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Objectives and expected results of judicial reform in Ukraine:

**Objective 1:** The legislative and regulatory framework for judicial reform complies with European and international norms and supports judicial accountability and independence.


2. Expected Result 1.2: Constitutional Reform Related to the Judiciary is Pursued in an Inclusive Manner.

**Objective 2:** The accountability and transparency of key judicial institutions and operations are strengthened.

1. Expected Result 2.1: Ukrainian Judges are Appointed on Objective, Knowledge- and Performance-Based Criteria.

2. Expected Result 2.2: Ukrainian Judges are Disciplined in Transparent Processes.

3. Expected Result 2.3: The Regulatory and Institutional Framework for Judicial Accountability and Integrity is Strengthened.

**Objective 3:** The professionalism and effectiveness of the Ukrainian judiciary are strengthened.

1. Expected Result 3.1: The Skills and Competencies of Ukrainian Judges and Court Staff are Bolstered through Modern Demand-Driven Training Programs.

2. Expected Result 3.2: Judicial Operations are Evaluated and Funded According to an Objective Assessment of Needs and Performance.

3. Expected Result 3.3: The SJA’s Capacity to Represent and Support the Developing Needs of Ukraine’s Judiciary is Strengthened.

4. Expected Result 3.4: The Capacity of Courts and Judicial Institutions to Communicate Effectively with the Public is Enhanced, Leading to Greater Public Appreciation of Their Activities.
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**ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>case management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNU</td>
<td>Chernivtsi National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COJ</td>
<td>Council of Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>Court Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Citizen Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible Judiciary Program in Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>High Administrative Court of Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCJ</td>
<td>High Council of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQC</td>
<td>High Qualifications Commission of Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAHR</td>
<td>Institute of Applied Humanitarian Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>Interim Special Commission on Judicial Vetting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNU</td>
<td>Lviv National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSJ</td>
<td>National School of Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJA</td>
<td>State Judicial Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROL</td>
<td>Combating Corruption and Strengthening Rule of Law in Ukraine project (USAID)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible Judiciary Program in Ukraine (FAIR) was a five-year project that began implementation on October 1, 2011. FAIR was designed to build upon initiatives implemented by the USAID Combating Corruption and Strengthening Rule of Law in Ukraine (UROL) project conducted from 2006 to 2011.

FAIR supported legislative, regulatory, and institutional reform of judicial institutions to build the foundation for a more accountable and independent judiciary, and included five key components. Component 1 focused on developing a constitutional, legislative, and regulatory framework for judicial reform that is compliant with European and international standards and supports judicial accountability and independence. Component 2 centered on strengthening the accountability and transparency of key judicial institutions and operations. Component 3 dealt with strengthening the professionalism and effectiveness of the Ukrainian judiciary. Component 4 was directed at strengthening the role of civil society organizations (CSOs) as advocates for and monitors of judicial reform. Component 5, added in December 2014 after the Revolution of Dignity that ousted former President Viktor Yanukovych, supported implementation of the Law on the Purification of Government of September 16, 2014.

This final performance report includes a summary of FAIR’s accomplishments and success stories to highlight its achievements. It provides background information regarding every expected result, discusses problems encountered, shares what objectives were not achieved, and explains what circumstances prevented these achievements. Additionally, it outlines lessons learned and suggestions for possible follow-on programs under each objective.
SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

OBJECTIVE 1: THE LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL REFORM COMPLIES WITH EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL NORMS AND SUPPORTS JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INDEPENDENCE

Constitutional Reform
- Supported adoption of amendments to the Constitution that brought the legal framework for the judiciary in line with international and European standards strengthening judicial independence and accountability.
- Conducted a comprehensive awareness campaign that raised public understanding and increased support for constitutional reforms related to the judiciary.
- Promoted consensus and an inclusive approach to the development of draft constitutional amendments related to human rights, including key provisions concerning the right to fair trial and prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Legal and Regulatory Framework for the Judiciary
- Supported adoption of an amended Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges in line with Council of Europe (COE) Venice Commission recommendations.
- Assisted the presidential administration, High Qualifications Commission of Judges (HQC), and State Judicial Administration (SJA) in developing regulations to effectively implement new provisions of the Law on Judiciary and Status Judges promoting better access to court decisions, strengthening court security, and improving court budgeting processes and procedures for transferring judges.
- Supported the development of the regulatory framework for the National Bar Association of Ukraine, including strengthening requirements for admission to the legal profession and improving disciplinary procedures for ethical violations by lawyers.

Legal Education Reform
- Assisted the Ministry of Education (MOE), Ministry of Justice (MOJ), and leading law schools in organizing and conducting two international conferences, five nationwide policy-level roundtable discussions, 13 law faculty development programs, 11 rule of law lectures with 1,700 unique online viewers, and a legal education study visit to Germany, all of which resulted in the development of draft National Legal Education Standards laying the foundation for comprehensive law school curricula reform and a draft Legal Education Reform Concept Paper outlining the government’s comprehensive vision for legal education reform.
- Engaged civil society in analyzing the legal knowledge, professional skills, and abilities that law graduates should have to meet modern job market requirements, paving the way for developing competence-based legal education standards and engaging professional associations of lawyers in legal
education reform. As a result of these initiatives, the Association of Advocates of Ukraine and Ukrainian Bar Association established committees to support legal education reform.

- Developed a methodology for independent, external, on-site assessment of the quality of legal education based on international and European standards and successfully tested this tool at Lviv National University (LNU) Law School and Chernivtsi National University (CNU) Law School, providing these institutions with recommendations for improving the quality of their legal education.
- Supported the design and implementation of a strategic development and action plan for LNU Law School, setting out a vision for developing high-quality legal education.
- Supported the development and implementation of an honor code for law students, faculty, administrators, and support staff at CNU Law School, providing a mechanism for ensuring academic integrity.
- Supported LNU and CNU in implementing an online anticorruption course with Washington and Lee University School of Law, providing a real-time modern legal education experience for law students on two continents.
- Supported the MOE and MOJ in piloting a standardized entrance exam for admissions to master’s programs in law, promoting merit-based, transparent, and corruption-free admission to nine self-selected law schools nationwide.

**OBJECTIVE 2: THE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY OF KEY JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS AND OPERATIONS ARE STRENGTHENED**

**Judicial Selection**

- Supported the HQC in conducting three rounds of nationwide judicial testing and selection processes that resulted in appointing more than 900 judges in a more merit-based and transparent manner.
- Supported the HQC and National School of Judges (NSJ) in developing and training a cadre of 50 test item writers, building sustainability into the process for developing, piloting, validating, and revising test items to be used in judicial selection and performance evaluation processes.
- Supported the HQC in developing and defining judicial competencies that allowed it to better evaluate the professional knowledge, skills, and abilities of judicial candidates and sitting judges. This also included supporting the Commission in developing tools for general skills and psychological testing based on defined competencies.
- Conducted a business process analysis of the HQC and provided software and hardware to automate the qualifications exam and create and maintain electronic dossiers for judicial candidates and judges, expanding the Commission’s efficiency and effectiveness.
- Provided the HQC with audio-visual recording equipment for use during its judicial selection, performance evaluation, and discipline processes, increasing its transparency and accountability.
Judicial Discipline

- Supported the HQC in developing regulations for the processing and adjudication of complaints of judicial misconduct to guarantee fair and transparent judicial discipline procedures in line with international and European standards.

- Supported the HQC in developing and disseminating a standardized judicial misconduct complaint form, which assists the Commission in more effectively processing complaints and educates the public about the judicial discipline process. More than one-third of complaints are now filed using the standardized form, which is available on the HQC’s website.

- Prepared and published a manual on investigating and adjudicating complaints of judicial misconduct that sets out guidelines and provides tips for both HQC commissioners and disciplinary inspectors.

- Designed and implemented comprehensive curricula for initial and ongoing training programs for HQC disciplinary inspectors to increase their ability to properly investigate complaints of judicial misconduct and improve the quality of their written reports.

- Supported civil society monitoring of HQC judicial disciplinary practices and provided the Commission with recommendations on how to improve the quality of decisions in disciplinary cases and unify the application of rules and procedures in its case law, including appropriate sanctions.

Judicial Self-Governance

- Supported the development of a new, modern Code of Judicial Ethics, as well as Commentary to the Code, both of which were approved by the Council of Judges (COJ), providing judges with clear standards and guidance related to their conduct on and off the bench.

- Trained 15 newly appointed members of the High Council of Justice (HCJ) on international and European standards, best practices, and lessons learned related to judicial selection and discipline, providing the tools and information to more effectively fulfill their important roles, which have long-lasting consequences.

