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| --- |
| *Progress reporting template in longer version, which is adjusted from the "General guidelines for grant administration through Danish NGO’s." Revised 7th of January 2015.* *Complete the form electronically in Word using Calibri 11 font. The report should be forwarded in English.* |
| **Does this status report contain any information requiring specific decisions?** (e.g. changes in the project’s objectives, expected output or budgets?)  | YES | In which point is it described?Annexes X, Y and Z |
| **NO** |  |
| **1. File no.** | 403.A.20-1-1 (UNDP Ukraine) |
| **2.** **Contact person and email** | Mrs. Olena Ursu – Project Coordinator (olena.ursu@undp.org)United Nations Development Programme in Ukraine |
| **3. Programme title** | Democratization, Human Rights and Civil Society Development Programme in Ukraine (DHRP) |
| **4. Total budget (DKK)** and accumulated expenditures in the end of reporting period. | Budget 2013-2017: DKK 23,591,200; USD 4,078,516Accumulated expenditures 2013-2017: DKK 23,517,553; USD 3,970,777 |
| **6. Programme period** |
|  **Start** (day/month/year) 1 January 2013 | **Completion** (day/month/year)31 March 2017 |  |
| **7. Reporting period** |
|  **From** (day/month/year)1 January 2013 | **To** (day/month/year)31 March 2017 |  |
| **8. Monitoring and reviews***Give an account of the main monitoring activities during the period, e.g. steering committee meeting, visits, review etc. (in bullet points)** Board meetings: 29 August 2013, 4 March 2014, 11 August 2014, 21 January 2015, 27 August 2015, 11 February 2016, 10 November 2016
* Mid-term review: January-February 2015
* DANIDA mid-term review: March 2015
* DMFA monitoring missions: 16-19 May 2016, 15-17 May 2017
* Final project evaluation: February-March 2017.
 |
| **9. Assessment of external context, assumptions and risks relevant to the Programme***A brief description of the national context that is relevant for the Programme.* **KEY DEVELOPMENTS*** The 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity has led to the period of unprecedented democratic governance reforms, but also to the protracted conflict in certain districts of Donetsk and Lugansk oblasts, and to the loss of Government control over Crimea
* Сivil society has been developing steadily over the past years resulting in 3.3 out of 5 points of the average cumulative 2016 CSO Sustainability Index which demonstrated some improvement in institutional capacity, governance structures, engagement of supporters, advocacy and public image.
* The [President’s Decree](http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/68/2016) on the National Strategy on Civil Society Development for 2016-2020 was adopted providing a general favourable framework for civil society development in the country, however, some follow-up legislative initiatives contradicted with the overall spirit of supporting the civil society development.
* The National Human Rights Strategy and Action plan were developed and approved. As assessed by the Ombudsperson and NGOs, 21% of the activities envisaged by the National Human Rights Strategy were fully implemented, while 13% were partially implementated.
* Since the beginning of the conflict in mid-April 2014 until 15 August 2017, OHCHR recorded 34,766 conflict-related casualties in Ukraine, among civilians, Ukrainian armed forces and members of the armed groups. This includes 10,225 people killed and 24,541 injured (para 35, 19th OHCHR Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine).
* Amendments to the current legislation were enforced by Parliament in 2017 expanding the scope of subjects of e-declaration covering CSOs’ staff, experts, consultants, individuals who provide/supply any auxiliary services or products, and participants of seminars, trainings, other events organized at the expense of an anti-corruption donor-funded project.

**OVERVIEW**The years of the project period in Ukraine have been characterized by developments that have drastically changed the political and security landscape. The 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity and subsequent armed conflict in Donbas have further thrown back Ukraine’s security, economy and public finances. This has had significant consequences for the poorer segments of society, exacerbating already existing vulnerabilities. As a result of the conflict, over 10,000 people were killed, over 1,7 mln people were displaced, and over 5 mln people live in the conflict-affected areas. The economic impact of the protracted crisis is estimated at 20% of Ukraine’s GDP. The ongoing volatility of the political and security environment continues to threaten the country’s peace, stability, and democratic development.Yet, despite armed conflict and economic obstacles, Ukraine lives through a period of unprecedented reforms. The post-Maidan government has prioritized democratic governance reforms, and progress has been made in a number of areas, such as decentralisation, openness and transparency of the public administration, anti-corruption and human rights. Since 2015, the economy has slightly recovered, and the outlook has been positive. ***Trends in civil society****:* In Ukraine, civil society has developed steadily over the past years. Attitudes toward civic engagement have been slowly changing, including a higher standard for human rights, especially among the younger generation and in urban centres. Throughout the last years, civil society organisations have been drivers for change and have played a central role in influencing legislation, restoring dialogue and trust with authorities and building national unity. CSOs actively advocate for the democratic reforms in different areas, such as government transparency and accountability, combat of corruption, promoting decentralisation, reform of prosecutorial and judicial systems. They do so through a number of different channels including policy consultation, national civic expert platforms like the Reanimation Package Reforms (RPR), advocacy campaigns, social media etc. Civil society leaders, representatives and journalists entered parliament in order to revive political parties as proactive agents of change and fight against corruption. In general, there has been a decrease in funding to CSOs from both the private sector and from state budget, however, this has benefitted them in terms of their impartiality and independence. Although foreign financial support increased, such funding has been unevenly distributed with over 70% of this support going to organizations assisting IDPs and other victims of the conflict (2015 ISAR Ednannia). Overall, the number of registered CSOs decreased by about 2,000 in 2015 due to the political and economic situation.The average cumulative 2016 CSO Sustainability Index issued by CCC under USAID support in 2017 was 3.3 out of 5, which demonstrated some improvement in institutional capacity, governance structures, engagement of supporters, advocacy and public image.The legal framework in general, is open and supportive for civic engagement and civil society initiatives. Civil society organizations have called for a renewed “pact” between civil society and the state which led to the adoption of the [President’s Decree](http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/68/2016) on the National Strategy on Civil Society Development for 2016-2020 providing a general favourable framework for civil society development in the country, however, a number of follow-up legislative initiatives of the authorities contradicted with the overall spirit of supporting the civil society development. A UNDP-supported [study](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/blog-publications/1165-20160421-en-publication) seeking to define civil society for Ukraine[[1]](#footnote-2), conducted in 2016, has revealed that the obstacles hindering the development of civil society in Ukraine include: stagnation of institutional capacity building and insufficient state support for capacity building of CSOs; lack of engagement of CSOs in advocacy and implementation of the national policy; limited forms of participatory democracy; lack of state incentives to engage CSOs in educational and public awareness campaigns on pressing issues for society; low participation of CSOs in social-economic development due to the lack of both investments and incentives for social entrepreneurship; lack of established practices to involve CSOs as implementers of earmarked programs at various levels; low capability of CSOs to define, deliver and monitor the quality of social and other socially important services; poor cooperation of CSOs with public authorities hindering cross-sectoral cooperation of CSOs; lack of incentives for volunteer work; limited understanding and insufficient focus on the subject of civil society in curricula of secondary, higher and vocational educational institutions; and lack of a systemized approach to studying and analyzing civil society developments in Ukraine.In 2017, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine amended the current legislation, which came into effect on 30 March, to expand the scope of subjects to e-declaration covering CSOs’ staff, experts, and consultants who receive salaries or fees from donor-funded anti-corruption projects implemented in Ukraine, individuals who provide/supply any auxiliary services or products, if payment for such services (products) comes – directly or indirectly – from donor-funded anti-corruption project implemented in Ukraine, and participants of seminars, trainings, other events organized at the expense of an anti-corruption donor-funded project. These discriminatory amendments will have a far-reaching effect on anti-corruption reform in Ukraine. The President of Ukraine has suggested to substitute these requirements with new reporting obligations