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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATO</td>
<td>Anti-terrorist operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCOP</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBRE</td>
<td>Decentralization Offering Better Results and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVV</td>
<td>Deutscher Volkshochschul-Verband e.V., German Adult Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECNL</td>
<td>European Center for Not-for-Profit Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EED</td>
<td>European Endowment for Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGE</td>
<td>Enhance Non-Governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Foreign direct investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICNL</td>
<td>International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAC</td>
<td>International NGO Training and Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF</td>
<td>International Renaissance Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAR</td>
<td>Initiative Center to Support Social Action &quot;Ednannia&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>Intermediary support organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key informant interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transsexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDI</td>
<td>National Democratic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Organizational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGP</td>
<td>Open Government Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPR</td>
<td>Reanimation Package of Reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small/medium enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAH</td>
<td>Ukrainian hryvnia (currency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAN</td>
<td>Ukraine Citizen Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI PR</td>
<td>Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The purpose of the assessment is to identify the needs of, gaps in, and opportunities for civil society development in Ukraine. The assessment primarily focuses on USAID/Ukraine’s current Civil Society Enabling Environment and Civil Society Capacity-Building activities implemented by the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR; also, “the Center”) and the Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia (ISAR)-Ednannia, respectively. The Assessment identifies continuing needs across dimensions of civil society development covered and not covered by USAID or other international donors, and discusses approaches and actions that could reinforce the sustainability of donor-funded activities to strengthen civil society.

The Mission will use the assessment findings to determine its approach to civil society development going forward, including potential follow-on activities to the above-mentioned USAID awards, both of which end in mid-2019. In particular, the Assessment Team has focused on the following questions:

1. Which UCIPR and ISAR project approaches and activities have been most effective in achieving their respective objectives? Did the UCIPR and ISAR projects yield results other than those planned?

2. To what extent does the current legal environment in Ukraine enable or prohibit civil-society organization (CSO) development? What else needs to be done to ensure a sustainable, flourishing civil society?

3. Is there a critical mass of CSOs with adequate organizational and technical capacities to fulfill their missions and sustain their goals? Is there a relevant infrastructure for continued organizational development support?

4. Are there other critical civil society sector development needs that are not covered by USAID programs or by other international donors? Sub-questions could include, but are not limited to, the following:
   - How do CSOs support themselves financially?
   - To what extent do the financial conditions to support civil society exist, especially those outside of government?

5. What are the critical necessary steps for civil society sector sustainability, including but not limited to the sub-sectors addressed by UCIPR (enabling environment) and ISAR (capacity development)?

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In July 2014, USAID/Ukraine made two direct awards to local Ukrainian CSO partners: (1) UCIPR for the Civil Society Enabling Environment activity; and (2) ISAR-Ednannia for the Ukraine Civil Society Capacity-Building activity. Both organizations had benefited from the advanced capacity-development program under USAID’s large civil-society program, Ukraine National Initiatives to Enhance Reforms (UNITER).¹ The UNITER program transitioned UCIPR and ISAR to direct USAID awards by July 2014; both awards are scheduled to end in July 2019.

In September 2016, USAID/Ukraine launched a new flagship civil society program, Enhance Non-Governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagement (ENGAGE), which is working to increase citizen engagement in civic actions at the national, regional, and local level.

**EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS**

The assessment began with a desk review of USAID-provided materials and background reading about civil society developments in Ukraine. Subsequent fieldwork for the project included 73 key informant interviews (KIs), including 40 representing Ukrainian CSOs. The team aimed to reflect regional dynamics of civil society and conducted three regional trips: to the East (Kharkiv), South (Odesa), and West (Uzhgorod). To widen the sample of civil society representatives, the assessment team invited 1,471 CSOs to participate in the online survey; 328 CSOs submitted their responses related to key questions of civil society development in Ukraine. In addition, two focus groups were conducted with civil society representatives and activists in Kyiv and in Uzhgorod.

A limitation to this methodology is the inability to generalize responses of the online survey to the wider civil society. The sample mainly consisted of groups that are funded by Western donors; in particular, those partnering with the USAID supported programs. In an effort to reach out to more grass root initiatives and less donor-connected CSOs, the assessment team included several such representatives into KIs. The sample of KII participants also lacked CSOs from rural areas or small towns. The assessment attempted to mitigate this bias by conducting interviews with CSOs and implementing partners who work with communities beyond the regional capitals and review data from nationwide polling. However, the mixed methods approach allowed for in-depth, comprehensive assessment of the civil society sector and for developing focused, detailed findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Thus, the assessment team is confident that findings, conclusions, and recommendations presented in this report are generally reflect fit-for-use measures of key assessment questions.

**FINDINGS / CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS**

**CURRENT STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES**

**Opportunities.** The size and scale of civil society sector since the Euromaidan has increased. New initiatives emerged to assist the veterans, conflict-affected population, urban development, the environment and animal rights, human rights, and the fight against corruption. 14 percent of Ukrainian citizens report volunteering. Against a background of extremely low trust in public institutions, trust in voluntary organizations and civic associations is increasing.

Ukrainian CSOs are seeking to develop their capacity; 73 percent said they could “partially” meet their organizational development (OD) needs. The main providers of OD services for respondents were freelance consultants, online educational platforms, and the Marketplace supported by USAID.

The supply of local sources of funding (individual donations, corporate sponsorship and state funding) is increasing. Thanks to UCIPR’s advocacy in cooperation with veterans’ CSOs, the transparency of national funding allocation is improving.

Civil society also has access to funding from oblasts and municipal budgets. Several cities have introduced a competitive awards process for local CSOs, including the city of Kyiv. At the local level, new tools of channeling resources for community projects are being developed. In 2018, 100 cities, towns, villages, amalgamated communities of Ukraine successfully implemented participatory budgets.

Private individual giving is growing, including various crowd funding platforms that flourish in Ukraine. Spilnokosht, Na Starte, Go Fund, Ukrainian Philanthropic Marketplace, People’s Project and Facebook are
the main crowd-funding hubs. A poll records that 37 percent of Ukrainians gave money to charities or
on charitable causes in 2016.

**Challenges.** The main challenges related to civil society are weak financial diversification and citizen
engagement. 75 percent of both regional and Kyiv-based CSOs surveyed online named Western grants
as their main source of funding. Despite nominal growth, most state funding is disbursed in non-
competitive way. Nationally, only 2.5 percent of state funding is allocated to CSOs on a competitive
basis.

Low citizen engagement into institutionalized CSOs remains an issue. Currently only 7 percent of
citizens report engagement in civic activism. There are few powerful membership-based CSOs.
Horizontal connectivity amongst CSOs is negatively affected by competition for western grants. Only 50
percent CSOs report membership in any coalition.

Ukraine has uneven development of civil society across regions, with striking disparities in capacity
between Kyiv-based and regional CSOs. Some of the ‘depressive’ regions include Zakarpattia,
Khmelnytsky, Volyn, Chernivtsi, and Sumy. Reflecting this issue, 60 percent of online survey respondents
chose the response, “Although the CSO community is large, many CSOs are not effective.”

Due to sharp increase in the number of registered CSOs, the issue of integrity becomes a real challenge.
The most worrying dimension is proliferation of ‘fake’ CSOs set up for nefarious purposes to co-opt the
voice of civil society for political reasons or vested interests.

A worrisome trend in post-Euromaidan civil-society development often mentioned by interviewees is
the radicalization of civic activism and the emergence of ‘uncivil’ far-right actors that use hate speech,
promote ethnic and religious intolerance, threat to use or use violence.

Finally, one of the major concerns for sustainability of the sector are threats of restrictive legislature.
Such efforts, similar to e-declarations for anti-corruption CSOs, are in the legislative pipeline and are
related to additional fiscal reporting or additional reporting for CSOs have receive foreign funding. In
addition, the vast majority of attacks on civil society activists and organizations remain unpunished.

Conclusions. Post-Euromaidan civil society strengthened thanks to the inflow of new CSOs, active
citizens and volunteers. The sector has acquired greater legitimacy in Ukraine and a high level of citizens’
trust. The culture of organizational development and self-awareness about the impact is improving. Local
sources of funding, new tools of local democracy make citizen participation more accessible.

**Key Recommendations.**

- To capitalize on an upward trend in local funding, donors should introduce co-funding incentives
to motivate CSOs to fundraise from local sources.
- Ensure a diversified regional approach to civil-society development. Focus on the regions that
get less attention from donors and have fewer professional CSOs.
- Ensure more efforts in OD are directed towards new and regional CSOs. Develop regional OD
programs with mid- to long-term modules and mentorships.
- Further efforts should be directed to reform the delivery of the state funding to CSOs via state
grants, local grants, or participatory budgeting.
- Special watchdog effort to safeguard against possible restrictive regulation for CSOs and legal aid
and support to civic activists addressing local corruption issues should be set up.

**ISAR Approaches and Results**

**Key Findings.** ISAR’s OD assistance includes three types of grants (basic, advanced, group) that
channel assistance to both new and more developed organizations. A majority of ISAR sub-grantees are
regional CSOs. For most CSOs, Marketplace grants were the only source of funding for organizational development. ISAR reported recent growing demand for OD grants. In 2018 the number of applications to ISAR per month increased by 30 percent as compared to 2012. Most applications come from Kyiv, Lviv, and Vinnytsia.

A majority of KII respondents belonging to CSOs demonstrated awareness about the opportunities of ISAR’s OD sub-grants program. ISAR’s activities beyond its OD grants and Civil Society Forum were much less-often mentioned in the KII.

Regarding the interface of the Marketplace, the grantees would prefer to receive ISAR’s references or quality certificates for trainers or consultants they could hire. Regional CSOs expressed concerns that sometimes it is difficult for them to access to quality of the OD proposals by trainers.

According to the online survey, the top needs in capacity-building are fundraising (16 percent), effective public communication (15 percent), effective coalition-building, and networking (12 percent). Most of ISAR’s OD grants (86 percent) are awarded for strategic planning, followed by financial viability.

The positive impact of ISAR’s OD assistance is reflected in the online survey; 65 percent of respondents described Marketplace assistance as a “very important” or “somewhat important” contribution. Improvements are reported in financial viability, especially access to local funding and development of new services.

Conclusions. ISAR is a unique platform that delivers OD assistance to Ukrainian CSOs via multi-level financial support and various networking and community-of-practice opportunities. It remains the only source of OD small grants, especially for new CSOs. It has aided in developing the OD culture in Ukraine and is facing increasing demand for OD grants. Its effort to increase the financial viability of CSOs, as reported by the grantees, is successful. The Marketplace lags in quality control over the OD supply.

Key Recommendations.

- Marketplace priorities in OD support should continue focusing on the sector demanded capacities, in particular strengthening fundraising, effective public communication, effective coalition building.

- More attention should be paid to developing standards of service provision via the Marketplace. The standards, including possible trainer certification, should be widely discussed with the sector, including Ukrainian and international groups with strong experience in training and consulting.

- ISAR could aim to increase the number of grants to “young CSOs,” perhaps developing special technical assistance for emerging CSOs that require more attention and OD assistance.

UCIPR Approaches and Results

Key Findings. UCIPR’s advocacy focused on three main work streams: (1) improved registration for CSOs and preventing restrictive regulation; (2) more accessible, transparent and accountable state funding for CSOs; (3) expanding citizen engagement mechanisms at the local level. The advocacy approach often means that UCIPR is drafting amendments, model statutes, work plans, and new regulations. National government representatives stated that the project’s expertise was highly appreciated and described as “constructive and solution-oriented.”

UCIPR applied networking approaches and stakeholder consultations to mobilize the sector. It has created seven thematic networks to develop joint recommendations on various regulations. The assessment of UCIPR’s level of stakeholder consultation was less positive with regards to capacity to build consensus and facilitate dialogue with the leaders of the sector.
Key informants listed key successes resulting from UCIPR’s work, including: improvement of registration procedure for CSOs, simplification of state calls for proposals for CSOs, introduction of a competitive call for proposals for veteran and people with disability organizations, assistance in developing government action plans to implement the National Strategy for 2017 and 2018. UCIPR engaged with 18 cities across Ukraine, from Mariupol to Lviv, in developing instruments of local democracy (city statues, regulations for public hearings, participatory budgeting).

Most regional CSOs interviewed for this assessment had little awareness of UCIPR’s work at the regional level, despite the fact that UCIPR provided legal consultations to 1,207 individuals and 26 CSOs; most of these were new organizations.

According to the online survey, Ukraine’s regulatory environment suffers from over-regulation and red tape. Survey respondents stated that the primary problem is complicated procedures for state funding of CSO activities, followed by poor incentives for corporate contributions. The risk of introducing restrictive regulation, similar to e-declarations for anti-corruption CSOs, remains high. Regional KII participants, especially in Odesa and Kharkiv, complained about frequent attacks on activists as a major problem. According to desk research, there were over 40 attacks on activists, mostly those fighting local corruption, in 2018.

Conclusions. The Ukrainian civil-society enabling environment experienced both progress and setbacks in the last four years. UCIPR’s efforts have contributed to positive changes; in particular, improvements in CSO registration, more transparent state funding, and opening of local government to more citizen engagement. The main setback was the introduction of e-declarations for anti-corruption CSOs and remaining excessive administrative burden.

Among UCIPR’s most successful approaches were constructive advocacy at the national level, monitoring of CSOs related policies, awareness building about the new regulations. A collaborative sectoral approach to civil society advocacy was lagging behind, leading to weak ownership in the sector for some of UCIPR’s the advocacy initiatives.

Key Recommendations

- Ensure better ownership of the advocacy agenda and better alignment of UCIPR’s advocacy efforts and regulatory problems of the sector. To achieve this, regular needs assessments among the CSOs leaders should be conducted.
- Advocacy efforts could be more effective if there was a stronger collective effort via a coalition or a network. To demonstrate its added value to the sector UCIPR could channel more international expertise from its partners (ICNL, ECNL) into Ukraine.
- If UCIPR aims to develop into a fully-fledged advisory center for non-profit law, it should substantially improve its outreach to the regions of Ukraine and boost its capacity to deliver legal expertise.

International Technical Assistance Gaps

Key Findings. Foreign donor funding is weakly diversified with project grants mostly available for professional CSOs with previous grant history. Newly-established and small CSOs as well as informal civic initiatives lack funding. Donor funding also falls short of encouraging CSOs to look for local sources of support. Matching grants to support CSO fundraising through crowd-funding are lacking. Many interviewees mentioned the need to better develop social entrepreneurship as a means to enhance financial viability. This is coupled with regulatory impediments for CSOs to engage in income-generating activities.
Project grants, as a rule, do not include an OD component. Opportunities to receive institutional grants are limited, especially for smaller CSOs outside Kyiv. While there are enough training and short-term consultancy opportunities for CSOs, a more systematic approach to OD is needed.

Funding to CSOs remains concentrated in Kyiv, Donbas and large cities. There is insufficient outreach to Ukraine’s regions – especially to small towns and rural areas – to support grassroots civic initiatives. Funding to advocacy and watchdog CSOs should be better matched with efforts to support CSO campaigning and citizen engagement. Social services CSOs receive little attention from donors. There is insufficient support to civil society infrastructure, including civil society spaces, community centers, community foundations and CSOs with re-granting capacities, in the regions. An increasing demand in legal aid for CSOs and emergency support for civic activists at risk is not currently met.

**Conclusions.** Despite substantial international assistance to Ukrainian civil society, a number of funding gaps still need to be addressed. Weak diversification of types of funding, weak attention to encouraging CSOs to seek local sources of support through crowdsourcing, social services delivery and social entrepreneurship, lack of long-term approach to OD throughout Ukraine, concentration of funding in Kyiv, Donbas and large oblast centers, and insufficient support to the sectoral infrastructure of the sector all constitute major gaps in technical assistance.

**Key Recommendations.**
- Provide support to CSOs in the regions, especially in towns and rural areas, and to newly established and small CSOs and grassroots citizen initiatives.
- Provide incentives and build CSO capacities to develop local sources of support and income generating activities.
- Ensure a more systemic and long-term funding approach to OD through long-term mentorship, fellowship, and professional education programs for CSO leaders.
- Provide long-term institutional support for small- to middle-scale CSOs in the regions. Ensure that project-purpose grants include an OD component.
- Support development of civil society infrastructure in each region of Ukraine (community foundations, resource centers, civic hubs).

**Cross-Cutting Issues**

Future programming should reflect cross-cutting issues as youth, gender, vulnerable groups and minorities via support to CSOs who work with these groups and on these issues, building their capacity. In addition, a gender component should be also integrated in capacity-building programs for all other OD. Anti-corruption and decentralization reforms open a number of opportunities for civil society to engage in public policy making and contribute to transparency, accountability and citizen participation. However, they also constitute a number of challenges that need to be addressed, such as increased vulnerability of anti-corruption CSOs and activists, public demand to increase CSO transparency, and the uneven spread of local democracy practices. In addition, Ukrainian CSOs at the regional and local level could benefit from Open Government Partnership, an international tool to promote better governance in Ukraine.

**Key Assistance Approaches**

**Key Findings.** This assessment proposes a comprehensive integrated approach – a true ecosystem outlook. The interviews for this assessment revealed the following weak links in the current eco-system: weak collaboration between CSOs, poor exchanges between well-established and new CSOs and activists, gaps between CSOs and the wider citizenry, and a lack of open public spaces for civic
Eleven KII respondents spoke about the need for more knowledge sharing, especially impact measures, evidence, and research about the sector.

The assessment revealed a lack of self-regulation in the sector. Many KIIs, especially in Kyiv, suggested this could start addressing the pressing issue of integrity and ‘fake’ CSOs. Self-regulation could provide an ability to the sector to speak with a more unified voice against curtailing the space for CSOs and promote quality standards in the sector. It could also help fill gaps that are not part of broad state regulation (use of images, M&E, cooperation with political actors, accountability to beneficiaries, board relations, etc.).

Ukraine is a society that lives with conflict; the conflict in Donbas now stretches for almost four years. According to our desk research, the top citizen concerns are the war in the East, the security of Ukraine overall, and high crime rates. With no signs of retreat from Russian support for this conflict, Ukrainian society has to build resilience to this threat.

In the age of news abundance and ‘fake’ news, which is exacerbated in Ukraine by active Russian disinformation and monopolized media space by versed interests, Ukrainian society remains vulnerable. There is low capacity to distinguish disinformation, rare fact checking, and weak skills of critical thinking.

Conclusions. In view of fast-evolving reform processes, growth of the sector, and the active role of civil society in advancing Ukraine’s democratic transition, it is important that the new program supports critical elements of the ecosystem, such as an enabling environment and OD. These two pieces of the puzzle are of paramount importance. But equally important are promoting diversity of funding, growing indigenous sources of funding, and enabling connectivity within the system. Ukraine’s vulnerabilities in critical thinking and media literacy expose the need to integrate this approach across the civil society program. In view of possible Russia-made shocks resilience of communities and local CSOs is of paramount importance.

Key Recommendations

- Apply an ecosystem approach to the sector and ensure critical elements of the system are supported, such as enabling environment, OD, and diversity of funding.
- Ensure connectivity to close existing gaps. Promote sectoral horizontal partnerships and coalitions/movements to amplify advocacy and benefit from the “wisdom of crowds.” Encourage innovative approaches to networking, communication, and expert discussions.
- In view of continued conflict and active use of disinformation to disrupt and divide Ukrainian society, promote the practice of resilient communities and resilient organizations as an OD capacity-building focus.
- Reinforce efforts in building cognitive resilience. Donors should increase funding for educational and adult learning projects that develop critical thinking and build capacity to evaluate the quality of information. Such trainings are of key importance for CSOs and activists.

ADJUSTMENTS TO CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING

Key Findings. Overall, Ukrainian civil society is confident about its own impact. At the same time, 60 percent of CSO survey respondents believe that there are many ineffective CSOs. This demonstrates awareness in the sector about the need to improve impact, boost the quality of service and better demonstrate its added value. To ensure sustainable and flourishing civil society, according to survey respondents, it is extremely important to: ensure more active citizenship in Ukraine, i.e., have citizens participate in the work of CSOs; work to improve the quality of services CSOs provide; and diversify sources of funding.
Connection to the citizens is of prime importance for sustainability. Many key informants also mentioned that gaps between CSOs and citizens impede impact, complicate diversification of funding, and undermine CSO legitimacy.

To grow domestic state and private corporate giving, CSOs believe that it is necessary to simplify state funding procedures and to strengthen tax incentives for corporate sponsorship. Bridging the gap between CSOs and business could help achieve this objective. Present donor funding is not very diverse in Ukraine. Several participants mentioned a “high entry barrier” into the sector, and lack of start-up funding for new social initiatives. During the interviews, fifteen KII respondents emphasized the need for supporting new, grassroots initiatives in the regions with project funds and OD.

Fourteen KII respondents also spoke about the acute need to develop non-confrontational, action-based activism. Better cooperation with local authorities, support for projects in the newly amalgamated communities, and more funding for local campaigning were named as the necessary conditions for more effective civil society in Ukraine’s regions.

**Conclusions.** The current state of civil-society development in Ukraine requires more attention from the side of USAID to improving the quality of services and impact, developing more diverse sources of funding, strengthening cooperation of CSOs with the national and regional authorities. ENGAGE’s efforts to activate more citizens could further enhance positive dynamics in the sector under the condition there is further support to simple and effective pathways for participation either via CSOs, citizen initiative groups, campaigns or movements.

**Key Recommendations.** With regards to enabling environment (in addition to UCIPR recommendations):

- It is important to continue work related to enabling environment. It is crucial to avoid new restrictive regulations being imposed on the sector. This risk runs high, particularly with the upcoming Presidential and Parliamentary elections in 2019.

- Better align advocacy for regulatory change with the real needs of the sector. Continue focusing on state funding, add more efforts on developing economic activity of CSOs, social enterprise, social services, simplification of cumbersome reporting, and improvement of fiscal regime.

- Promote an associative approach to advocacy and facilitate self-regulation within the sector.

- Pursue development of the nationwide network of non-profit lawyers. Ensure there is assistance for activists under attack, including security assistance and legal aid.

With regards to capacity building (in addition to ISAR recommendations):

- Decentralize OD delivery and offer better-guided, longer-term capacity building. In addition to Marketplace, develop new OD centers and strengthen the existing ones (hubs).

- Ensure there is high quality OD offer on diversification of funding, especially crowd funding, social enterprise, costing and quality assessment of service.

- Promote more social innovation in the sector: support funding to pilots and new models, promote successful results, and scale them. Civil Society Forum could be a great place to share such scalable social innovation.

- Integrate funding for OD into all major grants, even if it is a small component.

- Establish a Knowledge Clearing House to aid better information-sharing about civil society throughout Ukraine.
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3. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

3.1 USAID CIVIL SOCIETY PROJECTS

In July 2014, USAID/Ukraine made two direct awards to local Ukrainian CSO partners: (1) UCIPR for the Civil Society Enabling Environment activity; and (2) ISAR-Ednannia for the Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building activity. Both UCIPR and ISAR-Ednannia had benefited from the advanced capacity development program under USAID’s large civil-society program, Ukraine National Initiatives to Enhance Reforms (UNITER).\(^2\) UNITER, among other efforts, focused on building the internal capacity of the leading civil-society organizations to be more sustainable, effective, and robust which had enabled CSOs to be “international-audit ready.” The UNITER program transitioned UCIPR and ISAR to direct USAID awards by July 2014. These two awards will end in July 2019.

In September 2016, USAID/Ukraine launched the new flagship civil-society program called Enhance Non-Governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagement (ENGAGE), which is working to increase citizen engagement in civic actions at the national, regional, and local level.

- **Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environment Activity implemented by the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR);** July 11, 2014 – July 10, 2019; total project amount $1,500,000  (www.ucipr.org.ua)

  The overall purpose of the Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environment activity is to make the legislative and policy environment more conducive to civil society needs and to reflect European standards. To achieve this, implementer UCIPR focuses on three objectives: (1) to improve the quality of relevant civil society enabling legislation and policy; (2) to increase the capacity of public officials and CSOs to ensure effective implementation of legislation and policy; and (3) to increase UCIPR’s technical and organizational capacity as a leader and driver of civil society legislative efforts. UCIPR’s unique approach will cover the full cycle of improvement of the legislative and administrative environment for civil society development in its key areas. Specifically, UCIPR will combine analysis of shortcomings and opportunities, monitoring of emerging challenges, development of proposals to improve legal acts and administrative practices, initiating and leading advocacy campaigns, and will offer awareness and training efforts, methodological support, and monitoring of adopted legislation for civil society development.

- **Ukraine Civil Society Capacity-Building Project implemented by ISAR-Ednannia;** July 11, 2014 – July 10, 2019; total project amount $2,000,000  (http://ednannia.ua/, http://cd-platform.org/)

  The purpose of the Ukraine Civil Society Capacity-Building activity is to improve the organizational capacity of Ukrainian CSOs to become stronger citizen advocates and government watchdogs. To achieve this purpose, ISAR will focus on three objectives: (1) improve CSOs’ organizational-development skills through the NGO Marketplace (mini-grants voucher system, web-portal and regular capacity-development forums); (2) strengthen the NGO Capacity-Building Marketplace as a tool to provide organizational development (OD) assistance to civil society; and (3) increase the technical and organizational capacity of ISAR-Ednannia as an Intermediary Support Organization (ISO) and Marketplace Administrator.

- **Enhance Non-governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagements (ENGAGE) activity implemented by Pact, Inc.;** October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2021; total

---

project amount $22,000,000

USAID’s flagship ENGAGE program is working to increase citizen awareness of and engagement in civic actions at the national, regional and local level. The ENGAGE program focuses on four key objectives: (1) Enhanced civic education; (2) Support for civic coalitions and initiatives at the national, regional and local levels; (3) Improved organizational capacity of partner CSOs; and (4) Long-term sustainability of civic engagement in democratic reforms. The five-year program will provide funding and capacity-building, and will facilitate networking among citizens, civic organizations, and coalitions on critical areas of democratic reform, with a special focus on anti-corruption. The ENGAGE program builds on the success of the former UNITER civil society strengthening project, which worked to empower Ukrainian CSOs to represent citizens’ interests and drive Ukraine’s reform agenda through more effective advocacy, monitoring, and activism.

3.2 CONTEXT

Since the Euromaidan protests of 2013-2014, Ukrainian civil society has faced significant positive and negative changes in its operating environment. Among the positive developments is an increase of active citizenship and entry of many new actors into civil society; more Ukrainians are engaged in voluntary activity. The armed conflict in eastern Ukraine was a strong impetus for many Ukrainians to volunteer, donate to charity, and support the army and conflict-affected population.

The state, with the entry of many new members of parliament and government officials, has reached out to civil society for assistance in reforms. At the national level, the government set up many cooperative efforts with civil society, most prominently various offices for reforms at line ministries. The process of decentralization has started an important trend of improved citizen engagement in public affairs. Greater transparency of state funds, registers, and introduction of online procurement has strengthened civil oversight and opened more opportunities for CSOs to expose and fight corruption.

At the same time, increasing political competition and the entry of some civil society leaders into politics created more tension between civil society and the state. The introduction of asset e-declaration reporting for anti-corruption groups, which is discriminatory and interferes with the freedom of association and the right to privacy, resulted in a push-back against independent CSOs and a desire to limit their range of operations. The armed conflict also has spillover effects on wider society. Increased circulation of firearms, more incidents of violence, and activism by groups that hold illiberal values and extreme ideas and use violence, point to new threats to civil society in Ukraine. As Russia continues to undermine Ukraine’s integration with Euro-Atlantic institutions, disinformation and political destabilization show their corrosive impact. Ukrainians become less optimistic, especially in the South and Kramatorsk, more anxious about the future, and doubt they will be able to succeed on the way to reform.

---


4 According to the public opinion poll conducted by the Democratic Initiatives Foundation in June 2018 for ENGAGE, the share of respondents of who declared that their experience with the new reforms in country has been only negative (34 percent) has increased by 10 percent since September 2017. The share of those whose experience from reforms had been only positive has remained unchanged (2 percent). The share of those who do not support reforms (25 percent) is similarly growing. See https://dif.org.ua/en/article/the-dissatisfaction-of-ukrainians-with-the-current-government-is-growing-while-trust-of-civil-activists-increases.
4. ASSESSMENT METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

4.1 ASSESSMENT METHODS

To answer the key research questions, the assessment combined both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Prior to fieldwork in Ukraine, the Assessment Team conducted extensive desk research analyzing existing sources of research and information relevant to civil society development in Ukraine. The key data were collected through three main methods.

First, the Assessment Team held semi-structured key informant interviews (KIIs) with UCIPR, ISAR-Ednannia, and Pact/ENGAGE and their partners and sub-grantees, as well as key sector stakeholders in Kyiv and three other regions of Ukraine. The three regional trips included Kharkiv in the East, Odesa in the South, and Uzhgorod in the West. Overall, the Assessment Team conducted KIIs with 74 representatives of 66 organizations. Of the interviewees, 41 represented Ukrainian CSOs; 16 USAID implementing partners; 9 international donor organizations, 5 national, regional or local governments and 3 experts. Forty one interviewees were based in Kyiv, 13 in Kharkiv, 11 in Odesa and 9 in Uzhhorod. The full list of interviewees is presented in Annex 1; their responses are anonymous in the report. The KII protocol is attached in Annex 2.

Figure 1: KII Distribution by Type

Second, the Assessment Team conducted two focus-group discussions (FGDs) with CSO representatives: one in Kyiv (thirteen participants) and one in Uzhhorod (eight participants). Among FGD participants were CSOs who were recipients of foreign donor funding, including recipients of ISAR-Ednannia grants, as well as CSOs and activists from informal civic groups that have never received any foreign funding. The FGD in Kyiv lasted three hours. The FGD in Uzhhorod lasted two hours.
Finally, the Assessment Team administered an online survey to Ukrainian CSOs. The survey questionnaire was emailed to 1,431 CSO contacts. The full version of the survey questionnaire in English is presented in Annex 3. The sample was created using contacts provided by the implementing partners and the U.K. Embassy. They included:

- UCIPR’s contact list of CSOs and individuals recipients of legal aid; members of UCIPR’s networks;
- ISAR-Ednannia’s list of participants of the 2017 Civil Society Forum;
- ENGAGE’s list of grantees, regional Hubs, Centre UA regional representatives, Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR) regional networks;
- The U.K. Embassy list of grantees.

The survey generated 328 responses which equals a representative 22 percent response rate. The survey was distributed between July 25 and August 15; this was during the usual Ukrainian vacation period, which may have lowered the response rate.

4.2 LIMITATIONS

FOCUS ON WESTERN DONOR FUNDING RECIPIENTS

The USAID Implementing Partners (UCIPR, ISAR-Ednannia, ENGAGE, and U-Media) provided the primary list for KIIs. The Assessment Team tried to expand the list to include CSOs that do not receive USAID funding or do not receive any foreign funding at all. However, CSOs benefiting from Western donor funding and, in particular, USAID funding, are overrepresented among the survey respondents and KIIs.

LIMITED GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE/DOMINANCE OF KYIV-BASED CSOS

Among online survey respondents, 31 percent are CSOs based in Kyiv City and 10 percent are based in Kyiv oblast. Other regions with high number of CSO respondents are Donetsk (6 percent), Lviv (5 percent) Dnipropetrovsk (5 percent), and Kharkiv (5 percent). There are no respondents from Crimea. The regions with lowest number of respondents are Ternopil, Zakarpatia, and Chernivtsi. There is no database of functioning CSOs against which one can juxtapose regional representation of the survey respondents, but the United State Register of Enterprises and Organizations in Ukraine offers the most proximate data. Within the Register, as of 2016, the highest number of CSOs registered as a civic association (hromadska orhanizatsiia), the most common legal form of CSO registration in Ukraine, were Kyiv City (12 percent), followed by Donetsk (7 percent), Lviv (7 percent), Kyiv (6 percent), Odesa (6 percent), Dnipropetrovsk (6 percent) and Kharkiv (5 percent) regions. Kyiv City and Kyiv Oblast CSOs are significantly overrepresented.

