

# 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:*

**Development Associates, Inc.**  
*1730 North Lynn Street*  
*Arlington, Virginia 22209-2023*

**January 2005**

---

---

**STRENGTHENING ELECTORAL ADMINISTRATION IN UKRAINE**  
**(SEPTEMBER 16—DECEMBER 31, 2004)**  
**QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT**

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

---

---

*Period of Performance: 12/15/03—12/31/06;*  
*Authorized Expenditures: \$4,480,893*

The activities described below are listed under the two Program Components (tasks) specified in the Cooperative Agreement and the Work Plan for Year One.

**I. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES**

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

During the reporting period, DA/SEAUP focused on improving the regulatory and judicial framework under which the 2004 presidential election was being conducted, and also provided key legislative drafting support at critical junctures. More specifically SEAUP:

- Supported public and informed stakeholder discussion of how best to secure voting rights of Ukrainian citizens temporarily abroad at the time of the election, and informed the regulatory process of means of establishing polling stations abroad;
- Took the lead on drafting the special “Law on the Peculiarities of Applying the Law on the Election of the President of Ukraine during Repeat Voting on December 26, 2004” (“Special Law”); and
- Supported SEAUP grantees in regulatory strengthening and related efforts.

**Outcome A. SEAUP Voting Abroad Study Completed and Presented/Voting Abroad Issues Publicly Defined**

During the reporting period SEAUP completed its STTA Voting Abroad Study, undertaken in earlier months and implemented by specialists Henry Valentino and Henry Rojas, with support from the DA Kyiv and Home offices.

**Parliament Round Table on Problems of Ukrainian Citizens Voting Abroad**

On September 29, 2004, a Parliament Round Table on Problems of Ukrainian Citizens Voting Abroad was convened by SEAUP with inputs from the Committee on European Integration Issues (chaired by Member of Parliament and former Foreign Minister of Ukraine, Ambassador Borys Tarasiuk) and the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation (IEAC). The agenda at this high profile, open to the press event, included presentations of the SEAUP Voting Abroad Study, as well as the “Elections 2004 From the Viewpoint of Ukrainians Abroad” survey, conducted by IEAC.

Some 50 MPs, government officials (at the Deputy Foreign Minister level), CEC representatives, voting abroad activists and campaign representatives (including one minor presidential candidate) held an animated discussion on legal ways of ensuring that suffrage rights for Ukrainians residing abroad on Election Day were protected. An equally intense discussion followed on the threat of vote fraud overseas, and ways of preventing or mitigating potential consequences.

Several national TV networks reported on the event (coverage was generally neutral, with the exception of the opposition-affiliated Channel Five, though no footage critical of the CEC or potential problems was aired). In the weeks thereafter SEAUP and IEAC distributed 500 copies of the conference proceedings, which included, in full, the IEAC survey results as well as a Ukrainian translation of the SEAUP Voting Abroad Study and conference recommendations.

### **Benefits of the Round Table**

Due in significant part to an inability to avoid the recommendations of the Voting Abroad Round Table, the CEC was forced to pass regulations that generally facilitated voting abroad by Ukrainians, within the framework of the Presidential Election Law.

In particular, CEC resolutions allowed Ukrainians abroad to vote with their internal passports, allowing thousands of people abroad with no foreign travel passport (in countries such as Russia) to participate in the balloting.

The CEC also followed the Round Table recommendation that polling stations be established beyond the boundaries of Ukrainian diplomatic missions, where permitted by host countries. As a result a greater number of Ukrainian citizens voted in Moldova, Vietnam, Australia and certain other countries than would have been the case otherwise. Finally, an attempt by the Viktor Yanukovich campaign team to push through the CEC the creation of more than 400 pseudo polling stations in Russia, a week before Round One voting, was foiled through some determined and skillful work by the Viktor Yushchenko campaign. The latter's lawyers referenced the Voting Abroad Study and Round Table in preparing court and other motions.

### ***Constraints:***

The primary constraint to maximum impact of the above activities was the pronounced passivity demonstrated by various CEC members in the performance of their duties (*i.e.*, drafting CEC resolutions) in securing the vote for Ukrainians abroad on Election Day. The source of this passivity could not be ascertained with accuracy.