for a wide range of NGOs, the prospects of cancelling the adopted amendments are not clear, and the newly proposed changes to CSOs’ reporting are also quite contradictory causing real confrontation between the authorities and civil society. ***Human Rights:***Despite a range of formal legal commitments, Ukraine has a generally poor human rights record. In 2016, human rights issues remained on the agenda of the government and there is an ongoing process of implementing the first National Human Rights Strategy. It addresses both systemic human rights issues and more recent conflict-related challenges. An assessment conducted by the Ombudsperson and NGOs rate the level of implementation of planned activities at 21% full implementation and 13% partial implementation. The protracted economic crisis and the armed conflict have deepened the existing gender gaps, and negatively affected gender equality and human rights. Following the outbreak of conflict in Eastern Ukraine in 2014 and large-scale internal displacement, and as a consequence from the annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation, many human rights actors reported a general deterioration in a number of areas of basic rights and freedoms. Since the beginning of the conflict in mid-April 2014 until 15 August 2017, OHCHR recorded 34,766 conflict-related casualties in Ukraine, among civilians, Ukrainian armed forces and members of armed groups. Casualties include 10,225 people killed and 24,541 injured. UNDP’s research shows that vulnerable and marginalized groups, such as people living with HIV, and drug users continue to be subject to significant abuses from various state institutions, and that strengthening support to those groups should be prioritized in future programming. Gender based violence (GBV) is one of the most widespread forms of human rights abuse especially in those population segments most affected by conflict.The human rights situation in the non-government controlled areas – separate districts of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts - have been marked by continuing restrictions on fundamental freedoms, exacerbating the isolation of persons living in these regions and their access to information. A higher number of civilian casualties have been reported in armed group-controlled territories than in Government-controlled areas of the conflict zone. In the temporarily occupied territory of Crimea, OHCHR documented several cases of abuses in detention and ongoing sanctions against members of the Mejlis. The continued prosecution of Crimean Hizb-ut-Tahrir members in Russian courts, and transfer of detainees from Crimea to penitentiary facilities in the Russian Federation raise serious concerns. The Global Gender Gap Index of Ukraine has deteriorated in 2016, shifting to 69th ranking out of 144 countries. Gender equality and women’s rights as well as the new challenges brought by the conflict have not yet become a priority under the Government’s comprehensive reform agenda. There are underpinned gaps in legislation, low capacity of law-enforcement bodies and limited forensic services. However, the ongoing reform agenda do not focus on human rights despite the recommendations that were made by UN human rights mechanisms and the fact that rights were a significant factor of concern underlying the ‘Revolution of Dignity’. |
| *Critical assumptions and risks (select the most relevant from programme document)* | *Assessment of the situation in the context* | *Assessment of the effect on the project’s implementation and description of any counteractive measures.*  |
| ***Risk***: Economic stringency, further banking sector volatility and bankruptcies | 5 CSOs (2 direct UNDP grantees and 3 sub-grantees) were affected by the banking sector, and due to instability and bankruptcy of some of the major commercial banks and CSO funds were frozen for the overall amount USD 23,644.56. | ***Effect on implementation (1 – low, 5 - high):***Impact = 2; Probability = 3***Counteractive measures:***All CSO grantees addressed temporary administrations of their banks with the request of funds retrieval. UNDP also addressed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Ukraine but received a response that the retrieval of funds would be conducted ONLY following the official procedure as per Ukrainian legislation which has not resulted in unblocking any funds so far. UNDP verification mission was conducted to all affected CSOs in August 2017 to collect documents for the mentioned cases (separate communication is available on these cases).  |
| ***Risk***: Continued crisis in the east undermines stability | The situation in the east of the country remains volatile with, currently, no indication that it could be solved fast or, at least, in the foreseeable future.  | ***Effect on implementation (1 – low, 5 - high):***Impact = 4; Probability = 5***Counteractive measures:***DHRP has responded to the continued crisis in the east and ongoing CSO re-adaptation processes with flexibility and required support, where necessary. No CSOs on the temporarily occupied territories are given support, and the project works only with those actors that are located on the government-controlled territories. The Donetsk Hub has fully relocated to Kyiv and has a field office in Kramatorsk after reviewing its strategy to become a think-tank specializing in the current challenges of the east of Ukraine. Under DHRP support, the Justice for Peace in Donbas Coalition has been formed and continues its activities to document human rights violations in the east. |
| ***Risk:*** Inability to maintain activities in the Crimean region | The Autonomous Republic of Crimea remains under Russian occupation and has now fully “transitioned” into the legal system of the Russian Federation with its relevant restrictions for functioning of CSOs. These include, notably, the “foreign agent” law, the “undesirable organizations” law, as well as so-called anti-terrorist laws of Yarovaya package that envisages a prison sentence for “liking” or reposting web materials that could be found extremist (a very broad definition) by the authorities. These developments, alongside growing pressure on civic activity and journalism work, provide for an extremely unfavourable environment for CSOs to function in. In essence, direct support to CSO activity in Crimea from the mainland is now impossible. | Impact = 4; Probability = 5***Counteractive measures:***Keeping in mind the current situation, DHRP is unable to render direct and open support to CSOs that operate in Crimea. The Crimean Field Mission established with DHRP support has become sustainable and continues functioning independently; its reports are issued on a regular basis.  |
| ***Risk:*** Introduction of e-declarations for members of anti-corruption CSOs may inhibit non-state anti-corruption activities in Ukraine (new risk emerged in 2017). | The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VRU) amended the current legislation, which came into effect on 30 March 2017, to expand the scope of subjects to e-declaration. Among others, this provision covers: (1) CSOs’ staff, experts, consultants, who receive salaries or fees from donor-funded anti-corruption projects implemented in Ukraine, either directly from the project or through other persons/entities (implementing organisation, sub-contractor, grantee, etc.); (2) individuals who provide/supply any auxiliary services or products, if payment for such services (products) come – directly or indirectly – from donor-funded anti-corruption project implemented in Ukraine (e.g. interpreters, persons providing printing or catering services, janitors, etc.); (3) participants of seminars, trainings, and other events organized at the expense of an anti-corruption donor-funded projects (if such persons accept any benefits, even with low value, e.g. handout materials, meals, travel costs, accommodations, etc.). These discriminatory amendments will have a far-reaching effect on anti-corruption reform in Ukraine. Particularly, the amendments will effectively inhibit the implementation of the existing anti-corruption development cooperation projects by both project implementation teams and their local partners. They will prevent appearances of both new anti-corruption NGOs and technical cooperation projects. Although the President of Ukraine has suggested to substitute these requirements with new reporting obligations for a wide range of NGOs, the prospects of cancelling the adopted amendments are not clear, and the newly proposed changes to CSOs’ reporting are also quite contradictory causing real confrontation between the authorities and civil society.  | ***Effect on implementation (1 – low, 5 - high):*** Impact = 3 Probability = 4***Counteractive measures:***New UNDP projects on CSOs will: (1) cooperate with development partners to push a strong position against new legislative provisions from Ukraine’s main international partners (2017); (2) cooperate with CSOs and other non-state actors to facilitate the introduction of the new declaration regime provided it is not revoked (2017). |
| **10. Status – Contribution to Programme's outcome objectives***Give an account of selected contributions to the Programme's objectives and indicators.* ***Outcome: CSOs are strengthened to be resilient and effective promoters of democratic value, supporting human rights actors to promote and defend human rights in Ukraine as well as fostering participatory and results-driven Government-CSO dialogue.*****Status of key outcome indicators by the end of the project*** Civil society has increased capacities and contribute to the democratic processes
	+ World Bank Government Effectiveness Index improved from 25 percentile in 2012 to 31.73 in 2016 (by 6.73 percentile)
	+ CSO Sustainability Index (USAID) for Ukraine slightly improved from 3.4 in 2013 to 3.3 in 2016.
