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I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Summary
The CEPPS Strengthening Political Processes in Ukraine (SPPU) program spanned a pivotal period (2009 to 2016) in Ukraine’s recent history. At the start of the program in 2009, Ukrainians’ hopes for more responsive and accountable political institutions, evident during the 2004 protests, were disappointed by political polarization, infighting among political leaders and policy paralysis. However, the Euromaidan demonstrations transformed the Ukrainian political landscape in 2013 and 2014. Often referred to as the ‘Revolution of Dignity,’ Euromaidan established new expectations for respectful, transparent, and responsive government behavior.

Throughout this program - both before and after the Revolution of Dignity - the CEPPS partners conducted activities that helped move citizens to the center of political decision making. Working with political parties and civil society, the CEPPS partners sought to strengthen democratic institutions and increase government accountability, based on the theory that engagement with citizens, accountability and internal reform are all essential to securing Ukraine’s future as an independent democratic nation.

During this important period in Ukraine’s history, CEPPS assistance supported Ukrainians as they worked to advance democratic reforms. CEPPS assistance to political parties and government officials at all levels helped them to be more inclusive and more responsive to citizens. Public opinion research enabled Ukrainian partners to better understand and respond to citizens’ interests. Support to civil society groups helped them to conduct effective monitoring and advocacy campaigns that improved linkages between citizens and elected officials at all levels. The CEPPS partners also organized international election observation missions that helped improve the transparency and integrity of electoral processes. The fact that international observers found Ukraine’s last three elections to be credible is a testament to the strides that the country has made over the last seven years. By placing Ukrainians at the center of activities, this program helped to develop local capacity in order to create lasting democratic change.

Note on the Report’s Organization
The objectives for the first half of the award (2009 to 2012) were reorganized in 2013 as part of a three-year add-on to the program, though the overall goals of the program remained the same. For the sake of clarity, the partners have organized the report by the objectives approved for the 2013 to 2016 period. However, each section includes activities and results for the life of the program.

**Problem Statement**

Broadly speaking, this seven-year CEPPS program can be viewed in two distinct parts (2009 to 2013) and (2013 to 2016), bridged by the events of Euromaidan, which took place in 2013 and 2014. Though the program’s overarching goal – to increase government responsiveness to citizens – remained the same throughout the life of the program, the challenges evolved in response to developments on the ground.

At the start of the program, CEPPS identified three key areas on which to focus: helping political parties better represent citizens’ interests, improving linkages between civic groups and parties and improving civic monitoring and advocacy, and increasing transparency and integrity in electoral processes. The political situation deteriorated between 2009 and 2013, with the imprisonment of opposition politicians, the consolidation of executive, legislative and judicial power in the hands of the presidential administration and its loyalists, and the parliamentary elections that most foreign observers determined did not meet international standards. During this period, Ukraine’s political parties tended to be organized around the personalities of their leaders rather than the issue priorities of supporters, civic groups struggled to transmit citizen concerns to elected officials and decision makers, and many citizens who were once involved in political life became disengaged and cynical about electoral processes.

The Euromaidan protests, which began in 2013, fundamentally altered Ukraine’s political landscape and created an opportunity to fundamentally reform and rebuild a pluralistic political party system in which parties and the Ukrainian government are more transparent and responsive to citizens. In the face of war, economic crisis and entrenched resistance from some individuals and sectors in government, it proved difficult to fulfill those high expectations. In addition, the country still faces the enormous and divisive challenge of determining the future of the separatist areas. Despite these many and varied obstacles, the Ukrainian government and parliament set forth a comprehensive reform agenda that included, among other things, decentralization and local governance reforms. Power is still highly centralized in Ukraine and these reforms seek to increase citizen input in decision-making processes at all levels of government. In order to assist communities across Ukraine to implement these reforms, CEPPS recognized that national and local officials must be provided with the skills necessary to be responsive to citizens, civil society must be strengthened to be able to peacefully voice citizen concerns, and relationships between the two groups must be enhanced.

**Objectives**
**Objective 1:** More representative and accountable political parties and processes through strengthened national level advocacy (CEPPS/NDI)

**Objective 2:** More representative and accountable political processes and actors through enhanced civic engagement and advocacy at the sub-national level (CEPPS/IRI)

**Objective 3:** Donors and key stakeholders are better informed of political and electoral environment (CEPPS/IFES)

**Objective 4:** The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic non-partisan election observers. (CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI)

**Political Update Relevant to Program Implementation**

Ukraine experienced a tumultuous period during the mid-2000s where a lack of elite consensus on addressing important socio-economic challenges hampered both economic and political development of the country, presenting a challenge to the consolidation of democracy in Ukraine. Political parties consistently failed to channel citizens’ concerns effectively because they tended to be organized around the personalities of their leaders.

Ukraine’s many civil society organizations, although active, were only partially effective in transmitting citizens’ concerns to elected officials and other decisionmakers. Few of the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that sought to organize citizens around policy issues at the national level were experienced in providing input into policymaking and policy implementation. Many lacked the capacity to articulate realistic policy solutions or implement strategies for marshaling their supporters, allies and other resources to successfully engage decisionmakers. Citizen frustration and the resulting disengagement from politics also lessened incentives for responsive government. Many of the people who were once vigorously involved in political life became disengaged and grew increasingly cynical about electoral processes.

After the election of President Victor Yanukovych in 2010, most political institutions came under the control of his organization, the Party of Regions (PoR). President Yanukovych secured a parliamentary majority through questionable legal tactics, replaced constitutional court judges, and expanded the legal powers of the executive branch. Concurrent with the concentration of authority in the president and his party, Ukraine witnessed a rapid erosion of democratic rights. Indicative of this trend was the regime’s selective prosecution of political opponents, most notably former Prime Minister (PM) Yulia Tymoshenko, who was convicted of abuse of office.

In the fall of 2013, massive spontaneous protests broke out in response to the Cabinet of Minister’s last minute decision to suspend negotiations with the European Union. Protestors created *Euromaidans* – public gathering places for protestors – across the country, with the largest one on Kyiv’s Independence Square. Special riot police attempted to brutally clear the square, beating peaceful protestors on November 30. Outraged by the use of force, almost a million protestors demonstrated in Kyiv on several Sundays thereafter. During the protests, CEPPS partners temporarily scaled back programming to assess the developing situation.

President Viktor Yanukovych fled Ukraine at the height of the demonstrations. Following a brief
period of interim governance, Ukraine held a presidential election in May 2014. The result of election day was a show of national unity behind now-President Petro Poroshenko, who won in the first round with more than 50 percent of the vote. The governing coalition disbanded in July 2014, and since a new coalition did not form within 30 days, early parliamentary elections were called for October 26, 2014. Poroshenko cited the need for a new legislature to pursue peace and fight corruption, unemployment and poverty, goals that would reinforce Ukraine’s independence and stability. He pledged a democratic and transparent process.

In October 2014, Ukraine held parliamentary elections in what proved to be the second time in less than six months that the Ukrainian people conducted elections that met international democratic standards. In spite of external Russian pressure and the ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine, the conduct of the elections was a major success. In the period since the parliamentary elections, the Rada, together with the president and his administration, have faced the tasks of reshaping the economy, decentralizing the government, fighting corruption and establishing an independent judiciary. The pressure from citizens and civic groups to deliver reform quickly has remained.

Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity, as the events of 2013 and early 2014 were called, marked a dramatic shift from increasing authoritarianism to a developing democracy with a vibrant civil society. Euromaidan established new expectations for respectful, responsive government behavior, and mobilized hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians into political activism. As a result, new opportunities and challenges for political parties and civic groups emerged.

In October 2015, regularly scheduled local elections were held, despite snap parliamentary and presidential elections that occurred in May 2014. As a result of these local elections, many new councilmembers entered office for the first time, which led to an exponential increase in requests for CEPPS training and assistance.

II. ACTIVITY IMPLEMENTATION

Objective 1: More representative and accountable political parties and processes through strengthened national level advocacy (CEPPS/NDI)

CEPPS Objective 1.1: National advocacy by CSOs with parties and their affiliated elected officials on elections and political process issues is improved.

Intermediate Result 1.1.A: More inclusive advocacy campaigns lead to political processes that better reflect European and international standards for democratic governance.

---

This objective combines Objectives 1 and 2 from the first half of the program (from 2009 to 2013). The original objectives were: Objective 1: Development of the democratic political system in Ukraine is enhanced through political parties that better represent citizens’ interests at the sub-national level, and Objective 2: Demand is increased for more effective representation of the public interest by political parties and elected officials through (a) improved advocacy and monitoring of political parties and elected officials by civic groups and (b) improved linkages between civic groups and political parties.
In 2010 and 2011, CEPPS/NDI worked with the Housing Coalition, a large coalition of NGOs founded by Opora and the Union of Dwelling Owners, as it advocated for amendments to legislation on housing and communal services, utility regulation and condominium regulations. Specific support included technical assistance on messaging, drafting legislation and conducting constituent outreach. CEPPS/NDI also assisted Opora in planning a national advocacy campaign to preserve transparent testing procedures for university admissions.

Together with CEPPS/IFES, in 2010 CEPPS/NDI assisted Opora in forming a consortium of civic groups to advocate for electoral reform in Ukraine. CEPPS/NDI provided guidance and support to the consortium as it developed a clear and unified position on the draft election law. In 2011, CEPPS/NDI assisted the consortium in organizing a series of public debates on the election law in Donetsk in Lviv, Odessa, and Kyiv. Throughout 2013, CEPPS/NDI coordinated with Ukrainian civic groups and the international community on advocacy regarding implementation of a controversial national referendum law passed in 2012. CEPPS/NDI also assisted Opora in launching a monitoring program for newly elected local councilors and mayors following the 2010 elections.

Beginning in August 2012, CEPPS/NDI issued a subgrant to the Institute of the Republic (IR), one of the leading members of a national coalition of civic groups working on the issue of freedom of assembly. In 2013, CEPPS/NDI also began working with the Reanimation Reform Package (RRP), a coalition of 50 civic groups and 150 political activists and policy experts, many of whom served as leaders of the Euromaidan movement. The coalition worked with the Reanimation Reform Caucus in parliament to promote a comprehensive legislative agenda for reform, addressing election laws, procurement practices, education policy, and access to public information, among other issues. In 2014, CEPPS/NDI conducted a series of grassroots organizing training sessions for regional civic activists from the For Peaceful Protest (FPP) coalition, the Center UA, and the Civic Sector of Euromaidan.

CEPPS/NDI also helped the Center for Legal and Political Analysis (CPSA) join with other groups from the RRP to seek pledges from candidates in the 2014 parliamentary elections to fight corruption, practice transparency and work with civil society. CEPPS/NDI supported FPP in early 2014 to identify grassroots organizing activities that could further their broader interest of democratic participation. CEPPS/NDI partnered with FPP in August 2014 for focus group research and opinion polls on civic engagement in the eastern and southern oblasts. This research also was shared with the local branches of political parties. Following the October 2014 elections, CEPPS/NDI continued to support FPP in protecting the freedom of assembly in Ukraine and to expanding into new areas of civic engagement.

In 2014, CEPPS/NDI conducted an intensive assessment (Attachment 4) of how to reshape its civic as well as political programming in the post-Euromaidan environment. The assessment consisted of six phases: preparation, desk studies, fieldwork in Kyiv, Lviv and Kharkiv, a survey of civic actors outside Kyiv, analysis of preliminary results, and preparation of the final report. For the assessment, four experts came to Ukraine to assess the environment and inform CEPPS/NDI’s programming in the following arenas: political, civic, research and open data.
Based on the results of the assessment, in 2014 and 2015, the CEPPS/NDI subgrantee Open North helped RRP to work with members of parliament (MPs) on the creation of an open data portal and updated website that can be used by citizens, journalists and activists to identify how individual MPs and party factions have voted in Parliament on different topics. Also to promote open data, CEPPS/NDI and Open North provided expertise on the government’s e-governance initiatives and white papers, and helped a regional civil society organization (CSO) in L’viv convene roundtables in Western Ukraine to gather citizen input on e-governance policies. Finally, with Open North, and Ukrainian CSO Social Boost, CEPPS/NDI helped the Kyiv city government develop and use a ‘budget simulator,’ through which citizens could provide feedback online to the city budget.

Also, building on assessment findings in 2015, CEPPS/NDI inaugurated a new civic program intended to build on Euromaidan’s momentum for citizen driven reform, channel protest energy into sustainable civic activism, and broaden the number of people involved in discussion on major reforms especially in the regions. Under this ‘multi-level dialogue’ initiative CEPPS/NDI issued subgrants to and trained national CSOs Centre UA and IR to organize at the local, regional, then national level on reform of party and campaign financing. To make these issues relevant to new activists, CEPPS/NDI helped its partners first design activities that demonstrated the local impact of national reforms - such as petitioning local candidates and parties to agree to transparent financing. As citizens became more involved, they began to share experiences at the regional level and then to advocate on national legislation.

As part of a multi-level dialogue process on campaign and party finance reform encouraged by CEPPS/NDI, Center UA and Institute Respublika initiated a campaign called “Follow the Money” with the goal of increasing the transparency of party and candidate funding in advance of the October 2015 local elections. The campaign educated citizens about the benefits of transparent campaign funding and involved them in monitoring traceable campaign costs, including television and print advertisements. To support and amplify the impact of all initiatives, CEPPS/NDI created a “Citizen Toolkit,” (Attachment 5) a compilation of easy to use templates and instructions for the entire spectrum of activities involved in civic organizing, which contained Ukrainian success stories including from the multi-level dialogues.

At the local level, CEPPS/NDI also provided technical assistance to IR’s “Active Community” project in 15 communities, in which citizens advocated on local issues such as improved infrastructure and services, but also joined the dialogues on campaign finance reform. Prior to “Active Community” in 2011 and 2012 CEPPS/NDI conducted its “NGO School,” a combination of micro grants and intensive training and mentoring for local NGOs in small towns and cities in Kherson, L’viv and Vinnihtsa oblasts. Intended to address a deficit in technical assistance to civil society outside major cities, the “School” was led by Ukrainian trainers and produced hundreds of local advocacy campaigns to improve access to services, and infrastructure.

**Intermediate Result 1.1.B: Increased cooperation and linkages between political parties and civic actors in advocacy campaigns on key electoral and political process issues**
In all of the civic advocacy activities described above, CEPPS/NDI counseled its civic partners to seek allies for their advocacy campaigns within political parties. For example, on the important political process issue of freedom of assembly, CEPPS/NDI helped the FPP coalition expand its outreach to additional MPs and contacts in political parties, including through advocacy in the Rada and letters directly to political party leaders. CEPPS/NDI also facilitated meaningful linkages between the Reanimation Reform Package coalition with MPs and political parties, organizing roundtables on drafting a code of conduct among political parties for the 2014 parliamentary elections. As part of the multi-level dialogue on campaign and party finance reform, CEPPS/NDI helped local level civic activists meet with political party branches to explain their program and seek support. At the local level, CEPPS/NDI incorporated into the NGO School, meetings between each civic trainee and local party branches to present the civic group’s advocacy issues.

Also, in 2012 CEPPS/NDI conducted a series of trainings on local level advocacy for Front of Change party activists intended to promote linkages and meaningful cooperation between civil society, community members, local councilors and particularly between parties’ elected officials and activists. CEPPS/NDI also encouraged cooperation between the Equal Opportunities Caucus and civic groups that work on gender issues.

**CEPPS Objective 1.2: Political parties are more responsive to concerns of citizens and marginalized groups, especially women.**

**Intermediate Result 1.2.A: Political parties are more representative and inclusive, particularly in relation to women’s participation, as well as to vulnerable groups**

Following a year-long party assessment process from 2009 to 2010, CEPPS/NDI developed a two-tiered approach to its party assistance program. CEPPS/NDI identified first-tier parties, which possessed the strongest capacity for, and commitment to, citizen engagement. These included Batkivshchyna, Front of Change, and Udar. CEPPS/NDI offered these parties multifaceted assistance in campaign management, constituent outreach and strategic communication. At the same time, CEPPS/NDI provided selective assistance to address the most pressing needs of other regional parties, which included the Party of Regions (PoR), Strong Ukraine, Reforms and Order, and Rukh.

From 2011 to 2013, CEPPS/NDI held regular consultations with representatives of these parties, along with other emerging parties in both Kyiv and the regions. It organized workshops, seminars and roundtables designed to help parties better identify and respond to citizen concerns. Specific training topics included public communication and message development skills; voter outreach methods; political analysis and media relations; using focus group and opinion poll results to help shape and formulate party strategy; election day observation strategies; and youth and volunteer recruitment. CEPPS/NDI invited international experts and politicians to share their experiences and discuss best practices in grassroots campaigning, including former Governor Howard Dean and former Seattle mayor Greg Nickels.

In advance of the October 2014 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/NDI met with major political parties and tailored consultations, roundtable discussions, and workshops designed to help the
parties build party branch capacity, and conduct effective constituent relations and voter outreach. CEPPS/NDI also organized ‘cascade’ training, or training of trainers (ToTs) to train others in their parties, in order to prepare large numbers of candidates, including from new parties to be electorally competitive. In March 2014, CEPPS/NDI invited former Governor of Vermont Howard Dean to share with party leaders best practices in voter outreach and lessons from the 2012 Obama campaign. In September 2014, CEPPS/NDI brought in senior Democratic Campaign party consultant David Hunter to lead a series of seven workshops with individual parties on voter contact in the post-Euromaidan political environment.

NDI also revamped its party programming after Euromaidan to assist new and reformist parties that had emerged, as well as respond to an assessment finding that all party leaders were far more receptive than previously to citizen demands for accountability. In January 2015, CEPPS/NDI conducted 23 focus groups in five cities and implied association tests (IATs)\(^2\) in Kyiv and Kharkiv on the 2014 parliamentary elections, attitudes towards parties. CEPPS/NDI shared both this and the results of later national survey through consultations with political parties, on the implications of the polling, potential changes to party practices. In 2015, CEPPS/NDI met with leaders of all significant parties in and out of parliament to present two rounds of research, one following the 2014 parliamentary elections and one conducted in spring 2015. In many cases, these led to requests for further follow up meetings with top leaders or presentations at party meetings and congresses.

**Parliamentary Assistance (2015)**

Throughout 2015, CEPPS/NDI organized or participated in a number of initiatives to enhance the responsiveness of parliament to civil society. CEPPS/NDI cooperated with the Institute of Representative Governance (IRG) to organize a study mission for six MPs in July 2015, and worked with House Democracy Project to facilitate a parliamentary exchange trip in September 2015. Following this trip, CEPPS/NDI brought former Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle to Ukraine to discuss the formation of an ethics body in the Rada modeled on the Congressional Ethics Commission. At CEPPS/NDI’s invitation, both Daschle and former Swedish Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik visited Ukraine to discuss coalition building and management with Ukrainian parties. CEPPS/NDI also shared its research with the EuroOptimist parliamentary caucus, a multiparty caucus formed to promote European values and standards, and participated in the Open Parliament Initiative, an international forum that connects civil society and MPs and promotes legislative openness.

**Constituency Relations Training Series**

From 2013 to 2015, CEPPS/NDI engaged with government and party representatives about becoming more responsive to constituents, including members of vulnerable and marginalized group. Several parties expressed interest in emulating the Obama campaign’s complex micro-targeting techniques from the 2012 election cycle. CEPPS/NDI engaged David Hunter, to conduct consultations for United Democratic Party for Reform (UDAR), the Democrats party, Batkivschyna, the People’s Force party and the civic group, Civic Sector of Euromaidan.

---

\(^2\) IATs measure implicit attitudes, including those that participants may be reluctant to state openly due to political, social, or other pressures.
In the second half of 2013, CEPPS/NDI conducted three constituency outreach trainings for MPs and their staff. CEPPS/NDI brought in former British Labour party MP Andrew MacKinlay to share his experience and best practices in constituent outreach and engagement. CEPPS/NDI prepared and led regional constituency outreach trainings for MP assistants in mid-2015, including the use of CiviMP a database management tool. CEPPS/NDI trained both parties and MPs extensively on use of this tool.

**CEPPS Objective 1.3: Women’s political participation is increased.**

*Intermediate Result 1.3.A: Politically active women have opportunities to assume greater public profile in championing public policy issues*

CEPPS/NDI consulted with its political party partners regularly throughout the project on a variety of party development issues related to gender, including women’s wings, recruiting and training women in the party, and research and policy on gender. In 2012, CEPPS/NDI engaged a polling firm to conduct a series of eight focus groups that would concentrate on different groups of women voters to determine their political priorities. To publicly highlight these research findings and generate more discussion on the need for increased women’s participation in the political system, CEPPS/NDI co-sponsored a conference on gender and the 2012 parliamentary elections on May 31 with the Equal Opportunities Caucus hosted the event in the Verkhovna Rada.

From 2012 to 2013, CEPPS/NDI held workshops on constituency relations for PoR women councilors at the oblast, city, rayon and village council levels around the country; organized seminars for women leaders from the regional branches of UDAR; assisted the Rukh party and Batkivshchyna in establishing multiday training schools for young women activists; and organized a one-day workshop for women elected officials, activists, and members from Batkivshchyna and the former Front of Change women’s wings to discuss their views and needs as party activists, and the best ways to organize women’s work in the party.

**Gender Issues and Elections**

CEPPS/NDI consulted regularly with the Network for Public Control of Gender Equality in the 2012 Parliamentary Elections (Network) on its monitoring and analysis of women in the elections. The Network was formed in August 2012 by several NGOs concerned with gender issues and women’s political participation, led by the Volyn Gender Center and the Women’s Consortium of Ukraine, with 45 member organizations throughout the country.

In the months leading up to the 2014 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/NDI: met with the head of the Lviv city party People’s Force to develop a party gender audit; and advised Bloc of Petro Poroshenko-Solidarity (BPP) leaders on best practices for approaching gender mainstreaming and forming a women’s wing. In the follow-up to the elections, CEPPS/NDI consulted with BPP women throughout Ukraine, including party activists, newly elected officials, and women who stood in the October local elections but did not win.
CEPPS/NDI also conducted trainings for multiparty groups of women candidates as part of a three-phase training of political party trainers and candidates from eight political parties in mid-2015 jointly funded by US Department of State’s Fundamental Freedom Fund (FFF). Ahead of the 2015 local elections, CEPPS/NDI conducted a preliminary analysis (Attachment 6) of 10 major political parties and their compliance with the 30 percent quota requirement, using publicly available data from the Central Election Committee (CEC) and from Opora. In the mid-campaign period, as well as after the election, CEPPS/NDI shared its analysis on the number of women candidates and party list compliance with the gender quotas with major party partners, civic groups, and international organizations.

**Equal Opportunities Legislative Caucus**

In 2012, CEPPS/NDI began to support the legislative and public communication efforts of the Equal Opportunities Caucus (EOC) in the Verkhovna Rada. This assistance built on the Institute’s work to help create the Caucus in November 2011 with funding from the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). The EOC re-formed in the new convocation of the Rada on in December 2012, and again in 2015. CEPPS/NDI consulted frequently and informally with the caucus co-chairs. In 2013, the Institute advised the EOC on the agenda for roundtables on reproductive health; assisted the Caucus in organizing a parliamentary hearing on gender equality; and an international conference on women’s leadership in 2013.