- Supported the HCJ by providing audio-visual recording equipment to broadcast its hearings live online, increasing transparency and accountability related to judicial selection and discipline processes.

OBJECTIVE 3: THE PROFESSIONALISM AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UKRAINIAN JUDICIARY ARE STRENGTHENED

Judicial Training

- Supported the NSJ in developing its Strategic Development Plan for 2014-2018, which provides a framework for strengthening the quality of professional development opportunities made available to judges and court staff — a first in Ukraine.

- Improved the NSJ’s capacity to design and implement distance learning courses for judges and court staff, including the first online course of judges on judicial ethics and a course for court staff on judicial administration.
Nearly 500 judges and more than 100 court staff have successfully completed online courses with the NSJ, which regularly includes online programs as part of its ongoing judicial education offerings, saving time and scarce resources.

- Supported NSJ with publishing 15 off-the-shelf curricula for training judges and court staff to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Courses covered rule of law and human rights, judicial ethics, courts and community communications, judicial administration, mediation, and access to courts and court services for persons with disabilities (PWDs). FAIR trained 193 NSJ trainers to teach the courses.

- Assisted NSJ in publishing five manuals to provide judges and court staff with resource materials on key topics, including books on judicial opinion writing, courts and community communications, investigating and adjudicating complaints of judicial misconduct, human resource management, and the *Judges Book: An Introduction to the Profession*.

- Supported the NSJ and SJA in designing and implementing a rigorous Judicial Administration Certificate Program for court administrators and chief judges with Michigan State University, resulting in 120 court administrators and 40 chief judges acquiring modern judicial administration and management skills. In addition, 15 program graduates became judicial administration trainers and continue to train their colleagues.

**Judicial Administration and Management**

- Supported the COJ and SJA in developing and promoting the Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework, which measures the performance of individual courts based on internal and external quality measures. This removed Ukraine from the list of COE Member States without such a system. Since formal adoption of the CPE by the COJ in 2015, 383 courts — nearly 50 percent of all courts nationwide — have implemented the Framework, providing them with a baseline on areas where they are doing well and where they can improve their overall operations.

- Supported the COJ in preparing and implementing a case-weighting survey for trial and appellate courts for all jurisdictions (civil and criminal, administrative, and commercial), enabling the COJ to make informed managerial decisions about case assignment, workload management, and court budgets.

- Assisted the COJ in developing the Strategic Plan for the Ukrainian Judiciary for 2013 to 2015, establishing core values and strategic issues for the judiciary — a first in Ukraine for any branch of government.

- Supported the President’s Judicial Reform Council in developing the Concept for Improving the Infrastructure for Logistical and Administrative Support of the Judiciary, providing a roadmap for reforming the infrastructure of the courts.

- Supported the SJA in installing automated information kiosks in 42 courts, enabling court users to access information about court services and pay court fees directly at the courthouse rather than having to go back and forth to a bank.
• Supported the COJ and SJA in developing regulations on an automated case management system (CMS) for courts, providing for improved court operations, including automated random case assignment and better public access to real-time court information.

• Assisted the COJ and SJA in implementing a pilot e-court project in three courts in the Odesa region that supported the transition to paperless case management, resulting in significant reductions in the length of court proceedings and considerable financial savings.

Court and Community Communications

• Supported the HCJ, COJ, and SJA in developing a series of strategic documents to guide judicial institutions and courts in public outreach and communications activities, including a model job description for public information officers, regulations on the Press Center of the Ukrainian Judiciary, and the Communication Strategy for the Council of Judges.

• Supported the NSJ in preparing tailored educational materials for judges and court staff, as well as journalists. Materials included the Courts and Community Communications Manual for Judges and Court Staff, the Courts and Community Communications Curriculum, and the Courts and Media Manual for Journalists.

• Supported the in SJA launching a distance learning course for court staff on Court and Community Communications, resulting in 38 court staff from across Ukraine improving their public outreach skills using modern, cost-effective means.

• Supported the HCJ and COJ in developing their websites, improving greater public access to judicial information.

• Developed and disseminated public awareness leaflets, brochures, and videos on the judiciary and court services, providing the public with useful information about how to access justice.

• Supported 26 courts in developing and implementing communication strategies, resulting in greater transparency in the day-to-day operations of individual courts and increasing the overall level of satisfaction of court users.

OBJECTIVE 4: THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS AS ADVOCATES FOR AND MONITORS OF JUDICIAL REFORM IS STRENGTHENED

Civil Society Engagement in Judicial Reform

• Supported civil society monitoring of court cases related to freedom of assembly, resulting in recommendations to improve the quality of related court decisions.

• Supported civil society monitoring of court cases regarding gender discrimination, leading to the development of a specialized training program for judges on how to better consider such cases, as well as drafting of amendments to discriminatory laws.
• Assisted the COJ in adopting a decision to collect gender disaggregated judicial statistical data, providing greater information to study and identify gender issues in the judiciary.

**Civil Society Monitoring of Courts**
• Increased the number of courts using Citizen Report Card (CRC) surveys to measure user satisfaction with court services from 34 in 2012 to 313 in 2016, shifting nearly half of all courts from a court-centric approach of judicial administration and management to an approach focused more on customer service and court users. This also resulted in an increase of court users’ recommendations being implemented by courts, from 39 percent in 2014 to 61.5 percent in 2016.

• Supported CSOs in monitoring and auditing access to courts and court services for PWDs in 20 courts in 10 regions, resulting in more than 20 recommendations on removing physical barriers and improving access to court information.

• Supported partnership between CSOs and the NSJ in developing a manual for court staff on how to better serve the needs of PWDs. This also included the development of a curriculum for training court staff on communicating and providing court services to PWDs and preparing 20 NSJ trainers to teach the course. As result of a series of training programs, 589 court staff nationwide improved their ability to understand and serve the special needs of communicating with PWDs.

**OBJECTIVE 5: SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW ON THE PURIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT**

**Legal, Regulatory and Institutional Framework for Lustration and Vetting**
• Supported the opportunity for representatives of the Verkhovna Rada (Parliament), MOJ, HQC, HCJ, and Interim Special Commission on Judicial Vetting (ISC) to study best practices and lessons learned related to the lustration and vetting of public officials and judges in Poland and the Czech Republic, resulting in the drafting of amendments to the Law on the Purification of Government in line with COE Venice Commission recommendations.

• Supported the MOJ by providing recommendations on improving the electronic registry of people subject to lustration as required by the Law on the Purification of Government.

**Professional Development and Capacity Building**
• Assisted the MOJ by conducting a leadership and management training program for its Lustration Department to ensure proper coordination and implementation of the Law on Purification of Government, which led to vetting and lustration of 929 public officials.

• Supported a comprehensive skills-based training program for newly appointed heads of the MOJ’s regional departments covering critical issues related to strategic planning, human resource management, and communications.
Civil Society Engagement and Public Awareness

- Supported the ISC with public outreach, resulting in the filing and consideration of more than 2,000 complaints against judges who handled Revolution of Dignity Euromaidan protest cases. The ISC ultimately recommended disciplinary measures or dismissal for 66 of those judges.

- Supported 10 CSOs in raising public awareness and monitoring the lustration and vetting process to promote proper implementation of the Law on Purification of Government in line with public demand.

- Supported CSOs in raising public awareness and monitoring administrative services provided by the MOJ to the public to ensure client-oriented delivery of public services.
OBJECTIVE 1

THE LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL REFORM COMPLIES WITH EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL NORMS AND SUPPORTS JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INDEPENDENCE

EXPECTED RESULT 1.1: UKRAINIAN JUDICIAL REFORM LEGISLATION RECEIVES FAVORABLE COMMENTS FROM THE VENICE COMMISSION AS MEETING INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND REFLECTS DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERT INPUT

Background. The May 2010 Law on the High Council of Justice and the July 2010 Law on Judiciary and Status of Judges introduced fundamental reforms to the judiciary, including creating the HQC as the single national body responsible for judicial selection and discipline; eliminating 13 regional commissions; bringing the SJA under the control of the judiciary; requiring testing of all judicial candidates; creating the NSJ; and establishing an automated system for random case assignment. However, there was backsliding after the laws were adopted. Activities under Expected Result 1.1 focused on efforts to further amend the laws to ensure a sustainable legal framework for the judiciary in line with international and European standards.