	+ According to the Nations in Transit report, civil society average score has improved from 2.75 in 2013 to 2.25 in 2016, as well as democracy score from 4.86 to 4.68 respectively.
	+ Ukraine improved its rank in the [UN E-Government Survey](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/articles/2016/08/04/ukraine-jumps-by-23-in-un-e-government-development-index-.html) from 87th in 2014 to 62nd position in 2016
	+ Ukraine ranked 44th in 2016 Open Data Barometer which is 18 positions higher than in 2015
* Civil society and human rights actors have increased capacity and contribute actively to respect international human rights standards
	+ Increase in knowledge of population about the Ombudsperson from 12% in 2013 to 48% in 2016, including 6% knowing OO mandate very well.
	+ 5 alternative reports attest to various international treaty bodies prepared by CSOs that allowed Ukraine to raise the human rights agenda at an international level and reinforce country’s commitment to eliminate all forms of discrimination in the country.
	+ The National Strategy on Human Rights and its Action Plan were developed and adopted by the Government with direct support from the programme to include inputs of a wide variety of CSOs
	+ Main government policies/plans and laws were approved/improved in compliance with the Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) (see Annex B for details)
* An improved enabling environment contributes to the realization of democratic rights and dialogue between civil society and authorities
	+ Legal frameworks to enable more effective, accountable and responsive public institutions are put in place. These include the following legal and policy acts: (1) Law on Public Associations (2012); (2) Laws “On Foundations of Anti-Corruption Policy in Ukraine for 2014-2017” and “On Preventing Corruption” (2014), (3) Amendments to the Law of Ukraine “On Access to Public Information in the Open Data Format” (2015).
	+ Clear results-driven Government-CSO dialogue is institutionalised in the National Strategy for Facilitation of Civil Society Development (2016), and respective subnational programmes.
	+ Government – civil society cooperation with measurable commitments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance are approved in the updated Open Government Partnership National Action Plan (NAP) for 2014-2015, and in 2016 – in the NAP for 2016-2018.

C:\Users\Olena ursu\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\INetCache\Content.Word\project map.png***Map 1*** *– Locations of the DHRP-supported CSO projects during all years*The Programme for Democratisation, Human Rights and Civil Society Development in Ukraine implemented by UNDP for the period of four years (January 1, 2013 to March 31, 2017) has delivered strong results in development of more inclusive and human rights-based governance on national and regional levels. The project throughout its lifespan built strong regional and local presence (the map above demonstrates the intensity of DHRP activities around Ukraine).As noted in external evaluations and project reviews, DHRP performed at high levels of efficiency and effectiveness across all areas and was very successful in strengthening the capacities of both the Government and civil society in Ukraine. The programme was ground-breaking in its ability to be one of the first-responders to the changing political situation in the country and laid foundation for multiple UNDP and other donor funded projects in Ukraine (see more details in the Final Evalution Report of DHRP in the Annex 5). ***Key areas of progress achieved:**** Civil society has increased capacities and contributes to the democratic processes
	+ 8 mid-size regional CSO hubs serve as capacity-building hubs in the area of good governance and human rights. Final capacity assessment report of the CSO hubs (2016) showed the following improvement of all organisations in 2016 as compared to 2013: democratic governance from 2.6 to 3.9, membership, volunteering, constituency from 3.0 to 3.6, financial sustainability from 2.7 to 3.7, and advocacy from 3.2 to 4.0.
	+ Over 2,600 participants from all sectors (government, CSOs, volunteers, journalists) strengthened or built skills to promote inclusive and democratic governance in Ukraine, including about 65% female, 35% male
	+ 76 successfully implemented CSO projects, including 29 direct CSO grantees and 47 initiatives supported through re-granting facilities (by ISAR, CCC and Zakarpattya hub) in the following thematic areas: democratization (openness, transparency, accountability, anti-corruption), free legal aid provision, and advancing democratic reforms with civic participation. There projects benefited about 23’761 citizens (15’445 female, 8’316 male). Together with the CSO projects on human rights, the total number is 140, and the total number of beneficiaries is 37’124.
	+ Open data legislation developed by RPR group under UNDP support was approved to create further environments to further the open data development in Ukraine
* Civil society and human rights actors have increased capacities and contribute actively to respect international human rights standards
	+ 5 coalitions and informal civil society networks were established, enabling synergy and mentorship between the members
	+ 64 successfully implemented CSO projects, including 53 direct CSO grantees and 11 initiatives supported through re-granting facilities in the area of human rights, including addressing new human rights challenges caused by the conflict (AR Crimea, Donbas, IDPs), strategic litigation, and outreach to international human rights mechanisms. There projects benefited about 13’363 citizens (8’686 female, 4’677 male). Together with the CSO projects on democratization, the total number is 140, and the total number of beneficiaries is 37’124.
	+ Ombudsperson’s presence extended into 12 regions allowing more people in the regions to protect their rights; knowledge of population about the Ombudsperson’s Office increased from 12% to 48% over the project period
	+ Intensity and quality of OO-civil society cooperation improved through the implementation of 13 joint projects and initiatives.
* An improved enabling environment contributes to the realization of democratic rights and dialogues between civil society and authorities
	+ Monitoring of the implementation of the new Law on Public Associations conducted by the UNDP supported [27-strong monitoring coalition](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/news/240-20131004-en) of CSOs with further awareness-raising campaigns and policy discussions on results and recommendations for future improvements
	+ The methodology of civic expert assessment developed and were incorporated by the Civic Expert Council established under the auspices of the Parliamentary Committee on Fighting Organized Crime and Corruption into its practices
	+ This methodology and results of UNDP-supported stakeholders’ monitoring of Ukraine’s progress against the milestones of the OECD Istanbul Anticorruption Action Plan informed further development of so-called anticorruption package of laws which were adopted by the Parliament
	+ The subnational programmes for civil society development elaborated in 4 regions (adopted in 3) strengthening CSO-government cooperation and mutual commitments in framework of the National Strategy for Facilitation of Civil Society Development for 2016-2020

***Areas of challenge:**** Legal environment seems to be favourable for civil society development, but undermined social trust into CSOs & recent confrontation with authorities enhances the vulnerability of the civil society
* Progress of democratic reforms, though evident, as confirmed by approval of the EU-Ukraine visa-free regime, is assessed as slow by citizens (44% of Ukrainians see no progress in the implementation of the reforms (2015 GfK survey); only 8% of citizens believe that they have influence on the situation in the country (2016 UNDP-commissioned survey).