**Gender Quotas**

In mid 2014, CEPPS/NDI worked with political party partners on applying gender perspectives to the electoral legislation reform debate, including adding more effective gender quotas into the law. In August 2014, CEPPS/NDI consulted with MP Liliya Hrynevych, EOC member, then representing Batkivshchyna faction, to discuss ways of organizing support among MPs for a binding gender quota in any new election law. CEPPS/NDI offered to provide technical assistance to Hrynevych and other Caucus members as they advocated for further reform of election legislation including the introduction of effective mechanisms to promote gender equity.

**Working Group on Gender in the Rada / Public Council on Gender:**

In early 2016, CEPPS/NDI participated in two meetings of a working group on the elaboration of amendments to proposed legislation on equal rights and opportunities. The meeting participants included: Suslova, chair of the Subcommittee on Gender; representatives of the Institute of legislation of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, and of the Committee on Human Rights, Equal Opportunities Caucus Office of the Ombudsman, Ministries of Justice and Social policy, IFES, Kyiv Institute of Gender Studies, Ukrainian Center for Gender Education; and other gender experts. Lyudmyla Chernyavska, a CEPPS/NDI consultant and expert on Ukrainian compliance with European gender norms analyzed gender-related legislation, advised the subcommittee chair on needed amendments, and facilitated meetings of the working group.

In March 2016, CEPPS/NDI - together with the EOC - initiated the inaugural meeting of the Public Council on Gender. The Council will coordinate the efforts of MPs, civic activists and international organizations working to promote gender equality in Ukraine. It is expected to become a permanent body, which will develop a joint strategy between the public sector, civic organizations, and international organizations working on gender equality and systemize information on programs of gender equality. Six working groups were created under the Public...
Council, and the co-leaders of the working groups will rotate every six months. CEPPS/NDI, along with the EOC’s interns, will facilitate communication between the EOC and other participants of the Council.

**Objective 2: More representative and accountable political processes and actors through enhanced civic engagement and advocacy at the sub-national level (CEPPS/IRI)**

**CEPPS Objective 2.1: Youth from political parties and civil society organizations (CSOs) are able to effectively contribute to the decision-making processes in their organizations.**

**Intermediate Result 2.1.1: Youth leadership capacity is developed and youth are increasingly effective participants in political processes at the local level.**

Over the course of the “Strengthening Political Processes in Ukraine” program, CEPPS/IRI sought to provide youth with the knowledge and skills necessary to become more effective leaders in their communities. Toward this end, CEPPS/IRI implemented extensive youth programming, focusing its efforts primarily on two programs: its Young Political Leadership Schools (YPLS) and its Political Leadership Academies (PLA). In addition, over the course of this program, CEPPS/IRI conducted trainings for youth party auxiliaries, Crimean youth internships, regional and international exchanges, civil society trainings, and supported the development of advocacy campaigns.

Prior to the April 2013 Cost Extension, CEPPS/IRI conducted 17 YPLS in cities including Sevastopol, Simferopol, Kharkiv, Simeiz, Luhansk, and Chernihiv. Each YPLS consisted of five two-day sessions in each community, and through these schools, CEPPS/IRI trained more than 450 young Ukrainians just beginning their political careers. During this period, significant programmatic efforts were dedicated to Crimea, with 11 of the 17 schools held in Sevastopol, Simferopol, and Simeiz. In addition, several YPLS were conducted exclusively for Crimean Tatars.

In response to the high level of youth activism created by the Revolution of Dignity, CEPPS/IRI relaunched its youth programming via Political Leadership Academies (PLA) in 2015. Utilizing lessons learned from its previous programming, CEPPS/IRI’s new approach to working with youth sought to develop a more advanced cadre of young professionals who wanted to expand upon their political experience. Through the remainder of this grant, CEPPS/IRI conducted four rounds of PLA in its training center in the city of Dnipro, gathering youth political party members, civic activists, and local elected officials from across the country, particularly from southern and eastern Ukraine. Participants were selected through a competitive process with opportunities to apply online. While the primary goal was to enhance the participants’ capacity to actively and meaningfully participate in political processes at an advanced level, the

---

3 Youth programming under the 2009-2013 Results Framework was conducted under Objective 1, “Development of the democratic political system in Ukraine is enhanced through political parties that better represent citizens’ interests at the sub-national level,” and Objective 2, “Demand is increased for more effective representation of the public interest by political parties and elected officials through (a) improved linkages between civic groups and political parties and (b) improved advocacy and monitoring of political parties and elected officials by civic groups.”
workshops also provided an opportunity for participants to interact on a personal and professional level with their counterparts from across Ukraine over the course of several sessions. This approach differed from CEPPS/IRI’s previous YPLS program, which was tailored to each stand-alone community. At the same time, the PLA encouraged dialogue and cooperation across sectors, by providing an opportunity for youth participants to build linkages between a cross-section of political sectors (i.e., political parties, civil society and local elected officials). In total, CEPPS/IRI trained 93 civic and political activists, representing all regions of Ukraine and eight political parties.

As the culmination of its USAID- and Global Affairs Canada-supported youth programming, CEPPS/IRI hosted the first National Conference on Youth Political Leadership, inviting star alumni from both programs to Kyiv on November 26-27, 2016. The purpose of the conference was to bring together youth from both programs to build linkages with one another and share best practices. CEPPS/IRI staff observed discussions amongst alumni about the status of political and civic advocacy projects developed during the seminars, how CEPPS/IRI’s youth leadership programs have positively affected the participants, and how they can further use CEPPS/IRI programming to reach their goals. For instance, conference participants discussed establishing a youth alumni club to maintain relationships created during the schools, academies, and the conference. These connections and communications will play a pivotal role for these alumni as they find themselves facing similar obstacles in their political and civic activism. Moreover, the relationships fostered between alumni from eastern and western Ukraine will continue to break stereotypes and increase understanding between leaders from across the country. CEPPS/IRI intends to leverage these relationships and networks in its USAID-supported U-RAP programming.

Intermediate Result 2.1.2: Political parties understand and respond to challenges affecting the participation of youth in political processes

Throughout this program, CEPPS/IRI offered dependable and proven public opinion research to Ukraine’s many political parties, the donor community, and other key stakeholders. Prior to the Cost Extension in 2013, CEPPS/IRI conducted a series of polls in Crimea, which are listed below. These surveys provided an in-depth look into a unique region of Ukraine with strong historical and cultural connections to Russia, and they supported CEPPS/IRI’s ongoing work in Crimea including, as is discussed in other sections of this report, its Public Hearings and Youth programs. Moreover, CEPPS/IRI’s 2013 Crimea poll was the last independent survey conducted on the peninsula prior to the Russian annexation. The poll provides the most credible data on attitudes towards the future status of Crimea, which was to remain as it was, and indicated that

---

4 At this time, Crimea was still under the control of Ukrainian authorities; Russia did not invade and annex the Crimean peninsula until May 2014.
support for joining the Russian Federation was in a downward trend since CEPPS/IRI began conducting surveys in 2009.

**CEPPS/IRI Public Opinion Research in Crimea (2009-2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Available on IRI’s website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 5 – December 4, 2009</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20 – October 2, 2011</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16 – 30, 2013</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, prior to the adoption of the Cost Extension, CEPPS/IRI worked with the sociological research firm GfK and Quirk Global Strategies to conduct regional focus groups on the opinions of Ukrainian youth (ages 18 to 30 years old). The focus groups took place in the following cities throughout February 2013: Kyiv, Kharkiv, Donetsk, Kirovohrad, Simferopol, and Lviv. Key findings included:

- A strong disconnect between youth and politicians and political parties;
- Disillusionment with current authorities’ efforts to improve the Ukrainian economy;
- The belief that corruption in Ukraine is so commonplace that it is becoming “legal;”
- Use of violent rhetoric to describe what should be done to those involved in corruption;
- A lack of knowledge of major nationwide civil society initiatives; and
- A lack of understanding as to what the then-proposed Association Agreement with the European Union meant for Ukraine.

Thus, when planning for the April 2013 Cost Extension, CEPPS/IRI chose to leverage its public opinion research to assist Ukrainian political parties in better understanding—and therefore being able to respond to—challenges affecting the participation of youth in political processes. For each of the following polls conducted after April 1, 2013, CEPPS/IRI conducted a series of briefings with political parties and other relevant stakeholders. For more information on the briefings conducted, please refer to the Activities Database (Attachment 7) in this report:

**CEPPS/IRI National Public Opinion Research in Ukraine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Oversample:</th>
<th>Available on IRI’s website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 30-November 11, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27-September 9, 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23-February 9, 2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not publicly released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14-16, 2014^5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3-12, 2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12-25, 2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16-30, 2015</td>
<td>Odesa <em>oblast</em></td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7-21, 2015</td>
<td>Zakarpattia <em>oblast</em></td>
<td><a href="#">here</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^5 Note that this is the last CEPPS/IRI national public opinion survey to include respondents from the territory of Crimea; since this survey, the political and security situation in Crimea has precluded CEPPS/IRI from being able to conduct field research in Crimea.
Lastly, in the aftermath of the October 2015 local elections, CEPPS/IRI conducted an additional round of youth focus groups to gauge their impressions of the elections and their expectations regarding local governance and their local elected officials. Youth aged 18-35 from across Ukraine (i.e., Dnipro, Kramatorsk, Uzhgorod, Ternopil, Vinnitsya, Sumy, Biliyivka, Kyiv, Odesa, Mykolaiv, Sieverodonetsk, Mariupol, Lviv, and Kharkiv) participated in the focus groups. CEPPS/IRI briefed political parties and other relevant stakeholders of the findings in the spring of 2016.

CEPPS Objective 2.2: CSOs and political parties develop trust and build working relationships through the implementation of joint advocacy campaigns.

Intermediate Result 2.2.1: Increased cooperation and linkages among political parties and civil society on local electoral and political process issues.

In the earlier years of this project, CEPPS/IRI focused on developing political party capacity by providing trainings on party structures and on the election law, particularly in preparation for the 2010 presidential elections. However, through its extensive programming throughout Ukraine over the course of the first few years of this project, CEPPS/IRI noted a significant gap between political parties and civil society organizations (CSOs) that lessened each sector’s ability to effect change. By working together, political parties and civil society could be more effective in advocating for and addressing issues of concern at the local level; however, underlying degrees of distrust prevented these sectors from collaborating. Political parties felt that CSOs were unorganized and at times worked against political parties, whereas CSOs felt that political parties only used civil society for political gain during election seasons and did not legitimately work towards solving the issues of concern to citizens. In addition, CSOs expressed concern that through cooperation with political parties, they would be seen as aligned to a particular party and would lose their reputation of objective independence.

Accordingly, CEPPS/IRI’s CSO/Political Party program sought to build trust between these two sectors by having them work together to address issues of local concern. Activities pursuant to

---

6 These activities in the 2009-2013 Results Framework were conducted under Objective 1, “Development of the democratic political system in Ukraine is enhanced through political parties that better represent citizens’ interests at the sub-national level;” and Objective 2, “Demand is increased for more effective representation of the public interest by political parties and elected officials through (a) improved linkages between civic groups and political parties and (b) improved advocacy and monitoring of political parties and elected officials by civic groups.”
Since the 2013 Cost Extension, CEPPS/IRI conducted 93 CSO/Political Party events for 3,488 people, including 1,779 women.

CEPPS/IRI began its CSO/Political Party Program by launching a pilot program in Chernihiv in 2011, then expanding to Chernivtsi, Ivano-Frankivsk, Rivne and Zhytomyr in 2013. Since 2014, CEPPS/IRI has added several cities in southern and eastern Ukraine. For a complete list of the communities that participated in this program, please refer to the Activities Database (Attachment 7). Local issues selected by communities varied over the life of this program and included: municipal waste management, oversight of the local budget, bodies of self-organization of the population, community amalgamation, city charter development, and housing association (OSBB) reform.

Although the premise of the CSO/Political Party program remained consistent throughout the SPPU project, the program shifted considerably in the wake of the 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity. As discussed further in the Results section of this report, considerable attention was given in the early years of this program (i.e., 2011-2012) to explaining the benefits of collaboration to Ukrainian political parties and CSOs. The Revolution in many respects accelerated these efforts, and CEPPS/IRI found that CSOs and political parties were much more willing to collaborate in the post-Revolution period. Therefore, toward the end of the program, CEPPS/IRI found the first step of one-off trainings on the benefits of collaboration to be unnecessary, as stakeholders were already interested in collaboration, and shifted its efforts solely to step two of the program, by supporting joint events between the two sectors.

**CEPPS Objective 2.3:** Local elected officials are able to fulfill their roles and responsibilities through increased access to information regarding citizen concerns and best practices.

**Intermediate Result 2.3.1:** Increased cooperation and linkages among local executive institutions, civil society and citizens on local electoral and political process issues.

CEPPS/IRI’s local governance programming under the SPPU program contained two distinct program elements: the Local Elected Officials program, discussed below under Intermediate Result 2.3.2, and the Public Hearings program. CEPPS/IRI’s Public Hearings program sought to establish a dialogue between local authorities and the community that enables citizens to directly
inform officials of their needs and provides an additional mechanism for citizen oversight of
government decision-making. Attendees of CEPPS/IRI-supported public hearings included local
government officials, civil society, local business representatives, journalists and citizens. 
Through these public hearings, CEPPS/IRI encouraged local officials and civil society/citizens 
present to come to an agreement on an initiative for future engagement.

CEPPS/IRI implemented the Public Hearings program in cooperation with the local organization 
Youth XXI Century from 2013 to the end of the project, primarily in cities in Chernihiv oblast, 
but also in Zhytomyr, Kyiv, Lviv, Kirovohrad and Donetsk oblasts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEPPS/IRI Public Hearings Program (2013-2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chernihiv oblast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nizhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Novogorod-Severskiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sosnitsya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koryukivka</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priluki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kozelets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other oblasts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baranivka, Zhytomyr oblast (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brusyliv, Zhytomyr oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zhytomyr, Zhytomyr oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bila Tserkva, Kyiv oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lviv, Lviv oblast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirovohrad, Kirovohrad oblast</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mariupol, Donetsk oblast</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the Public Hearings program that commenced with the Cost Extension in 2013, 
CEPPS/IRI conducted an iteration of the program in Crimea, which included several events for 
Crimean Tatars. Please refer to the Activities Database (Attachment 7) for a complete list of 
these events. For these events, CEPPS/IRI also partnered with local organizations, including 
Peacekeeper and the Crimean Tatar Resource Center. CEPPS/IRI chose to collaborate with local 
organizations in an effort to impart the knowledge and skills necessary for these groups to 
continue to conduct hearings in CEPPS/IRI’s absence. Unfortunately, given the Russian-
occupation of Crimea, CEPPS/IRI was unable to follow-up with these organizations; however, 
CEPPS/IRI is aware of additional public hearings that were conducted by these organizations 
only this iteration of programming concluded in 2012. The program also expanded into Kharkiv 
and Luhansks oblasts, as CEPPS/IRI found that these regions of eastern Ukraine had a relatively 
large gap between local authorities and citizens.

**Intermediate Result 2.3.2: Centers-of-excellence in local governance and civic engagement on 
local issues serve as models in multiple regions of Ukraine.**

As previously stated, CEPPS/IRI’s local governance programming consisted of two distinct 
components: its Public Hearings program (discussed above under Intermediate Result 2.3.1) and 
its Local Elected Officials (LEO) program. CEPPS/IRI’s support to local elected officials 
consisted of three components:

1. Trainings to equip local officials with increased knowledge of their roles and responsibilities 
as councilmembers so that they may better engage with and respond to their constituents. 
This is especially important as Ukraine debates and undertakes new decentralization reforms 
that will likely expand the scope of responsibilities for these LEOs. Since 2009, CEPPS/IRI
provided trainings to individual city councils, with members across political parties being trained together.

2. Interregional exchanges for LEOs to see best practices being implemented in other regions of Ukraine. These exchange tours also provide an opportunity for officials to build a bridge between geographic regions and communities within Ukraine. By building these professional linkages, councilors address stereotypes and misconceptions while exchanging ideas, comparing issues of concern, and discussing shared challenges. Spending time alongside their counterparts facilitates a mutual understanding and acceptance of their responsibilities as elected officials.

3. International study tours to other European countries that have recently undergone similar governance reforms (e.g., Poland, Lithuania) for the most active and reform-minded participants of the previous two activities. These study tours provide an opportunity for Ukrainian officials to learn best practices from their European counterparts and discuss how they may implement some of the ideas they observe back in their own communities.

CEPPS/IRI’s support to Ukrainian local elected officials began in 2010 with a series of three trainings (i.e., one basic and two advanced) in five selected cities across Ukraine: Kamyanets-Podilskiy, Khmelnytska oblast; Lutsk, Volynska oblast; Sumy, Sumy oblast; Ternopil, Ternopil oblast; and Ivano-Frankivsk, Ivano-Frankivsk oblast. This training series was designed primarily to work with newly elected LEOs from the October 2010 local election and give them knowledge of their rights, powers and responsibilities as LEOs in addition to assisting them with constituent communications and understanding the budget process. As the USAID-requested Impact Evaluation of CEPPS/IRI’s work in these cities revealed, these trainings improved local officials’ knowledge when compared to the comparison groups in each community. Please see Attachment 8 of this report to view the complete evaluation report. Moreover, having observed the improvements to local officials’ knowledge as a result of CEPPS/IRI trainings, the Institute conducted additional one-off trainings in several communities across Crimea in 2012, which have been listed in the Activities Database (Attachment 7) of this report.

In 2013, CEPPS/IRI expanded its support to local officials by incorporating interregional exchanges for officials from southern and eastern Ukraine to travel to western and central Ukrainian cities to study best practices in local governance and learn from their peers. After conducting basic trainings on the roles and responsibilities of local officials in each community, CEPPS/IRI facilitated a series of exchanges between the following cities, as well as the following international study trips:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEPPS/IRI Local Elected Officials Program (2013-2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7 Please refer to the Activities Database (Attachment 7) of this report for a complete list of the trainings conducted between 2013 and 2016.
### Interregional Exchanges
- Zaporizhia to Lviv (March 2016)
- Kherson to Ternopil (July 2015)
- Mykolaiv to Lviv (July 2015)
- Mariupol to Lviv (December 2014)
- Sumy to Ivano-Frankivsk (August 2014)
- Bakhchisaray, Crimea to Lutsk (February 2013)
- Sverdlovsk, Luhansk oblast to Ternopil (March 2013)

### International Study Trips
- Liublin, Poland (October 2013)
- Gdansk, Poland (February 2015)
- Klaipeda, Lithuania (October 2015)

Throughout the remainder of this program, CEPPS/IRI sought to be responsive to local demands for additional trainings—particularly in the aftermath of the October 2015 local elections. After these elections, hundreds of new officials entered city governments for the first time. Therefore, IRI conducted several one-off trainings for both communities that approached CEPPS/IRI and political parties who requested trainings for their newly elected councilmembers. Please see the Activities Database (Attachment 7) for a complete list of such trainings.\(^8\)

In addition, CEPPS/IRI observed a pointed need to provide additional training and opportunities for networking for women LEOs. Leveraging its global Womens Democracy Network (WDN), which had previously organized in Ukraine to conduct gender assessments of the elections, CEPPS/IRI relaunched the local Ukraine WDN chapter with a targeted training for women LEOs in May 2016.\(^9\) Also, in an effort to enhance local elected officials’ capacity to address citizen concerns and combat corruption at the local level, CEPPS/IRI conducted three Vulnerabilities to Corruption Assessments (VCA) in 2016 in the cities of Mykolaiv, Chernivtsi, and Ivano-Frankivsk. The third VCA report for Ivano-Frankivsk has been included as an attachment to this report (Attachment 9).

---

\(^8\) In addition, CEPPS/IRI built upon its support to the 26 heads of Rayon State Administrations in Odesa oblast by conducting a two-day event in May 2016 on decentralization reform and its implications for their work, as well as a training event in October 2016 for officials working in the region’s Public Administration Office on how to best communicate with constituents and appropriately address their needs.

\(^9\) Recognizing the need for women political and civic leaders to encourage other women, share experiences, and network amongst themselves, in its forthcoming U-RAP program, CEPPS/IRI will continue to leverage WDN’s resources and support its local chapter in Ukraine in its work with government officials on the local level.
Objective 3: Donors and key stakeholders are better informed of political and electoral environment (CEPPS/IFES)\textsuperscript{11}

Intermediate Results 3.1: Ensure accurate collection of Ukrainian public opinion data.

Annual Public Opinion Survey Research

Within the broader framework of the SPPU program, the main goal of CEPPS/IFES’ programming under this award was to provide regular accurate, reliable information on public opinions toward socio-political developments in Ukraine through the fielding of annual and omnibus surveys in Ukraine and distribution of the research findings to USAID, other critical stakeholders and the media in Ukraine. In addition to the CEPPS/IFES core trend questions, CEPPS/IFES’ public opinion research focused on the perception of democracy and its importance to Ukraine’s development issues with some additional themes added for specific

\textsuperscript{10} It is important to note that the political and security situation resulting from the 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity forced CEPPS/IRI to temporarily halt programming for several months. Upon resuming activities, CEPPS/IRI was unable to continue to support the cities of Luhans, Sverdlovsk, and Bakhchisaray (Crimea), as they had fallen under Russian-backed separatist or Russian control.

\textsuperscript{11} This Objective encompasses activities under the original program objective: To provide accurate, reliable information on public opinions toward socio-political developments in Ukraine through the fielding of annual surveys in Ukraine, and the distribution of research findings to critical stakeholders and the media in Ukraine.
surveys. For the main project objective, CEPPS/IFES partnered with the Kyiv International Institute for Sociology (KIIS), who conducted all public opinion fieldwork and data processing for all annual and omnibus surveys under this award.

2009 Annual Public Opinion Survey

Ahead of the January 2010 presidential elections, CEPPS/IFES conducted its 17th public opinion poll in Ukraine. In addition to focusing on socioeconomic and political issues, this survey also gaged Ukrainian’s attitudes in the run up to upcoming presidential election. Initial implementation of the fieldwork for this survey was delayed by almost three weeks due to the outbreak of H1N1 and concerns that it would be difficult for KIIS interviewers to travel in the West of the country and to obtain interviews. CEPPS/IFES consulted with USAID on the impact of the H1N1 outbreak on survey fieldwork and it was decided that in order to avoid starting fieldwork elsewhere and risking exclusion of the West, KIIS was to send day-by-day assessments of the situation on the ground to determine when things stabilized enough to start implementation. By November 17, conditions on the ground had stabilized enough to begin this stage of implementation.

The fieldwork took place from November 21 to 30, 2009, with 1,502 respondents throughout Ukraine. The sample was designed to be representative of adult population with additional focus on the areas of special interest (capital city and Crimea) and comprised a national sample of 1,252 respondents and an over-sample of 125 respondents in Kyiv and 125 respondents in Crimea. The data was been weighted by region, age, and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.5%.

CEPPS/IFES received the survey data from its local survey partner in early December and CEPPS/IFES public opinion experts then spent the following week on data analysis and drafting of an executive summary and presentation of key findings. During this week, CEPPS/IFES also prepared a press release on the survey that USAID reviewed and approved. The Applied Research Center Director traveled to Ukraine on December 12 for a series of briefings on the survey to present the findings of 2009 survey to various audiences and discuss programmatic applications of the data collected with the field team.