For KIIs, the Assessment Team had deliberately focused on Kyiv, where key sector stakeholders are based, and the cities Kharkiv, Odesa, and Uzhhorod to represent the eastern, southern and western regions of Ukraine. Voices of CSOs from other regions of Ukraine are represented through the online survey. Despite these geographic limitations, the Assessment Team believes that the report still presents a generalized picture of Ukrainian CSO views on enabling environment, capacity-building opportunities,
and other critical sector needs, including significant regional variation. Further research is needed to examine this regional diversity to a greater extent.

The sample of KII participants also lacked CSOs from rural areas or small towns. The Assessment Team tried to mitigate this bias by conducting interviews with CSOs and implementing partners who work with communities beyond the regional capitals.
5. CURRENT STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

To what extent does the current legal environment in Ukraine enable or prohibit CSO development? What else needs to be done to ensure a sustainable, flourishing civil society?

5.1 FINDINGS

This section addresses the shifting civil society landscape after the Euromaidan. The analysis is structured around featuring main strengths and challenges in the sectors with the particular focus on the following assessment questions:

1. Is there a critical mass of CSOs that have adequate organizational and technical capacities to fulfill their missions and sustain their goals?
2. Is there a relevant infrastructure for continued organizational development support?
3. How do CSOs support themselves financially?
4. To what extent do the financial conditions to support civil society exist, especially those outside of government?

STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Size and Scale of the Civil Society Sector

Many new civic actors. Since the Euromaidan, voluntary initiatives have led to the formation of new organizations. Whereas assistance to the army, veterans, and conflict-affected population dominated new civic activism, there were also new initiatives in urban development, the environment and animal rights, human rights, and the fight against corruption. The main strength of these new civil society organizations (CSOs) is highly motivated and dedicated people who entered the civic sector from the private sector, bringing more innovative approaches to their work. These new CSOs tend to have better links to their target audiences compared to pre-Euromaidan groups. Since they grew out of volunteer initiatives, they tend to depend more on volunteers.

Increased volunteerism since the Euromaidan. According to our desk research, 14 percent of Ukrainians volunteered in 2016, compared to 10 percent in 2010. As reported by a regional CSO during our KII: “[We] have more volunteers now and that reflects changes in the society. The culture of volunteering means that CSOs are important. Even if volunteers would do basic, simple work for us, their participation is a good sign.”

Greater legitimacy of civil society. Ukrainian authorities recognize the importance of civil society, political parties attempt to enlist civil-society leaders to their ranks, and civil-society speakers appear more frequently in the media. Against a background of extremely low trust in public authorities, public trust in voluntary organizations and civic associations is increasing. Civil society organizations are among the most trusted social institutions in Ukraine, along with Church and the army. According to a poll

8 https://dif.org.ua/article/blagodiynist-i-volonterstvo-2016-rezultati-sotsiologichnogo-doslidzhenya
conducted by the Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation and Razumkov Center in May 2018, 60 percent of Ukrainians believe that CSOs are necessary, and 34 percent know CSOs in their city, town or village — but only 5 percent are CSO members.⁹

Civil Society Infrastructure

CSO sustainability has slightly improved. The USAID CSO Sustainability Index for Ukraine enhanced from 3.4 in 2014 to 3.2 in 2017. The notable positive changes occurred in infrastructure and organizational capacity aspects of sustainability thanks to the development of intermediary support organizations (ISOs) in the regions and strengthened organizational capacities of local CSOs with international donors’ support. A network of regional CSOs that provide organizational and financial support to local CSOs has expanded. New centers opened in Sumy, Rivne, and Vinnytsia. Two Ukrainian universities are licensed by the Ministry of Education to offer Master’s and Bachelor’s degree in CSO management.

Growing interest in developing organizational capacity. Of the online survey respondents from both regional and Kyiv-based CSOs, 73 percent said they could “partially” meet their OD needs. OD could be complicated due lack of funds, insufficient experience and knowledge among personnel or lack of human resource. The main providers of OD services for respondents were freelance consultants (40 percent) and online educational platforms (25 percent). In most cases fees to cover external consultants are provided by western donors.¹⁰

In-Country Funding Sources for Civil Society

Upward trend in private funding. There are more local sources of support available to CSOs. According to data collected by the Ukrainian Philanthropists Forum from 89 charities who participated in their annual ranking, in 2016 charities spent UAH 1.8 billion (approximately USD 70.3 million), which is a UAH 384 million increase compared to the previous year.¹⁰ However, the data covers only 27 percent of all charity expenditures in the country; the actual number is bigger. According to the State Fiscal Service Data, charities spent UAH 6.5 billion (approximately USD 254 million) in 2016.¹¹ A representative survey of 200 charities conducted in early 2018 indicates that 56 percent of charity funding comes from private (individual and corporate) sources.¹²

State national funding. Our desk research indicates that, in 2018, the national government allocated UAH 368 million (Ukrainian hryvnia; approximately USD 10 million) to CSOs, which is 1.7 times more than in the previous two years.¹³ Most state funding for CSO projects is channeled via ministries (e.g. Ministry of Social Policy, Ministry of Youth and Sports). Thanks to UCIPR’s advocacy in cooperation with veterans’ CSOs, the government introduced a competitive procedure for the Ministry of Social Policy to distribute public funds.¹⁴ In 2018, the Ministry will spend 19 million UAH on eighty project proposals for veteran organizations.

National Fund for Civil Society Development. KIl’s also discussed plans to establish this Fund, envisaged by the National Strategy of Civil Society Development for 2016-2020. The main goal of the Fund, according to the draft law, is to provide institutional support to CSOs, rather than finance projects. The European Centre for Not-for Profit Law (ECNL) points to a vague scope of work; a
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¹¹ Ibidem.
¹³ http://texty.org.ua/pg/article/hohobi/read/86189/Derzhava_vydilya_gromadskym_organizaciym_368_milioniv_gryven
¹⁴ http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/156-2018-percentD0percentBF
cumbersome governance structure; and risks related to the definitions of institutional capacity, and to the inclusion of religious and business organizations and trade unions as recipients.\textsuperscript{15}

Six KIIs, including representatives of major donors to civil society, shared pessimism about the potential Fund’s ability to support civil society in a transparent and unbiased manner, due to the lack of trust in government. They feared that the Fund could be used to support loyal CSOs, and that Western donors could be obliged to channel contributions via this Fund. Three KIIs were more optimistic; they said that if percentage philanthropy is introduced, resources can be accumulated and spent via this Fund, and the Fund could improve CSOs’ access to state funding.

**Improved availability and distribution of funding at the local level.** Overall, the oblast and local authorities interviewed showed interest in supporting CSOs through a competitive process. At the regional level, a total of USD 11 million was allocated for activities related to the development of civil society.\textsuperscript{16} For example, according to a representative of the Kyiv City Administration, Kyiv City allocated UAH 4.5 million in 2018 to support civil-society initiatives on a competitive basis. In 2018, CSOs submitted 135 projects; 23 projects were supported. In addition to that, UAH 50 million was distributed through participatory budget in Kyiv with UAH 1 million per project.\textsuperscript{17} In Zhytomyr oblast, the regional state administration distributed 1 million UAH on a competitive basis for social projects of CSOs in 2017.\textsuperscript{18}

Our research indicates that many ISAR grantees successfully generate funds from local sources. According to a Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) survey of ISAR grantees, 64 percent of grantees having three and more OD grants successfully fundraise from local communities, and 57 percent of them from local budgets.

A participant in a focus group discussion in Kyiv voiced satisfaction with participatory budget and e-petitions as potential tools to mobilize and assist citizens’ groups (e.g., 500,000 Kyiv residents took part in voting). Lviv and Dnipro City allocated UAH 16 million each for participatory budget projects in 2017.\textsuperscript{19} In Kharkiv, a participatory budget was launched in 2018 with a UAH 50 million budget; citizens’ initiatives and CSOs can both apply for funding.

**Culture of private individual giving gradually develops.** Ukraine has risen from 102\textsuperscript{nd} position in 2013 to 90\textsuperscript{th} in 2017 in the World Giving Index assembled by Charities Aid Foundation.\textsuperscript{20} A poll reflects this: 37 percent of Ukrainians gave money to charities or on charitable causes in 2016, compared to 21 percent in 2012.\textsuperscript{21} Forty-two percent gave food, clothing or money to people or civil society organizations, an increase from 29 percent in 2012. Though the lion’s share of this support was conflict-related (army needs), aid to other vulnerable groups (orphans, the sick, people with disabilities, the elderly) was also covered.

**Alternative fundraising methods.** Many CSOs, especially smaller ones and those set up after 2014, said that they have either tried or intend to try alternative sources of funding (crowdfunding, local businesses, voluntary contributions of their members, sale of their services or products). Crowdfunding in Ukraine is a relatively new phenomenon. Established in 2012 with UAH 30,000, by mid-2018 the first
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\textsuperscript{16} Association for Community Self-Organization Assistance, *Analytical Digest No 7: Civil Society Development* (in Ukrainian), https://drive.google.com/open?id=1pq2vaDEtDy92ejNFOXwMO77RkpPQxPAXQs.

\textsuperscript{17} https://gb.kyivcity.gov.ua/pages/history

\textsuperscript{18} http://oda.xt.gov.ua/koordinaczijna-rada-viznachila-20-proektiv-peremozhcziv-yaki-otrimayut-grant-vid-zhitomirskoi-oda-perelik.html

\textsuperscript{19} https://lviv.pb.org.ua/about

\textsuperscript{20} https://www.cafonline.org/docs/default-source/about-us-publications/caworldgivingindex2017_2167a_web_210917.pdf?sfvrsn=ed1dac40_10

\textsuperscript{21} https://dif.org.ua/article/blagodijnist-i-volunterstvo-2016-rezultati-sotsiologichnogo-doslidzhennya
Ukrainian crowdfunding platform Spilnokosht has collected UAH 17.8 million from over 31,000 donors for more than 250 projects. According to its founder, the top three fundraising causes are education, the media, and human rights. Other crowdfunding platforms include Na Starte, Go Fund, Ukrainian Philanthropic Marketplace, People’s Project and Facebook.

However, only three CSO representatives interviewed said that their CSOs used crowdfunding. A CSO raised money for its Inclusion Festival, and said that it was more difficult than expected. An Odesa CSO representative said that the group had developed a crowdfunding platform. Our desk research also indicates that online giving still remains rather unpopular in Ukraine. According to a study conducted by Corestone Group and GfK Ukraine in early 2018, charities found more effective to collect money through face-to-face interaction, whereas Ukrainians prefer to donate cash or goods, only 5 percent donated money online.

Several CSOs interviewed said that they turned to local businesses for funding, which usually was given as in-kind contributions. According to a study conducted by NGO Forum among CSOs in five eastern regions of Ukraine, local CSOs tend to ask businesses for assistance in implementation of their projects less often than they ask local authorities (55 percent mentioned such requests). Two organizations (one in Kharkiv and one in Odesa) said that they are mostly funded by local businesses that are either among their funders or members.

A couple of key informants stated that legislation on tax benefits for business donations to CSOs should be improved. Several noted that the Government drafted a law to amend the Tax Code. This change would exempt persons with disabilities, the poor, and other vulnerable groups from personal income tax and military tax related to charitable aid.

KIIs and focus group participants in Kyiv suggested a need to develop percentage philanthropy. According to the International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL), “the central idea of percentage philanthropy is that taxpayers may designate a certain percentage of their income tax paid to a specific non-profit, nongovernmental organization (NGO), and in some cases to other organizations, mainly churches.”

**CHALLENGES**

**Narrow Funding Base**

Financial viability. Both in the case of “old” and “new” CSOs, financial viability remains the weakest element of CSO sustainability in Ukraine, according to the USAID CSO Sustainability Index and an overwhelming majority of KIIs interviewed by the AT. The situation has remained largely unchanged since before the Euromaidan. Foreign donor funding remains the main (and in some cases, the only) source of income for Ukrainian CSOs. Some volunteer-based CSOs that emerged after the Euromaidan said that they manage to exist without foreign grants and rely on volunteering of their members, but they said that the lack of funding is a major obstacle to continuous activity and organizational development.

Local sources of support such as state funding, business or individual donations, or income generating activities are either not accessible or have tiny shares in the budget of most CSOs. Of the online survey respondents, 75 percent named Western grants as their main source of funding. (See Figure 2.)
Access to funding is a more acute problem for organizations in the regions, especially outside oblast centers. Improved organizational capacity does not seem to immediately lead to better funding. As the leader of human rights organization from Kharkiv, who recently received capacity building assistance from several providers, including ISAR, stated: “It looks that we do everything right, but we have not had a quality transformation for the last two years. We do not get our projects funded. The best institutional development would be support to our projects. It would be the best to keep the team and the motivation going.”

State and local sources of funding are hard to administer and access. According to UCIPR, 85 million UAH is awarded for CSOs of people with disabilities for their statutory activities with no competition. Our research shows that only 2.5 percent of state funding is allocated to CSOs on competitive basis. Many KILs were skeptical about state and local government funding. A representative of a CSO for anti-terrorist operation (ATO) veterans who conducted an audit of public funds spent by the Ministry of Social Policy on veterans’ organizations stated that millions of UAH are spent on...
unknown organizations for dubious causes: “we got a list of thirty-eight CSOs, out of which there were three barely related to ATO”.

Those few KII who tried to apply for public funding through grants or contracts complained about bureaucratic impediments. As one CSO leader explained:

> There is an annual competitive call for social services in Odesa. But many CSOs do not know how to work with the Treasury. The calls are made in the middle of the year, and, after coordination of every comma, the projects start in December. What they offer now through social services is small money of UAH 35,000 and lots of bureaucracy. There is little interest in this. About seven years ago we had an experience when we did a project and all the paperwork and we did not receive the refund of UAH 20,000 back after a year of bringing them papers.

**Connectivity of Civil Society Actors**

**Low capacity to engage citizens.** The overwhelming majority of KIIs named failure to engage as the main weakness of Ukrainian CSOs. This problem is particularly relevant for well-established Kyiv-based CSOs engaged in advocacy. Our research shows that currently only 7 percent of citizens report engagement in civic activism; 87 percent of respondents say that they do not belong to any civic association.28

During KII, interviewed donors characterized both national and regional partner CSOs as “expert clubs” having insufficient or no support from the citizens. In their opinion, organizations cooperating with international donor programs do not see need to get their communities’ support but rather focus on donor requirements for project implementation and reporting. Indeed, 26 percent of survey respondents state that their expertise is the strongest asset. However, online survey also shows that the sector understands the importance of citizen engagement. 87 percent of respondents state that for sustainable civil society it is “extremely important” or “very important” to engage citizens in the work of CSOs. KII in Zakarpattia revealed that the citizens were more actively engaged with CSOs if their ideas were supported and activities resulted in fast, tangible results. Currently only 10 percent of the online survey respondents consider their positive image, citizen support of their goals, and ability to mobilize community as their main strengths.

**Little capacity for coalition building and cooperation.** Whereas during the Euromaidan and the beginning of the armed conflict, Ukrainian society demonstrated strong consolidation and increased cooperation, KII participants noted that Ukrainian CSOs have only a weak capacity for coalition building and cooperation. Competition spurred by the search for funds or CSO leaders’ personal ambition contributes to insufficient levels of cooperation among Ukrainian CSOs, according to KII respondents. According to the online survey, 50 percent of CSOs do not take part in any coalition.

Of those reporting membership in coalitions, majority named the Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR), UNDP Civil Society Hubs, Coalition of Civil Society Organizations, Coalition for Civic Initiatives, EU Platform for CS Development, and Coalition for transparent budgets including Dozorro (please refer to the Figure 4 below)
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Insufficient Civic Literacy and Education. Low level of civic engagement is also related to poor civic literacy of Ukrainians. Despite the fact that 39 percent of online survey CSOs claim activity in civic education, our desk research indicates that Ukrainians are poorly aware of citizens’ rights and duties, of the way how public budgets are generated and spent, how much taxes they pay to the state, names of their MPs and deputies in the local councils and held inconsistent beliefs regarding tolerance, non-discrimination and human rights. At the same time, KIIIs with CSOs reveal that civic education is rarely part of their activities and they struggle to explain citizens the purpose of civic organization. In Kharkiv, local CSOs state that anti-corruption activity is equated by citizens with political activity and citizens shy away from politics.

All interviewed donors emphasized the importance of blanket civic education at the grass-root levels. Thus, the ENGAGE program has elaborated the Civic Education Curricula and textbook for grades 1-9 in secondary schools, and encourages its sub-grantees to include the civic education component into their activities. IFES created a course on civic education for universities’ students that covers human rights, elections, skills of democratic citizenship and critical thinking plus methodology of teaching the course. Both courses have been approved by the Ministry of Education of Ukraine. Comprehensive information campaign “Change.org” of PACT/ENGAGE with 30 local CSOs plans to engage adults or kids outside the schools to participate in the course via training, conferences, public lectures, simulation game for teenagers “State Building”. National Democratic Institute (NDI) fills the gap between CSOs and communities with targeted public communication of its local partner Institute Respublica with citizens in 30 locations: informational hours with citizens, clubs of active citizens, newspaper with success stories of active citizens, regional CS forums.

29 See the results of the public opinion poll ‘Civic Literacy in Ukraine’ carried out by Kyiv International Institute of Sociology for the UNDP (http://www.ua.undp.org/content/dam/ukraine/docs/DG/socinnov/CivilLiteracyEng.pdf) and of the public opinion poll ‘Public Opinion about Human Rights in Ukraine’ conducted by the Democratic Initiatives Foundation and the Ukrainian Sociology Service for UNDP (https://dif.org.ua/article/gromadska-dumka-pro-prava-lyudini-v-ukraini) both in 2016.
Regional Discrepancies

Uneven capacity of civil society across Ukraine, with striking disparities between Kyiv-based and regional CSOs. Kyiv groups are rarely involved in strengthening regional CSOs, with the exception of few donor-supported projects to build regional networks and work with local communities, as in case of ENGAGE-funded RPR and Centre UA.

Several KII respondents pointed out that “new” CSOs have less-developed organizational structures and capacities. Their understanding of OD is limited, interviewees explained, mostly related to fundraising and external communications with different stakeholders including local constituents, rather than internal organizational procedures, governance, and service quality. Many activists reported suffering from professional burnout that slowed some new CSOs’ activities. As one KII put it, many former managers or creative people from private business who had joined the civil sector left after two or three years disappointed due to the stagnation of reform, lack of regular income and disorganization/ineffectiveness in the civic sector.

KII participants at regional CSOs demonstrated poor understanding of international donors’ requirements. This was especially true of “new” activists and volunteer-based organizations. They consider the donors’ OD demands to be superfluous and far removed from the practical work they do for their communities.

Two respondents, one from an international NGO and one from an experienced Ukrainian resource center, noted a certain decrease in civil society expertise. Due to the influx of many new CSOs, many employees act unprofessionally, and lack expertise and non-profit management skills. From the government side, a KII respondent claimed CSOs showed little professionalism and awareness about local governments, which negatively impacts their capacity to conduct civic oversight. The ISAR Civil Society Forum 2016 resolution indicated that increasing the expert potential of civil and charity organizations was a prerequisite for smart changes.

Quality and spread of civil society is uneven across Ukraine. KII respondents from donors, USAID implementing partners, and national CSOs, which cooperate with different regions, pointed to many “depressive” regions, where it was difficult to find a reliable partner or qualified CSOs experts for partnerships. Zakarpattia, Khmelnytsky, Volyn, Chernivtsi, and Sumy are transborder regions that have high migration flows from Ukraine to the European Union (EU) or Russia. Besides, Zakarpattia has the largest national minorities of Roma, Hungarians, and Slovaks that significantly influence the regional civil-society landscape. Kirovohrad oblast is an economically underdeveloped region in the center of the country with poor transport connections to all regions of Ukraine, including Kyiv. All those regions experience the lack of qualified personnel and have low civic activism.

The monitoring of the implementation of the National Strategy on Civil Society Development prepared by UNDP in 2018 demonstrates that almost half of the oblasts have failed to implement the strategy.

---

31 Compare to the results of CSOs survey conducted in five Eastern regions of Ukraine by NGO Forum in late 2017-early 2018, according to which 41 percent of CSOs mention professional burnout of their staff/members as a main obstacle for future CSO development. See http://www.ngoforum.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/NGOForum_analysis.pdf, page 39. According to another study of humanitarian CSOs conducted by NGO Forum in Donetsk, Luhansk and other regions of Ukraine, the main reasons for professional burnout relate to organizational processes and management of the organization and staff rather than personal conflict-related experiences. The primary reasons for burnout include “uneven workload among employees; work overload and overtime; irregular vacations; imbalance of responsibility and authority; complex and imperfect work documentation; absence or ineffectiveness of staff evaluation; unclear prospects of further cooperation with the organization; problems in cooperation with other organizations and local authorities; inadequate needs assessments of beneficiaries”. See http://www.ngoforum.org.ua/how-to-identify-prevent-and-reduce-burnout/. Whereas the scope of the study is limited to humanitarian CSOs, the listed problems related to organization and staff management may be common to non-humanitarian CSOs in Ukraine that have under-developed organizational structures and policies.
Integrity Challenge and Uncivil Actors

Fake CSOs. While public trust in CSOs grows, the sector faces a growing problem of integrity related to many fake CSOs. Despite the high number of registered non-profit entities, many groups are inactive. In other words, they exist only on paper, or, more worrisome, use a CSO as cover to pursue other political, business, or criminal goals. Several interviewees explained that many CSOs are registered by political parties, local business groups or paramilitary organizations in order to gain loyal “pocket” civil-society voices. In some cases this is done to launder money and influence local politics. Our desk research also confirms that the proliferation of “pocket” CSOs created by authorities, parties or oligarchs is the most widespread concern for the sector development: 74 percent of respondents in a CSO survey conducted in 2017 named it). For local governments who aim to cooperate with civil society, distinguishing between ‘fake’ and ‘real’ CSOs appears a difficult task. For example, in Kyiv city, out of 15,000 legally registered CSOs, only up to 500 are active. KII respondents from Kyiv city council stated that it is difficult to distinguish real CSOs from fake ones. This is especially acute when local government wants to engage in public consultations, run due-diligence for grants, and engage legitimate organizations in working groups.

Radicalization. A worrisome trend in post-Euromaidan civil-society development often mentioned by interviewees is the radicalization of civic activism and the emergence of far-right actors that use hate speech, promote ethnic and religious intolerance, threaten to use or use violence against the “Other,” be they the LGBT community, feminists, leftists, ethnic minorities, or the Russian Orthodox Church. In Zakarpattia, many KII participants, especially representing Hungarian and Roma communities, raised concern that groups such as Karpatska Sich contribute to interethnic tensions in the region. Even more worrisome, Ukraine’s law-enforcement agencies provide these groups with impunity from prosecution or even tacit support. This type of activism poses a threat to Ukraine’s democratic development for a number of reasons. First, such civic activism promotes extreme views and ideologies and obstructs fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens. Second, it undermines legitimate civil society and the idea of non-violent citizen action. Third, it undermine citizens’ confidence in the state and law enforcement agencies. If unresponded to, such radical activism legitimizes use of political violence, which is potentially explosive in a conflict-torn country.

In Odesa, interviewed civic activists complained about armed criminal or semi-criminal organizations that represent themselves as patriotic CSOs established during the Euromaidan. They are believed to take part in illegal property seizures and extortions from business, cover up corruption of local elites, and attack civil-society leaders who fight corruption. According to interviewees, these suspect organizations have members who sit on the Civic Council, and enjoy the support of the city administration, which even provides them downtown office space. They also discredit the public image of civil society. According to a Kyiv-based key expert in decentralization, groups composed of young, physically-fit men that are labeled as “civil society” are engaged by local politicians and businessmen to solve business conflicts or take part in local power struggles.

---

32 CSO Sustainability Index 2017: As of July 31, 2017, 165,735 organizations had nonprofit status, including 30,550 public associations, 7,978 charitable organizations, 123 creative unions, 18,438 religious organizations, 348 unions, 660 associations, and 17,454 trade unions.


34 http://www.ccc-tck.org.ua/download/library/69/

Deteriorating civic space. Although there are notable improvements in the regulatory environment for CSOs, there are worrisome signs that civic space is narrowing. First, Ukraine is witnessing a series of incidents of physical violence, including physical assaults, murder attempts and assassinations, property damage and intimidation of civic activists.

Civil society groups and activists in the regions that engage in high-profile anti-corruption activities and community mobilization, especially on such issues as illegal land allocations, environmental pollution, justice, and misuse of local budgets, face physical security risks. LGBT and feminist movement activists are often targets of radical right groups. In addition, attorneys doing human rights work and activists working on conflict-related issues are among at-risk groups. Interviewees reported that several attacks on activists in the Odesa and Kharkiv regions took place in 2017 and early 2018.

According to the Human Rights Information Centre report that documented 50 cases of interference with activities of human rights defenders and civic activists from March 2014 to March 2017, “the common feature for most of these cases is the lack of effective investigation by the police and total impunity of perpetrators.” In many cases, the police either fail to launch criminal investigation, or choose the incorrect legal classification of criminal offence (e.g., hooliganism instead of hate crimes). In cases in which police managed to investigate cases and submit them to the court, only the attackers are prosecuted, whereas those behind the attacks are not identified. According to the most recent UN report, “Long drawn-out investigations and police de-prioritization of cases involving attacks against civil society activists and media professionals continue to contribute to the compression of civic space as perpetrators are not brought to account.”

Second, there are smear campaigns against civic activists and organizations, especially those fighting against corruption or vested interests. Law enforcement agencies seem to be directly involved in such campaigns. For example, criminal investigations against such CSOs as the Anti-Corruption Action Centre and Patients of Ukraine and their respective leaders involved conducting surveillance and gathering of private data that was later “leaked” online. Criminal prosecution serves as a tool for discrediting and intimidating not only of the CSO and activists involved, but the entire CSO sector. Another risk group for discrediting campaigns are activists dealing with armed conflict-related issues, in particular those who visit non-government controlled territory. The Human Rights Information Centre documented cases when activists from this category received threats after their personal data was published on the Myrotvorets website. The website, allegedly launched with the support of government officials, publishes personal data of individuals, including media professionals and NGO activists, who are labelled as "terrorists" or "separatist supporters". Similarly, there has been no effective

---

36 Civic space can be defined as a set of conditions that allow civil society organizations and citizens to organize, participate and communicate freely and to influence the political and social structures around them. The freedoms of association, assembly and expression are crucial for civic space. See CIVICUS Monitor 2018, https://monitor.civicus.org/whatiscivicspace/.
43 Ibidem.
criminal investigation against the Myrotvorets website opened on the grounds of obstructing professional activity of media professionals and violating personal privacy.\textsuperscript{44}

**Threats of Restrictive Regulation: Shrinking Public Space**

There are concerns about restrictive regulations that are imposed, or could be imposed on CSOs. Our desk research indicates that a large share of CSOs believe that there is purposeful backlash of the government against independent CSOs and civic activists.\textsuperscript{45} Anti-corruption CSOs are particularly vulnerable. Introduction of e-declarations for CSO employees is just one recent example. New restrictive laws are in the pipeline, such as the proposed Draft Laws No. 6675 on Amendments to the Tax Code of Ukraine to Ensure Transparency of the Financing of Activities of Civic Associations and of the Use of International Technical Assistance, No. 6674 on Amendments to Some Legislative Acts to Ensure Public Transparency of Information on Finance Activity of Civic Associations and of The Use of International Technical Assistance and No.8501 on Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine on Transparency and Openness of Information about the Activities of Charitable Organizations and Civic Associations Receiving Funding from Foreign States and Foreign Non-Governmental Organizations. The draft laws impose additional reporting for CSOs, the last one for CSOs with more than 50 percent foreign funding. The deterioration of the legal environment for CSOs was reflected in the revision of this dimension of CSO Sustainability Index from 3.4 to 3.5 points in 2017, to the level that existed before the Euromaidan.

5.2 **CONCLUSIONS**

**OPPORTUNITIES**

- Since the Euromaidan protests of 2013–2014, many new civic actors emerged in Ukraine formed by initiative citizens or volunteers.
- Civil society has acquired greater legitimacy in Ukraine and a high level of citizens’ trust.
- The positive change occurred in the infrastructure dimension of civil-society sustainability via developing networks of CSO hubs, assistance centers and academic education programs on CSO management.
- There is growing interest in organizational capacity development among regional CSOs.
- Local sources of funding, such as state, local government and individual donations are on the rise. Despite lack of competitive procedures, the accountability and access to state funding improves in some sectors, such as funding for veteran CSOs.
- Tools of local democracy, partially thanks to decentralization, make citizen engagement in policy-making more effective.

**CHALLENGES**

- Over-reliance on Western donors in terms of both funding and aid priorities is the main challenge for civil society sustainability in Ukraine.


\textsuperscript{45} According to a survey of 192 CSO representatives conducted by the Democratic Initiatives Foundation in December 2017, 48.5% of respondents believe so, whereas 37.5% consider that such cases are rare and there is no systemic campaign. Meanwhile, 23 % of respondents said that their CSO had experienced obstacles to their activity imposed by the government. https://dif.org.ua/uploads/pdf/1396398165a9eeef1b022177.77359526.pdf, p. 18.
CSOs have low capability to engage citizens and communicate about CSO work to wide audiences.

Knowledge and skills in using alternative to Western grants fundraising tools, in particularly crowdfunding, is nascent but remains insufficient.

Capacity of newly-registered and regional CSOs remains weak and the level of development of civil society across Ukraine patchy.

Weak coalition building and lack of integrity in civil society. There is a significant number of ‘fake’ CSOs that pursue dubious, sometime uncivil goals.

Poor civic literacy causes misunderstanding of citizens’ rights and duties, civil society functioning, and possible ways of civic participation. That results in the low level of citizens’ engagement into CSOs’ work.

Deteriorating civic space: Risks of restrictive regulation, smear campaigns and civic activists, especially for anti-corruption, local government watchdog and LGBT groups combined with impunity from prosecution for perpetrators of attacks against civil society actors.

Growth of ‘uncivil’ civic actors, in particular radical far-right groups, who instigate hate, intolerance and violence.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

To capitalize on an upward trend in local funding, donors should introduce co-funding incentives to motivate CSOs to fundraise from local sources. The emphasis should be on fundraising from local communities and the private sector. Local fundraising is also a path to better connection to citizens’ and local communities’ support of CSOs activities. Provide access and build skills of local CSOs in best instruments of the local fundraising.

Consider support to development of percentage philanthropy through facilitation of public discussion about potential model and necessary legislative changes. Lessons learned from Moldova and other Eastern European countries could stimulate thinking in the right direction. To be successful it would require a detailed design and a strong advocacy campaign about the added value to the sector for Ukraine’s social and economic development as it will require changes in the tax code and administration of taxation.

Ensure a diversified regional approach to civil-society development. Focus on the regions that get less attention from donors and have fewer professional CSOs, such as Zaporizhzhia, Kherson, Khmelnytsky, Zakarpattia, Kyivograd (Kropyvnytsky), Cherkasy, Zhytomyr, Volyn, Ternopil, and Sumy. A diversified regional approach should be based on civil society assessments in the regions and include program support to initiatives that get the most support from local communities.

Promote regional and inter-regional partnerships and coalitions/movements.

Civic education programs should be expanded from educational institutions (schools, universities) to wider communities, including the hyper-local level – villages and district (rayon) centers.

Ensure more efforts in OD are directed towards new and regional CSOs. Develop regional OD programs with mid- to long-term modules and mentorships. The OD centers should be available in all regions of Ukraine. They could become networking centers for local CSOs, hubs of information, providers of training and consultancy support. They could be linked up to community hubs or centers.
Further efforts should be directed to reform the delivery of the state funding to CSOs via state grants, local grants, or participatory budgeting. Particular attention should be paid to development of the National Fund to Support Civil Society. Civil society's involvement in shaping this new institution and civic oversight and accountability are key. USAID and other donors supporting decentralization reform should continue to engage with local governments and local government associations (e.g., Association of Ukrainian Cities, Association of Amalgamated Territorial Communities) to promote effective support to CSOs at the local level.

