QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT
STRENGTHENING ELECTORAL ADMINISTRATION IN UKRAINE

Submitted to:

U.S. Agency for International Development
Regional Mission for Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova

Under:

Agreement No. 121-A-00-04-00701-00

Submitted by:

2300 Wilson Boulevard, #300
Arlington, Virginia 22201-3308

April 2005

STRENGTHENING ELECTORAL ADMINISTRATION IN UKRAINE (JANUARY 1—MARCH 14, 2005)
QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT

Agreement No. 121-A-00-04-00701-00

Period of Performance: 12/15/03-12/15/06
Amount: $4,480,893

The activities described below are listed under the two Program Components, or Tasks, specified in the Cooperative Agreement and the Work Plan for Year Two.

I. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

TASK ONE: IMPROVING THE LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

During the reporting period, DA/SEAUP collected information and assembled lessons learned from the 2004 presidential election, while simultaneously outlining and planning specific support activities to enhance a variety of election administration laws and procedures. Key activities were:

- Examining voting abroad in the 2004 presidential election;
- Analyzing electoral system options for enhanced parliamentary and local election laws; and
- Catalyzing the overhaul of voter list compilation process and the eventual move to a permanent voter registry.

Outcome A. ***Voting Abroad Experience and Lessons Learned in the 2004 Presidential Election Examined in Parliament***

During the reporting period SEAUP again focused on the issue of voting abroad, though from a retrospective vantage point and with a view of identifying particular lessons learned to enhance legislative provisions, procedures and practices that will more effectively secure the right of Ukrainians abroad to exercise their vote in the future.

Parliamentary Round Table on Voting Abroad: Experience of the 2004 Ukraine Presidential Election in the "International" Territorial District

On February 3, 2005, in collaboration with the Election Law Institute, SEAUP conducted a round table on the above topic in the Parliament complex. More than 50 participants, including MPs Anatoliy Matviyenko and Yuriy Klyuchkovskyi (Chair and Deputy Chair, at the time, of the Parliament State Building and Local Self-Government Committee), MP Refat Chubarov, Supreme Court Judges Hnatenko and Humenyuk, Deputy Foreign Minister Valentyn Nalyvaichenko, Central Election Commission Deputy Chair Mykola Melnyk and CEC Secretary

Serhii Dubovyk, a variety of election experts and NGO representatives, engaged in a frank discussion of voting abroad practices during the past presidential election. Participants received a set of statistical and analytical materials at the beginning of the event, including comparative information on various Ukrainian elections since independence in 1991.

In his introduction, MP Matviyenko noted that the round table was one of the first high level attempts at properly recording and understanding what had occurred during the past presidential election. He conducted a brief discourse on voting abroad patterns during the 1999 and 2004 presidential and 2002 parliamentary elections. MP and Election Law Institute President Klyuchkovskyi focused on specific problems that cropped up in organizing and conducting voting abroad from the perspective of the Viktor Yushchenko presidential team (Mr. Klyuchkovskyi was Mr. Yushchenko's official representative at the CEC).

Deputy Foreign Minister Nalyvaichenko presented an in-depth report on the work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in acting as the on-site organizer of voting abroad and liaising with the CEC and candidate teams. Mr. Nalyvaichenko focused especially on the logistical and, at times, diplomatic, aspects of establishing and supporting polling stations abroad, and ensuring that the polling station commissions (PSCs) were able to function efficiently at all times. Mr. Nalyvaichenko also noted for the future that more attention should be paid to the variety of municipal laws and international (bilateral) agreements and treaties with which the Ministry must honor when negotiating the granting of permission to open "extra-territorial" polling stations, *i.e.* those which are not located directly on the premises of a diplomatic mission or official representative office of Ukraine.