FAIR provided support to changes to laws and regulations that included input from government officials and civil society, as well as expertise from international and European experts. FAIR activities included:

- Providing comparative law materials and information on international and European best practices
- Supporting inclusive events, such as hearings, workshops, conferences, and discussion forums
- Assisting drafting laws and regulations

After the Revolution of Dignity of 2014, the process of amending laws and regulations become a priority. In January 2015, President Petro Poroshenko approved the Sustainable Development Strategy, “Ukraine – 2020.” Judicial reform was among key reforms needed to ensure compliance to European standards for the rule of law, and the strategy focused on amending legislation to restore trust in the judiciary and improving the quality of judges and court staff.

In October 2014, President Poroshenko established the Judicial Reform Council as an advisory body to develop justice sector reform legislation. FAIR supported the Council by providing technical expertise in drafting legislation and administrative support in conducting meetings. In May 2015, President Poroshenko approved the Justice Sector Reform Strategy for 2015-2020, which was developed by the Council with FAIR support. This strategy sets priorities for judicial reform and has led to significant accomplishments.
FAIR worked with a variety of institutional partners, including the Verkhovna Rada, HCJ, HQC, and the presidential administration to improve the legislative and regulatory framework for the judiciary, and constantly monitored legislative initiatives to prevent backsliding. These activities paralleled efforts regarding constitutional reform. (See Expected Result 1.2).

Accomplishments. FAIR contributed to improving the legal framework for the judiciary by supporting efforts to amend the Law on the High Council of Justice and the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges to bring them in with the Constitution and Venice Commission recommendations. The project developed recommendations to improve the draft Law on the High Council Justice; more than 10 revisions were included in the final draft version.

FAIR also contributed to the development of the draft Law on Ensuring the Right to a Fair Trial. Adopted in February 2015, this law amended the Law on the High Council of Justice and the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges. It improved judicial disciplinary procedures by better defining grounds and providing a menu of sanctions. It also introduced performance evaluation of judges, promoting greater professionalism and accountability. The Venice Commission later found the law to be generally responsive to its recommendations. To implement the law, FAIR worked with its partners, including the HCJ, HQC, SJA, and NSJ, identifying problems, inconsistencies, and areas for improvement that were used to further refine the law.

In June 2016, the Verkhovna Rada adopted an amended Law on the Judiciary and Status of judges that eliminated all three high courts, simplified the court system from four to three tiers, set rules for the competitive selection for all judicial positions top-down starting with the Supreme Court, and introduced anticorruption and intellectual property courts. Despite shortcomings, the law was a significant step forward in implementing the constitutional amendments discussed under Expected Result 1.2 and brought the legal framework for the judiciary more in line with international and European standards for judicial independence and accountability. Its adoption was a clear sign of political will to promote sustainable judicial reform.

Improving Court Security and Budgeting Processes
FAIR supported the SJA in developing regulations for the new Court Security Service, balancing the need for public access to courts and the need to protect judges, court staff, and courthouses. The service, under the SJA, now has a sound regulatory framework developed by a working group supported by FAIR that includes clearly defined competencies for recruiting and training court security officers and procedures for managing emergency situations in courts.

In support of improved court budget-making processes, FAIR brought together representatives of the COJ, SJA, Ministry of Finance, and Verkhovna Rada Budget Committee to discuss and identify gaps in the legal and regulatory framework. This resulted in several changes, including better engagement of the HCJ and SJA in the budgeting process and providing individual courts with greater flexibility in allocating resources to meet their needs. FAIR advocated for these changes, which were later included in the 2015 amended Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges significantly strengthening the role of the judiciary in the budgeting process.
Creating Higher Standards for the Judiciary Through Regional Cooperation

As a result of FAIR support of the participation of Ukrainian delegations at an annual series of regional Conferences of Chief Justices of Central and Eastern Europe in Tbilisi, Georgia (June 2014), Brijuni, Croatia (October 2015), and Belgrade, Serbia (June 2016), justices of the Supreme Court of Ukraine benefited from off-the-record discussions on topics ranging from issuing clear, well-reasoned opinions at all levels and handling long trials to continuing judicial education and building public trust by strengthening media services. At the conference in Brijuni, Chief Justice Yaroslav Romaniuk signed the Brijuni Statement on the Independence of the Judiciary Principles, a landmark regional document that promotes judicial independence and integrity by setting clear objectives and goals for every judiciary to achieve, with a focus on inspiring judges about the importance of their work. The Principles also set benchmarks for relations between the judiciary and the legislative and executive branches, as well as between the judiciary and the media, contributing to building public respect for the judiciary and judges while providing foundational support for continued development of rule of law.

Promoting Greater Access to Court Decisions

FAIR supported improving the legal and regulatory framework related to accessibility to court decisions in line with international and European standards. Based on project recommendations, the Law on Amending Some Legislative Acts of Ukraine regarding the Consideration of Cases by the Supreme Court of Ukraine of October 20, 2011, canceled the rule that all court decisions be posted on the Unified Registry of Court Decisions. This addressed the challenge of an overwhelming number of court decisions being posted at once. FAIR supported the SJA and COJ to develop a list of court decisions to be included in the Registry, and assisted the SJA in amending the caseflow instructions for courts. In response to FAIR recommendations, the SJA introduced a unique case numbering system to be instituted and maintained through all stages of the appellate and cassation processes to make it easier to search the Registry, which increased its functionality without the need to make legislative changes.

Supporting Anticorruption Efforts

FAIR developed recommendations to ensure consistent background checks for judicial candidates under the Law on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction. It also analyzed provisions of the Law of Ukraine on the Rules of Ethical Conduct, to safeguard compliance with judicial independence guarantees under the Constitution, and the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, and developed recommendations...
to eliminate any contradictions. FAIR provided these recommendations to members of Parliament for their consideration.

After the National Anticorruption Bureau and Anticorruption Prosecutor Office started operations, it became apparent that local court judges did not have the appropriate level of skills and support to consider their cases of high-level corruption. Together with U.S. Department of Justice Overseas Prosecutorial Development Assistance and Training program, FAIR supported a working group that developed a framework for establishing an anticorruption court. The working group included representatives of the National Anticorruption Bureau, the Anticorruption Prosecutor Office, and civil society, who developed a concept paper for an anticorruption court. FAIR also developed a detailed action plan to create the court. Recommendations developed by the working group and FAIR resulted in the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges of June 2016, including the establishment of the High Specialized Anticorruption Court.

Advancing Access to Free Legal Aid
After adoption of the Law on Free Legal Aid in 2011, FAIR supported the MOJ in developing the regulatory framework for providing free legal aid services. The project helped the MOJ’s Coordinating Center for Providing Legal Aid to launch regional branches by establishing selection criteria for engaging defense lawyers to work in regional offices and developing a methodology for assessing the quality of its legal services. FAIR also partnered with other donors in meeting the needs of the Center, including jointly funding an information campaign to promote free legal aid services to target audiences.

Strengthening the Legal Profession
In July 2012, the Verkhovna Rada adopted the Law on the Bar and Law Practice, which aligned the status of the defense bar in Ukraine with European standards by establishing a self-governed organization of defense attorneys, the Ukraine National Bar Association, and granting it self-regulating authorities. FAIR provided expert support to the association in developing internal bylaws and regulations that promoted higher standards for admission to the bar and fair and transparent procedures for disciplining attorneys based on the best practices and lessons learned from the American Bar Association.

Developing the Legal Framework for Alternative Dispute Resolution
FAIR supported the drafting mediation legislation through a comprehensive review of competing draft laws, focusing on ensuring that the legal framework encouraged parties to opt for mediation before filing a case in court to reduce backlogs. FAIR made recommendations that would establish clearer standards for becoming a mediator and create a system for continuous professional development for mediators. Two draft laws on mediation are still pending in the Parliament.

FAIR also supported the National Association of Mediators of Ukraine in conducting expert meetings and public events to promote mediation as a tool for alternative dispute resolution. This association also developed and implemented a mediation training program for judges with the NSJ to raise awareness with the judiciary about the benefits of mediation.
Problems encountered. FAIR’s main obstacle was the lack of political will to proceed with holistic justice sector reform. Until 2015, there was no long-term strategy or unified vision for judicial reform. The Parliament often adopted conflicting amendments to legislation, as well as amended laws that demonstrated backsliding on key gains. Lack of judicial leadership was also a factor, as the judiciary did not speak with one voice and could not present a clear, consolidated statement on proposed amendments.

Ongoing political crises also presented significant challenges. Early in the project in 2011, there was hope that President Viktor Yanukovich would proceed with the full-scale judicial reform to safeguard judicial independence and accountability, as the 2010 Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges introduced major changes in the judicial system. However, it became clear that President Yanukovich was not focused on developing democratic institutions, which led to the violent events of the Revolution of Dignity in 2014.

