

**Сприяння реформі соціальних послуг в Україні
Facilitating Reform of Social Services in Ukraine**

UK Department for International Development

FACILITATING REFORM OF SOCIAL SERVICES IN UKRAINE PROJECT

Contract # CNTR 200708006

RECOMMENDATIONS

On Decentralisation of Responsibilities in Social Services Provision

(based on consultations in working groups in Kharkivska and Khmelnytska oblasts)

30 January 2008



FISCO

informed decisions in public finance
поінформовані рішення в публічних фінансах

54a Pivnichna Str, apt 86
Kyiv 04213, Ukraine
<http://www.fisco-inform.com.ua>
E-mail: office@fisco-inform.com.ua

Acknowledgements:

Authors: Denys Kovryzhenko, Kateryna Maynzuyk, Yuriy Dzhygyr.

FRSSU project team expresses its gratitude to the participants on the focus groups in Kyiv, Khmelnytska and Kharkivskf oblasts for their valuable contribution to the discussion of technical issues of social services in preparing this document.

Project Director and authors of this document are responsible for the content of this paper.

Analytical Note

Re: Decentralisation of responsibilities in social services

In order to facilitate decentralisation of responsibilities in regulation and control of social services delivery and to implement the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, dated 13.04.2007 # 178-p, "On Approval of the Concept of Reforming the System of Social Services", the FRSSU Project held consultations with local experts from Kharkiv and Khmelnytsk oblasts.

These consultations recommended a number of amendments to the laws of Ukraine "On Local Self-Governance in Ukraine" and "On Local Public Administrations" and to several regulations on central executive power bodies (Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine, Ministry of Health Care, Ministry of Family, Youth and Sport). Recommended changes include the following:

1. Central executive bodies in respective sectors are recommended to take over responsibilities for:
 - a) approving minimum standards of social services, approving criteria for defining categories of beneficiaries eligible for specific types of social services;
 - b) developing and administering a *National Register of Providers and Recipients of Social Services*, ensuring open access to the data in the register;
 - c) identifying, jointly with other central executive authorities, requirements for staff directly involved in delivery of social services and standards of their training, ensuring the needs of social services recipients;
 - d) strategic sector planning in social services, expenditure management for specific national programmes;
 - e) running diagnostic inspections of social service delivery to inform general strategic planning in the sector;
 - f) planning, organising and delivering highly specialised social services;
 - g) scientific and methodological support for social services delivery for service providers;
 - h) defining the mode of interaction of structural units of the central executive authorities in social services sector;
 - i) defining minimum requirements for the tender procedure for social service delivery;
 - j) in liaison with the Ministry of Finance - projecting, planning and defining the total amounts of funding allocated on sub-national social services programmes through equalisation transfers;
 - k) planning and funding capital expenditures on highly specialised social services.
2. Oblast state administrations (Law of Ukraine "On local state administrations" Art. 23) are recommended to take over responsibilities for:
 - a) running programmes of professional development in the workplace for social workers;
 - b) licensing professional providers of social services;
 - c) approving innovative services on submission of local self-governance institutions;
 - d) controlling observance of standards of social services;

- e) in liaison with control and audit service, controlling legality and effectiveness of the use of funds that are allocated from the State Budget of Ukraine for funding social services delivery;
- f) expenditure management for regional social services programmes;
- g) inspecting (for planning purposes) and consulting on the issues of delivery of social services rayon state administrations, local self-governance and social services providers;
- h) support to administration of the *National Register of Providers and Recipients of Social Services* at the intermediary level of keeping the register; inputting data on professional licensed providers of social services;
- i) operational management of institutions and organisations funded from oblast budgets;
- j) management of an insurance fund designed to efficiently handle social services crises at oblast level and lower levels of administrative and territorial division.

3. Rayon state administrations (Law of Ukraine "On local state administrations" Art. 23) are recommended to take over responsibilities for:

- a) setting specific targets for allocation of equalisation transfer receipts among local social services programmes;
- b) managing expenditures in regional social services programmes;
- c) making decisions on matters within the competence of executive bodies of villages, settlements and cities of rayon importance in the event when the corresponding executive bodies do not exercise their responsibilities in social services (on consent of the respective local self-governance agencies).