Mr. Nalyvaichenko also urged that ways be found to avoid the last minute creation of polling stations abroad. He gave the example of an attempt by the CEC to form over 400 such stations in the Russian Federation a week before Round One of the 2004 presidential election. In that case, following a boisterous CEC session surrounded in violence that created 41 such polling stations, the Supreme Court overturned the CEC decision on procedural grounds. Mr. Nalyvaichenko commented that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would do more in the future to secure free and fair elections, and that the best way to assist it would be to provide for clearer and more detailed legal parameters governing the creation and operation of polling stations abroad, with duties and responsibilities assigned as clearly as possible.

In turn Central Election Commission Deputy Chair Mykola Melnyk underlined the need to begin improving voting abroad provisions of parliamentary election legislation immediately, to avoid problems such as those experienced during the presidential election. Mr. Melnyk also noted that the special law "On Peculiarities of Conducting Repeat Voting at the Election of the President of Ukraine on December 26, 2004" was not without its defects in how the vote abroad was organized. More importantly, Mr. Melnyk noted, it is unacceptable to make substantive amendments to election laws in mid-stream. He concluded by suggesting that the CEC become more direct in expressing its thoughts on prospective election legislation and its application.

Ukraine Supreme Court Justice Andriy Hnatenko gave a brief rundown of how Ukraine's highest judicial institution of general jurisdiction reviewed disputes based on voting abroad provisions. Mr. Hnatenko concurred with Mykola Melnyk that in the future no mid-stream amendments of election laws should be considered, as the practice makes it much more difficult to evenly and

equitably adjudicate election disputes by judges who simply lack the time to delve into the details of administrative changes as well as legislative intent.

Justice Hnatenko's colleague Justice Vasyl Humeniuk concurred on the need for more legislative consistency, and also noted that the Presidential Election Law's provisions for judicial appeal of voting abroad provisions should be strengthened; he did not elaborate.

Other speakers included Valeriy Rudenko of the Institute of Psychology at the Academy of Pedagogical Science of Ukraine. Mr. Rudenko had been active in several NGOs that worked in countries with substantial Ukrainian migrant worker and diaspora populations, both in establishing information networks for Ukrainian voters abroad, as well as helping organize official observers for candidate Yushchenko abroad. He had worked closely on the latter with MP Oksana Bilozir, who had been appointed Minister of Culture by President Yushchenko around the time of the round table.

In summary, it was clear that important alterations will need to be made to the Presidential Election Law to further facilitate access to election ballots for Ukrainian citizens residing abroad and that specific modifications of the judicial and administrative appeal procedures are required. The many lessons and best practices that were developed for the vote abroad mechanisms of the 2004 presidential election will need to be "folded in" as appropriate into parliamentary election legislation.

A positive note, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs assured participants of its intent to stay focused on this matter and work on a permanent basis with the Central Election Commission and the Parliament State Building and Local Self Government Committee to continually improve voting abroad procedures.

Constraints

There were no particular constraints encountered during the reporting period.

Outcome B*. *Electoral System Options for Enhanced Parliamentary and Local Election Laws Discussed and Disseminated

During the reporting period, SEAUP undertook a variety of activities aimed at helping define and focus the budding debate on election systems and what is best for Ukrainian voters and office seekers for the future.

Parliamentary Round Table on Open and Closed Proportional Election Systems for Parliamentary and Local Elections

On March 15, in cooperation with the Association of People's Deputies of Ukraine and the Parliament State Building and Local Self Government Committee, SEAUP conducted a round table on one of the timeliest and most contentious topics on the legislative agenda, namely the nature of election systems and types of electoral systems appropriate for Ukraine. Nearly 60 participants, including MPs Anatoliy Matviyenko (Yulia Tymoshenko Bloc), Yuriy Klyuchkovsky (Our Ukraine), Borys Bezpalyi (Our Ukraine), Stepan Havrysh (Democratic Initiatives), Mykola Onishchyk (Will of the People faction), Vasyl Havryliuk (Center), Oleh

Zarubinsky (People's Democratic Party) and Heorhiy Ponomarenko (the Communist Party), joined by experts from the Association, Election Law Institute, Association of Ukrainian Cities, Razumkov Center, Foundation in Support of Democratic Elections, Agency for Legislative Initiatives, legislative staffers and others, waged a lively debate on the plusses and minuses of open versus closed lists, and the political and constitutional implications of adopting particular election systems to current Ukrainian realities.

