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There is still no such law in Ukraine that could fully regulate monitoring and evaluation in the field of public administration. So, as of December 2017, the Law of Ukraine "On State Strategic Planning" has not yet been adopted. There were several attempts to adopt mentioned-above law in 2009 and 2017. In international practice, monitoring and evaluation are usually governed by the strategic planning laws.

Enacted in 2004, the Law of Ukraine "On State Target Programs" does not mention anything about monitoring and evaluation. Article 13 "Control over the implementation of the State Target Program" defined the following: "The control over the implementation of the State Target Program is performed in order to: ensure the implementation of the program's targets and tasks on schedule; achievement of the envisaged program targets; placing constraints on the use of financial, logistical and other resources as intended ". Thus, this Law verifies only the implementation of state target programs, but not theirs monitoring and evaluation.

Enacted in 2015, the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy" introduced the concept of monitoring and evaluation: "the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation effectiveness of the state regional policy - periodic review of the relevant indicators based on official statistics and information provided by the central executive authorities, local authorities, and further assessment, based on the received data, of the effectiveness of implementation of these indicators by comparing the obtained results with their target values». This M & E definition is very narrow and does not match to modern M & E capabilities.

Section V of the Law "Monitoring of the implementation of the state regional policy" has determined that "The list of indicators is formed by the methodology for monitoring the implementation of the state regional policy, which is approved by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine", as well as "The procedure for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the State Strategy for Regional Development of Ukraine and action plan its implementation action plan is determined by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine ".

The procedure and methodology for monitoring realization and effectiveness evaluation of the implementation of the state regional policy have been approved by the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated October 21, 2015, No. 856. The Board Member of Ukrainian Association of Evaluation (UAE) M. Savva has analyzed the monitoring and evaluation procedure and order (expert opinion dated 31.03.2017 attached) and has come to the following conclusions:

The accessible monitoring and evaluation system of the state regional policy enables:
- the comparison of the economic development rates of the oblasts of Ukraine and the city of Kiev. Objectively, this comparison activates the competition between regions and Kiev for the indicators improvement;  
- determine the directions of changes in the Ukrainian economy as a whole.

The monitoring and evaluation system of the state regional policy is ably prepared. It is integrated and assesses all significant changes for the region and country. This is crucial for a regional policy monitoring system. Regional policy is an extremely broad term, as a result not every monitoring and evaluation attempt is successful. At the same time, ideal monitoring and evaluation systems are not formed right away, since the process requires
constant amendments based on the practical use expertise. The existing system can be considered as a pilot project, which should be substantially improved following the results of the practical application. The M & E system is not complete and does not make use of all the possible tools for an adequate effectiveness assessment of the state regional policy.

An M&E system performance of regional policy in Ukraine is possible to evaluate through newly-generated material values. However, intangible assets, such as changes of public consciousness, are immeasurable by this kind of system.

There is no citizens’ and public associations’ participation in the monitoring of the state regional policy effectiveness envisaged by the Procedure and Methodology. Though, public associations are involved in assessing the implementation effectiveness of the state regional policy. There is no information available in the open domain about public associations’ participation in the Ministry’s of Regional Development assessment of state regional policy implementation effectiveness.

The object of regulation prevents any possibilities of the financial enrichment for specific officials. Nevertheless, abuse might occur. Such probability takes place mainly by the lack of clear and detailed reglamentation of the Ministry of Regional Development activities regarding public participation engagement in the evaluation of the state regional policy implementation effectiveness.

The Procedure and Methodology do not fully meet the requirements of the European Union’s rules and procedures for monitoring and evaluation. There are certain limitations on the existing system of the monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the state regional policy. Achieved results are not enough (insufficient) (for):

- to provide convincing objective assessment for Ukraine’s partners of the proven need for the further support of the country. Therefore, in 2015, around 22% of EU citizens believed that Ukrainians are only interested in money support, so it led to a wrong idea of Ukraine being a burden for EU.
- to provide Ukrainian authorities with adequate data regarding influence of regional policy on the social well-being of the population. The monitoring results are not enough to predict the social consequences of the state regional policy;
- to present comprehensive, detailed and relevant recommendations to oblast and Kyiv authorities.
- to compare Ukraine’s and EU’s development dynamics when it comes to important indicators for the “EU 2020” strategy;
- to define broad range of decentralization impact aspects on regional development;
- to give grounds for competitiveness analysis between Ukrainian oblasts and Kyiv itself to the external market (various indicators of monitoring and evaluation of regional policy and GCI).