2010 Annual Public Opinion Survey

IFES conducted its 18th public opinion poll in Ukraine in September 2010, In addition to focusing on relevant socioeconomic and political issues, this public opinion researcher took at deeper look at Ukrainian’s views regarding the recently held 2010 presidential elections and broader views on democracy and rights. CEPPS/IFES’ contractor for survey fieldwork in Ukraine, KIIS, conducted fieldwork from September 8 to 20, 2010, with 1,519 respondents throughout Ukraine. This sample comprised a national sample of 1,269 respondents and an over-sample of 125 respondents in Kyiv and 125 respondents in Crimea. The data was weighted by region, age, and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.5%. CEPPS/IFES received the survey data from KIIS in late September. IFES public opinion experts then spent the following
week on data analysis and drafting of an executive summary and presentation of key findings. CEPPS/IFES also prepared a press release on the survey that was approved by USAID during this week. CEPPS/IFES’ Applied Research Center Director, Rakesh Sharma, traveled to Ukraine on October 10 for a series of briefings on the survey, in collaboration with IFES’ Deputy Director for Europe and Asia, Gavin Weise, presented the from the 2010 survey to various audiences.

2011 Annual Public Opinion Survey

CEPPS/IFES conducted its 19th public opinion poll in Ukraine earlier than initially planned, as the non-election year and 20 years anniversary of independence presented an opportunity to focus on important electoral and legal reform issues, such as the controversial draft election law. The fieldwork was conducted from July 16 to 31, 2011, by CEPPS/IFES’ partner, KIIS, with 1,519 respondents throughout Ukraine. This sample comprised a national sample of 1,269 respondents and an over-sample of 125 respondents in Kyiv and 125 respondents in Crimea. The data was weighted by region, age, and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.5%.

CEPPS/IFES’ Deputy Director for Europe and Asia and Applied Research Center Director traveled to Ukraine to conduct a series of briefings on the survey findings with a variety of audiences, starting in September, with the last briefings held in early October 2011.

Adapting to the programmatic needs, and for a more efficient audience targeting for the 2011 survey results distribution CEPPS/IFES used a “workshop model,” planning and leading workshops with domestic NGOs, political parties, and other electoral stakeholders. In these workshops, CEPPS/IFES presented data on public perceptions of NGOs, political parties, and the electoral law and the participants discussed implications for NGOs, political parties and other stakeholders, as well as the implications for advocacy efforts surrounding the election law reform.

IFES Omnibus 2012 Survey

To enhance its pre-election data collection base, CEPPS/IFES placed several questions on a KIIS omnibus poll conducted in April. The dates of fieldwork for this poll were April 12 - April 26, 2012. The sample was based on random selection of sampling points throughout Ukraine. Overall, 2,038 interviews were conducted and the sample was representative of the population of Ukraine, with the margin of error plus/minus 2.2%. This small scale survey research project allowed IFES to fine-tune next field questionnaire and have trends in place for the upcoming annual regular survey later that year, to be undertaken in the early fall. As there had not been any reputable surveys in Ukraine conducted at the time, this data also informed stakeholders and USAID on latest shifts in public opinion on issues related to the upcoming 2012 parliamentary election.

2012 Annual Public Opinion Survey
CEPPS/IFES’ 20th annual public opinion survey was designed to measure the opinions and attitudes of the Ukrainian adult population on significant and current social, political and economic issues, including the upcoming 2012 parliamentary elections, in order to provide timely information on the socio-political environment and the pre-election landscape. The fieldwork took place from September 15 to 27, 2012, by survey firm KIIS, with 1,512 respondents throughout Ukraine. This sample comprised again a national sample of 1,262 respondents and an over-sample of 125 respondents in Kyiv and 125 respondents in Crimea. The data was weighted by region, age, and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.5%.

In early October 2012, CEPPS/IFES’ Deputy Director for Europe and Asia and Applied Research Center Director conducted a series of briefings on the survey findings with a variety of audiences. In Kyiv, CEPPS/IFES held a briefing for the Deputy Chief of Mission, political section and USAID staff. A separate briefing took place for the USAID mission leadership, DG, and other program and communications staff. CEPPS/IFES also held a third presentation for members of the international community, including the majority of USAID democracy and governance (DG) partners. The data covered during these events consisted of public perceptions of political parties, the electoral process, NGOs, and the electoral law. Discussion on electoral support for the political parties and general opinions on the electoral process were a focus of these presentations. In addition to the Ukraine-based briefings, IFES held a presentation for representatives from NGOs, USAID, Department of State, Embassy of Ukraine, and the media in Washington D.C. shortly before the parliamentary election.

2013 Annual Public Opinion Survey

The 2013 public opinion survey was designed by CEPPS/IFES with input from USAID and various civil society organizations (such as Disabled Persons Organizations (DPOs)) to measure the opinions and attitudes of the Ukrainian adult population on significant and current social, political and economic issues with special focus on issues of access and inclusion. At the time of the survey took place, it focused on topics including Ukrainian’s attitudes on the then regularly scheduled 2015 parliamentary elections, the EU and Euro-integration process in order to provide timely information on the major socio-political issues and pre-election dynamics.

Fieldwork took place between October 26 and November 8, 2013, with 1,517 respondents throughout Ukraine. This standard CEPPS/IFES sample comprised a national sample of 1,267 respondents and an over-sample of 125 respondents in Kyiv and 125 respondents in Crimea. The data was weighted by region, age and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.6%.

CEPPS/IFES Applied Research Center staff completed data analysis, presented the 2013 survey findings in Ukraine and released them via IFES website in the late fall of 2013. To share a more in-depth analysis of Ukrainians’ opinion on disability and access in elections and in other aspects of political life, (an area relevant to the CEPPS/IFES programming in Ukraine), Applied Research Center Director and CEPPS/IFES Ukraine Chief of Party presented survey findings on these topics to the representatives of the DPO community and other interested parties in addition to the regular public release briefings. CEPPS/IFES presented data and key findings from the
survey at a meeting of USAID implementing partners, and shared data from the survey with some of the implementing partners based on request. CEPPS/IFES held a briefing for staff with the Canadian Embassy on the key survey findings. CEPPS/IFES had also planned to conduct a press conference on the survey findings, but canceled this event due to concerns about releasing of some sensitive data during a period of uncertain political dynamics in Ukraine.

**CEPPS/IFES 2014 Omnibus Surveys**

Given the social, political and economic upheaval Ukraine has faced with the *Euromaidan* revolution and fluid situation on the ground, IFES decided in 2014 to track opinions on the changing situation through placing a series of questions on several omnibus surveys of KIIS. The three national omnibus surveys took place on February 11, May 9 and December 22 2014, with IFES placing various set of questions in each survey.

**IFES 2014 Omnibus Survey I**

In early February, CEPPS/IFES placed 11 questions on the first of these surveys focused on the ongoing political dynamics related to the *Euromaidan* movement, its leaders and the upcoming presidential elections in the country. Tracking this data through repeat surveys will allow USAID, IFES, and other stakeholders to keep a pulse on evolving public opinion in what is likely to be a very dynamic political environment for the remainder of 2014. IFES planned to distribute findings from these questions to USAID and the international donor community and per approval of USAID, publicly - in Ukraine and Washington D.C. (Note: Later in the process, USAID and CEPPS/IFES jointly made the decision not to distribute findings beyond the U.S. government (USG) due to the sensitive nature of data.)

Questions for the first omnibus survey were designed by CEPPS/IFES program and research staff, to measure support of the Ukrainian public for the ongoing at the time *Euromaidan* protests and its leaders, involvement of various international players in the crisis resolution, possible upcoming elections, Euro-integration process etc. The omnibus survey was designed and finalized in early February, with fieldwork conducted by CEPPS/IFES’ local long-time survey partner KIIS between February 7 and 17, 2014, with representative national sample of 2,041 respondents throughout Ukraine, including Crimea. The data was weighted by region, age and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.2%.

CEPPS/IFES Chief of Party David Ennis presented survey data and key findings to USAID and USG on March 11; in addition, CEPPS/IFES shared these findings CEPPS implementing partners, based on request. CEPPS/IFES had also planned to conduct a wider distribution of the survey findings; however, per USAID’s request IFES cancelled distribution of the survey due to concerns about the release of some sensitive data during a period of highly uncertain and volatile political dynamics in Ukraine.

**IFES 2014 Omnibus Survey II**

The second omnibus survey, “Opinions and views of Ukrainian people: April-May 2014,” was conducted by KIIS and the sample was based on random selection of sampling points (post-
office districts) in 110 settlements (PSU) in all regions of Ukraine (without the Autonomous Republic of Crimea). Overall 2,022 interviews took place during the fieldwork stage. In late April-early May, IFES placed nine questions on the KIIS’ omnibus survey, focusing on the upcoming presidential election of May 25, its candidates and emerged post-Maidan leaders and their performance since taking power after the collapse of the previous government. The data was weighted by region, age and gender to be nationally representative for the adult (18+) population of Ukraine. The margin of error for a sample of this size is plus/minus 2.2%. IFES shared the findings from the survey with USAID in Kyiv. CEPPS/ IFES Deputy Director Gavin Weise presented data and key findings from the survey to USAID and USG stakeholders. Additionally, CEPPS/IFES shared the data with CEPPS implementing partners upon request. IFES also issued a press release on key survey findings in English.

*IFES 2014 Omnibus Survey III*

In December 2014, CEPPS/IFES placed a series 22 of questions on a KIIS sponsored omnibus public opinion survey of the adult population in Ukraine (18 years and older). The omnibus survey, “Opinions and views of Ukrainian people: December 2014,” was made up of 2,011 respondents from all regions of Ukraine, excluding Crimea. The sample developed was representative for the entire adult population of Ukraine (18 years and over) outside of Donbas, and based on random selection of sampling points (post-office districts) in 110 settlements (PSU) in all regions of Ukraine excluding Crimea. In Donbas, a mix of methodologies was utilized to obtain interviews in Luhansk and Donetsk, but due to the ongoing conflict in the region the sample from these two oblasts is more accurately described as ‘indicative’ rather than ‘representative.’ In Luhansk oblast, the survey was conducted only in the areas under the control of Ukrainian forces. In Donetsk oblast, the survey was conducted in territories that were both under and not under the control of Ukrainian forces.

**Objective 4: The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic nonpartisan election observers (CEPPS/NDI and CEPPS/IRI)**

*Intermediate Result 4.1: NDI’s partners implement effective observation efforts, including technically sound statistical analysis and reporting of Election Day that is widely distributed domestically and internationally. (CEPPS/NDI)*

CEPPS/NDI worked closely with Opora members to build their capacity to conduct comprehensive observation missions for the 2010 presidential elections, and the 2012 and 2014 parliamentary elections. The Institute not only provided Opora guidance in planning for the pre-election period, but also for robust monitoring of the later election periods and election day, statistically-based observation (SBO), and publicly reporting on concerns and violations in real time throughout the process. The Institute also conducted a series of training-of-trainers (TOT) sessions for Opora’s regional LTOs, who then had the responsibility for training the 3,500 and 1,600 short term observers (STOs) for the 2012 and 2014 parliamentary elections, respectively.

---

12 This objective reflects activities conducted under the original program’s Objective 3: The transparency and integrity of Ukraine's electoral process is enhanced through international non-partisan election observers.
CEPPS/NDI also assisted Opora with an SBO of December 2013 extremely contentious re-runs of elections in five parliamentary districts where 2012 electoral results were invalidated due to fraud.

During each observation effort, CEPPS/NDI elections experts provided remote assistance and advice to Opora as it prepared for Parallel Vote Tabulation (PVT) efforts, including planning its observation deployment structure, drawing its statistical sample, designing STO reporting forms, and devising strategies for reporting data via text-message or SMS technology. In the immediate run up to the elections and on election day, CEPPS/NDI deployed election experts to work with CEPPS/NDI’s Ukraine staff to advise Opora on refining its database, establishing a call center for collecting observer reports, and other technical aspects of the PVT.

Throughout the project, CEPPS/NDI worked with Opora to develop a strategy to improve its overall communications, public outreach and media skills, particularly in the areas of framing messages, drafting press releases, holding effective press conferences and publishing high quality LTO reports. CEPPS/NDI also coordinated multiple meetings and briefings at which Opora presented the international community its pre-election findings to alert them to what to watch for in observing elections. CEPPS/NDI also facilitated strategic planning meetings for Opora leadership prior to all elections. In October 2013, CEPPS/NDI sent international civil society experts to Kyiv to help Opora facilitate a comprehensive self assessment and develop a set of recommendations for addressing weaknesses. This was intended to prepare it for then-anticipated 2015 presidential elections. CEPPS/NDI shared the recommendations with USAID.

CEPPS/NDI also advised Opora in its participation with working groups of Ukrainian and international CSOs, in addition to a working group at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In November 2014, CEPPS/NDI facilitated a trip to Washington, D.C. for Opora’s executive director, Olha Aivazovska, and Opora’s PVT manager, Yuri Lisovsky, to present the results of its PVT, and general analysis of the October 26 parliamentary elections and post-election political prospects.

**Intermediate Result 4.2: Pre-election assessment and analysis missions demonstrate international awareness of the importance of credible elections. (CEPPS/NDI)**

CEPPS/NDI provided technical and financial assistance to the European Network of Election Monitoring Organizations (ENEMO), a coalition of domestic monitoring groups from Central Eastern Europe and Central Asia to observe the 2010 presidential elections. ENEMO fielded 50 LTOs and 400 election-day observers. ENEMO leadership established communications with election administration officials, media representatives, and members of other domestic and international monitoring groups. Following each round, the ENEMO mission leaders held a press conference to release the results of ENEMO’s observation and recommendations for the overall improvement of the electoral process.

Also in 2010, CEPPS/NDI, CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/IFES conducted a Joint Expert Election Assessment in Ukraine in late October and early November to examine and report on the processes surrounding the local elections in 2010. The delegation paid particular attention to the Ukrainian nonpartisan election observation efforts, such as Opora’s, in order to assess the space...
and credibility of the civic observation efforts and to amplify their findings. The findings were shared with political parties and civic groups involved in electoral reform.

On March 2012, CEPPS/NDI deployed a limited election day assessment mission for the October parliamentary elections, covering 13 of the 15 polling stations, for a mayoral by-election in Obukhiv, a suburb of Kyiv. CEPPS/NDI’s informal assessment mission provided information on parties’ election day behavior and also allowed the mission to gauge how parties and authorities were treating observers throughout the process, from accreditation through election day and vote counting. While CEPPS/NDI did not make any public statements on this mission, it privately shared its findings and recommendations with parties, civic groups, and international representatives.

CEPPS/NDI deployed an international pre-election assessment delegation to Ukraine in September 2012. The high-level international team of six conducted a week-long review of the conditions and preparations in place for the October 28 parliamentary elections in Ukraine. CEPPS/NDI released its statement in a press conference on September 17 in Kyiv, posted it on the Institute’s website and distributed it among interested contacts in Ukraine, Washington, D.C. and in Europe. CEPPS/NDI’s statement included recommendations on the key reforms that, if implemented, could enhance the credibility of the electoral process and improve electoral institutions’ readiness to address potential challenges in the month before election day.

To follow up to CEPPS/NDI’s pre-election assessment, the Institute engaged a team of long-term election analysts (LTA) in Kyiv to track electoral developments and provide expert analysis of the election environment, focusing on recommendations made in CEPPS/NDI’s pre-election assessment. CEPPS/NDI released an interim progress report on October 11, presenting its evaluation of the progress made on the recommendations from CEPPS/NDI’s pre-election assessment during the month before election day. Using the LTA’s data and analysis, CEPPS/NDI released a post-election report with its overall findings and recommendations from these elections on November 29.

For the 2010 local elections, CEPPS/IFES conducted its pre-election technical assessment with a heavy emphasis on overall electoral management body structure and its functionality from the CEC down to the precinct level. The assessment also included analysis of electoral legislation, voter registration and electoral dispute resolution, framed also from an electoral management perspective. In its assessment, CEPPS/IFES made a set of recommendations to the Government of Ukraine and the CEC aimed at not only improvement of the conduct of local elections on 31 October, but also creation of a solid basis for a harmonized electoral system and legislation that adheres to international standards and best practices.

Addressing one of the crucial elements of the effective electoral management, CEPPS/IFES also conducted in-depth analysis of the Ukrainian election dispute resolution system, providing electoral reform stakeholders with the overview of the existing process and its shortcomings, and suggesting areas for improvement and specific recommendations, and publishing a paper called, Adjudication of Disputes Related to Local Election.
For the 2012 parliamentary elections CEPPS/IFES provide international community with the best overview of Ukraine’s electoral reform progress and preparedness to hold democratic elections, CEPPS/IFES assembled its Pre-Election Technical Assessment (PETA) team of leading five election experts to undertake a detailed technical evaluation of the electoral environment and procedures in Ukraine ahead of the parliamentary elections of October 28, 2012. The goals of the mission were defined as to provide an objective, impartial assessment of Ukraine’s parliamentary election processes and to make specific recommendations for improvement – both short term (i.e., before the election) and long term. The assessment team met with a wide range of electoral experts, stakeholders and participants, including representatives of the CEC and lower-level election commissions, the State Registry of Voters, political parties, local experts, civil society, international organizations and domestic and international election observation missions. The CEPPS/IFES Assessment Team focused its efforts on the electoral administration and the conduct of electoral processes, and paid less attention to the political context for these elections, including the media environment or abuse of administrative resources. The technical report suggested a number of short-term and long-term practical recommendations for the parliament, CEC, lower level commissions, and other authorities aimed at improving both the legal framework governing the parliamentary elections and preparation to conduct of voting, tabulation and establishment of the election results, including the resolution of disputes.

Intermediate Result 4.3: International election delegates conduct an objective assessment of the October 2014 parliamentary elections in the context of Ukrainian law and international norms. (CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI)

CEPPS/IRI
In order to observe the October 2014 parliamentary elections, Victor Ashe - former United States Ambassador to Poland - and Iveta Radičová - former Prime Minister of Slovakia - led CEPPS/IRI’s high-level election observation mission from October 23-28. CEPPS/IRI observers visited 131 polling stations in Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Kyiv, Lviv, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Ternopil, Volyn, Zaporizhia and Zhytomyr oblasts. CEPPS/IRI was also the only international observation mission outside of the OSCE to send observers to Donetsk oblast to observe voting in the city of Slovyansk. CEPPS/IRI observers reported only minor non-systemic irregularities and none that would have affected the outcome of the election. CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI held a joint press conference on October 27 for local and international media and a subsequent press release was published. In addition, eight domestic Ukrainian media sources reported on statements issued by CEPPS/IRI’s election observation mission. On October 29, CEPPS/IRI released a statement reflecting the team’s observations.

CEPPS/NDI
CEPPS/NDI fielded a pre-election assessment mission in September 2014 to assess the overall quality of the election process and preparations leading up to the October 26 parliamentary elections. The delegation included Edward “Ted” Kaufman, former U.S. senator; Robert Adams, international elections and democratization expert for London-based Electoral Reform International Services (ERIS); Marija Babic, independent electoral expert; Laura Jewett,
CEPPS/NDI regional director for Eurasia; and Mary O’Hagan, senior resident director for CEPPS/NDI in Ukraine.

The delegation held a series of meetings in Kyiv, Dnipropetrovsk and Lviv with a broad spectrum of candidates, parties and campaigns participating in the parliamentary elections; members of the CEC and district election commissions (DECs); citizen monitoring groups and other civic organizations; members of parliament; journalists; and the international and diplomatic communities. CEPPS/NDI’s delegates gathered information on the political, legal, and security environment in which the election would take place and examined factors that could affect the integrity of the electoral process.

CEPPS/NDI deployed a high-level election-day mission from October 22 to 28 to observe Ukraine’s October 26, 2014, parliamentary election. The 18-member delegation deployed to observe voting and counting in polling stations in Kyiv and in 18 single-mandate districts around the country. Leading the delegation was Karan English, former member of the U.S. Congress (D-AZ), and Janusz Onyszkiewicz, former defense minister of Poland and former deputy vice president of the European Parliament. Other members included former MPs and experts from the US, UK, Sweden, Estonia, Moldova, Romania, Armenia, Slovakia, and Bulgaria.

Intermediate Result 4.4: The Ukrainian public and international stakeholders have access to public statements of international election observation missions and recommendations for future electoral processes. (CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI)

**CEPPS/IRI**

Throughout the course of this project, CEPPS/IRI observed every presidential and parliamentary election in Ukraine. For the 2010 presidential election, CEPPS/IRI deployed 46 election observers throughout Ukraine for the first and second rounds on January 17, 2010 and February 7, 2010. In total, CEPPS/IRI observers visited more than 300 polling sites across Ukraine. CEPPS/IRI’s observation teams measured the quality of election administration at each site, discussed voting experiences with voters after they cast their ballots, and discussed the electoral process with polling station election commissioners and political party poll watchers. Statements were issued on January 18, 2010, and February 8, 2010. In addition, CEPPS/IRI conducted election trainings for lawyers and judges in preparation for the 2010 presidential election.

Also in 2010, CEPPS/IRI, CEPPS/NDI and CEPPS/IFES conducted a Joint Expert Election Assessment from October 28 to November 4 to examine and report on the processes surrounding the local elections. CEPPS/IRI conducted its observation in Zhytomyr oblast. As part of the Joint Expert Assessment Team, CEPPS/IRI coordinated and briefed more than 10 international

---

13 This activity was conducted under Objective 3, “The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic non-partisan election observers,” in the 2009-2013 Results Framework.

14 This activity was conducted under Objective 4, “Demonstrate international interest in and support for democratic elections in Ukraine,” and Objective 5, “Contribute to safeguarding electoral integrity by evaluating the election processes, including amplifying the observations of nonpartisan citizen election monitors and other credible sources,” in the 2009-2013 Results Framework.
and domestic groups on electoral processes in Ukraine. CEPPS/IRI provided advice and consultation to the Civil Initiative Support Center (CISC) as it monitored the elections in six regions of the country. CEPPS/IRI met before and after the elections with officials at USAID and the U.S. Embassy to provide feedback on its observations and contributed to a broader understanding of the obstacles that led to a decrease in the integrity of the elections. This was noted in the official statement released by the USG, which noted that Ukraine failed to meet the international democratic standards that had been met in the 2010 presidential election.

In order to observe the 2012 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/IRI deployed a high-level international election observation mission observing more than 160 polling stations on Election Day. On October 29, CEPPS/IRI released a preliminary statement reflecting initial observations.

In order to observe the October 2014 parliamentary elections, Victor Ashe, former United States Ambassador to Poland, and Iveta Radičová, former Prime Minister of Slovakia, led CEPPS/IRI’s high-level election observation mission from October 23 to 28. CEPPS/IRI observers visited 131 polling stations in Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Kyiv, Lviv, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Ternopil, Volyn, Zaporizhia and Zhytomyr oblasts. CEPPS/IRI was also the only international observation mission outside of the OSCE to send observers to Donetsk oblast to observe voting in the city of Slovyansk. CEPPS/IRI observers reported only minor non-systemic irregularities and none that would have affected the outcome of the election. CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI held a joint press conference on October 27 for local and international media and a subsequent press release was published. In addition, eight domestic Ukrainian media sources reported on statements issued by CEPPS/IRI’s election observation mission. On October 29, CEPPS/IRI released a statement reflecting the team’s observations.