Substantive input was given as well by Yevhen Radchenko of the OSCE Project Coordinator Office in Ukraine (OSCE PCU) and grass roots and regional political party activists. The event was covered by several TV stations and various print media published articles on the proceedings over the following weeks. Round table participants received a set of materials, including a comparative table of election systems in various countries with narrative discussion.

In accordance with new election laws set to take effect on October 1, 2005, closed pure party list electoral systems will be introduced for parliamentary elections, as well as local elections to the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, regional, municipal (city) and district councils. Many politicians and electoral system experts have taken issue with the effectiveness of such a prospective system, and an effort has been made to compare international experience, in particular European experience, with the proposed changes in Ukraine.

Specific issues raised by speakers included:

1) the political environment and opportunities for changing or enhancing the election system for parliamentary elections;
2) constitutionality of closed party list proportional representation systems at parliamentary and local elections; and
3) enhancement of election systems for local elections.

Nearly all participants were in favor of proportional election systems *per se* at the parliamentary and many local election levels, in particular municipal council elections. At the same time most participants voiced the belief that some form of preferential (compensatory) voting, or regional party lists, be considered as the basis for the proportional representation election system at parliamentary elections. At the same time, participants underscored that cleaning up and improving the reliability of voting lists and other procedures should take precedence over radical changes to the electoral system. This stance was encouraged by some of the MPs, who appear focused on retaining "safe" spots for re-election in 2006 via party lists. This attitude is not encouraging from an opening up the election systems and a party democracy development standpoint.

Arguments against anything but a closed proportional party list parliamentary election system included:

1) alleged "technical complexity" of open list/preferential voting of various types;
2) the fear of electoral regionalization if a regional party list system were introduced;
3) lack of political will in the leadership of many parliamentary parties; and
4) alleged inability of voters to grasp the principles and mechanics of open list/preferential voting systems.

Most participants departed the round table with the sense that while procedural improvements to both parliamentary and local election laws were a near certainty, the extent of change in election systems was indeterminate. It is likely that the Local Election Law will be more affected by the emerging election system debate than the Parliamentary Election Law.

Journalist Information Campaign Begun to Shed Light on Election Systems throughout Ukraine

SEAUP and the Center for Ukraine Reform Education, the country's premier public information NGO and a veteran partner (in 2004 CURE produced a comprehensive polling station commissioner training video at SEAUP's behest), entered into an agreement to conduct a series of regional and national press club round tables on election systems. It is planned that SEAUP experts will travel in pairs with a CURE representative to approximately 25 such regional and one-or-two national events March through June of 2005. The objective is to inform a Ukrainian media and electorate that are almost clueless on what election systems are to be used in electing the Parliament and various local councils at the 2006 elections.

During the reporting period three SEAUP/CURE press round tables were conducted: on March 10 in the western cities of Lutsk and Rivne; and on March 11 in Zhytomyr. Average attendance was 20 journalists per round table. Each event resulted in not less than eight publications in local print media and two TV broadcast pieces. It is expected that coverage will be heavier in other regions as the program is fine-tuned and Parliament refocuses on election law issues.

Other events

SEAUP experts participated in a seminar on open and closed proportional election systems held by the Ukrainian Independent Center for Political Research, a former Development Associates, Inc., grantee and known quantity in the election law reform area writ large. Again it was clear that certain MPs do not want to seriously consider opening up the closed party list proportional system for parliamentary elections due to fear of unemployment after the 2006 election.

Constraints

During the reporting period, there were no meaningful constraints on providing information to broad audiences on election systems. However the lack of political will to discuss certain issues publicly for fear of looking undemocratic is a sign that opening up Ukraine's closed proportional representation systems will be a difficult task, with reasonable chance of success at the local level, but less certain odds at the parliamentary election level.