***Outcome B.*** *Key counsel on drafting of the special “Law on the Peculiarities of Applying the Law on the Election of the President of Ukraine during Repeat Voting on December 26, 2004” (“Special Law”) led to a nearly “watertight” legal framework for the Round Two Revote.*

This special law was drafted in a four day period following the December 3, 2004, Supreme Court decision setting aside the results of fraud-ridden Round Two voting of November 21. The draft was written by a Working Group in which SEAUP experts took the lead; the Law was adopted days thereafter and signed by then-President Kuchma. It led to a Round Two Revote

generally recognized as free and fair by OSCE and numerous other international observer missions. Provisions assured equal representation by both candidates on election commissions; cut to nearly nil the most egregious fraud associated with absentee voting and voting at home seen in the earlier balloting; and enabled effective observation of vote and vote count. (*It is unfortunate that for the sake of compromise SEAUP advice on absentee voting and voting at home was not heeded and recommended safeguards were not adopted when the original Law was debated in the spring of 2004.*)

***Constraints:***

There were no significant constraints faced; quite to the contrary, SEAUP substantive inputs were welcomed by all other drafters. A Draconian provision effectively barring voting by disabled persons (and opposed, to no avail, by SEAUP experts) was invalidated by the Constitutional Court the day before the Round Two Revote.

**Outcome C. *Legislative Strengthening Grant Activities***

A SEAUP sub-grantee, the Razumkov Centre, completed its grant in the first half of the reporting period with a set of discrete opinion research activities incorporated into their grant work product.

***Constraints:***

No particular constraints were encountered other than main line media censorship of the Razumkov Centre at the behest of undetermined individuals or institutions.

**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, directly and through its sub-grantees and other partners, implemented a broad range of publication, training and consulting activities aimed at improving legal awareness, skills and practice by poll workers, judges and other official persons involved in election administration and adjudication. SEAUP also conducted additional training and consultation aimed at the above and other audiences (including candidate proxies and international observers) to further enhance the overall conduct of the election prior to the December 26, 2004 court-ordered revote of Round Two.

As before, most activities under Task Two were conducted either with the official blessing of (as part of an official USAID-CEC Plan of Cooperation) or in consultation with the Central Election Commission. In other cases, SEAUP worked directly, on a non-partisan basis, with the campaign headquarters of the remaining 24 presidential candidates, as well as with international observers who sought SEAUP assistance in obtaining background legal and practice information under the fluid conditions preceding the revote of Round Two.

Specifically, SEAUP:

- Completed distribution of the Commentary on the Presidential Election Law;

- Distributed training materials (including manuals, charts, workbooks and a video—nearly 450,000 copies in total) throughout all 225 Territorial Election Constituencies (TECs) and, indirectly, to all 33,000 polling stations, through training participants;
- Completed a nationwide TEC commissioner training program for more than 4,500 TEC commissioners before Round One voting, and major additional training before Round Two and the Round Two Revote;
- Managed initiation and completion of a Mass Training Program for nearly 100,000 Polling Station Commission (PSC) commissioners (prospective and serving);
- Oversaw a grant to the Institute for Applied Humanitarian Studies for judicial “discussion events” with judges throughout Ukraine who heard election-related cases;
- Provided legal and political analysis to implementing partners, including USAID, on topics of heightened interest;
- Provided training and consultation assistance to international and domestic observers, election commissioners, candidate proxies and election lawyers throughout all three rounds of voting; and
- Participated in media-related activities aimed at strengthening adherence to election laws and regulations.

**Outcome A. Election Law Commentary Distribution Completed**

During the reporting period, distribution of 6,000 copies of the Scientific-Practical Commentary on the Presidential Election Law was completed. All 225 Territorial Election Commissions received copies (total of 4,500 copies), while a further 1,500 copies were distributed by the CEC at its discretion. (For details of the publication’s content, please see the previous quarterly report.)

***Constraints:***

No significant constraints were encountered.

**Outcome B. Election Commissioner Training Materials Development and Publication Distribution Completed**

During the reporting period, SEAUP completed distribution of a variety of training and instructional publications (for details on content of all publications under “Prior to Round One” below, please see the previous quarterly report), as follows:

**Prior to Round One**

- **Unified Training Manual for Territorial Election Commissioners: 5,500 copies** to TEC trainees;
- **Unified Training Manual for Polling Station Commissioners: 100,000 copies** to PSC trainees and TECs;
- **Workbook for PSC Commissioners: 100,000 copies** to PSC trainees and campaign teams;
- **Election Procedures Diagram: 100,000 copies** to PSC trainees and TECs; and

- **Election Commissioner Training Video: 2,000 VHS copies** to TECs and all candidate headquarters.