4. Executive authorities of village, settlement and town councils (with consideration to the proposed amendments to the Law of Ukraine "On local state administrations" Art. 34) are recommended to take over responsibilities for:

- a) identifying the needs of territorial communities in social services, monitoring overall social services delivery;
- b) inputting data on social services providers and recipients as well as social services providers which are not subject to licensing to the National Register of Providers and Recipients of Social Services;
- c) approving social services standards which imply services above minimum national standards;
- d) initiating partial funding of in-patient facilities and institutions delivering social services that are funded from rayon (oblast - for cities of oblast importance) budgets (in the short-term perspective);
- e) identifying the list of paid social services and setting fees for delivering these services; defining quality standards of paid social services;
- f) setting specific targets for allocation of equalisation transfer receipts among local social services programmes (including executive authorities of cities of oblast significance);
- g) controlling effectiveness of the use of funds from local budgets allocated for funding social services;

- h) approving, based on guidance from central executive authorities, local tender procedures for selecting social services providers, running the tenders to select respective providers, and defining delivery mode and procedure for funding social services.

5. It is recommended to amend the Law of Ukraine "On Social Services" by adding a separate section which would:

- a) allow each local executive authority to create an independent intergovernmental advisory body for social services, gathering representatives of territorial division of Chief Control and Audit Inspection, local self-governance officials and representatives of social services providers. These independent units would ensure effective use of funds from local budgets for funding social services, monitor social services delivery, develop standards of innovative services, and organise tenders for social services providers;
- b) describe the responsibilities of the newly created intergovernmental bodies, grounds for their interaction with local councils and local state administrations;
- c) describe mechanisms for implementing decisions made by such newly created bodies.

6. Bring the Law „On Local Self-governance in Ukraine” (Articles 32, 34) and „On Local State Administrations” (Articles 22, 23) into compliance with the provisions of Articles 87-89 of the Budget Code of Ukraine (which define which local expenditures are included and not included into equalisation transfer calculation).

Proposed recommendations allow:

- to alleviate the current functional load held by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, and by other central executive authorities regulating social services and controlling their delivery;
- to create additional incentives for local self-governance to enhance quality of social services at community level and to effectively use local budgets funds allocated for social services delivery;
- to achieve greater effectiveness in the use of the funds provided through intergovernmental transfers to local self-governance in order to fulfil delegated responsibilities in social services area;
- to limit the risk of duplicating functions and responsibilities of public institutions in social services vertically, in particular with regard to regulation and control.

Annex 1.

Handout materials for Working Group consultations on „Decentralisation of regulatory responsibilities in social services: problems and ways to solution"

ISSUES AND COMPLEXITIES RELATED TO THE CONCEPT OF DELEGATED EXPENDITURE FUNCTIONS IN UKRAINE

1. Principles and legal context

The principle of delegated expenditures was introduced to Ukraine in 2001 within a newly adopted Budget Code. Introduction of this principle symbolised an attempt to establish a new paradigm in the Ukrainian system of intergovernmental fiscal relations. Prior to the adoption of the Budget Code, the post-soviet budgetary system regarded local budgets of all levels as components of a single 'consolidated' national budget. Essentially, every smallest local expenditure article had to be approved, through a lengthy cascading process, at the central level. The Budget Code attempted to replace this system with a fundamentally new approach, allowing each level of local government to design and approve its own. This has transformed the former term of 'consolidated' (*konsolidovanyi*) budget into a new term of 'combined' (*zvedenyi*) budget which became a purely analytical instrument devoid of legal effect.

In addition, the new Budget Code has divided all expenditure functions into three groups, each group broadly describing responsibilities most appropriate for being 'central', 'delegated' or 'own/local' costs, depending on the government level responsible for funding and implementing them. The idea behind 'delegated' expenses was that the central government remains responsible for the delivery of this category of public services, but since they can be more effectively delivered locally, the funds are delegated to the corresponding local budgets for service delivery. On the other hand, local governments were made fully responsible for the quantity and quality of their "own" local programmes.

