



Among other things, petitioner arranged for a psychological evaluation of the mother, facilitated visitation between the mother and the child, provided the mother with parenting classes, referred the mother for counseling, invited the mother to participate in service plan reviews, and contacted potential guardians, whom the mother had identified, for the child.

Contrary to the mother's further contention, petitioner established that, despite those efforts, the mother failed to plan appropriately for the child's future (see *Alex C., Jr.*, 114 AD3d at 1150; *Matter of Whytnei B. [Jeffrey B.]*, 77 AD3d 1340, 1341). It is well settled that, to plan substantially for a child's future, "the parent must take meaningful steps to correct the conditions that led to the child's removal" (*Matter of Tatianna K. [Claude U.]*, 79 AD3d 1184, 1185-1186; see *Matter of Nathaniel T.*, 67 NY2d 838, 840). Here, the mother failed to accept responsibility for the events that led to the child's removal and the entry of the order of protection against her, and she failed to attend the recommended counseling aimed at dealing with the mental health issues underlying those events. In addition, the mother failed to identify any meaningful plan for the child while the order of protection was in place, and that failure, like the failure of an incarcerated parent to plan, supports a finding of permanent neglect (see *Matter of Gena S. [Karen M.]*, 101 AD3d 1593, 1594, *lv dismissed* 21 NY3d 975). We therefore reject the mother's contention that it was not in the child's best interests for the court to terminate her parental rights.