**CEPPS/NDI**

Ahead of the 2014 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/NDI released its pre-election statement in a September 19 press conference at the Ukrainian Crisis Media Center. The delegation concluded that Ukraine could overcome challenges to democratic parliamentary elections on October 26. CEPPS/NDI called, however, for additional steps prior to the election to promote enfranchisement and electoral security, constructive campaigning, and financial disclosure. The delegation also noted encouraging signs that several political parties have placed more women in winnable positions on candidate lists.

On October 27, CEPPS/NDI released a preliminary statement in a press conference at the Ukraine Crisis Media Center, at which Laura Jewett, CEPPS/NDI Eurasia regional director, and CEPPS/NDI mission leaders Karan English and Janusz Onyszkiewicz, spoke. The delegation concluded that the October 26 parliamentary elections met international democratic standards, despite the inability of some Ukrainians to cast their ballots due to the Russian occupation of Crimea and Russian-backed separatist conflicts in the east. CEPPS/NDI noted that the credibility of these elections would help the Verkhovna Rada, or parliament, advance Ukrainians’ aspirations for democracy, independence and sovereignty.

---

15 This activity was conducted under Objective 3, “The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic non-partisan election observers,” in the 2009-2013 Results Framework.
The delegation recommended steps to enhance the integrity of future electoral processes, including promoting enfranchisement and electoral security, constructive campaigning, and financial disclosure in future elections. It also noted encouraging signs that several political parties have placed more women in winnable positions on candidate lists than in past elections.

This followed earlier recommendations shared by CEPPS/NDI on improving the conduct of Ukrainian elections. Following its informal assessment of the mayoral by-elections in Obukhiv in March 2012, CEPPS/NDI shared recommendations for improving the electoral environment ahead of parliamentary elections in the fall. Following the election, CEPPS/NDI briefed the U.S. Embassy and USAID, as well as political party representatives from Batkivschyna, FoC, and PoR and local government officials. CEPPS/NDI also discussed its recommendations with the Kyiv Governor Anatoliy Prysiazhniuk, the Head of the Kyiv Oblast Council, Oleksandr Kachny, and the Governor’s Advisor and International Observer Liaison, Leslav Giller, campaign advisor. Earlier, before the new electoral law passed in November 2011, CEPPS/NDI provided its perspective for improving the draft law to governmental and political party representatives, civil society groups, and international organizations on potential improvements to the new system and the process of considering the law. CEPPS/NDI participated in election reform coordination meetings hosted by the OSCE on October 7 and October 21. CEPPS/NDI also began spearheading conversations among international organizations about the strategy for election monitoring and advocacy before the 2012 elections. CEPPS/NDI co-sponsored a roundtable with the Council of Europe’s Venice Commission and the Verkhovna Rada’s Committee on State-building and Local Self Governance in March to discuss the implementation of the new parliamentary election law.

III. RESULTS

The following results highlight some of the key achievements of the seven-year initiative, indicative of the long-term impact of the program and corresponding to the long-term program objectives. The full Performance Management Plan (PMP) for the program is attached (Attachments 1 and 2).

**Objective 1: More representative and accountable political parties and processes through strengthened national level advocacy (CEPPS/NDI)**

**CEPPS Objective 1.1: National advocacy by CSOs with parties and their affiliated elected officials on elections and political process issues is improved.**

In the period prior to Euromaidan, 132 CSOs supported by CEPPS/NDI organized successfully advocated to the Rada for changes to laws regulating condominium associations and services, legislation governing elections and legislation affecting freedom of assembly, which was contained in a number of different laws regulating the police, courts and other institutions. In each area the CSOs were able to affect policy making. Equally important, they demonstrated that they could mobilize bottom up pressure to bring about changes in national legislation. In addition, the organizers in Kyiv became more sophisticated in their ability to navigate the
legislative process, and cultivate alliances with political parties. With CEPPS/NDI assistance, activists shared focus group research and invited US and European experts to amplify their policy recommendations. Although the freedom of assembly coalition presented constant challenges, it also is notable that in each case, the CSOs conducted these advocacy campaigns through coalitions of groups with diverse missions. At the local level, CEPPS/NDI also supported 18 local level advocacy campaigns through its NGO school in 2011-2012.

During the tumultuous Euromaidan period, CEPPS/NDI advised the most prominent CSO coalitions, the RRP and CPSA, as they sought to translate the momentum from protest into meaningful legislative changes. At the end of that period, as the 2014 parliamentary elections approached, both RRP and CPSA were able to secure pledges from candidates to practice transparency and fight corruption.

Following Euromaidan and CEPPS/NDI’s comprehensive assessment of the civic landscape in 2014, CEPPS/NDI transitioned to a new form of civic programming intended to ensure the widest possible participation in the momentous national reforms then under discussion. This model, of multi-level (local, regional and national), dialogues, accompanied by advocacy succeeded in reaching thousands of Ukrainians, many of them participating in organized political life for the first time. CEPPS/NDI proved that it is possible to engage citizens in a meaningful way around complex political reforms, including political finance reform, anti-corruption reform and electoral reform. It helped foster clear understanding among national civic groups and think tanks of the importance of engaging citizens in discussion around national reforms (CentreUA).

In some cases, CSOs multiplied the effects of CEPPS/NDI trainings by developing self-sustaining community-based projects that fostered public discussion on issues of citizen concern. In total, CEPPS/NDI supported 118 national and local level CSOs to engage in advocacy and government watchdog activities.

Intermediate Result 1.1.A: More inclusive advocacy campaigns lead to political processes that better reflect European and international standards for democratic governance

Freedom of Assembly

- With ongoing assistance from CEPPS/NDI, in August 2012 the “For Peaceful Protest!” (FFP) coalition gathered more than 18,000 petition signatures and used this base of support to advocate to leaders in the Rada and Presidential Administration to improve the law. It succeeded in getting restrictive draft legislation on freedom of assembly removed from the Rada agenda in October 2012. Also, in April 2013, the FPP succeeded in convincing the Rada Human Rights Committee to withdraw the legislation on assembly, which it considered flawed. The FPP coalition presented revisions on various provisions to improve the draft.

“I did not take any interest in political life and government monitoring, though I studied political science. I got interested when I heard that my friends take pictures of political campaigning ads.”

~Citizen in Ivano-Frankivsk, regarding the Follow the Money campaign’s Ad Hunters initiative
Election Law Reform

- CEPPS/NDI subgrantee Opora helped to form a consortium of CSOs advocating for electoral reform (Consortium). The Consortium held a series of public debates and roundtables in 2011, which promoted awareness of the flaws in the draft electoral law among national and regional civic and political actors, journalists, and internationals. The Consortium publicized their views via radio, television and a blog site. The law that was ultimately passed in November 2011 contained many of the Consortium’s recommendations.
- In 2013, Opora began spearheading the development of a more comprehensive vision of electoral reform in Ukraine, as well short-term changes in the local, presidential, and parliamentary election laws, with the transparent inclusion of civil society input.

Code of Conduct/Parliamentary Reform

- With support from CEPPS/NDI, the Center for Political Studies and Analysis (CPSA) developed a memorandum of understanding (MoU), and corresponding list of pledges, that it asked political parties and single mandate candidates to sign in advance of the elections. With the exception of Bloc of Petro Poroshenko and the Radical Party, all major political parties signed the memorandum, as did 18 single-mandate district candidates and 10 party-list candidates. It committed parties to fight corruption, promote transparency, and cooperate with civil society on reform. The pledges were a checklist of reform laws that the candidate pledges to vote for. CPSA held a series regional roundtables, asking party branches and single-mandate candidates to sign the MoU and pledges.
- Leading up to the elections, CPSA joined forces with 20 other civic groups to create the “For a Responsible Rada!” coalition. The coalition developed a voter guide with data on incumbent parliamentarians’ voting records on major legislation. At CPSA’s regional roundtables in the candidate pledge drive (above) the coalition distributed almost 3,000 copies of the voter guide. CPSA, along with the Civic Sector of Euromaidan and FPP, distributed an additional 37,000 copies of the voter guides to citizens in 18 oblasts, for a total of 40,000.

Party and campaign finance

- The “Follow the Money” campaign demonstrated that political parties and their candidates are willing to engage and communicate with citizens. In response to citizen petitions, 975 candidates signed Declarations of Responsibility, committing to make their campaign financing transparent. Of the party candidates who signed the Declaration, nearly 94.7 percent fulfilled their promise to submit or publish

An activist dressed as an oligarch holds a “dependent political party” on a leash during a Follow the Money campaign flash mob in Cherkasy in 2015.
their asset declarations. The Follow the Money Campaign generated excitement and enthusiasm; in one event in the regional city of Ternopil activists collected 700 signatures at local universities by organizing a flash mob.

- With assistance from CEPPS/NDI, the campaign developed an Activist Toolkit to help coordinators raise public awareness and mobilize communities and individual citizens.
- In July 2015, with funding from the Black Sea Trust (BST), Institute Respublika conducted local-level discussion forums and workshops on election and campaign finance reform in 25 communities. These local-level discussions then fed into the four regional and two national dialogues for more than 200 citizens and activists organized with CEPPS/NDI funding in fall 2015.

**E-governance reform**

- With support from CEPPS/NDI, the Podil Agency for Regional Development (PARD) organized a series of regional discussions, public meetings, and press conferences in eleven oblast centers in late 2014 that brought together a total of 216 local government representatives, civic leaders, technology experts, and members of the media and business to discuss e-governance reform. Following the roundtables and workshops, PARD followed up with citizens, civil society groups and local government to solicit their recommendations for the White Paper on e-participation Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) at the National Agency for e-governance.
- The launch of the Citizen Budget Simulator in Kyiv led to more than 1,016 citizens submitting proposed budgets, which the Kyiv City Council took into consideration during the 2016 budgeting process.

**Local CSO Advocacy**

- The majority of the 17 advocacy campaigns organized by NGO School participants led to greater accountability as local government officials agreed to allocate funds, schedule votes, and give citizens greater access to decisionmaking. A few examples include: trying to open a new school in a village in the Turka rayon in Lviv; advocating for equal access to healthcare by repairing elevators in Simferopol hospitals in Crimea; and promoting government transparency through regular public reporting on local budgets in Dniprodzerzhynsk.
- From March 2015 through March 2016 nearly 10,000 citizens were involved in Institute Respublika’s Active Community and more than 1,000 became activists. Successful projects included securing improved access to communal and housing services; construction of a playground and educational center; youth education on recycling; improvement to city drainage and sanitation services; and creation of a humanitarian headquarters to assist internally displaced persons.
- In January, 2016 the mayors and local councilors in nine cities signed a “Roadmap for the Government,” in which they agreed to implement key priorities identified by local citizens. The cities were Ternopil, Uzhgorod, Cherkasy, Zinkiv, Dobropillya, Skadovsk, Vinnytsya, Kherson and Bohuslav.
- As a result of the Follow the Money campaign’s efforts, local officials took steps to increase transparency and report to citizens:
  - The mayors of seven cities - including Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, Burshtyn, Zhytomyr, and Khmelnitskii - agreed to report publicly about their first 100 days
in the office. Three of them - in Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi and Khmelnytsky - broadcast their presentations live on local television channels. The video of the mayor’s report in Ivano-Frankivsk is available online.\textsuperscript{16}

**Intermediate Result 1.1.B: Increased cooperation and linkages between political parties and civic actors in advocacy campaigns on key electoral and political process issues**

- Political parties started to view civic activists at the local level as experts in reforms and local issues and eagerly engaged them in reform processes, including with Active Community projects in Žinkiv and Uzhgorod and with CentreUA in Ternopol.
- At a series of regional roundtables on a parliamentary code of conduct, the CPSA reached out to party branches and single-mandate candidates, asking them to sign a MoU and pledges. The local coordinators also organized 30 meetings with potential candidates for mayoral races in the upcoming elections. The events received wide media coverage, facilitating widespread information about candidates and their initiatives to voters.
- As a result of consultations with CEPPS/NDI, Opora developed a strategy to improve its overall communications, including outreach to political parties and the media. Accordingly, during the 2012 and 2014 parliamentary election periods, CEPPS/NDI facilitated meetings between Opora and other Consortium members with political party representatives to discuss pre-election environment, long-term assessments and post-election analysis.

**CEPPS Objective 1.2: Political parties are more responsive to concerns of citizens and marginalized groups, especially women.**

CEPPS/NDI established working relations with the leadership of all major parties, and provided technical assistance to more than 1,300 party members representing national headquarters and 40 branch offices across Ukraine. Party representatives acquired direct voter outreach skills such as door-to-door contact, get out the vote (GOTV) techniques, and learned how to strategically use new technology and voter communication tools, such as social media, websites, phone calls, and SMS blasts. Through meetings with US and European campaign experts, parties had the opportunity to discuss best practices in grassroots organizing and advancing women’s political participation, as well as targeting marginalized constituencies. Parties benefitted from case management and constituent tracking software provided by CEPPS/NDI’s ITC and governance teams, noting that they are better able to track and respond to constituent concerns in a timelier manner.

After Euromaidan, when regional tensions and divisions, were strong and exacerbated by Russian hybrid warfare, NDI helped parties such as Samopomich, which had emerged in the West, develop a structure of national branches.

In regards to women’s roles in parties and as candidates, specific successes included: the establishment of party schools for young women politicians (Rukh and Batkivshchyna), the

\textsuperscript{16} https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yOmhC1IWn5c
adoption of internal gender quotas (Batkivshchyna and the Kyiv branch of Udar), the formation of women’s wings (Democratic Alliance and Bloc of Petro Poroshenko) and the conduct of gender audits. In the 2015 local elections, the major political parties that CEPPS/NDI had been working with put forward 30 percent or more women candidates at the level of raion and city councils.

**Intermediate Result 1.2.A: Political parties are more representative and inclusive, particularly in relation to women’s participation, as well as to vulnerable groups**

**Advocacy and Constituent Outreach**

- Following CEPPS/NDI’s public opinion research presentations to political parties, in early 2016 party leaders from 10 political parties requested CEPPS/NDI’s assistance on topics such as: building internal party structures, developing party platforms, and improving citizen outreach. In 2015 leaders of six parties, Batkivshchyna, the Bloc of Petro Poroshenko, Democratic Alliance, the Radical Party, People’s Force and Volia requested advice from CEPPS/NDI on improving constituent outreach following CEPPS/NDI’s presentation of polls and focus group results.
  - For example the People’s Force national campaign manager, said that the key findings from CEPPS/NDI’s survey results influenced the way the party organized its party work and developed its campaign message. Since honesty of the candidates was a top priority for people, the party’s message was: “Honest politics. Working honestly means don’t steal and don’t lie.”
  - Samopomich started conducting its own polling on a smaller scale but similar to CEPPS/NDI’s methodology to better understand citizen priorities and develop evidence based policies,
- In the 2014 parliamentary elections, the majority of political party participants in CEPPS/NDI’s pre-election training program implemented CEPPS/NDI-taught campaign strategies such as door-to-door contact, get out the vote (GOTV) techniques, and using new technology and voter communication tools, such as social media, websites, phone calls, and SMS blasts.
- CEPPS/NDI noted that some of the newly emerging parties, such as Samopomich and People’s Force, successfully implemented some of these direct voter outreach techniques despite having fewer financial resources than larger parties.
- The Radical party’s leadership approved the CiviCRM system as the party’s main constituent and voter outreach system, and the party began to implement the system in its national, regional, and local offices. When the program ended, Samopomich was considering a similar step.
- Following CEPPS/NDI’s presentation of the CiviCRM system at a training in November, 2015 staff from six different MP offices approached CEPPS/NDI about implementing the system. By the end of the program, four MP offices were actively using CiviMP to communicate with constituents and respond to constituent requests.

**Internal Inclusivity:**

- Research presentations and consultations with CEPPS/NDI also catalyzed internal change within parties. Samopomich increased the quality of internal party communication via social media After CEPPS/NDI’s presentation to members of the Radical Party, party
leaders were particularly engaged on internal party communication and platform development. CEPPS/NDI suggested that the leadership could offer party members a questionnaire to solicit their views at the upcoming Party Congress. This idea was implemented immediately; the party received approximately 1,000 responses and is actively following up with conference participants.

- In advance of the October 2015 local elections, the Institute implemented an innovative candidate training program - jointly funded by CEPPS, the Department of State, and the Canadian government - particularly aimed at giving skills to new entrants to electoral politics. CEPPS/NDI trained teams of trainers for nine parties that then trained more than 5,000 candidates. Twenty percent of them were elected.
- In addition to those attending trainings in person, CEPPS/NDI’s nine candidate training Youtube videos received a combined total of more than 25,000 hits
- During the cascade training program on citizen outreach in between elections, Samopomich, Batkivshchyna, Nash Krai and People’s Force have created training departments that are working on the internal party development. Radical Party is in the process of designing a training department.
- Analyzing the trainings outcomes, People’s Force leader Oleksandr Solontay mentioned that party “had good results only in those regions where candidates used the high-impact and low cost methods of direct voter outreach. In the regions where more financial resources were available but candidates did not communicate directly with voters, they did not do well.”

Women’s Participation

- Following consultation with CEPPS/NDI in mid-2012, the Democratic Alliance (DA) established a new women’s organization. As a first step, the party decided to hold a series of seminars through the fall to educate its members about gender issues, women’s organizations, and women in politics and the elections. CEPPS/NDI agreed to provide recommendations for experts and trainers. In 2015, Udar leader Vitaliy Klytchko pledged a goal of 30 percent representation of women in its parliamentary faction.
- With ongoing consultations from CEPPS/NDI, the Batkivshchyna party completed its School for Young Women Politicians in 2014 and instituted an internal party gender quotas on national lists (30 percent). The party expressed commitments to giving women opportunities to increase their role and leadership through party-sponsored projects and managing aspects of party work.
- With CEPPS/NDI’s support, BPP-Solidarity decided to create a women’s wing for the party in December 2015 to promote women leaders within the party. Twenty-six BPP women party activists also outlined plans for the women’s wing’s mission, functions, structure, funding, and role in the party. Even though the party charter has a formal clause requiring the inclusion of 30 percent women into its candidate lists, BPP nominated only 19 percent of women candidates for the 2014 parliamentary elections. The party expected that the formation of a women’s wing would raise women’s visibility in the party.
- Three national parties have conducted gender audit with CEPPS/NDI’s assistance. Based on the audit findings and following CEPPS/NDI’s recommendations People’s Force established an informal women’s group in the party, which works on engagement with women activists and voters. Nash Krai analysed its gender audit results and, together with CEPPS/NDI, designed a training program for women members and candidates.
CEPPS Objective 1.3: Women’s political participation is increased.

Through its work with the Ukrainian parliament and international organizations, CEPPS/NDI advanced the issue of women’s participation among government, civic and party representatives in Ukraine. To support political parties’ efforts to be more responsive institutions and better listen to and act on the priority concerns of women voters, CEPPS/NDI designed and prepared focus groups. The focus groups served as a springboard for lively discussion among party leadership on ways to support women candidates through training, gender quotas, and women’s wings. CEPPS/NDI election delegation for the 2014 parliamentary elections noted that major parties placed more women in winnable positions on candidate lists than in past elections.

Since its formation in 2011, CEPPS/NDI has worked closely with the Equal Opportunity Gender Caucus to promote women’s participation in political life. The new gender caucus was the only cross party grouping in the new Rada as of late 2012. Based on advice from CEPPS/NDI, the Caucus organized a parliamentary hearing on gender equality in 2013, representing the first hearing on this topic in more than seven years in Ukraine. The Equal Opportunities Caucus also played a crucial role in amending the new local election law to include a 30 percent gender quota for political party lists in multi-mandate districts. As a result, following the 2015 local elections, there are currently no oblast, city or rayon councils in Ukraine without women members.

Intermediate Result 1.3.A: Politically active women have opportunities to assume greater public profile in championing public policy issues

- The Institute’s March 2012 conference, co-sponsored by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on gender-responsive political parties provided a high-profile opportunity for political parties and civil society to interact directly. Civic groups were able to learn more about how parties are working to improve women’s political participation, and parties were able to gather information on the issues that groups focusing on gender pursue and on how civic representatives view women in political life. More than 140 participants from political parties, civil society groups, academia, the media, and the international community attended the event. This included party leaders from the FoC, the People’s Rukh, and Udar, as well as the Deputy Head of the Party of Regions Leonid Kozhara.

- The Equal Opportunities Caucus re-formed in the new convocation of the Rada on in December 2012, after several weeks of unofficial negotiations among MPs. CEPPS/NDI advised Caucus activists throughout the negotiations on how to effectively re-establish the Caucus, keeping in mind long-term sustainability. The Caucus initiated a parliamentary hearing on gender issues, held by the Human Rights Committee in October 2013. Almost 45 participants contributed to a three-hour hearing, with members of parliament, government representatives, civil society experts, and members of the international community testifying.

- CEPPS/NDI supported the re-formation of the Equal Opportunities Caucus in the Rada following 2014 parliamentary elections as well. It has served to inspire other women leaders and five similar caucuses have been formed on the local level. The Equal
Opportunities Caucus in the Kyiv City Council, formed shortly after the Rada’s Caucus, is the first gender equality caucus at the municipal level.

- With CEPPS/NDI support, the Equal Opportunities Caucus (EOC) in the Parliament continued working after 2014 elections on gender focused policy proposals. For the first time in Ukraine’s modern history, EOC members introduced gender quotas in electoral legislation.
- With CEPPS/NDI’s support, in early 2016 the EOC formed the Public Council on Gender, a working group that seeks to promote greater coordination between civil society and the public sector on women’s political participation, systematize information on existing gender equality programs in Ukraine, and to design a national strategy for greater women’s political participation.

**Objective 2: More representative and accountable political processes and actors through enhanced civic engagement and advocacy at the sub-national level (CEPPS/IRI)**

**CEPPS Objective 2.1:** Youth from political parties and civil society organizations (CSOs) are able to effectively contribute to the decision-making processes in their organizations.

**Intermediate Result 2.1.1:** Youth leadership capacity is developed and youth are increasingly effective participants in political processes at the local level.

During the final years of the SPPU program, CEPPS/IRI’s youth programming focused on its Political Leadership Academies (PLA). The PLA targeted professionals from across the country, but particularly from southern and eastern Ukraine for a more advanced learning program, providing an opportunity for a comprehensive and weighty dialogue through a multiple-session format. While such a deep but narrow design limits the number of youth who can participate in the program, participants were able to spend more time with one another, which as CEPPS/IRI observed, offers more potential for building sustainable relationships. CEPPS/IRI believes that by providing such collaborative programming for participants from across Ukraine who represent political parties, civil society and government sectors, participants learn how to interact with representatives from other sectors and break down stereotypes that may exist between the sectors or across Ukraine’s geography. The PLA format supports the development of sustainable relationships with colleagues and counterparts that lead to continued collaboration on political and civic activism throughout the country.

As evidenced by the many success stories resulting from the program, CEPPS/IRI’s PLA alumni have successfully advocated for reforms in their communities. Through follow-up conversations with program participants, CEPPS/IRI noted many instances of alumni increasing their capacity and more effectively engaging in political processes. Only one session of the PLA was conducted ahead of the October 2015 local elections; however, of the 25 participants, fifteen noted their intention to run as candidates for city council, one was a candidate for city mayor, one was a candidate for both city mayor and local council, and six worked on the election campaigns for candidates. Some examples of how the Academy has affected participants as revealed through CEPPS/IRI follow-up with PLA alumni from the trainings in Dnipro include:
• “I began cooperation with local MPs, helping to attract about 400,000 UAH for the development of the community. For the first time I gave an interview to local television;” and
• “I organized and conducted a lobbying campaign for the adoption of participatory budgeting in Pidhorodne.”