* The protracted conflict in the East of Ukraine, effective border conflict in Crimea and lack of capacities of the duty-bearers to provide effective response to the human rights challenges causes deterioration of human rights situation in the country

***IO 1. Civil society has increased capacity and contributes to the democratic processes.*****CSOs capacity development: regional hubs**Screen ClippingDespite many challenges, civil society in Ukraine has been developing steadily since its independence and played a very influential position in bringing forth the reforms and advocacy for government transparency and accountability at a national level. However, the geopolitical influence of Ukrainian CSOs are limited to Kyiv-based organizations who have stronger connections with the government, media, volunteers, and the international community. Smaller regional-level CSOs do not have enough resources and capacities to compete with larger national ones, and therefore, do not participate in the promotion of reform agendas. DHRP/UNDP intervention focused on empowering regional-level CSOs act as regional hubs and leaders of moving the democratization process forward, and promoting human rights. Throughout the project implementation period, a total of 8 CSOs became regional civil society leaders, as a result of strengthening their performance in terms of membership, financial sustainability, and operational procedures and policies. These hubs became regional leaders amongst CSO communities upon comprehensive organizational assessments. Out of these CSO hubs, 5 focused specifically on strengthening the role of civil society in democratic processes and the other three focused on promotion and defense of human rights in Ukraine. *Timeline of the process of the Hubs institutional development continued from 2013 till 2016:***2013-2014 – Organizational Assessments**All selected hubs went through capacity assessments based on Participatory Results-Oriented Self-Evaluation (PROSE) instruments, commonly referred to in DHRP practice as the ‘‘three circles’’ assessment tool (developed for UNDP Ukraine by Intrac in 2013 and finalised after a pilot study in 2014). The selected hubs received a comprehensive picture of areas of focus for development in 4 areas of work: *i) democratic governance, ii) financial sustainability, iii) membership and volunteer management, iv) advocacy.* **2014-2015 - Institutional Support and Mentorship**Based on the results of the assessment, all 8 CSOs worked on strengthening 4 organizational areas and undergone rigorous exercises in each area to improve their scores:* Democratic governance: Strategic planning development, defining management structures, improving management tools (policies, rules, procedures), developing ethical principles and preventing corruption
* Constituency: Designing systems to recruit and maintain members and volunteers, developing new programmes for target groups
* Financial sustainability: Strengthening financial control and resources (sources of funding, their diversification and planning)
* Advocacy: Planning promotion of topics related to democratization and human rights, lobbying for civil interests, conducting strategic analysis of stakeholders relations (government, business, civil society) in line with the organizational mission and goals

**2016 – Final Organizational Assessment** **4 OD indicators to measure progress: 2013 – 2016 dynamics*****Chart 1:*** *Aggregate performance of Hubs on four indicators in 2013 (baseline) and in 2016**(maximum 5 points)* **Upon the completion of tailored organizational development plans, involving 18 months of in-depth training and mentoring, CSO hubs were enabled to**:* Serve as regional CSO hubs and benefit over 2,600 CSO representatives and local authorities;
* Increase CSO budgets by 200-400% since 2013 on top of streamlining financial procedures
* Act as local advocates for democracy and human right strengthening by carrying out 25 local campaigns
* Be governed in democratic and participatory way with strong planning and management systems in place

 The programme selected CSOs were diverse in their levels of experience, focus of work and location, allowing CSO hubs to mentor each other within the network and grow in their influence at the sub-national and regional levels. This fulfilled CSOs roles as regional-level drivers of change, DHRP-nurtured CSO hubs were actively engaged in promotion of reforms at the subnational level. **Some of the results of hubs-facilitated initiatives include:** * A development strategy was designed for 10 amalgamated communities
* Hubs conducted analyses of first steps for decentralization reforms and amalgamation of communities, which were discussed over 6 round tables, a forum, and several meetings on the subnational level with over 600 participants in 3 regions.
* 4 CSO Hubs from Lviv, Chernihiv, Kropyvnytskyi (former Kirovohrad), and Rivne conducted numerous human rights courses for new patrol police officers in their cities. Over 1,250 patrol police officers took part in human rights training courses conducted by these Hubs
* Lviv CSO hubs conducted training on the prevention of family violence and human trafficking for 38 police officers
* 4 pilot regions developed and adopted subnational programmes on facilitating the civil society development in line with the National Strategy on the Facilitation of Civil Society Development (2016-2020), involving over 1,300 stakeholders

 As noted in the Monitoring Mission Report (May 2017), both at national and regional level, DHRP has, as part of implementing the programme, **played a crucial role in the capacity development of both state institutions and CSOs**, which has been instrumental in the large number of activities, where the various actors have had to collaborate and participate in dialogues with each other. The award of the grant of almost EUR 1 million by the EU delegation to the hubs’ network, through one of the Hubs to continue empowering local CSOs in rural and remote areas, serves as strong evidence of the effectiveness and trust that the hubs established in communities around the country. Summary of the results of CSO hubs’ final organisational assessment is given in Annex 2.  **The hubs continue to play crucial roles in their communities:*** Serving as centres for the best practices in volunteers’ management and community mobilization
* Offering support to the new CSOs and initiative groups
* Providing input and/or draft policy documents
* Serving as partners of choice for reforms related to policing, justice and elections in amalgamated communities
* Advocating for local inclusive decision-making
* Debunking propaganda and serve as defenders of the right of access to information
* Developing social enterprises that benefit communities
* Providing legal assistance for communities including families of deceased soldiers, and IDPs

 **Promoting openness and transparency and advancing reforms** Open Government DataThe programme has been working with Ukrainian partner organizations to **promote open government data** as part of the Ukrainian national reform agenda, to **raise stakeholders' awareness on the benefits of open data**, **to reinforce the political will in the field of opening government data**, and **to strengthen the public and government support for the development of a favorable legislation on open data**. This initiative started with DHRP first piloting open budget information in Lviv, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk municipalities in partnership with the CSOs in 2015. The project partnered with civil society (thematic group of the Reanimation Package of Reforms) and the newly formed National Agency on e-Governance to co-develop the Law “On introduction of amendments into some laws of Ukraine as to access to public information in form of open data” (the so-called open data legislation). Adopted in April of 2015, the law laid out the much needed legislative foundation for opening and publishing structured government data. The real breakthrough in government data openness came with the Cabinet of Ministers Resolution that mandated the disclosure of 331 databases. DHRP also worked on building capacities of social activists, data journalists, and IT experts to motivate them to use data and to produce socially important applications and tools based on open data, thus increasing transparency of the public sector.In such a way, the Programme, with engagement of IT specialists, civil society and media enabled the transformation of a successful pilot initiative into a nation-wide initiative to encourage state agencies to disclose public information in form of open data. As of June 2017, **45+ municipalities use the open budget tool and** **over 17,500 datasets are open for public on data.gov.ua,** which, the Programme helped to hand over from the CSO developer to the State Agency on E-Governance for the platform sustainability and growth. **The Open Data Development Roadmap (2016)** ensured the sustainability and government ownership of the openness initiative for future years. The roadmap, which contained 41 tasks, aimed to achieve better data availability, quality, and capacity-building of authorities to publish open data, strengthen the role of open data in implementing state policy, providing regulatory support and developing citizen's capabilities to utilize open data. It was informed by the results of UNDP-funded Open Data Readiness Assessment conducted following the World Bank methodology. In March 2017, the State Agency reported that the roadmap has been implemented by 60%. Best practices of e-democracy and civic engagement in the promotion of government transparency and accountability based on open data were exchanged with more than 180 civic activists and municipal officials at the [Personal Democracy Forum](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/news/1276-20160622-en) Ukraine co-organised by DHRP in 2016. Open Parliament