### **Prior to the Round Two Revote**

In response to and in development of the Special Law on Conducting the Election of the President of Ukraine on December 26, 2004, SEAUP developed and distributed the only tailor-made set of instructional materials produced specifically for Round Two Revote administration and observation, as follows:

- **Unified Training Manual on Applying the Special Law on Conducting the Election of the President of Ukraine on December 26, 2004**: *A comprehensive, 64 page guide to the Special Law, its interplay and how it amended the basic Presidential Election Law, with clear and direct recommendations to TEC and PSC commissioners on application, specific Election Day practice, model situations, with Q and A.* This manual was prepared by SEAUP staff and published with a 70,000 print run during a four day period in early December 2004. **3,300 copies were distributed directly at SEAUP seminars and a further 66,500 were distributed by our regional organizers working directly with the 225 TECs and by pipelining two copies to each of the more than 33,000 polling stations throughout the country.** All materials were delivered on site by December 21, 2004. *By contrast the CEC delivered no additional instructional materials for Round Two Revote to polling stations.*
- **Four-color Revised Election Procedures Diagram**: *Three charts detailing all Election Day procedures with reference to the laws and practical advice based on the Special Law.* A 70,000 print run in Ukrainian was produced and distributed in the same fashion as the training manual discussed above. A further 1,000 copies of each were produced in Russian and English and distributed to ENEMO, UCCA and other international observation missions to facilitate step by step Election Day monitoring efforts.

**The total distributed print run of all training/instructional publications for all rounds totaled 47,500, exclusive of the video. All above materials were posted upon publication, in download-friendly PDF format, to the SEAUP [www.vybor.com](http://www.vybor.com) website.**

### ***Constraints:***

In distributing all publications, save for the Presidential Election Law Commentary, SEAUP relied exclusively on its own and its sub-grantees' formal and informal distribution networks. While this approach increased the effectiveness of distribution, it also increased the administrative burden and cost. The CEC's failure to follow-through on providing letters introducing SEAUP and its sub-grantees to the 225 TECs (largely responsible for instructing the 33,000 PSCs nationwide) did not obstruct our ability to distribute our materials, which had undergone informal CEC approval. It did, however, put the onus on SEAUP to prove our relationship with the CEC, which was done by showing relevant parts of the USAID-CEC Plan of Cooperation. SEAUP materials were observed in use throughout the country during all three rounds of voting. Several PSC commissioners used SEAUP color charts to walk themselves step-by-step through Election Day procedures.

**Outcome C.** *Web-based Interactive Election Law Consultation System (located at <http://info.vybory.com> and linked to the SEAUP project website [www.vybory.com](http://www.vybory.com)) Online and Visited.*

Online from October 1, 2004 this web-based tool was established to provide qualified pin-point consultations to all interested parties on the finer points of the Presidential Election Law and associated laws and practices. A total of 178 questions were submitted and the same number of responses posted by SEAUP experts, including 49 specifically for Round 3 (based on the Special Law).

***Constraints:***

No particular constraints were experienced.

**Outcome D.** *Territorial Election Commissioner Training Completed*

During the reporting period and in accordance with our Work Plan and the USAID-CEC Plan of Cooperation, SEAUP completed its nationwide training program for Territorial Election Commission members on the key aspects of election administration at the middle management (TEC) level. (For substantive details of this program, please see the previous quarterly report.)