Youth activism in Ukraine waxed and waned significantly from 2009-2016. In many ways, the years following the Orange Revolution mirror the post-Revolution of Dignity period. Youth played pivotal roles in both revolutions and as a result sought to transition their activism into engagement with decision-making processes thereafter. However, as the reform process stalled in the years following the Orange Revolution, the window of opportunity for youth engagement seemed to narrow. Some young Ukrainians continued to engage in political processes, though they often lacked the tools to compete with more established political actors. The Revolution of Dignity reversed the downward trend in youth activism. As mentioned earlier in this report, CEPPS/IRI was overwhelmed with the number of applications for its four rounds of PLA. The Institute received more than 1,600 applications for only 93 slots.17 Utilizing lessons learned from the post-Orange Revolution period, it is necessary to maintain this momentum. High levels of youth activism must be bolstered by providing youth with the knowledge and skills to be able to contribute to decision-making processes. As a result, CEPPS/IRI sought to capture its programmatic learning when designing its follow-on USAID-supported “Ukraine: Responsive and Accountable Politics (U-RAP)” program. With a significant youth component, CEPPS/IRI intends to utilize the PLA model in each of its focus communities to provide advanced learning opportunities for young professionals to develop their skills. In addition, building upon its YPLS model, in order to engage youth in political processes at an earlier age, CEPPS/IRI also designed programming that targets 15-17 year old youth.

**Intermediate Result 2.1.2: Political parties understand and respond to challenges affecting the participation of youth in political processes**

As the 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity has shown, political parties need to be more accountable to Ukrainian citizens and the country’s youth, in particular, given their growing call for pro-European reforms. To do so, politicians need to have access to credible information about their constituencies and the issues of concern for them. In addition, as the conflict in the Donbas continues, it is particularly important for politicians to have access to information on the thoughts and opinions of eastern and southern Ukrainians. As such, CEPPS/IRI’s public opinion research from 2013-2016 sought to address this need, from its national polls to its oversamples in eastern and southern regions of Ukraine. With each public opinion survey and focus group, CEPPS/IRI briefed Ukrainian political parties and other relevant stakeholders on the findings. Documentation from CEPPS/IRI briefings with political parties indicated that national-level data was of great interest to political parties, particularly ahead of elections and other significant political changes (e.g., the replacement of Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk with Volodymyr Groisman).

---

17 As evidence of the overwhelming demand for youth programming, for its final PLA cohort, CEPPS/IRI received an unprecedented number of applications (i.e., 485) from political and civic activists for an available 25 slots in the program. The number of applicants was a significant increase from the 119 applicants who applied for the first PLA. In total, CEPPS/IRI received 1,658 applications for 93 slots in its four PLAs.
With regard to youth issues, CEPPS/IRI’s crosstab data on youth opinions often tracked with national trends—though there were slight divergences that were discussed in quarterly reports submitted by CEPPS/IRI throughout the grant. Unfortunately, CEPPS/IRI public opinion research conducted toward the end of this program indicates that youth dissatisfaction with the direction Ukraine is going in remains high. Respondents attribute this to the ongoing war in the Donbas, corruption and the deterioration of living standards.

According to CEPPS/IRI staff and their follow-up with party representatives, some political parties took the issue of increasing youth participation in political processes very seriously. For example, in advance of the 2012 parliamentary elections, the Fatherland Party (i.e., Batkivshchyna)—as a part of the united opposition—supported several young candidates on their party list and in single-mandate districts in an effort to promote a more youthful image of the party. One such candidate, Ivan Krulko, was head of the party’s youth wing and had participated in several CEPPS/IRI trainings under previous programs. Similarly, the Party of Regions, UDAR and Fatherland Party all had active youth wings that were frequently included in CEPPS/IRI’s polling briefings.

**CEPPS Objective 2.2: CSOs and political parties develop trust and build working relationships through the implementation of joint advocacy campaigns.**

**Intermediate Result 2.2.1: Increased cooperation and linkages among political parties and civil society on local electoral and political process issues.**

In many respects, CEPPS/IRI’s CSO/Political Party program mirrored the shifting political context in Ukraine. As the Activities section outlined, CEPPS/IRI began the program by training political parties and CSOs separately on the benefits of cooperation before proceeding with joint events that addressed issues of local concern. Indeed, at the start of this program, CEPPS/IRI worked with a local polling organization, GfK, to conduct phone interviews with political parties and CSOs and found a high degree of skepticism on the need to collaborate with one another. Although political parties demonstrated a slightly higher degree of willingness to work with CSOs, CEPPS/IRI found CSOs to be less willing and many appeared to not understand that lobbying local council members often entails lobbying political party members who were elected. Toward the end of the grant, CEPPS/IRI saw a marked improvement in both sectors’ willingness to collaborate. CEPPS/IRI no longer needed to dedicate as much effort to training each sector on why they should collaborate with one another and instead could move directly into collaborative events. CEPPS/IRI attributes this shift to the impact the Revolution of Dignity had on the Ukrainian psyche, as many citizens—whether they represented CSOs or political parties—felt inspired and, perhaps more importantly, able to influence their local authorities and affect change on the local level.

Consequently, in 2015, CEPPS/IRI began to receive numerous requests from emerging political parties (e.g., Self-Reliance [Samopomich] Party, Strength of the People [Syla Lyuday] Party, and Bloc Petro Poroshenko) to conduct joint events with civic groups. As one CEPPS/IRI staff member explained, “They came to us with real proposals for cooperation… Parties understood how they could use this opportunity to involve people and show that their party was open to
voters and their ideas.” Indeed, CEPPS/IRI’s joint events, which were open to the public, attracted unaffiliated citizens, civic activists representing multiple organizations, as well as members of opposing political parties. Although event participants did not always agree on how to address the local issue at hand, CEPPS/IRI’s joint events at the very least provided a unique platform for these public discussions to take place. With the exception of election periods, it is important to note as well that while most political parties hold regular meetings on their own volition, their meetings are often open to members only; thus, CEPPS/IRI’s events were unique insofar as they were open to the public and provided an opportunity to conduct voter outreach between elections.

In addition to the aforementioned value of CEPPS/IRI’s CSO/Political Party program, in many respects the greatest success of this program concerned the issue of housing associations (i.e., OSBB) in Ukraine. This reform gained national attention following the introduction of a new law in May 2015 in which all apartment owners in multi-apartment buildings were asked to decide by a set date on the management of the communal spaces of their buildings and their adjacent territory—or local authorities would be forced to make that decision on behalf of the residents. Whereas many multi-residential buildings were previously overseen by government-contracted management companies known as ZhEKS, this law required that apartment owners in multi-apartment buildings be empowered to decide for themselves who would administer their buildings’ communal spaces—including the options of creating citizen-led housing associations (OSBB), renewing their contracts with ZhEKS, or seeking out a private property management company. In response to this legislation, several political parties saw an opportunity to increase cooperation with citizens and civic groups already active on this issue and contacted CEPPS/IRI for assistance on this issue.

The joint events held on housing association reform were widely popular, particularly in southern and eastern Ukraine. Whereas previous joint events attracted a few dozen participants depending on the issue, these seminars on housing associations attracted between 100 and 250 individuals. The largest events took place in the cities of Mariupol and Slovyansk—two cities in the Donbas, a region of Ukraine that has historically had low levels of civic participation in local self-governance.
These successful events also served to generate competition between political parties—particularly in southern and eastern Ukraine—as parties tried to be the most helpful to citizens. This is particularly significant given the fact that parties in these regions of Ukraine have long been relatively silent in between elections. Through this CSO/Political Party program, CEPPS/IRI staff observed a marked change in citizen attitudes while working in these communities in southern and eastern Ukraine. Speaking about his experience in Mariupol, for example, one CEPPS/IRI staff member commented, “People began to ask different questions: instead of ‘Who can fix this for me,’ people began to ask ‘What can I do to fix this myself?’”

CEPPS Objective 2.3: Local elected officials are able to fulfill their roles and responsibilities through increased access to information regarding citizen concerns and best practices.

Intermediate Result 2.3.1: Increased cooperation and linkages among local executive institutions, civil society and citizens on local electoral and political process issues.

Public hearings are used the world over as a practice whereby legislative and executive democratic institutions formally present policy proposals, initiatives or legislation to citizens and organized civil society for both the purpose of providing information, but also to receive comments and feedback from the public. Though similar to town hall meetings in that the supply-side actor leads the event and interacts with the audience, the intent of a public hearing is to review and receive commentary on a specific initiative, as opposed to simply providing a space for dialogue. Although CEPPS/IRI’s internal evaluation, “Ukraine: Local Governance Programming Evaluation and Needs Assessment,” conducted in November 2015, found that many of CEPPS/IRI’s public hearings conducted under this Intermediate Result did not follow the exact model of a traditional public hearing, but were rather more along the lines of town hall meetings, the evaluation found that these events facilitated much-needed introductory engagements between local officials and civil society actors in the communities where the events were held. Indeed, the topics covered during these events often concerned methods of engagement to be employed in the community in the future.
CEPPS/IRI’s Public Hearings program, while not serving as traditional public hearings in some cases, did achieve positive results. First, it was clear to CEPPS/IRI’s evaluation team that the program in Chernihiv raised awareness of the purpose and value of engagement with local governments. Participants in evaluation focus groups were able to articulate the objectives of government engagement with citizens; namely, to increase citizens’ influence on government decision-making and to build linkages with authorities to better address issues of local concern—a finding relevant to Intermediate Result 2.3.1. Secondly, CEPPS/IRI’s evaluation found that Public Hearing program participants were able to provide examples of how the program resulted in changes in attitudes. Several respondents discussed how the experience of participating in the public hearing events changed attitudes of elected officials toward citizen participation; one explained that there was a “realization among authorities that people can demand public hearings, that these procedures exist and they need to respect them.” Further, the public hearing event provided practical experience to both local officials and demand-side actors on how to host and participate in engagement mechanisms. Additionally, respondents indicated that participation in the public hearing events encouraged some attendees to become more involved in grassroots politics, with one city council member reporting that 18 of his friends (youth) ran for local council in the October 2015 local elections, with 13 being elected. Another respondent stated, “This particular program was a push for starting my career in politics.” Finally, many of the public hearing events did result in agreements made to formalize citizen engagement mechanisms moving forward, with some communities following through on this. For example, one evaluation participant reported that a public hearing was organized by their community around the issue of whether or not to remove a Lenin statue and another reported that their community engaged in subsequent discussion regarding territorial land reform.

Though the aforementioned results of the public hearing program are initial, they demonstrate that there is an appetite and space for progress to be made in the implementation of citizen engagement mechanisms and participation in transparent political processes. Additional international support is therefore needed to facilitate these connections between local authorities and citizens. Despite the increase in civic activism in the wake of the Revolution of Dignity, Ukrainian society still fundamentally lacks knowledge of how to engage with their authorities. As one interviewee in CEPPS/IRI’s evaluation commented, “It was hard to get citizens to attend the public hearings because they couldn’t understand what they would get out of participating.” Similarly, another added, “Local authorities either don’t have the skill or the will to conduct these public hearings.” These findings, among others, resulted in critical programmatic learning for CEPPS/IRI: when designing future programming around such events between demand- and supply-side actors, as one interviewee explained, it is “not enough to run one public hearing on one issue. [We] need to do them often and repeatedly to get people’s buy-in for this mechanism.” Indeed, this shift in emphasis from one-off events in communities to a more sustained, “deep dive” approach was instrumental in the design of CEPPS/IRI’s follow-on USAID-supported “Ukraine: Responsive and Accountable Politics (URAP)” program. Similarly, CEPPS/IRI’s after-action review from its Public Hearings program revealed the need to adopt a more integrated approach to its local governance programming (i.e., to take advantage of programming complementarities wherever possible). For example, this programming would have been bolstered had it been implemented in tandem with CEPPS/IRI’s Local Elected Officials program.
(i.e., Intermediate Result 2.3.2), which would have equipped officials with the knowledge of how to properly conduct a public hearing.

**Intermediate Result 2.3.2: Centers-of-excellence in local governance and civic engagement on local issues serve as models in multiple regions of Ukraine.**

In Ukraine, the historic, Soviet-model of centralized power has resulted in a deficit of knowledge and capacity amongst local government officials to affect change in areas within their control. Moreover, in some cases, local power structures—often involving the mayor or other powerful business interests—have sought to discourage the development of empowered and active city councils in order to maintain the status quo that benefited them for years. Therefore, CEPPS/IRI’s Local Elected Officials program (described in greater detail under the Activities section of this report) sought primarily to empower councilmembers to better represent their constituents and play a greater role in policy discussions affecting their communities. With a debate in the Ukrainian parliament currently underway on statutory and constitutional amendments that would devolve additional power to the local level, such assistance to local councils is more necessary now than ever. In order for Ukrainian decentralization reforms to succeed, local governments must be prepared for and ready to implement the additional responsibilities that the central government will assign to them.

Given the importance of such programming at this critical juncture in Ukraine’s democratic development, CEPPS/IRI sought to work with local elected officials across the country in an effort to strengthen their ability to represent constituents and implement best practices in democratic governance at the local level. Relevant to Intermediate Result 2.3.2, throughout the course of this program, CEPPS/IRI conducted several interregional exchanges in an effort to disseminate best practices in local governance and civic engagement on local issues across Ukrainian communities. According to the findings of CEPPS/IRI’s internal evaluation, “Ukraine: Local Governance Programming Evaluation and Needs Assessment,” conducted in November 2015, these exchanges were quite effective at showing examples of what is possible under the Ukrainian legal framework and context. Comments from program alumni included:

- “This work has really opened our eyes;”
- “This program makes us want to work harder and improve ourselves;”
- “Through IRI, I was introduced to councilmembers from eastern Ukraine who came to [my city]. We could see that the same Ukrainians—like us—could do so much. In this way, we are able to push each other to grow;”
- “Through these experiences, we changed ourselves. When we returned home, we wanted to try to change others around us;”
- “After visiting [that city], we realized that our communities have exactly the same problems, but our approaches to resolving these problems are very different. For us, it was useful to see how [that city] solves problems on the local level;”
- “IRI is giving real inspiration and clear targets to local elected officials to work towards.”

Another fundamental strength of CEPPS/IRI’s programming, revealed during the evaluation, was that it helped to break down perceived stereotypes and barriers that the respective regions have toward one another. Given the size of Ukraine and the relatively poor infrastructure in between
regions, it is often difficult for Ukrainians to travel around their country. Several evaluation participants remarked that it is sometimes easier to travel all the way to the capital, Kyiv, than traveling to a neighboring region given the state of roads. Thus, CEPPS/IRI’s programming provided an opportunity for Ukrainians to interact across regions. As one participant stated, “Ukraine is large, and thanks to CEPPS/IRI we are discovering Ukraine and Ukrainians for the first time.” Given the current political and security situation in Ukraine, with Russia’s attempts to divide Ukraine along its east/west axis, such programming that builds bridges across Ukraine is essential.

In keeping with these efforts to disseminate best practices in local governance across Ukraine, several evaluation participants commented that they continued to liaise with their colleagues from around the country after completing CEPPS/IRI’s programming. For instance, one official explained how he tried to draft water treatment legislation for his community and consulted his peers from his interregional exchange for advice on how to get his bill passed through his council. As another official explained, “The exchange of experiences is the number one benefit of these trips. Thanks to these exchanges, we can now make a call and ask our counterparts and get solutions to our problems. We can do this anywhere, no matter where we are.” Many of these stories of local officials implementing in their respective cities lessons learned and best practices witnessed on an exchange have been reported in CEPPS/IRI’s quarterly reports.

CEPPS/IRI’s internal evaluation also revealed the importance of its trainings for local elected officials, especially for newly elected ones who lack knowledge of their responsibilities and basic council procedures; however, CEPPS/IRI acknowledges the challenges in being able to support the thousands of local elected officials in Ukraine—particularly immediately after local elections when so many new faces enter office. In order to mitigate this, CEPPS/IRI designed and launched its e-Learning Platform, an online Ukrainian-language platform with training videos and manuals, in an effort to reach a larger audience than it could through in-person trainings.

**Objective 3: Donors and key stakeholders are better informed of political and electoral environment (CEPPS/IFES)**

**Intermediate Results 3.1: Ensure accurate collection of Ukrainian public opinion data.**

Over the course of the SPPU project, CEPPS/IFES conducted seven public opinion survey, providing an overview of the changing winds of attitudes of Ukrainians towards the direction of their country and the importance of democracy. These findings were used to inform other programming from IFES under the Ukraine Election Law Reform Program, in addition to drive the work of local stakeholders over the course of the project. Reliable public opinion data provided a key insight into shifting attitudes in the lead-up to Maidan, and throughout the political transition.

**2009 Public Opinion Survey**

In the run-up to the 2010 presidential elections in a pessimistic mood about the direction of the country. Nearly three-quarters of Ukrainians (74%) believed Ukraine is on a path toward instability and chaos, similar to the 76% who expressed this opinion in the 2008 survey. Only 7%
believed Ukraine is on the path toward stability. The vast majority of Ukrainians were
dissatisfied with the economic situation (96%) and political situation (92%) in Ukraine. Reflecting the dissatisfaction with the economic situation, 95% of Ukrainians described the
current economic situation as being very or somewhat bad. Ninety percent also expressed
dissatisfaction with the healthcare situation in the country. Seventy-one percent are dissatisfied
with the foreign policy of Ukraine. The level of dissatisfaction with the political and economic
situation, and with foreign policy was little changed since the 2008 survey.

Inflation continued to be a major concern for Ukrainians as it was mentioned by 58% as one of
the most serious issues facing Ukraine. Economic issues dominate the list as general economic
problems are mentioned by 40%, unemployment and poverty are each mentioned by 39% and
corruption by 37%. Political issues were also mentioned by many, as political bickering was
mentioned by 20%, general political instability by 15% and problems with Russia by 15%.

Ninety-six percent of Ukrainians believed corruption was very or somewhat common in Ukraine. When asked whether corruption is a serious or not serious issue in specific institutions, a
majority said corruption is a very or somewhat serious problem in the police (86%), hospitals
(86%), courts (86%), universities and schools (75%), the Rada (75%), the Cabinet of Ministers
(70%), the tax authorities (69%), the Presidential administration (67%) and the customs
authorities (65%).

Economic concerns dominated the list of issues Ukrainians would like the winning presidential
candidate to address once he or she takes office. Seventy-one percent named the creation of jobs
as an important issue followed by reducing inflation (56%), reduction in corruption (48%),
改善 of health care services (33%), political stability (33%) and addressing the gas
delivery situation with Russia (17%).

Only 24% of Ukrainians believed Ukraine was a democracy compared to 49% who did not
believe it is a democracy. Still, the percentage that believes that Ukraine is a democracy has
increased from 15% in 2008. When asked what defines a democracy, most respondents believe it
means the protection of human rights (59%). Respondents also identified fair/consistent
enforcement of laws (47%), everybody having work (46%), freedom of speech (36%), no official
corruption (35%), state support of those unable to work (29%) and state support of pensioners
(29%) as tenets of democracy. A small proportion of respondents (28%) associated democracy
with the freedom to vote, checks and balances between branches of government (22%), freedom
of religion (20%) and freedom of association (12%).

Confidence remained low in many critical institutions and individuals in Ukraine. Respondents
have no or little confidence in the Verkhovna Rada (85%), President Viktor Yuschenko (85%),
the Cabinet of Ministers (78%) and the Ministry of Justice (62%). A majority also cited a lack of
confidence in the two leading presidential contenders: Viktor Yanukovych (60%) and Prime
Minister Tymoshenko (73%). While lack of confidence in Yanukovych declined slightly from
2008 to 2009 (64% to 60%), it increased significantly for Tymoshenko (63% to 73%).

2010 Public Opinion Survey
Ukrainians were slightly less pessimistic this year about the direction of the country, yet 44% of Ukrainians believed Ukraine is on a path toward instability and chaos. This was down from 74% in 2009 and 76% in 2008. Twenty-one percent believe Ukraine is on the path toward stability and prosperity and this has increased from 7% in 2009.

As Ukraine neared its 20th anniversary of independence, 41% of Ukrainians feel the country is worse off, compared to 21% who believed it is better off, 14% who viewed the country as being the same, and one quarter who said they do not know (24%).

Majorities of Ukrainians remained dissatisfied with the economic situation this year (83%), though slightly less so than 2009 (96%). Sixty percent were dissatisfied with the political situation; this decreased from 92% who were dissatisfied in 2009. Regarding the foreign policy situation, 41% of Ukrainians said they are satisfied, 37% are dissatisfied, and 22% say they don’t know.

Inflation was an even bigger concern for Ukrainians as it was mentioned by 75%, in contrast to 58% in 2009, as one of the most serious issues facing Ukraine. Other economic issues included unemployment is mentioned by 56%, poverty by 51%, corruption by 37%, and general economic problems by 36%. This year, political issues were less of a concern with political bickering only being mentioned by 11%, general political instability by 7%, and problems with Russia by 3%.

When asked about corruption, the two most common experiences with corruption involved being asked for unofficial payments at public hospitals to receive better treatment and asking for payments to avoid penalties by traffic officers. At hospitals, 46% of respondents say they have been asked more than once and 12% once. With traffic officers, 22% have been asked more than once and 4% have been asked once.

Confidence in select institutions remains under 50% for all institutions except the media, which 54% of Ukrainians had confidence in. Forty-three percent of Ukrainians expressed confidence in President Yanukovych, 35% in the Central Election Commission, 29% in the Verkhovna Rada, 24% in former Prime Minister Tymoshenko. And only 8% have confidence in former President Yushchenko. For Tymoshenko and Yushchenko, confidence has steadily been declining from 2008, while confidence in Yanukoych has increased from 2008.

Ukrainians were nearly equally split on their preference for democratic government. Thirty-two percent of Ukrainians said democracy is preferable to any other form of government, while 25% said in certain situations non-democratic government can be preferable, 27% said the form of government doesn’t matter to people like them, and 16% said they do not know.

More Ukrainians did not view Ukraine as a democracy than those who view it as a democracy. At the time, only 25% of Ukrainians believed that Ukraine is a democracy compared to 41% who do not believe it is a democracy.

Respondents had mixed assessments of certain policies and decisions that the Yanukovych administration has made since it took office. Ukrainians approved of the Yanukovych administration’s granting Russian language official status for legal proceedings (61%) and
declaring Ukraine’s maintaining of non-bloc status (52%). Forty-percent of Ukrainians disapproved of the agreement with Russia to extend the lease of the Russian fleet in Crimea, but 45% approved. Forty-percent disapproved of the administration’s stopping the movement to recognize Holodomor as genocide, while 20% approved, and 40% do not know. Majorities disapproved with the administrations’ denying broadcasting frequencies to some private TV channels (55%), and increasing gas tariffs by fifty percent (91%).

