities come into the forefront, and budget financing of social services has never been a budgetary priority. As a result, an array of declared social services are financed with remaining leftover funds in much smaller amounts compared to those declared by the state.

In addition to the limited capacity to finance social services, there is another facet to the problem i.e. a lack of local service providers, especially in rural areas, and the unwillingness of existing private providers to deal with the “state” as a customer of social services and the payer due to complicated procedures for obtaining money through the Treasury. The decentralization process is expected to smooth away problems in dealing with the Treasury, but in any case, it will take time for the stereotypes to be broken and for a sufficient number of budget-funded providers to appear. To expand public access to social services for population in many territories it is proposed in strategic documents to develop the market of social services.

Representatives of NGOs involved in the social services reform through the partnership with the Ministry of Social Policy point out “the need to ensure the provision of social services at the level closest to the user”. They believe that “at regional level only those services should be provided that, due to external factors, cannot be provided locally”. As for funding, they agree that “community-based services should be financed from the local budget, although there is a risk that the needs of stigmatized and discriminated groups will be funded residually.”

# Social service market creation and development though NGO involvement

Transitioning to the market and the implementation of the national transition strategy (from maintenance of social service institutions to funding social services), which involves government funding of private social service providers, is a challenge. It will be difficult to simultaneously eliminate the extensive network of institutions. On the other hand, all regulatory documents developed by the Ministry of Social Policy with regard to private providers of social services are implemented by the Departments of Labor and Social Protection of Population with consideration of the financial interests of public and municipal social service institutions (providers).

Currently, NGOs are funded at different levels. For example, there is a small number of organizations that traditionally receive funds from the national budget, in particular, such as the Ukrainian Society of the Deaf and the Ukrainian Society of the Blind.

The scope of government support for NGOs in 2015:

* Financial support for NGOs of the disabled and veterans – 71 134,1 thousand hryvna
* Financial support for physical training and sports NGOs – 31 845,7 thousand hryvna
* State youth policy activities and government support for youth and children’s NGOs – 12 777,0 thousand hryvna

However, most organizations can only seek local budget funds that is to say those funds remaining after public and municipal social service institutions and establishments have been financed, since ensuring public and municipal providers’ financial interests are a priority. Each social institution “determines the needs" of its own target populations: children, family, youth; pensioners, veterans; disabled; other social groups, which are funded only from local budgets. As a result, the planning of local budgets for social services ignores NGOs thereby depriving them of financing.

Social service procurement (commissioning) is declared in the regulatory framework to be a mechanism for funding NGOs. This mechanism is intended to stimulate competition among social service providers, and improve the quality of such services; it is also planned to develop and introduce a social service funding mechanism on the principle of “money follows the recipient”. However, these mechanisms, which are intended to create a market of social services, are secondary to the subject of social service procurement, i.e. the amount of budget funds for the provision of a certain scope of social services. Since service costing mechanisms in Ukraine are imperfect and the state-funded minimum package of services is not defined, this makes it impossible to determine “the subject of social service procurement” and engage NGOs in the provision of social services using budget funding.

The social service procurement mechanism involves several stages, each of which has its barriers to its successful completion:

1. Determining the scope of services to be the subject of social service procurement in a particular territory. At this stage, the problem is the lack of information about the sizes of many vulnerable social groups as well as the number of those members of these groups that really need help. Often, only estimated data are available for larger territories rather than for local communities or raions. In addition, persons not registered in a particular territory, for example a city, can reside there (the homeless, displaced persons, Roma ...), whose numbers are changeable throughout the year. For several years now, the MSP has been trying to assess the social service needs of populations in administrative territories (such an assessment was first conducted in 2013 in accordance with the Guidelines approved by MSP order #648 of 10.15.2012). However, a preliminary analysis of the assessment results showed that:

* the needs assessment ahs been conducted partly;
* priority social service needs were not identified at oblast level;
* the potential of private social service providers was not taken into account;
* types of social services were not used correctly to identify the needs of certain social groups;
* potential demand for social services in most oblasts had not been calculated;
* quantitative indicators of needs of selected social groups are not adequate compared with their total sizes (according to official statistics and estimated data);
* estimated volumes of funding of social services to meet the demand were not substantiated.