The Revolution of Dignity marked a new stage in the reform process. The newly elected Verkhovna Rada, the new Cabinet of Ministers, and newly elected President Poroshenko had to move quickly to meet public demands for reform. Throughout this period, FAIR supported governmental partners in responding to challenges in light of very fluid situations.

Lessons learned. Throughout implementation, FAIR learned the value of providing a neutral and balanced platform for professional discussions between a broad range of stakeholders. The environment was highly politicized and turbulent, but FAIR worked to build fruitful cooperation with all its partners on nonpartisan basis.

To support its activities, FAIR signed memoranda of cooperation with the presidential administration and the MOJ. These documents outlined areas for current and future cooperation to promote justice sector reforms led by these institutions and proved to be a useful tool in supporting seamless project implementation.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. These activities are recommended to continue improvements to the legal framework:

- Improve the Unified Registry of Court Decisions
- Support establishment of a sound and effective alternative dispute resolution system
- Support development of the Court Security Service
- Support implementation of newly adopted laws related to the enforcement of judgments
- Support implementation of key provisions of the amended Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, including establishing an anticorruption court
- Cooperate with the Verkhovna Rada Secretariat in implementing a series of advanced-level training programs to improve law drafting skills
- Support public awareness of judicial reform
Legal Education Reform

Background. FAIR worked to improve the quality of legal education, which continues to face serious challenges in meeting job market demands for legal professionals. Even respected Ukrainian law schools still provide poor instruction, weak links to the legal job market, and a limited understanding of the quickly changing professional environment. As a result, these law schools lack the capacity to consistently produce high-quality legal professionals needed for a well-functioning justice sector.

In a 2013 independent survey that ranked law schools on a 100-point scale, graduates, employers, and experts awarded more than 20 points to only five of Ukraine’s 120 law schools. At the same time, job market survey reports indicated that only one in seven law school graduates found a job in the legal field. Furthermore, Ukraine’s legal education system suffers from the lack of a clear, comprehensive, formally approved vision of legal education reform, absence of approved legal education standards, and lack of comprehensive policies for legal education quality assurance.

Accomplishments. FAIR’s efforts to address these challenges included supporting the MOE, MOJ, the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Science and Education, the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, leading law schools, lawyers’ professional associations, and other CSOs through the following key activities.

Building Political Will and Capacity to Reform Legal Education
FAIR engaged the MOJ and the MOE in the legal education process to ensure policymakers were aware of legal education challenges and possible ways to address them through comprehensive reform. FAIR assisted both ministries to move from lack of interest before the Revolution of Dignity by supporting initiatives aimed at reforming legal education in 2014-2015 to coordinated, minister-level cooperation and support of the reforms in 2016. In May 2016, Minister of Education Lilia Hrynevych and Minister of Justice Pavlo Petrenko publicly announced their cooperation on advancing legal education reform, including joint efforts to develop national legal education standards compatible with modern job market demands. Key activities included:

- Concluding protocols of cooperation with the MOJ and MOE, outlining areas of existing and future cooperation to promote legal education reform in accordance with international and European standards.
- Conducting a study visit to Germany for key Ukrainian legal education policymakers, opinion leaders, and specialists in cooperation with the German Foundation for International Legal Cooperation. Twelve representatives obtained hands-on experience on German best practices and standards for training high-quality lawyers, particularly judges.
- Supporting the development of draft national legal education standards for the bachelor’s degree in law.
- Supporting the MOE in drafting the Legal Education Reform Concept Paper and action plan.
FAIR’s work on building political will and capacity to reform legal education had a positive impact on promoting and enabling legal education reform in Ukraine in line with international and European best practices at the highest level of government. It is noteworthy that Ms. Hrynevych, a study visit participant, became the first education minister committed to modernizing legal education in the country.

**Advocating for Legislative Support of Legal Education Reform**

FAIR contributed to developing a draft Law on Higher Education as it relates to legal education. FAIR submitted the draft law along with proposals for alternative ways to regulate higher education matters following best international practices. The bill became law in July 2014, and prescribed a general framework for transforming legal education in accordance with best practices of education management and education quality assurance. However, because of its general nature, the law did not comprehensively reform legal education. FAIR continued to advocate for more comprehensive legislative measures to support education reform.

FAIR also advocated for overhauling the current two-tier legal education system. The introduction of a master’s as a base degree for lawyers in Ukraine — as it is for doctors, pharmacists, and veterinarians — is important to meet modern job market expectations. This will increase the base requirements for law schools and minimize the time and resources needed to prepare a legal professional for the demands of the modern job market. As a result, a draft Legal Education Reform Concept Paper provides for transition to crosscutting master’s degree programs in law.

**Aligning Legal Education with Modern Job Market Demands**

FAIR worked with the MOE, MOJ, leading law schools, lawyers’ professional associations, and CSOs to implement initiatives and projects to advocate and build the momentum for comprehensive legal education reform. For the first time in the country, FAIR engaged the Ukrainian Marketing Association in analyzing the legal knowledge, professional skills, values, and attitudes law graduates need to meet modern

---

**Providing a Platform to Discuss Legal Education**

In 2013-2015, FAIR brought together policymakers, law school administrators, academics, students, legal employers, representatives of lawyers’ professional associations, and independent experts to discuss challenges and opportunities in improving the quality of legal education.

- With the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe project and Kharkiv National Law School, conducted the international conference “Improvement of Legal Education in Ukraine: Fundamentals”

- With LNU, conducted the international conference “Modern Trends in Legal Education”

- With the MOJ and MOE, conducted the roundtable discussion “Optimal Structure of Legal Education in Ukraine: Two-Tier Model (Bachelor – Master) or Cross-Cutting Master Program?”

---
job market demands, the aim being to support the development of a legal profession qualifications framework and standards for the legal profession and education. Information from the 2013 survey contributed to rethinking of the approaches to legal education, particularly to curricula development in law schools, and contributed to the development of the draft National Legal Education Standard. The survey results also led to consolidation efforts of lawyers’ professional associations to support legal education reform and advancement of the legal profession in Ukraine.

**Engaging Professional Associations of Lawyers in Legal Education Reform**
FAIR promoted the establishment of legal education reform committees in the Association of Ukrainian Lawyers and the Association of Ukrainian Advocates. These committees now engage the legal community in building bridges between academia and the legal profession. FAIR also supported capacity building at these organizations by sharing best practices of bar associations in advancing legal education, drawing on bar practices in developed countries and those of the International Bar Association. This work led to the associations’ active involvement in the legal education process, including organizing opinion surveys about legal education reform for their members, and organizing and participating in roundtable and panel discussions on reform.

**Developing and Piloting the Methodology for Independent, External, On-Site Assessment of Legal Education Quality and Building Capacity to Use It**
FAIR supported the MOE, the MOJ, and leading law schools in designing and testing the methodology for an independent, on-site assessment of legal education quality as an effective tool for monitoring, and continuing improvements of legal education given Ukrainian law schools and nationwide. (See the Snapshot on the next page.)

**Building Law Schools’ Capacity to Strengthen Legal Education Through Follow-On Pilot Projects**
Following the assessments of LNU and CNU, FAIR offered the schools consistent demand-driven assistance in their efforts to enhance the quality of legal education by implementing recommendations provided in the assessment reports. From September 2014 to March 2015, FAIR supported LNU in developing its Strategic Plan 2015-2020 and Action Plan, the first strategic documents for a law school in Ukraine. Strategic planning included establishing the Strategic Planning Committee; conducting strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis; collecting stakeholder feedback; and receiving external feedback. The process resulted in a draft Strategic Plan and draft Action Plan developed by the Strategic Planning Committee, which received approval by LNU’s Academic Council in April 2015. FAIR developed a report describing the Strategic Plan development process, and provided recommendations for managing strategic planning processes at law schools.

From April 2015 to February 2016, FAIR implemented a program to improve the quality of computer-based testing at LNU. The project conducted four training courses on international standards and best practices of developing, peer-reviewing, approval, piloting, and calibrating high-quality test questions, as well as administration and monitoring of testing for 10 LNU faculty members. As a result, the team developed more than 900 test items covering nine legal disciplines. The review and analysis of test questions — statistical and psychometrical — followed. FAIR shared the report on improving the quality of testing at LNU and made recommendations on building other law schools’ capacity to ensure high-quality testing.
SNAPSHOT

Assessments Support Improved Legal Education

Independent assessments help to improve the quality of legal education in Ukraine

An independent survey in 2013 found that only five of 120 higher legal education institutions in Ukraine received more than 20 points on a 100-point performance scale by graduates, employers, and experts. In addition, job market survey reports indicated that only one in seven law school graduates found a job in the legal field.