Outcome C. ***Voter List and Voter Registry Issues Enhancement Process Catalyzed***

During the reporting period SEAUP put the issue of vastly improving the integrity and quality of voter list compilation at the 2006 parliamentary elections foursquare before the Central Election Commission, legislators and the expert community. During the 2004 presidential election the quality of voter lists and their apparent deliberate manipulation by supporters of one of the candidates were a key factor in the December 2004 Supreme Court decision throwing out the results of the November 21 second round of voting and ordering a repeat vote. While the voter list quality was slightly better at that repeat vote than before, the existence of systemic problems

in how voter lists are compiled, who is responsible for their integrity, and how to avoid the type of manipulation that took place last year, are unavoidable issues that must be addressed.

Parliamentary Working Round Table on Improving Voter List/Registration Procedures

In conjunction with the Election Law Institute, SEAUP organized a March 9 round table at facilities in the Parliament State Building and Local Self Government Committee dedicated to voter registration and voter list compilation procedures. This was the first in a series of working meetings and round tables to be held with the participation of MPs, CEC members, and various government officials. Included were MPs Yurii Klyuchkovskyi and Mykola Onyshchuk; CEC Chair Yaroslav Davydovych, Deputy Chair Maryna Stavniychuk and Zhanna Usenko-Chorna, the Commission member responsible for voter lists.

Also involved were staffers from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, State Tax Administration and Ministry of Justice (all with specific duties with regard to voter lists or citizen registration); Ihor Popov of the Committee of Voters of Ukraine; Yevhen Radchenko of the OSCE Project Coordinator Unit in Ukraine; and Natalia Bohasheva of the Election Law Institute. Guests included voter list consultants Riccardo Chelleri and a Danish colleague from the European Union-funded Support to the Electoral Process Project, which was in the process of winding up activities in Ukraine.

Participants reviewed the most pressing problems and most troubling practices per the 2004 presidential election, and considered how reflecting the lessons learned in new election laws could affect the quality of the 2006 parliamentary and local elections. SEAUP's Deputy Chief of Party, Dr. Volodymyr Kovtunets, proposed a road map for prioritizing work to be undertaken on improving voter list and registration provisions in specific substantive election laws to assure convergence with provisions of the draft Law on the State Voter Registry (currently in Parliament past its first reading, but essentially frozen).

A list of issues was compiled that serve to guide the crafting of solutions for substantive law-specific provisions while simultaneously improving the draft Law on the State Voter Registry and readying it for an eventual second reading. The nine point list addressed:

1) Method for compiling the permanent voter registry (mandatory or voluntary);
2) Voter registry structure (national or a network of local registries);
3) Voter identification;
4) Registry contents;
5) State body (bodies) to serve as Custodian of the Registry;
6) Order for compiling election-specific voter lists for national and local elections;
7) Modification of the State Voter Registry in case administrative-territorial reform takes places;
8) Phases for introducing the voter registry; and
9) Ensuring quality compilation of one-time voter lists for the 2006 elections.

There was unanimous agreement among the working round table's dozen or so participants that convergence was a possible way forward to ensure that specific changes to substantive laws not be put aside in what would be a longer road for a comprehensive national voter registry. Following the initial event, SEAUP undertook a two-track approach to further develop the above

approach: working informally and directly with the CEC and MP Yurii Klyuchkovskyi, on the one hand; and on the other feeding ideas to the OSCE PCU in Kyiv, which in turn worked with other CEC members and other GOU agency representatives.

Constraints

As with other legislative development activity areas, the primary constraint was a certain trance-like inability or unwillingness by some lawmakers and government officials to plug themselves into the necessary business of drafting, debating, re-drafting and packaging solutions to existing voter registration problems. The overall stance of the responsible decision-makers must improve if the parliamentary election process is to show improvements over previous efforts.