The draft law “On State Strategic Planning” was posted on the website of the Ministry of Economics on December 5, 2017 for the further discussion. This legislative proposal defines the legal and institutional principles for the formation of a state strategic planning comprehensive system of the country’s development, also it establishes the general terms for the development, approval and implementation of state strategic planning documents, as well as the powers of participants in these processes.

It is essential that the bill contains norms regarding the monitoring and evaluation of the state strategic planning, especially monitoring and evaluation definition. The bill contains a number of shortcomings, for instance:

- incomplete and inpercise wording (e.g. definition of monitoring as a monitoring of documents). With this objective in bill, the following is required: 1) monitoring of development of documents; 2) monitoring of the documents’ approval; 3) monitoring the documents implementation of state strategic planning. All of the above are considered as monitoring activities;
- there are no regulations regarding the mandatory presence of a monitoring and evaluation section in the structure of strategic planning documents (Articles 11, 12);
• there are no regulations on civil society representatives (members of public councils under executive bodies) obligatory participation in the process of evaluation.

Ukrainian Association for Evaluation representatives on the request of the Ministry of Economics prepared an expert opinion on this draft law and sent it on 20.12.2017 (attached). UAE offers to address the above-mentioned shortcomings: to correct the monitoring definition; to correct assessment definition; to make a section on monitoring and evaluation for the central executive body compulsory; to make a section on monitoring and evaluation for a particular sector (s) / national program development strategy compulsory; to separate monitoring and evaluation as a type of activity; to engage civil society representatives, like members of public councils under executive power bodies.

Thus, Ukraine has got a legislative framework and methodology only for monitoring and evaluating the state regional policy. Existing regulations in the field of M & E of the state regional policy are underdeveloped and do not rectify all the actual problems of the reforms’ evaluation. At the same time, monitoring and evaluation of the state programs’ implementation in Ukraine grow their significance. Formal non-public evaluation of the state programs implementation ruins the credibility of government’s actions for both society of Ukraine and foreign partners.

In the shortest possible time, a legislative framework for monitoring and evaluating the activities of public authorities must be created, e.g., in the Law "On State Strategic Planning".

2. M & E systems in national strategies and programs

During the implementation of the project "Strengthening decentralization in Ukraine", were drafted and published expert opinions on M & E systems. They included several national, domestic strategies and programs. Examination strategies/programs were selected for evaluation of the documents that were compiled at different times. Therefore, the following documents were expertized (expert opinions are attached):

- Sustainable development Strategies “Ukraine - 2020” (author of the expertise - M. Savva).
- State target socio-economic program for construction (purchase) of affordable housing for 2010-2017 (author of the examination - L. Pilgun).
- National Strategy for Promoting the Civil Society Development in Ukraine for 2016-2020 (author of the review is L. Pilgun).
- State Target Social Program “Youth of Ukraine” for 2016-2020 (author of the review - L. Pilgun).
- Concept of Reforming Local Self-Government and Territorial Organization of Authorities in Ukraine (author of the review - L. Pilgun).
- State Social Counter Human Trafficking Program for the period up to 2020 (author of the review - L. Pilgun).

The M & E system strategy/program examination was performed due to the following criteria:

1. The indicators’ ability to determine the strategy’s/program’s execution dynamics.
2. Completeness of indicator system: whether indicators are provided for each and every strategy/program task.
3. The M & E results accessibility: whether public disclosure of the evaluation results is available.
4. The M & E process accessibility: whether civil society representatives are involved in M & E of state and municipal programs.
5. Compulsory strategy/program adjustments based on the M & E results: whether mechanisms of changing activities due to the received data are designed in the M & E system.