The Budget Code itself (or any other document) has not directly defined any single one of the above mentioned concepts. The issue of defining responsibilities of different levels of government was deemed too fundamental and required broader political consensus. Still, although the terms of *delegated* and *local* expenditures are not used in any law, the idea behind them was introduced through application of the corresponding system of intergovernmental transfers. The Budget Code has clearly defined the list of expenditures that can be funded by different levels of government, and it has also defined principles for intergovernmental allocation of revenues to cover these expenditures. The new revenue allocation system assumed that equalisation transfers were calculated depending on the relative expenditure needs for delegated functions, while spending needs for "own local" functions were not included into transfer calculation. Therefore, the official terms describing these three types of expenditures – (1) *expenditures covered from the national budget*, (2) *expenditures covered from local budgets and included into intergovernmental transfers* and (3) *expenditures covered from local budgets and not included into intergovernmental transfers* - have in fact become synonymous to *central*, *delegated* and *own/local* responsibilities.

1a. Practical complications

Defining delegated responsibilities only in *budgetary terms*, without full legal implementation of the concept, was a forced step of crucial importance. Even though it was somewhat limited in

scope, it allowed to clarify relations between levels of government and provoked a systemic discussion, based on unified terminology, in the professional circles on how to further improve existing allocation of responsibilities. Nonetheless, because the reform was not complete, the concept of delegated responsibilities has not yet been practically introduced in Ukraine to this day. This fact is manifested in the following symptomatic problems:

Firstly, the fundamental legal definition of responsibilities of different level governments to deliver public services remains a highly controversial question. Allocating types of expenditures between the budgets has not been an adequate replacement for such legal definition. To the contrary, it has accentuated the lack of political consensus on the question and the dire need in such consensus.

Secondly, since the adoption of the Code, the local governments have not been granted sufficient level of institutional autonomy to make decisions on the organisation of public services delivery. As explained earlier, the concept of delegating responsibilities assumes that the central government *delegates* some of its functions to the local level in order to make them more effective and suitable to local needs. But delegating functions without the flexibility in administering them defeats the purpose since it does not leave local governments any space for making decisions which could accommodate the local context and maximise effectiveness as intended.

In the classical delegation scenario, greater effectiveness is ensured by two related conditions. On the one hand, authorities receive delegated functions with sufficient governance freedom in respective areas to deliver these functions effectively. On the other hand, the delegating level introduces appropriate control mechanisms to check the quality with which the delegated services are provided (ensuring that agreed performance indicators are achieved and / or national quality standards are maintained). Achieving this requires a number of additional steps. E.g., effective quality control of delegated services at sub-national level calls for introduction of a range of effectiveness indicators and for establishment of a specific competent authority at the regional level to perform this control function (of the type similar to Poland's regional accounting chambers).

In Ukraine, local authorities responsible for "delegated" functions still remain hostages to the central regulatory policy, which, in turn, is often focused not so much at maintaining standards as at imposing a uniform and universal method of service delivery throughout the whole country.

Thirdly, the Budget Code has allocated expenditure functions between the levels of government by as specified *categories of budget services and institutions* (for instance certain types of hospitals and schools), not by defining actual functions (e.g.. *primary medical aid* or *primary education*). This continued to dictate local governments which specific types of institutions they have to use for delivering delegated functions. This discourages them from looking for alternative, and perhaps more effective, approaches.

The fourth remaining problem is a perpetual deficit of local revenue sources and excessive dependence of local budgets on equalization transfers. Theoretically, this situation could be acceptable (if the transfers were calculated based on generally accepted methodology and the funds were transferred fully in a timely fashion). However, transfer dependence in Ukraine is problematic not so much because it leads to scarcity of resources, but because how it crowds out the flexibility of local governments in decision making. Local revenue sources (duties and taxes where local government can regulate both the tax base and tax rates) are significant for two reasons. Apart from being an additional source of local revenue, they also offer extra space for manoeuvre and create opportunities to pursue a more active local policy in performing delegated functions.