DataHowever, support to openness initiatives were not focused only on the executive branch, and grew out of efforts from civic activists and younger Members of Parliament (former civic activists), launching the Open Parliament initiative in autumn of 2015 with DHRP support. The Programme was the first to support Ukraine to join international Open Parliament Initiative (OPI) which is a pledge designed between the legislators and the parliamentary CSO monitors to improve procedures and every-day practices of the Parliament. Specifically, DHRP made a significant progress in the development of the first ever **Action Plan of the Declaration of the Parliamentary Openness** (endorsed in February 2016), by establishing and providing ongoing support to the Working Group of CSOs, and the Parliament that coordinated and implemented the Action Plan. The Plan envisages easier citizen access to Parliamentary proceedings and public information on Members of Parliament as well as disclosure of Parliamentary inquiries and information debated within Committees. In addition to this, the Plan envisages channels for the public to comment on draft laws, to request the Parliamentary Secretariat to disclose budgetary data for the main legislative body of the country, and to improve data search and processing via the Parliamentary Open Data Portal.In May 2016, the Working Group reported on:* Launching an [Open Data Portal of VRU](http://data.rada.gov.ua/open) – a tool developed by the OPORA Civic Network with DHRP support. The website contains over 400 data sets. The Programme supported capacity development for activists to work with the tool, as well as used regional hubs network to raise the awareness about the Portal
* Launching a web-resource for people to [monitor MPs vote](https://rada4you.org/)
* Disclosing partial financial information

*(Other results can be found in the Working Group report* [here](http://dhrp.org.ua/uk/publikatsii1/1226-20160517-ua-publication)*)*On June 2016, this initiative was transferred to the UNDP EU-funded ‘’Rada za Evropu’’ project with an objective to strengthen the capacity of the Verkhovna Rada to produce quality legislation and monitor its implementation, notably in the framework of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement. The DHRP initiative on Parliamentary Openness was transformed into one of the three components of the project – ‘’Support greater transparency and openness of the Verkhovna Rada and more consistent communication and dialogue with the citizens’’. ‘’Rada za Evropu’’ built on the success of DHRP and continues to promote Open Data Portal, implementing Communication Strategy and Action Plan for the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, and enabling Ukraine to assume the role of international leadership in Parliamentary transparency. Anti-Corruption Responding to legislative amendments introduced by the Ukrainian Parliament in 2013, DHRP capitalized on its collaboration with the Anti-Corruption Parliamentary Committee to develop an anti-corruption risk assessment of the drafted laws initiated both by the Government and the MPs. The DHRP-supported civic experts that comprised the civic advisory group for the Committee were able to plough through legislative drafts tabled and find possible corruption risks in 27% of the draft bills assessed. The Programme was one of the first to respond to the post-Euromaidan challenges by providing support to the Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR), particularly in the field of anti-corruption strategies and legislation. UNDP promoted the work of RPR at the regional level through the CSO Hubs, built capacities of the RPR experts and activists through study visits and training. The experts applied their experience in the development of the policy strategies and legislation, particularly the law ‘’On Foundations of Anti-Corruption Policy in Ukraine’’, (also known as the ‘’Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2014-2017’’) and the law ‘’On Preventing Corruption’’. Both laws were adopted in October 2014. DHRP was actively involved in the development of these laws and their implementation. The RPR anti-corruption group was able to educate over 4,000 stakeholders in 22 regions on decentralization, anti-corruption and other reforms. The first UNDP Anti-Corruption School **gave skills to the 30 top applicants** in building national transparency and integrity, but also allowed the participants to implement 29 micro-initiatives through seed-funding, out of which 22 were recognized by a regranting CSO hub as success stories*.* The graduates have initiated eight criminal cases based on the irregularities in competitive procurement, saving around USD 1.3M by terminating 21 procurement contracts with fraud and collusion, detecting 26 cases of illegal construction. The initiative has been taken over by UNDP's ''Enhancing Transparency and Integrity in Public Sector'' project, that fully adopted DHRP approach in equipping over 100 experts in anti-corruption throughout 2016 – 2017. See more details on the programme achievements on fostering democratization in Annex 1a. ***IO 2. Civil society and human rights actors have increased capacity and contribute actively to respect for international human rights standards.*****Developing capacities of the National Human Rights Institutions (Ombudsperson Office (OO))**National Strategy on Human Rights and Action PlanOne of the biggest results of the Programme’s interventions in the area of human rights development was the development of a National Strategy on Human Rights and its Action Plan. DHRP played an important role in the finalization of the draft Strategy by providing expert assistance to ensure compliance with the UN principles, and coordinating the work of many stakeholders involved in the development of this key national document. The Strategy was approved by the President of Ukraine on August 2015. DHRP enabled participatory development of the Action Plan for the Strategy to ensure the sustainable results of the Strategy implementation (approved by the Prime Minister in November 2015). It was achieved through targeted capacity-building activities for Ukrainian officials, OO staff and CSOs, study visits and expert support. *“The drafting of the National Strategy on Human Rights and its Action Plan represent one of the fundamental contributions of the DHRP to human rights in Ukraine during 2014-2017”* (DHRP Final Evaluation). The Strategy design and its implementation is important for the country also from the perspective of achieving Sustainable Development Goals targets, as it is perfectly aligned with the 2030 Agenda objectives to promote rights of people for good health and well-being (SDG 3), quality education (SDG 4), gender equality (SDG 5), decent work and economic growth (SDG 8), reduced inequalities (SDG 10) and peace, justice and strong institutions (SDG 16). The Ombudsperson’s Office and 65 civil society organizations (represented by 96 experts and civic activists) formed a platform for coordinating monitoring efforts on the NHRS and AP implementation. Currently, the implementation of the plan, however, is noted to be at 20% level, indicating the need to further strengthen support of the human rights actors in Ukraine in this regard. Support to the Office of the Ombudsperson DHRP supported CSOs that were able to build capacities within the OO and establish CSO-government dialogue. Following the assessment of the OO in 2012 by the Programme and subsequent development of the ‘’Ombudsperson Strategy and Action Plan for 2013-2017’’, DHRP enabled the OO to fulfil its mandate as the National Human Rights Institution of Ukraine, including supporting the National Human Rights strategy for Ukraine, its Action Plan, and developing the National Preventative Mechanism (NPM). The Programme ensured expansion of the OO regional coordinators network in 12 oblasts, enabling 1,140 legal consultations and 301 court hearings to protect the rights of Ukrainian citizens. The number of consultations provided to the citizens has been significantly increasing since 2014. DHRP also built the capacities of 25 civic activists from 15 regions of Ukraine to monitor places of deprivation of liberty, and enabled them to become National Preventive Mechanism monitors under the "Ombudsperson+" model. DHRP was able to bridge the gap between the OO and CSOs. The result of this partnership was the monitoring of compliance with the Law on Access to Public Information, monitoring of Criminal Procedure Code and its application, the establishment of the IDP Resource Centre in 2014, etc. The strong results of the Project were integrated into the new UNDP/DMFA project - ‘’Strengthening Capacities of the Office of the Ombudsperson’’ project, that builds on the expertise and experience of DHRP and carries on the important work in promoting OO and human rights in Ukraine. International Human Rights MechanismsDHRP supported the Ukrainian civil society organizations and the Office of the Ombudsperson in Ukraine in becoming more a consolidated force in monitoring international commitments on human rights. The programme stimulated operations of several thematic coalitions that presented an alternative view of the situation, and demanded accountability from the duty bearers at the international review platforms.  **DHRP successfully mobilized CSOs in preparation of the reports on:*** **Ukraine’s implementation of the OECD recommendations under the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action plan -** a group of seven anti-corruption CSOs were joined by a team of renowned national independent experts to pick apart every recommendation received by Ukraine in the previous round, present a well-grounded civic position on that issue, and finally, deliver a presentation at the assessment event, establishing the position of civil society regarding the status of anti-corruption legislation and institutions as of February 2014.