During the expertise, the indicators were studied for compliance with the following minimal requirements:

...
1. whether they allow to measure the results of the activities;
2. whether the indicators are equally understood and measured by different people at various times;
3. does the indicator measure one single parameter;
4. Does the indicator ask for any additional costs.

M & E systems of national strategies and programs have several common disadvantages:

1. Not all indicators are appropriate to measure the dynamics:
   1.1 Indicators consist of other independent indicators. For instance, indicator № 1 of the Concept of Reforming Local Self-Government and Territorial Organization of Authorities in Ukraine "The Dynamics of the United Territorial Communities Formation" from the presentation of the Ministry of Regional Development "Monitoring the process of decentralization of power and reform of local self-government as of October 10, 2017", consists of the following independent indicators: "the united territorial communities number; the number of territorial communities that formed the united territorial communities; the number of residents in the united territorial communities; average number of territorial communities united in one united territorial community (UTC); the average population in one UTC ".
   1.2 Certain indicators do not measure the dynamics. For instance, Indicator № 2 of the Concept of Reforming Local Government and Territorial Organization of Authorities in Ukraine "Ranking of Oblasts in the UTC Formation" does not characterize the dynamics of the reform of local self-government and territorial organization of authorities and it can not be an indicator of the Concept implementation.
   1.3 Some indicators are meaningless and not clear. For example, the implementation task rate for the period up to 2020 does not include some units of measurement, even though there are corresponding columns for performance indicators in the charts. Consequently, some of the indicators are inaccurate and incomprehensible. For example, "the information product quantity": in 2016 - 1, 2017 - 1, 2018 - 1, 2019 - 1, 2020 - 1. So the question is: What are these numbers about? What is the information product unit? Is it one information material? Is it one copy of the printed product? The text of the Program and its annexes does not answer these questions.
   1.4 So, some indicators are very ambiguous and do not meet the requirement "equally understood and measured by different people at various times". For example, indicator No. 12 of the Sustainable Development Strategy "Ukraine 2020", "based on the results of the survey, will increase the expert environment (attorneys, lawyers) confidence level up to 70 percent. "The category - "expert environment" - is not specified. The results of the expert survey will vary considerably depending on the selection of various experts.
   1.5 Names and wording of some indicators do not coincide. State Target Social Program "Youth of Ukraine" for 2016-2020 indicator "The number of young people involved in activities aimed at national-patriotic education and raising the level of civic consciousness of youth" is measured as a percentage. Final target figure for 5 years of program implementation is 50.27%. These values were obtained by adding planned values over the years: 2016 - 3.91%, 2017 - 11.08%, 2018 - 11.43%, 2019 - 11.77%, 2020 - 12.08%. It is obvious: a person can participate in the Program in various years, then this person should be "credited" several times. Even if the final target is achieved, the actual percentage of Program participants is reduced. In fact, this indicator counts the number of event visits, not the amount of the Program participants.
   1.6 There are no indicators for measuring social impact of strategies / programs. For example, among the objectives of the Concept of Reforming Local Self-Government and Territorial Organization of Authorities in Ukraine the following is mentioned: "Satisfaction of the citizens’ interests in all spheres of life in the respective territories." There are no metrics to measure the achievements of this goal. It does not let to assess the important aspect of the activities impact on the Concept implementation, namely, the change of public consciousness.
   1.7 There are no indicators based on the results of the public opinion surveys. All indicators used by the Minregion for the Concept of Reforming Local Self-Government and Territorial
Organization of Authorities in Ukraine are based on official statistics. Indicators based on the public "feedback" (public opinion surveys) are not used.

2. Indicator lists are usually incomplete. There are no indicators for a number of tasks and expected results of the program. For example, such indicators for the expected outcomes of the State Target Social-Economic Program for Affordable Housing Construction (Acquisition) for 2010-2017 as "to introduce a new state-security financial investment mechanism aimed at ensuring maximum use efficiency of public funds, to build service housing for those categories of citizens who have the right to use it, to create conditions for stable work of construction industry enterprises, job conservation " are missing.