Support for activists and CSOs’ staff might help overcome the burnout and disillusionment among CSOs, especially those working with human rights and vulnerable groups (internally displaced persons, IDPs), people with disabilities, LGBT citizens) and anti-corruption.

The mediation and conflict-resolution programs should be launched to assist civil-society actors to overcome the barriers to cooperation and integrity. In view of the growing polarization around some issues and increase of radical groups promote the practice of empathetic dialogue at a core of which is deep listening and understanding the problems and positions of your counterparts.

Security issues for CSOs and civic activists should be addressed via legal assistance in case of threats or attacks, court litigation, security training, and teams of rapid response for emergency cases. Any case of violence against civic activists should not stay unnoticed or uninvestigated.

Support CSO advocacy efforts aimed at abolish existing laws and drafts laws that restrict civic space. Support monitoring and documentation of attacks against civil society and state efforts to end impunity for perpetrators of such attacks.

5.4 ISAR APPROACHES AND RESULTS

Which ISAR project approaches and activities have been most effective in achieving their respective objectives? Did the ISAR projects yield unexpected results?

FINDINGS

ISAR. A majority of KII respondents belonging to CSOs demonstrated awareness about the opportunities of ISAR’s OD sub-grants program. In the regions, in particular in Uzhgorod, CSOs and focus group participants were less aware about opportunities offered by ISAR. A focus group and KII respondents in Zakarpattia demonstrated extremely weak knowledge of grant applications, mission and strategic planning, human resources, and how to build partnerships.

ISAR’s activities beyond its OD grants and Civil Society Forum were much less often mentioned in the KIIs. Such activities as regional advocacy schools, OD trainings, community of practice meetings, social entrepreneurship development, development of community foundations, training of trainers, design of standards for Marketplace service providers, and Kyiv Civil Society Forum were less known.

A majority of ISAR sub-grantees are regional CSOs. 64 percent of ISAR’s grantees implement their activities at the regional level. Our research showed that most of Marketplace users are established CSOs; 75 percent of CSOs that received three or more ISAR grants were established before 2014. Only 25 percent of this group are new CSOs established in 2014–2015.46

For most CSOs (86 percent of those with three or more grants; 78 percent of those with less than three grants), Marketplace grants were the only sources of funding for organizational development (OD). Our research shows an appreciation of such funding opportunities. Per KII’s survey of ISAR:

---

46 Survey of ISAR grantees conducted by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) in 2017.
There is limited number of donors supporting the organizational development of NGOs in Ukraine. Most donors provide funding for program activities. SIDA, IRF and DANIDA are few donors that focus on OD but mostly support large established CSOs; the majority of donors prefer supporting program activities only. ISAR provides opportunities to allocate time, funds and expertise to OD.

Even more important, ISAR’s Marketplace is among the few donors that offer grants for newly registered NGOs and is the only organization that provides OD support for new organizations along with an opportunity to participate in networking events.

ISAR also provides noticeable assistance to vulnerable groups. ISAR reports that between 13 percent and 24 percent of OD mini-grants are allocated to CSOs representing LGBT individuals, IDPs, people with disabilities, and groups promoting gender equality and human rights.

**OD grants.** OD assistance includes three types of grants (basic, advanced, group) that channel assistance to both new and more developed organizations. The unique online self-assessment approach allows CSOs to be in control of their own OD agenda; one respondent who provides OD training to CSOs commented favorably on this self-assessment approach.

Regarding the interface of the Marketplace, several interviewees from regional CSOs found it difficult to discern the qualifications of training providers registered on the Marketplace. The grantees procuring OD assistance via the Marketplace would prefer to receive ISAR’s references or quality certificates for trainers or consultants they could hire.48

ISAR reported recent growing demand for OD grants. In 2012, ISAR received about 20 applications per month. In 2018, this number swelled to 65; each month ISAR funded around 18 CSOs. Most of the grants were awarded to develop missions and strategic planning, and to improve financial viability, public relations, and communication.

---


48 The Assessment Team is aware that ISAR has started developing standards for the service providers listed on its platform.
According to the AT’s online survey, the top needs in capacity-building are fundraising (16 percent), effective public communication (15 percent), effective coalition-building, and networking (12 percent). ISAR responds quite well to these demands in the OD market. Strategic planning leads the list since many donors require strategic plans and it was quite a popular buzzword in the sector. Some of the gaps in OD assistance, as pointed by several KII respondents, relate to human resource management and coalition building. Focus group participants in Kyiv spoke about the need to bring more information about social innovation, impact assessments, results-based management.

ISAR reported unequal regional distribution of OD mini-grants throughout Ukraine in 2015 and 2016. The regions with the most grant applications were Kyiv, Lviv, and Vinnytsia. The “outsider” regions with few if any applications included Cherkasy, Luhansk, Khmelnitsky, and Kirovograd. However, the number of applicants from the regions of Kherson, Ternopil, Khmelnitsky and Zakarpattia increased slightly in 2016, as did Mykolaiv in 2017. Uzhgorod focus group and KIIIs with Roma groups showed lack of understanding about the types of OD possibilities.

To improve regional outreach, ISAR hosted regional OD Schools. As stated in the ISAR’s 2016 annual report: “Eighty-five percent of respondents-trainees from the Kharkiv region mentioned they did not know each other prior to the School, and they were not aware of activities of other CSOs.” Despite regional information sessions, ISAR reported little awareness of the Marketplace and other training opportunities in Kharkiv.

Some positive impact of OD assistance is reflected in the online survey; 65 percent of respondents described Marketplace assistance as a “very important” or “somewhat important” contribution.

Our research showed a direct correlation between the number of grants from ISAR and successes in organizational development. CSOs receiving three or more grants (3+) reported better improvements in their capacity compared to organizations that had fewer than three grants. For example, 79 percent of groups receiving 3 or more grants introduced new services and areas of work, compared to 61 percent of those getting fewer than 3 grants. Similarly, desk research shows that ISAR’s sub-grantees self-reported significant improvements in their financial viability: 86 percent of ISAR grantees with three or more grants reported a rise in annual budgets and 93 percent noted an increased number of funding sources.49

KIIIs from CSOs and donor organizations acknowledged that the Civil Society Forum plays an important role in networking and best-practices exchange. In 2017, the Forum gathered over a thousand participants from all over Ukraine for a two-day event in Kyiv. Interview subjects suggested that the Forum should focus more on OD and in-depth thematic sessions. According to respondents, the Forum’s focus has shifted somewhat from organizational capacity to discussion of acute issues in Ukrainian society.

ISAR builds successful partnerships with other donors to deliver OD assistance. It has built partnerships with Pact, Inc., the Mott Foundation, and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Moreover, ISAR successfully cooperates with international and local stakeholders in Ukraine to enable organizational development support for their local CSOs. The list of partnering agencies includes Deutscher Volkshochschul-Verband e.V. (German Adult Education Association, DVV), UNDP, Kyiv City Administration, UNHCR, and the European Wergeland Centre.

Conclusions

ISAR is a unique platform that delivers OD assistance to Ukrainian CSOs via multi-level financial support and various networking and community-of-practice opportunities. It remains the only source of OD small grants, especially for new CSOs. It has aided in developing the OD culture in Ukraine as

49 KIIIs survey of ISAR grantees, 2017.
demonstrated by increasing demand for OD grants. Its effort to increase the financial viability of CSOs, as reported by the grantees, is successful. Marketplace grantees manage to develop new local funding sources, such as local budgets, public-private partnerships, and community foundations. Longer-term, multi-year (3+) gradual OD assistance, proved by ISAR, demonstrated better results across various OD areas, in particular diversification and size of funding, new partnerships and increase of beneficiaries.

ISAR applies a demand-driven approach to meet Ukrainian civil society needs and expectations in organizational development. This approach encourages CSOs to develop their capacities step by step. ISAR’s grants, OD trainings, webinars, and Civil Society Forums offer Ukrainian CSOs a multi-faceted development experience.

Regular grantees’ surveys, site visits and feedback mechanisms allowed ISAR to respond the changes in the civil society landscape, particularly to focus on emerging actors in civil society. Assistance to CSOs serving IDPs and ATO veterans increased in response to humanitarian crises caused by the armed conflict in the east of Ukraine.

By accumulated funding from various donors, ISAR provided an effective re-granting for smaller international donor organizations interested in OD for civil society.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Marketplace priorities in OD support should continue focusing on the sector demanded capacities, in particular strengthening fundraising, effective public communication, effective coalition building, strategic planning, public awareness tools, needs assessment and service provision. Ensure there is high quality OD offer on diversification of funding, especially crowd funding, social enterprise and social services.

- As a leader of OD delivery in Ukraine, ISAR should stimulate more visionary professional development among CSOs, and emphasize monitoring and evaluation (M&E), social innovation, results-based management, and transfer of relevant skills — especially communication — from the private sector. Thus, the involvement of private sector experts might enrich the ISAR OD schools and be considered during quality-standards development.

- More attention should be paid to developing standards of service provision via the Marketplace. ISAR has already started to develop service standards in cooperation with the International NGO Training and Research Centre (INTRAC), but may require further technical assistance. The standards, including possible trainer certification, should be widely discussed with the sector, including Ukrainian and international groups with strong experience in training and consulting. Interested parties should stimulate more feedback from the CSO community about trainers and courses, and perhaps consider a ratings system similar to those on various resource-sharing websites (e.g., Airbnb - an online accommodation service that allows users and providers to exchange services and rate each other’s performance according to a pre-set list of criteria).50

- ISAR should extend its communication and outreach strategy beyond the oblast centers. It could focus on positioning ISAR as a strong resource center that goes beyond the mini-grants program and Civil Society Forums. ISAR should continue its regional OD schools to bring together actors from the same region. Regional Civil Society Forums might contribute to improving awareness.

---

50 For example, the beneficiaries can publish written reviews of services provided by consultants/trainers and also submit an overall star rating and a set of category star ratings. The service providers can view their star ratings on their page and they can also see a breakdown of beneficiary ratings by category. The set of categories on which beneficiaries can give ratings is to be defined by the Marketplace. The number of stars displayed at the service provider’s page on the Marketplace website is an aggregate of the primary scores beneficiaries have given. The number of beneficiaries who provided star ratings is also reflected on the page.
The ISAR website might benefit from a functionality audit and upgrade, which might include a better search engine for OD topics, and a database of trainers and consultants, including their history of cooperation with ISAR and feedback from clients.

- ISAR could aim to increase the number of grants to “young CSOs,” perhaps developing special technical assistance for emerging CSOs that require more attention and OD assistance. Migrant support might be supplemented with additional seminars, mentorship, and training.

- In addition to current vulnerable groups, attention should also be paid to building organizational capacity of national minority groups and CSOs that advocate rights of the Roma population. Regional human rights, LGBT, HIV/AIDS, gender and IDP groups still require substantial OD assistance.

- Civil Society Forums remain vitally important. Civil society members need a professional platform to discuss their ideas and learn from peers. The Forum should strengthen the OD component and provide more workshops and in-depth presentations of topics as demanded by the beneficiaries, such as several mentioned during KIIs (best international practices in environmental protection, education, social enterprise, cooperation with business). Such an approach would help distinguish ISAR’s Forum from other networking civil society events and reform conferences.

5.5 UCIPR APPROACHES AND RESULTS

Which UCIPR project approaches and activities have been most effective in achieving the respective objectives of these activities? Did the UCIPR projects yield results other than those planned?

FINDINGS

Assessment of UCIPR’s Operational Approaches

UCIPR’s main approaches to achieving more enabling environment included: advocacy for better regulation for the sector and improvement of funding mechanisms; monitoring of civil society related policies; and increasing awareness about new laws and regulations among government officials and CSOs.

Advocacy. UCIPR’s advocacy focused on four main work streams: (1) improved registration for CSOs; (2) advocacy for better regulation and prevention of restrictive laws for the sector; (3) more accessible, transparent and accountable state funding for CSOs; (4) expanding citizen engagement mechanisms at the local level.

All Kyiv-based CSOs, donors, national and regional level government officials, and most participants of the Kyiv focus group heard the name of the leader of the Citizen in Action project. Most stated that the project leadership is an effective advocate and recognized their active engagement for better CSO legislation. All KII participants stated that he actively engages with the Parliament, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Finance, State Fiscal Service, and the Ministry of Social Policy, and provides expertise related to legislation.

At the Cabinet of Ministers level, the project’s expertise was highly appreciated and described as “constructive and solution-oriented,” – in particular, efforts to improve Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No. 1049, which sets guidelines for state funding of CSOs. The improvements were introduced in May 2018.

The advocacy approach often means that UCIPR is drafting amendments, model statutes, work plans, and new regulations. For example, at the regional level, UCIPR developed new materials related to participatory budgeting. More than 150 cities in Ukraine have introduced participatory budgeting. UCIPR
advised on the best composition of project review councils, stimulating government influence over decisions, and civic oversight. Several interviewees mentioned the value of international legal expertise that UCIPR attracts via the ICNL and ECNL. For example, in October 2017 UCIPR in cooperation with the ICNL invited international experts to present at the conference on international standards for CSO reporting in Kyiv.

**Networking and Stakeholder Consultations.** The assessment of UCIPR’s level of stakeholder consultations was less positive. Despite the fact that UCIPR has created seven thematic networks to develop joint recommendations on various regulations, these networks were unable to prevent e-declarations for CSOs. RPR, with UCIPR’s participation led the sector dialogue about the best counter measures. UCIPR’s networks were more effective in developing joint positions on CSO registration, taxation, reform of public funding, and local democracy. Three Kyiv-based participants from leading CSOs expressed concern about UCIPR’s mandate to represent the sector on a variety of regulatory issues, and expressed doubts about its capacity to hold proper consultation with sector leaders. Some spoke of UCIPR’s weak capacity to moderate and facilitate discussions, seek consensus, and ensure that input is taken into account during development of legislative amendments. Others said that UCIPR is “too close to government to defend the position of the sector” and mentioned the case of one of its experts trying to get a position in the President’s Administration.

It was also difficult for UCIPR to moderate the discussion about the best ways to counter the introduction of e-declarations for anti-corruption CSOs. According to one Kyiv-based KII participant, UCIPR was more willing to look for compromise with the President’s Administration in order to regulate the issue, while many leading CSOs, including the Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union (comprised of 29 human rights CSOs), insisted on the high risk of state manipulations and called for boycotting any negotiation with the authorities on the subject and demanded full cancellation of the law. As the result these diverging positions, in June 2018, a new Coalition to Defend Civil Society was formed of forty-four CSOs. Led by Freedom House, it aims to communicate the issues of the sector and defend the rights of activists, CSOs, and journalists. UCIPR is a member of the coalition and mostly provides international expertise.

**Policy Monitoring.** UCIPR’s approach to advocacy also includes monitoring the implementation of civil-society-related laws. The Center is examining the legal framework for public hearings, implementation of National Strategy for Support for Civil Society, oblasts’ funding practices for CSOs, and the practices of tax authorities in granting non-profit status.

**Awareness about UCIPR and Its Regional Reach.** Another key approach to create more enabling environment is increasing awareness about new laws and regulations among government officials and CSOs. UCIPR operates legal aid hotline, provides trainings and prepares information materials.

Most regional CSOs interviewed for this assessment had little awareness of UCIPR’s work at the regional level. They were not aware about UCIPR’s pursuit of legislative changes for the sector. Only seven out of thirty-three regional CSOs interviewed by the AT knew Citizen in Action project expert Maksym Lastyba. Some attended UCIPR’s trainings. A participating government representative at the oblast level was unaware of the new changes to Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No. 176.

Regional KII subjects mentioned the following effective activities: consultations on how to submit e-declarations, overall information about available trainings, and trainings on changes about regulations for CSOs. UCIPR has stronger regional networks in some cities, such as Kharkiv, Mariupol, and Kryvyi Rih. Data from the legal hotline provided by UCIPR lists incoming calls from Kharkiv, Odesa, Vinnytsia, Lviv and Donetsks, Mykolaiiv, Zhytomyr, Zaporizhzhia, and Cherkasy. But due to a small team, UCIPR can hardly seize upon new opportunities in the regions (such as the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI’s) offer to cooperate there).
The awareness about the legal hotline among the interviewed KII is also quite low. Nobody from the interviewed KII has received legal aid from UCIPR or mentioned about such a resource. With regards to legal aid in the regions, few Uzhgorod Focus Group participants mentioned the regional hub and two KII from Kharkiv mentioned Studio 42. Interviewed regional activists said they most often turn to local lawyers to register CSOs or get legal advice. In some cases, the activists were from UCIPR’s partners, like Studio 42, a self-described “hub of civic activity” in Kharkiv.51

The register of legal-consultation recipients, which UCIPR provided to the AT, includes over 1,207 individuals and 26 CSOs. It provides consultation only on CSO registration, taxation and reporting. UCIPR employed three lawyers: one worked on the legal hotline full-time, then in 2016–2018, the Center hired two more in the large eastern cities of Mariupol and Kryvyi Rih. These regional CSO Advisory Centers provided 87 consultations in Mariupol and 109 consultations in Kryvyi Rih for the period of October 2017 to March 2018. They were effective thanks to close cooperation with local hubs, fiscal service, regional justice department and centers of legal aid. No other regional advisory centers were set up, as it was not envisaged by the project.

According to the information UCIPR provided, the legal consultations mostly concerned the registration of an organization; verification of statutes for compliance with the Tax Code; application for non-profit status; taxation and reporting for CSOs; development of local regulations; and city statutes. There was high demand in July 2017 when CSOs had to re-register their statutes.

Legal aid information is provided on the project web site (www.dovidnyk.org.ua), Facebook page (www.facebook.com/UCIPR/), and printed materials.52 The Facebook page has more than 4,000 followers. The project leader also shares materials on his personal Facebook page. This reach is average compared to some other leading civil-society social media outreach (see box at right).

Training Component. The training component was a smaller part of the program. UCIPR mainly provided trainings and seminars on new regulations. The Center targeted its training to address the most problematic issues of policy implementation. For example, it has trained fiscal service officials on non-profit status registration in the oblasts where there were most complaints (Odesa, Kharkiv, and Dnipro). It has run a School of Civic Engagement and a School of Local Democracy, a joint seminar for CSOs and local government representatives. Six interview subjects from CSOs said it was a good idea to have such joint trainings.

Government representatives also appreciated UCIPR’s efforts to build capacity in the region and develop mechanisms for civic participation in policy-making. In cooperation with IFES, UCIPR developed a new civic education course, “Democracy: from Theory to Practice.”

UCIPR produced a variety of materials about changes in civil-society regulations, expected amendments that it advocates at the national level, and the results of its monitoring of civil-society policies. The Center presents complex information in a simplified, understandable format, often using infographics, and shares it on social media. Some of UCIPR’s publications are uploaded in the library of the major decentralization portal.53 KII participants evaluated the printed materials’ quality as high; one national government representative stated that they were happy to disseminate them.

Regulatory Climate for Civil Society

51 http://www.stdo42.com/en/
52 https://www.facebook.com/citizensinactionUA/
53 https://decentralization.gov.ua/library
UCIPR’s impact. Key informants listed key successes resulting from UCIPR’s work, including: simplification of state calls for proposals for CSOs (Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1049); introduction of a competitive call for proposals for veteran and people with disabilities organizations (Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 176) and inclusion of UCIPR’s member into a selection committee; and assistance in developing government action plans to implement the National Strategy for 2017 and 2018. There are two more key laws in the pipeline, developed with UCIPR’s input: Draft Law No. 7372 on changes to state registration of all-Ukrainian CSOs and Draft Law No. 8237 on more enabling tax regime for charitable aid.

In four years it successfully advocated 49 decisions in favor of CSO environment, including 6 laws, 8 executive resolutions, 2 Presidential decrees, 30 local government resolutions. Fifty-four percent of online survey respondents stated that UCIPR makes a “somewhat important” or “very important” contribution to improving the regulatory environment.

Online survey respondents name top three improvements in regulatory environment as simplified registration, changes to tax code allowing economic activity and new participatory democracy tools. Simplified registration contributed to substantial savings for citizens in the CSO registration costs, with the slashed fee from USD 65 to USD 6.

Outstanding Challenges in Regulation: Despite some important improvements in Draft Law No. 7372, respondents expressed concerns about the status of CSOs’ regional chambers. For example, both a national and regional representative from a leading CSO stated that a proposed change will substantially complicate the work of the network and will add serious managerial costs to their Kyiv office. Plus, regional chambers will not be able to apply for funding without a having a legal status.

According to the online survey, Ukraine’s regulatory environment suffers from over-regulation and red tape. The survey respondents stated that the number-one problem is complicated procedures for state funding of CSO activities (42 percent), followed by poor incentive for corporate donations (31 percent) and tax liabilities to cover costs for participants in events who are not members of a CSO (29 percent). E-declarations were listed by 23 percent of CSOs as a problem. The ability to conduct economic activity and further improvement of state funding to CSOs (open calls and social services) are two main areas where the needs and UCIPR’s advocacy coincide. Only 9 percent of surveyed CSOs mentioned difficulty with registration as a challenge.

Five KII participants, especially in Odesa and Kharkiv, complained about frequent attacks on activists as the main problem. According to our research, 46 percent of CSOs said that the state puts pressure on CSOs and activists. And nine KIIs mentioned the importance of strong legal aid, including emergency legal assistance for the sector.

UCIPR’s monitoring reveals a sharp discrepancy in the implementation of civil-society policies across Ukraine, and also incoherence between practices and normative rules. For example, in violation of the regulation, four oblasts (Vinnytsia, Kharkiv, Donetsk, and Odesa) systematically refuse to provide non-profit status for CSOs and charitable organizations with entrepreneurial activities in their charters.

Another example of discrepancy comes from monitoring public-hearings regulation. In UCIPR’s monitoring, Kyiv is rated at 53 percent for the quality of public hearing regulation — much higher than Lviv, at 13 percent. But in practice, according to the Kyiv Focus Group, Kyiv lags substantially behind Lviv in public hearings: In Kyiv, there are seven public hearings on average per year; in Lviv, two per

54 The draft law “On Amendments to Some Legislative Acts of Ukraine Regarding the Regulation of Activities and State Registration of all-Ukrainian Civic Associations” further simplifies regulations (register in one day), allows CSOs to defend rights in courts, introduces a concept of a model statute, and changes the status for regional chambers (there will be no separate legal status of those units and they will be administered from Kyiv headquarters).

week. In other cases, as stated by the head of a regional CSO, “there are norms about openness and participation but there are no mechanisms.”

**Conclusions**

The Ukrainian civil-society enabling environment experienced both progress and setbacks in the last four years. The Legal Environment score in the CSO Sustainability Index 2017 (3.5) showed slight declension first time since 2013 (3.4). There is still opportunity for a substantial improvement, compared to Poland’s better score of 2.1.

UCIPR’s efforts have contributed to positive changes, in particular, improvements in CSO registration, more transparent state funding, and opening of local government to more citizen engagement. The main setback was the introduction of e-declarations for anti-corruption CSOs, which was a gesture of political revenge, and now increasing attacks on anti-corruption activists.

For UCIPR to be successful, Ukrainian civil society must feel ownership of the advocacy agenda pursued at the national level. Among UCIPR’s most successful approaches were constructive advocacy at the national level, monitoring of CSOs related policies, awareness building about the new regulations. The strength of UCIPR’s approach is good working relations with the national and regional governments, including mayors. UCIPR provided much needed technical assistance to the government and ensured that rights of CSOs are addressed. Two regional legal aid centers could be replicated as a model in other regions.

A collaborative sectoral approach to civil society advocacy is effective, and thematic networks working on various issues of CSO regulation provide better ownership in the sector. However, several of UCIPR’s networks are more like working groups, and there is little awareness of them in the wider civil-society sector. Many CSO leaders are not part of the networks.

Ukraine’s weakness in reform is usually revealed in implementation. Including a strong monitoring component, makes advocacy more effective. It allowed UCIPR to expose substantial regional discrepancy in practice of citizen engagement across Ukraine and registration.

However, there is a mismatch between the problems in regulatory environment as perceived by the CSOs and UCIPR’s advocacy efforts.

The cross-sectoral approach to trainings, which includes both CSOs and government officials, is viewed as effective practice. The trainings, which address issues of poor policy implementation is effective, as was the case with the training for fiscal service officials and assistance with the registration offices.

Flexibility of the program allows for fast response to emerging needs and generated some additional results. After the abolition of regional and municipal Offices of the Ministry of Justice the number of registration units dropped to 25 nationwide. UCIPR managed to avoid a serious crisis by developing new regulation jointly with the central government to register CSOs at the administration service centers and legal secondary aid offices. As the result, the number of registered units increased to 850.

Finally, the approach to providing legal aid only via the hotline yields weak results. Currently legal aid supplied from UCIPR does not match demands, which is especially high in the regions. Development of regional CSOs support centers and establishment of network of legal advisors was one of the weakest components, with the exception of Mariupol and Kryvyi Rih, where such centers were set up.

**Recommendations**

- Ensure better alignment of UCIPR’s advocacy efforts and regulatory problems of the sector. To achieve this, regular needs assessments among the CSOs leaders should be conducted. This could be administered via an online survey, during the Civil Society Forums, on social media, via civil society portals. Address the issue of legitimacy amongst Kyiv-based groups and extend the
circle of counterparts. UCIPR should direct efforts to develop common positions in the sector by conducting facilitated discussions. Those discussions could be run as part of RPR working group, Coalition to Defend Civil Society, or by expanding thematic networks that currently exist. To demonstrate its added value to the sector UCIPR could channel more international expertise from its partners (ICNL, ECNL) into Ukraine. The whole advocacy efforts could be more effective if there was a stronger collective effort via a coalition or a network, similar to the Ukrainian Philanthropist Forum, a membership organization for Ukrainian charities.

- If UCIPR would like to develop into a fully-fledged advisory center for non-profit law, it should substantially improve its outreach to the regions of Ukraine and boost its capacity to deliver legal expertise. Due to the size of Ukraine and substantial growth of the sector, it would be desirable to develop a network of non-profit lawyers / centers across Ukraine. UCIPR could provide secretariat, materials, consultations to the network, and develop a community of practice.

- Improve strategic communication. As part of its own organizational development it is key that UCIPR has clear messaging about its role in contributing to enabling environment in Ukraine. This should also include increasing both digital and print circulation of its information materials. Ensure these materials are easy to find on UCIRP’s website and other leading civil society websites.
6. INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GAPS

Are there other critical civil society sector development needs that are not covered by USAID programs or by other international donors?

6.1 FINDINGS

Weak diversification of foreign donor support. According to interview subjects, grants are more easily available for experienced professional CSOs. Small grants for new CSOs are less available, with the notable exception of funds from the International Renaissance Foundation (IRF) and the European Endowment for Democracy (EED). Mini-grants or seed funding for new CSOs or civic initiatives are nearly absent. Only one donor, the Mott Foundation, has systematically supported the development of community foundations in Ukraine that could provide support to grassroots civic initiatives and citizens’ groups. Few CSOs could serve as regional resource centers for smaller CSOs at the community level. In terms of diversity of funding, several key informants suggested that western donors could better encourage them to use crowdfunding. Currently the supply of matching grants that would pay a dollar from each dollar fundraised by a CSOs through crowdfunding is very small. ISAR has a small facility of such matching grants of USD 80,000 per year. ISIPR states that grants such as these really help local CSOs find local resources and cultivate local philanthropy.

Gaps in assistance. Aid is crucial for the future financial sustainability of Ukrainian CSOs, yet there are gaps, related to the development of social enterprises and delivery of social services. Many interviewees mentioned the need to better develop social entrepreneurship as a means to enhance financial viability. Only a few donors work in this niche. Western NIS Enterprise Fund is the only source of low-cost microfinance to social enterprises in Ukraine, while few other donors provide grants to launch entrepreneurial activity for people affected by the conflict (IDPs, women, ATO veterans).

There are two sides of the coin to developing social entrepreneurship. First, there is a need to train CSOs about the nature of economic activities, and to develop their business skills, financial literacy, and a culture of social entrepreneurship. As one KII participant put it, “The Ukrainian population perceives civil society work as something free, voluntary, not generating any income.” According to a manager of a charity shop in Kharkiv, training on social entrepreneurship is needed for both civil society and business people. CSOs should develop business thinking, and businesses should have a better understanding of social goals and responsibility.

Second, the regulatory environment for CSOs’ income-generating activities must be improved. There is no single opinion in the sector as to whether a social-entrepreneurship law is needed, but certainly there is a need to amend the Tax Code to bring more clarity regarding profit-making activity by non-profit organizations and to introduce preferential taxation for social enterprises. According to most KII participants, CSOs rarely apply the right for the profit-making activity. In addition, several oblasts (Kharkiv, Odesa, Donetsk, and Vinnytsia) do not register CSOs with such a clause in their statutes.

---


The State Fiscal Service clarifications regarding the right of CSOs to conduct economic activity are controversial. As a result, a number of CSO representatives interviewed raised fears that if they conduct economic activity, they will lose non-profit status, which cannot be renewed.

Apart from these gaps, there is also insufficient access to loans, investment, and private companies’ funds. In a way, it is easier for CSOs to get access to a sequence of grants to run their projects than to a low-cost finance tool that may allow for greater CSO sustainability through economic activity.

**Social services** could be another major source of income for CSOs and be a major boost in legitimacy for the sector. Due to the nature of their work, social-service organizations tend to have the strongest connections to constituencies. However, as cities and various ministries develop their capacity to procure social services, our research shows that CSOs have a weak capacity to provide social services and an inability to properly cost them. In words of an interviewee who represents a national CSO resource center, “social-services organizations get insufficient donor attention today, except for organizations for people living with HIV/AIDS.” Organizational development of social-service CSOs also could potentially impact citizens’ awareness of CSOs and their levels of participation and support.

Legislation on social-services provision should also be reformed to expand opportunities for CSOs to provide services through a competitive and transparent procedure. According to one KII participant representing a CSO that builds capacity for service-provision CSOs, “privatization of the social services market is vital and open market conditions should be created for vetted and professional CSOs.” The government submitted a draft law on social services in 2016 that is pending Parliament’s approval.

Many participants from CSOs expressed concern that grants tend to be short-term and project-oriented. In most cases, project finance does not include institutional development or capacity-building components. Opportunities to receive institutional grants are limited, and they are mostly available for big and well-established NGOs, among which the majority are Kyiv-based organizations. ISAR-Ednannia, IRF, and in the past, NGO Forum provided small grants for capacity-building. Respondents reported a lack of medium- or small-scale institutional grants that would be accessible for smaller organizations, including those from the regions.

**Long-term approach needed.** Many interviewees stated that there are enough short-term training opportunities for organizational capacity-building, but a more systematic OD approach is lacking. Such approach, similar to that of the Marketplace, would start with an OD assessment, OD plan, and an implementation strategy. Capacity-building should be extended to include special assignments, follow-up sessions, and a possibility to get a grant. KII interviewees also said that there is a need for a long-term capacity building approach through mentorship programs, fellowship programs, and professional education opportunities for CSO management and staff. The NGO Forum, a resource center established by national and international NGOs working on Ukraine’s crisis, once had a mentorship program for senior CSO staff, but its activities were discontinued. Currently ISAR provides mentorship to 37 CSOs funded by the Ch.S. Mott Foundation, UNHCR and UNDP.