The features of Ukraine's intergovernmental relations described above clearly indicate that, as of today, the **key budgetary responsibilities have not yet been delegated to sub-national level and still remain deconcentrated..** This classical distinction in terms is rather critical. Traditionally, the degree of decentralisation is assessed by the following scale: the most powerful level of decentralisation is called *devolution* (when all decisions on the implementation of the corresponding function are made locally), a moderate degree implies *delegation* (when the local level is empowered to make decisions which are to some degree controlled by the centre) and the weakest degree is called *deconcentration* (when local level only implements certain tasks of the central government).

2. Legal background on distribution of responsibilities in social services between the central and local governments

The legal definition of own and delegated responsibilities of the executive bodies of village, settlement and town councils in regard to social services is provided in Articles 32 and 34 of the Law of Ukraine "On Local Self-Governance". Since the constitutional model of self-governance in Ukraine does not provide for existence of executive bodies for rayon and oblast councils, the authorities of the executive bodies are granted to rayon and oblast state administrations. The law "On Local State Administrations" (Art.22, 23) defines the mandate of rayon and oblast state administrations concerning social services.

The legal foundations of the responsibilities granted to the government and ministries in the matter under discussion are stipulated by the law "On the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine" and provisions on ministries defining the rights and mandate of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine, Ministry of Health Care and Ministry of Family, Youth and Sport.

A single regulation that would define the procedures of controlling and exercising responsibilities of local self-governance in the area of regulating social services does not exist in Ukraine to this date. The laws "On local state administrations" and "On local self-governance" and provisions on Ministries define the principles of public control in the domain of social services.

As already discussed, in addition to the above regulations, the principles of distribution of responsibilities between the state and local self-governance are laid down in the Budget Code. Articles 87-89 of the Code list the expenditures made from the central budget on social care and expenses that are included in calculation of the equalisation transfers (expenditures on execution of responsibilities by self-governance and local state administrations) and expenditures that are not accounted for when calculating intergovernmental transfers (expenditures on execution of own responsibilities of local self-governance).

The mechanisms of control over the use of budget funds which provide the funding for execution of responsibilities in social services, which are delegated to local self-governance, are regulated by the following two laws: "On Control and Audit Service of Ukraine" and "On Accounting Chamber". In accordance with the law "On Control and Audit Service of Ukraine" the Control and Audit Service is obliged to exercise control over the use of local budgets and communal property. Unlike the Control and Audit Service, the Accounting Chamber is not authorised to control the use of local budgets, since its constitutional competence is limited exclusively to the use of funds from the National Budget of Ukraine.

3. Description of the problem

1. Unlike the laws of most Eastern European countries, the Ukrainian laws "On Local State Administrations" and "On Local Self-Governance" do not stipulate distribution of responsibilities

between self-governance institutions of different levels (of oblast, rayon and local territorial communities). This can be accounted for by the specific structure of the administrative and territorial structure of Ukraine. Both laws define self-governance and delegated responsibilities based on the criteria of the subject (area) of regulation. Thus, the law distinguishes responsibilities concerning social, economic and cultural development, budget, finance and pricing, managing communal property, construction, health care, culture, physical culture and sport, social protection, etc. This approach makes it difficult to clearly delineate competencies of executive bodies of village, settlement and town councils and local administrations, and, accordingly, to define which level exactly should be responsible for various competences.

2. The laws "On Local State Administrations" and "On Local Self-Governance" do not provide a clear definition of the functions of local self-governance and executive power in the domain of social services market. In a number of cases, abstract constructions are used for defining these functions, such as *promotes, is involved in, takes statutory action*, etc. This approach to formulating tasks prevents identifying the subject(s) who are responsible for their execution. On the other hand, some tasks are formulated quite clearly, in particular with regard to the right to grant benefits and compensations to certain categories of people, resolve custody and care issues.