2011 Public Opinion Survey
Sentiments on the direction of the country turned sharply negative in the 2011 survey after a brief positive upsurge in the first year of the Yanukovych administration. Negative sentiment is also reflected in other indicators on the current situation in Ukraine. The percentage saying Ukraine is on a path toward instability rose from 44% in 2010 to 62%. There was been a sharp increase in negative sentiments regarding instability since the 2010 survey in Eastern Ukraine (42% to 61%) and in Southern Ukraine (19% to 49%), a significant part of the trend explaining the higher levels of negative sentiments nationally.

A large majority of Ukrainians were dissatisfied with the economic (87%) and political (70%) situation in the country, and close to half (46%) were also dissatisfied with Ukraine’s foreign policy. Residents of all areas of Ukraine were more likely to be dissatisfied than satisfied with Ukraine’s foreign policy; in Kyiv, the majority was dissatisfied (61%).

Economic concerns were central to Ukrainians’ opinions on the most important issues facing the nation with inflation, unemployment and poverty being the issues mentioned most often by respondents. When asked to name the most important issues facing the country, economic issues were most often mentioned: inflation (74%), poverty (54%), unemployment (53%), corruption (49%), general economic problems (32%), political bickering/political instability (20%) and external debt (11%).

The percentage saying they have confidence in President Yanukovych fell from 43% to 29%. Front of Change leader Arseniy Yatsenyuk was the highest rated political personality with 30% expressing confidence in him. Confidence in former Prime Minister Tymoshenko was at 24%. Members of the then-government all saw significant declines in confidence with Prime Minister Azarov declining from 37% in 2010 to 20% in this year’s survey; Vice Premier Tigipko declining from 41% to 20%; and Minister of Education Tabachnyk declining from 20% to 12%.

In contrast to national-level institutions, confidence in local institutions rose since the 2010 survey. Confidence in mayors/heads of village councils rose from 45% to 50%, and confidence in city or village councils rose from 42% to 46%. Confidence in the media stayed at 54% in this year’s survey.

There was a general decline in satisfaction with President Yanukovych’s handling of several important issues over time. A large majority of Ukrainians were dissatisfied with Yanukovych’s handling of economic issues. Nine in ten Ukrainians or higher say that they were dissatisfied with President Yanukovych’s performance in creating jobs (90%) and keeping prices low (95%).
There continued to be significant dissatisfaction with President Yanukovych in handling corruption and oligarchs. More than three-quarters of Ukrainians were dissatisfied with Yanukovych’s handling of corruption (76%) and two-thirds were dissatisfied with his actions to limit the influence of oligarchs and big business (66%). President Yanukovych does not receive high marks for his efforts at reforms in several areas. More than eight in ten were dissatisfied with his handling of pension reform. A majority were also dissatisfied with his advocacy for constitutional reforms (52%) and for changes in the tax code (52%).

Satisfaction with Yanukovych’s handling of relations with Russia fell significantly over the past year (from 66% in 2010 to 44% in 2011). This was especially been the case in the South (86% to 48%) and the East (79% to 49%). The Ukrainian public was also less satisfied with Yanukovych’s effort to bring political stability to Ukraine. Satisfaction with these efforts fell from 39% in 2010 to 29% in 2011, especially in the South (61% to 27%) and the Center (37% to 22%).

Sixty-six percent of Ukrainians believed that corruption is very common in Ukraine, while another 27% believed that it is somewhat common. These opinions are little changed from IFES surveys over the past few years. Corruption was thought to be a serious issue at many social and official institutions. Eighty-eight percent though corruption is very or somewhat serious in hospitals, 82% in the police, 81% in the courts and 79% in universities and schools. In Ukrainians’ personal experiences, the most common forms of encounters with corruption happened with regard to unofficial payments for nominally free healthcare, to obtain official documents, to avoid traffic fines and to ensure better grades or admission in schools.

A majority of Ukrainians did not consider democracy definitively preferable to any other form of government. Apathy toward the system of government, some preference for non-democratic governance and lack of clear opinions accounted for the majority of responses on preferred system of government. While one-third of Ukrainians (35%) said democracy is preferable to other forms of government, 33% also said to people like them it doesn’t matter what system of government they have. Eighteen percent of Ukrainians said in certain situations a non-democratic government can be preferable, leaving 14% who said they do not know.

In 2011, 44% of Ukrainians did not view Ukraine as a democracy; 21% viewed Ukraine as a democracy; 14% volunteered that Ukraine has both democratic and undemocratic tendencies; and 22% did not know. This continued a trend seen in CEPPS/IFES surveys over the past 12 years. Responses were mostly similar across regions, with the exception of the West compared to the East. In the East, 47% of respondents said Ukraine is not a democracy, while 36% in the West said Ukraine is not a democracy. Residents of the West, however, had the highest percentage of respondents volunteering that they believe Ukraine is both a democracy and not a democracy (21%).

_IFES Omnibus 2012 Survey_

A majority of Ukrainians believed that the 2012 parliamentary elections would not be free and fair, with 28% believing the elections would mostly not be free and fair and 23% believing they would not be free and fair at all. Only 5% believed the elections would be completely free and fair, and 23% believed they would be partially free and fair. As for what type of events or actions
will lead to the elections not being free and fair, respondents cited falsification of results (68%) and voters being given money or other rewards to vote a certain way (41%). Twenty-seven percent mentioned ballot stuffing, 22% said some voters will be stopped from voting, while 21% said that some voters will be able to vote multiple times, and 19% said that the authorities will pressure parties and candidates from campaigning openly. Among those who believed the elections will not be free and fair, the majority (63%) believed that government authorities will primarily be responsible for taking actions that would make the elections not free and fair. Only 6% said that opposition parties would primarily be responsible for taking these actions, and 13% each believed that electoral authorities or local government leaders would be responsible.

2012 Public Opinion Survey

A majority of Ukrainians believed their country is on a path toward instability, a finding that has stayed fairly consistent since the November 2005 CEPPS/IFES survey in Ukraine; the only exception being the September 2010 survey, when a plurality held this opinion. More than seven in ten Ukrainians were dissatisfied with the economic situation in the country, and more Ukrainians said their family’s economic situation has gotten worse (34%) rather than better (12%) over the past year. Corruption remains a vital concern, seen as widespread in major institutions and as a main problem facing the country.

In this environment of dissatisfaction and concern, Ukrainians went to the polls in October 2012 for the third parliamentary election since the Orange Revolution. The year was marked by momentous political changes, including the introduction of a new electoral system that included single-member constituencies and the creation of new political parties. Despite these changes, the survey found an increased level of apathy toward the October 2012 Rada elections compared to recent national-level elections in the country. Survey data also indicates that only a small portion of Ukrainians believe the election is likely to be completely free and fair, a finding consistent with others from previous CEPPS/IFES surveys in Ukraine. Responses indicated an electorate skeptical of the impact of voting, the integrity of the election process and lacking information on important aspects of the election process. The majority of Ukrainians had low expectations for fairness during the 2012 Verkhovna Rada elections, believing results would be falsified and vote-buying would be widespread. One month before the elections, three quarters of Ukrainians had not seen the list of candidates in their district. There was a similar lack of information on the number of ballot papers voters would receive. The installation of cameras in the polling stations was controversial in the period leading up to the elections. However, survey findings show a majority respondents did not believe the cameras lent greater transparency, nor would the cameras impact their likelihood to vote.

While democracy remains the most preferable form of government by a plurality of Ukrainians, confidence in Ukrainian democracy remained low. Significantly more Ukrainians believed the country is more undemocratic than democratic—a continuation of a decade-long trend in CEPPS/IFES’ surveys. Indeed, a majority of Ukrainians reported concern or alarm over the perceived reversal of rights by the Yanukovych administration, and large percentages do not believe voting provides citizens with influence on the government. While a large percentage of Ukrainians defined democracy in terms of rights and freedoms in CEPPS/IFES’ surveys, economic prosperity and social welfare guarantees continue to be associated with democracy as well. The inability of the Ukrainian political system to deliver the economic well-being and
security that democracy connotes for many citizens is one reason that many doubt the veracity of Ukrainian democracy.

Given this opinion environment, it is not surprising that there was little faith in political leaders and institutions in the country. While confidence in some leaders has waxed and waned over the past few years, the more general trend in Ukraine has been characterized by large-scale lack of confidence in the political class. In this survey, only one leader (Vitali Klitschko) managed to elicit confidence among slightly more Ukrainians (42%) than not (40%). The majority of Ukrainians lack confidence in all other prominent political leaders and institutions. In this electoral year, there had been an increase in citizens viewing parties as serving the people, yet the proportion with this view remained low, and the majority of Ukrainians continued to see political parties serving their own interest or the interests of elites.

2013 Public Opinion Surveys

A clear majority of Ukrainians (58%) believed Ukraine was headed toward instability (up from 53% in 2012), with only 14% believing Ukraine was headed toward. There was significant deterioration of opinions on this issue in eastern and southern Ukraine over the past year. In the East, the percentage with negative assessments on this question increased from 36% in 2012 to 56% in this year’s survey, while in the South this percentage increased from 43% to 59%.

The majority of Ukrainians professed a lack of confidence in all of the major national leaders they were asked to rate: President Viktor Yanukovych (23% confidence, 69% not); Head of Ukrainian Democratic Alliance for Reform (UDAR) Vitali Klitschko (37%, 52%); Prime Minister Mykola Azarov (19%, 73%); Speaker of Parliament Volodymyr Rybak (13%, 68%); Yulia Tymoshenko (22%, 67%); Head of Batkivschina Arseniy Yatsenyuk (23%, 66%); Head of Svoboda Oleh Tyahnybok (18%, 70%), and Head of the Communist Party Petro Symonenko (15%, 75%). The percent expressing a lack of confidence in these leaders rose for each of them from 2012 to 2013.

When asked to state their preference for a system of government for Ukraine, 37% of Ukrainians said democracy is preferable to other systems of government, 21% said in certain situations a non-democratic system may be preferable, while 29% said the system of government does not matter to them. The percentage preferring democracy fell from 46% in 2012 to 37% in 2013, while the percentage apathetic about the system of government increased from 20% to 29%.

Nationally, only 12% of Ukrainians said they are very or somewhat satisfied with the way democracy works in Ukraine, compared to 64% who are very or somewhat dissatisfied. Among those who preferred a democratic system of government, 19% were satisfied with democracy in Ukraine compared to 69% who were dissatisfied. Satisfaction with democracy in Ukraine was lower among those who prefer a non-democratic system in some situations (8% satisfied) and among those apathetic about the system of government (9%).

A significantly higher percentage of Ukrainians say Ukraine was not a democracy compared to the percentage that said it is a democracy (46% versus 20%). Twelve percent thought Ukraine has both democratic and non-democratic tendencies, and 22% did not offer an opinion. The
percentage saying Ukraine is a democracy declined slightly between 2012 and 2013 (25% versus 20%).

2014 Omnibus Surveys
Over the course of 2014, CEPPS/IFES conducted three omnibus surveys, revealing insights into the rapidly changing attitudes of Ukrainians during the year.

Less than 50% of Ukrainians countrywide were in support of the protests on the Maidan in Kyiv and other cities prior to the events of February 18, 2014. Overall, 43% of Ukrainians either completely supported the protests (22%) or supported the protests for the most part (21%), while 51% were either completely opposed (36%) or opposed for the most part (15%). The support for the Maidan protests varied greatly across Ukraine, with high levels of support in the West (82%) and North (64%) and low levels of support in the South (23%) and East (15%). Support for the protests was mixed in both Kyiv (53%) and the Center of Ukraine (47%).

Support increased over the course of the year however. By November 2014, over half of Ukrainians outside Donbas (61%) either strongly (30%) or somewhat supported (31%) the Maidan movement, compared to 26% who either somewhat (12%) or strongly opposed (14%) the movement.

Only 38% of Ukrainians approved of the actions of the civil society protest leaders during the Maidan protests. Support for their actions was highest in the West (75%), while only 12% of Ukrainians in the East approved of their actions. Ukrainian approval of leaders and diplomats from Western Countries during the protests was low, with only 30% supporting their actions. Meanwhile, leaders and diplomats from Russia saw even lower approval ratings, with only 21% approving of their actions. Approval for the Russian leaders and diplomats, unsurprisingly, was highest in the South (41%) and East (30%), where support for the protests was lowest. Finally, support for the Police and the Berkut was only 25% countrywide, again seeing spikes in the South (45%) and West (44%).

Despite increased support of the Maidan movement, only 13% of Maidan supporters said that the current authorities had done either very well (1%) or somewhat well in addressing the aspirations of the Maidan movement (12%). Meanwhile, among Maidan supporters, 81% said that the authorities have not done a good job in addressing the aspirations of the movement. Despite drawing more support, those saying the authorities have done well in addressing the aspirations of the movement has decreased from September, when 19% said that the authorities were doing well in this regard.

Ukrainians are split as to whether Ukraine would be better off if it had closer economic relations with Europe (37%) or Russia (37%). Eighteen percent of Ukrainians would prefer to see Ukraine have economic relations with both Europe and Russia, while 3% would prefer relations with neither. This represents similar numbers to the findings of CEPPS/IFES’s November 2013 national survey. Regional differences again appear, with respondents in the West (77%), North (59%), and Kyiv (53%) desiring stronger ties with Europe. However, support for economic relations with Russia are higher in both the East (61%) and the South (59%).
Before the events of February 18, 2014, opinions among Ukrainians were split as to how best to proceed through the political crisis. Thirty percent of Ukrainians supported the resignation of President Yanukovich and both early presidential and parliamentary elections. A further 11% supported the resignation of President Yanukovych, coupled with only early presidential elections. Meanwhile, 19% of Ukrainians were willing to see President Yanukovych see out his presidential term, in exchange for having early parliamentary elections. A full 14% of Ukrainians thought that the best way to resolve the dispute was for the government to immediately disburse the demonstrators, using force if necessary. At least a quarter of respondents in both the East (27%) and South (27%) supported this option. Support for the resignation of Yanukovych was highest in the West (73%), the North (70%), and Kyiv (58%).

Ukrainians were split as to whether international mediation was needed to end the stalemate between the government and protestors. Overall, 37% thought that international mediation was needed, while 42% did not think that it was needed. Support for mediation was highest in the West (64%) and in Kyiv (60%), while respondents in the South (27%) and East (20%) were more reticent for international mediation.

Almost half of Ukrainians outside Donbas (48%) said that the country is heading in the wrong direction, while 29% said that it is heading in the right direction. Within Donbas, however, attitudes were different, with only 9% of Ukrainians there saying that the country is heading in the right direction, while 65% say that the country is heading in the wrong direction.

Attitudes towards the Verhovna Rada elections held on October 26, 2014 are largely positive, with 25% saying the elections were completely free and fair, and 46% saying that the flawed, but reasonably free and fair. Only 15% say that the Rada elections were either so flawed as to doubt the accuracy of the results (9%) or not at all free and fair (7%). Compared to voters’ expectations of the elections, there has been a 14 percentage point increase in attitudes towards the free and fairness of the election.

Following the parliamentary elections, Ukrainians outside Donbas largely thought that election results accurately reflect how people voted. Sixty-nine percent of Ukrainians outside Donbas either strongly (19%) or somewhat agreed (50%) with this notion, while only 20% disagreed. Attitudes have changed since the fall of the Yanukovich regime in February 2014. In October 2013, only 22% of Ukrainians outside Donbas agreed with this statement. This increase in agreement represents a 214% change over the past year.

**Objective 4: The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic nonpartisan election observers (CEPPS/NDI and CEPPS/IRI)**

Throughout the grant period, CEPPS/NDI worked closely with Opora to prepare the organization to conduct both qualitative and statistically-based election observation. CEPPS/NDI’s assistance focused on mutually identified areas of organizational weakness, most notably: the need to improve internal communication, streamline data collection, analysis, and reporting, improve media outreach and public relations, and develop clear procedures and contingency plans when facing challenges or crises. CEPPS/NDI closely advised Opora on implementing its public
relations strategy and finalizing its strategy on technology security, protecting data, and implementing new technologies safely in a potentially difficult environment. Prior to election day, CEPPS/NDI brought ICT and statistical experts to assist the organization in sampling and data collection for its PVT (parallel vote tabulation) efforts.

As a result of CEPPS/NDI’s assistance, Opora was able to monitor the full course of each electoral cycle in 2010, 2012 and 2014, with long-term observers in single mandate districts who analyzed the conduct of the campaign. On election day, Opora organized a hotline for voter consultations and conducted statistically-based observation (SBO) of national party lists. In each election, Opora’s PVT results closely mirrored the official vote count, adding a stamp of legitimacy to the outcomes. Also, as a result of CEPPS/NDI’s assistance on crowd sourcing techniques, data visualization, and analysis, Opora issued LTO reports and organized press conferences, where it discussed the conduct of elections.

With financial and technical assistance from CEPPS/NDI, international observer delegations were deployed during the pre-election periods and on election day for the 2010 presidential elections and the 2012 and 2014 parliamentary elections. As a result of CEPPS/NDI’s assistance, ENEMO was able to organize long and short-term observers to assess both the conduct of the 2010 presidential campaign and voting procedures on election day. International delegations in 2012 helped political parties navigate the new mixed electoral system, highlighting the opportunities for manipulation and fraud. An international delegation organized by CEPPS/NDI noted progress in the conduct of the 2014 elections, which the delegation noted broadly met international standards.

Through public roundtables, forums, coordination meetings and press conferences, CEPPS/NDI also helped to foster discussions on the pre-election environment among Ukrainian civic groups and political, government officials, and international observation organizations. CEPPS/NDI’s assessment missions covered including the electoral legal framework; electoral management and preparations; the work of election commissions; the environment for campaign activities; legal mechanisms for addressing electoral complaints; and the media environment. As a result of each mission, observer delegations were able to offer recommendations to further improve the integrity of the electoral process.

**Intermediate Result 4.1: NDI’s partners implement effective observation efforts, including technically sound statistical analysis and reporting of Election Day that is widely distributed domestically and internationally. (CEPPS/NDI)**

**2010 Presidential and Local Elections**
- With guidance from CEPPS/NDI, Opora introduced changes to address obstacles to collecting timely reports from all its observers. This included changes to its software amending the STO reporting form and accompanying instructions, improved the overall organization of the PVT operations, and provided additional training to LTOs and STOs.
- With CEPPS/NDI’s moderation, Opora and Committee of Voters in Ukraine (CVU) shared information on where each organization planned to deploy observers.
- Opora used a network of 74 long-term observers (LTOs) to collect information across the presidential election cycle. Alongside the LTOs, Opora deployed 1,003 short term
observers (STOs) who observed election day procedures from the opening of polling stations through the completion of the vote count in district election commissions.

- After the polls closed, Opora held a press conference to present the group’s findings in regard to both the qualitative and the quantitative aspects of the election. Opora also distributed a preliminary report to an extensive press list, as well as at the press conference. It noted the positive aspects of the conduct of election day and highlighted the areas that remained in need of improvement, such as the quality of voter lists and the lack of clearly set criteria for voters to be eligible to vote at home. Its reports also included broader recommendations for improving the electoral process. Opora also provided results of its PVT, which supported the official results released by the CEC.

- CEPPS/NDI provided technical and financial support to Opora to help the group observe and report on the 2010 local elections. CEPPS/NDI worked closely with Opora to improve its communication and media outreach strategies and the system of collecting and presenting information in its reports. As a result of the technical assistance, Opora was able to field 177 long term observers.

2012 Elections

- Opora released several LTO reports, covering February to April 2012, May 2012 and June 2012. The statements addressed the districting process for the new single-mandate constituencies and other issues with electoral preparations, including early campaigning, abuse of administrative resources, and voter bribery or gifts.

- Upon advice from CEPPS/NDI on cyber security, Opora moved its website to an international host platform, and instituted several best practices in information security, including linking to international phone lines to prevent the system from being shut down within the country on election day. CEPPS/NDI also helped Opora store its data in multiple back-up systems and develop technology security protocols for election day.

- Following TOT sessions conducted by CEPPS/NDI in October 2012, Opora regional LTOs trained 3,500 STOs around the country.

- On election day, Opora organized a hotline for voter consultations, conducting SBO of national party lists, as well as targeting additional observation in the most problematic districts.

- Opora released its election-day report on Tuesday, October 30 and its PVT results on Wednesday, October 31. Opora found that election day was mostly peaceful and without systemic violations of the voting process, but cited numerous aspects of the electoral framework, administration, campaigns, and vote counting and tabulation process that prevented a finding of free and fair.

2014 Elections

- With CEPPS/NDI’s assistance, Opora successfully deployed, trained and accredited PVT observers to 1,600 polling stations throughout the country. As a result, Opora was able to project the election results with a high level of precision. During and after election day, CEPPS/NDI advised Opora on data analysis and provided guidance as Opora drafted key findings about the electoral process. As a result, Opora was able to draft comprehensive reports and statements on the PVT data.
Intermediate Result 4.2: Pre-election assessment and analysis missions demonstrate international awareness of the importance of credible elections. (CEPPS/NDI)

2010 Presidential Elections
- For the 2010 presidential elections, CEPPS/NDI provided technical and financial assistance to an ENEMO delegation consisting of 50 LTOs and 400 STOs, representing all of the ENEMO member groups. ENEMO’s LTO report highlighted several problems in the electoral process, although the mission did not report any significant violations on election day that had the potential to alter the outcome.

2010 Local Elections
- The limited size and duration of an informal assessment conducted jointly by CEPPS/NDI and CEPPS/IFES precluded production of a comprehensive election observation statement providing in-depth analysis of polling procedures throughout the country. To help amplify key findings of nonpartisan Ukrainian election monitors, CEPPS/NDI reported publicly on difficulties with a new election law and interference by state authorities. CEPPS/NDI also publicly concluded that the environment surrounding the local elections had deteriorated compared to the situation during the presidential election earlier this year. CEPPS/NDI’s views were covered widely in local news, as well as in several international papers, including the Financial Times and Wall Street Journal.

2012 Parliamentary Elections
- CEPPS/NDI began spearheading conversations among international organizations on the strategy for election monitoring and advocacy before the 2012 elections. The Institute organized and hosted a gathering of IFES, Internews, PACT, and the NED on October 27 to begin these strategy discussions. As a result of the gatherings, all participants agreed on the need for aggressive monitoring plans that focus on the pre-election period and account for new opportunities for fraud in the mixed system, as well as the need to coordinate all international efforts and support for local partner organizations for domestic election monitoring.
- At an CEPPS/NDI co-sponsored a roundtable with the Council of Europe’s Venice Commission and the Verkhovna Rada’s Committee on State-building and Local Self Governance in March, a large group of international and domestic electoral and legal experts discussed the law and the nuances of its implementation, including MPs, representatives of the presidential administration, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of International Affairs, the Central Election Commission, local self-government, and community and civic leaders.
- CEPPS/NDI deployed an international pre-election assessment delegation to Ukraine in September 2012. The high-level international team of six conducted a week-long review of the conditions and preparations in place for the October 28 parliamentary elections in Ukraine. The delegation met with election and government officials, political competitors, civil society organizations, and the media to gather information on the election process, both in Kyiv and in Lviv and Dnipropetrovsk. As a result of the mission, the team was able to assess the preliminary electoral preparations and the pre-election environment, including, but not limited to: the electoral legal framework; electoral management and preparations; the work of election commissions; the environment for
campaign activities; legal mechanisms for addressing electoral complaints; and the media environment.