3. In the sections on M & E, there are no requirements for the mandatory evaluation results public disclosure.

4. The M & E sections do not involve the participation of civil society representatives in the monitoring / evaluation of strategies programs. They include participation in monitoring but not in the assessment.

5. The M&E sections do not take into account the possibility of programs' activities adjustments according to the evaluation results.

6. Specified goals in strategies / programs are not clear. It is impossible to create an adequate indicators for such goals. For example, the indicators' system for the Ukraine-2020 Sustainable Development Strategy assessment evaluates Ukraine's progress in the economic, social and cultural spheres. At the same time, these indicators can not be used for the goal achievement evaluation of the Strategy " European standards of life implementation in Ukraine and Ukraine's entry into leading positions in the world" due to the insufficient definition of the goal settings . Firstly, the goal consists of two different components that do not duplicate each other - "European standards of life" and "leading positions in the world." Secondly, while the first component can be assessed (the European Union is actively implementing the common standards to all countries), the same operation can not be done for the second one . It is rather a motivating verbal formula than an achievable goal.

Some national strategies do not include a M & E system. For example, the National Strategy for Promoting the Development of the Civil Society in Ukraine for 2016-2020: there is no indicator and criteria system for monitoring and evaluation of the National Strategy.

Thus, M & E systems of national strategies and programs do not provide effective monitoring and evaluation of these documents. Accordingly, there are no grounds for making the necessary adjustments in the performance of the strategies / programs.

3. M & E systems in regional (oblast) development strategies

During the "Strengthening Decentralization in Ukraine" project realization, the regional experts examined 24 strategies from the M & E of the regions and cities of Ukraine. Same method was applied for all expertises.

The "Implementation and monitoring strategy performance" section in the development strategy of the oblasts includes the "Monitoring the strategy implementation" sub-paragraph. The monitoring methodology for these sections has got several shortcomings:

1. The periodicity of the compilation of information during the monitoring period is not defined: once every three months, six months, year, etc.
2. The monitoring methodology does not contain recommendations about information generalization. There are no requirements of the final document format - it may be a report, a summary, an analytical note, etc.
3. Monitoring does not provide possibility for the publication of its results: in the mass media, posts on the authorities' official web-sites. Therefore, civil society can not reach these results.

4. There is no independent monitoring of development strategies' execution.

5. Participation in the monitoring, which is carried out by representatives of the government, experts, initiative groups, public organizations, as well as public councils in the authorities, is not provided.

6. The disadvantages of monitoring techniques enable authorities to formulate results according to their own needs and tasks.

The development strategies of the oblasts and Kyiv have revealed several shortcomings of the indicators' systems:

1. Lack of unification. The location of indicators' list varies depending on the region. E. g., it can be found in the regional development strategy annex (Donetsk oblast), or in the paragraphs about operational goals (Zhytomyr region). It complicates the comparison of strategies in different areas.

2. Lack of dynamics indicators of factors that contribute or lead to corruption.

3. Lack of indicators of changes affects attitude of the population towards the regional authorities' activities.

4. Absence of social component in the indicators for measuring economic changes in the process. For example (Odesa Oblast): "1. Ensuring competitiveness of the local economy: 1) Gross regional product (in actual prices) per capita; 2) Available revenue per person; 3) Amount of foreign direct investment per capita; 4) Export of goods per one person; 5) Number of small enterprises with a view per 10 thousand population; 6) The volume of realized innovative products to the total volume of realized industrial products; 7) Energy production and boiler output 1 Gcal of thermal energy in the regions ". This approach has a significant drawback: a) it does not reflect the attitude of the society towards development strategy realization; b) it does not show the social changes during the implementation of the strategy; c) it does not assess and demonstrate the social impact of reforms.