A representative of a national coalition of CSOs suggested introducing two-to-three-month modules based at universities in the various regions, modeled after the non-profit management program at Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv. A leader of one of the CSO resource centers interviewed opined:

---


59 See Pact, The Social Entrepreneurship Ecosystem in Ukraine.

60 See Pact, The Social Entrepreneurship Ecosystem in Ukraine.

61 Draft Law No. 4670 on Social Services from 6 May 2016, [http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=58997](http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_1?pf3511=58997)

62 SIDA provides grants for capacity building to Ukrainian CSOs. CIDA/GAC include capacity building part in projects to their few local CSO partners who receive long-term (two- to three-year) grants. The EU’s “Together” project has a small OD component; it aims to expand CSO networking and prepares coaches for CSOs.
“NGO training does not work anymore. New approaches should be applied such as coaching, supervision, exchange programs and others.” One KII from Odesa suggested establishing a “basic school for the third sector to which a CSO should turn. Such a school would include space, networking opportunities, legal support, capacity-building on how to work with target groups, organizational development, PR and communications, interaction with the authorities, and how the government works.”

**Concentrated funding and CSOs.** Many interviewees also frequently stated that most funding is concentrated in Kyiv and, since the start of the armed conflict, in Donbas. There is insufficient funding for CSOs from the other regions of Ukraine, and donor money rarely reaches beyond oblast centers. The donor requirements tend to benefit strong and well-established CSOs. At the same time, in rural areas and small towns, organized civil society barely exists. There are few, if any, registered CSOs. Civil society is embodied in informal groups of active citizens who are also politically active or often represent local business communities. According to KIIIs, there are virtually no donors who would try to engage with civil-society groups at the micro community level. For example, although ENGAGE supports advocacy and watchdog CSOs and encourages them to work in the regions, it does not support groups with stronger grassroots connections such as membership organizations, charity funds, or non-registered citizen-initiative groups.

In addition to geographical distribution, a number of KIIIs noted that USAID has mostly focused on advocacy and watchdog function of CSOs. However, some CSO representatives among KIIIs emphasized that western donors too often have a narrow understanding of advocacy, as an interaction with authorities, lobbying or influencing government policy-making. They spoke about the need to focus advocacy campaigns on mobilization of citizens. They say that a broader approach to advocacy is needed that would include campaigning and citizens participation. According to one KII whose CSO builds capacity of the sector, “donors should contribute to civic participation in the governance rather than in control over expenditures”. A KII in Kharkiv shared a similar opinion: “Donors want to spend on advocacy but they think that citizens are ready. There is a need to increase readiness and awareness of citizens first”.

Among advocacy CSOs, there is still a deficit of knowledge and skills of how to work with citizens and informal citizens groups or grassroots initiatives. At the same time, many civic groups and activists who engage in campaigning are small, often informal initiatives, at grassroots level with no paid staff and resources to apply for donor funding. Most often they mobilize their members and supporters through social networks for street actions at the local level. As one regional KII who works with three different volunteer CSOs, said: “I would like to get money for campaigns, for example, to print information materials. Now we pay for it with our own money. It would be nice to get 1000 UAH for a campaign and to be able report to donor easily.”

The absolute majority of KIIIs highlighted the need to support grassroots initiatives and citizens’ groups at the local level, especially in small towns and rural areas, and provide flexible funding to meet local CSOs’ and civic activists’ needs. Many donors do not have capacity to administer small grants, thus one possibility would be to use strong Ukrainian CSOs for re-granting schemes. However, it is a challenge to fund such CSOs with wide regional presence and necessary skills. There are insufficient donor efforts to build re-granting capacities of Ukrainian CSOs. Community foundations could also play such a role in funding citizen initiatives and small CSOs, but there are very few compared to the size of Ukraine. Several newcomers joined the re-granting community after attending ISAR’s Community Foundation School. In addition, since 2016 ISAR has started to build the ACT LOCALLY network in Ukraine. In 2018 there were 10 ‘Act Locally Centres’63 that ISAR helps develop into a grass root resource centers to support local initiatives, partner with local authorities, helping them administer grantmaking programs
from local budget resources). They are located both in small towns and some in oblast centers. This is work is based on the Polish model, which is quite successful in developing local donors.64

There is insufficient support to civil-society infrastructure, including civil society spaces and community centers. Despite current efforts, including by OTI, ENGAGE and UNDP, to establish civic hubs in Ukrainian cities, demand for such spaces is high. Such hubs could serve both as meeting and networking spaces and co-working facilities for smaller CSOs who could not afford paying rent. Currently, local authorities could provide CSOs with subsidized office space, however according to KII, getting an office space from local and regional authorities is a problem for most CSOs. Such free spaces is most often provided to loyal organizations or ‘old’ organizations (WWII veterans, Chernobyl rescuers, Afghan war veterans, now some ATO veteran organizations).65 A KII from Kharkiv stated: “we need a center/space for different organizations working in the field of culture. Many culture organizations do not have offices, meet in the cafes or partner organizations office. It would be useful to have a physical space. It would be good to have a place when CSOs can get legal and organizational support in such a place.”

Many KII’s, especially regional CSOs, also mentioned acute need in legal advice and support to. According to AT desk and field research, UCIPR’s Citizens in Action is an only CSO program providing legal advice to the sector, which could hardly meet current demand, especially in the regions. Moreover, KII’s say that they need more technical legal advice in concrete cases, which they face. A number of interviewed CSOs stated that they hire lawyers to solve issues with registration or to deal with cases related to pressure on activists. In general, for many smaller CSO legal awareness related to non-profit activity is weak.

KII participants from Kharkiv and Odesa also noted a need for emergency support to civic activists in crisis situations, given a growing number of physical attacks against civil society leaders in Ukraine. Such support should include security measures, medical and psychological assistance, and legal aid. Though there are international NGOs providing such emergency support to human rights defenders in the region such as Frontline Defenders or Freedom House, such support is not quickly delivered. In the words of one KII respondent who documents violations against civil activists, it may take up to three months to get funding, whereas money are needed now: “We had to hire guards for one of the leaders of Gay Pride. They received threats and we could not wait for 3 months.” Another issue is that some flexibility is needed in providing assistance to civic activists in the Ukrainian context. In the words of the respondent, Frontline Defenders’ standards of providing emergency support to human rights defenders are too strict for the Ukrainian context in which many grassroots civic activists combine multiple identities being political active, belonging to religious groups, or being part of local government; such is the case of Kateryna Handziuk from Kherson, who was a widely known civic activist serving in the City Council.66

Interview subjects who have been victims of such attacks also noted the importance of moral support and solidarity by Western diplomats and pressure on Ukrainian law-enforcement services to investigate such cases duly and bring perpetrators, including those who ordered such attacks, to justice. Western statements and attention also contribute to increasing public resonance around attack cases which improve chances that law enforcement agencies will properly investigate.

---

64 See more about the Polish model: http://en.pafw.pl/program/development-of-local-communities/act-locally/
66 On 31 July 2018, Kateryna Handziuk was sprayed with acid by a man near her home in Kherson. She received burns of to 30 percent of her face, head and upper part of the body. See http://khpg.org/en/index.php?id=1533071545
6.2 CONCLUSIONS

Despite substantial international assistance provided to Ukrainian civil society by various international donors, there are still serious gaps in funding in order to achieve sustainability. Weak diversification of types of funding, weak attention to encouraging CSOs to seek local sources of funding (social services, social enterprise, crowdsourcing), lack of long-term OD throughout Ukraine, concentration of funding in Kyiv and large oblast centers, and insufficient support to the infrastructure of the sector (including community foundations, civic hubs, and regional resource centers) all constitute major gaps in technical assistance. Small CSOs, new civic start-ups and grassroots initiatives struggle to tap into western grants. In addition to support to advocacy and watchdog organizations that focus their work on government policies and actions, donors need to promote advocacy CSOs that campaign to mobilize citizens for social change. Given a worrisome trend towards physical attacks, including deadly ones, against civic activists in Ukraine, quick and flexible emergency support is needed. As more active citizens consider setting up CSOs and institutionalizing their work, more legal assistance and advice will be needed in Ukraine as well as even more spaces and community hubs for CSOs and activists.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Funding should reach beyond the capital city of Kyiv and oblast centers to rural areas and small towns. Donors should aspire to better distribution of funds beyond Donbas, which is oversaturated with aid to civil society at the expense of other regions.
- Focus on developing indigenous sources of funding as part of technical assistance. Develop skills, capacities, and a regulatory basis for social entrepreneurship and delivery of social services. To develop indigenous sources of funding, consider setting up innovative mechanisms that provide seed money, crowd sourcing, co-funding, and mini grants for grassroots citizen initiatives and newly established CSOs.
- Support development of community foundations and the re-granting capacities of Ukrainian CSOs, who could administer such grant schemes and serve as regional CSO resource centers.
- Ensure donors that invest in OD pursue more systemic and long-term funding to OD. New professional development courses at educational institutions with strong mentorship component could satisfy growing demand. Invest in long-term mentorship, fellowship, and professional education programs for CSO leaders. Ensure that project-purpose grants include an OD component.
- Long-term institutional support for small- to middle-scale CSOs in the regions could support further growth of the sector and expand civil society’s reach in Ukraine. As they do with Kyiv-based CSOs, donors could provide multi-year institutional support to regional CSOs that have viable strategic plans and democratic and accountable governance.
- To best engage community-based organizations and grass root groups develop a special funding pool for citizen campaigns to complement advocacy efforts of the sector. Ukraine could benefit from developing initiatives similar to Akcja Demokratyczna in Poland, 38 Degrees in the U.K., or MoveOn.org in the U.S. These groups provide tools to organize nationwide campaigns through online and offline mobilization of citizens and local communities. Consider launching an Annual Campaign Award at the Civil Society Forum.
- To best support grass roots:
  - Support widening of civil society infrastructure at the regional and local levels. Connect them to resource centers, community foundations and regional CSOs. Ensure stronger hubs and resource centers have mini-grants components to assist small/new CSOs and civic initiatives at the regional level.
- Develop peer support through mentorship/fellowship programs run by more experienced civil society leaders, rather than professional consultants. Issues of particular interest to grassroots are: campaign management, citizen mobilizations for e-petitions, monitoring of local budgets, public information campaigns, social media, and volunteer management. Such peer work would also improve exchanges between different regions of Ukraine.

- To mitigate risks of violent attacks and shrinking of civic space, ensure efficient support. Provide grassroots activists with ‘safe haven’ in crisis situations. More citizens would be vocal at the local level, if they knew that they would not be left alone if vested and criminal interests attack them.

  - Ensure there are information platforms that can easily connect active citizens to various CSOs and their causes. TakePart is a good example of mobilizing people for various causes: http://www.takepart.com/

  - Multi-donor initiatives could be established in various oblasts to support civil-society hubs/centers of civic activism. Such hubs would support more networking and knowledge exchange, and increase visibility of the sector in the community. This is especially key for new grass root initiatives that lack public space.

  - More resources should be invested into providing legal advice to CSOs, especially in the regions. In view of the expanding number of CSOs, increasing political tensions ahead of the upcoming elections, and decentralization, there will be more demand for legal aid. Such legal aid should cover key operational issues: fiscal, registration, cooperation with the state, and economic activity.

  - In crisis situations, quick and flexible provision of emergency assistance to civil-society activists, especially anti-corruption groups, is necessary, including security measures, medical and psychological assistance, and legal aid.
7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES FOR CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

7.1 YOUTH

More inclusion of youth into civil-society activism is of paramount importance for Ukraine. As stipulated by the USAID Youth in Development document, young people are expected to “fully participate in democratic and development processes, play active roles in peace building and civil society.”

There are some encouraging trends. Young people are taking more interest in newly amalgamated communities as part of youth councils work, but much work remains to boost youth engagement in civil society. Almost all key informants emphasized the importance of youth and advised the program to target this segment of Ukrainian citizens.

Current levels of youth engagement in civil society remain critically low. Only 4 percent of young people have ever signed a petition; 3 percent have volunteered. In the 18-29 age group, membership in CSOs is up to 4 percent.

The idea of what democratic citizenship means is still evolving in Ukraine, and young people need to be better informed of what is means. Today, according to our research, only 39 percent of young people fully agree that voting in elections is citizens’ responsibility in a democracy, and only 10 percent say they are interested in politics. The share of young people willing to vote in the next elections is the smallest of all age groups (31 percent said they would definitely vote).

Youth-targeted activities require a special approach. Youth and children are one of the largest demographic groups targeted by CSOs according to the assessment survey: 18 percent of CSOs focus on this group. A representative of a leading Kyiv-based CSO spoke about the importance of entertaining and educational formats. In order to get youth interested in electoral system, they have created a special education series called “Pizza and Democracy.” It generated solid interest.

But there is potential to reach young people in Ukraine. Possible actions could include more OD for youth CSOs; more inclusion of youth into other thematic programs, especially anti-corruption; capacity-building for CSOs in youth engagement; development of the volunteer sector; and special targeting of high-school students (development of Youth Banks, civic education, trainings in project development and management for youth).

7.2 GENDER

Gender equality and female empowerment is a vital component of OD and is essential for a sustainable civil society. The USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy rightly set three key desirable outcomes: reduce gender disparities, reduce gender violence, and increase the capacity to realize key rights. All those outcomes are of strong relevance and importance to Ukraine. Our research and online survey show that around 10 percent of CSOs deal with the rights and interests of women and only 4 percent believe they need OD on gender issues.

---

67 https://www.usaid.gov/policy/youth
69 http://neweurope.org.ua/analytics/ukrayinske-pokolinnya-z-tsinnosti-ta-oriyentyry/
70 http://www.iri.org/sites/default/files/2018-5-21_ukraine_poll_presentation_0.pdf
Although the assessment did not focus specifically on gender issues, we tried to reflect both male (49 percent) and female (51 percent) viewers on sustainability of civil society. Among interviewees, the following gender related issues were mentioned:

- Impact of labor migration on families (split families, lack of care for children);
- Increase of domestic violence in families where male veterans are returning from the military operation in the East;
- Inequality in political representation at the national and regional levels.

Other research data show that only 8 percent of Ukrainians believe that men and women in Ukraine are equally involved in political life. However, for the first time, the NDI poll registered than more than half of Ukrainians (52 percent) support equal participation of men and women or more women than men in political life.73 Indeed, there are many systemic gender inequalities, including low level of participation in the political and civic process (only 12 percent women in Parliament and Cabinet of Ministers). The conflict has further deepened existing gender issues (employment, wage gap, domestic violence, human trafficking) and added new such as displacement. Seventy-four percent of conflict-affected older people are women.74

ISAR supported gender CSOs via provision of ten OD small grants to regional gender groups in Lviv, Mykolaiv, Dnipro, Kherson, Zaporizhzhia and Kyiv in period 2012-2018, and made an agreement with the Ukrainian Women’s Fund to promote Marketplace services for their network institutions. With the purpose of facilitating CSO understanding of gender issues, ISAR hosted several meetings of practitioners with the participation of 30 gender experts to find out how CSOs may become more gender sensitive in their everyday activities. As a result, “gender packages for CSOs” were developed and distributed on Marketplace. A series of workshops during the CS Forum and open webinars on gender capacities with gender experts were delivered.

However, awareness about gender issues remains low, and stereotypes and misconceptions persist. Only 21 percent of young people believe that women do not have enough rights in Ukraine.75

To better integrate the gender component, the future program should ensure that projects include perspectives of both genders; gender equality, mainstreaming and integration trainings are available on Marketplace. The program should also stimulate the development of new CSOs dealing with gender issues.

### 7.3 MINORITIES AND VULNERABLE GROUPS

To deliver sustainable growth of civil society, the new programming should ensure minorities and vulnerable groups are included. Their full participation in the society is one of the key goals of the USAID worldwide.76 Viable development of civil society thus must ensure that their main actors promote issues of inclusion, tolerance, and support for the most vulnerable groups. Our research shows that 57 percent of Ukrainians believe CSOs should protect vulnerable groups.77 The assessment survey indicates that around 6 percent of CSOs work with this target group. Over 6 percent of Ukraine’s

---

73 [https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/December%202017%20Polling%20Results%20%28English%29.pdf](https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/December%202017%20Polling%20Results%20%28English%29.pdf)
74 [https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2016_HNO_English_percent20FINAL.pdf](https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2016_HNO_English_percent20FINAL.pdf)
citizens have disabilities, which amounts to about 2.6 million people. There is increasing disability among children.\textsuperscript{78}

The conflict in eastern Ukraine and economic decline have increased the number of vulnerable groups in Ukraine. The World Bank estimates that moderate poverty in Ukraine is at 24 percent in 2018, a sharp increase from 14 percent in 2013.\textsuperscript{79} The conflict-related displacement created approximately two million IDPs, many of whom are elderly and children.

In addition, over 300,000 Ukrainian military personnel participated in the anti-terrorist operation (ATO) in the East. There are around 8,000 that returned wounded and many struggle to integrate into civilian life. Several key informants mentioned about increasing cases of domestic violence and shooting in public places. Official statistics report around 500 suicides among veterans.\textsuperscript{80} Radical right-wing groups, such as Civil Corps, Carpathian Sich, and C14 often recruit veterans struggling with the reintegration. This trend is quite visible at the municipal level. As reported by an expert on decentralization, in Kyiv (Sviatochyn district) a group called Haidamaky, led by a local council member from the Svoboda Party, is increasingly visible. They have blocked local authorities for twelve hours even with police present; the police were unable to restore public order.

There is a new cohort of CSOs assisting this vulnerable group and their families in Ukraine. According to one interviewee, there are over 1,200 veteran associations in Ukraine.

Ukraine is a multi-ethnic nation with Russian, Hungarian, Polish, Bulgarian, Greek, Roma and other minorities residing across the country. Zakarpattia oblast has a compact settlement of large Hungarian and Roma communities, which have recently, become targets of various violent attacks. Integration, especially of the Hungarian and Roma communities, remains weak. Participants in the Uzhgorod focus group spoke of “[the Hungarian and Roma] hidden agenda of remaining autonomous, unwillingness to participate in any joint projects. The fact is that Hungarian youth organizations do not want to cooperate with Ukrainians.” On the other hand, a key informant from a Hungarian CSO with over 40,000 members expressed interest in developing more active cooperation with Kyiv, in particular in developing multi-language education: “Kyiv has forgotten about us. We are closer to 12 other capitals than Kyiv.”

Our research shows that Hungarian and Romanian communities are poorly integrated into Ukraine due to weak knowledge of the Ukrainian language.\textsuperscript{81} For Roma, lack of housing, lack of education opportunities for children, and missing ID documents are the main obstacles to integration.

The process of decentralization could also be threatening to identities. A key decentralization expert stated:

\textit{When they worked in Bolgrad district where ethnic minorities live, there was a lot of conflict, almost fights. We took a professional psychologist with us. The media have formed a picture of aggression.}

There is little social sensitivity to various issues of discrimination in Ukraine. Our research shows that among youth, only 19 percent believe that the rights of LGBT community, ethnic minorities, and IDPs are not protected, despite a myriad of outstanding issues.\textsuperscript{82} Tolerance of people of different nationality and religion remains low. For example, 46 percent Ukrainians state they do not trust a person of a different nationality.

\textsuperscript{78} https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/news/281117-v-ukrayini-kilkist-lyudey-z-invalidnistyu-zrosla-do-26-mln-i-stanovyt-6-naselennya
\textsuperscript{80} https://www.unian.ua/war/10021772-matios-nazvav-novu-kilkist-samogubsyt-sered-uchasnikiv-ato.html
\textsuperscript{81} http://texty.org.ua/pg/article/editorial/read/81080/Ne_rozumijut_Ukrajinski_ugorci_ta_rumuny_u
\textsuperscript{82} http://neweurope.org.ua/analytics/ukrayinske-pokolinnya-z-tsinnosti-ta-oriyentyry/
Focus on inclusion was rarely expressed during KIIs, with the exception of Roma groups. One regional CSO interviewee pointed to the need “to have a platform of social businesses with a focus on inclusion. It is important to have such communications platform for business, local authorities and civil society.”

Issues of minorities and vulnerable groups are crucial for Ukraine’s social cohesion. It is important that donors support new groups addressing the needs of those groups (including ATO veterans), if those groups manifest liberal, democratic, and inclusive values. With a growing trend of social service procurement by the state, these CSOs could provide critical contribution to the improvement of conditions for many vulnerable groups and positively impact state policies. Donor support should focus on, among other things, inclusion of ethnic minorities (especially Roma and Hungarians), social innovation in providing more inclusive education, development of multilingual education, and promotion of tolerance and diversity.

ISAR has a solid share of vulnerable groups, which receive OD assistance via Marketplace work; see Figure 6 below for mini-grants by the type of group.

**Figure 6: Number of ISAR OD Mini-grants for CSOs Representing Vulnerable Groups (% of all CSOs supported)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Human rights</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>LGBT</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 (half year)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 ANTI-CORRUPTION

Corruption in state bodies is the main issue facing Ukraine, as perceived by its citizens. It deprives Ukraine of foreign direct investment (FDI), depletes public funds, and undermines its economic growth. Ukraine ranks 131 out of 176 countries in Transparency International’s 2017 Corruption Perception Index, almost the same level as during former president Viktor Yanukovych’s time (February 2010–February 2014).

After the 2014 Euromaidan, the Ukrainian government—with active cooperation and under pressure from civil society—has made some significant progress in closing opportunities for corruption, especially

---

in the gas sector, public procurement, and banking sector. Transparency of public finance and access to information has improved.

But “state capture” still remains a serious problem. The unreformed political system allows vested interests to profit by maintaining monopolies, limiting accountability, and having considerable discretion in the use of public resources. The worrying signal is a significant increase in tolerance to corruption among the population by the 2018 SCORE Index. Citizens are tasking the top leadership to fight corruption, but are less committed to take a personal action in uprooting it. Many anti-corruption activists complained during interviews that citizens do not understand the nature of their work, and that citizens believe that fighting corruption is too “political.” Attacks on activists that challenge vested interest and e-declaration further complicate the fight against corruption.

Future programming should integrate anti-corruption elements across the board. There is a high need to increase awareness of new civic-oversight tools and instruments of digital democracy that increase transparency and cut red tape. CSOs should develop a stronger capacity to identify corruption risks in various public transactions, learn more about international standards of transparency and accountability, and better communicate recent anti-corruption efforts to a wider public.

Many key informants and 50 percent of online survey respondents said that e-declarations for anti-corruption activists are very problematic. As civil society fights to abolish the e-declaration law, it is important that the civil society itself, especially groups promoting accountability and transparency in public agencies, considers its own level of transparency to its constituency and wider public. Such efforts could be structured as self-regulation initiatives. See Section 8 on self-regulation of civil society.

7.5 DECENTRALIZATION

Decentralization is one of the most overarching reforms in Ukraine since the Euromaidan. The reform is changing the political map of the country by creating new amalgamated communities with more effective self-governance and fiscal decentralization. According to state statistics, there are 705 newly created communities with 6.8 million people residing there.

The key change with decentralization is direct election of heads of territorial communities and local council members. It also provides substantial fiscal decentralization. The Ukrainian government reports that local budgets have continued to increase, amounting to almost 51.5 percent of the consolidated budget in 2017 — the highest rate in Ukraine’s modern history. In terms of financial support for decentralization, the National Regional Development Fund has financed 4 billion UAH of projects for newly amalgamated communities.84

Many interviewees mentioned that decentralization allows for greater accountability, transparency, and more effective citizen-government cooperation. This process provides ample opportunity for active citizens and CSOs to influence local policy-making and contribute to social and economic developments. Decentralization opens up doors for more effective public hearings, consultations, and various forms of citizen engagement, in particular youth councils, e-petitions, and participatory budgeting.

A key expert on decentralization stated that the use of local democracy instruments in communities (hromadas) varies. The plus side of decentralization is that it opens direct channels of communication with the local authorities. According to this interview subject, e-petitions are the most widespread instruments of citizen participation. Participatory budgets develop well, both in smaller and larger communities, and there are cases of local authorities running open calls for proposals for CSOs.

It is crucial to improve local administrative and service delivery capacity, while simultaneously working with civil society or otherwise supporting development of responsive and participatory governance. It means that more joint trainings for active citizens, CSOs, and local government officials are needed in

84 https://decentralization.gov.ua/en/about
understanding the applicability and effectiveness of those public participation tools. Almost all key informants mentioned that joint trainings will be highly desirable and beneficial since they allow building better connections and personal relations, and they bring both sides to the same level of knowledge, which is important for effective cooperation.

In view of very uneven implementation of various aspects of citizen engagement in policy, levels of decentralization, and quality of service provision, it is important to support exchanges and networking between elected council members, heads of hromadas, and civil-society leaders across Ukraine to promote best practice. This could promote peer-to-peer learning and boost those processes.

7.6 OPEN GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP (OGP)

Ukraine has been a member of the OGP since 2011.85 Ukrainian CSOs and donors are active participants in developing working plans for the initiative. An independent assessment acknowledged some progress in the implementation of open governance in Ukraine. From 2014 to 2018, positive results were achieved in public procurement (Prozorro), state funding of political parties, open data, access to historical archives, unified web site of public expenses, e-petitions, e-declarations for government officials, and implementation of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) standards.86

One key informant from national government provided positive feedback about the cooperation with civil society and donors in the implementation of the OGP. According to the informant, in 2018 the Ukrainian government has received over 160 ideas for the new action plan, of which 24 were shortlisted after the open online voting. The top three priorities were selected based on the results of the online voting with around 2,700 people voting.87 The new action plan for 2018–2020 includes the following priorities: digital verification of extractive industries ownership, introduction of verification of end-beneficiary ownership, and introduction of international standards of transparency in infrastructure costs. All these priorities meet OGP criteria, such as improved access to information, citizen engagement, new IT and accountability.

None of the CSO officials interviewed about the assessment mentioned OGP as a tool for influencing policy.

The OGP is an excellent vehicle for CSOs collaboration with the state and should be better promoted both at the national and regional levels.

85 https://www.opengovpartnership.org/
8. KEY ASSISTANCE APPROACHES

What are the critical necessary steps for civil society sector sustainability, including but not limited to the sub-sectors addressed by UCIPR (enabling environment) and ISAR (capacity development)?

8.1 FINDINGS

The current programming under Democracy and Governance Civil Society component has a thematic approach to civil society. Its programs focus on increasing citizen engagement in civil society (ENGAGE), supporting organizational development and capacity building (ISAR) and assisting in enabling environment (UCIPR). This assessment proposes a comprehensive integrated approach – a truly ecosystem approach. Civil society, like any other sector, must have a certain set of functions to ensure its effectiveness. If we apply an ecosystem thinking to sustainability of civil society, we can identity a set of elements of such a system. It recognizes interdependence and interaction between its different components.

Figure 7: Civil Society Ecosystem

An effective ecosystem is resilient, which means it is able to respond to perturbations by resisting damage and recovering quickly. In view of conflict and volatile political environment, such quality is of high importance for Ukraine.

An effective ecosystem also generates a virtuous cycle of civil society. It is the cycle that allows civil-society actors to create social innovation and deliver the wider public good. Currently, as one major donor said for this assessment, “Donors focus on achieving objectives that can be delivered by certain CSOs, but few really look at civil society as a sector as a whole.” The ecosystem approach provides that view as it consider key factors that enable impact and emphasizes the importance of interaction and connectivity between these critical elements.

88 https://csis-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/170630_VanDyck_CivilSocietySustainability_Web.pdf?QfxMleHr9U8aeV1kQjFo.FBTsLG76HPX
The strength of the ecosystem is defined by its weakest link. The interviews for this assessment have revealed the following weaknesses:

**Networking**

**CSO to CSO.** Fifteen key informants from CSOs, donors, and focus group participants spoke about the need for more coalitions, movements, cross-sectoral cooperation, and projects that promote cooperative values, since these are underdeveloped in Ukraine. Several informants spoke about the need for inter-regional exchanges between Ukrainian CSOs. This could help address excessive competition in the sector. Only seven percent of survey respondents believe the strength of their CSO comes from participation in horizontal national networks.

**Well-established CSOs and new activists.** There is a generation gap in civil society. During the KII, RPR informed that their regional work is impeded by disconnect between experts, CSOs and activists.

**Kyiv CSOs to regional CSOs.** Many Kyiv-based groups spoke of difficult to develop regional links. An RPR effort over eighteen months to develop regional coalition with a dedicated personnel in Kyiv led to creation of sixteen coalitions that have either developed (eight coalitions) and developing (eight coalitions) reform roadmaps. Kyiv groups struggle at the regional level for several reasons. RPR reports the following problems working at the regional level: weak policy expertise of CSOs, generational clashes between new groups and well-established groups, disconnect of CSOs from their beneficiaries. Coalition building is further complicated by political ambitions of some CSO leaders, polarizing views in communities, fear of competition, and strong vested interests, which local CSOs sometimes protect.

**Lack of common spaces**, such as hubs/ community centers/civic co-working: mentioned by eight key informants. If such places existed they could also, according to a leading donor, “help bridge the gap between activists with established donor-funded NGOs.”

**Citizen Engagement**

**CSO to citizen.** Eight KII respondents spoke about the need to support projects that engage citizens and increase citizen awareness about the sector. More effective two-way communication to wider audiences, using modern tools and effective methods of communication, was mentioned by eight key informants. Access to media is critical, in particular to anti-corruption groups. “The media [are] the strongest resource for us,” said a key informant from an Odesa CSO. “More powerful than the courts because the courts are corrupted.” We understand that ENGAGE is addressing this issue, but its results are yet to be assessed.

**Citizen to CSO.** According to online survey only 14 percent of CSO nationwide claim their organizational strength derives from membership and 38 percent of regional CSO believe they can mobilize community for local action. The practices of beneficiary needs assessment, audience surveys, or solicitation of feedback are rare at best. Need assessment among beneficiaries is not in the top three needs of OD. Only 23 percent of CSOs believe they need this skill.

**Knowledge Sharing**

**Knowledge sharing and more communities of practice.** Eleven KII respondents spoke about the need to share impact measurements, evidence, and research about the sector. The idea of introducing more results-based management was suggested. Often various donors accumulate these materials; they commission research, but there is no “knowledge clearing house” on civil society in Ukraine. Gurt does not have such a section, and Civic Space’s library is not comprehensive and does not include many research studies on civil society.

The ecosystem approach means that cooperation and connectivity has similar, or even higher institutional value than the work of a single CSO. Much effort it currently directed towards development of capacity of individual CSOs, but if they remain isolated and disconnected from other civil society
actors, their OD will be benefit only a small circle of beneficiaries and will not deliver structural change. More importantly, according to SCORE index path analysis, “social connectedness” has a positive influence on a variety of key qualities that are crucial for sustainable civil society, in particular social tolerance, pluralistic identity, and civic responsibility.89

**SELF-REGULATION COMPONENT**

Another important approach to civil society assistance would support more self-regulation. Key respondents frequently raised the issue of integrity in the civil-society sector. Almost all informants stated that there are many fake, publicly affiliated CSOs and individuals who discredit the sector. Democratic Initiatives Foundation research confirmed that 74 percent of Ukrainian CSOs named “pocket” CSOs, which are controlled by local government, political parties and oligarchs, as the main obstacle to the sector’s development.90

Two key informants from national and municipal governments described difficulty in finding credible and professional CSOs for cooperation or public consultations. An official in Kyiv had to do a Google search to gather such data, which she did not always find efficient. One Kyiv-based CSO interviewee raised a concern that when Western funding flooded after 2014 for anticorruption, decentralization, civic engagement, and other popular issues for donors, it attracted many dubious experts and organizations with no experience in those sectors. In some cases donors fail in proper due diligence for evaluating operational methodologies and expertise of regional CSOs.

Acknowledging this problem, several informants mentioned that it would be timely to launch a self-regulation process in the sector. In view of the rapid growth of newly registered CSOs, negative trends in imposing restrictive regulation (e-declarations) and new attempts to curtail civil society freedom, which are publicly justified as a need for more transparency, it could be a ripe moment to facilitate self-regulation. Such initiatives could provide an ability to the sector to speak with a more unified voice against curtaining the space for CSOs. It could also help fill gaps that are not part of broad state regulation (use of images, M&E, cooperation with political actors, accountability to beneficiaries, board relations, etc.)