- To follow up on CEPPS/NDI’s September pre-election assessment, the Institute engaged a team of long-term election analysts in Kyiv from early September through the end of November. The LTAs provided expert analysis of the election environment in three specific areas: election administration and legal framework, the political environment, including parties and campaigns, and the media. Using the LTA’s data and analysis, CEPPS/NDI released a post-election report with its overall findings and recommendations from these elections on November 29. The final report noted the problems with the legal framework, election commission formation, media, abuse of administrative resources, systemic barriers to women’s participation, and campaign financing. It also highlighted the major irregularities observed by domestic and international missions in the counting and tabulation phases of the election. CEPPS/NDI made recommendations in each of the major areas that the Ukrainian government and election authorities could use to bring the process closer to international norms and credibility standards.

Intermediate Result 4.3: International election delegates conduct an objective assessment of the October 2014 parliamentary elections in the context of Ukrainian law and international norms. (CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI)

**CEPPS/IRI**

Throughout the course of this project, CEPPS/IRI observed every presidential and parliamentary election in Ukraine.

2014 Parliamentary Elections

- In order to observe the October 2014 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/IRI conducted a high-level election observation mission from October 23-28. CEPPS/IRI observers visited 131 polling stations in Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Kyiv, Lviv, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Ternopil, Volyn, Zaporizhia and Zhytomyr oblasts. CEPPS/IRI was also the only international observation mission outside of the OSCE to send observers to Donetsk oblast to observe voting in the city of Slovyansk. CEPPS/IRI observers reported only minor non-systemic irregularities and none that would have affected the outcome of the election. CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI held a joint press conference on October 27 for local and international media and a subsequent press release was published. In addition, eight domestic Ukrainian media sources reported on statements issued by CEPPS/IRI’s election observation mission.

**CEPPS/NDI**

- CEPPS/NDI fielded a pre-election assessment mission in September 2014 to assess the overall quality of the election process and preparations leading up to the October 26 parliamentary elections. In September, CEPPS/NDI released its statement in a press conference at the Ukrainian Crisis Media Center, at which CEPPS/NDI Eurasia Regional Director Laura Jewett, Ted Kaufman, Marija Babic, and Robert Adams spoke. The
delegation concluded that Ukraine could overcome challenges to democratic parliamentary elections on October 26. CEPPS/NDI called, however, for additional steps prior to the election to promote enfranchisement and electoral security, constructive campaigning, and financial disclosure. The delegation also noted encouraging signs that several political parties have placed more women in winnable positions on candidate lists.

- CEPPS/NDI deployed a high-level election-day mission from October 22 to 28. The 18-member delegation deployed to observe voting and counting in polling stations in Kyiv and in 18 single-mandate districts around the country. Leading the delegation was Karan English, former member of the U.S. Congress (D-AZ), and Janusz Onyszkiewicz, former defense minister of Poland and former deputy vice president of the European Parliament.

**Intermediate Result 4.4: The Ukrainian public and international stakeholders have access to public statements of international election observation mission and recommendations for future electoral processes. (CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI)**

**CEPPS/IRI**

**2010 Presidential Elections**

- For the 2010 presidential election, CEPPS/IRI deployed 46 election observers throughout Ukraine for the first and second rounds on January 17, 2010 and February 7, 2010. In total, CEPPS/IRI observers visited more than 300 polling sites across Ukraine. CEPPS/IRI’s observation teams measured the quality of election administration at each site, discussed voting experiences with voters after they cast their ballots, and discussed the electoral process with polling station election commissioners and political party poll watchers. Statements were issued on January 18, 2010, and February 8, 2010. In addition, CEPPS/IRI conducted election trainings for lawyers and judges in preparation for the 2010 presidential election.

**2010 Local Elections**

- Also in 2010, CEPPS/IRI, CEPPS/NDI and CEPPS/IFES conducted a Joint Expert Election Assessment from October 28 to November 4 to examine and report on the processes surrounding the local elections. CEPPS/IRI conducted its observation in Zhytomyr oblast. As part of the Joint Expert Assessment Team, CEPPS/IRI coordinated and briefed more than 10 international and domestic groups on electoral processes in Ukraine. CEPPS/IRI provided advice and consultation to the Civil Initiative Support Center (CISC) as they monitored the elections in six regions of the country. CEPPS/IRI met before and after the elections with officials at USAID and the U.S. Embassy to provide feedback on its observations and contributed to a broader understanding of the

---

**18 This activity was conducted under Objective 3, “The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic non-partisan election observers,” in the 2009-2013 Results Framework.**

**19 This activity was conducted under Objective 4, “Demonstrate international interest in and support for democratic elections in Ukraine,” and Objective 5, “Contribute to safeguarding electoral integrity by evaluating the election processes, including amplifying the observations of nonpartisan citizen election monitors and other credible sources,” in the 2009-2013 Results Framework.**
obstacles that led to a decrease in the integrity of the elections. This was noted in the official statement released by the U.S. government, which noted that Ukraine failed to meet the international democratic standards that had been met in the 2010 presidential election.

2012 Parliamentary Elections

- In order to observe the 2012 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/IRI deployed a high-level international election observation mission observing more than 160 polling stations on Election Day. On October 29, CEPPS/IRI released a preliminary statement reflecting initial observations.

2014 Parliamentary Elections

- In order to observe the October 2014 parliamentary elections, CEPPS/IRI conducted a high-level election observation mission from October 23-28. CEPPS/IRI observers visited 131 polling stations in Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Kharkiv, Kyiv, Lviv, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Ternopil, Volyn, Zaporizhia and Zhytomyr oblasts. CEPPS/IRI was also the only international observation mission outside of the OSCE to send observers to Donetsk oblast to observe voting in the city of Slovyansk. CEPPS/IRI observers reported only minor non-systemic irregularities and none that would have affected the outcome of the election. CEPPS/IRI and CEPPS/NDI held a joint press conference on October 27 for local and international media and a subsequent press release was published. In addition, eight domestic Ukrainian media sources reported on statements issued by CEPPS/IRI’s election observation mission. On October 29, CEPPS/IRI released a statement reflecting the team’s observations.

CEPPS/NDI

2014 Parliamentary Elections

- On October 27, CEPPS/NDI released a preliminary statement in a press conference. The delegation concluded that the October 26 parliamentary elections met international democratic standards, despite the inability of some Ukrainians to cast their ballots due to the Russian occupation of Crimea and Russian-backed separatist conflicts in the east. The credibility of these elections would help the Verkhovna Rada, or parliament, advance Ukrainians’ aspirations for democracy, independence and sovereignty. The delegation called, however, for additional steps to promote enfranchisement and electoral security, constructive campaigning, and financial disclosure in future elections. It also noted

---

20 This activity was conducted under Objective 3, “The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic non-partisan election observers,” in the 2009-2013 Results Framework.

22 As seen in the Activities Database (Attachment 7), CEPPS/IRI became increasingly adept at tracking both output- and outcome-level results and reporting to the corresponding indicators. The most notable increase came in 2015 when CEPPS/IRI underwent a significant shift in its approach to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). This is evidenced by the submission of a revised performance monitoring plan (PMP) and hiring of a Kyiv-based M&E specialist who could dedicate more resources to monitoring programmatic results. Prior to 2015, it was more difficult for CEPPS/IRI to consistently track program data, which accounts for the gaps in the attached Activities Database.
encouraging signs that several political parties have placed more women in winnable positions on candidate lists than in past elections.
IV. ANALYSIS

Progress toward Achieving Objectives/Impact

Objective 1: More representative and accountable political parties and processes through strengthened national level advocacy (CEPPS/NDI)

CEPPS Objective 1.1: National advocacy by CSOs with parties and their affiliated elected officials on elections and political process issues is improved.

Prior to the Revolution of Dignity CEPPS/NDI’s civic program proceeded on two successful but separate tracks. The NGO School empowered and equipped passionate but inexperienced activists, who won local advocacy victories and built new relationships with political parties. At the national level, advocates became increasingly skilled in navigating the parliament and were able to influence policy making on freedom of assembly, housing and election laws.

After 2014, the local and national tracks were merged in CEPPS/NDI’s multi-level dialogues. This was given the urgency of channeling the momentum of protest and uniting Ukraine. In the immediate post Euromaidan period Russia’s hybrid war and attempts to divide Ukrainians made an inclusive national reform process a matter of national sovereignty. Later, with Ukraine’s democratic transition far from complete, fragile democratic gains would have been jeopardized if a frustrated public disengaged from political life, ceding the field to elites, oligarchs and undemocratic patterns of governance against which the Revolution of Dignity was waged.

NDI demonstrated that it is possible to engage people in a meaningful way around complex political reforms, such as campaign finance. With its CSO partners it developed the multi-level dialogue model. Combining civic education with monitoring and advocacy activities with local candidates and government, the dialogue processes make reforms relevant. The ‘multi-level’ aspect enables citizens to move gradually up a ladder of civic engagement. This model can be used to foster inclusive debate on other complex issues, which the Institute has done using other grants, on decentralization and local ethics codes. CEPPS/NDI and its partners have trained and empowered thousands of activists, many of whom continued to work, on a purely volunteer basis.

Active Community and Follow the Money, along with monitoring initiatives such as They Vote for You have created models for successful local campaigns for government accountability. Local level politics are emerging as a key locus for the continuation and consolidation of reform. Decentralization is transforming the structure of government, directing more power and resources to the local level and making local level advocacy and oversight even more consequential. IR’s Roadmap for Local Government initiative (the Roadmap) in 15 cities, developed with CEPPS/NDI advice local activists developed community development priorities with citizen input, collected signatures in support of the priorities, and secured commitments from local councilors and mayors to implement the initiatives.

CEPPS Objective 1.2 (NDI): Political parties are more responsive to concerns of citizens and marginalized groups, especially women.
All but one of the parties with which CEPPS/NDI currently works have emerged since Euromaidan. Many were led by civic activists or others with little political experience, and there was a need and opportunity for quickly developing their skills. The relatively clean slate also provided an opportunity to decisively break with the old top down, oligarch-driven model of political party. CEPPS/NDI’s research consistently showed that a fundamental re-orientation of parties is what the public demands; Ukrainians are able to describe in detail their expectations for the ideal political party the extent to which existing parties fall short. Euromaidan also revealed a deep hunger for new leadership and receptivity to women’s leadership. NDI’s programming since 2014 has capitalized on these opportunities. The Institute has, on one hand, used mechanisms such as cascade training and online videos to deliver basic skills, such as in campaigning, and small donor fundraising, to the greatest number of people. This has enabled thousands of candidates, including new entrants to politics, to compete in parliamentary and local elections.

To respond to a completely different kind of opportunity to deliver assistance, through consultations CEPPS/NDI has undertaken cutting edge public opinion research and developed customized presentations for each party. Innovative research methodologies introduced by CEPPS/NDI, including Implicit Association Tests, a visual experiment and deliberative polling, pushed political parties to introduce new internal policies. CEPPS/NDI’s consultations on research findings have been the catalysts for numerous changes in the external outreach and internal organization of parties. All of the 10 parties with which CEPPS/NDI has consulted have undertaken significant steps to become more externally responsive and internally democratic. The results of the October 2015 local elections demonstrated the benefits of such changes, including developing clear party platforms and messages, engaging directly with voters, and collecting donations from small donors and not from oligarchs. The parties who implemented these techniques were able to win seats even in places traditionally dominated by other parties.

There was also an urgent need after Euromaidan to help previously regional parties, such as Samopomich, develop national structures and to support the growth of new parties in the south and east. National parties were essential to help Ukraine overcome lingering east-west tensions exacerbated by Russian hybrid war. A political vacuum threatened in the east with the collapse of the Party of Regions. CEPPS/NDI prioritized national branch development of groups like Samopomich, BPP and Batkyvshynna, as well as assistance to emerging parties such as Renaissance. Sampomich went on to win important victories in eastern cities such as Mykolaev. In the east levels of political party affiliation increased markedly by 2016, in NDI surveys.

NDI’s parliamentary program, although small and targeted, has had complementary impact. MPs as well as parties have embraced the use of CiviCRM to ensure that their constituent outreach is effective. The Institute has been able to leverage its institutional contacts to produce targeted interventions in support of reform and cross party cooperation. At the request of Ukrainian MPs who visited the U.S on an CEPPS/NDI supported trip, CEPPS/NDI Board Member Tom Daschle visited Ukraine to share a model for an effective parliamentary ethics office, following which several MPs launched a working group to establish an independent Ethics Committee in the Rada. During the coalition building trip to Oslo, four party faction leaders met with former Norwegian Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik and with other Norwegian leaders who shared their experiences in developing strong cross-party relationships. Following the Oslo trip, party
leaders continued to strive to build cross-party initiatives that advanced reforms and promoted transparency.

Just before the program ended, in March 2016 the Rada also voted to adopt all 52 recommendations in the European Parliament’s Report on Internal Reform and Capacity-Building in the Rada, which is the final product of the European Parliament’s Needs Assessment Mission to Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. The Needs Assessment Mission was chaired by former President of the European Parliament, Pat Cox, who will remain engaged in the implementation phase of these reforms in Ukraine. His involvement and the Rada’s support opens up another opportunity to leverage influential European or American interlocutors to help RAda factions work together.

**CEPPS Objective 1.3 (NDI): Women’s political participation is increased.**

One of the most enduring cross party initiatives in the RAda has been the EOC, which introduced gender quotas in electoral legislation for the first time in Ukraine’s modern political history. CEPPS/NDI’s post-election discussions with MPs and civil society made it clear that the case for quotas has largely been won. Emphasis shifted to how best to apply quotas in the draft law in order to ensure they are enforced in future elections.

The EOC also promotes sustainable policies by creating vertical linkages between the national and local levels. For example, the national EOC wrote a letter of support when women leaders in Vinnytsia formed a local EOC. Since then the Vinnytsia EOC, with support from CEPPS/NDI’s Swedish funding, has started to work with women leaders in four other oblasts to support the formation of local EOCs there as well. As a result of these efforts, by the end of the award five EOCs existed at the local level. As power shifts under decentralization these will take on added importance.

In the post Euromaidan environment, there is an increased interest in gender equity and gender mainstreaming not only in legislatures but in the executive branch and civil society. In the final months of the award, in 2016, the EOC and CEPPS/NDI launched the Public Council on Gender. With representation from all sectors it is designed to promote greater coordination between civil society and the public sector on women’s political participation, systematize information on existing gender equality programs in Ukraine, and to design a national strategy for greater women’s political participation.
Objective 2: More representative and accountable political processes and actors through enhanced civic engagement and advocacy at the sub-national level (CEPPS/IRI)

Throughout the “Strengthening Political Processes in Ukraine” (SPPU) project, CEPPS/IRI programming focused intervention efforts on four sectors of stakeholders from both the supply and demand-sides of the democratic political system: local elected officials and local political party branches (supply-side), and local civil society organizations/citizens and youth (demand-side). While the majority of international democracy and governance assistance to Ukraine remained centralized in Kyiv, the SPPU project as implemented by CEPPS/IRI valued and prioritized the opportunity to promote increased and sustainable interaction between supply- and demand-side sectors on a more local, grassroots level. By developing a trusted reputation and building strategic partnerships with local stakeholders throughout Ukraine, CEPPS/IRI was able to develop innovative programming that both met the interests and needs of local communities while also instilling the democratic and good governance values of accessibility, accountability, responsiveness and transparency in local governance processes and civic activism. Indeed, CEPPS/IRI’s work in Ukraine’s regions under this project was particularly timely in the wake of the Revolution of Dignity, as the country debated and began to implement sweeping decentralization reforms that woulddevolve significant responsibilities to the local level.

More than 13,000 local elected officials, political party representatives and citizens in Ukraine participated in CEPPS/IRI activities from 2009-2016.

While a review of CEPPS/IRI’s output- and outcome-level results pursuant to this Objective yields interesting findings, as was discussed in length under the Results section of this report, CEPPS/IRI notes that the intangible effects of providing mere exposure to the democratic and good governance values of accountability, inclusivity, responsiveness and transparency through a spectrum of activities (i.e., training seminars, exchange and study trips, public hearings, and roundtable dialogues) are difficult to quantify. It is important, therefore, to start a broader analysis of impact by simply acknowledging the overall scope of the project, which aimed to expose local supply- and demand-side stakeholders to new ideas and tools for engagement, representative governance, and advocacy. Indeed, over the course of the SPPU project (i.e., from 2009 to 2016), CEPPS/IRI trained more than 13,000 local political and civic activists in Ukraine.22

To assess progress achieved during this project, CEPPS/IRI engaged in the following data collection and analysis process: review of prior quarterly reports and other assessment reports; interviews with CEPPS/IRI Ukraine program staff in Washington, D.C. and in Ukraine; and interviews with current and former program managers. Based upon these interviews and

---

22 As seen in the Activities Database (Attachment 7), CEPPS/IRI became increasingly adept at tracking both output- and outcome-level results and reporting to the corresponding indicators. The most notable increase came in 2015 when CEPPS/IRI underwent a significant shift in its approach to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). This is evidenced by the submission of a revised performance monitoring plan (PMP) and hiring of a Kyiv-based M&E specialist who could dedicate more resources to monitoring programmatic results. Prior to 2015, it was more difficult for CEPPS/IRI to consistently track program data, which accounts for the gaps in the attached Activities Database.
CEPPS/IRI’s collective experience over the course of this project, CEPPS/IRI makes the following conclusions:

In many respects, this SPPU project can be understood in two phases: the first period, spanning the project’s start in 2009 through the April 2013 Cost Extension, and the second period, which spanned the remainder of the project through December 31, 2016. When assessing the impact of this project, it is important to stress that these two programmatic phases closely tracked with critical developments in Ukraine, which centered on the 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity. More broadly, during the early years of this project, Ukraine transitioned from an Orange pro-European government to a period of democratic backsliding under former President Viktor Yanukovych. As discussed in the Constraints/Challenges section of this report, this negatively impacted CEPPS/IRI’s ability to work within Ukraine and created an environment in which U.S.-based implementers were met with skepticism and distrust by the government of Ukraine and the ruling Party of Regions. Despite these challenges, CEPPS/IRI’s initial program design was innovative, flexible, and sought to achieve progress at the local level that would later be accelerated by the Revolution of Dignity. For example, as one CEPPS/IRI staff member explained, the Institute’s CSO/Political Party program sought to actively dismantle the Soviet mentality that pervaded Ukraine’s political parties under the Yanukovych years. “Political parties did not know how to engage with citizens, and citizens did not know how to engage with parties before the Revolution. Our program, at the time, was revolutionary; but after Maidan, almost all parties shifted their approach and saw our program as a new way to engage with civil society and potential voters.”

It is critical that one views progress made toward Objective 2 within this political context, as the Revolution of Dignity brought back a pronounced shift toward pro-European values and political freedoms. As another staff member explained, CEPPS/IRI helped to develop “people’s demand for change in Ukraine.” Describing CEPPS/IRI’s contribution during this political transition, he said, “People’s demands continue to grow after Maidan, but the revolution may not have happened had people’s expectations not been raised for what their government could be.”

Thus, this second phase of SPPU, from 2014 through the remainder of the project, was markedly different from the first. First and foremost, the Revolution of Dignity showed Ukrainians that ordinary citizens can make a meaningful difference in their country. With expectations high, citizens sought ways to become more active in local decision-making processes. In this way, CEPPS/IRI’s programming under Objective 2 provided concrete mechanisms for citizens to be effective and to help authorities be more responsive in their roles. Therefore, when asked whether local politics are more representative and accountable after the Revolution, one CEPPS/IRI staff member answered, “Yes; while it’s not to the extent that we’d like, the situation has improved considerably.” For example, CEPPS/IRI has seen political party branches on a local level begin to compete outside of election seasons to provide information to citizens and to work with civil society organizations—indeed, as described in the Results section, this is

**“People’s demands continue to grow after Maidan, but the revolution may not have happened had we not been working to raise people’s expectations for what their government could be.”**
evidenced by the overwhelming interest political parties had in addressing housing association reform (i.e., through CEPPS/IRI’s CSO/Political Party program). Additionally, as CEPPS/IRI’s follow-up with its youth participants has revealed, Ukrainian youth have become more engaged with local government officials, creating their own local civil society organizations, lobbying local government to adopt reforms, and running for office themselves. Moreover, CEPPS/IRI has seen local governments wanting to adopt more transparent practices with the growth in popularity of citizen service centers, public dialogues, e-governance, and participatory budgeting processes. Whether these changes are the direct result of CEPPS/IRI interventions or merely correlated, they underscore the myriad changes to Ukrainian politics in the wake of the Revolution of Dignity.

Reflecting upon these changes, one CEPPS/IRI local staff member remarked, “One of our biggest successes has been finding really motivated people who want to make changes in their community. You should see the number of requests we have received in recent months for assistance.” The strength of CEPPS/IRI’s work under SPPU, he added, was that, “Our programming helps citizens translate their energies and expectations into tangible mechanisms for engaging with local government.” Toward this end, it will be essential that international assistance continue to provide the means through which supply- and demand-side actors can engage productively on the local level. As Ukraine embraces decentralization reform, local elected officials will receive more responsibilities and thus civil society more responsibility to monitor and engage with local governments. It will be imperative that these local elected officials be supported as they take on these additional roles, while simultaneously recognizing that they cannot be experts on all the issues and will therefore need to reach out to civil society as the experts to help with decision-making. Also, it will be critical that civil society takes advantage of this opportunity to provide helpful partnerships with local governments. In fact, a focus on encouraging engagement between government authorities and citizens on a local level opens opportunities for citizens to more clearly monitor government decisions, as well as for government to be tangibly responsive to citizens’ demands.

While significant roadblocks remain toward achieving truly responsive and accountable governance in Ukraine—from the undue influence of oligarchs to rampant corruption and inefficient bureaucracies—CEPPS/IRI’s after-action review of this project revealed that the most significant successes that CEPPS/IRI local staff can readily recall are those where stakeholders from multiple sectors within one community worked together to affect change. In order to garner maximum potential impact, it is therefore critical to work simultaneously with supply- and demand-side stakeholders in a community. Additionally, CEPPS/IRI believes that interventions have a greater potential for long-term impact with youth and other newly engaged demand-side actors. The energy, enthusiasm and hope, which are necessary to spark and sustain campaigns for social and political change, are more successful when stakeholders recognize the direct benefits of these reforms to their own lives.
Objective 3: Donors and key stakeholders are better informed of political and electoral environment (CEPPS/IFES)

CEPPS/IFES’ survey work over the course of the SPPU project served enhance the knowledge levels of key donors and stakeholders. Through the implementation of seven survey instruments from 2009 to 2014, CEPPS/IFES provided a wide array of data with unique and important decade-long trends on the opinions of Ukrainians on a variety of democracy and governance topics. This data has been widely and publicly disseminated to stakeholders within Ukraine, as well as to donor agencies in the aim of better informing them of the attitudes of Ukrainians on politics, elections, democracy in general and the economy. Analysis of this data by these stakeholders and donors have helped to shape and adapt relevant programming by these actors over the course of the CEPPS/IFES project as well as moving forward.

Throughout the course of the project, CEPPS/IFES worked closely to develop reports based on the data from the surveys and disseminated in a public manner to a wide variety of stakeholders. For each survey, a report and analysis was created by CEPPS/IFES. These findings were distributed at both in-person meetings, as well as via the internet. For each survey, findings were released in both Ukrainian and English to maximize impact. Overall, throughout the course of the project, CEPPS/IFES produced 11 public opinion products detailing the results of its survey research.