3. In the majority of cases, the laws "On Local State Administrations" and "On Local Self-Governance" only define the functions (tasks) and do not specify the procedure for their implementation or responsibilities that are realised through corresponding functions. Therefore, in cases when a local self-governance institution or local public administration is responsible for running certain facilities (i.e. facilities in communal ownership or administered by local self-governance or administrations), the content of responsibilities for executing respective managerial functions is not specified. The law "On Local State Administrations" makes the local administrations responsible for providing support to non-governmental organisations in assisting socially vulnerable people, however it does not define the rights the public administrations have in the process of providing *support*.

4. A number of gaps exist in the legislation on local administrations and local self-governance as to the definition of responsibilities for regulating social services per se. The very notion of *social services* is not clearly defined, just as the role of local self-governance in setting standards of social services, selecting providers of these services, etc. In a number of cases, these laws narrow the scope of regulatory responsibility over in-patient facilities and institutions (boarding schools, social facilities, etc.) only to the right to create or close such institutions. Whether there is a legal possibility to regulate actual operation of such institutions remains an open question.

5. Similar deficiencies remain in the laws defining the functions, rights and obligations of central executive authorities responsible for designing and implementing social services policy. In particular, regulations on ministries describe the functions of the Ministry of Health Care, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Ministry of Family, Youth and Sport in a manner which is as vague as the definition of functions for local public administrations and local self-governance (relying on wordings such as to *promote, participate, take action to*, etc.). These definitions do not explain which ministerial powers should allow respective ministries to implement the functions it assigns to them.

6. The lack of delineation of regulatory competencies of the central bodies of executive power, local public administrations and executive bodies of local self-governance results, firstly, in complexity of defining responsible parties for policy implementation. Secondly, it limits the ability of local self-governance and public administrations to enhance the quality of services delivered in the process of execution of delegated responsibilities. Thirdly, it creates prerequisites for active (and unlimited) state interference into implementation of delegated responsibilities.

7. Furthermore, the current legislation does not clearly define and delineate responsibilities of the state and local self-governance for control and quality assurance for social services delivery. Current legislation does assign respective ministries with the function of control over implementation of policy in the areas of their competence. But again, it does not define, at statutory level, which responsibilities the ministries should use to exercise these control functions. The function of quality control in social services is also excessively centralised. For instance, the function of licensing delivery of social services was granted to the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine and oblast state administrations, although corresponding responsibilities could be delegated to the lower level (since a number of organisations work only in one locality and do not provide services to broader oblast public).

8. There is also a number of issues calling for improvement in the system of control over social services funding. At the local level (village, settlement, town), the only authority for control of financial activities of executive bodies available to local representative authorities are standing committees of respective councils (for all spending programmes, including social services). At rayon and oblast level, financial control is carried out by control and audit service (territorial divisions of the Control and Audit Service), while similarly corresponding control functions would be better placed with the institutions created with the direct involvement of rayon and oblast councils.

9. In practice, the role of the central government in regulating social services provision is quite decisive, which contradicts the concept of delegating responsibilities. In particular, the Cabinet of Ministers and respective central executive bodies regulate the procedure for delivering specific types of social services (i.e. rehabilitation, social and medical services for the homeless and ex-prisoners), define the mode of interaction between institutions locally (for instance, interaction between the Centre of National Social Service for Family, Children and Youth and health care institutions), regulate the procedure for running in-patient facilities (centres for social rehabilitation of disabled children, boarding schools for children, institution of permanent or temporary stay of patients with mental disorders, etc.)

4. Relevance of the problem and strategic objectives for solution

1. The degree of decentralisation of social services is one of the criteria defining the degree of readiness of a country for accession to the EU.

2. The problem of excessive centralisation of social services and solutions are reflected in the two documents, approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine: the *Concept for Reform of Social Services System* dated 13.04.2007 and the *Concept for Reform of Local Budgets* dated 23.05.2007. According to the former document, the objectives of the reform of social services system include improving management of public expenditure on social services in order to enhance their effectiveness and to strengthen the role and responsibility of local self-governance in the quality, scope, funding, planning, organisation of social services delivery, and choice of service providers. According to the concept of reform of local budgets, improved effectiveness of the process of forming expense part of the local budgets provides, in particular, for differentiation of taxes on delegated and inherent responsibilities of the local self-governance, specifying spending responsibilities of local budgets in budgetary institutions (operational expenses of health care institutions, social protection and measures in these areas), review of expenditures, which are included into the calculation of intergovernmental transfers and those that are not.