Respondents did not have any specific idea about the type of self-regulation that could work in Ukraine. Some mentioned the Code of Ethics developed under the Ukraine Citizen Action Network (UCAN) project, some - the type of self-regulation that exists in the media sector (Independent Association of Broadcasters).

The global practice usually entails three key types of self-regulation: (1) the most common — a coalition of CSOs that define common standards; (2) third-party, usually peer external assessment of CSOs regarding agreed standards; and (3) co-regulation with the government.91

**RESILIENCE TO CONFLICT AND DISINFORMATION**

**Impact of Conflict:** Ukraine is a society that lives with conflict. Enabled and directed by the Russian-led forces, the conflict in Donbas now lasts for almost four years. Although, only 2 KIIs in the region mentioned this as an issue for development of civil society, the state of insecurity remains quite high. According to AT’s desk research, the top list of citizen concerns is war in the East, security of Ukraine overall and high crime rates.92 Russian leadership is showing no signs of retreat from supporting this conflict, which means Ukrainian society has to build resilience to this threat. Nestor Group

---

90 https://dif.org.ua/article/ukrainske-gromadyanske-susplisv, March 2018
92 https://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=772&page=1
characterized the current state of social interactions as driven by a zero-sum game approach, survival motivation, suspicion to diversity, paternalism, victimization, and deep-seated fear of change. This undermines societal trust and creates fertile ground for populism. Top three political parties that are leading in the polls heavily instrumentalize populist rhetoric\textsuperscript{93}.

**Information Space**: In the age of news abundance and ‘fake’ news, which is exacerbated in Ukraine by active Russian disinformation and monopolized media space by versed interest, Ukrainian society remains vulnerable. NDI research shows how Russia weaponizes issues of gender, European values and diversity. All those issues are key to civil society. There is low capacity to distinguish disinformation, rare fact checking and weak skills of critical thinking. The critical thinking skills have not been integrated in the current system of education, which largely remains post-Soviet in its approaches. At the same time, desk research shows that 61 percent Ukrainians believe that state and CSOs should deliver media literacy programs\textsuperscript{94}.

### 8.2 CONCLUSION

Currently, there are positive developments within the ecosystem, as described in the Opportunities and Challenges section of this report. In view of a certain maturity of the sector, fast-evolving reform processes, growth of the sector, and the active role of civil society in advancing Ukraine’s democratic transition, the current gaps in connectivity impede the sector’s impact and social innovation. Self-regulation of the sector is non-existent at the moment but demand, as expressed by leading Kyiv-based CSOs is growing in view of problem with ‘fake CSOs’.

Ukraine’s vulnerabilities in critical thinking and media literacy expose the need to integrate this approach across the civil society program. In view of possible Russia-made shocks resilience of communities and local CSOs is of paramount importance.

### 8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Apply an ecosystem approach to the sector and ensure critical elements of the system are supported, such as enabling environment, OD, and diversity of funding. These two pieces of the puzzle are of paramount importance. But equally important are promoting diversity of funding, growing indigenous sources of funding and enabling connectivity within the system.

- Ensure connectivity to close existing gaps. Civil society could play an important role in boosting social connectedness in Ukraine. Promote sectoral horizontal partnerships and coalitions/movements to amplify advocacy and benefit from the “wisdom of crowds.” Encourage innovative approach to networking, communication and expert discussions. Consider developing regional or municipal digital atlases/maps of civil society. Similar the global practice of community foundations to consolidate information and enable synergies. See, for example, [http://communityfoundationatlas.org/](http://communityfoundationatlas.org/).

- In view of the continued conflict and active use of disinformation to disrupt and disunite Ukrainian society, promote the practice of a resilient community and a resilient organization as one of the OD capacity. Resilience is the capacity of any entity to prepare for disruption, to recover from shocks, and to adapt and grow from the disruptive experience. Resilience requires a systemic outlook and connects well to the eco-system approach. Donors could support resilience audits both in organizations and communities to better understand vulnerabilities, assess existing resource base, and consider valuable partnerships. When disruption occurs, especially a complex one, it is always valuable to bring a range of knowledge and variety of perspectives to

---


design the best solution to a crisis. CSOs and active citizens are an immense resource for such knowledge.

- Reinforce efforts in building cognitive resilience. Quality information is key to informed opinion making and is a backbone of deliberative democracy. Disinformation campaigns and info-war have further underlined the critical need in building such cognitive resilience. Donors should increase funding for educational and adult learning projects that develop critical thinking and build capacity to evaluate the quality of information. Such trainings are of key importance for CSOs and activists.

- Facilitate self-regulation to enhance Ukraine’s civil society legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of the public and government. The process would help to maintain and develop public trust and development; spread best practice and learning in the sector. Such initiatives would be successful if they managed to unite the leaders of the sector and assist them in develop their own best approach to self-regulation. This would require a commitment at the highest executive level and clear understanding of an added value of this effort. Such an initiative should include an information-sharing platform about CSOs that would include information about key activities, administrative costs and statement of annual accounts. CIVICUS and European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL) are both trying to assist and guide groups in better self-regulation. Such an initiative could complement existing coalitions (RPR, Coalition to Protect Civil Society).

- Maintain flexible programming in the current volatile, unpredictable and rapidly changing environment.

- Donors should approach strong and well-established Ukrainian CSOs as partners. They are eager to contribute to development strategies, provide feedback about impact of programs and stimulate more openness and synergy between different USAID programs with civil-society components. This may entail creating a position in the mission in Kyiv dedicated to facilitating such synergy and cooperation.

- Consider the possibility of additional long-term grants that are more institutional in nature and include an OD component. Such funding is key to covering administrative costs for CSOs, in particular for hiring outreach and citizen engagement coordinators.

- Ensure there is a diversified regional approach to civil-society development.
9. ADJUSTMENTS TO CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING

9.1 FINDINGS

Given that the UCIPR and ISAR projects will end next year, the next stage of programming could be adjusted to account for the following feedback from the civil-society sector.

According to the survey, 77 percent of CSOs leaders believe that their organizations have impact all or most of the time, but 60 percent believe that there are many ineffective CSOs. This contradiction speaks to a concern about the quality of the sector that should be seriously addressed.

To ensure sustainable and flourishing civil society, according to the survey respondents, it is extremely important to:

- Ensure more active citizenship in Ukraine, i.e., have citizens participate in the work of CSOs (54 percent);
- Work to improve the quality of services CSOs provide (48 percent);
- Diversify sources of funding (47 percent).

Figure 8 presents online survey answers by Kyiv-based, regional CSOs and a national sample.

Figure 8: Percentage of CSOs that Rated Each Item "Extremely Important" for Sustainable and Flourishing Civil Society in Ukraine
Connection to the citizens is of prime importance for sustainability. Many key informants also mentioned that gaps between CSOs and citizens impede impact, complicate diversification of funding, and undermine CSO legitimacy.

**Funding for the sector is one of the top challenges for its sustainability.** Since Western donor grants are the top source of funding both for Kyiv-based and regional CSOs, more diversity is highly needed. The two top challenges in the regulatory environment are also related to funding: (1) the complicated state funding procedure for CSO activities; and (2) weak tax incentives for corporate sponsorship.

In order to develop corporate funding sources, six respondents pointed to the need to bridge the gap between CSOs and business. Seven key informants across all groups suggested the importance of developing social enterprise in Ukraine.

Present donor funding is not very diverse in Ukraine. Several participants mentioned a “high entry barrier” into the sector, and lack of start-up funding for new social initiatives. Currently, crowdfunding and private donations would be the sole source of such revenue. For some regional CSOs, OD grants from the Marketplace were more important as a vehicle to build grant history than to develop capacity. ISAR informed the Assessment Team that 70 percent of all grants on Marketplace went to new organizations.

During the interviews, fifteen KII respondents emphasized the need for supporting new, grass roots initiatives in the regions, including with project funds and OD. The model of delivery of OD assistance was suggested during a KII by one regional CSO:

*There should be some basic school for the third sector to which a CSO should turn to. This should both a network of people and public space. Such school could provide legal support, how to work with target groups, organizational development, PR and communications with the authorities, interaction with the authorities and how the government works (people do not understand).*

Mentorship between more experienced CSOs and newcomers, coaching was mentioned by five key CSO informants as an effective tool for OD.

Fourteen KII respondents also spoke about the acute need to develop non-confrontational, action-based activism. Better cooperation with local authorities, support for projects in the newly amalgamated communities, and more funding for local campaigning were named as the necessary conditions for more effective civil society in Ukraine’s regions. Different factors hinder more cooperative approaches: lack of political will, corrupt reputation of state and local officials, fear of co-optation, and use of civil society work for political propaganda. An example of the latter from Kharkiv were activists who complained that Bicycle Day was being used as personal PR for a governor they believe lacks integrity: “We need to keep distance from them [oblast authorities] unless there is change.”

Finally, eight interviewees mentioned the importance of bringing best international practice to Ukraine in order to improve impact. Respondents from CSOs mentioned topics of CSO effectiveness, environmental security, urban planning, and general usefulness of organizational development study trips abroad.

**9.2 CONCLUSIONS**

ENGAGE must quickly address the issue of citizen engagement in the sector, so new efforts could be directed to address other issues of sustainability. The current state of civil-society development in Ukraine requires more attention from the side of USAID to improving the quality of services and impact, developing more diverse sources of funding, strengthening cooperation with the national and regional authorities. Many of those issues could be addressed to a large extent by continuing and
modifying assistance delivered to enabling environment and capacity building. In view of concerns about
the quality of the sector (both service delivery and integrity), growth inside the sector, decentralization
and ENGAGE’s efforts to activate more citizens, it is crucial that both components of the program
(enabling environment and OD) continue. They could be further boosted and modified in the following
direction:

9.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Concerning the enabling environment (in addition to UCIPR’s section):

- It is important to continue the work related to enabling environment. There are clearly needs in
  improving regulation and monitoring of its implementation. It is crucial to ensure no new
  restrictive regulations are imposed on the sector. The risks run high, in particularly ahead of the

- Better align advocacy for regulatory change with the real needs of the sector. Continue focusing
  on state funding, add more efforts on developing economic activity of CSOs, social enterprise,
  social services, simplification of cumbersome reporting, and improvement of fiscal regime.

- Promote associative approach and launch more self-regulation within the sector. Ensure leaders
  of the sector have opportunities to suggest best ways to organize such work. Strengthen
  stakeholder consultations to ensure better engagement of CSOs to develop joint positions
  about key regulatory issues.

- Pursue development of the nationwide network of non-profit lawyers. Ensure there is assistance
  for activists under attack, including security assistance and legal aid. Consider stronger
  partnership with the Coalition to Defend Civil society.

- Scale up the work with local government to introduce effective grant-making mechanisms for
  local CSOs. Share best practices across Ukraine’s cities, build awareness and support CSO
  advocacy campaigns in this direction at the local level.

Concerning capacity building (in addition to recommendation in ISAR’s section):

- Decentralize OD delivery and offer better guided longer-term capacity building. In addition to
  Marketplace, develop new OD centers and strengthen the existing ones (hubs). Ensure OD
  assistance has mid- to long-term modules and substantially strengthen mentorships component.
  Such study program could also strengthen regional networking.

- Consider launching more programs in non-profit management in Ukrainian higher education
  institutions, similar to the master’s-level program at the Ukrainian Catholic University.

- Ensure there is high quality OD offer on diversification of funding, especially crowd funding,
  social enterprise, costing and quality assessment of service.

- Strengthen translational linkages for Ukrainian civil society. Provide best international practice in
  environmental activism, heritage protection, migration, and protection of children.

- Promote more innovation in the sector: old well-established CSOs offer the same set of
  activities to donors and it is a challenge for many donors to fund them repeatedly. Support
  funding to pilots and new models, promote successful results, and scale them. Civil Society
  Forum could be a great place to share such scalable social innovation.

- Integrate funding for OD into all major grants, even if it is a small component.

- Establish a Knowledge Clearing House to aid better information-sharing about civil society
  throughout Ukraine.
Consolidated Recommendations for Future Programming:

To ensure sustainable approach to civil society:

- **Apply an ecosystem approach** to the sector and ensure critical elements of the system are supported, such as enabling environment, OD, and diversity of funding.
- In view of continued conflict and active use of disinformation to disrupt and disunite Ukrainian society, promote the practice of a **resilient community and a resilient organization** as one of the OD capacity. Donors could support resilience audits both in organizations and communities to better understand vulnerabilities, assess existing resource base, and consider valuable partnerships.
- **Reinforce efforts in building cognitive resilience.** Quality information is key informed opinion-making and is a backbone of deliberative democracy. Donors should increase funding for educational and adult learning projects that develop critical thinking, especially towards building awareness about Russian disinformation.
- **Facilitate self-regulation** to enhance Ukraine’s civil society legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of the public and government. The process would help to maintain and develop public trust and development; spread best practice and learning in the sector.
- Ensure there is a **diversified regional approach** to civil-society development. Ukraine’s regions have stark differences in the levels of civil society development.
- **Ensure funding reaches beyond the capital city of Kyiv and oblast centers to rural areas and small towns.** This is especially important because of decentralization. Donors should aspire to better distribution of funds beyond Donbas, which is oversaturated with aid to civil society at the expense of other regions.
- **Maintain flexible programming** in the current volatile, unpredictable and rapidly changing environment.

To enhance civil society engagement:

- **Increase levels and quality of citizen engagement** in CSOs. It would lead to a positive collateral effect for wider sustainability. Development of strong membership and stakeholder base for CSOs would serve as a powerful mobilizing factor. It will help alleviate many of the other challenges facing the sector (illegitimacy, poor public image, financial diversification vis-à-vis individual philanthropy, etc.).
- **Ensure there are programs that target grass root and community based organizations.** Support widening of civil society infrastructure at the regional levels to cater to new types of civic activism. Ensure stronger hubs and resource centers have mini-grants components. Develop peer support through mentorship programs run by more experienced civil society leaders, rather than professional consultants. Such peer work would also improve exchanges between different regions of Ukraine. Issues of particular interest to grassroots are: campaign management, citizen mobilizations for e-petitions, monitoring of local budgets, public information campaigns, social media, and volunteer management.
- **Design efforts to improve state-civil society cooperation, especially at the local level.** Promote tools of local democracy, including digital democracy that offer simple but
meaningful engagement. It helps generate ownership and interest of citizens in the life of municipalities. By monitoring the implementation of public policies, civil society organizations could bring to the table practical policy results and identify false narratives. Such meaningful engagement could also partially remedy growing populism in Ukraine.

- Focus on the regions that get less attention from donors and have fewer professional CSOs. Support development of civil society infrastructure in each region of Ukraine (community foundations, resource centers, civic hubs).

- Establish a Knowledge Clearing House to aid better information-sharing about civil society throughout Ukraine.

**To enhance impact and capacity of the sector to implement missions:**

- Grow CSO development infrastructure nationwide. Decentralize OD delivery and offer better guided longer-term capacity building. In addition to Marketplace, develop new OD centers and strengthen the existing ones (hubs). Consider launching more programs in nonprofit management in Ukrainian higher education institutions. Ensure the offer includes fellowships and mentoring by peers.

- Effective CSOs – means impactful CSOs. Promote more social innovation in the sector: support funding to pilots and new models, promote successful results, and scale them. Civil Society Forum could be a great place to share such scalable social innovation.

- Provide long-term institutional support for small- to middle-scale CSOs in the regions. Ensure that project-purpose grants include an OD component.

**To augment financial diversification and grow local philanthropy:**

- Ensure there is high quality technical assistance on diversification of funding, especially crowd funding, social enterprise, costing and quality assessment of service.

- CSOs, in particular service providers, could better formulate their added value and supply offer. More attention should to be paid to developing standards of service provision via the Marketplace. The standards, including possible trainer certification, should be widely discussed with the sector, including Ukrainian and international groups with strong experience in training and consulting.

- Promote tools to generate local giving. Provide incentives (co-funding) and build CSO capacities to develop local sources of support and income generating activities, such as Local Action Centres and community foundations.

- Scale up the work with national and local government to introduce effective grantmaking mechanisms for CSOs. Share best practices across Ukraine’s cities, build awareness and support CSO advocacy campaigns in this direction at the local level.

**5. To safeguard and further improve enabling environment for the sector:**

- Ensure strong focus on protecting enabling environment. It is crucial to ensure no new restrictive regulations are imposed on the sector. The risks run high, in particularly ahead of the upcoming Presidential and Parliamentary elections in 2019. Special watchdog effort to safeguard against possible restrictive regulation for CSOs and legal aid and support to civic activists addressing local corruption issues should be set up.

- Develop a fully-fledged advisory center for non-profit law via substantial improvement of current efforts by enhancing regional reach and boosting capacity to deliver legal expertise.
Pursue development of the nationwide network of non-profit lawyers. Ensure there is assistance for activists under attack, including security assistance and legal aid.

Better align advocacy for regulatory change with the real needs of the sector. Continue focusing on state funding, add more efforts on developing economic activity of CSOs, social enterprise, social services, simplification of cumbersome reporting, and improvement of fiscal regime.

Ensure better ownership of the advocacy agenda and better alignment of regulatory advocacy efforts and regulatory problems of the sector. To achieve this, regular needs assessments among the CSOs leaders should be conducted. The whole advocacy efforts could be more effective if there was a stronger collective effort via a coalition or a network. Channel more international expertise from its partners (ICNL, ECNL) into Ukraine.

To deepen deliberative and participatory democracy and better protect human rights in Ukraine:

To better engage community-based organizations and grass root groups develop a special funding pool for citizen campaigns to complement advocacy efforts of the sector. Ukraine could benefit from developing initiatives similar to Akcja Demokratyczna in Poland, 38 Degrees in the U.K., or MoveOn.org in the U.S. These groups provide tools to organize nationwide campaigns through online and offline mobilization of citizens and local communities. Consider launching an Annual Campaign Award at the Civil Society Forum.

Increase funding for solution-based activism (in addition to civic oversight) that offers constructive partnership with local government. Ensure CSOs popularize existing tools of local democracy and mobilize citizens to exercise their rights. Fund models that can be scaled and share best cases in a wider community of practice.

In view of growing polarization around some issues and increase of radical groups promote the practice of empathetic dialogue at a core of which is deep listening and understanding the problems and positions of your counterparts. This would enable better community cohesion. The mediation and conflict-resolution programs should be launched to assist civil-society actors to overcome the barriers to cooperation and integrity.

Youth involvement into the civil society work should be among the priority areas. The educational programs for youth should be innovative and attractive to keep the youth’s interest to ongoing participation in decision-making at the local and national levels.

Continue support to gender equality initiatives and deepen CSOs’ understanding of the importance of building the OD in gender issues.

In addition to current vulnerable groups, more attention should also be paid to building organizational capacity of ethnic minority groups and CSOs, including Roma population.
Ціль та обсяг питань дослідження

Ціллю даного дослідження є визначення потреб розвитку громадянського суспільства в Україні, можливостей його розвитку, а також прогалин у його підтримці. Ключовим фокусом даного дослідження є поточна діяльність USAID-Україна зі створення Сприятливого Середовища для Громадянського Сусільства та Нарощування Потенціалу Громадянського Сусільства, впроваджувана Українським Незалежним Центром Політичних Досліджень (УНЦПД; також «Центр») та Ініціативним центром сприяння активності та розвитку громадського почину «Єднання» (надалі Єднання) відповідно.

Дослідження прозентує загальні потреби у сфері розвитку громадянського суспільства, на які спрямована та не спрямована діяльність USAID або інших міжнародних донорів, та розглядає підходи та дії, які зміцнили сталий розвиток процесів укріплення громадянського суспільства, що фінансуються донорами.

Місія використовуватиме висновки дослідження для визначення підходів до зміцнення розвитку громадянського суспільства, включно з потенційними подальшими діями в рамках вищевказаних грантів USAID, термін дії яких разом спливає в середині 2019 року. Зокрема, Група експертів фокусувала свої зусилля на наступних питаннях:

(1) Який підхід та дії УНЦПД та ІСАР в рамках проекту були найефективнішими в досягненні ними поставлених цілей? Чи дали проекти УНЦПД та ІСАР результати відмінні від тих, що планувалися?

(2) В яких межах правове поле, що нині існує в Україні, уможливлює чи унеможлилює розвиток організацій громадянського суспільства (OGS)? Що ще потрібно зробити для забезпечення існування сталого та успішного громадянського суспільства?

(3) Чи створена вже критична маса OGS із відповідними організаційними та технічними потужностями для виконання їх місій та досягнення їх цілей? Чи існує вже відповідна інфраструктура для безперервної організаційної підтримки розвитку?

(4) Чи існують інші критичні потреби розвитку сектора громадянського суспільства, не включені до програм USAID або інших міжнародних донорів? Підпитання можуть включати наступне:

- Як OGS забезпечують своє фінансування?
- В якому обсязі існують фінансові умови підтримки громадянського суспільства, особливо умови недержавної підтримки?

(5) Якими є критично необхідні кроки при забезпеченні сталого розвитку сектора громадянського суспільства, включно, але без обмеження, з підсекторами, що входять у сферу діяльності УНЦПД (середовище уможливлення) та Єднання (нарошування потенціалу)?
ЗАГАЛЬНИЙ КОНТЕКСТ
У липні 2014 року USAID-Україна видав два прямеї гранти місцевим українським ОГС-партнерам: (1) Єднання на діяльність зі створення Середовища Уможливлення Громадянського Суспільства та (2) Єднання на діяльність з Нарощування Потенціалу Громадянського Суспільства. Обидві організації одержували підтримку від розширеної програми розбудови потенціалу в рамках великої програми USAID з розвитку громадянського суспільства, Українські національні ініціативи «Об’єднуємося заради реформ» (UNITER). Під егідою програми UNITER УНЦПД та Єднання отримали прямої гранти USAID у липні 2014 року, термін дії яких одночасно спливає в липні 2019 року.
У вересні 2016 р. USAID-Україна запустив флагманську програму з розбудови громадянського суспільства «Збільшення участі неурядових структур та простих громадян (ENGAGE), яка працює для збільшення залучення громадян до громадських ініціатив на національному, регіональному та місцевому рівнях.

МЕТОДИКА ТА ОБМЕЖЕННЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ
Дослідження було розпочато з аналізу матеріалів, наданих USAID, та ознайомлення з інформаційно-довідковими матеріалами стосовно розвитку громадянського суспільства в Україні. Подальша практична робота в рамках проекту охопила 73 інтерв’ю з ключовими особами (ІКО), 40 з яких представляли українські ОГС. Метою дослідження було відображень регіональні динаміки у громадянському суспільстві. Додатково до роботи в Києві, експерти здійснили три поїздки в регіони: на Схід (Харків), Південь (Одеса) та Захід (Ужгород). Для розширення вибірки представників громадянського суспільства експертна група запропонувала 1471 ОГС до участі в онлайн-опитуванні. 328 ОГС надали свої відповіді стосовно ключових питань розвитку громадянського суспільства в Україні. Додатково було проведено дії фокус групи з представників та активістів громадянського суспільства у Києві та Ужгороді.
Обмеження даної методології полягає в неможливості узагальнення відповідей онлайн-опитування на дуже широке коло громадянського суспільства. Вибірка головним чином складалася з груп, що фінансувалися західними донорами; зокрема, що були партнерами в програмах, підтримуваних USAID. Намагаючись досягнути більшої кількості ініціатив розширення простих громадян та залучити меншу кількість ОГС, відмови були від донорами, група з оцінювання включила декілька таких представників до ІКО. Вибірці учасників ІКО також бралися ОГС з сільської місцевості або малих міст. При оцінюванні намагалися компенсувати цей недолік, проводячи інтерв’ю з ОГС та залучаючи партнерів, які працюють із громадами поза межами обласних центрів, та враховувати дані інших загальнонаціональних опитувань. Проте, такий підхід із комбінованими методами дозволив виходити глибоку та повну оцінку сектора громадянського суспільства та надати сфокусовані й детальні дані, висновки та рекомендації. Тому, експерти впевнені в тому, що дані, висновки та рекомендації, представлені в цьому звіті, загалом вказують на ефективні заходи, що мають бути вжиті відносно ключових питань дослідження.

ДАНИ / ВИСНОВКИ / РЕКОМЕНДАЦІЇ

Поточний стан розвитку громадянського суспільства: можливості та проблеми

МОЖЛИВОСТІ. Розмір та обсяг сектору громадянського суспільства після Євромайдану збільшилися. З'явилися нові ініціативи щодо допомоги ветеранам, населенням, пострахованим від конфлікту, розвитку міст, захисту навколишнього середовища та тварин, прав людини та боротьби з корупцією. 14 відсотків громадян України займаються волонтерською діяльністю. На тлі надзвичайно низької дохідності у громадських установ, довіра до громадських організацій та громадянських об'єднань збільшується.

Українські ОГС прагнуть розвитку свого організаційного потенціалу; 73 відсотки заявили, що можуть «частково» задовольнити потреби свого організаційного розвитку (ОР). Основними постачальниками послуг ОР для респондентів були консультанти-фрілансери та освітні онлайн-платформи.

Пропозиція місцевих джерел фінансування збільшується (індивідуальні пожертви, корпоративне спонсорство та державне фінансування). Завдяки підтримці УНЦПД у співробітництві з ветеранськими ОГС покращується прозорість розподілу державного фінансування на національному рівні.

Громадянське суспільство також має доступ до фінансування з обласних та муніципальних бюджетів. Декілька міст, включаючи Київ, запровадили конкурсний процес виділення коштів для місцевих ОГС. На місцевому рівні розробляються нові засоби спрямування бюджетних коштів для проектів громади. У 2018 році 100 міст, селищ, сіл та об’єднаних громад України успішно запровадили бюджет участі.

Зростає фінансування фізичними особами, включно з різноманітними платформами crowdfunding, які переживають бум в Україні. Спільнонокощетування платформ, Na Chteni, Go Fund, Українська Біржа Благодійності, Народний проект та Фейсбук є головними хабами такого фінансування. Опитування показало, що 37 відсотків українців давали гроші благодійним організаціям або на благодійні цілі в 2016 році.

ПРОБЛЕМИ. Головними проблемами розвитку громадянського суспільства є слабка фінансова диверсифікація та залучення громадян. 75 відсотків як регіональних, так і міських ОГС, опитаних онлайн, назвали західні гранти як основне джерело їх фінансування. Незважаючи на номінальне зростання, більша частина державного фінансування здійснюється в неконкурентний спосіб. На національному рівні тільки 2,5 відсотків державного фінансування виділяється ОГС на конкурсній основі.

Залишається актуальною низька залученість громадян до ОГС. Зараз тільки 7 відсотків громадян займаються громадською діяльністю. Існує лише невелика кількість потужних ОГС, основаних на членстві. Горизонтальні зв’язки між ОГС зазнають негативного впливу через конкурентну боротьбу за західні гранти. Лише 50 відсотків ОГС входять до складу якогось об’єднання.

Україна має нерівний розвиток громадянського суспільства по регіонах із надзвичайно великим розривом у потенціалі між міськими та регіональними ОГС. Такими «депресивними» регіонами є Закарпаття, Хмельницький, Волинь, Чернівецька та Сумська області. Підтверджуючи цей факт, 60 відсотків респондентів онлайн-опитування обрали відповідь: «Хоча громада ОГС є великою, багато ОГС є неефективними».

Через стрімке зростання кількості зареєстрованих ОГС справжньою проблемою стало питання доброчесності. Найбільше занепокоєння викликає розповсюдження «фейкових» ОГС, створених для підтримки цілей, часто з метою привласнення думки громадянського суспільства в політичних цілях або задля захисту бізнес інтересів.
Небезпечною тенденцією в розвитку пост-євромайданівського громадянського суспільства, яку нерідко відзначали респонденти, є радикалізація громадянської активності та виникнення “нецивілізованих” ультраправих сил, які використовують агресивні висловлювання, пропагують етнічну та релігійну нетерпимість, погрожують застосуванням насильства або застосовують його.

Нарешті, одною з найбільших перешкод для сталого розвитку сектора є загрози нового законодавства, яке обмежує права громадянського суспільства. Певні наміри, подібні до вимог електронного декларування для антикорупційних ОГС, знаходяться в законодавчому полі та спрямовані на ведення додаткової фінансової чи бухгалтерської звітності тими ОГС, які отримують іноземне фінансування. Окрім цього, переважна більшість нападів на активістів та організації громадянського суспільства залишається нерозслідуваною та непокараною.

Висновки. Громадянське суспільство після Євромайдану зміцнилося завдяки появі нових ОГС, активних громадян та волонтерів. Сектор набув більшої легітимності в Україні та високого рівня довіри громадян. Підвищується рівень культури організаційного розвитку та самоусвідомлення громадянського впливу. Місцеві джерела фінансування та нові інструменти місцевої демократії роблять участь для простих громадян більш доступною. Проте, виклики залишаються, в основному, щодо диверсифікації фінансування та загрози законодавства, які може обмежити вплив сектору.

Ключові рекомендації.

- Для використання тенденції зростання місцевого фінансування, донори мають запроваджувати методи заохочення співфінансування для мотивації ОГС до одержання коштів із місцевих джерел.
- Забезпечити диверсифікований регіональний підхід до розвитку громадянського суспільства. Сконцентруватися на регіонах, що отримують менше уваги донорів та мають менше професійних ОГС.
- Більш зусиль спрямувати на ОР на нові та регіональні ОГС. Розробляти регіональні програми ОР з модулями та менторством, розрахованими на середні та довготривалі терміни.
- Подальші зусилля мають бути спрямовані на реформування надання державного фінансування ОГС через державні гранти, місцеві гранти або бюджет участі.
- Мають вживатися спеціальні наглядові заходи для захисту від ухвалення можливих обмежувальних норм для ОГС та надаватися правова допомога та підтримка громадянським активістам, які займаються боротьбою з корупцією на місцевому рівні.

Підходи та результати Єднання

Ключові висновки. Допомога Єднання в ОР включає три типи грантів (базові, розширені, групові), які спрямовують підтримку як для нових, так і для більш розвинених організацій. Більшість одержувачів суб-грантів Єднання це регіональні ОГС. Для більшості ОГС гранти від Маркетпейс були єдиним джерелом фінансування для організаційного розвитку. Єднання продемонстрував попит на ОР-гранти, що останнім часом зростає. У 2018 році щомісячна кількість заяв до Єднання зросла на 30 відсотків у порівнянні з 2012 роком. Більшість заяв надходять із Києва, Львова та Вінниці.

Більшість респондентів ІКО, що відносяться до ОГС, показали обізнаність у можливостях програми Єднання по суб-грантах ОР. Діяльність Єднання, яка не має відношення до її грантів на ОР та Форуму громадянського суспільства, згадувалася під час ІКО набагато рідше.
Що стосується інтерфейсу платформи Маркетплейс, одержувачі грантів віддають перевагу отримувати характеристики або сертифікати якості ICAP для тренерів чи консультантів, які вони можуть найняти. Регіональні ОГС скаржилися, що іноді їм важко визначити якість пропозицій тренерів щодо ОР.

Згідно з даними онлайн-опитування, ключові потреби в розвитку організаційного потенціалу - це збір коштів (16 відсотків), ефективний зв’язок із громадськістю (15 відсотків), ефективна розбудова коаліції та об’єднання зусиль (12 відсотків). Більшість грантів Єдиння на ОР (86 відсотків) надані за стратегічне планування, після якого друге місце посідає фандрейзінг.

Позитивний вплив допомоги Єдиння у сфері ОР відображено в онлайн-опитуванні; 65 відсотків респондентів охарактеризували допомогу від Маркетплейс як «дуже важливий» або «достатно важливий» внесок. Важливо удосконалити програму у напрямку навчання економічній доцільності, особливо у доступі до місцевого фінансування та розвинені нових послуг.