5. Absence of individual (unique) indicators for each regional strategy. Typically, indicators are copied from the State Strategy for Regional Development for the period up to 2020. For example (Odesa Oblast): Indicative Indicators (2012, 2016, 2020) are envisaged only for 22 indicators from the State Strategy for Regional Development. 10 unique regional indicators, which are not copied, have no target figures. Among them is "the number of public associations, including those who are involved in consultations during preparation of regional development strategies". However the number of the public associations, after the completion of the the Regional Strategy realization, is unclear. In some regional development strategies the majority of indicators can not be measured. For example, Zhytomyr oblast has 62 indicators, out of them 22 are agreed with State Strategy for Regional Development, while the rest (40) have no planning figures.

6. Meaningless indicators. For instance (Kyiv oblast): "The following is created: favorable conditions for business regulations; support of the innovative technologies development; implementation of educational programs that take into account the high-tech business needs; small and other cities (including rayon significance) development; social justice enhancement; the territorial specialization potential effective use in the economic development."

7. Indicators contain other indicators. For example (Zhytomyr oblast): "the special educational programs’ number and volume in the field of healthy lifestyle" is two in one; "The number of small and medium enterprises that implement innovative development, energy and resource-saving, environmentally friendly technologies" - four in one; "Indicators of general and infant mortality, morbidity classified by major classes of diseases" - an uncertain number in one.
8. Indicators include other independent multi-level indicators. For example (Zhytomyr region): "quantity and quality of solid household waste recycling". Quantity and quality are measured differently; these parameters can not be combined in one indicator.

9. Indicators of the State Strategy for Regional Development are used for regional development strategies. For example (Donetsk region): "... the mandatory condition for monitoring the realization of the Strategy is the use of a system of indicators used to determine the effectiveness of the implementation of the State Strategy for Regional Development for the period up to 2020". This approach does not allow to trace the region’s development by its unique directions.

Some disadvantages of M & E of regional strategies are derived from the absence of logical links between goals, tasks, expected results, sections, etc. For example:

1. The definition of the expected results reflects the process, not the outcome. For example (Zaporozhye region): "Operational goal 2.1. is to stimulate investment attraction. Expected outcomes: development of the machine-building complex and related industries of the oblast; the infrastructure development of the oblast; modernization of production capacities of industrial enterprises, creation of new factories; increase in the amount of the passenger and cargo transportations; improving the level of safety and quality of passenger transportation services; financial condition improvement of transport and road enterprises; increase in direct foreign investment flows into the region’s economy; provision of affordable housing".

2. The goal definition reflects the process, not the result. For example (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast): "Operational goal 1.1 is to stimulate investment attraction. Operational goal 1.2 is to stimulate the development of small and medium business." Obviously, stimulation is a process, while the goal is to determine the final result of the activity.

3. For the purpose definition vague concepts are used. For example (Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast): "Operational Objective 1.3 is ensuring energy efficiency security." Energy efficiency is perceived differently. In the Law of Ukraine "On Energy Saving" energy efficiency is treated as a synonym for energy saving. The official website of Kyivenergo says: "Energy efficiency is a sphere of knowledge at the intersection of engineering, economics, jurisprudence and sociology."

4. The strategic goal of development contains a large number of different components. For example (Volyn oblast): "The strategic goal of regional development of the oblast for the period up to 2020 is creating conditions for balanced well-being, improving the quality of population’s life, development, growth of competitiveness of the oblast economy, introduction of innovation-investment model of sustainable development, modern technologies introduction, comprehensive economic and social development of cities, districts, villages and villages of the oblast and the development of civil society." Mixing goals, objectives, activities and priorities leads to a number of problems. Particularly, indicators cannot be created and measured (in the strategies of the Volyn oblast it is civil society development). This goal, task and priorities can not be displayed in operational goals, tasks and activities.

Monitoring and evaluation of regional development strategies is carried out on the basis of central authority documents. As a rule, these documents are not well-performed by the M & E system of the regional development strategy.

4. M & E systems in community development strategies

During the "Strengthening decentralization in Ukraine" project realization, regional experts of the project under the unified methodology carried out M & E sections expertize; 24 strategies / programs / development plans (hereinafter - documents) of the municipal (local) level. One strategy was chosen either from the city, or community, or united territorial community from each oblast of Ukraine. Also, in some cases, an expert review of municipal strategy projects was carried out.