5. Possible strategies for solving the problems

1. It seems expedient to distinguish regulatory functions in education, health care and social care between self-governance of regional (rayon, oblast) and local (village, settlement, town) levels in Articles 32 and 34 of the law "On Local Self-Governance" and Articles 22 and 23 of the law "On Local State Administrations". For this distinction, attention should be given to the Budget Code provisions as to the list of expenditures for implementation of own and delegated responsibilities (expenditures, which are included into the calculation of intergovernmental transfers and those that are not). This would ensure that the norms defining competences of local and regional self-governance are compliant with the provisions of the Budget Code.
2. The functions of executive bodies of self-governance and local administrations should be formulated with greater clarity in these articles. Definitions should rest on the subject criterion (subject of regulation). Namely, the function of social care for community should be subdivided into several 'sub functions': improving quality of life for socially vulnerable community members, improving labour conditions and labour protection, and addressing employment issues.
3. The articles in question should also clearly distinguish assigned functions from responsibilities through which corresponding functions are implemented. The Law should stipulate the scope of responsibilities for implementing every function. Thus, the function of improving living standards for socially vulnerable community members should stipulate the right to establish in-patient facilities or other alternative services for such individuals, stipulate provisions for their operation, selection of social services provides for these individuals, the right to set higher quality standards in comparison with the minimum national standards, etc. Each level of self-governance organisation should be granted reasonable autonomy in implementation of its tasks. Respectively, each level of self-governance should have a standard scope of responsibility regarding planning, organising and regulating (including quality), monitoring and control. Some competencies of self-governance bodies can be divided vertically (for instance, communities or rayon can play a key role in defining quality standards of social services, selection of providers, etc. while oblast councils and oblast state administrations can have limited responsibilities in these matters).
4. Since the laws "On Local Self-Governance" and "On Local State Administrations" do not contain provisions as to the competencies of self-governance and local state administration in the domain of social services delivery, these laws have to be brought in compliance with the needs of social services market. This entails granting executive self-governance bodies and local administration rights to do the following: a) to define procedure for organising social services delivery in in-patient facilities or in any other way; b) to independently choose providers of social services, define selection procedure in compliance with requirements and limitations set at central level; c) to set local quality standards of social services based on minimum national standards; d) to define the procedure for controlling compliance with respective quality standards.
5. In order to prevent uncontrolled extension of competences for central executive power bodies in regulation of social services, provisions on ministries (Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine, Ministry of Family, Youth and Sport and Ministry of Health Care) should give a clear and exhaustive definition to the scope of responsibilities which can be used to accomplish the tasks assigned to ministries. It should be taken into account that decentralisation principle assumes that the scope of such responsibilities should decrease. The ministries should retain three fundamental rights regarding regulation of social services market: the right to formulate state policy in the respective area (develop draft programmes, draft laws), the right to establish minimum quality standards of social services, other minimum requirement and limitations, and the right to control observance of the minimum requirements. All other responsibilities in

service delivery (regulation of facility operation, control of observance of local quality standards of social services, defining procedures for using equalisation transfers, etc) should be formally delegated to local self-governance.

6. Local and regional self-governance authorities should be granted the right to control the use of funds for implementing their own and delegated responsibilities, including in the domain of social services. Local accounting chambers have to be created at local level, which would control legality and effectiveness of the use of respective funds. The law "On Local Self-Governance" should define the status of these accounting chambers, their functions and rights in the process of implementing control measures, etc.