To address these challenges, the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project conducted the first external, independent quality assessments of Ukrainian law schools, at Ivan Franko Lviv National University (LNU) Law School in 2014 and at Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University Law School in 2015. FAIR evaluated key performance areas, including policies and procedures for internal quality assurance, admission and assessment of students, and quality assurance of teaching staff.

Based on survey results, FAIR provided recommendations such as improving computer-based testing through training on testing methodologies, providing comprehensive training for faculty on modern interactive teaching methods, and fully utilizing the potential of online education. FAIR also supported LNU in designing and implementing a strategic action plan. The project facilitated four training courses for LNU faculty on international standards and best practices of testing, and interactive teaching methods. Volodymyr Melnyk, rector of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, explained, “We must aspire to open a new page in the development of the university, requiring an assessment of quality with proper reflection. This pilot program is at the vanguard of the university’s efforts to create objective criteria for assessing the current state of affairs which should continue no matter what.”

Building on this success, FAIR supported the development of a strategic plan to improve the quality of legal education at the LNU Law School and an action plan to implement the strategy. FAIR also provided faculty training on the assessment methodology, interactive methods of teaching, international best practices, and in testing.

Piloting independent, external, on-site quality assessments improved legal education in the two pilot schools and contributed to advancing nationwide legal education reform.
FAIR also supported LNU and CNU in implementing Ukraine’s first international online anticorruption course taught in English in cooperation with the Washington and Lee University School of Law in Lexington, Virginia. Students from all three institutions engaged in problem-based learning focused on the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and key regional and domestic corrupt practices acts. The students led community service projects, one of which resulted in establishing the Chernivtsi Student Anticorruption Action Center, which focuses on fighting academic corruption in the region.

From September 2015 to September 2016, FAIR pioneered the successful development and adoption of the Ukraine honor code for law students, faculty, administrators, and support staff that integrated international best practices. The project worked simultaneously with the LNU and CNU working groups to develop the codes, and provided six webinars on university community ethics, in addition to two on-site workshops on development and implementation of honor codes. (See the Snapshot on the next page.) FAIR’s work on developing honor codes preceded the January 2016 launch of the MOE’s Strengthening Academic Integrity in Ukraine Project in partnership with American Councils for International Education and supported by the U.S. Embassy in Ukraine. FAIR and its partners shared their first-hand experience with the project and its partners to support their work on enhancing academic integrity in Ukraine.

Implementing Independent, External, Standardized Entrance Exams for Master’s Degree Programs in Law
Since the implementation of the nationwide external, standardized testing of high school graduates as a prerequisite for entering universities in 2008 onward, admissions to master’s programs have remained the most corruption-prone element of Ukraine’s higher education system. Significantly, the public perceives admissions to law programs as the most corrupt. (See the Snapshot on page 20.)

Improving Legal Education Quality Through Faculty Training
In November 2015, FAIR, with the NSJ, involved 15 law professors from LNU, CNU, and the Ukrainian Catholic University Rule of Law Center in a training-of-trainers program for judges-trainers. Based on pedagogical techniques for adult learners, it was their first learning opportunity in practical teaching skills. In April 2016, FAIR conducted a follow-on training for 15 faculty members that focused on modern methods of teaching law, specifically the Socratic dialogue.

At the request of the MOE, from January to May 2016, FAIR partnered with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to roll out six training courses on international standards and best practices of testing. Participants included 207 administrators and faculty from the nine law schools participating in the pilot independent entrance exam for master’s programs in law from September 2015 to August 2016.

FAIR also provided a Rule of Law Lecture Series that contributed to the promotion of high-quality legal education and the advancement of justice sector reforms in line with international and European standards. In February 2016, FAIR delivered a lecture at Kyiv-Mohyla Academy entitled “The Immoral Choice — How Judges
SNAPSHOT

Strengthening Academic Integrity

Ukrainian law school institutes honor codes to increase academic integrity

The Yuri Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (CNU) Law School faced rampant cheating, corrupt academic practices, sexual harassment, and other violations of the honor and dignity of participants in the educational process. In response to an external, independent assessment of legal education quality at CNU that uncovered many of these challenges, the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project supported the law school to be the first in Ukraine to develop an honor code and code of conduct.

Through a series of webinars, FAIR shared information on community ethics and international best practices in developing honor codes for law schools. FAIR provided guidance to the CNU code of conduct working group, which included the participation of law professors and students.

The CNU Law School adopted its first honor code, “Moral and Ethical Minimum,” in December 2015. In February 2016, FAIR conducted a workshop for CNU students, law professors, and administrators on the implementation and enforcement of the code. Following this workshop, the law school established the CNU Committee on Ethics, comprising six faculty members, administrators, and four students elected by their peers.

With FAIR support, CNU has been refining the honor code, and developing rules of procedure and enforcement policies. These continued efforts will help ensure the code is an effective tool in promoting academic integrity, which includes ethical approaches to teaching and learning, as well as the elimination of plagiarism and corruption in the law school setting.

Law School Dean Petro Patsurikivskyi explained that “adoption and further work on our Moral and Ethical Minimum is a small, but a very important step towards enhanced academic integrity and improved legal education.” It is a step that CNU has been sharing with other Ukrainian law schools, policymakers, academics, civic activists, and practitioners to strengthen academic integrity in Ukraine.
SNAPSHOT

Improving Transparency in Legal Education Through Independent Entrance Exams

Enhancing legal education quality through independent, external admissions tests for candidates of master’s degree programs in law

Although independent, external exams for undergraduate degree programs have been used in Ukraine for more than 10 years, the public generally perceived entrance exams for master’s degree programs in law as corrupt and unfair.

Since 2014, the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project has advocated for the introduction of an independent, external, standardized entrance test these programs. In September 2015, the Ministry of Education (MOE) requested FAIR’s assistance in piloting an exam to ensure fair and corruption-free admissions in self-selected law schools.

In coordination with OSCE, FAIR supported the newly established Pilot Project Working Group to organize its regular meetings; draft the pilot exam’s concept, programs, and methodology; provide six training courses on international standards and best practices of testing for 69 professors of the pilot law schools; design multiple choice exam questions; and implement the pilot program.

On July 23, 2016, the MOE successfully administered the pilot exam in nine pilot law schools. The exam consisted of three parts: critical, analytical, and logical thinking akin to the Law School Admission Test in the United States; legal knowledge; and English language. It was simultaneously conducted at 12 venues in Kyiv, Chernivtsi, Lviv, Odesa, and Poltava, where 1,743 candidates completed the exam, which was monitored by observers, including FAIR. The UCEQE automatically processed the answer sheets and announced the exam results through the Unified States Electronic Database on Education on July 27.

The MOE plans to launch a compulsory examination for master’s programs in law schools nationwide in 2017 and use this as a model for introducing independent, external testing in all higher education.

“"This pilot project ensures the transparency of examination procedures and legal education quality. It is also important for overall legal education reform as it can serve as a basis for introducing a unified, standardized qualification exam for all law schools.”

— Liliia Hrynevych, Minister of Education and Science
Participate in the Transformation of Rule of Law to Legal Evil” to raise public awareness about the role of judicial accountability in ensuring the rule of law. More than 600 law students, academics, and legal practitioners, including judges and international rule of law experts, attended the lectures. FAIR supported the online broadcast of all lectures, garnering more than 1,700 unique online viewers.

Support to Law Students Participating in International Law Competitions
FAIR sponsored five law student teams comprising 18 students and seven coaches in five international legal competitions. The team from Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University Law School participated in the International Moot Court Competition on World Trade Organization Law in Halle, Germany, and Kyiv-Mohyla Law School team took part in competitions worldwide, including in the Netherlands, Poland, and the United States. This project support contributed to the education of highly skilled Ukrainian law students, who developed key legal skills in oral presentation, litigation, counseling, mediation, and negotiation.

Problems encountered. The main challenges arose from leadership changes at the MOE, the MOJ, and LNU, and the resulting lack of capacity to maintain institutional memory. FAIR addressed these challenges by building on the advances made in cooperation with former leadership and advocating for legal education reform going forward by providing a neutral forum for constructive public policy discussions among legal education stakeholders.