TASK TWO: STRENGTHENING ADHERENCE TO THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND TO INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS BY THE UKRAINIAN GOVERNMENT, POLITICAL PARTIES AND CANDIDATES

During the reporting period, SEAUP focused on collecting best and worst practices in implementation of election laws, in light of the 2004 Ukraine presidential election. Insofar as the lion's share of Project activities in the latter half of 2004 were in some way related to training and orientation of election commissioners, judges, campaign lawyers and others, SEAUP staff "called in" many of these groups' representatives to provide feedback with the aim of enhancing similar activities for the 2006 parliamentary and local elections. Specifically, SEAUP:

- Publicly reviewed best and worst practices in training election commissioners for the 2004 presidential election, and made recommendations for increasing impact;
- Initiated a public information campaign on election management and campaigning practice in coming parliamentary and local elections in all regions of Ukraine;
- Undertook a review of best and worst practices in implementing the Presidential Election Law during the recent election.

Outcome A. *Review of Best and Worst Practices and Ways of Improving Election Commissioner Training, based on 2004 Presidential Election Experience*

Following on the heels of the charged and difficult 2004 Ukraine presidential election, and aiming to take stock of what worked and what did not in our core activity under Task Two, on February 21, 2005 SEAUP organized an introspective conference on "Training of Election Commissioners: Organizational and Methodological Issues." The event drew more than 120 election specialists from a variety of communities.

Members of the Central Election Commission, MPs, NGO activities, representatives of 2004 presidential candidates, former poll workers, and other election assistance implementer and donor representatives participated in this all day event held at the Budynok Kino (Cinema House) facility. An exhibit of training and related materials was held in parallel with materials provided by the CEC, SEAUP, the OSCE Project Coordinator in Ukraine, the European Commission's "Support to the Electoral Process in Ukraine" project, the Election Law Institute, Center for Political Education, Institute of Political Technologies, Foundation in Support of Democratic Elections, the Luhansk-based Politsocium Center of Political and Sociological

Research, the Our Ukraine Political Bloc Headquarters, Chernihiv Public Committee for Human Rights Defense and regional offices of the Committee of Voters of Ukraine.

The conference was an opportunity for SEAUP and its partners to take a fairly detached and analytical look at ourselves. Some of the more prescient participant comments included the following:

On organization of training: Participants reaffirmed that mass training of election commissioners is a *sine qua non* for free and fair elections. However the timing of training was disputed, with some participants believing that most such training should take place before election campaigns begin or at the very least, before election commissions are seated and immediately burdened with various election administration tasks. Other participants disagreed with this approach and stated that training of serving election commissioners and other officials is the most efficient and effective approach. CEC Deputy Chair Maryna Stavniychuk noted that any training of serving commissioners must be conducted exclusively under the aegis of the CEC, no matter how trainers are provided. Many participants also complained that during the recent presidential campaign, local government bodies interfered with, and sometimes succeeded in administratively undermining, various training efforts, including those supported by SEAUP.

On legal regulation of election administration: Some participants noted that current election laws do not sufficiently regulate, or indeed describe, training of serving election commissioners. A recommendation was made to attending MPs that they take into account the lack of firm duties on the part of the CEC, Cabinet of Ministers and other bodies to undertake substantive training and education of election commissioners as well as voters. It was noted that during the past campaign the government had violated the provisions of both the December 8, 2000 Presidential Decree and the Cabinet of Ministers Resolution dated January 31, 2001 on "enhancing the legal culture of election participants."

Training content and methodology: Participants were generally positive in their appraisal of the SEAUP election commissioner training, and found other training conducted with support of the OSCE and the European Commission useful as well. Participants noted, however, certain deficiencies, such as a lack of time to conduct "deep" training activities. The relatively large number of per seminar participants (100 or more at most of the 983 SEAUP PSC grantee-implemented events) meant that there was little time for questions and answers. This was partially compensated for by consultations both during breaks as well as post-event. At the same time many participant and grantee representatives suggested that in the future a specific segment of polling station commissioner training be devoted exclusively to criminal liability for election violations. In turn some of the 2004 PSC Training Program grantee representatives noted that their efforts to deal with criminal liability issues often sent alarm bells to local government representatives in the eastern and southern regions of the country, which later ended up being the foci of the most egregious systematic fraud encountered, especially during the Novemebr 21, 2005 second round of voting later thrown out by the Supreme Court.