At the beginning of 2014, the MSP issued order #28 (of 01.20.2014) (registered with the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine under #253/25030 on February 7, 2014) “On approving the Procedure for determining social service needs of a population in an administrative territory”. In 2014, experts of the Bureau also conducted an independent needs analysis that showed that:

* the needs assessment procedure did not ensure adequate data collection and analysis;
* the definition of the target populations eligible for certain types of social services was unclear and sometimes discriminatory;
* the needs assessment had been conducted partly; in most oblast the collected data had not been analyzed and core priority services were not defined;
* priority social service needs were not indentified at oblast level. Administrations of most oblasts do not consider it necessary to analyze and set priorities since this is the responsibility of the Ministry of Social Policy;
* it was impossible to analyze the capacity of various social service providers and infrastructure, under the new social service needs assessment procedure;

Therefore, the needs assessment so far does not provide necessary information on the scope of social services that need to be procured.

1. Determining the amount of funding to budget for future procurement of social services and their inclusion in local budgets. As was mentioned in the section on funding, the cost of services calculated based on standards is often “unaffordable” for local budgets. The use of the MSP Methodical recommendations for costing social services also requires the involvement of high level specialists (the same applies to the costing of services according to the existing standards). In addition, most of the funds are already distributed among public and municipal institutions, and those remaining (if any) are not enough to cover all expenditures proposed in the standards or guidelines. Furthermore, budget process participants might not have information at all about the existence of these regulatory documents to rely on in their calculations.
2. Developing scopes of work and organizing the completive bidding process (call for proposals). This stage seems to be the least problematic provided that the previous 2 stages are completed successfully, especially given that the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine issued directive #324 on April 29, 2013 approving the “Procedure for social service procurement using budget funds”. However, it should be noted that this directive restricts the provisions of several existing laws of Ukraine:

* the law of Ukraine “Government procurement”, Article 2, which provides that bidding procedures for the procurement of services from the budget must be employed starting with 100,000 hryvna. The Procedure introduces bidding in amounts under 100,000 hryvna;
* the law of Ukraine “On social services”, Article 14, which provides that social services are to be funded from the national and local budgets. The procedure mandates that funding is to be allocated only from local budgets (under Article 91 of the Budget Code of Ukraine);
* the law of Ukraine “On social services”, which establishes the equality of public and private social service providers. The Procedure uses social service procurement only for services that are not rendered by public or municipal social service providers.

1. Participation of social service providers in social service competitive bidding. As was already stated, at this stage, there could be a lack of providers of necessary services in a particular territory, or their unwillingness to receive funds from the budget under complex procedures, or to expose their organization to additional state audits (including because of previous negative experience, information from partners). Another problem may be that potential bidders may not have information about the call for proposals, especially if such competitive bidding processes have been conducted in the past, and they are not used to monitoring information sources where such information may appear. Here is an interesting example: in 2013, one of the international projects in the Zaporizhzhia oblast was piloting a social service procurement mechanism in accordance with the Cabinet’s directive #324. Only one provider (the Red Cross) took part in the bidding process and received the same budget funds that it had received in previous years without competitive bidding.
2. Selecting and contracting social service providers. If local authorities do not have information about the activity of NGOs in their territory, they may have difficulty selecting a provider. Formally, selection should rely on the social service provider criteria, approved by the Cabinet of Ministers’ directive #1039 of November 14, 2012. They are fairly brief and simple, although some of the requirements are too demanding (for example, the availability of a motor vehicle in an organizations that provides social prevention services) and reduce the chances of organizations that can not meet them. Overall, it was planned that a Register of social service providers will be created based on the criteria, which will include only those providers that meet the approved standards. In particular, it is noted in the Social service system reform strategy (approved by the Cabinet’s directive #556-p of August 8, 2012). When this register is created, only registered social service providers will be allowed to bid for social service procurement.
3. Provision of social services under contracts, process monitoring and results evaluation by the customer. For monitoring and evaluation purposes, the social services monitoring and evaluation Guidelines should be used (MSP order #904 of 27.12.2013). However, it requires an expert whose job description would include such responsibilities. Often, specialists, who could perform such tasks, are overloaded with other functions, which is why there is a risk that monitoring and evaluation will not take place or will be conducted only on paper. In addition, the guidelines status of a regulatory document does not make its provisions binding since they are recommendatory in nature.