Lessons learned. FAIR’s efforts to support legal education reform were successful because the pilot projects built momentum and political will — and thus demand for reform. Another key to success was close observation of law schools’ day-to-day operations to understand their practices and identify opportunities for improvement. This is how the idea of a law school development strategy and honor codes arose. Once areas for improvement were identified, FAIR activities supported by an authority were more likely to be successful. For example, to advocate for Kyiv National University Law School to participate in the pilot project on implementing the external, independent, standardized entrance exam for master’s programs, FAIR actively lobbied university authorities, relying on official support from the MOE, the MOJ, and the Cabinet of Ministers, who provided the legal basis for the pilot after a successful advocacy campaign. FAIR also engaged additional stakeholders in the reform process. The project used this approach to involve Ukrainian bar associations in legal education reform by assisting them in creating legal education policy committees. Building coalitions of stakeholders proved to be highly effective when

Rule of Law Lecture Series
In 2015-2016, FAIR conducted a Rule of Law Lecture Series at Ukrainian Catholic University on the following rule of law issues:

• The Rule of Law: Is its future secure?
• The Rule of Law in the U.S. Criminal Justice System
• The Ukrainian Constitutional Reform Process: Challenges to the process and substance from an outsider’s perspective
• Standards of Judicial Discipline: What Works
• The Prosecution on Corruption under the Rule of Law: A German Perspective
• The Role of Civil Society in Guaranteeing the Rule of Law
• Rule of Law and Reforming the Judiciary: Should this be based on international standards or is an “a la carte solution” required?
• Reforms on the Ukrainian Procuracy
• What is “Equal Protection of the Laws”?
• Fight Against Corruption: Criminal investigation methods
preparing the basis for establishing the MOE-MOJ Working Group on Developing Legal Education Reform Concept Paper and Action Plan.

Suggestions for follow-on on programs and activities. Future activities related to legal education reform could include the following:

- Advocate for adoption and implementation of the draft Legal Education Reform Concept Paper and the draft National Legal Education Standard
- Advocate for and provide support to roll out independent, external, standardized entrance examination for master’s programs in law
- Continue to conduct external, independent, on-site assessments of legal education quality by involving the Ukrainian faculty trained on using the Methodology for External, Independent, On-Site Assessments of Legal Education Quality
- Build on faculty training on teaching methodologies and support the establishment of an inter-law school task force on the advancement of legal teaching in Ukraine
- Continue to advocate for cooperation between lawyers’ professional associations and law schools to establish boards of external advisors to facilitate law school development in line with the legal profession’s expectations

EXPECTED RESULT 1.2: CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM RELATED TO THE JUDICIARY IS PURSUED IN AN INCLUSIVE MANNER

Background. Previously, the Constitution had provisions that prevented the establishment of a truly independent and accountable judiciary. The COE Venice Commission regularly criticized provisions that enabled the president to unilaterally liquidate courts, allowed duplication of authorities between the HQC and HCJ on judicial selection and discipline, had limited tools for disciplining judges, and had limited procedures for appointing chief judges. In 2011, President Yanukovych instructed the Constitutional Assembly to develop a draft concept paper to proceed with constitutional reform. This was an ad hoc body, on which academics and civil society were broadly represented. In the fall of 2011, FAIR provided input on the draft concept paper, which defined the objectives, tasks, principles, and procedures for the Constitutional Assembly’s activities. The paper was approved by President Yanukovych in January 2012.

FAIR further supported the Venice Commission by completing a gap analysis of the current Constitution, identifying provisions that contradicted the rule of law and needed improvement to meet European standards. Moreover, to ensure transparency, FAIR assisted the Constitutional Assembly in designing and launching a website to ensure an independent channel for civil society education and active engagement in the constitutional reform process (http://cau.in.ua/).

Meanwhile, the presidential administration developed a draft law on amending provisions of the Constitution regarding the judiciary, which opposition members of Parliament viewed as a danger to the system of checks and balances, as it removed
the that body from the judicial appointment/dismissal process. They were also concerned that the law provided the president with unlimited power over judicial careers (i.e., appointment, transfer, promotion, and dismissal). At the same time, the Venice Commission welcomed proposals to abolish judicial probation periods, to increase the age limit and working experience of judicial candidates, and to implement a ceremonious role for the president in judicial appointments and dismissals. However, the Venice Commission once again pointed out the need to clarify the grounds for judicial discipline and dismissal, and recommended narrowing the scope of judicial immunity. In October 2013, the Verkhovna Rada approved the revised draft law in the first reading.

During the Revolution of Dignity, the constitutional reform process was interrupted, and the Constitutional Assembly lost its legitimacy when President Yanukovych fled the country in February 2014. Throughout the spring of 2014, the new Verkhovna Rada majority and new government focused on stabilizing the country by reforming local self-governance and decentralizing powers. In July 2014, the Verkhovna Rada voted against the adoption of Assembly’s draft law and it was removed from the list of draft laws under consideration.

In March 2015, President Poroshenko established the Constitutional Commission, which consists of 64 members, including members of the Parliament, academics, judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and CSO representatives. The Constitutional Commission focuses on decentralization, reforming the judiciary, and improving the guarantees of civil rights and liberties; it split into three working groups to address each area, and each working group proceeded with developing amendments to the relevant chapters of the Constitution.

Accomplishments. FAIR worked with international donors and Ukrainian partners to enable an inclusive and consistent constitutional reform process. FAIR also worked with civil society and professional organizations to advocate with the Verkhovna Rada, the president, and the presidential administration for the adoption of the draft laws on the required amendments. The project committed to support the Judiciary Working Group and the Human Rights Working Group, ultimately supporting 13 meetings of the former and 33 meetings of the latter.

The Human Rights Working Group reviewed provisions of the Constitution, comparing them to the texts of the Convention on Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and EU Human Rights Charter (2000) to ensure they addressed the current constitutional gaps. FAIR supported regional events to present Working Group outcomes and discussed human rights issues nationwide (Rivne, Ivano-Frankivsk, and Uzhhorod in June 2015, and Kyiv in October 2015). These events included expert panels and public discussions, and aimed at providing a forum to exchange opinions, identify priority areas, and develop recommendations for the Human Rights Working Group. The group solicited Ukrainian society’s expectations of the Constitutional Commission’s activities, and informed participants how the proposed amendments were addressing problems and gaps in human rights regulations. The group is working on proposed amendments, which it will submit to the Constitutional Commission for consideration.
FAIR supported the Judiciary Working Group’s to draft amendments to the Constitution related to the justice sector by providing expert and administrative assistance. After reviewing the drafted amendments in July 2015, the Venice Commission voiced its strong support. In September 2015, the Constitutional Commission approved the final text of the draft amendments to the Constitution in the justice sector and sent them to President Poroshenko for consideration. In November 2015, the president submitted the draft Law on Amending the Constitution (regarding justice) to the Verkhovna Rada.

Throughout the activity of the Constitutional Commission, FAIR provided technical support to its members, attended working group meetings, and commented on the proposed amendments. It also engaged U.S. constitutional law experts to conduct a comparative analysis of judiciary chapters of constitutions in Moldova, Romania, Poland, Lithuania, Georgia, and Kosovo. The experts presented examples of well-drafted constitutional chapters and provisions to members of the Constitutional Commission to raise their understanding of regional and international standards and best practices.

FAIR also worked with its partners to promote adopting the proposed constitutional amendments. To promote the need for constitutional reform to the public and legal community, FAIR supported a nationwide information campaign, “Judging Justly: Informational Campaign for Raising Awareness about the Constitutional Reform Related to Judiciary.” Internews-Ukraine, an NGO, received a competitive grant to run the campaign. In coordination with the presidential administration, Internews-Ukraine conducted focus groups to identify an effective message about the judiciary to raise the public’s awareness about the constitutional reform process. The messages were used to develop three informational videos about the judicial reform and six infographics. The materials were designed to bring broader public attention to the progress of constitutional reform in the judiciary by highlighting changes in the reform process. Internews-Ukraine also trained journalists from regional media outlets on how to effectively cover constitutional reform in the judiciary.