**TEC Training before Round One**

Sixty-one seminars were conducted in which a total of 4,330 potential and serving TEC commissioners (and several hundred other officials) were trained, as specified here:

**TEC Training (Totals for August—October 2004)  
Participant distribution  
(by candidate)**

<b><i>Candidates</i></b>	<b>TEC Training</b>
<b>Yushchenko V.</b>	<b>585</b>
<b>Yanukovych V.</b>	<b>234*</b>
<b>Moroz O.</b>	<b>355</b>
<b>Symonenko P.</b>	<b>288</b>
<b>Basyliuk O.</b>	95
<b>Boiko B.</b>	154
<b>Brotskyi M.</b>	327
<b>Chernovetskyi L.</b>	198
<b>Chernysh H.</b>	87
<b>Chornovil A.</b>	119
<b>Dushyn I.</b>	170
<b>Hrabar M.</b>	208
<b>Kinakh A.</b>	272

<b>Komisarenko S.</b>	2
<b>Kononov V.</b>	25
<b>Korchynskiy D.</b>	119
<b>Kozak R.</b>	107
<b>Kryvobokov V.</b>	85
<b>Nechyporuk V.</b>	101
<b>Omelchenko O.</b>	102
<b>Rohozhynskiy M.</b>	0
<b>Rzhavskiy O.</b>	194
<b>Vitrenko N.</b>	160
<b>Volha V.</b>	173
<b>Yakovenko O.</b>	114
<b>Zbitniev Y.</b>	162
<b>Judges**</b>	212
<b>Unspecified***</b>	128
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,542</b>
<b>Total number of seminars</b>	61
<b>Average number of participants per seminar</b>	<b>78</b>

**Top 4 Round One candidates denoted in orange fields**

\*Regional HQs in several regions failed to ensure participant attendance; this improved in the latter half of the program.  
 \*\* Judges were invited in certain regions at the request of appellate courts, often as a result of attendance at IAHR/SEAUP and ABA/CEELI judicial seminars/discussion events.  
 \*\*\* Denotes participants who did not indicate which candidate they represented (despite instructions).

**TEC Training After Round One**

Within a few days of Round One voting (October 31, 2004) it became clear that many TECs were overwhelmed with the variety and volume of violations committed. SEAUP rose to this challenge by scheduling previously unplanned, unified TEC commissioner, candidate proxy and lawyer training seminars for Round Two (November 21, 2004) and the Round Two Revote (December 26, 2004) as follows:

Trainings before Round Two	10 Seminars	742 Trainees
Trainings before Round Two Revote	32 Seminars	2,333 Trainees

**Total additional TEC commissioners, proxies and lawyers trained after Round One equaled 3,075.**

As before, these seminars were organized on a non-partisan basis, though attendance was greater by representatives of candidates who seemingly had not committed widespread, systematic violations. The seminar content was based on the law (including the Special Law in the case of training before the Round Two Revote), as well as instant analyses of the typical irregularities and violations that were put into play during both Round One and Round Two.

It should be noted that the 10 seminars between Rounds One and Round Two were conducted by four two-person teams in a one week period, while the 32 seminars conducted between Round Two and the Round Two Revote were conducted by five teams in a 10 day period who traversed the country on a round-the-clock basis to accommodate the complexity of the situation.

**Constraints:**

- 1) The number of positive responses to seminar invitations continued to exceed capacity. In such situations, SEAUP, as before, either increased the limit for participants or “re-routed” late confirmations to parallel seminars in approximate geographic proximity;
- 2) As before, some of the “minor” candidates did not organize commissioners efficiently;
- 3) In certain cases, acting TEC commissioners could not participate in training due to their work-related duties;
- 4) Throughout the reporting period, SEAUP continued to receive reports of regional and local authorities blocking TEC training organization. As before, most incidents occurred in eastern regions, with no significant reports of such problems from other regions of the country; and
- 5) The CEC continued to be uneven in providing assistance in cases where blocking of seminars occurred. Given the highly charged campaign atmosphere this was taken as a fact of life and SEAUP typically worked around problems by appealing to individuals’ civic sensibilities, or where lacking, used informal networks to get the job done.

**Outcome E. PSC Mass Training Program Initiated and Completed**

During the reporting period, SEAUP, through three Ukrainian NGOs and their nearly 200 trainers, conducted a series of 983 half-day seminars for prospective and serving Polling Station Commission (PSC) members. (Please see previous performance report for a detailed description of this training-of-trainers program's principles and framework.) Through this component, 95,069 poll workers were trained in the Presidential Election Law and specific ways of preventing and dealing with election law violations and irregularities. The total number of commissioners trained by SEAUP sub-grantees represented approximately 10 percent of the nearly 1 million persons who worked in PSCs during one or more rounds of the election.

Training participants received a standard packet of training materials, described above in Outcome B.