For the municipal documents, all the shortcomings mentioned above are typical.
The M & E systems' shortcomings, which are found mainly in municipal level documents, should be highlighted as well:

1. Invalid / illiterate / false Definitions. For example (Velikoivka Rural Unified Territorial Community of Ternopil Oblast): "The main community problem will be solved - wastewater treatment, which will increase the investment potential ...".
2. Contradicting indicators that require an explanation. For example (Velikuchukurovskaya UTC of Chernivtsi region): "110% of the community inhabitants signed agreements on the export of domestic waste from households."
3. The absurd formulations that were probably the result of copying the text from another strategy. For example (Velikoyevskaya UTC of Ternopil region): "Monitoring the external environment of community development. It is based on the key indicators analysis of the state, as a whole, and in Zhytomyr oblast in particular."
4. The formulation of the typical goals is absent, either prescribed beforehand, either defined ambiguously. For example, the Development Strategy of Dobropillya city for the period till 2020.
5. Formulation of the document's typical components is absent. For example, certain strategic goals have expected results, other strategic goals are deprived of expected results, or they are formulated vaguely. An example of such discrepancies is the Development Strategy for Dobropilia city up to 2020.
6. The use of the terminology in the foreign language (particularly in Polish). For example, the foreign term "EVALUACIA", instead of Ukrainian "OTSINUVANNA", complicates understanding between parties. An example is taken from the Strategy for the development of the Ustyluzskogo united urban territorial community of the Volyn oblast.

Comparing to regional development strategies, municipal strategies usually:
1. Do not have section about monitoring and evaluation, or they do not include indicators.
2. There are no indicators based on public opinion "feedback".
3. There are no indicators aimed at measuring the dynamics of civil society development.
4. Contain indicators that display the process, not the result.
5. Do not include methodology for monitoring program documents.
6. The monitoring method does not specify the self-government body, unit or organization responsible for monitoring.
7. There is no public disclosure of results of monitoring and evaluation documents.
8. There is no civil society representatives involved in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of program documents.
9. There are contradictions between different document sections.

The quality of M & E systems of municipal strategies and development programs remains substandard and does not effectively manage the execution of the documents. There is no legislative framework that regulates M & E issues locally in Ukraine. It is advisable to form it by supplementing the Law of Ukraine "On Local Self-Government in Ukraine".

5. Pilot assessment of administrative services in Ukraine.

The decentralization reforms’ principal task is to improve the quality of services provided by authorities at all levels to individuals and businesses. "The deterioration of the quality and availability of public services due to the resource insolvency of the overwhelming majority of local self-government bodies to exercise their own and delegated powers." - the first problem of the Concept of reforming local self-government and territorial organization of authorities in Ukraine. Measures taken by authorities to improve services are not enough. Poor quality of service legislation does not let these improvements to work. Two laws regulate the provision of services: the Law on Social Services in 2003 and the Administrative Services Act 2013.
In the law "On Administrative Services" there is no concept of the service's quality standard. In the law "On Social Services" the content of the standard is vague. The legislation of Ukraine lacks the requirement for the regulation creation, that is, the service provision algorithm; there is no concept of public service (common services that may be provided by both authorities and non-profit organizations or businesses); there is no requirement for a mandatory public discussion of the draft regulation / standard of services; there is no services' division, which are rendered upon request, and also no functions performed on the authority's or official's initiative.

Ukrainians do not notice the decentralization reform's value, because the quality of public services remain very poor, especially locally. Nationwide public opinion surveys' results witness it. High-quality and affordable services for people and businesses should be introduced when communities are completely associated. However, this next stage of decentralization is not prepared. At today's stage of decentralization it is important to identify the public services recipients typical problems. To do so, 43 different public services (the description methodology and format of the services are added) were described and analyzed by executives, including regional experts during the project "Strengthening decentralization in Ukraine". Receiving services was set as an experiment at that stage of the project. The purpose of this project's stage is to define the evaluation directions of public services in Ukraine.