There was universal praise for SEAUP training materials and numerous suggestions that in the future, SEAUP greatly increase print runs and provide said materials not only to actual training participants but also to the more than 33,000 polling stations directly—as was done for the December 26, 2004 Round Two Revote with encouraging results. SEAUP representatives took

this under advisement and noted that this was, in part, a resource allocation issue, *i.e*. "more is better" but there are practical logistical and budgetary limits to what can be done.

Multi-media and training: The training materials exhibit included three different training videos produced for the recent election: a) SEAUP's, with an introduction by the CEC's then-Deputy Chair Yaroslav Davydovych; b) the Our Ukraine [Viktor Yushchenko] HQ training video; and c) a video produced under the European Commission's "Support to the Electoral Process in Ukraine" project. There was general agreement that mass distribution of VHS cassettes, as well as CD-Rom media, of such training aides are an important complement to printed training materials. Computer media are particularly useful in urban areas while VHS access is universal in most small towns. Multi-media is not as useful for mass training at the village level, though even there it has a place, and use is dependent on how well (or poorly) organized training is at this bottom level.

Participants were enthusiastic about Internet-based training aides, including the http://info.vybory.com training system developed for the 2004 presidential election and subject to modification and transformation into a full-fledged Interactive Course on Election Law, in cooperation with the CEC.

Overall assessment of training: Almost without exception participants noted that training of election commissioners needs to be redoubled in scope and breadth for the 2006 parliamentary elections. There was general agreement that the CEC should take greater responsibility and lend more meaningful support to commissioner training. CEC Deputy Chair Maryna Stavniychuk noted that the CEC has a limited training capacity in-house but that it would work within the laws to do more in the future. She also welcomed suggestions on increasing the CEC's in-house capacity, though this remark was tempered by the statement that the Commission needs to stay within its mandate. Clearly there is room for longer-term institutional capacity and training capacity building and enhancement. The expected several year lull after the 2006 parliamentary and local elections will be a fitting time to fully address this opportunity.

Constraints

No significant constraints were encountered; project implementers were, however, struck by the volume and complexity of work yet to be done in this area.

Outcome B*. *Public Information Campaign on Election Administration Management and Practice for coming Parliamentary and Local Elections Initiated

During the reporting period, SEAUP began a joint public/journalist information campaign with the Center for Ukraine Reform Education, devoted to explaining in detail the positive and negative aspects of open and closed proportional representation systems at parliamentary and local elections. While the discussions at the three regional round tables conducted during the reporting period centered heavily on hypotheticals, part of the content focused on how the philosophy and simplicity or complexity of a particular election system might affect implementation of voting, vote count, tabulation and related activities on Election Day.

A parallel topic at these events was election administration management at future national and local elections. This component of the round tables was largely interwoven into discussion of

election systems, a fitting approach for journalists who are not well versed on many basic points of election administration, despite having heavily covered the recent presidential election. Utilizing a Q&A approach, SEAUP Activity Managers commented on problems typical to the regions they were visiting. Each of the media round tables resulted in fairly vibrant local and regional press discussion of event content, though our AMs sometimes sensed a "post-presidential election hibernation factor" at work.

Constraints

No significant constraints were encountered.

Outcome C. ***Review of Best and Worst Practices Stemming from 2004 Presidential Election***

SEAUP's Activity Manager began culling information on the past presidential election, to identify best and worst practices in implementing the legal framework. The result of this effort will be a Ukrainian-language document to be distributed to all interested readers, but in particular to election administrators, political party officials, central and local government officials, members of the judiciary and others with a professional interest in the legal and technical aspects of organizing and conducting elections in Ukraine.