In February 2016, FAIR awarded the Ukrainian Centre for Economic and Political Studies a grant project called “Constitutional Process in Ukraine: Improvement of the Principles of Justice and Human Rights.” The grantee analyzed the adopted amendments to the Constitution in the justice sector and the amendments to human rights, and developed a list of proposals and recommendations for government agencies, political forces, civil society institutions, and all stakeholders. The recommendations were presented at a roundtable discussion with independent experts, civic activists, members of Parliament, and representatives of the government and the presidential administration. High-level representation at the event allowed for fruitful discussion of next steps needed to effectively and efficiently implement amendments for justice to the Constitution, and further efforts in amending the chapter pertaining to human rights. The grantee also conducted a nationwide public opinion poll to gauge attitudes toward the drafts on improving the constitutional principles, and conducted an expert survey regarding the constitutional amendments. Experts, Ukrainian stakeholders, and international partners will use the data and opinions to plan further constitutional reform activities.
Last, on June 2, 2016, the Verkhovna Rada adopted the draft Law on Amending the Constitution regarding the justice sector with 335 votes. This marked the success of nearly 10 years of efforts in constitutional reform conducted with USAID support. Adoption of this law is an important step toward establishing a truly independent judicial system in Ukraine. The new amended Constitution:

- Removes the power of the Verkhovna Rada and president to appoint and dismiss judges
- Limits the role of the president in the establishment and dissolution of courts
- Strengthens guarantees of judicial independence by eliminating the initial five-year appointment of judges in favor of lifetime appointments for all judges and giving the judiciary a greater role in the budget process
- Abolishes the “breach of oath” as a ground for dismissal of judges
- Brings the composition of the HCJ in line with European standards, with more than half of its member judges elected by their peers
- Increases the minimum age to become a judge from 25 to 30
- Includes the participation of the Verkhovna Rada in determining the composition of the HCJ
- Limits judicial immunity to conduct on the bench, thereby promoting greater judicial accountability
- Balances the composition of the Constitutional Court, with its members being appointed by the president, the Verkhovna Rada, and the Congress of Judges after a competitive selection among candidates whose exacting qualifications are listed in the Constitution
- Introduces a constitutional complaint process for individuals to challenge the constitutionality of laws after exhaustion of the domestic remedies
- Includes termination or dismissal of Constitutional Court judges by a two-thirds vote of the Court

However, the law amending the Constitution requires further amendments due to the following concerns:

- Does not include a clear procedure or deadlines for the appointment of judges by the president, which may cause possible delays or deadlocks
- Does not include a clear statement about a three-tier court system
- Retains the right of the Verkhovna Rada to conduct a no-confidence vote in the prosecutor general
- Limits representation in courts to advocates only
- Contains incomplete transitional provisions that could cause implementation problems
- Includes alternative dispute resolution, which is not typically a constitutional right
- Postpones Rome Statute ratification to take effect three years from the day the law is published

Nevertheless, the law is very positive overall, and represents a significant step forward in establishing an independent and accountable judiciary.
Problems encountered. Project implementation was effected by the politicization of the constitutional process. The complex process of amending the Constitution required coherent cooperation from all stakeholders, which was challenging to secure. Progress under this expected result was halted for more than a year due to political and social turmoil, especially the Parliamentary crisis, the Revolution of Dignity, pre-term presidential elections, and the Russian invasion of Ukrainian territory. FAIR postponed some of its activities and paid more attention to the promotion of the needed amendments to adjust its work based on ongoing developments and the pace of partner activities.

Lessons learned. It was crucial to actively ensure consistency of all new initiatives with previously prepared expert opinions. The highly politicized process of development and adoption of the constitutional amendments sometimes made it difficult to ensure the consistency of the process and efficient usage of the institutional memory. FAIR worked to ensure that expert support was utilized effectively.

FAIR activities demonstrated the huge demand for informational materials and training for journalists. During this training, conducted by FAIR grantee Internews-Ukraine, regional journalists requested further training in the regions to provide professional and structured information about constitutional reform. Moreover, during public awareness events (e.g., USAID Field Days in the regions), FAIR identified public interest in the constitutional reform issues.

Constitutional reform is a controversial and challenging issue that involves many stakeholders. Therefore, there is always a risk for clashes of interest to hinder adoption of the amendments. Aware of this, FAIR worked to create a neutral platform for discussions with the participation of all stakeholders to ensure that the process was conducted in an inclusive manner. This approach was effective, and should be considered in future activities.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. Future activities related to constitutional reform should include the following:

- Effectively support the implementation of new legislation considering constitutional changes, such as the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges and the Law on the High Council of Justice, which can include providing information about international best practices, expert reviews, and promotion of inclusive reform
- Ensure that further proposed changes to the respective sections of the Constitution are in line with international and European standards regarding judicial independence and human rights
- Ensure inclusive participation of civil society and professional organizations, key stakeholders, and experts in the transparent reform process
- Continue public awareness activities with a special focus on the content of the constitutional reform and constitutional provisions, which can include conducting information campaigns and civic education campaigns
- Continue building effective dialogue between governmental institutions and civil society so the key reform stakeholders can effectively communicate their activities and approaches
OBJECTIVE 2

THE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY OF KEY JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS AND OPERATIONS ARE STRENGTHENED

EXPECTED RESULT 2.1: UKRAINIAN JUDGES ARE APPOINTED ON OBJECTIVE, KNOWLEDGE- AND PERFORMANCE-BASED CRITERIA

Background. Before 2010, Ukraine lacked a standardized, merit-based, objective process for selecting judges. The testing and evaluation of judicial candidates was conducted in closed meetings by 13 part-time regional judicial qualifications commissions, which lacked standards governing the number and scope of questions to candidates, as well as rules of procedures. In 2010, the Law on Judiciary and Status of Judges envisioned a more standardized and objective appointment system; it terminated the regional judicial qualifications commissions, and established a single HQC as the permanent full-time body responsible for judicial selection. The law required the HQC to advertise all judicial vacancies on its website, and provided clear steps for the appointment process, including background checks, a nationwide anonymous admission test, initial theoretical and practical training, an anonymous qualification exam, and publication of each candidate’s qualification exam results on its website, as well as the rating list of judicial candidates with account to the estimated number of vacant positions.

The Revolution of Dignity resulted in increased public demand for holding judges accountable for corruption and violations of human rights. In national opinion polls, the level of public trust in the judiciary reached new lows, with only five percent of Ukrainians expressing trust in the court system. In response, President Poroshenko’s Judicial Reform Council drafted the Law on Ensuring the Right to a Fair Trial, which introduced sweeping changes to the law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges regarding the evaluation of the performance of individual judges. It was adopted by Parliament on February 12, 2015.

The Law on Ensuring the Right to a Fair Trial mandates three forms of judicial performance evaluation:

- An initial qualifications evaluation of all sitting judges to determine their ability to administer justice through an exam of legal knowledge, and a review of a judge’s dossier, which includes the number of cases considered and reversed, complaints of misconduct, and training courses completed, and interviews about the results of the study of the judicial dossier.

- A qualifications evaluation of judges seeking transfer to a higher court or lifetime appointment, as well as judges who have received a disciplinary sanction for misconduct.

- Regular evaluation of judges to identify areas for improvement and motivate them to engage in professional development. Regular evaluation is conducted by instructors at the NSJ during judicial training programs, peer judges in the same court, self-evaluation, and NGO representatives who assess a judge’s
performance during trials. The HQC was responsible for developing procedures and methodology for all forms of judicial performance evaluation covering nearly 8,000 judges with support from the NSJ, to be approved by the COJ.

The amendments to the Constitution and the law in 2016 were a strong move toward judicial reform; they were aimed at strengthening the independence and accountability of the judiciary while ensuring it was more responsive to citizens. This constitutional reform provided for the reorganization of Ukrainian courts and key judicial self-governance institutions through changes to their structure, composition, scope of duties, and functions. The law replaced the initial judicial qualifications evaluation procedure with the qualifications evaluation to determine the capability of a judge to deliver justice properly in a relevant court. Furthermore, it introduced selection of Supreme Court justices, a set of new integrity and anticorruption measures for judges, including a declaration of family ties. It also included a declaration of “judicial integrity,” which includes financial and standard of living data, information about any previous violations of anticorruption policies, and judicial disciplinary records, all of which would be available to the public. In addition, the law established the Public Integrity Council to provide support to the HQC and ensure better public oversight of the judicial selection and evaluation processes.

Accomplishments. From 2011 to 2013, FAIR supported the HQC in successfully conducting three rounds of the anonymous national judicial tests. (See Exhibit 1 and the Snapshot on the next page.) More than 9,000 lawyers took the test; approximately 2,800 passed it and were admitted to the HQC qualifications exam.

Exhibit 1. Number of Judicial Candidates (Lawyers) Tested Under FAIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Passing</th>
<th>Completed Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY 22, 2011</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>3,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 2012</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>3,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER 20, 2012</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>3,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judicial candidates prepare to take the anonymous test on December 20, 2012, in Kyiv.
Objective Testing Improves Judiciary

Merit-based judicial testing advances the creation of a professional corps of judges

Ukraine lacked a standardized, merit-based, or objective process for selecting judges. Instead, testing and evaluation of judicial candidates was primarily conducted in closed meetings by part-time regional judicial qualifications commissions, without standards to govern the number, content, and scope of questions.