The project did not set out the task of identifying quantitative pattern for received services: a small amount of received services does not allow this to be done. Services were received in Kiev and in 12 oblasts:
1. Vinnitsa.
2. Dnipropetrovsk.
5. Lugansk.
7. Odessa.
8. Poltava.
10. Cherkasy.
11. Chernihiv.
12. Chernivtsi.

Services received from all levels of authorities: central, oblast, and local during the period from February 1 to November 30, 2017.

The following services were received during the project:
1. Social services provided in accordance with the Law "On Social Services".
2. Administrative services provided in accordance with the Law "On Administrative Services".
3. Public services of budget organizations (educational, medical, etc.). For example, registration of pensions, assistance, registration of a child to kindergarten, school, etc.).
4. Public services of commercial organizations (suppliers of electricity, gas, water, utilities).

According to the project implementers, services quality has grown during the reform performance: an increase in the list of services that can be obtained through e-services (online services); improved comfort in the premises where services are provided; the attitude of government officials to recipients has become more benevolent.

Evaluation experts during the project "Strengthening decentralization in Ukraine" has made some preliminary conclusions about the quality and accessibility of services:
1. The first factor that determines quality of services is the manager's and staff's attitude to their work and duties. There were cases, when centers of administrative services within one locality provided very varying levels of services. It leads to conclusion, that
regulations must be more precise and the M&E of the public services provision must be introduced. Due to the legislation of Ukraine, the adoption of regulations (the procedure for services provision) is not required. Nevertheless, these regulations are extremely important, as they give control over the delivery of the services. It is advisable to initiate changes to the Ukrainian legislation in order to include a rule on mandatory regulations. Before that, state authorities and self-governed bodies may develop and adopt such regulations on their own.

2. There are information stands at all service centers for the recipients. At the same time, standards of quality and standards of service provision are missing. The recipient does not know about the required timing for waiting in line and service delivery.

3. Some service centers, but not each, are equipped with ramps for people with disabilities or for moms with baby carriages. Though, it is contradicting, how some of the ramps are designed and built-in in a way that it becomes impossible to apply them due to very steep climbs / descents.

4. Often, document forms, needed to receive the service, is missing in the center of services. While, these forms can be purchased somewhere nearby (from commercial organization), which is a sign of corruption.

5. Getting some services is accompanied by high corruption risks. For example, "Re-registration of a vehicle of domestic production" service. In one of the regional territorial service centers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs was recorded an attempt of illegal intermediary who offered his "help". The intermediary asked 2000 hryvnias for fast and high-quality service provision. The refusal of the intermediary services did not affect the result of the service provision - the car was re-registered.

6. In some cases, service centers do not notify the recipient about the readiness of his documents. The recipient finds it out by himself, by calling and asking. This problem is common for tax authorities.

7. In cases of social services provision were recorded facts of requiring additional documents, which are unintended by the regulations. For example, "The Procedure for the Making and Issuing Certificates for Parents of a Large Families and Children from Large Families".

8. Employees, who accept documents, do not always check the correctness of the filling these papers. Insignificant mistake, that could be corrected right away, leads to denial of service.

9. At some authorities, the certificate is issued by one institution, while the stamp is sealed by another. The recipient should go from one to another premises to legislate his document.

10. For example, an official "refugee" in Ukraine, who wants to cross a border, needs to have not only a document to travel abroad (an analogue of international passport), but also an internal refugee identity card, which is not always carried with him. In this case, he will not be able to pass customs and travel to his destination. Not many people are subjected to these requirements. Nevertheless, it might seem that authorities do not take into account the interests of the "refugees" group representatives.

11. To correct a mistake in the state register, the court decision is needed. The authority representative with the relevant documents must be present during the court session. If the representative does not show up or forgets required papers, decision-making, in some cases, may be delayed by 4 months. "Participation of a representative of authorities in a court session" function regulation must be adopted, as well as liability of officials for violating this rule.