* **Ukraine's implementation of the provisions of the Convention against Torture (CAT)** in 2014 - presented by human rights defenders and the Ombudsperson to the UN Committee against Torture provided an objective picture of the situation in the country, a list of questions to the Ukrainian delegation, in particular, on the investigation of torture cases, access to medical help, and translators in places of detention, detention of migrants, juvenile justice, and others
* **Ukraine's compliance with the CERD (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination)** put together by the CSOs and the Office of the Ukrainian Ombudsperson and presented in 2015, highlighted challenges of Roma populations in Ukraine, risks of the decentralization reform on minorities' rights, and ineffective systems of registering and prosecuting hate crimes
* **Ukraine's implementation of commitments under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).** DHRP helped up to 45 CSOs come together with a Gender Strategy Platform, and prepare an alternative report that highlighted issues unaddressed by the country's 8th periodic report. Also, in collaboration with UN Women, a number of coordinating meetings with the CSOs were held prior to the review of the State report by the CEDAW in Geneva in February 2017

 In addition, the Programme applied the same approach in **supporting CSOs in the UPR (Universal Periodic Review) process**. The stakeholders’ submission to UPR focused on conflict-related human rights violations, prepared by the Coalition, *Justice for Peace in Donbas*, identified the following through over 280 interviews with the victims:* over 90 women victims of sexual violence in the prisons established by illegal military groups
* 30 cases of recruiting children in the armed conflict in Donbas
* a total of 1,023 persons are currently considered missing (including 19 children)

This report was submitted to the UN Human Rights Council and will be taken into consideration during Ukraine’s review under UPR on November 2017. As the prepared report includes concrete recommendations to address the issues, the Programme is committed to provide further support to the CSOs who work in these areas to ensure proper actions to be taken by the duty-bearers.  **Addressing New Human Rights Challenges Caused by the Conflict**‘’Crimea Human Rights Field Mission (CFM)’’Following the 2014 annexation of Crimea, DHRP responded to the situation by providing support to the Crimean Human Rights Field Monitoring Mission – a coalition of over 15 human rights organizations from Ukraine and Russia, that served as the only source of information on human rights violations on the territory of the annexed peninsula. The coalition was enabled to produce a number of vital reports between 2014 and 2015, highlighting the systematic issues of disappearances of pro-Ukrainian and Crimean Tartar activists, the use of military force and pressure, and violations of freedom of speech, peaceful assemblies, and religious beliefs. The Mission gained enough momentum to lock its sustainability and act independently from UNDP.‘’Justice for Peace in Donbas Coalition (JFP)’’ In 2014, the Programme with other partners supported 17 Ukrainian human rights organizations to join forces as the *Justice for Peace in Donbas Coalition* for documenting the violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Donbas during the armed confrontation.In order to ensure the documentation of human rights violations, the Coalition uses a professional data storage and tracking software, which was purchased and installed with UNDP, and other partners’ support. The database is operational with over 200 cases of human rights violations, and is used to seek humanitarian law remedies and redress (e.g., ECHR, IHL, domestic criminal and civil law cases) for victims. Many of the victims are IDPs and other vulnerable members of communities in Donbas.Based on the documented data, the Coalition develops joint analytical [reports](https://jfp.org.ua/rights/analityka/reports/coalition) to advocate for better human rights related policies of those who suffered from the conflict. The project regularly supported the Coalition in the following ways:* *Strategic planning:* the Coalition outlines clear goals and actions for 2015-2017 with the help of DHRP
* *Capacity-building:* on the issues of joint management of the database, learning from international best human rights practices through exchange visits to Serbia and Croatia, documenting gender-based violence and military use of children. The coalition learned how to use documentation as a tool to restore peace.
* *Communication and outreach*: the website of the Coalition uses DHRP-funded databases for storing evidence on human rights crimes in eastern of Ukraine to present an interactive map of human rights violations to the general public. Over 15,000 individuals accessed the information on the website. In total, 11 thematic reports have been produced by the Coalition and its members, and used to advocate the promotion of respective human rights agendas at international and national levels.

Coalition members have made efforts to improve access to justice for those who suffered the most during the conflict, and to continue providing vital support to such people. These include victims of illegal detentions, tortures, released prisoners, immigrants unlawfully deprived of property, and facilitate their reintegration into Ukrainian society.The Joint Response to the crisis by the Office of Ombudsperson and CSOsThe OO was able to start monitoring the situation in the conflict-affected regions right upon the beginning of the crisis due to the timely support from DHRP, and other international organizations. OO initiated the discussion of the role of Ombudsperson Institution in conflict and post-conflict situations at an international level. With the Programme’s support, the OO led the development of the Kyiv Declaration on the Role of Ombudspersons in Conflict, that was adopted by over 100 representatives from NHRIs, leaders, human rights experts, and civic activists in October 2015, calling for a stronger role of NHRIs in conflict and post-conflict settings. The Kyiv Declaration has the potential to impact conflict-affected people around the world. Throughout 2014-2015, DHRP supported the *IDP Resource Centre,* established by 7 prominent CSOs, and the OO. The Centre’s main objectives include providing support to the development and implementation of long-term strategies for IDPs, amending legislation and administrative practices, monitoring violations of IDPs rights, as well as establishing communication and cooperation between the various initiatives and organizations that provide assistance to IDPs. In this regard, the Centre provided legal advice on labour laws, a system of passes to enter the Anti-Terrorist Operation zone, issues of welfare, registration as IDPs, and document recovery. The Centre prepared 3 analytical reviews and conducted 4 monitoring field-visits covering 12 locations. The Centre also launched its dedicated [website](http://pereselennya.org/) and [Facebook page](https://www.facebook.com/pereselentsam/?fref=ts) with more than 4,000 followers.These successful initiatives were adopted and further developed by the new DMFA-funded project ‘’Strengthening Capacities of the Office of the Ombudsperson’’ which continues to build the capacities of the OO office and its partners to address IDPs’ human rights violations. This is done through training courses, and strengthening regional presence in conflict-affected Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts. The results of such rapid response to the needs of the vulnerable population made the Ombudsperson’s Office one of the most trusted institutions in Donbas – according to the National Human Rights Baseline study, 21% of the population in those regions believe the institution to be effective in protecting their rights. See more details on the programme achievements on promoting human rights in Annex 1b. ***IO 3. An improved enabling environment contributes to the realization of democratic rights and dialogue between civil society and authorities.***Law on Public AssociationsSince 2014 the Law on Public Associations has not been fully implemented and continues to have persistent problems, it has been challenging for CSOs to avoid tax penalties, putting them at risk of losing their non-profit status. Despite legislative challenges, the DHRP has been able to support CSOs with securing funding, and develop CSO-public dialogue at a local level. Monitoring of the implementation of the new Law on Public Associations was conducted in 2013-2014 by the UNDP, supporting a [27-strong monitoring coalition](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/news/240-20131004-en) of CSOs following the joint methodology and trainings conducted for its members. The Programme has enabled local CSO’s to collaborate on new funding models with local municipalities such as provided free legal aid to citizens. Over the last couple of year, CSOs have made progress in transparency and public dialogue through public forums, removing bureaucracy barriers and providing transparent documents. CSOs have worked to negotiate these actions with local governments to increase public engagement in the decision-making process. Promoting volunteerismOne of the main areas that the DHRP has worked in since 2015 has been to support the engagement of volunteers, particularly at the local level, into activities of civil society groups. UNDP hosted a conference on "Philanthropy and Volunteering in Action: Saving, Reconciling and Building Future" with over 300 civil society actors on how to foster a culture of volunteerism in Ukraine. This led to a report on “Volunteering in Ukraine” and specific recommendations on improving legislation for volunteering and developing frameworks for volunteer movements. A main focus of these recommendations was on peace building and reconciliation actions in the conflict affected areas. Enhancing civil society development policy In early 2016, the DHRP-supported [study](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/news/1159-20160422-en) “Defining Civil Society in Ukraine” was launched by CCC – one of the major think tanks on civil society development. This study defines civil society in the Ukrainian context, specifying the terms and attributes of a