Підсумки. Єдиння має унікальну платформу, що надає допомогу в ОР українським ОГС через багаторівневу фінансову підтримку та різноманітні можливості для об’єднання зусиль та обміну досвідом. Вона залишається єдиним джерелом малих грантів на ОР, особливо для нових ОГС. Вона сприяла розвитку культури ОР в Україні та відображає попит, що зростає на ОР-гранти. Її зусилля у збільшенні посилення фінансової складової розвитку ОГС, як повідомляють одержувачі грантів, є успішними. Маркетплейс варто посилити контроль за якість пропозиції по ОР.

Ключові рекомендації.

- Пріоритети Маркетплейс у підтримці ОР мають і надалі бути сфокусовані на потенціалі, якого потребує сектор, зокрема, зміцнені здатності до збору коштів, ефективному зв’язку з громадськістю, ефективній розбудові коаліцій.
- Більше уваги має приділятися розробці стандартів надання послуг через Маркетплейс. Стандарти, включаючи з можливою сертифікацією тренерів, мають широко обговорюватися з сектором, включно з українськими та міжнародними групами зі значним досвідом у навчанні та консалтингу.
- Єдиння варто збільшити кількість грантів «молодим ОГС», можливо, розвиваючи надання спеціальної технічної допомоги ОГС, що з’являються та потребують більшої увagi та допомоги в ОР.

Підходи та результати УНЦПД

Ключові висновки. Адвокація з боку УНЦПД, сфокусована на трьох основних напрямах: (1) вдосконалення реєстрації для ОГС та запобігання прийняттю обмежувальних норм; (2) більш доступне, прозоре та підзвітне державне фінансування для ОГС; (3) розбудова механізмів залучення громадян на місцевому рівні. Підхід до адвокації часто означає, що УНЦПД здійснює підготовку поправок, типових статутів, планів роботи та нових норм законодавства. Представники Уряду зазначили, що експертиза проекту була якісна та «конструктивна і спрямована на усунення проблемних ситуацій».

УНЦПД застосував підходи спрямовані на об’єднання зусиль та консультації з учасниками проекту для мобілізації сектора. Він створив сім тематичних мереж для розробки спільних рекомендацій щодо різних норм законодавства. Оцінка рівня УНЦПД щодо консультацій з представниками сектору була менш позитивна, зокрема щодо потенціалу досягнення консенсусу та сприяння діалогу з лідерами сектора.

Ключові інтерв’юери надали перелік успіхів, що витікають із роботи УНЦПД, включаючи такими: вдосконалення процедури реєстрації для ОГС, спрощення державного конкурсу проектів для ОГС,
Запровадження конкурентної процедури конкурсу проектів для організацій ветеранів та інвалідів, сприяння в розробці планів державних заходів для впровадження Національної стратегії сприяння розвитку громадянського суспільства на 2017 та 2018 роки. УНЦПД співпрацював з 18 містами по всій Україні, від Маріуполя до Львова, в розробці інструментів місцевої демократії (статуті міст, нормативні акти для громадських слухань, бюджетів участі).

Більшість регіональних ОГС, опитаних в рамках цієї оцінки, були погано поінформовані про роботу УНЦПД на регіональному рівні, незважаючи на той факт, що УНЦПД надав правові консультації 1207 фізичним особам та 26 ОГС; більшість із них були новими організаціями.

Згідно з даними онлайн-опитування, українська законодавча база потерпала від надмірного регулювання та бюрократії. Респонденти опитування зазначили, що первинною проблемою є укладені процедури для отримання державного фінансування діяльності ОГС та слабкі пільги для заохочення корпоративних пожертвлів. Ризик запровадження обмежувальних норм, таких як електронне декларування для антикорупційних ОГС, залишається високим. Учасники регіональних ІКО, особливо в Одесі та Харкові, скаржилися на часті напади на активістів як на найбільшу проблему. Згідно з даними аналізу матеріалів у 2018 році було біля 40 нападів на активістів, головним чином на тих, що борються з місцевою корупцією.

Підсумки. Українське регуляторне середовище для громадянського суспільства в останні чотири роки переживало як розвиток, так і деградацію. Зусилля УНЦПД сприяли позитивним змінам; зокрема, вдосконалення реєстрації ОГС, правовішу державному фінансуванню та відкриттю місцевої влади для більшого залучення громадян. Найбільшим кроком назад стало запровадження електронного декларування для антикорупційних ОГС та адміністративний тягар, що залишається надмірним.

Серед найуспішніших підходів УНЦПД була конструктивна адвокатура на національному рівні, моніторинг регулювання діяльності ОГС, роз’яснювальна робота щодо нових норм. Колаборативний секторальний підхід до підтримки громадянського суспільства не був розвинений, що призвело до слабкої пітрями ключовими представниками сектору деяких ініціатив УНЦПД.

Ключові рекомендації

- Забезпечити потужнішу співучасть ключових учасників громадянського суспільства у адвокатури та координації зусилля УНЦПД з підтримки та вирішення регуляторних проблем сектору. Для досягнення цього мають проводитися регулярні оцінювання потреб серед лідерів ОГС.

- Зусилля з адвокатури можуть бути ефективнішими, якщо б докладалися потужніші колективні зусилля шляхом створення коаліції або мережі. Для демонстрації свого результативного внеску до розбудови сектора УНЦПД може забезпечити передачу міжнародної експертізі в Україну від своїх партнерів (Міжнародний та Європейський Центри Некомерційного Права ICNL, ECNL).

- Якщо УНЦПД прагне розвинутися до повноцінного консультативного центру з неприбуткового права, він має значно підсилити свою присутність у регіонах України та розбудувати свій потенціал для надання юридичної допомоги.

Прогалини у міжнародному технічному фінансуванні

Ключові висновки. Фінансування від іноземних донорів слабо диверсифіковане. Гранти на проекти надаються переважно професійним ОГС, що вже мають попередню історію їх
одержання. Щойно засновані та малі ОГС, а також незареєстровані громадянські ініціативи фінансування не одержують. Фінансування від донорів також є недостатнім для заохочення ОГС до пошуку місцевих джерел підтримки. Відповідні гранти на підтримку збору коштів ОГС через фінансування crowd funding не виділяються. Багато респондентів вказаło на необхідність кращого розвитку соціального підприємництва як засобу покращення фінансової життєздатності. Це пов’язано з регуляторними перешкодами для ОГС у веденні комерційної діяльності.

Проектні гранти, як правило, не включають компонент ОР. Możливості для отримання інституційних грантів обмежені, особливо для малих ОГС за межами Києва. За наявності достатньої кількості можливостей для тренінгів та короткотермінового консалтингу для ОГС, необхідним є більш системний підхід до ОР.

Фінансування ОГС залишається сконцентрованим у Києві, на Донбасі та великих містах. Присутність у регіонах України є незначною – особливо в малих містах та сільській місцевості – для підтримки громадянських ініціатив рядових громадян. Фінансування ОГС, що займаються адвокацією та громадським контролем, має краще координуватися з зусиллями з підтримки пропагування ОГС та залучення громадян. Соціальні послуги ОГС не привертають велику увагу донорів. Недостатня підтримка надається розвитку інфраструктури громадянського суспільства в регіонах, включно з громадськими просторами, клубами та фондами розвитку громад, а також брак підтримки ОГС, що мають потенціал ре-грантингу. Зростає гострий запит на правову допомогу ОГС та невідкладну підтримку громадянським активістам, яким загрожує небезпека.

Підсумки. Незважаючи на значну міжнародну допомогу громадянському суспільству України, цілі низька прогрес у фінансуванні ще має бути усунена. Слабка диверсифікація типів фінансування, незначна увага, що придається заохоченню ОГС до пошуку місцевих джерел підтримки через фінансування crowd funding, надання соціальних послуг та соціальне підприємництво, відсутність довготривалого підходу до ОР по всій Україні, концентрація фінансування в Києві, Донбасі та великих обласних центрах, а також недостатня підтримка інфраструктури для розвитку сектору – все це являє собою найбільші прогалини в міжнародній підтримці.

Ключові рекомендації.

- Надавати підтримку ОГС в регіонах, особливо в невеликих містах та сільській місцевості, а також щойно заснованим і малим ОГС та ініціативним групам громадян.
- Надавати дофінансування для розбудовування потенціалу ОГС у пошуку місцевих ресурсів фінансування та розвитку економічної діяльності.
- Забезпечити більш системний та довготривалий підхід до фінансування ОР через довготривалі програми менторства та програми професійної освіти для лідерів ОГС.
- Надавати довготривалу інституційну підтримку малим та середнім ОГС в регіонах. Забезпечити наявність компонента ОР у проектних грантах.
- Підтримувати розвиток інфраструктури громадянського суспільства в кожному регіоні України (фонди громади, ресурсні центри, громадянські хаби).

Наскрізьні питання

Розробка майбутніх програм має включає такі наскрізні питання, як молодь, гендер, вразливі групи та національні меншини через підтримку тих ОГС, які працюють із цими групами та з цими питаннями, шляхом розбудови їх потенціалу. Окрім цього, гендерний компонент має також бути інтегрований до програм із розбудову потенціалу для всіх інших ОР. Реформи з протидії корупції та децентралізації відкривають низку можливостей для громадянського суспільства залучення до формування державної політики та сприяння прозорості, підвітності та участі громадян. Проте, вони також несуть із собою низку проблем, що мають бути вирішені, таких як підвищення
вразливість антикорупційних ОГС та активістів, суспільна вимога підвищення прозорості ОГС та нерівний розподіл праців місцевої демократії. Також українські ОГС на регіональному та місцевому рівні можуть використовувати переваги від співпраці з організацією «Відкритий уряд» - міжнародним інструментом просуванням кращих принципів управління в Україні.

Ключові підходи до програмування

Ключові висновки. Це дослідження пропонує комплексний та цілісний підхід – справжне бачення сектору як екосистеми. Інтерв’ю в рамках цього дослідження виявили наступні слабкі ланки в теперішній екосистемі: слабке співробітництво між самими ОГС, слабкий зв’язок між сталями та новими ОГС та активістами, розрив між ОГС та широким загалом громадян, а також відсутність відкритих публічних майданчиків для громадянського співробітництва. Одинадцять респондентів новими ОГС та активістами, розрив між ОГС та широким загалом громадян, а також відсутність відкритих публічних майданчиків для громадянського співробітництва. Одинадцять респондентів ІКО висловлювалися про потребу в ширшому обміні знаннями, особливо про ефективність програм, даних та дослідження про сектор.

Дослідження виявило відсутність саморегулювання в секторі. Багато ІКО, особливо в Києві, припинили, що саморегуляція може допомогти розв’язанню загальних проблем справжніх та «фейкових» ОГС. Саморегулювання може надати сектору можливість більш одноставно відстоювати та захищати законодавче поле для ОГС та запровадити стандарти якості в секторі. Воно також може допомогти заповнити пропаганистичні, які не є частиною широкого державного регулювання (використання зображення, музики та звукових ефектів, співробітництво з політичними силами, підзвітність власникам, якість правління і т. ін.).

Україна є суспільством, яке живе з конфліктом; конфлікт на Донбасі триває вже майже чотири роки. Ізгнано з нашим аналізом матеріалів основними занепокоєннями громадян є війна на сході, безпека України в цілому та високий рівень злочинності. За відсутністю ознак припинення російської підтримки цього конфлікту, українське суспільство має виробити стійкість (resilience) до цієї загрози.

За умов інформаційного шквалу новин та великої кількості «фейкової» інформації – дуже важливо звертати увагу на медіа грамотність. Ситуація в Україні загострюється через активну російську дезінформацію та за рахунок медіапростору, який монополізовані олігархами. Українське суспільство залишається дуже вразливим. Слабкою є здатність відірвання дезінформації, споживачі інформації рідко перевіряють факти і бракує досвіду критичного мислення.

Підсумки. З огляду на стрімкі процеси реформ, зростання сектора та активну роль громадянського суспільства в розбудові демократії в Україні важливо, щоб нова програма підтримала критичні елементи екосистеми, такі як організаційний розвиток та сприятливі середовище. Ці два елементи пазлу мають стратегічне значення. Але не менш важливою є сприяння диверсифікованості фінансування, зростання місцевих джерел фінансування та посилення зв’язків у межах екосистеми. Відкритості України в критичному мисленні та медійній грамотності породжують потребу інтегрований цього підходу до програми розбудови громадянського суспільства. Пам’ятайте про можливі потрясіння російського походження, стійкість (resilience) громад та місцевих ОГС відіграє вирішальну роль.

Ключові рекомендації

- Заставляти екосистемний підхід до розвитку сектору та забезпечити підтримку критичних елементів екосистеми, таких як сприятливе середовище, ОР, а також диверсифікація фінансування.
Забезпечити зв’язки між елементами системи для усунення наявних прогалин. Сприяти секторальному горизонтальному партнерству та коаліціям/рухам для зміцнення підтримки та отримання переваг від “колективного розumu”. Стимулювати створення інноваційних підходів до об’єднання зусиль, спілкування та експертні обговорення.

З огляду на конфлікт, що триває, та активне використання дезінформації для розколу та розділення українського суспільства сприяти створенню стійких спільнот та стійких організацій як один з критеріїв у розбудові потенціалу ОР.

Зміцнювати зусилля у формуванні когнітивної стійкості. Донори мають збільшити фінансування освітніх проектів та проектів з навчання дорослих, які розвивають критичне мислення та розбудовують навики оцінювання якості інформації. Такі тренінги мають ключове значення для ОГС та активістів.

**Коригування поточної діяльності та рекомендації щодо майбутніх програм**

**Ключові висновки.** Загалом, українське громадянське суспільство усвідомлює свій власний вплив. Водночас, 60 відсотків респондентів опитування ОГС вірять, що існує багато неефективних ОГС.

Це демонструє обізнаність у секторі щодо потреби зміцнення впливу, покращення якості послуг та крізь демонстрації доданої вартості сектору для країни. Для забезпечення існування сталого та успішного громадянського суспільства, згідно зі онлайн опитуванням, надзвичайно важливим є наступне: 1) забезпечити активнішу громадянську свідомість в Україні, тобто, зробити так, щоб громадян брали участь у роботі ОГС; 2) працювати над покращенням якості послуг, що її надають ОГС; 3) та диверсифікувати джерела фінансування.

Зв’язок із громадянами має вирішальне значення для стійкості сектору. Багато ключових респондентів також зазначили, що наявний розрив між ОГС та громадянами зменшує вплив, ускладнює диверсифікацію фінансування та підрикає легітимність сектору.

ОГС вірять, що для збільшення національної державної та приватної корпоративної благодійності необхідно спростити процедури державного фінансування та збільшити податкові пільги для корпоративного спонсорства. Зближення між ОГС та бізнесом може допомогти в досягнення цієї цілі. Фінансування від донорів, що нині існує в Україні, не є дуже диверсифікованим. Декілька учасників указали на «високий прохідний бар’єр» для сектора та відсутність фінансування для започаткування нових соціальних ініціатив. Під час інтерв’ю п’ятнадцять респондентів ІКО підкреслили наявність потреби в підтримці нових ініціатив громадян в регіонах, низові ініціативи, включно з їх організаційним розвитком.

Чотирнадцять респондентів ІКО також говорили про гостру потребу в розвитку неконfrontаційної, а дієвої активності. Краще співробітництво з місцевою владою, підтримка проектів у щойно об’єднаних громадах та збільшення фінансування на місцеві кампанії були названі як необхідні умови для ефективнішого громадянського суспільства в регіонах.

**Підсумки.** Поточний стан розвитку громадянського суспільства в Україні вимагає більшої уваги з боку USAID для покращення якості послуг та збільшення впливу, розвинення більш диверсифікованих джерел фінансування, зміцнення співпраці ОГС з органами державної та регіональної влади. Зусилля ENGAGE з активації більшої кількості громадян може покращити подальшу позитивну динаміку в секторі за умови подальшої підтримки простих та ефективних шляхів для участі через ОГС, місцеві ініціативи громадян, кампанії або рухи.

**Ключові рекомендації.** Щодо сприятливої середовища (додатково до рекомендацій УНЦПД):
Важливим є продовжувати роботу зі створення сприятливого середовища для громадянського суспільства. Принциповим є упередження прийняття нових обмежувальних норм та їх застосування до сектора. Цей ризик зростає, зокрема, з наближенням президентських та парламентських виборів у 2019 році.

Краще узгоджувати адвокацію щодо регуляторних змін з реальними потребами сектора. Продовжувати концентруватися на реформі державного фінансування, докладати більше зусиль для розвитку економічної діяльності ОГС, соціального підприємства, соціальних послуг, спрощення надмірної звітності та покращення фіскального режиму.

Стимулювати застосування коаліційного підходу до адвакації та сприяти саморегулюванню в секторі.

Сприяти розбудові національної мережі некомерційних юристів. Забезпечити надання допомоги переслідуваним активістам, включно з безпековою та правовою допомогою.

Щодо нарощування організаційного потенціалу (додатково до рекомендацій Єднання):

Децентрализувати забезпечення ОР та пропонувати довготривале нарощування організаційного потенціалу з менторською підтримкою. Окрім платформи Маркетплейс, розробляти нові центри ОР та зміцнювати існуючі (хаби).

Забезпечити наявність високоякісної пропозиції ОР з методів диверсифікації фінансування, особливо фінансування crowd funding, соціального підприємства, ціноутворення та моніторинг якості послуг ОГС.

Сприяти більшому обсягу соціальних інновацій у секторі: підтримувати фінансування пілотних проектів та нових моделей, сприяти втіленню позитивних результатів та масштабувати їх. Форум громадянського суспільства може стати ідеальним місцем для обміну такими соціальними інноваціями, що можуть масштабуватися.

Інтегрувати фінансування для ОР в усі великі гранти, навіть якщо йдеться про маленький компонент.

Заснувати Кліринговий центр знань для сприяння кращому обміну інформацією про громадянське суспільство по всій Україні.
ANNEX B: ASSESSMENT STATEMENT OF WORK
CIVIL SOCIETY SECTORAL ASSESSMENT

I. Introduction
This is a Statement of Work (SOW) for the Ukrainian civil society sector assessment with the focus on the enabling environment for civic participation and organizational capacities of the Ukrainian civil society organizations (CSOs).

II. Assessment Purpose
The purpose of the Assessment is to assess the needs, gaps, and opportunities for civil society development in Ukraine. This will include, but not be limited to, USAID/Ukraine’s current Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environment and Ukraine Civil Society Capacity building activities. The Assessment will identify continuing needs in these dimensions of civil society development and other dimensions of civil society development that are not covered by USAID or other international donors, and discuss the potential sustainability of donor-funded civil society strengthening activities. The Mission will use Assessment findings to determine its approach to civil society development going forward, including potential activities following on from the above-mentioned awards, both of which end in mid-2019.

III. Background
In July 2014, USAID/Ukraine made two direct awards to local Ukrainian civil society organizations (CSOs): 1) to the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR) for the Civil Society Enabling Environment activity; and, 2) to the Initiative to Support Social Action Ednannia (ISAR-Ednannia) for the Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building activity. Both UCIPR and ISAR Ednannia had benefited from advanced capacity development under USAID’s large civil society program called the Ukraine National Initiatives to Enhance Reforms (UNITER) -http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00JZTG.pdf.
UNITER, among other efforts, focused on building the internal capacity of the leading CSOs to be more sustainable, effective, and robust —i.e., “international audit ready.”

Due to the high capacity of these organizations, as well as the critical areas in which they worked, USAID in July 2014 transitioned UCIPR and ISAR from UNITER sub-grants to direct cooperative agreements with USAID. These two awards will end in July 2019. USAID/Ukraine requires an external assessment of the state of civil society development in Ukraine, given the significant changes in the operating environment (Revolution of Dignity, Russian aggression in the Donbas and Crimea, upcoming 2019 Presidential and Parliamentary elections) since the initial design of these awards in 2013, in order to inform potential follow-on programming or other sector development activities aligned with USAID’s strategic goals.

USAID’s civil society development and civic engagement portfolio is summarized below.

I. Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environment Activity implemented by the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR); July 11, 2014 – July 10, 2019
www.ucipr.org.ua

The overall purpose of the Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environment activity is to improve the legislative and policy environment to become more conducive to civil society needs and to reflect European standards. To achieve this, UCIPR focuses on three objectives: 1) to improve the quality of relevant civil society enabling legislation and policy; 2) to increase capacity of public officials and CSOs to ensure effective implementation of legislation and policy; and, 3) to increase technical and organizational capacity of UCIPR as a leader and driver of civil society legislative efforts. UCIPR’s
unique approach will cover the full cycle of improvement of legislative and administrative environment for civil society development in its key areas. Namely, UCIPR will combine analysis of shortcomings and opportunities, monitoring of emerging challenges, development of proposals for improvement of legal acts and administrative practices, initiating and leading advocacy campaigns as well as offer awareness and training efforts, methodological support and monitoring of adopted legislation for civil society development.

2. Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building Project implemented by the Initiative to Support Social Action Ednannia (ISAR-Ednannia); July 11, 2014 – July 10, 2019
   http://ednannia.ua/, http://cd-platform.org/

The purpose of the Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building activity is to improve organizational capacity of Ukrainian CSOs to become stronger citizen advocates and government watchdogs. To achieve this purpose, ISAR will focus on three objectives: 1) organizational development skills of CSOs improved through the NGO Marketplace (mini-grants voucher system, web-portal and regular capacity development forums); 2) NGO Capacity Building Marketplace strengthened as a tool that provides organizational development assistance to civil society; and 3) technical and organizational capacity of ISAR Ednannia increased as an Intermediary Support Organization (ISO) and the Marketplace Administrator.

3. Enhance Non-governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagements (ENGAGE) activity implemented by Pact, Inc.; October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2021

USAID’s flagship Enhance Non-Governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagement (ENGAGE) program is working to increase citizen awareness of and engagement in civic actions at the national, regional and local level. The Enhance Non-Governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagement program focuses on four key objectives: (1) Enhanced civic education; (2) Support for civic coalitions and initiatives at the national, regional and local levels; (3) Improved organizational capacity of partner CSOs; and (4) Long-term sustainability of civic engagement in democratic reforms. The 5-year program will provide funding, capacity building, and facilitate networking among citizens, civic organizations, and coalitions on critical areas of democratic reform, with a special focus on anti-corruption. The Enhance Non-Governmental Actors and Grassroots Engagement program builds on the success of the former UNITER civil society strengthening project, which worked to empower Ukrainian CSOs to represent citizens’ interests and drive Ukraine’s reform agenda through more effective advocacy, monitoring, and activism.

IV. Scope of Work

The Contractor will assess the needs, gaps, and opportunities for civil society development in Ukraine, identify continuing needs in these dimensions of civil society development and other dimensions of civil society development that are not covered by USAID or other international donors, and discuss the potential sustainability of donor-funded civil society strengthening activities.

In particular, the Contractor will answer the following questions (numbers do not reflect priority):

1. Which UCIPR and ISAR project approaches and activities have been most effective in achieving the respective objectives of these activities? Did the UCIPR and ISAR projects yield results other than those planned?
2. To what extent does the current legal environment in Ukraine enable or prohibit CSO development? What else needs to be done to ensure a sustainable, flourishing civil society?
3. Is there a critical mass of CSOs that have adequate organizational and technical capacities to fulfill their missions and sustain their goals? Is there a relevant infrastructure for continued organizational development support?
4. Are there other critical civil society sector needs are not covered by USAID programs or by other international donors? Potential sub-questions could include but not limited to:
   - How do CSOs support themselves financially?
   - To what extent do the financial conditions to support civil society exist, especially those outside of government?

5. What are the critical necessary steps for civil society sector sustainability, including but not limited to the sub-sectors addressed by UCIPR (enabling environment) and ISAR (capacity development)?

In answering assessment questions, the Assessment Team (AT) should highlight gender specific outcomes and impact where appropriate.

The Contractor will visit UCIPR, ISAR-Ednannia and Pact/ENGAGE partners and sub-grantees, as well as key sector stakeholders in Kyiv and three other regions of Ukraine (East, South and West).

V. Assessment Design and Methodology

It is anticipated that a mix of assessment methodological approaches will be required to meet the requirements outlined above. Suggested data sources include: (a) USAID/Ukraine Draft CDCS Framework (attached), (b) DRG Strategic Assessment Framework, (c) CSO SI, (d) Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environmental and Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building activities plans and reports, (e) relevant GOU legislation and policy documents, (f) key informant interviews (KIIs), (g) focus group discussions (FGDs), (h) survey(s) of sector stakeholders and beneficiaries, and, (i) direct observations and case study data.

When planning and conducting the Assessment, the Assessment Team (AT) will make every effort to reflect opinions and suggestions of all key sector stakeholders from the host government, civil society and other private sector organizations, other donors, USAID and non-USAID implementing partners working in Ukraine in civil society sector. Emphasis will be on collection of reliable empirical data and/or objectively verifiable evidence, as opposed to anecdotal evidence. Where surveys or interviews are used, appropriate sampling and questioning techniques will be utilized to ensure representative results; where references are made to the data generated by USAID partners, they will be complemented by references to independent data sources and any significant data differences must be explained.

VI. Assessment Team Qualifications and Composition

The AT will include Senior International Assessment Specialist/Team Leader, Senior Local Civil Society Expert, Evaluation/Assessment Specialist and an individual who will provide administrative, logistics and interpretation support.

The AT Leader: Responsible for coordinating and directing the reporting effort, developing the research methodology and preparing and submitting the draft and final report. The team leader should have a professional background in development work in the E&E and NIS region and in the implementation of technical assistance in addressing civil society issues. The expert should have extensive overseas sector assessment experience, including USAID experience, preferably in the E&E region. He/she must be thoroughly familiar with organizational and team-building skills. Highly developed communication skills (both verbal and written), the ability to conduct interviews and facilitate discussions, and experience writing assessment reports is required. Knowledge of USAID operation and principles would be helpful.

The AT Leader must have strong team management skills and extensive and diverse experience in designing and/or conducting sector assessments in the areas of civil society development and sustainability. The AT Leader should have a professional background in development work in the E&E and NIS region and in the implementation of technical assistance in addressing civil society issues. The
AT Leader must have very good knowledge of USAID development policies and practices. Excellent communication skills (both verbal and written) and experience in managing assessments of civil society developments in Ukraine are desirable.

The AT will use Senior Local Civil Society Expert who should have a professional background in development work in the region and in the implementation of technical assistance in addressing civil society issues. Experience in designing and conducting comprehensive civil society sector development assessments for USAID or other donor is critical. Regional experience and/or country knowledge is required. Good writing and presentation skills are required.

The Contractor must assign one specialist (an Assessment Specialist) with strong understanding of data collection and analysis methodologies and substantial international experience in designing and conducting assessments of international development opportunities. Assessment Specialist(s) must have good knowledge of USAID programming policies and practices. Experience in designing and conducting comprehensive sector development assessments for USAID is desirable. Knowledge of Eastern Europe/CIS region development issues is desirable.

USAID asks that gender be considered in the formation of the AT.

VII. Assessment Management

USAID/Ukraine will appoint an assessment manager at the Mission (to the COR at USAID Washington) to provide technical guidance and administrative oversight in connection with the Assessment, to inform key project stakeholders about the assessment, to review the Assessment Work Plan (AWP) and to review and accept the draft and final Assessment Reports (ARs).

To facilitate assessment planning, the managers will make available to the Contractor Program Descriptions, Annual Implementation Plans, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plans, and Annual Reports of the Ukraine Civil Society Enabling Environmental Program and Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building Program, as well as lists of projects partners, grantees, counterparts and all documents related to civil society development in Ukraine. As warranted, the Contractor will receive additional project-related documentation. The Mission will make available to the Contractor the Ukraine Democracy, Human Rights and Governance Assessment (2015), as well as other assessments and evaluations in the related areas upon request.

To keep the Mission informed about the status of the Assessment, the Contractor will submit electronic version of the Assessment Work Plan (AWP) to the Assessment managers within four working days following the award. The plan will highlight all assessment milestones and include a preliminary list of interviewees and survey participants, a schedule of meetings, visits, and focus group discussions, draft assessment questionnaires and surveys, and, if appropriate, an updated explanation of the assessment methodology. The AT will discuss any assessment barriers/constraints and significant deviations from the original/updated AWP with the Assessment managers and seek USAID’s guidance on those matters.

The AT will conduct weekly briefings for the Assessment managers and other relevant Mission personnel in order to keep them informed of the progress of the Assessment and any issues that may arise/have arisen. The AT shall also be prepared to do an in-briefing for the Assessment managers and other relevant Mission personnel within two working days after their arrival for the field data collection. The AT will invite the Assessment managers and other relevant Mission personnel to participate in all meetings, group discussions, site visits and other activities planned in conjunction with the Assessment as soon as those events are on agenda. The AT shall be prepared to have USAID staff and other activity stakeholders invited by the Assessment managers to any meeting, site visit, or other activity planned in conjunction with the Assessment as observers. The AT will provide an out-briefing to the Mission before departure.
VIII. Deliverables

The Contractor will submit a clear, informative, and credible AR (up to 30 pages, excluding annexes and references) that reflects all relevant AT findings, conclusions, and recommendations made in conjunction with the Assessment. The AR must describe in detail assessment design and the methods used to collect and process information requested in the Assessment Purpose, Scope of Work and Assessment Design and Methodology sections. It must disclose any limitations to the Assessment and, particularly, those associated with the assessment methodology. The AR Executive Summary Section should be three-five pages long and reflect the purpose of the Assessment, assessment methodology and its limitations, key assessment findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The AR should represent thoughtful and well-organized effort that includes sufficient local and global contextual information. Assessment findings should be based on facts, evidence, and data. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by reliable quantitative and qualitative evidence [i.e. there should not be words like “some”, “many”, “most” in the report and frequency of responses and absolute number of interviewed respondents should be given, e.g. five out of 11 experts agreed that …; 30 per cent of survey respondents reported that]. Conclusions should be supported by a specific set of findings. Recommendations should be clear, specific, practical, action-oriented, and supported by a specific set of findings, conclusions, estimates of implementation costs, and suggested responsibility for the action. The Contractor shall ensure that conclusions and recommendations are based on data that are accurate, objective, and reliable.

AR annexes should include an Executive Summary section in official local language; the Assessment SOW; description of the AT and its member qualifications; the final version of the AWP; the tools (in English and Ukrainian) used for conducting the Assessment such as questionnaires, checklists, discussion guides, etc.; properly identified sources of information; in-depth analyses of specific issues; and an MS PowerPoint-based presentation of the Assessment design, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

The AR will be written in English and submitted in electronic form readable in MS Word 2010 based on MS Word Times New Roman 12 or other legible font of similar size. The AR must follow all USAID Branding and Graphic Standards (see http://www.usaid.gov/branding/gsm). In addition, the cover of the AR should provide enough information that a reader can immediately understand that it is an assessment and what was assessed.

Any data (at a minimum, raw quantitative data and any code books) used to prepare the AR (except for the data protected by any formal agreements between the Contractor and interviewees and survey/focus group participants) will be presented in the MS Office compatible format suitable for re-analysis and submitted either by e-mail or on a CD or a flash drive to the assessment managers and COR. The data should be fully documented and well organized for use by those not fully familiar with the Assessment. USAID will retain ownership of all assessment records including interview transcripts or summaries, survey(s), datasets developed, copies of which are provided to the COR.

The AT will present their major assessment findings and preliminary conclusions in a pre-departure briefing for the Mission.

Draft AR will be due in 20 days after the pre-departure briefing for the Mission. A draft AR must include all relevant AT findings and conclusions made in conjunction with the Assessment, as well as preliminary AT recommendations. A draft AR shall be prepared in line with the general requirements (clarity, credibility, length, font size, etc.) set for the final AR. It may include the feedback received from the Mission and stakeholders at the pre-departure briefings. The Mission will have 15 working days to review the draft AR and provide comments to the Contractor. The Mission will decide whether any stakeholders will be invited to comment on the draft AR.

The final AR will be due in 10 working days following the receipt of the Mission’s comments on a draft AR. The Contractor will use either a cover memorandum or similar format to explain how comments
provided by the Mission and other stakeholders (when solicited) were addressed in the final AR if the final AR differs substantially from the draft one. Both the Mission and the Contractor will have a right to initiate an extension of the AR review or preparation/completion time for up to 10 working days at no additional cost. The Contract must be completed by September 30, 2018.