Another risk for social service procurement and stimulation of private social service providers is the fact that on January 1 2014 amendments to Budget Code of Ukraine #11298 (10.04.10.2012) were came into effect (specifically, articles 87 and 20 were amended) “financial support for NGOs on a competitive basis for national policy implementation”, as well as Articles 91, 20) “financial support for NGOs on a competitive basis for regional implementation”. Such competitive bidding will be organized under the Competitive bidding procedure, approved by the Cabinet of Ministers’ directive #1049 (of 10.12.2011). Given the uncertainty of the mechanism for the formation of "subject of social service procurement”, one can anticipate that funds will be distributed not to procure social services but to provide financial support for NGOs.

# Conclusions

Problems

Facility-oriented funding complicates transition to service-oriented funding in the community and prevents de-institutionalization, which is also opposed by the system: institution personnel and management at different levels.

There is no basic guaranteed package of social services, which should be funded regardless of the economic status of a territory.

The issue of decentralization of social services ahs not yet been addressed seriously and is not detailed in the regulatory framework. The attempts that the MSP has made meet with the resistance from the Ministry of Regional Development.

The introduction of the social service procurement encounters a lot of barriers at each of its stages. Specifically, the lack of reliable data on the sizes of different target populations who need social services; the complexity of the methodology for determining needs for social services (proposed by the Ministry of Social Policy); the complexity of coating social services to be procured; limited territorial financial resources, given the priority of facility-oriented instead of service-oriented funding, not services; the lack of local social service providers; the lack of a system to monitor and evaluate of social service procurement recipients.

The various elements of the social service delivery system such as social service procurement, setting priorities to determine the scopes of funding for social services, raising additional funds to provide social services etc., are not used in the regions as a single mechanism.

Existing regulatory documents are cumbersome and do not meet the needs of the social service reform. Moreover, due to their complexity they are often not used or misused locally, especially in rural areas. For example, determination of needs is primarily aimed at ensuring the financial interests of public and municipal providers. Every social institution “determines needs” of their target populations: children, families, youth; pensioners, veterans; disabled; other social groups funded only from local budgets. As a result, local budgeting for social services hardly considers NGO services and funding.

Proposals

As today Ukraine’s social service system in is disarranged (on the one hand, there is a gap between the regulatory framework and practice, and on the other hand, a gap between the declared rights to social services and the lack of financial security) it is necessary to employ a integrated approach to remedy the situation. Taking into account local changes resulting from the decentralization, the following key objectives should be addressed:

* 1. Determine a minimum guaranteed package of services and strictly targeted categories of recipients, taking into account the financial status of recipients, and including social prevention services, and to approve a funding mechanism for these services, which would allow to avoid the risk of underfunding.
  2. Provide local authorities and specialists with simple tools to plan their social activities and related expenditures, which would not require regular involvement of individual experts for their interpretation, as is now the case with the existing methodological base (revision of the list of services to avoid split-level services, as well as development of planning software).
  3. Plan necessary social activities based on existing community problems (such as high levels of child abandonment, large numbers of poor people, high crime rates, etc.): based on the interaction with the community leaders, make a list of typical problems; afterwards, involve experts to identify typical causes of these problems, target populations associated with them, and link requisite services to the community to mitigate these problems.
  4. Introduce a national income level and financial status verification system (understandable to the public) and an appeals mechanism if a person disagrees with verification findings, conduct a large-scale information campaign on all aspects of verification and its possible consequences.
  5. Ensure the integration of resources, including through the use of the potential of related sectors (education, health care, administrative services) and raise additional funding (charitable, international, community).
  6. Allocate the authority of each level of government in the provision of social services, including oversight of social service funding and provision (local governments must understand what in their communities is funded from the national budget their community, and what they will have to fund from their local budgets).
  7. Introduce electronic management for social service planning and delivery.
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