civil society organization. It lists the types of entities that qualify as civil society organizations, and identifies obstacles and needs these organizations have in terms of their development and growth. The key conclusions of the study informed the National Strategy for Civil Society Development in Ukraine approved by the President in February 2016. See the brief summary of the results of the study in the Annex 3. To speed up the implementation of the National Strategy at a regional level, DHRP together with its CSO hubs in Kherson, Dnipro, Zakarpattia, and Donetsk oblasts implemented 4 pilot projects, using an entirely participatory process of developing regional programmes for civil society development. The process involves over 1,300 CSO representatives, local government officials, and activists. In close cooperation with DHRP-supported hubs, and local administrations, three Coordination Councils were developed, and lobbied for approval of the regional programmes. Regional programmes for civil society development were developed in 4 regions (3 of them were adopted).During the years of Project implementation, DHRP has been supporting a very important and unique national platform for discussing key standards and practices in the area of civil society organizational development – Civil Society Development Forum (organized by ISAR Ednannya since 2012). Every year DHRP would use this opportunity to share good practices in organizational development and showcase stories of successful DHRP initiatives (e.g. anti-corruption, Open Government Partnership implementation plan, tips for effective organizational development, etc.). The Forum is the key event for building stronger partnership and knowledge exchange between CSOs in Ukraine. In 2016, the 5th [Civil Society Development Forum](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2016/11/30/empowering-civil-society-to-advance-reforms-in-ukraine/) brought together over 1,200 Ukrainian civil society professionals to promote best practices that ensure the development of adequate skills and organizational capacities to ultimately enable civil society to effectively move the reform process forward in Ukraine. As a result of the forum, civil society representatives developed the “Civil society TO-DO list”, defining key priorities for their planning to inform efforts on supporting the reform agenda in Ukraine. The list includes the following agenda which was identified by participating CSOs as priority directions for further engagement:* + Promote rule of law, freedom, democracy, basic human rights, social solidarity and respect for human dignity as a set of values that serves as a benchmark for the entire society in Ukraine;
	+ Invest time and energy in building stable institutions that work based on democratic procedures, accountability, and transparency;
	+ Ensure the sustainability of civil society initiatives by increasing social capital, involving a wide range of supporters and volunteers, and building a broad range of fundraising strategies;
	+ Create networks and coalitions to unite efforts and experiences;
	+ Continue to shape the reform agenda of the state, strengthen civil society's influence at all stages of the reform process and tirelessly increase public participation in decision-making processes;
	+ Fight corruption while remaining a crucial player on this field, using e-platforms, capitalise on partnership with independent media in the fight against corruption;
	+ Address the causes and consequences of the conflict in eastern Ukraine, actively promote dialogue, support integration of IDPs in their new host communities, and make use of the "cultural diplomacy". Liaise and assist CSOs in occupied Crimea;
	+ Increase professionalism and expand opportunities for intersectoral collaboration;
	+ Work with the community and for the community. Promote and advertise new life practices - environmentally conscious behaviour with "zero tolerance" to populism, corruption, and paternalism. Support and develop civic education.

Many of these values and work priorities were included into the vision of the follow-up project to DHRP. See more details on the programme achievements on civil society development in Annex 1c.  |
| **11. Status – programme outputs** *Describe the progress and difficulties in the planned outputs and indicators during the 12 months reporting period (as above – please include the entire programme period). Indicate if an output also has been supported by another international agency. Include quantitative as well as qualitative data.* *[1-2 cases per country]*Please refer to Annex B: Status in Logical FrameworkThe project, alongside with the DMFA-funded initiative “[Strengthening Capacities of the Ombudsperson's Office Project](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/strengthening-capacities-of-the-office-of-the-ombudsperson.html)” contributed to better coordination of stakeholders in the process of Ukraine’s repotting under international conventions and mechanisms (ICERD, CEDAW, UPR). In coordination with the “[Enhanced Public Sector Transparency and Integrity Programme](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/project_sample112112.html)”, the project reached out to their partner CSOs supported under the municipal component of the project to promote application of the human rights based approach to their programme work. For achievements in coordination with the implementing partners in Moldova (EEF) and Belarus (PACT Inc), please refer to the completion report under the Regional Component of the Programme (see Annex 4).  |
| **12. Deviations from planning in the original programme document***Give an account of significant differences in implementation compared with the approved project document.* During the project period, events in Crimea, the Revolution of Dignity, and the subsequent conflict in the certain districts of Donetsk and Lugansk oblasts influenced the original project design significantly. In 2014, following the recommendation of the mid-term review mission, the project log-frame was revisited to reflect the project response to the new challenges. In 2015 two major work streams elaborated under the umbrella of DHRP – anticorruption and support to Ombudsperson’s Office – grew into the independent projects: *“*[*Enhanced Public Sector Transparency and Integrity Programme*](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/project_sample112112.html)” and “[*Strengthening Capacities of the Ombudsperson's Office Project*](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/strengthening-capacities-of-the-office-of-the-ombudsperson.html)” (both 2015-2018).Additionally, since autumn 2015, UNDP implemented the regional capacity development component of the Programme aiming at building capacities of the implementing partners and their partner CSOs to apply the human rights based approach and gender mainstreaming in their programming (please refer to a separate report on the Regional Component of the Programme).  |
| **13. Sustainability and exit strategy**The strategy for ensuring the institutional sustainability of the regional organisations – CSO hubs (exit strategy) has been developed based on the conclusions and recommendations of the Analytical Report on the results of the final organizational assessment of the CSO hubs conducted during April-May 2016. The results of the joint CSO hubs’ meeting was held on the 30th of November 2016. The Strategy focuses on two different work directions: 1) ensuring sustainability of the positive results of the individual CSO hubs and their further institutional development; 2) ensuring further development of the hubs’ network without additional donor support.For further sustainable development of the *individual CSO hubs*, the organisations will aim to ensure a more systemic participation of the Board in the decision-making of the organization for its higher impact on their organizational and financial strategies; continue reshaping the management structure in the organisations; improve the system of monitoring and evaluation; conduct the self-assessment of the organization on a constant basis, and redistribute the responsibilities between the personnel for ensuring sustainable growth. CSOs will continue efforts to reduce dependence from donor programmes by attracting funds from the local budgets; promote the local fundraising strategy; use the endowment fund provided by UNDP effectively, cost-efficiently and in line with the approved programme; consider creating their own social enterprises; and aim to develop the ‘bank of ideas’ (public initiatives and long-term projects). For *ensuring sustainability and efficiency of the hubs’ network*, it is foreseen to institutionalize the hubs’ network through the development of joint visions, values, strategic goals and respective policies; expanding the network through the selection of partners sharing the same vision and values; enhancing the professionalism of hubs’ – members of the network – through implementation of new projects and programmes; actively promoting the network through strategic communication to fundraise for the networks’ projects; and introduce the model of “community of practices” for defining, rethinking and structuring the positive practices of the organizational development and promote such practices among the local CSOs (see more details [by the link](https://issuu.com/olenaursu/docs/exit_strategy)).  |
| **14. HRBA and Gender equality**HRBA and gender mainstreaming were addressed by DHRP via 1. *Integrating gender and HRVS into grantees’ activities*. DHRP continues to promote gender equality and awareness of HRBA and to request all the direct grantees incorporate gender and HRBA dimensions into their respective deliverables and project actions as well as to carry out gender-disaggregated monitoring. Among some of the examples are the DHRP-supported *Justice for Peace in Donbas* Coalition, which defined the documentation of gender-based violence cases as its strategic priority for 2016 and produced the thematic report “[Unspoken pain](https://jfp.org.ua/system/reports/files/81/uk/Justice_for_Peace_in_Donbas_EUCCI_Gender-based_violence.pdf)”. In Lviv, the CSO hub, *Women’s Perspectives Centre* supports internally displaced female entrepreneurs to produce handmade goods in addition to conducting advocacy campaigns on preventing human trafficking and reducing violence against women.