Dissemination of results was also done in-person, with CEPPS/IFES staff briefing donors and other electoral stakeholders of key findings from the surveys. Over the course of the project, CEPPS/IFES provided via direct and targeted information sessions 18 major stakeholders with data and findings from the public opinion research surveys, in addition to indirectly reaching many other national stakeholders. As a result, the data from these surveys was able to reach a wide variety of individuals for timely use in their programming design and implementation.

In addition, CEPPS/IFES’ extensive nationwide public opinion surveys in country, examining socio-political issues, attitudes towards elections and democracy among other topics, greatly assisted in guiding IFES programming under the non-CEPPS USAID Ukraine Election Law Reform Program. CEPPS/IFES used its public opinion research provide robust data and information on the views of the Ukrainian electorate on democracy and elections to guide programming in a manner more targeted and focused on stakeholder needs.

Objective 4: The transparency and integrity of Ukraine’s electoral process is enhanced through international and domestic nonpartisan election observers (CEPPS/NDI and CEPPS/IRI)

CEPPS/IRI

CEPPS/IRI has observed more than 200 elections in countries around the world, including more than 10 elections in Ukraine. Through these many observation missions, the Institute has observed that while a country’s commitment to democratic values and principles is not determined solely by its capacity to conduct well-administered elections, elections are an important snapshot and benchmark of progress made along a country’s democratic path.
Throughout the course of the SPPU program, CEPPS/IRI observed every presidential and parliamentary election in Ukraine, including both rounds of the 2010 presidential elections, a Joint Expert Mission for the 2010 local elections, 2012 parliamentary elections, 2014 presidential election (supported by other funding sources), and the 2014 parliamentary elections. During this period, Ukraine had three presidents and many different compositions of ruling coalitions. Previously dominant political parties disappeared, while others emerged. As a result, CEPPS/IRI designed its election observation missions to adapt to the shifting political environment, in addition to new methods for election tampering. Throughout its many election observation missions over the course of the SPPU program, CEPPS/IRI observed many commissioners proudly demonstrate their knowledge and skills in election administration. Ukrainians across the country expressed their gratitude to CEPPS/IRI for the Institute’s observation missions and its contribution to Ukraine’s electoral processes.

Ukraine’s 2014 presidential and parliamentary elections were conducted under unique circumstances. For the first time, perhaps since Ukraine became independent in 1991, Ukrainians cast their ballots not only in support of a candidate or party, but in support of a united Ukraine. As Senator Kelly Ayotte, the leader of CEPPS/IRI’s May election observation stated, “I was inspired to see so many voters turn out to vote in large numbers and stand against Russia’s aggression towards their country.” This was particularly true in Ukrainians’ participation in the October parliamentary elections, and especially in the previously occupied areas in the Donbas. CEPPS/IRI observers were struck by the patriotism and willingness of the brave residents who participated in the electoral process. The CEPPS/IRI’s delegation praised election commissioners who were able to operate polling stations on Election Day under difficult circumstances, seeking to ensure that as many voters as possible were able to vote as part of a united Ukraine. Therefore, more than any other elections, the 2014 elections necessitated the presence of international election observation missions to contribute to the legitimacy of the elections. In discussing election observation missions, one CEPPS/IRI staff member stated, “There are only two reasons not to have international election observers: a country is a totalitarian state or a country is a flourishing democracy. We hope that one day Ukraine will not need international election observers, but in the short-term, they are an essential part of legitimizing Ukraine’s electoral processes.”

CEPPS/NDI

With the ultimate victor, Yanukovych, tarnished through credible reports of fraud in the previous, 2004 elections, the 2010 presidential election was closely watched by international observers. CEPPS/NDI did not observe, but was able to achieve wide coverage of the country by independent monitors, through support for ENEMO and Opora. NDI also sent its top expert in statistically based observation to Ukraine to advise Opora. The group’s parallel vote tabulation matched official counts and contributed to the legitimacy of results. The report was distributed widely with Opora holding three press conferences in Kyiv, 50 more, covering every oblast of Ukraine and appearing on television 40 times. This resulted in more than 1,000 press mentions.

The October 2012 elections were widely evaluated by all credible observer groups as a step backwards. Observers noted the lack of an even playing field for electoral contestants, with
extensive evidence of abuse of administrative resources, manipulation of election commissions, candidate intimidation, and voter bribery. The most egregious irregularities took place in vote counting in some single mandate districts, with unexplained delays and blatant fraud in tabulation.

Throughout the election season, including in the contentious process of drafting a new election law, Opora was one of the most visible observer groups. CEPPS/NDI supported Opora as it led a consortium of CSOs to advocate for a more inclusive and transparent process of adopting the new electoral law. Consortium leaders also engaged the media on their views on election reform, making television and radio appearances, and writing articles on the subject. CEPPS/NDI began spearheading conversations among international organizations about the strategy for election monitoring and advocacy before the 2012 elections. For example, the Institute organized and hosted a gathering of IFES, Internews, PACT, and the NED on October 27 to begin these strategy discussions.

An international delegation mission organized by CEPPS/NDI concluded that the October 26, 2014 parliamentary elections met international democratic standards, despite the inability of some Ukrainians to cast their ballots due to the Russian occupation of Crimea and Russian-backed separatist conflicts in the east. The delegation called, however, for additional steps to promote enfranchisement and electoral security, constructive campaigning, and financial disclosure in future elections. It also noted encouraging signs that several political parties have placed more women in winnable positions on candidate lists than in past elections.

The reports of international observers supporting the credibility of these elections will help the Verkhovna Rada, or parliament, advance Ukrainians’ aspirations for democracy, independence and sovereignty. Through Euromaidan and the subsequent presidential and parliamentary elections, Ukrainian citizens have voiced their choice for European reforms and continue to demand that their leaders be more representative and transparent.

**Constraints/Challenges**

**CEPPS/NDI**

- Prior to Euromaidan, a key challenge to efforts to building broad based, accountable democratic political parties was over-dependency on oligarchs for funding and media access resulting in parties that represent the interests of a small, corrupt minority, rather than society.
at large, and this has adversely affected the reform potential of all political institutions at all levels. The situation has improved since Euromaidan. Recent laws on transparent public procurement and asset disclosure requirements for government officials represent a major break with the past. Continued progress will depend on citizen oversight and pressure for integrity in politics.

- Security related challenges forced program changes. With the occupied areas off limits, CEPPS/NDI and its civic partners were unable to conduct local government accountability programs, such as Active Community, in areas that arguably would benefit from them. The inaccessibility of these areas has meant that the views of Ukrainians in these areas are not reflected in public opinion research that CEPPS/NDI has presented to political party leaders.
- Since the Revolution of Dignity, Ukrainian unity and sovereignty has been under threat. CEPPS/NDI responded with an intensive push to help develop civil society and parties particularly in the southern and eastern regions in which a vacuum had begun to develop with the collapse of the once-dominant Party of Regions.

**CEPPS/IRI**

- Consistent political instability created a sense of uncertainty in Ukraine, which complicated CEPPS/IRI’s project implementation. Ukraine experienced a significant democratic regression under the presidency of Viktor Yanukovych. As a result, CEPPS/IRI’s capacity to operate freely was hindered during this period. The political environment created an increased sense of mistrust and fear, which complicated CEPPS/IRI’s programmatic implementation, particularly regarding its Impact Evaluation. Some interviewees were suspicious of being interviewed by an American organization at a time of shrinking democratic space. In addition, CEPPS/IRI staff were intimidated and interviewed by SBU (Security Services of Ukraine) officers when conducting LEO trainings that sought to address issues with local budget procedures. The 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity, the subsequent illegal annexation of Crimea, and the war in eastern Ukraine resulted in unprecedented programmatic and security challenges as well. During and immediately after the Revolution, CEPPS/IRI had to stop all programming for four months. CEPPS/IRI’s first priority was to ensure the safety and security of its staff and partners in the country. In addition, during this period of uncertainty, it was difficult to engage beneficiaries in CEPPS/IRI’s programing, particularly regarding work with local elected officials. In addition, there were very real consequences of Russia’s illegal annexation of Crimea and the war in eastern Ukraine; for example, CEPPS/IRI could not conduct its planned programming in Crimea’s Yevpatoria and was unable to complete its planned east/west exchanges with cities in the Donbas. Additionally, over the course of the SPPU grant, Ukraine held two presidential, two parliamentary and two local elections, resulting in a temporary suspension of most training programs in preparation for the elections. As a result of the local elections, CEPPS/IRI was not able to fully implement its local elected officials’ program until after the October 2010 elections and then again relaunched the program after the 2015 local elections. In both instances, and particularly after the 2015 elections, there was significant turnover in local councils. Although it is an important step in Ukraine’s democratic development to engage new actors in political processes, at the same time, it is a loss of institutional knowledge. Consequently, CEPPS/IRI had to redouble its efforts to provide local officials with the knowledge and skills to be able to effectively fulfill their roles and responsibilities. As mentioned in the Lessons Learned section of this report, CEPPS/IRI sought to address this
overwhelming demand to enhance the capacity of newly elected local officials through the creation of its e-Learning Platform.

- Shifting political environments have a significant impact on programmatic implementation. This is particularly true in the context of an election observation mission. Over the course of the SPPU project, Ukraine held both elections that met international standards and elections that did not meet international standards. During this period, election laws were changed. All of the political and electoral changes resulted in a continually shifting context, which required a deep and comprehensive knowledge from relevant stakeholders to not only implement the elections, but observe them as well.

- For election observation missions conducted under the SPPU project, CEPPS/IRI utilized the IVR phone system for calling in individual polling station data. Although this system proved to be significantly faster than a simple paper system, there was still a delay in processing the information. However, as discussed in more detail in the Recommendations for Future Programming section of this report, CEPPS/IRI utilized tablet technology for the first time to observe the 2016 Georgian parliamentary elections. The tablet technology expedited data aggregation and enhanced team coordination.

**CEPPS/IFES**

- Due to the changing political environment over the course of the project, CEPPS/IFES had to be adaptive and responsive in its survey instrument design and sampling design. At the beginning of the SPPU project, CEPPS/IFES created a sample design that would accurately assess public opinion based on a nationally representative sample. This sample design would act as the basis for future CEPPS/IFES surveys in the country, although in some scenarios an oversample in certain parts of the country would be utilized to learn more about attitudes in that critical part of the country (ex. Crimea). The events following the Maidan protests in 2014, including the seizure of the Autonomous Region of Crimea by Russia and the beginning of the civil war in Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts (Donbas), meant that for the last two omnibus surveys in 2014, that a new sample design was needed and a shift in the reporting of data was likewise necessary.

- The annexation of Crimea ended the ability of CEPPS/IFES’ survey partner to be able to survey residents in this region, and as a result Crimea was removed from the sample design. Donetsk and Luhansk were still included in the sample, however, the surveys were only fielded in non-occupied territories due to the security and authenticity concerns. This decision to change the sample design impacted CEPPS/IFES’ ability to report data equally across the project. Since the sample design had changed, and the interviews in Donbas were not necessarily representative of public opinion in the region, it was decided that beginning with the second omnibus survey that CEPPS/IFES would report data for only areas where the survey could occur unencumbered. Beginning with this survey, CEPPS/IFES would report only on data from Ukraine nationwide, outside of Donbas and Crimea. Furthermore, when data from these omnibuses was being compared to previous surveys, responses from Donbas and Crimea were removed in order to be able compare findings reliably across data points. Despite the challenges raised by these factors, CEPPS/IFES was able to react to emerging situation on the ground accordingly to ensure the continuation of high-quality public opinion data with trends intact. Data from the two omnibus surveys following these events were key
for stakeholders to learn more insight about attitudes within the country following President Yanukovich’s removal from office and the continuing political transition.

Lessons Learned

CEPPS/NDI

- There is a great opportunity for women and other underrepresented groups to play a larger part in the political process in Ukraine, precisely because they are less likely to be seen as tainted by the past. However, parties in Ukraine, especially emerging parties, need assistance to set up effective wings for women and youth that are avenues for progression within the party structures, not a means of sidelining new entrants, and to identify and develop new leaders from these groups. The Equal Opportunities Caucus played a crucial role in amending the new local election law to include a 30 percent gender quota for political party lists in multi-mandate districts.
- Following an assessment of political parties in 2015, CEPPS/NDI identified several priority areas of assistance to help parties become more responsive to citizens, and to encourage greater coordination. These include: bringing in high-level consultants to discuss coalition building and negotiation among the ruling parties; and providing advice to the Opposition Bloc on constructively engaging within the new political system and providing real political and policy alternatives, especially for voters in the south and east.
- There is increasing receptivity in Ukraine for creative and technologically sophisticated constituent outreach methods. For instance, civic advocacy groups such as the Follow the Money campaign have enjoyed success using a variety of citizen outreach tactics, ranging from door-to-door meetings to flash mobs, social media, SMS blasts, texting and mobile applications. Newer political parties have also displayed an interest in more complex micro-targeting techniques requiring the use of voter database software.

CEPPS/IRI

- With regard to program stakeholders, with more than 150,000 local councilmembers in Ukraine, as well as the occurrence of local elections every five years, at any given time there are thousands of local elected officials that may need assistance in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities. As such, general “how-to” trainings for local elected officials on their roles and responsibilities should be held in rapid succession in the weeks and months following a local election. CEPPS/IRI acknowledges that its staff simply cannot visit all city councils across Ukraine in the narrow window following a local election; therefore, CEPPS/IRI concludes that a significant lesson learned is to provide similar training opportunities digitally and online for a larger audience of stakeholders to access. By utilizing an online training platform (which CEPPS/IRI did launch in December 2016), CEPPS/IRI can post introductory “how to” training content online for newly elected officials to access. Additionally, an online training platform can be leveraged to advertise more advanced technical training on a particular subject matter (e.g., waste management or public transportation) well in advance for interested officials to apply online to CEPPS/IRI. CEPPS/IRI does plan to continue the implementation of this lesson learned with further promotion and expansion of the e-Learning Platform during its implementation of the U-RAP
program. Additionally, CEPPS/IRI recognizes the need to expand the reach of its local governance work to not only local elected officials, but to those working in the executive branch or in other appointed positions. Assistance to local elected officials alone will not result in sweeping reforms at the local level without buy-in from the executive branch; for example, even if a city council passes legislation, there is no guarantee that the executive committee will implement it without both branches agreeing on the good-governance values that they are attempting to promulgate for their city. Therefore, future programming should work to generate this buy-in across local government.

- As was described under the Results section of this report, CEPPS/IRI’s CSO/Political Party program was instrumental in assisting communities to address housing association (OSBB) reform. When working with communities to identify issues of local concern to address, CEPPS/IRI recognizes the need to select issues with broad appeal that affect a cross-sector of a community (and, in this case, their pocket books), rather than a niche issue. The more individuals that are affected by the local issue at-hand, the more likely they will be to engage with and actively participate in CEPPS/IRI programming, and the more likely local governments will be in participating in the program as well.

- With regard to election-related activities, over the course of its international election observation missions in 2010, 2012 and 2014, CEPPS/IRI has noted the importance of the right composition of a delegation. Consequently, CEPPS/IRI has determined that high-level international election observation missions should be composed of a combination of high profile officials (i.e. current or former members of congress, local level officials, current or former foreign officials) and experienced observers. High profile observers increase the reach and audience of a delegation, while more experienced observers offer the knowledge and expertise necessary to comprehend more complex environments, as is frequently the case in Ukraine.

**CEPPS/IFES**

- National representativeness of a sample at the design stage continues to be a challenge that could not be overcome unless current situation on the ground in the east changes dramatically. Therefore, to mitigate the sampling problems for future annual surveys, CEPPS/IFES may need to take a similar approach to its rapid response surveys conducted under USAID Leader Cooperative Agreement No. DFD-A-00-08-00350-00, where data was divided into two categories, one for respondents outside Donbas, and one for data available within Donbas. In close coordination with the survey partner, CEPPS/IFES would be able to develop a hybrid sampling approach that provided representative data for much of the country, while also providing indicative data for Donetsk and Luhansk. Using this scheme, CEPPS/IFES would be able to analyze the data so that results that can be used as a representative sample for all regions outside of Donbas, and provide an indicative review of public opinion within Donbas and other areas affected by the ongoing conflict.

**Recommendations for Future Programming**

**CEPPS/NDI**
• CEPPS/NDI believes it is important to continue to enable citizens to better monitor and hold accountable political and civic leaders on the local, regional, and national levels and improve citizen engagement in the national reform process. The Institute will also work to help develop a new generation of civic and political leaders, with a particular focus on training women and youth.

• In order to help political parties to become truly national movements, CEPPS/NDI will work with parties to improve public outreach beyond their core constituencies. CEPPS/NDI will continue to work with new research tools and methods that further elucidate public opinion on reform issues, which have a direct impact on party policy development. The Institute will also help provide opportunities for cross-party cooperation in the Rada, including through the intervention of high level peers in Europe and the U.S.

• It is also important to continue to address barriers to women’s political participation within political parties. Supporting more inclusive internal processes within parties as well as improved communication with citizens will increase demand for accountability in party decision making while promoting equality amongst party members.

CEPPS/IRI

• Regarding program implementation, CEPPS/IRI maintains that the most effective interventions engage multiple sectors in a community for a sustained period. In fact, it was under these conditions that CEPPS/IRI’s “Strengthening Political Processes in Ukraine” program achieved some of its greatest results. Accordingly, CEPPS/IRI’s support to communities under its U-RAP program will reflect this “deep-dive” approach insofar as it will target its assistance to a limited number of communities per year. One additional means to facilitate these successes is the presence of satellite offices throughout the country that enable CEPPS/IRI staff to better liaise with and support communities. Toward this end, CEPPS/IRI will maintain its training center in Dnipro through its forthcoming U-RAP program to better support communities in southern and eastern Ukraine. An additional takeaway regarding program implementation concerns online learning. In order to expand the reach of CEPPS/IRI programming, in December 2016 CEPPS/IRI launched its e-Learning Platform (ELP), an online educational resource for Ukrainians seeking to learn more about their own government, the principles of democracy, and best practices in good governance. This website, developed with support from USAID and Global Affairs Canada (GAC), contains online training seminars and educational materials developed by CEPPS/IRI, and provides a means for participants to register for upcoming in-person events. The creation of the ELP originated with key programmatic learning, as CEPPS/IRI conducted an internal evaluation of its local governance programming in November 2015. Almost all participants with whom CEPPS/IRI’s evaluation team met requested an online platform through which they may continue learning. Therefore, the ELP will be integral to CEPPS/IRI’s future U-RAP programming, providing opportunities for Ukrainians who are unable to attend in-person trainings to still benefit from CEPPS/IRI’s work in Ukraine. Moreover, in order to make CEPPS/IRI’s resources more inclusive, printed materials will be available in audio-format for persons with visual disabilities while training videos will include subtitles for the hearing impaired. Lastly, CEPPS/IRI also maintains that given the often shifting nature of Ukrainian politics, CEPPS/IRI believes that programs should be designed with a level of flexibility. Over the course of the SPPU grant, Ukraine transitioned from an Orange pro-
European government to democratic regression under President Yanukovych, to the Revolution of Dignity and a shift back toward a pro-European government post-Revolution. As a result, CEPPS/IRI sought to incorporate this programmatic learning into the design of its U-RAP program; for example, by including an internal evaluation after the first year of programming in order to determine the program’s future trajectory.

- With regard to program stakeholders, through its longstanding work with political parties and local officials, CEPPS/IRI believes that additional efforts should be made to increase the visibility and prominence of local elected officials—particularly mayors—in national political parties’ organizational structures. As is evidenced by CEPPS/IRI polling data, as well as anecdotal evidence, certain mayors enjoy strong support from their citizens, compared to national leaders; as such, party-building efforts should work to incorporate these local figures more into party decision-making as a way to build trust from supporters and be able to point to concrete successes achieved by their party members at the local level.

- With regard to program activities, as was evidenced by CEPPS/IRI’s internal evaluation of its local governance programming, interregional exchanges are a highly effective intervention. Feedback from participants—representing supply- and demand-side actors—indicated that these trips are instrumental in not only building personal and professional relationships across Ukraine, but in showing Ukrainians what reforms are possible within their own country. Through the old adage that a picture is worth a thousand words, these trips bring theory into practice in a way that regular classroom trainings cannot. As such, CEPPS/IRI has incorporated several exchange trips into its forthcoming U-RAP program. In addition to this learning concerning exchanges, CEPPS/IRI has additional recommendations for election-related activities. CEPPS/IRI has a long history of observing elections, having observed more than 200 elections around the world. As such, the Institute is always seeking to incorporate new technology when it adds value to programming, as evidenced by the creation of the CEPPS/IRI e-Learning Platform, and in its election observation missions. CEPPS/IRI recognizes that with any new technology, it is necessary to assess the benefits and potential drawbacks, particularly in a country-specific context. Considering this, CEPPS/IRI’s Eurasia Division utilized tablet technology for the first time in its election observation mission for the 2016 Georgian parliamentary elections. The tablet technology was invaluable in providing the command center with more robust real-time data and in incorporating map technologies, in addition to providing more opportunities for team coordination. CEPPS/IRI hopes to utilize this kind of tablet technology in future election observation missions in Ukraine. Moreover, as discussed in the Activities and Results sections of this report, CEPPS/IRI’s election observation missions have contributed to legitimizing Ukraine’s electoral processes. However, most missions were limited in scope due to the size of the delegations. Therefore, with a more robust delegation for future elections, CEPPS/IRI believes that it could contribute an even stronger voice to the process. In the same way, CEPPS/IRI believes that the presence of long-term observers (LTO) provides a richer context for short-term observers (STO), thereby bolstering the role of the observation mission in the process.

CEPPS/IFES

- Given the shifting socio-political dynamics in Ukraine, public opinion research has been and remains a critical tool that supports and informs programs of democratic support on a range
of emerging issues. This data aids democratic support programs in advising their partners and stakeholders on effective ways to address public views and concerns on key issues. Three strategies for effective use of public opinion research should be emphasized in the future:

- **Special Population Research:** Programs of democratic support in Ukraine are increasingly focused on marginalized populations, which have generally not been adequately engaged by public opinion research. Future efforts should focus on developing research tools to engage special populations. IFES implements special population surveys in Ukraine and will continue to seek opportunities to use research to inform its and others’ programming focused on marginalized populations.

- **Applying Technology and Innovative Tools in Research:** Given the near universal use of mobile and smart phones as well as a high level of internet and social media penetration in Ukraine, these tools should be leveraged for cost-effective and efficient opinion research. Such tools can represent a cost-effective approach to documenting exposure to voter and civic education messaging, a common programming feature in democratic support programs. These tools can also be used to establish cost-effective ‘panels’ that can be used to track the impact of policy and programmatic initiatives on populations of special interest. Other research techniques used by market researchers can also be useful in democratic support programs. One such example is eye tracking technology, which can be used to test engagement with voter education products and ensures effective use of scarce resources.

- **Elections-focused Research:** Public opinion research is an especially useful tool to inform policy, programming, and decision-making around elections. Surveys and focus groups are effective tools for informing discussions and actions on key policy issues that usually emerge around electoral events. IFES has significant experience in using public opinion research around electoral events to provide critical data for its programming, and government partners such as the Central Election Commission, and will continue to use research as opportunities and needs arise.