In furtherance of this effort AM Barabash reviewed a plethora of election observation reports, including publicly issued documents as well SEAUP's internal observation documents. While there is no set deadline for this activity, the primary author's intent is to have a viable document ready in the autumn of 2005 to distribute to readers well before the start of the 2006 parliamentary and local elections. Once complete, the document will be posted at www.vybory.com.

Constraints

No significant constraints were encountered.

II. OTHER ACTIVITIES

During the reporting period, SEAUP conducted or participated in a number of activities of direct relevance to and in support of our two core Project Tasks. They included:

Grant Activities

Close-out of 2004 Presidential Polling Station Commissioner Training Grants

Throughout the January–March 2005 period, SEAUP AM (Grant Programs) Serhii Kalchenko and the Assistant Grant Manager reviewed final activity and financial reports for the 2004 Presidential Polling Station Commissioner Training grants. Final reports were submitted by the Znannia Society, Committee of Voters of Ukraine, and the Secretariat of the Freedom of Choice Coalition. Together these grantees conducted some 983 seminars for PSC commissioner candidates and serving commissioners (see previous quarter report for full breakdown). Because of the very large quantities of supporting documentation and extensive Q&A on all three grants,

the grants were not closed until (shortly) after the reporting period ended. All three grantees cooperated well in the close out process on what was a truly massive effort.

Legacy and NGO Network Grant Programs Developed and Competed

In mid-January, SEAUP staff, in consultation with USAID, defined the scope of the Legacy Grant Program (to support activities of election think tanks) and the NGO Regional Election Resource Center and Network Support Program.

The Legacy Grant Program was focused on conducting research on and drafting proposals for further enhancement of Ukrainian election legislation and the overall legislative framework, election training development, and election consulting. The NGO Network Grant Program was focused on implementation of programs devoted to building a nationwide network of election law resource centers, and for strengthening existing NGOs networks and their involvement in electoral processes.

RFAs for these grant programs were released on February 11, 2005, and published at local news papers, placed at the SEAUP website, and disseminated via the SEAUP mailing list. Following the announcement, SEAUP conducted written Q&A on the two grant programs; answers were disseminated and published at www.vybory.com on March 5-6, 2005.

The Grant Selection Committee was scheduled to meet early in the following reporting period.

Constraints

No significant constraints were encountered.

Analysis, Implementer Coordination, Etc.

Although the first half of the reporting period incorporated a relative lull in election administration-related events (the unsuccessful litigation by the Viktor Yanukovych camp at the Supreme Court challenging the results of the December 26, 2004, Round Two Presidential Revote, and the inauguration of Viktor Yushchenko as President of Ukraine aside), SEAUP made every effort to keep key MPs, political party and CEC representatives, and experts focused on the need to continue reform of election laws and practices.

Apart from activities described earlier, SEAUP continued its practice of publishing election updates (two during the reporting period) to www.vybory.com, as well as some brief and unpublished items in response to USAID Mission information requests. SEAUP staff also participated in events hosted by other organizations, including major presentations by SEAUP DCOP Dr. Volodymyr Kovtunets and Activity Manager Oleksandr Barabash at an international conference titled “The 2004 Ukraine Presidential Election: Problems of Securing and Defending the Rights of Citizens of Ukraine”, organized by the Foundation in Support of Democratic Elections (headed by former CEC Chair Mykhailo Ryabets); and in a seminar on “The Activities of the Central Election Commission and Enforcement of Citizens and Political Rights of Voters in Ukraine” conducted by the Eastern European Institute of Development as part of its “Strengthening the Role of Citizens as Taxpayers, Voters and Individuals” seminar series.

III. FINANCIAL REPORT

Contractor Name: Development Associates, Inc.
Cooperative Agreement No. 121-A-00-04-00701-00
Quarterly Financial Report, Cumulative through March 31, 2005

Authorized Expenditures:	$4,480,893.00
Actual Expenditures to Date:	$1,965,435
Balance Remaining:	$2,515,458

Ukraine Quarterly Report (April 2005).doc/SEAUP-1