Training participants represented all 26 initially registered presidential candidates. Access to all trainings was via invitations transmitted by the sub-grantees (the Znannya Society, Committee of Voters of Ukraine, and Freedom of Choice Coalition) to the 225 TECs as well as candidate central and regional campaign headquarters. All training was conducted on a non-partisan basis. The top four candidates in the race, *i.e.* then-Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovich (12,411 trainees), former Prime Minister Viktor Yushchenko (11,824 trainees), Socialist Party of Ukraine leader Oleksandr Moroz (6,576 trainees), and Communist Party of Ukraine leader Petro Symonenko (5,721 trainees), took the greatest advantage of the training offered. Of the remaining 22 minor candidates in the race, 11 delegated more than 3,000 PSC commissioners each for training; five delegated more than 2,000 PSC commissioners each; one delegated more than 1,000 PSC commissioners; and the remaining five each delegated fewer than 1,000. This "gradated" participation in SEAUP PSC training closely corresponded with the relative organizational capacities of the various candidates' campaign teams.

The following table gives a precise per-candidate breakdown of PSC commissioners trained:

**PSC Training (TOTAL for training in  
September—October 2004)  
Participant distribution  
(by candidate)**

<b>Candidates:</b>	<b>PSC Training</b>
<b>Yushchenko V.</b>	<b>11,824</b>
<b>Yanukovich V.</b>	<b>12,411</b>
<b>Moroz O.</b>	<b>6,576</b>
<b>Symonenko P.</b>	<b>5,721</b>
<b>Basyliuk O.</b>	3,495
<b>Boiko B.</b>	3,784
<b>Brodskyi M.</b>	3,973
<b>Chernovetskyi L.</b>	2,393
<b>Chernysh H.</b>	176
<b>Chornovil A.</b>	3,190

<b>Dushyn I.</b>	2,883
<b>Hrabar M.</b>	3,285
<b>Kinakh A.</b>	2,267
<b>Komisarenko S.</b>	175
<b>Kononov V.</b>	63
<b>Korchynskiy D.</b>	3,027
<b>Kozak R.</b>	3,326
<b>Kryvobokov V.</b>	2,501
<b>Nechyporuk V.</b>	2,682
<b>Omelchenko O.</b>	1,427
<b>Rohozhynskiy M.</b>	11
<b>Rzhavskiy O.</b>	3,504
<b>Vitrenko N.</b>	846
<b>Volha V.</b>	3,664
<b>Yakovenko O.</b>	5,032
<b>Zbitniev Y.</b>	3,255
<b>Unspecified</b>	3,578
<b>Total</b>	<b>95,069</b>
<b>Total number of seminars</b>	983
<b>Average number of participants per seminar</b>	<b>97</b>

**Top 4 Round One candidates denoted in orange fields**

Distribution of trainees by region correlated closely with the percentage of voters that a particular region comprised within the national voter population. The eastern Donetsk region, with roughly 10 percent of all Ukrainian voters and a more difficult political environment, provided more than 8.5 percent of all PSC trainees.

Distribution of trainees by gender correlated with the general situation on the ground, *i.e.* a majority of trainees were female, as was the majority of PSC commissioners throughout the 2004 presidential election, as is typical of modern day Ukrainian elections.

#### ***Constraints:***

Dozens of reports from sub-grantees of low- and mid-level sabotage of seminar organization, with little response from the CEC. In the large majority of cases, sub-grantee and SEAUP informal contacts resolved or mitigated obstacles and problems.

#### ***Outcome F. Judicial Education Program Completed***

During the reporting period, the Institute for Applied Humanitarian Studies (IAHR), the SEAUP Judicial Education grantee, completed its regional training seminar (“engagement” or “discussion event”) program for local (district) and appellate court judges on election law.

Among other accomplishments, IAHR:

- 1) Conducted the final seven (of 24) regional seminars for judges in the remaining regions of Ukraine;
- 2) Collected, on an on-going basis, court decisions stemming from the ongoing presidential campaign; analyzed these decisions; and distributed “recommendations” to judges participating in the discussion events. This had a direct effect on how judges tried specific categories of election cases both during the reporting period and thereafter; and
- 3) By the end of the reporting period, trained a total of 1,016 appellate and local court judges. The large majority of these judges were practically involved in resolving election related disputes. A smaller number judicial clerks, prosecutors, and court administration officials also participated in IAHR seminars during the reporting period.