2. *Providing support to civic monitoring of the international human rights treaties*. DHRP supported the preparation of alternative/shadow reports on Ukraine’s compliance with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women ([CEDAW](http://dhrp.org.ua/uk/publikatsii1/1623-20161219-ua-publication) in Ukrainian), or (“[List of issues](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/UKR/INT_CEDAW_NGO_UKR_24631_E.pdf)” in English), and the International Convention of the Elimination of Racial Discrimination ([ICERD](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/blog-publications/1363-20160725-en-publication)). DHRP-supported coalitions of CSOs prepared overarching documents covering all areas of the Conventions, giving attention to issues that concern the most vulnerable and marginalized groups, namely rural women, Roma people, Crimea Tatar people, Crimean Ukrainians, IDPs and other groups.
3. *Raising awareness and building CSOs capacities in HRBA*. A [5-day HRBA workshop](http://dhrp.org.ua/en/news/1217-20160431-en) was conducted for all 8 CSO hubs in April 2016 to introduce them into the HRBA topic by Chernihiv hub with the support of DHRP. Additionally, the hubs were exposed to the international hands-on workshop on HRBA application in CSOs’ work as well as participated in a webinar on the theory of change designed with consideration of the gender mainstreaming principles, which was organised within the Regional Capacity Development Component of the Programme for CSOs from Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine.
4. More systemically, a [training session for 18 trainers](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/articles/2016/12/23/civil-society-organisations-trained-on-human-rights-based-approach.html) was conducted on HRBA for the CSO hubs organised with support of the CSO MART to help them acquire the necessary skills and knowledge transfer knowledge from HRBA to the other CSOs in their regions. It is expected that trainers from the CSO hubs, who were equipped with trainers' guides and training materials, will further conduct their own trainings in their regions in early 2017, reaching up to 200 representatives of smaller CSOs. Later, the trainers organised subnational trainings on HRBA for CSOs from their regions. In total, 8 trainings were conducted with 160 participants selected from their partner networks and the [open call](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/articles/2017/01/23/want-to-know-more-about-the-human-rights-based-approach-register-for-a-training-for-civic-activists-.html) at UNDP website. After the trainings, DHRP disseminated the questionnaire survey among the training participants to define future course of action in integrating the approach into everyday practices at the local level.
 |
| **15. 'Added Value' and Advisory from contract partners***Provide examples of how the contract partners have provided "added value" to their partner(s)*On 2016, the methodology for the civic literacy test was initially designed by PACT Inc for Belarus combining national representative polling and a series of focus groups to study three pillars of knowledge, competencies and values under the [21st Century Citizenship concept](http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/Reimagining_Citizenship_for_21st_Century_webversion.pdf): 1) Civic literacy; 2) Global citizenship; and 3) Digital Citizenship. The idea was further developed and upgraded to the regional level by UNDP within the framework of the DMFA-funded three-country (Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine) Human Rights and Democratization Program. UNDP Ukraine, after consultations with Pact, included the Civic Literacy Test idea into the suggested list of common activities for three countries. The idea was supported and included into the overall regional activity plan for 2016. While the survey questions used for three countries were inherently different for each of them, a common framework approach to the hands-on research was adopted, thus making the idea of a cross-country comparison possible. Connection between Pact’s research design, and UNDP-suggested modifications of the survey for Ukraine and Moldova were ensured, and sociological research was deployed in Ukraine and Moldova under the overall guidance of UNDP Ukraine. As a result of wider data collection exercises, the data collected for three countries was compared, allowing to define common and divergent tendencies in civic literacy while looking at the wider picture (for more details please see the progress report for the Regional Component).  |
| **16. Lessons learned***Mention 1-3 important lesson learned during the reporting period.*  1. CSO Hubs’ institutional development approach of DHRP was successful according to their final assessment and external evaluation results. However, few important lessons will be incorporated in future programming, particularly related to the duration of the institutional development (should be longer than 1.5 years), and working with CSOs’ staff to support institutional changes and stabilizing CSOs networks and results.
2. More investment is necessary into the capacity building of local-level CSOs and citizen awareness. The experience has shown that regional- and local-level CSOs engaged professionally into the promotion of the reform agenda to be quite scarce. At the same time, there is a genuine interest among Ukrainian CSOs to engage in public monitoring of authorities’ performance at the local level, which will only gain in importance of the ongoing administrative and fiscal decentralization process.
3. Despite the fact that Ukraine is a signatory of a number of international conventions on gender equality and women’s rights, and has a national policy and legal frameworks in place that guarantee equality for men and women, their implementation has been poor. Further strengthening of capacities of civil society organizations as “watch-dogs” are needed to monitor and push the Government toward the implementation of these obligations and defending human rights from a gender perspective.
4. A human rights based approach, and gender mainstreaming are still considered to be novel approaches even for such advanced CSOs as UNDP-supported regional hubs. Time and human resources are necessary to have this approach strongly rooted in everyday activities of CSOs to further contribute to strengthening democracy and human rights in society as a means to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.
5. The programme has significantly built the capacities of selected regional mid-sized hub CSOs outside the capital, and major cities to serve as regional leaders (expert capacity-building hubs). Despite areas that still require improvement or change, the approach has worked well and needs to be replicated to the other regions of Ukraine along with further enhancing the hubs’ network for stronger impact.
6. The DHRP-advocated approach of ‘demonopolization’ of civil society niches and sectors is to be intensified. Networks and coalitions of small and mid-sized CSOs in different sectors need to be nurtured to ensure emergence of additional CSO players in the field and break up the status-quo of de facto monopolies.
 |
| **17. Partners involvement in regional/global activities**Throughout the whole project period, DHRP representatives participated in the Regional Partners’ Forum and used it as a platform for discussion of the project achievements and lessons learned, as well as could benefit from other partners’ experiences. Under the framework of the Regional Component, DHRP also supported a number of capacity development activities for the Implementing Partners and their partner CSOs from Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine. Additionally, in coordination with partners, the civic literacy test has been conducted in all three countries, (commissioned by PACT Inc in Belarus and by UNDP in Moldova and Ukraine), with a follow up development of the analytical trend-based report, as well as the regional study and practical guidance for the CSOs has been elaborated on application of the human rights based approach in their work (for more details please see the report for the Regional Component in the Annex 4).Throughout the project period, DHRP widely promoted civil society assessment of Ukraine’s commitments under various international treaties and conventions, including the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action plan, the Convention against Torture, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).  |
| **18. Comments on the financial reporting**Refer to ANNEX A 1 for the financial status in context of DHRP Ukraine.Refer to ANNEX A 2 for the financial status in context of the Regional Component.  |
| **Annexes** |
| Annex A 1. DHRP Ukraine: Financial status – yearly budget plus expendituresAnnex A 2. Regional Component: Financial status – yearly budget plus expendituresAnnex B. Status in logical frameworkAnnex 1a – [Fostering Democratization (UNDP/DHRP 2013-2017)](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4RzQwVHRpX3o1UDQ/view?usp=sharing)Annex 1b – [Promoting Human Rights (UNDP/DHRP 2013-2017)](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4M1REeWdadjdVd1E/view?usp=sharing)Annex 1c – [Developing Civil Society (UNDP/DHRP 2013-2017)](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4emhvc0VzVzF4bUk/view?usp=sharing)Annex 2 – [Hubs’ final organisational assessment results](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4RG50UHdYTnltQWc/view?usp=sharing)Annex 3 – [Defining civil society in Ukraine (summary of main findings)](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4eWFOXzlZN0FlQzg/view?usp=sharing)Annex 4 – [Project completion report for DHRP regional component.](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4RE5LMEtqeUxfcGc/view?usp=sharing) Annex 5 – [DHRP final project evaluation report](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6PWVKrwu4f4ZlNicVhWVzFzUkk/view?usp=sharing)  |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)