IX. Time Frame

The period of performance for this assessment is June-August 2018. USAID envisions field work to be conducted over approximately three weeks in June-July, with draft assessment findings/conclusions presented during an in-person outbrief to the Mission at the end of field work. A draft AR must be submitted no more than 20 days following the outbrief, and a Final Report must be submitted no more than 10 days following the receipt of USAID comments (by August 30, 2018). A six-day workweek is authorized.

X. Logistical Support

The Contractor will be responsible for all logistical support of the assessment, including translation/interpretation, transportation, accommodation, meeting/visit arrangements, office space, equipment, and supplies. The Contractor must not expect any substantial involvement of Mission staff in either planning or conducting the assessment. Upon request, the Mission will provide the Contractor with introductory letters to facilitate meeting arrangements. USAID requests that any forthcoming American and Ukrainian holidays be considered in scheduling assessment meetings, surveys, and visits in the United States and Ukraine.
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INTRODUCTION

The Assessment Work Plan highlights all assessment milestones and includes: draft preliminary list of semi-structured key informant (SSKI) interviews; draft SSKI protocol; draft focus group protocol; draft on-line survey questionnaire; a tentative schedule of meetings, visits, SKIIs, and focus group discussions (FGDs). At this point, the team does not need to update the assessment methodology presented in the Concept Note.

PRELIMINARY LIST OF SEMI-STRUCTURED KEY INTEVIEWS

Civil Society Organizations

(1) NGO Forum
(2) ProMova
(3) Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR)
(4) Legal Hundred (assistance to ATO veterans)
(5) Crimea SOS /Vostok SOS
(6) At least 5 beneficiaries of Marketplace program (at least 3 regional CSOs)
(7) Gurt / Civic Space
(8) Iryna Solovey, Spilnokosht
(9) Ukrainian Associations of Philanthropists (UFB)
(10) Anatoliy Tkachuk, Institute of Civil Society
(11) Counterpart Creative Centre
(12) Masha Nasedkina, Dyvovyzhni
(13) Centre UA (Strong Communities of Donbas)
(14) Association of Self-Organization of Citizens (Odessa)
(15) Dmytro Bulakh, Kharkiv Anti-Corruption Centre
(16) 2-3 Volunteer organizations in Kharkiv and Odesa
(17) Ukrainian Business Association
(18) Community Foundations (Odesa, Kharkiv)
(19) HUB Odesa
(20) Way to Home Foundation, Odesa
(21) Roma association, Uzhgorod
(22) Hungarian Cultural Centre, Uzhgorod
(23) UNDP Civil society hub in Zakarpattia

USAID Implementers

(1) UCIPR
(2) Ednannia
(3) Pact Engage
(4) Decentralization Offering Better Results and Efficiency (DOBRE)
(5) Interviews Ukraine

Donors / International Organizations

(1) USAID Democracy and Governance team
(2) Iryna Ozymok, Western NIS Enterprise Fund
(3) Victor Liakh, East Europe Foundation
Lesia Tymoshenko, European Endowment for Democracy
Kateryna Haertel, OSCE representative on national minorities
Inna Pidluska, IRF
SIDA

UA Government

Dmytro Shumkiv, Deputy Head of Administration of the President
Natalia Oksha, Cabinet of Ministers
Sergiy Vlasenko, Member of Parliament, Head of State Building Committee

Local Government

Representatives of municipalities cooperating with CSOs
Members of Local Councils (elected officials)
1-2 heads of new consolidated communities

Third-party Civil Society / Democracy Experts

Kateryna Zarembo, New Europe Centre
Kyiv Institute of Sociology
Solomia Borshosh, Deputy Director, Arsenal Art Centre
DRAFT KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII) PROTOCOL

Demographics Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose / Introduction:

We are from NORC at the University of Chicago, a U.S.-based non-profit social science research organization. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has contracted us to conduct an assessment of civil society development in Ukraine. Our work is independent from USAID and **this is an independent assessment.**

We will assess the needs, gaps, and opportunities for civil society development in Ukraine. This will include, in particular such areas as enabling environment and capacity building activities. Your civil society organization (CSO) is of great interest in our assessment.

**Confidentiality clause:** This is a confidential interview and your comments will be generalized with no personal attribution.

**Colour coding for note taking:**
- references (for desk review)
- ideas for recommendations
- examples / quotes we could use in the report

I. Introduction:

1. Before we begin, please tell us a bit about your CSO. Do you cooperate with any USAID-funded project? What type of activities are they supporting or have they supported in the past?

2. Were you engaged in civil society before 2014?
   - NO / YES

3. What are the main sources of funding for your CSO?
4. Do you think there is a vibrant civil society sector in your community/in Ukraine?

II. Enabling Environment

1. How would you describe the current regulatory environment in Ukraine for civil society?

2. What are the main challenges in the regulatory environment for CSOs?

3. If you were to name the most important improvements in the last 4 years in regulatory environment for CSO, what would it be?

4. Are you familiar with the work of UCIPR? How would you describe their contribution to improving regulatory environment?

III. Capacity Development

1. Do you invest in capacity development in your organization? How do you finance such work?

2. Who is providing capacity development for your CSO?
3. What kind of current needs in capacity development you have in your CSO? What are main strength and weaknesses of your CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In general in the civil society sector, where do you see main gaps in capacity?

5. Did you use the services of Marketplace? How would you assess the quality of capacity development assistance? If no, probe about awareness and plans to use them in the future?

IV. Civil Society Sustainability

1. What is needed to ensure sustainable and flourishing civil society in Ukraine?

2. How can Western donors best help support civil society?

3. Is there something that we did not ask you about that you would like to share with us?
PRELIMINARY LIST OF FGDs

Locations: Kyiv and 1 regional city (Kharkiv or Odesa)
Focus groups: 10-12 participants
Duration: 2 hours

Sample participant list:

- 2-3 beneficiaries of Marketplace;
- 2-3 members of coalition for monitoring of implementation of National Strategy for Development of civil society;
- 2 newly registered voluntary organizations working either with IDPs or issues related to conflict;
- 2 representatives of community foundations or community centres (hubs, youth centres, libraries, local museum);
- 1-2 journalists reporting on civil society.
DRAFT FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

Introduction: Goals of the assessment and introduction of each of the participant and facilitators.

Q1: How impactful is civil society in your community? Are there are many CSOs working?

Q2: In your opinion, what are the main obstacles to development of sustainable civil society in Ukraine?

Q3: How would you describe the current regulatory environment in Ukraine for civil society? What are the main problematic areas? Probe for awareness about the work of UCIPR.

Q4: How would you improve capacity of your organization? Probe for experience with the Marketplace.

Q5: What is needed to ensure a sustainable and flourishing civil society in Ukraine? How can Western donors best help?
PRELIMINARY LIST OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

The online survey will be disseminated among the following CSOs:

- Marketplace beneficiaries.
- Engage/PACT grantees
- Members of Association for Self-Organization of Citizens
- UCIPR’s beneficiaries (groups that they have provided consultations or legal assistance)
- Regional HUBs (supported by the UNDP)
- Members of the Reanimation Package of Reform coalition
- Partners of DOBRE program
- Members of the NGO Forum
- Members of Strong Communities of Donbas coalition
- Centre UA partners in the regions

To ensure a high response rate for the online survey, assistance and cooperation from USAID implementing partners is key. We hope such cooperation and support will be available.
# DRAFT ON-LINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

*Introduction explaining confidentiality and purpose of this survey.*

| 1. What is the type of your organization? [Choose one] | ▪ Registered non-profit association based on common interests (students, SMEs, teachers, ATO veterans, IDPs)  
▪ Think-tank  
▪ Informal network of active citizens who volunteer (not registered)  
▪ Charitable foundation  
▪ Other (please specify): _____________________ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Where is the location of your main office?</td>
<td>▪ List of oblast centers (dropdown menu):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. What would you say is your main type of activity? [Choose one] | ▪ Advocacy for policy change (national or regional level)  
▪ Service provision to members (assistance, legal aid)  
▪ Civic education (trainings, lectures, online education, youth camps)  
▪ Charitable aid  
▪ Research  
▪ Other (please specify): _____________________ |
| 4. What kind of citizen group(s) does your CSO represent? [Choose all that apply] | ▪ Youth and children  
▪ IDPs  
▪ ATO veterans  
▪ Disabled  
▪ Professional group (teachers, SMEs, farmers, journalists, etc.). Please specify ____  
▪ Voters  
▪ Consumers  
▪ Local community  
▪ Elderly population  
▪ Ethnic minorities  
▪ Women  
▪ Men  
▪ Other (please specify): _____________________ |
| 5. Is your organization a member of a coalition? | ▪ Yes  
▪ No  
▪ If, yes – specify |
| 6. Do you think there is a vibrant civil society sector in your community/in Ukraine? [Choose one] | ▪ Yes, there are many active CSOs  
▪ Yes, but the CSO community is small  
▪ No, definitely not enough |
| 7. What are the top 3 main sources of funding for your CSO? [Choose all that apply] | ▪ Individual donations (including SMS donations)  
▪ Corporate sponsorship (including local business)  
▪ Local government grants  
▪ National government grants  
▪ Western donors grants  
▪ Income from our services (social enterprise)  
▪ Other (please specify): _____________________ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. Do you think regulatory environment in Ukraine is..? [Choose one]    | ▪ Good, there are no problems  
▪ Rather good, but needs improvement  
▪ Bad  
▪ Restrictive |
| 9. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is “Not at all important” and 5 is “Very important”, please rate each of the following challenges in the regulatory environment for CSOs: | [1-5 scale for each]:  
▪ Complicated registration of new CSOs  
▪ Difficulty with obtaining non-profit status with tax authorities  
▪ Cumbersome accounting  
▪ E-declarations for CSOs  
▪ Tax liabilities to cover costs for participants of events who are not members of a CSO  
▪ Poor tax incentives for corporate sponsorship  
▪ Reporting to fiscal authorities  
▪ Lack of viable framework for cooperation with state authorities?  
▪ Difficult access to state-owned institutions (education, social care sector).  
▪ Complicated procedures for state funding of CSO activities  
▪ Frequent inspections for state authorities  
▪ Informal harassment  
▪ Other (please specify): _____________________ |
| 10. If you were to name the most important improvement in the last 4 years in regulatory environment for CSO, what would it be? | [Verbatim response] |
| 11. Are you familiar with the work of UCIPR?                            | ▪ Yes  
▪ No [if “No”, skip to Q13] |
| 12. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “No contribution at all” and 5 is “Most important contribution”, please rate UCIPR’s contribution to improving regulatory environment for CSOs. | [1-5 scale] |
| 13. What current needs in capacity development do have in your CSO? [Choose up to three] | ▪ Fundraising  
▪ Governance  
▪ Needs assessment among beneficiaries  
▪ Effective coalition building and networking  
▪ Advocacy for policy-change  
▪ Public awareness tools  
▪ Effective public communication  
▪ Provision of social services (costing and quality of services)  
▪ Gender issues  
▪ Mediation and public dialogue skills  
▪ Other (please specify): _____________________ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14. Can you meet your capacity development needs at present? | Yes, but only partially  
Yes  
No  
If “No”, please explain why: __________________________ |
| 15. Who are the main providers of capacity development assistance to your CSO? [Choose up to three] | Private training organizations  
Free-lance trainers  
Online educational platforms  
Universities and business schools  
Marketplace  
Other (please specify): ______________________ |
| 16. Did you use the services of Marketplace? | Yes  
No [if “No”, skip to Q18] |
| 17. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “No contribution at all” and 5 is “Most important contribution”, please rate Marketplace’s support to your organizational capacity. | [1-5 scale] |
| 18. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is “Not at all important” and 5 is “Very important”, please rate each of the following in terms of what is needed to ensure sustainable and flourishing civil society in Ukraine: | [1-5 scale]  
Better regulatory environment  
More high quality capacity building to CSOs  
Better cooperation with the state at the national level  
Better cooperation with local authorities  
Improved public image of CSOs  
Improvement of quality of services provided by CSOs  
More sources of funding for CSOs  
More active citizenship in Ukraine (citizens participate in the work of CSOs)  
Improved legitimacy of CSOs  
Better governance of CSOs  
Other (please specify): ______________________ |
| 19. What constitutes the three main strengths of your organization? [Choose three] | Expertise of our employees  
Expertise of our employees  
Strong membership base  
Capacity to mobilize local community for action  
Strong public image and reputation  
Participation in horizontal national networks  
Belonging to international networks  
Connections with the Western decision-makers  
Citizens’ support our goals  
Access to decision-makers at home  
Enabling legal framework that enshrines our role in the society  
Media presence (including social media)  
Access to financial resources  
We offer added value to the society (services, innovation); please describe: __________________________  
Other (please specify): ______________________ |
20. Do you believe your CSO has an impact?

- Yes, all the time
- Yes, most of the time
- Yes, but rarely
- No

*Survey completion; thank you message.*
TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF ASSESSMENT MILESTONES: MEETINGS, VISITS, KII, AND FGDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2-6</td>
<td>Desk review, finalize and release survey to be confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9</td>
<td>Team arrival to Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team meeting, finalization of interview protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>KII in Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>KII in Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USAID in-briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12</td>
<td>Travel by train to Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KII in Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>KII in Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel by train to Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>KII in Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17</td>
<td>KII in Kyiv, FGD in Kyiv to be confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>KII in Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel by air to Odessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19</td>
<td>KII in Odessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>KII in Odessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21</td>
<td>Travel by air to Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>Travel by air to Uzhgorod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23</td>
<td>KII in Uzhgorod, FGD in Uzhgorod to be confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24</td>
<td>KII in Uzhgorod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel by air to Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>KII in Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparations for out-briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26</td>
<td>USAID out-briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>Team departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>Draft assessment report submitted to USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17</td>
<td>USAID comments to NORC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>Final report submitted to USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX E:
LISTS OF RESPONDENTS OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS (KIIS) AND FOCUS GROUPS, NORC FIELD MISSION IN UKRAINE, JULY 9–27, 2018

IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maksym Latsyba, COP</td>
<td>Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svitlana Kononchuk, Executive Director;</td>
<td>Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Heletiy, DCOP</td>
<td>Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Kovats, COP</td>
<td>Pact Inc. – ENGAGE program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Reed, COP</td>
<td>Global Communities DOBRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volodymyr Sheyhus, COP</td>
<td>ISAR-Ednannia – Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentyna Demkina, Event Manager</td>
<td>ISAR-Ednannia – Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andriy Donets, developer of the Marketplace</td>
<td>ISAR-Ednannia – Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Klymova, communications and OD manager</td>
<td>ISAR-Ednannia – Ukraine Civil Society Capacity Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oksana Maydan, DCOP</td>
<td>Internews – Strengthening Independent Media in Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaropolk Brynykh</td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iryna Bilous, DCOP</td>
<td>Pact Inc. – ENGAGE program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayder Khalilov</td>
<td>Pact Inc. – ENGAGE program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olena Botsko, Senior Program Manager, Civil Society</td>
<td>NDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kobakhidze, IFES Deputy Country Director for</td>
<td>IFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Pashkova, Senior Project Officer</td>
<td>IFES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS, KYIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inna Borzylo, Executive Director</td>
<td>Center UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatoly Tkachuk, COP</td>
<td>Institute for Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesia Vasylenko</td>
<td>Legal Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iryna Solovey</td>
<td>Spilnokosht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredric Larsson</td>
<td>Former NGO Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Omelian, Coordinator on Org. Cap. and Reg. Dev.</td>
<td>Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras Bryzhovatyi</td>
<td>Charity Foundation Social Service “Yefanova”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohdan Maslych, Executive Director</td>
<td>GURT Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olha Ayvazovska</td>
<td>Opora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olha Kiasian</td>
<td>Azov &amp; Co., assistant to MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olha Gvozdiova</td>
<td>Donbas SOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleksandr Pavlichenko</td>
<td>Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetiana Pechonchyk</td>
<td>Human Rights Information Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS, KHARKIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna Prokazova</td>
<td>Kharkiv Zero Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmytro Bulakh, Head of the Board</td>
<td>Kharkiv Anticorruption Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Rofe-Beketova, Project Manager</td>
<td>Charity Foundation “Kharkiv with You”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleksandra Schukina</td>
<td>Center UA, Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iryna Salnyk</td>
<td>Charity Fund “Yasna Rich”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna Minkina</td>
<td>Kharkiv OPORA. Activities: election observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyudmyla Dolya, Deputy Head</td>
<td>Kharkiv Press Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleksandra Naryzhna</td>
<td>City Reforms NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehor Matiukhin</td>
<td>Street Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina Khanbabaeva</td>
<td>NGO, Culture Agency B - Days of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariya Yasenovska, Head of the Organization</td>
<td>Kharkiv Regional Foundation “Public Alternative”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS, ODESA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andriy Krupnik</td>
<td>Association of People Self-Organization. Activities: support to civil society development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonid Ignatiev, Head of the Organization</td>
<td>Public union, “Eurostrategy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlo Kolotvin, Head</td>
<td>NGO, Institute of Political Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serhiy Kostin, Founder and director</td>
<td>Charity Fund &quot;Way to Home&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svitlana Pidpala, member,</td>
<td>Centre of Legal Monitoring 'Dignity'; '2 May Group' and Zelenyi Lyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetiana Semikop, Head</td>
<td>Civic Movement &quot;Faith Hope Love&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeriy Bolgan, Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Odesa branch of &quot;Committee of Voters of Ukraine&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitalii Ustymenko, Head</td>
<td>Automaidan Odesa; Odesa Centre UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladyslav Serdiuk, Deputy Director</td>
<td>Centre of Legal Monitoring 'Dignity', Head of ‘Right to Defense’; Member, “2 May Group”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yana Tytarenko, Deputy Director</td>
<td>NGO, Zelenyi Lyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriii Nikitin, Head</td>
<td>Save Odesa Ourselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS, UZHGOROD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sviatoslav Babilia, Regional coordinator</td>
<td>Uzhgorod branch of Civil Network OPORA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriy Kopynets, Head of the Board</td>
<td>Civil Society Development Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karoline Dorch</td>
<td>Hung. Cultural Society of Zakarpattia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myroslav Horvat</td>
<td>City council; NGO “Roma Star”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolton Zoltonovych Kulin</td>
<td>Intern. Party of Hungarians, culture department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andriy Vyshniak, Head of the Board</td>
<td>ChF “Center for Civic Initiatives”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# CIVIL SOCIETY EXPERTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatoliy Mazhora</td>
<td>Kharkiv-based journalist, Radio Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myroslava Lendel</td>
<td>Uzhgorod National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viktoria Mryshuk</td>
<td>NGO Trainer, Institute for Social and Economic Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obraztsova Olga Ivanivna, Deputy Head of Internal Policy, Head of Department for Public Communications</td>
<td>Kharkiv Oblast Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryna Honda, Head of Public Communication Department</td>
<td>Kyiv City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriy Mandych, Council Member</td>
<td>Uzhhorod City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilak Oleksandr Pavlovych, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>Uzhhorod City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Oksha</td>
<td>Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DONOR ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vasyl Romanyuk, Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Embassy of Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Long</td>
<td>OTI, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Coughlan, Head of HMG Programmes in Ukraine</td>
<td>The U.K. Embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svitlana Yavorska, Policy and Programmes Co-coordinator</td>
<td>The UK Embassy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oksana Kosenko</td>
<td>UNDP, CSO Capacity Development Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inna Pidluska, Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>International Renaissance Foundation in Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesya Tymoshenko</td>
<td>EED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetiana Shulha</td>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlad Ionescu</td>
<td>Canadian Embassy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS, KYIV, JULY 17, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasiya Makarenko</td>
<td>Kyiv Cyclist Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evgeniya Tkachenko</td>
<td>NGO Magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna Alimova</td>
<td>Civic Organization, “It Is Our Kyiv”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna Zhuk</td>
<td>Holos Stolitsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina Kondur</td>
<td>Roma Women Fund “Chirikli”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariya Nasedkina</td>
<td>NGO Dyvovyzhni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Sofiy</td>
<td>Ukrainian Foundation “Step by Step” (USSF), educational reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nataliya Chornohub</td>
<td>Natalka Park (support to civic participation in the city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleksandr Volf</td>
<td>Association of Palliative and Hospice Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlo Kaliuk</td>
<td>Samosad, gardening in Podil /Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serhiy Loboyko</td>
<td>Kyiv’s Civic Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitaliy Drobotun</td>
<td>NGO, Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitaliy Kuzmenko</td>
<td>Ministry of Veterans, project office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriy Yuzhych</td>
<td>Plast (National Scout Organization of Ukraine)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS, UZHGOROD, JULY 19, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleonora Kulchar</td>
<td>Charity Fund BLAGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostiantyn Blazhevych</td>
<td>NGO Zakarpattia - Donbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianna Sobran</td>
<td>Municipal Agency of Uzhgorod Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykola Sus’ko</td>
<td>Youth Space NGO, deputy of city council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olena Makarenko</td>
<td>Union of Women of Ukraine, Uzhgorod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetiana Khoroshlyova</td>
<td>NGO Zakarpattia - Donbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentyna Mytrovtsiy</td>
<td>Union of Women of Ukraine, Uzhgorod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriy Kushnir</td>
<td>Economics Dept., Uzhgorod National University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX F:
KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII) PROTOCOL

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PURPOSE:
We are from NORC at the University of Chicago, a U.S.-based non-profit social science research organization. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has contracted us to conduct an assessment of civil society development in Ukraine. Our work is independent from USAID and **this is an independent assessment**.

We will assess the needs, gaps, and opportunities for civil society development in Ukraine. This will include, in particular such areas as enabling environment and capacity building activities. Your civil society organization (CSO) is of great interest in our assessment.

**Confidentiality clause**: This is a confidential interview and your comments will be generalized with no personal attribution.

Color coding for note taking:

- □ - references (for desk review)
- ☀ - ideas for recommendations
- ☀️ - examples / quotes we could use in the report

INTRODUCTION

1. Before we begin, please tell us a bit about your CSO. Do you cooperate with any USAID-funded project? What type of activities are they supporting or have they supported in the past?

2. Were you engaged in civil society before 2014?
   NO / YES
3. Do you think there is a vibrant civil society sector in your community/in Ukraine?

4. What are main strengths and weaknesses of civil society in Ukraine / your region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses (including gaps in capacity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENABLING ENVIRONMENT**

5. How would you describe the current regulatory environment in Ukraine for civil society?

6. What are the main challenges in the regulatory environment for CSOs?

7. If you were to name the most important improvements in the last 4 years in regulatory environment for CSO, what would it be?

8. Are you familiar with the work of UCIPR? How would you describe their contribution to improving regulatory environment?
CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

9. Do you invest in capacity development in your organization? How do you finance such work?

10. Who is providing capacity development for your CSO?

12. Did you use the services of Marketplace? How would you assess the quality of capacity development assistance? If no, probe about awareness and plans to use them in the future?

13. What are the main sources of funding for your CSO?

CIVIL SOCIETY SUSTAINABILITY

14. What is needed to ensure sustainable and flourishing civil society in Ukraine?

15. Recommendations: How can Western donors best help support civil society?
16. Is there something that we did not ask you about that you would like to share with us?
ANNEX G: UKRAINE CSO ONLINE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

INTRODUCTION: We invite you to participate in this on-line survey of civil society in Ukraine. This survey was designed by NORC at the University of Chicago, a U.S.-based non-profit social science research organization for a study commissioned by The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

The survey has two goals. First, we want to understand how recent efforts in improving regulatory environment and develop capacity impacted the sector. Second, we need to gather information about future programming priorities to further develop sustainability of the sector.

*Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and the survey responses will be kept completely confidential.* All responses will be confidential and no names of respondents or organizations will be used in the assessment report.

We assure you that your answers will be **anonymous**. Your answers will not be used individually. We will be putting all the responses of the survey together. **Because of this anonymity USAID or its partners will NOT be able to connect your answers with your organization.**

Your participation is important to our effort to develop an accurate assessment of civil society in Ukraine. We estimate this survey will take about 15 minutes to complete. Please complete all questions in the survey.

Please note that by completing this survey you agree to the use of the information provided for the purposes described above. Please complete the survey and submit no later than August 3. We value your opinion and thank you for your cooperation.

**Q1 What is the type of your organization? [Choose one]**

- Registered non-profit association based on common interests (students, SMEs, teachers, ATO veterans, IDPs)
- Think tank
- Informal network of active citizens who volunteer (not registered)
- Charitable foundation
- Other (please specify) ________________________________


Q2 Where is the location of your main office?
- Odesa Oblast
- Dnipropetrovsk Oblast
- Chernihiv Oblast
- Kharkiv Oblast
- Zhytomyr Oblast
- Poltava Oblast
- Kherson Oblast
- Kiev Oblast
- Zaporizhia Oblast
- Luhansk Oblast
- Donetsk Oblast
- Vinnytsia Oblast
- Mykolaiv Oblast
- Kirovohrad Oblast
- Sumy Oblast
- Lviv Oblast
- Cherkasy Oblast
- Khmelnytskyi Oblast
- Volyn Oblast
- Rivne Oblast
- Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast
- Ternopil Oblast
- Zakarpattia Oblast
- Chernivtsi Oblast
- Kiev (Municipality)
- Autonomous Republic of Crimea

Q3 What would you say is your organization’s main type of activity? [Choose one]
- Advocacy for policy change (national or regional level)
- Service provision to members (assistance, legal aid)
- Civic education (trainings, lectures, online education, youth camps)
- Charitable aid
- Research
- Other (please specify) ____________________________________________
Q4 What are the main constituencies that your CSO represents? [Choose all that apply]
- Youth and children
- IDPs
- ATO veterans
- Disabled
- Professional group (teachers, SMEs, farmers, journalists, etc.) (please specify)
- Voters
- Consumers
- Local community
- Elderly population
- Ethnic minorities
- Women
- Men
- Other (please specify)

Q5 Is your organization a member of a coalition?
- Yes
- No

Display This Question:
Is your organization a member of a coalition? = Yes

Q5a What coalition?

Q6a What do you consider the main geographic sphere in which your CSO operates? (Please choose one)
- Local community
- Oblast
- Region (multiple oblasts)
- National
- International
Q6b Within the geographic sphere in which your CSO operates, do you think there is a vibrant civil service sector?
- Yes; the CSO community is large and CSOs are effective
- Yes; the CSO community is small, but CSOs are effective
- Yes; but although the CSO community is large, many CSOs are not effective
- No

Display This Question:
If What do you consider the main geographic sphere in which your CSO operates? (Please choose one) ≠ National

Q6c Do you think there is a vibrant civil society sector in Ukraine as a whole?
- Yes; the CSO community is large and CSOs are effective
- Yes; the CSO community is small, but CSOs are effective
- Yes; but although the CSO community is large, many CSOs are not effective
- No

Q7 What are the top 3 main sources of funding for your CSO?
- Individual donations (including SMS donations)
- Corporate sponsorship (including local business)
- Local government grants
- National government grants
- Western donors grants
- Income from our services (social enterprise)
- Other (please specify) ________________________________________________

Q8 Do you think the regulatory environment in Ukraine is... [Choose one]
- Good, there are no problems
- Rather good, but needs improvement
- Over-regulated with “red tape”
- Restrictive
Q9 On a scale from "not at all important" to "extremely important," please rate each of the following challenges in the regulatory environment for CSOs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Does not apply to my CSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complicated registration of new CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with obtaining non-profit status with tax authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbersome accounting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-declarations for CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax liabilities to cover costs for participants of events who are not members of a CSO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor tax incentives for corporate sponsorship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to fiscal authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of viable framework for cooperation with state authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult access to state-owned institutions (education, social care sector)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated procedures for state funding of CSO activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent inspections for state authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 If you were to name the most important improvement in the last 4 years in the regulatory environment for CSOs, what would it be?
________________________________________________________________

Q11 Are you familiar with the work of UCIPR?
0 Yes
0 No

Display This Question:
If: Are you familiar with the work of UCIPR? = Yes

Q12 Please rate UCIPR's contribution to improving the regulatory environment for CSOs.
0 No contribution at all
0 Slight contribution
0 Moderate contribution
0 Somewhat important contribution
0 Very important contribution

Q13 What are the three top needs for capacity development in your CSO? [Choose up to three]
0 Fundraising
0 Governance
0 Needs-assessment among beneficiaries
0 Effective coalition building and networking
0 Advocacy for policy change
0 Public awareness tools
0 Effective public communication
0 Provision of social services (costing and quality of services)
0 Gender issues
0 Mediation and public dialogue skills
0 Other (please specify) ___________________________________________________________________
Q14 Can your CSO meet its capacity development needs at present?
0 Yes
0 Yes, but only partially
0 No

Display This Question:
If: Can your CSO meet its capacity development needs at present? = No

Q14a Please explain why not:
________________________________________________________________

Q15 Who are the main providers of capacity development assistance to your CSO?
[Choose up to three]
0 Private training organizations
0 Freelance consultants and trainers
0 Online educational platforms
0 Universities and business schools
0 Marketplace
0 Other (please specify) ________________________________________________

Q16 Did your CSO use the services of Marketplace?
0 Yes
0 No

Display This Question:
If Did your CSO use the services of Marketplace? = Yes

Q17 Please rate Marketplace's support to your CSO's organizational capacity.
0 No contribution at all
0 Slight contribution
0 Moderate contribution
0 Somewhat important contribution
0 Very important contribution
Q18 On a scale from "not at all important" to "extremely important," please rate each of the following in terms of what is needed to ensure sustainable and flourishing civil society in Ukraine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Does not apply to my CSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better regulatory environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More high quality capacity building to CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better cooperation with the state at the national level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better cooperation with local authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved public image of CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of quality of services provided by CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sources of funding for CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More active citizenship in Ukraine (citizens participate in the work of CSOs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved legitimacy of CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better governance of CSOs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 What constitutes the three main strengths of your organization?

- Expertise of our employees
- Strong membership base
- Capacity to mobilize local community for action
- Strong public image and reputation
- Participation in horizontal national networks
- Belonging to international networks
- Connections with Western decision-makers
- Citizens’ support for our goals
- Access to decision-makers at home
- Enabling legal framework that enshrines our role in the media
- Media presence (including social media)
- Access to financial resources
- We offer added value to the society (services, innovation); please describe:
  ____________________________________________________________

- Other (please specify) __________________________________________

Q20 Do you believe your CSO has an impact?