(For a detailed description of the IAHR sub-grant and program, please see the previous quarterly report; also, note that a further 212 judges attended TEC seminars conducted directly by SEAUP staff.)

***Constraints:***

No significant constraints were encountered. IAHR was able to conduct its events without major resistance due to its longstanding record of successful training of judges, often at the behest of the Supreme Court, and the inclusion of several Supreme Court judges into its discussion and training teams.

***Outcome G. Training and Consulting Assistance Provided to International Observers, Election Commissioners, Domestic Observers, Proxies and Campaign Lawyers on Election Day (Rounds One, Two and Round Two Revote)***

During grantee monitoring and fact finding trips, SEAUP AM Oleksandr Vorobyov conducted four brief training sessions for several dozen international observers posted to the Luhansk, Mykolaiv, Odesa and Kherson regions.

In early December, SEAUP COP Yarema Bachynsky and AMs Oleksandr Vorobyov and Serhii Kalchenko conducted four day-long training sessions for a further 400 plus international observers in Kyiv (prior to the latter’s deployment throughout the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine).

SEAUP also distributed a limited number of copies of commissioner training materials and charts at the above trainings. The training organizers took the time to download a variety of items from [www.vybory.com](http://www.vybory.com) and reproduce them at a fairly high quality level.

In parallel with election observation activities as *accredited journalists*, DCOP Dr. Volodymyr Kovtunets and AMs Vorobyov, Kalchenko and Barabash provided pin-point trouble-shooting consultations via cell phone during all three rounds of voting (more than 250 consultations total). COP Bachynsky, in his capacity as an *international observer*, provided similar recommendations.

**Constraints:**

The above activities were constrained only by time and physical activity limits, and on occasion by illegal attempts to stifle our consultations made by some of the same persons committing violations during voting and vote counting. In such cases we informed the violators of the legal sanction for their actions, and moved on without confrontation.

## **II. OTHER ACTIVITIES**

### **ELECTION LAW/LITIGATION ANALYSIS, PUBLIC INFORMATION AND DONOR/IMPLEMENTER COORDINATION**

Throughout the reporting period, SEAUP staff participated in media-related activities on Radio ERA and other media outlets, providing commentary on election law and implementation issues, in a non-partisan and nonpolitical manner.

During the reporting period, SEAUP experts provided informal consultations to a variety of analysts observing ongoing appellate litigation stemming from the Round One and Round Two voting. SEAUP staff further provided real time litigation structure analysis, keying in to the preparation and conduct of the Yushchenko v. Central Election Commission case that led to the Supreme Court decision setting aside the Round Two vote of November 21, 2004, and ordering a Round Two Revote for December 26, 2004.

SEAUP staff also authored the following print media articles published during the reporting period:

1. “Presidential Election Legislation: Some Problems of Enforcement”, *Yurydychna Gazeta*, October 20, 2004, Serhii Kalchenko.
2. “Decision or Action?”, *Yurydychna Gazeta*, December 8, 2004, Serhii Kalchenko.
3. “International Obligation of Ukraine Concerning Elections and Their Implementation” *Elections and Democracy*, No.1, 2004, Dr. Volodymyr Kovtunets.
4. “Has Law Gone Against Tradition?” *Elections and Democracy*, No. 2, 2004, Dr. Volodymyr Kovtunets.

Throughout the reporting period, SEAUP participated in the Indiana University Democratic Parliamentary Strengthening Program’s monthly parliamentary assistance coordination meetings. Special legislative updates were prepared, presented and distributed for these meetings.

During the reporting period, project representatives participated in numerous meetings with OSCE, Freedom House, IRI, NDI, Internews, ABA/CEELI and other implementers, as well as in consultations with Ukrainian think tanks such as the Razumkov Centre, the Election Law Institute, Democratic Initiatives Foundation, and the Agency for Legislative Initiatives (ALI), on the entire range of election-related issues.

### **III. FINANCIAL REPORT**

Contractor Name: Development Associates, Inc.

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

Quarterly Financial Report, Cumulative through December 31, 2004:

Authorized Expenditures:	\$4,480,893.00
Actual Expenditures to Date:	\$1,800,423.03
Balance Remaining:	\$2,680,469.97