6. Objectives for the task force:

The focus group session should address the following issues:

1. Which responsibilities in the domain of social services should be assigned to central executive bodies; which ones should be assigned to local public administrations; and which ones should be assigned to the basic level of self-governance (cities of rayon significance, settlements, villages)?
2. What degree of independence (from state and local administrations) should be provided to self-governance bodies in: allocating the funds received as equalisation transfers from the central budget, regulating operation of in-patient facilities, selecting social service providers, identifying quality standards of social services, exercising control over observance of the standards, etc.?
3. Should the responsibilities to control the quality of social services and control the use of budget funds to finance delivery of social services be decentralised at all; and if yes, to which degree? Should self-governance institutions have their internal agencies to control the use of budget funds (i.e. local accounting chambers) or should the control and audit service retain the mandate it currently has?

Annex 2.

List of focus group participants in Khmelnytsk oblast

Name	Position
1. Yaroslava Yaroslavivna Dmytryshyn	<i>Head of Budget Department of the Main Finance Department of Khmelnytsk Oblast State Administration</i>
2. Mykola Petrovych Holub	<i>Representative of Khmelnytsk Oblast Council</i>
3. Nadiya Kostiantynivna Pidkotska	<i>Head of Labour and Social Protection Department of Kamianetsk-Podilskyy City</i>
4. Natalia Mykolayivna Martyniuk	<i>Deputy Head of Labour and Social Protection Department of Kamianetsk-Podilskyy City</i>
5. Yulia Viloriyivna Poberezhna	<i>Director of Centre of Social Services for Family, Children and Youth, Board Member of Businesswomen of Podillia Association</i>
6. Lesya Ivanivna Malanchak	<i>Chairman of the non-governmental organisation "Youth for Future", Director of the state vocational school "Krasyliv Vocational School"</i>

List of the focus group participants in Kharkiv oblast

Name	Position
1. Olena Oleksiyivna Khvatynets	<i>Deputy Head of Chuhuyiv Mayor in Social Policy</i>
2. Tetiana Borysivna Babenko	<i>Head of Department of In-patient Institutions and Organisations of Social Care in Kharkiv Oblast State Administration</i>
3. Serhiy Ivanovych Kuchir	<i>Deputy Head of Oblast Centre on Accrual and Payment of Social Benefits of Kharkiv Oblast State Administration</i>
4. Mariya Oleksandrivna Bezvesilna	<i>Deputy Head of Labour and Social Protection Department of Kharkiv Oblast State Administration, Head of Planning and Finance Department</i>
5. Hanna Stanislavivna Levkina	<i>Chief Specialist of the Department of In-patient Facilities and Organisation of Social Care of Kharkiv Oblast State Administration</i>
6. Svitlana Volodymyrivna Kharchykova	<i>Deputy Head of Labour and Social Protection Department, Director of Territorial Centre</i>
7. Olena Oleskiyivna Budko	<i>Leading Specialist of the Department of Education, Boarding Facilities and Social Protection of the Head Education and Science Department of Kharkiv Oblast State Administration</i>
8. Tetiana Ivanivna Fedorenko	<i>Head of Planning and Analysis Sector of Finance Department of Dergachiv Rayon State Administration</i>
9. Volodymyr Mykolayovych Nestorenko	<i>Director of the Territorial Centre of Loziv Rayon of Kharkiv Oblast</i>
10. Hanna Volodymyrivna Kolosiuk ВОЛОДИМИРІВНА	<i>Head of the Secretariat of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Social Policy and Labour</i>
11. Ihor Oleksandrovych Rudenko	<i>Chief Specialist of the Secretariat of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Social Policy and Labour</i>

Facilitating Reform of Social Services in Ukraine Project team

1.	Yuriy Dzygyr	<i>FRSSU Project Director</i>
2.	Oleksandr Syniookyy	<i>FRSSU Project Deputy Director</i>
3.	Denys Kovryzhenko	<i>FRSSU Project Legal Advisor</i>
4.	Roman Sheyko	<i>FRSSU Project Expert</i>
5.	Iryna Chernyshova	<i>FRSSU Project Co-ordinator in Kharkiv oblast</i>
6.	Inna Buriakovska	<i>FRSSU Project Co-ordinator in Khmelnytsk oblast</i>
7.	Olena Pavlenko	<i>FRSSU Project Administrator in Khmelnytsk oblast</i>