- Yes, all the time
- Yes, most of the time
- Yes, rarely
- No
### A. CURRENT STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>• Civil society has acquired greater legitimacy in Ukraine and a high level of citizens’ trust.</td>
<td>• Donors should introduce co-funding incentives to motivate CSOs to fundraise from local sources. The emphasis should be on fundraising from local communities and the private sector. Local fundraising is also a path to better connection to citizens’ and local communities’ support of CSOs activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many new civic actors since the Euromaidan, voluntary initiatives have led to the formation of new organizations. Main strength of the “new” organizations is high motivation and dedication of people in CSOs.</td>
<td>• There are many CSOs in Ukraine but their effectiveness and their capacity to fulfill their missions and sustain their goals is uneven. However, the distribution of capable CSOs is uneven by regions of Ukraine, with the strongest CS actors in Kyiv.</td>
<td>• Regional CSOs and activists’ groups should stay a top-priority for civil society development. Diversified regional approach to civil-society development should be based on civil society assessments in the regions and prioritize initiatives that get the most support from local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CSO sustainability is slightly improved. Growing interest in developing organizational capacity mostly caused by western donors.</td>
<td>• The positive change occurred in the infrastructure and OD dimensions of civil-society sustainability via developing networks of CSO hubs/assistance centers and academic education programs on CSO management.</td>
<td>• Promote regional and inter-regional partnerships and coalitions/movements. The mediation and conflict-resolution programs should be launched to assist civil-society actors to overcome the barriers to cooperation and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upward trend in local sources of state and private funding. The government started introducing competitive procedures for CSOs.</td>
<td>• Local sources of funding improve despite often lack of competitive procedures in the national and local governments. Tools of local democracy, partially thanks to decentralization, make citizen engagement in policy-making more effective.</td>
<td>• Civic education programs should be expanded from educational institutions (schools, universities) to wider communities, including the hyper-local level – villages and district (rayon) centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved availability and distribution of funding at the local level – participatory budgets and social service contracts.</td>
<td>• High-dependence on Western donors in terms of both funding and aid priorities is a threat for civil society sustainability in Ukraine.</td>
<td>• Ensure more efforts in OD are directed towards new and regional CSOs. Develop regional OD programs with mid- to long-term modules and mentorships. The OD centers should be available in all regions of Ukraine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture of private giving gradually develops.</td>
<td>• CSOs have low capability to engage citizens and communicate about CSO work to wide audiences.</td>
<td>• Assist the national and local governments to reform the delivery of the state funding to CSOs via state grants, local grants, or participatory budgeting by elaboration of relevant procedures and further monitoring. Particular attention should be paid to development of the National Fund to Support Civil Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
<td>• Weak coalition building and lack of integrity in civil society. A significant number of ‘fake’ CSOs that pursue dubious, sometime uncivil goals.</td>
<td>• OD programming should include support to help overcome the burnout and disillusionment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both in the case of “old” and “new” CSOs, financial viability remains the weakest element of CSO sustainability in Ukraine. Western donors remain main source of funding.</td>
<td>• Risks of restrictive regulation, smear campaigns and increasing risks of physical violence against security threats for civic activists, especially for anti-corruption, local government watchdog and LGBT groups combined with impunity for perpetrators of attacks against civil society actors.</td>
<td>• Security issues for CSOs and civic activists should be addressed via legal assistance in case of threats or attacks, court litigation, security training, and teams of rapid response for emergency cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State and local sources of funding are hard to administer and access.</td>
<td>• Growth of ‘uncivil’ civic actors, in particular from radicalized activists and far-right groups causes distrust to civil society and place the human rights CSOs in shadow.</td>
<td>• Support CSO advocacy efforts aimed at abolishing existing laws and drafts laws that restrict civic space. Monitoring and documentation of attacks against civil society and state efforts to end impunity for perpetrators of such attacks. Instead, the regulations to minimize radical CSOs interventions should be considered and proposed to the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only 7 percent citizens report civic engagement. Poor civic literacy causes misunderstanding of civic rights, civil society functioning, and possible ways of civic participation among citizens.</td>
<td>• The narratives building and lack of integrity in civil society and the emergence of far-right actors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of integrity in Ukrainian civil society without self-regulation mechanisms causes appearance of fake CSOs affiliated to political parties, criminals or paramilitary that exploit the citizens’ trust to civil society for their interests.</td>
<td>• Deteriorating civic space via wave of physical attacks and threats on CS activists in southern and eastern regions in 2017 and 2018. Legal regulations on e-declaration and taxation of paid services limit development of anti-corruption and service-providing CSOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. CURRENT STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

#### ISAR Ednannia: Approaches and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivers OD assistance to Ukrainian CSOs via multi-level financial support and various networking and community-of-practice opportunities.</td>
<td>An important OD resource center for CSOs from all the regions.</td>
<td>OD support should continue focusing on development of the sector demanded capacities. High quality OD should focus on diversification of funding, especially crowd funding, social enterprise, social services, and development of local philanthropy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains the only source of OD small grants, especially for new CSOs. Its effort to increase the financial viability of CSOs, as reported by the grantees, is successful.</td>
<td>Aided in developing the OD culture in Ukraine as demonstrated by increasing demand for OD grants.</td>
<td>Stimulate more visionary professional development among CSOs, and emphasize monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E), social innovation, results-based management, and transfer of relevant skills — especially communication — from the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace grantees manage to develop new local funding sources, such as local budgets, public-private partnerships, and community foundations.</td>
<td>Applies a demand-driven flexible approach to meet Ukrainian civil society needs and expectations in organizational development.</td>
<td>More attention should be paid to developing standards of service provision via the Marketplace. The standards, including possible trainer certification, should be widely discussed with the sector, including Ukrainian and international groups with strong experience in training and consulting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAR’s grants, OD trainings, webinars, and Civil Society Forums offer Ukrainian CSOs a multi-faceted development experience.</td>
<td>By accumulated funding from various donors, ISAR is an effective re-granting mechanism for smaller international donor organizations coming to Ukraine.</td>
<td>ISAR should extend its communication and outreach strategy beyond the oblast centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular grantees’ surveys, site visits and feedback mechanisms allowed ISAR to respond the changes in the civil society landscape, particularly to focus on emerging actors in civil society. Assistance to CSOs serving IDPs and ATO veterans increased in response to humanitarian crises caused by the armed conflict in the east of Ukraine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to current vulnerable groups, attention should also be paid to building organizational capacity of national minority groups and CSOs that advocate rights of the Roma population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term, multi-year (3+) gradual OD assistance, as proved by ISAR’s recipients, demonstrated better results across various OD areas, in particular diversification and size of funding, new partnerships and increase of beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society Forums should strengthen the OD component and provide more workshops and in-depth presentations of topics as demanded by the beneficiaries. Regional Civil Society Forums might contribute to improving awareness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. CURRENT STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

### Findings

- **UCIPR: Approaches and Results**
  - Legal environment component of CSO Sustainability Index 2017 score (3.5) has slightly decreased first time since 2013. The main setback was the introduction of e-declarations for anti-corruption CSOs, which was a gesture of political revenge, and now increasing attacks on anti-corruption activists.
  - Successful advocate of 49 decisions in favor of CSO environment. 54% of online survey respondents stated that UCIPR makes a “somewhat important” or “very important” contribution to improving the regulatory environment.
  - UCIPR’s advocacy focused on four main work streams: (1) improved registration for CSOs; (2) advocacy for better regulation and prevention of restrictive laws for the sector; (3) more accessible, transparent and accountable state funding for CSOs; (4) expanding citizen engagement mechanisms at the local level. UCIPR’s approach to advocacy also includes monitoring the implementation of civil-society-related laws.
  - Government representatives appreciated UCIPR’s efforts to build capacity in the region and develop mechanisms for civic participation in policy-making. In cooperation with IFES, UCIPR developed a new civic education course, “Democracy: from Theory to Practice.”
  - UCIPR’s networks were more effective in developing joint positions on CSO registration, taxation, reform of public funding, and local democracy. However, some CSOs are concerned about UCIPR’s mandate to represent the sector on a variety of regulatory issues.
  - Ukraine’s regulatory environment suffers from over-regulation and red tape. UCIPR’s monitoring reveals a sharp discrepancy in the implementation of civil-society policies across Ukraine, and also incoherence between practices and normative rules.

### Conclusions

- Contributed to positive changes; in particular, improvements in CSO registration, more transparent state funding, and opening of local government to more citizen engagement.
- Achieved the most success in constructive advocacy at the national level, monitoring of CSOs related policies, awareness building about the new regulations.
- Good working relations with the national and regional governments, and technical assistance to the government are among key strengths of UCIPR’s approach.
- A collaborative sectoral approach to civil society advocacy is effective, and thematic networks working on various issues of CSO regulation provide better ownership in the sector. However, there is little awareness of UCIPR networks in the wider civil-society sector.
- There is a slight mismatch between the problems in regulatory environment as perceived by the CSOs and UCIPR.
- Monitoring component allowed UCIPR to expose substantial regional discrepancy in practice of citizen engagement across Ukraine and registration.
- The cross-sectoral approach to trainings, which includes both CSOs and government officials, is viewed as effective practice.
- UCIPR applied flexible program approach for fast response to emerging needs and generated some additional results.
- Providing legal aid only via the hotline yields weak results. Currently legal aid supplied from UCIPR does not match demands, which is especially high in the regions.

### Recommendations

- Ensure better alignment of UCIPR’s advocacy efforts and regulatory problems of the sector. To achieve this, regular needs assessments among the CSOs leaders should be conducted.
- Address the issue of legitimacy amongst Kyiv-based groups and extend the circle of counterparts. UCIPR should direct efforts to develop common positions in the sector by conducting facilitated discussions.
- To demonstrate its added value to the sector UCIPR could channel more international expertise from its partners (ICNL, ECNL) into Ukraine.
- To be a fully-fledged advisory center for non-profit law, UCIPR should substantially improve its outreach to the regions of Ukraine and boost its capacity to deliver legal expertise. UCIPR could provide secretariat, materials, consultations to the network, and develop a community of practice.
- Improve strategic communication: as part of its own organizational development it is key that UCIPR has clear messaging about its role in contributing to enabling environment in Ukraine.
### B. INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak diversification of foreign donor support. Donors prefer experienced CSOs with strong OD when allocating grants.</td>
<td>Despite substantial international assistance provided to Ukrainian civil society by various international donors, there are still serious gaps in funding in order to achieve sustainability.</td>
<td>Funding should reach beyond the capital city of Kyiv and oblast centers to rural areas and small towns. Donors should aspire to better distribution of funds beyond Donbas, which is oversaturated with aid to civil society at the expense of other regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in assistance related to the development of social enterprises and delivery of social services; insufficient access to microfinance, impact investment, and private companies’ funds.</td>
<td>Weak diversification of types of funding, lack of long-term OD throughout Ukraine, concentration of funding in Kyiv and large oblast centers, and insufficient support to the infrastructure of the sector (including community foundations, civic hubs, and regional resource centers) all constitute major gaps in technical assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services could be a major boost in legitimacy for the sector. Only 9 percent believe strength of their CSOs comes from added value to society. CSOs have a weak capacity to provide social services and an inability to properly cost them; CSO fear that if they conduct economic activity, they will lose non-profit status, which cannot be renewed.</td>
<td>Small CSOs, new civic start-ups and grassroots initiatives struggle to tap into western grants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors plan annually and offer short-term grant programs to CSOs. Many interviewees stated that there are enough short-term training opportunities for organizational capacity-building, but a more systematic OD approach is lacking.</td>
<td>Given a worrisome trend towards physical attacks, including deadly ones, against civic activists in Ukraine, quick and flexible emergency support is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most funding is concentrated in Kyiv and, since the start of the armed conflict, in Donbas.</td>
<td>More legal assistance and advice for new created initiatives to get institutionalized, more civic spaces and community hubs for CSOs and activists will be needed in Ukraine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western donors too often have a narrow understanding of advocacy, as an interaction with authorities, lobbying or influencing government policymaking. CSOs spoke about the need to focus advocacy campaigns on mobilization of citizens. Simultaneously, CSOs have a deficit of knowledge and skills of how to work with citizens and informal citizens groups or grassroots initiatives.</td>
<td>More legal assistance and advice for new created initiatives to get institutionalized, more civic spaces and community hubs for CSOs and activists will be needed in Ukraine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient support to civil-society infrastructure, including civil society spaces and community centers. Despite current efforts, including by OTI, ENGAGE and UNDP, to establish civic hubs in Ukrainian cities, demand for such spaces is high.</td>
<td>Despite substantial international assistance provided to Ukrainian civil society by various international donors, there are still serious gaps in funding in order to achieve sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many in the regions spoke about acute need to support grassroots initiatives and citizens’ groups at the local level, Acute need in legal advice and support to CS. The UCIPR hotline and consultants’ network is not sufficient. There is also need for emergency support to civic activists in crisis situations, given a growing number of physical attacks against civil society leaders in Ukraine.</td>
<td>Weak diversification of types of funding, lack of long-term OD throughout Ukraine, concentration of funding in Kyiv and large oblast centers, and insufficient support to the infrastructure of the sector (including community foundations, civic hubs, and regional resource centers) all constitute major gaps in technical assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding should reach beyond the capital city of Kyiv and oblast centers to rural areas and small towns. Donors should aspire to better distribution of funds beyond Donbas, which is oversaturated with aid to civil society at the expense of other regions.</td>
<td>Focus on developing indigenous sources of funding as part of technical assistance. Develop skills, capacities, and a regulatory basis for social entrepreneurship and delivery of social services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support development of community foundations and the re-granting capacities of Ukrainian CSOs, who could administer such grant schemes and serve as regional CSO resource centers.</td>
<td>In addition to support to advocacy and watchdog organizations that focus their work on government policies and actions, donors need to promote advocacy CSOs that campaign to mobilize citizens for social change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors should aspire to better distribution of funds beyond Donbas, which is oversaturated with aid to civil society at the expense of other regions.</td>
<td>Support development of community foundations and the re-granting capacities of Ukrainian CSOs, who could administer such grant schemes and serve as regional CSO resource centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure there are information platforms that can easily connect active citizens to various CSOs and their causes. Multi-donor initiatives could be established in various oblasts to support civil-society hubs/centers of civic activism.</td>
<td>Ensure a more systemic and long-term funding approach to OD. New professional development courses at educational institutions with strong mentorship component could satisfy growing demand. Invest in long-term mentorship, fellowship, and professional education programs for CSO leaders. Ensure that project-purpose grants include an OD component.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources should be invested into providing legal advice to CSOs, especially in the regions. Such legal aid should cover key operational issues: fiscal, registration, cooperation with the state, and economic activity.</td>
<td>IN crisis situations, quick and flexible provision of emergency assistance to civil-society activists is necessary, including security measures, medical and psychological assistance, and legal aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES FOR CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth.</strong> Young people are taking more interest in newly amalgamated communities as part of youth councils work, but much work remains to boost youth engagement in civil society including via educational institutions and city communities. The online survey shows 18 percent of CSOs focus on this group.</td>
<td><strong>Youth.</strong> There is potential to reach young people in civil society remain critically low. Youth-targeted activities require a special approach.</td>
<td><strong>Youth.</strong> Possible actions could include more OD for youth CSOs and more inclusion of youth into thematic programs; capacity-building for CSOs in youth engagement; development of the volunteer sector; and special targeting of high-school students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender.</strong> The desirable outcomes of the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy are of strong relevance and importance to Ukraine. AT online survey shows that around 10 percent of CSOs deal with the rights and interests of women; and only 4 percent believe they need OD on gender issues.</td>
<td><strong>Gender.</strong> Awareness about gender issues remains low among Ukrainians, and stereotypes and misconceptions persist.</td>
<td><strong>Gender.</strong> To better integrate the gender component, make perspectives of both gender, gender equality, mainstreaming and integration trainings are available on Marketplace. The program should also stimulate the development of new CSOs dealing with gender issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minorities and Vulnerable Groups.</strong> Among AT survey respondents, around 6 percent work with this target group. Integration of national minorities, especially of the Hungarian and Roma communities, remains weak. Minorities’ CSOs are not willing to cooperate with Ukrainian CSOs. On the other hand, the biggest Hungarian CSO expressed interest in developing more active cooperation with Kyiv, in developing multilingual education.</td>
<td><strong>Minorities and Vulnerable Groups.</strong> Issues of minorities and vulnerable groups are crucial for Ukraine’s social cohesion. It is important that donors support new groups addressing the needs of those groups (including ATO veterans), if those groups manifest liberal, democratic, and inclusive values.</td>
<td><strong>Minorities and Vulnerable.</strong> With a growing trend of social service procurement by the state, these CSOs could provide critical contribution to the improvement of conditions for many vulnerable groups and positively impact state policies. Donor support should focus on inclusion of ethnic minorities (especially Roma and Hungarians), social innovation in providing more inclusive education, development of multilingual education, and promotion of tolerance and diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anti-Corruption.</strong> The unreformed political system allows vested interests to profit by maintaining monopolies, limiting accountability, and having considerable discretion in the use of public resources. The tolerance to corruption among the population increases (2018 SCORE Index). Citizens are tasking the top leadership to fight corruption but are less committed to take a personal action in uprooting it. Attacks on activists that challenge vested interest and e-declaration further complicate the fight against corruption.</td>
<td><strong>Anti-Corruption.</strong> The CSOs’ and government’s achievements toward eliminating corruption and raising transparency of the government work are crossed out by raising citizens’ tolerance to the corruption and reluctance to take personal actions.</td>
<td><strong>Anti-corruption.</strong> As civil society fights to abolish the e-declaration law, it is important that the civil society itself, especially groups promoting accountability and transparency in public agencies, considers its own level of transparency to its constituency and wider public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decentralization.</strong> Centralization allows for greater accountability, transparency, and more effective citizen-government cooperation.</td>
<td><strong>Decentralization.</strong> It is crucial to improve local administrative and service delivery capacity, while simultaneously working with civil society or otherwise supporting development of responsive and participatory governance. It means that more joint trainings for active citizens, CSOs, and local government officials are needed in understanding the applicability and effectiveness of those public participation tools.</td>
<td><strong>Decentralization.</strong> In view of very uneven implementation of various aspects of citizen engagement in policy, levels of decentralization, and quality of service provision, it is important to support exchanges and networking between elected council members, heads of hromadas, and civil-society leaders across Ukraine to promote best practice. This could promote peer-to-peer learning and boost those processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Government Partnership.</strong> National government provided positive feedback about the cooperation with civil society and donors in the implementation of the OGP. The new action plan for 2018–2020 includes the following priorities: digital verification of extractive industries ownership, introduction of verification of end-beneficiary ownership, and introduction of international standards of transparency in infrastructure costs.</td>
<td><strong>Open Government Partnership.</strong> The OGP is an excellent vehicle for CSOs collaboration with the state and should be better promoted both at the national and regional levels.</td>
<td><strong>Open Government Partnership.</strong> Promote OGP priorities set in the government’s National Plan on OGP that reflect such criteria as improved access to information, citizen engagement, new IT and accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. KEY ASSISTANCE APPROACHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- International donors focus on achieving objectives that can be delivered by certain CSOs, but few really look at civil society as a sector as a whole. The ecosystem thinking to sustainability of civil society recognizes interdependence and interaction between its different components.</td>
<td>- In view of a certain maturity of the sector, fast-evolving reform processes, growth of the sector, and the active role of civil society in advancing Ukraine’s democratic transition, the current gaps in connectivity impede the sector’s impact and social innovation.</td>
<td>- Apply an ecosystem approach to the sector and ensure critical elements of the system are supported, such as enabling environment, OD, and diversity of funding. But equally important are promoting diversity of funding, growing indigenous sources of funding and enabling connectivity within the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Networking. Need in more coalitions, movements, cross-sectoral cooperation, and projects that promote cooperative values in Ukraine. Only 50 percent surveyed CSOs are members of coalitions. Insufficient transfer of knowledge and skills from well-established CSO to new activists. Lack of common spaces to bridge the gap between different CSOs in the region, and between activists with established donor-funded CSOs.</td>
<td>- It is important that the new program supports critical elements of the ecosystem, such as an enabling environment and OD. These two pieces of the puzzle are of paramount importance. But equally important are promoting diversity of funding, growing indigenous sources of funding and enabling connectivity within the system.</td>
<td>- Promote sectoral horizontal partnerships and coalitions/movements to amplify advocacy and benefit from the “wisdom of crowds.” Encourage innovative approach to networking, communication and expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Citizen engagement. CSOs practice one-way communication to their audiences. CSO have limited access to traditional media, and weak skills to communicate via internet-technologies. The practice of beneficiary needs assessment, audience surveys, or solicitation of feedback is rare at best.</td>
<td>- All three programs (ENGAGE, ISAR and Citizen in Action) make a crucial contribution to Ukrainian civil society by providing knowledge and financial resources. Each has unique set of activities and services for the sector. These programs could be regarded as key elements of civil society eco-system.</td>
<td>- Maintain flexible programming in the current volatile, unpredictable and rapidly changing environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge-sharing. The donors’ commission research is not accessible in one place. Much effort it currently directed towards development of capacity of individual CSOs and do not deliver structural change.</td>
<td>- Ukraine’s vulnerabilities in critical thinking and media literacy expose the need to integrate this approach across the civil society program. In view of possible Russia-made shocks resilience of communities and local CSOs is of paramount importance.</td>
<td>- Promote sectoral horizontal partnerships and coalitions/movements to amplify advocacy and benefit from the “wisdom of crowds.” Encourage innovative approach to networking, communication and expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-regulation component. Many fake, publicly affiliated CSOs and individuals who discredit the sector. Informants from national and municipal governments described difficulty in finding credible and professional CSOs for cooperation or public consultations. In some cases, donors fail in proper due diligence in evaluating operational methodologies and expertise of regional CSOs.</td>
<td>- Recognize the necessity of expanding the base of professional CSOs. These CSOs can serve as a pool of candidates for the role of more credible and professionally managed CSOs.</td>
<td>- Encourage innovative approach to networking, communication and expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resilience to conflict and disinformation. Ukraine is a society that lives with conflict. According to AT’s desk research, the top list of citizen concerts is war in the East, security of Ukraine overall and high crime rates.</td>
<td>- In view of continued conflict and active use of disinformation to disrupt and disunite Ukrainian society, promote the practice of a resilient community and a resilient organization as one of the OD capacity. Reinforce efforts in building cognitive resilience via training in critical thinking and evaluating the quality of information.</td>
<td>- In view of continued conflict and active use of disinformation to disrupt and disunite Ukrainian society, promote the practice of a resilient community and a resilient organization as one of the OD capacity. Reinforce efforts in building cognitive resilience via training in critical thinking and evaluating the quality of information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. ADJUSTMENTS TO CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 77 percent of respondents of AT survey believe that their organizations have impact all or most of the time, but 60 percent believe that there are many ineffective CSOs. This contradiction speaks to a concern about the quality of the sector that should be seriously addressed. There is demand for bringing best international practice to Ukraine in order to improve impact.</td>
<td>• ENGAGE must quickly address the issue of citizen engagement in the sector, so new efforts could be directed to address other issues of sustainability.</td>
<td>• It is crucial to ensure no new restrictive regulations are imposed on the sector. The risks run high, in particularly ahead of the upcoming Presidential and Parliamentary elections in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Since Western donor grants are the top source of funding both for Kyiv-based and regional CSOs, more diversity is highly needed. Present donor funding is not very diverse in Ukraine. CSO see a “high entry barrier” into the CS sector with donor funds, and lack of start-up funding for new social initiatives. There is a need for supporting new, grass roots initiatives in the regions, including with project funds and OD.</td>
<td>• The current state of civil-society development in Ukraine requires more attention from the side of USAID to improving the quality of services and impact, developing more diverse sources of funding, strengthening cooperation with the national and regional authorities.</td>
<td>• Better align advocacy for regulatory change with the real needs of the sector. Continue focusing on state funding, add more efforts on developing economic activity of CSOs, social enterprise, social services, simplification of cumbersome reporting, and improvement of fiscal regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Old well-established CSOs offer the same set of activities to donors and it is a challenge for many donors to fund them repeatedly.</td>
<td>• Many of those issues could be addressed to a large extent by continuing and modifying assistance delivered to enabling environment and capacity building.</td>
<td>• Promote associative approach and launch more self-regulation within the sector. Ensure leaders of the sector have opportunities to suggest best ways to organize such work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better cooperation with local authorities, support for projects in the newly amalgamated communities, and more funding for local campaigning were named as the necessary conditions for more effective civil society in Ukraine’s regions.</td>
<td>• In view of concerns about the quality of the sector (both service delivery and integrity), growth inside the sector, decentralization and ENGAGE’s efforts to activate more citizens, it is crucial that both current components of the program (enabling environment and OD) continue.</td>
<td>• Pursue development of the nationwide network of non-profit lawyers. Ensure there is assistance for activists under attack, including security assistance and legal aid. Consider stronger partnership with the Coalition to Defend Civil society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The two top challenges in the regulatory environment are also related to funding: (1) the complicated state funding procedure for CSO activities; and (2) weak tax incentives for corporate sponsorship.</td>
<td>• There is acute need to develop non-confrontational, action-based activism.</td>
<td>• Decentralize OD delivery and offer better guided longer-term capacity building. In addition to Marketplace, develop new OD centers and strengthen the existing ones (hubs). Ensure there is high quality OD offer on diversification of funding, especially crowd funding, social enterprise, costing and quality assessment of service. Integrate funding for OD into all major grants, even if it is a small component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is acute need to develop non-confrontational, action-based activism.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider launching more programs in non-profit management in Ukrainian higher education institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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METHODOLOGY:

- Desk and document review
- Field Trip [3 weeks in Ukraine]
- Regional visits: Uzhgorod, Odesa, Kharkiv
- 61 Interviews (KII)
- Online survey [1,412 contacts]
Key Informant Interviews: 61
  Kyiv: 27
  Odesa: 12
  Uzhgorod: 9
  Kharkiv: 13

KII per respondent type:
  CSOs and experts: 43
  Donors: 11
  Government: 5
  Implementing Partners: 4
  ISAR, UCIPR, Engage, U-Media
ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Which UCIPR and ISAR project approaches and activities have been most effective in achieving the respective objectives of these activities? Did the UCIPR and ISAR projects yield results other than those planned?

2. To what extent does the current legal environment in Ukraine enable or prohibit CSO development?

3. Is there a critical mass of CSOs that have adequate organizational and technical capacities to fulfill their missions and sustain their goals? Is there a relevant infrastructure?

4. Are there other critical civil society sector development needs that are not covered by USAID programs or by other international donors?

5. What are the critical necessary steps for civil society sector sustainability, including but not limited to the sub-sectors addressed by UCIPR (enabling environment) and ISAR (capacity development)?
CIVIL SOCIETY: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

OPPORTUNITIES

- Increase in motivated, committed civic leaders and CSOs and readiness of citizens to engage [20%]
- Role of civil society recognized by state and citizens [34% know CSOs active in their city/village]
- Ample training opportunities for capacity development. Demand for OD is growing.
- Non-restrictive regulatory environment, many mechanisms in place
- More local democracy instruments are available but varied patterns of citizen engagement
- More state funding (including open calls: CSOs, youth, veterans) but mostly non-transparent. $13 million USD in 2018 vs $6 million IRF: only 7% open calls
CIVIL SOCIETY: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

CHALLENGES

- Weak connections between CSO and their constituents (communities)
- Integrity issue (conflict of interest). Many fake CSOs. Non-existent self-regulation
- High dependence on western donor funding
- Uneven grant support: Kyiv, Donbas, big cities
- Weak culture and incentives to develop local sources of funding for CSOs
- Lack of solidarity, cooperative spirit (zero-sum game approach) in the sector
- Weak inter-regional cooperation between CSOs in the same field and within their regions
CIVIL SOCIETY: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

- Higher security risks for activists fighting vested interests
- High level of fatigue among newcomers after 2-3 years of civic activism
- New CSOs still have low levels of organizational capacities and less aware of OD and funding opportunities
- Value-based polarization and rise of radical ‘uncivil’ groups
- Implementation practices of CSO regulations vary (longer periods of registration in practice, difficulty registering economic activity of CSOs, modalities of state funding)
UCIPR: FEEDBACK ABOUT ACTIVITIES

- Mostly focuses on working with government (technical assistance) and their expertise is appreciated
- UCIPR’s supply of legal aid does not match demands, especially high in the regions
- Resource and support centers for CSOs in the regions are not visible (Mariupol and Kryvyi Rih)
- Weak mandate (as perceived by national CSOs) to represent views of the sector
- Low awareness among CSOs in the regions, no UCIPR brand recognition
- Network of legal advisers on non-profit law is not visible
ISAR EDNANNIA: FEEDBACK ABOUT ACTIVITES

- Well-recognized and acknowledged as OD provider in Kyiv and the regions
- Growing demand for ISAR’s OD grants
- Mostly known for OD grants and annual Civil Society Forum
- Appreciated for opportunity to obtain first small grant by new CSOs
- ISAR builds successful partnerships with other donor CS programs
- Difficulty in understanding kinds and quality training offer on Marketplace
REGIONAL ISSUES: KYIV CITY

- Regulation on e-petitions allows effective state-civic cooperation
- New source of urban activism: teams formed around e-petitions [100]
- Few donors work at the Kyiv city level
- Gaps in local democracy: 7 public hearings per year compared to 2 per week in Lviv

- 500 active CSOs out of 9600 registered
REGIONAL ISSUES: KHARKIV

- Confrontation: mayor – citizens
- Several strong CSOs but passive citizens and youth
- Popular perception of CSOs as political actors
- Substantial city funding for sport and culture [1 mln UAH for street culture]
- Cases of violence against activists, threats to anti-corruption groups
REGIONAL ISSUES: UZHGOROD

- Ethnic ‘segregation’ in the CSO sector: isolation from each other and Kyiv
- Brain drain
- Hungarian state funding for Hungarian CSO
- Impunity (captured oblast, smuggling, organized crime)
- Decentralization stalled
- Visibility of radical groups: Carpathian Sich (target Roma, Hungarians, witch hunt for separatists)
REGIONAL ISSUES: ODESA

- A part of post-Euromaidan ‘patriotic’ CSOs are co-opted by the authorities, discredit the idea of civil society.

- Civic activists who touch upon vested interests are under risk (threats, physical attacks, defamation)

- Extreme ideologies are not popular, but more radical civic activism is on the rise as civic activists see no effect in protecting their causes through legal/peaceful mechanisms
DONOR ASSISTANCE GAPS

◆ Funding gaps:
   - Medium scale institutional support
   - Matching grants: for crowd funding
   - Start-up grants for social enterprise
   - Seed money and micro-grants, outreach to community level

◆ Funding priorities tilted towards anti-corruption

◆ Insufficient donors support to infrastructure of civil society

◆ Lack of SOS support for activists at risk

◆ Deficit of knowledge and best practices in citizens engagement

◆ Lack of mid to long-term OD programs with mentoring to learn more complex skills
  (e.g. 1 degree program in non-profit management)
CROSS - CUTTING ISSUES AND KEY TRENDS

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES:
- YOUTH
- Minorities and Vulnerable groups
- Anti-corruption
- Gender

KEY TRENDS:
- Decentralization
- Open Government Initiative
KEY ASSISTANCE APPROACHES

◆ APPLY ECOSYSTEM APPROACH
◆ PROMOTE VIRTUOUS CYCLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY
CIVIL SOCIETY ECOSYSTEM

- OD SYSTEM
- KNOWLEDGE SHARING
- FUNDING
- NETWORKING AND COP
- CULTURE OF CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT
- VISIBILITY: CS FRIENDLY MEDIA
- POLITICAL CULTURE: PARTICIPATORY
- ENABLING REGULATION
CONNECTIVITY IS KEY
KEY ASSISTANCE APPROACHES

- Develop indigenous sources of funding by co-funding incentives
- OD: develop regional OD centers, with mid to long term modules and mentorships. Integrate funding for OD into all major grants
- Enabling environment: promote associative approach and self-regulation. Ensure leaders of the sector have opportunities to suggest best ways to organize such work.
- Promote sectoral horizontal partnerships and coalitions/movements
- Support pilots/models (social innovation), promote them, scale
CHANGES TO CURRENT ACTIVITIES

01 Assistance to OD and enabling environment should be boosted

02 Stimulate more professional development (VISION), M&E, new channels for knowledge sharing

03 Invest more in improving supply side of Marketplace (quality of OD offer, feedback on trainers, search by OD topics)
CHANGES TO CURRENT ACTIVITIES

04 Promote and support citizen campaigns. Launch Annual Campaign Award at CSD Forum.

05 Environment: in addition to technical assistance to UAG, ensure better engagement of CSOs to develop joint positions about key issues. Develop network of lawyers to support the sector.

06 Ensure there is a diversified regional approach to civil society development

07 Support development of community centers, independent public spaces
“HOPE is definitely not the same thing as optimism. It is not the conviction that something will turn out well, but the certainty that something makes sense, regardless of how it turns out.”

CIVIL SOCIETY IN UKRAINE PROJECTS HOPE

Critical thinking without hope is cynicism, but hope without critical thinking is naivete.
THANK YOU!

LET US DISCUSS!

ORYSIA LUTSEVYCH: orysiaua@gmail.com
NATALIA SHAPOVALOVA: natalka.shapovalova@gmail.com
IRYNA NEGREEVA: negrieiva@gmail.com