12. In 2017, an extra payment to issue an urgent international passport, in a number of cases, did not work. The customer paid more than 800 hryvnias to receive his urgent document within 7 working days, while in fact it took more than a month. This precedent has a temporary nature, due to the introduction of a visa-free regime for Ukrainians with the EU starting from June 2017, which led to the increased demand for biometric passports.
13. The construction of centers for the provision of administrative services (CPAS) is an important, but insufficient precondition for high quality services. Some CPASs do not apply the “single window” principle, which virtually nullifies the benefit for service recipients. Many CPASs do not provide even minimum comfort for visitors (sufficient number of chairs, availability of an electronic queue). The creation of new CPASs must be accompanied by detailed regulation of their activities, procedures for the provision of each service, the disclosure of full information about services for the visitors, effective staff training.

14. Tax inspection was assessed with the lowest service quality amongst the government bodies. It was characterized by following disadvantages: long waiting in lines (esp. during the period of tax reporting); inability to obtain qualified advice; lack of instructions in the taxation authorities’ premises about needed procedures to obtain certain services; rudeness of the employees; absence of the employees on their workplace during working hours. The service of providing the the key to a single digital signature takes too much time, because there are lack of employees for this function. As a result, many people decide to pay and receive this service in a commercial organization, since it takes only one working day. Interesting, that there is no fixed time for this particular service, according to the words of one of the employees. The understaffing is explained by recent staff cuts. Mainly employees, who were directly working with clients were released.

15. Commercial utilities enterprises, which supply gas, for instance, offer very low-standard services, which are characterized by the following disadvantages: long waiting in lines; lack of the instructions in the premises about needed documents; requirements for additional documents. As a rule, this kind of enterprises do not have quality standards and service regulations. Interests of clients are not taken into account when it comes to communication time and other norms. Everything is decided by the service provider itself, while the Law of Ukraine "On Administrative Services" and state authorities regulatory documents must manage the provision of gas, electricity, water, heat, and other utilities by the commercial enterprises.

6. Conclusions and recommendations

There are government-wide, regional and local documents that contain effective indicators and methodologies for the widespread use. The best of them should be collected, published and included in strategic planning in Ukraine. The legislative framework and methodology in Ukraine is only used for monitoring and evaluating the state regional policy. However, regulatory and legal acts in the field of M & E are incomplete and require significant changes. In the near future a legislative framework for M&E must be created to assess the activities of public authorities. These regulations could be part of the Law "On State Strategic Planning". Appropriately the draft of Law of Ukraine "On State Strategic Planning" should be specified and supplemented in the section about monitoring regulation and evaluation.

The M & E system of national strategies and programs is incomplete and does not provide an effective assessment of these documents implementation. There is no basis for making the necessary changes in the strategies’ / programs’ implementation.

M & E of regional development strategies are carried out in accordance with documents of central authorities. As a rule, the quality of the M & E system of regional development strategies does not allow effectively manage the execution of these documents.

Legislative base of M & E local regulation is absent, so the Law of Ukraine "On Local Self-Government in Ukraine" should be amended with them. The quality of the M & E systems of local development strategies and programs remains low and does not allow the effective management of the implementation of these documents.

Ukrainian legislation on service provision is incomplete. In the Law "On Administrative Services" there is no concept of the service quality standard. In the Law "On Social Services" the content of the standard is not clearly defined. In the legislation of Ukraine there is no
regulation requirements, therefore no algorithm for service provision; there is no concept of public service (a public service that can be provided not only by authorities, but also by non-profit organizations or businesses); there is no requirement for the mandatory public discussion of the draft regulation / service standard; the absence of services divided upon request and functions performed on initiative of the authority or official.

The research on the practice of providing public services in Ukraine has shown some improvement in the quality of these services. At the same time, this study revealed a number of problems with the quality and availability of services. The poor quality of public services is the main reason of people’s dissatisfaction with authorities. To solve this problem, the following measures are needed: to reform the executive power bodies system (administrative reform), including analysis and optimization of their functions; making changes to the legislation on services; a complex of measures for the standardization of public services; training of employees who provide services.
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