A joint effort by the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project and the High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQC) has resulted in an anonymous national judicial test and qualifications exam. These requirements are now reiterated in the new law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges, adopted by the Parliament on June 2, 2016.

From 2011 to 2013, more than 2,300 candidates passed three rounds of nationwide judicial selection testing. As recommended by USAID, the HQC now provides judicial candidates with information about the test in advance, including sample questions and videotaped instructions on how to fill out forms on its website.

Building on recommendations from USAID and lessons learned from the first round of judicial selection, the HQC conducted second and third rounds of the anonymous judicial test and qualifications exams at a single location in the presence of independent monitors and representatives of the media. This added presence helped to ensure a level playing field for all candidates, and improved the transparency of the testing process. Test scores were automatically processed and immediately posted on the HQC website.

Since 2011, more than 900 new judges have been appointed through the new system of judicial selection. This is a major step toward ensuring a fair, transparent, and professional judiciary that will contribute to advancing the creation of a professional corps of judges who improve public trust and confidence in the judiciary.

SNAPSHOT

More than 3,500 lawyers take the nationwide judicial anonymous testing at a single location.

Improved judicial selection procedures ensure a fair, transparent, and professional judiciary.
Promoting Development of Judicial Competencies

To clearly define required competencies, FAIR conducted a psychological analysis of professional aptitude and competencies for all sitting judges. The research considered the 10 judicial competencies developed by HQC with FAIR support in 2010, the Judicial Practice Analysis results conducted by FAIR in cooperation with the HQC in 2013 and 2015, and international best practices. Based on the findings, FAIR supported the HQC in developing the Judge’s Professiogram (see box, right), a profile of general and psychological competencies required to perform functions and professional duties. It also outlines the cognitive and personal requirements to be assessed during judicial selection and performance evaluation processes. The Judge’s Professiogram helped the HQC to develop and improve regulations for judicial selection and evaluation, and assist the NSJ in developing and improving training for judicial candidates and sitting judges.

Creating Evaluative Methodologies and Tools

The Law on Ensuring the Right to a Fair Trial and the amended Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges of June 2016 provides for the HQC to conduct admission examinations for judicial candidates, in the form of anonymous testing. The tests ensure the candidates’ general theoretical knowledge of law, their command of the official language of the country, and their personal, moral, and psychological qualities. Moreover, the new law provides the HQC with the authority to adopt a decision on introducing and conducting other tests to check personal moral and psychological qualities, general abilities, and to use other means to identify the compliance of a judge (judicial candidate) with the criteria of qualifications evaluation for the purposes of compiling a judicial dossier (dossier of judicial candidate).

FAIR supported the HQC in developing tools for testing personal, moral, and psychological qualities of judicial candidates and judges in judicial selection and evaluation processes. With FAIR support, experts in psychology from the Faculty of Psychology at Kyiv National University developed four tools: moral dilemma scenarios; a personality test; a test of professional interests (motivation, goals, and values); and a test of cognitive abilities. The HQC is considering applying these tools during judicial selection and evaluation, particularly during selection of new Supreme Court justices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE’S PROFESSIOGRAM (EXERPTS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cognitive qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pecularities of comprehension, attention, and memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pecularities of information-processing (formal, logical, and creative thinking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotional qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stress resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation and volitional qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stability and consistency of the leading reasons of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Moral traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on fairness, integrity, and honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shaped value and conceptual sphere of personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impartiality of personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other important qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal writing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speaking skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Striving for professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal dignity and self-respect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improving the Capacity of Test Writers and Evaluators

FAIR provided technical assistance to the HQC and the NSJ in developing a bank of test items for judicial testing, as well as in establishing and training a high-quality pool of judicial test item writers. To ensure test item quality control, in November 2013, the HQC and NSJ, with FAIR support, conducted 12 training sessions for test item writers (representatives of the HQC and NSJ, academics in law, and lawyers) and the group of test items evaluators (Supreme Court justices and judges from the high specialized courts). Participants were trained on the methodology of developing, validation, piloting, revision of test items, the methodology of case study development and evaluation, as well as standards settings, scaling methods, and their applications.

A FAIR expert in testing methodology developed two manuals, one for test item writers and one for test item validation. The writers use these manuals to develop, validate, and revise test items to ensure their quality. The project also purchased Statistical Package for Social Science software for the HQC and NSJ to conduct analyses of the quality and complexity of every test question and the test in general. It provided additional training to NSJ and HQC staff on the software’s applications. With FAIR support, HQC and NSJ trained more than 70 test item writers and evaluators, and developed more than 4,000 test items for anonymous testing and qualifications exams.

Automating Business Processes

To improve relevant business processes and ensure openness and transparency of the HQC’s activities, FAIR assisted the Commission in establishing transparent and efficient procedures of selecting candidates for judicial positions and qualification evaluation of judges by introducing modern technologies. Thus, FAIR supported the HQC in automating its internal business processes by developing software and procuring hardware to ensure automation of qualifications exams and commencing operations of the automated system of forming and maintaining judges’ and judicial candidates’ dossiers. An analysis of business processes determined that automation was necessary. Qualification exams for judicial selection and qualifications evaluation exams are taken anonymously. Candidates must also prepare a case study.

FAIR also procured 90 laptops with software and two Ethernet switches to equip working stations in two media classes at HQC facilities to use as a testing center during qualifications examinations for judicial candidates and judges. The project also provided two media classes with audio and video recording systems to broadcast the judicial selection and qualification evaluation procedures. This will ensure greater transparency, objectivity, and impartiality in the judicial selection and evaluation process, increasing the level of public confidence in the judiciary.

Advancing Performance Evaluation of Judges

The Law on Ensuring the Right to a Fair Trial, which came into force in March 2015, introduced a new version of the Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges. It granted new authorities to the HQC, including keeping judicial dossiers and evaluating sitting judges. FAIR assisted the HQC and NSJ in developing and implementing a judicial performance evaluation system, in part by translating U.S. guidelines related to judicial performance evaluations, including a blueprint developed
by the Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System at the University of Denver and guidelines prepared by the American Bar Association.

In cooperation with the OSCE, EU, and the COE, the project conducted two roundtables, one in April 2015 on the application of international and European standards for judicial performance evaluation, including comparative criteria and related risks and challenges, lessons learned, and international best practices, and another in March 2016 on regular judicial performance evaluations focusing on international best practices and lessons learned that can be applied in Ukraine.

FAIR experts provided recommendations to improve the draft procedures and methodology for judicial performance evaluation, such as improving the structure of and providing a separate qualifications evaluation procedure for judges being considered for lifetime appointment and transfer; an initial performance evaluation of all sitting judges, and a qualifications evaluation resulting from a disciplinary sanction; connecting the evaluation criteria with the evaluation methods applied by the HQC for the qualifications evaluation procedure and to distinguish between the qualitative and quantitative indicators applied; describing in more detail the three evaluation methods (an exam, a review of the judge’s dossier, and an interview with the judge).

Judges completed an anonymous written test, prepared a case study, and were interviewed by HQC Qualifications Chamber members on the results of their judicial dossiers overview. As of September 2016, the HQC had conducted two rounds of initial judicial qualifications evaluations. It completed the evaluations for 93 judges who submitted applications for lifetime appointments, of which 73 proved their ability to administer justice and 12 were suspended and sent to the NSJ for additional training, which will be followed by a reevaluation. The HQC also completed the initial qualification evaluations for the appellate court judges from Kyiv and Kyiv oblast, determining that 172 of the 225 judges proved their ability to administer justice. Eight of those judges were sent to the NSJ for additional training, which will be followed by a reevaluation.

In June 2016, the Parliament adopted the Law on Amending the Constitution of Ukraine regarding the justice sector and the new edition of the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges to implement constitutional changes. The amendments to the Constitution and the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges were a strong move toward judicial reform, aimed at strengthening independence and accountability of the judiciary while ensuring it is more responsive to citizens. The law replaced the initial judicial qualifications evaluation procedure with qualifications evaluation in order to determine the capability of a judge to deliver justice properly in a relevant court. According to the law, the HQC is responsible for developing the procedures and methodology to evaluate judicial qualifications.

Problems encountered. Because of the political developments in the country and the implementation of the Law on Restoring Trust in the Judiciary in April 2014, the HQC had to cease operations for more than eight months, which delayed FAIR activities that required cooperation with the HQC. Once the new HQC was established in 2014, FAIR faced the challenge of building relationships with newly appointed members and staff, and introducing them to issues related to proper implementation of the judicial selection process. Furthermore, lack of consensus
between the HQC and the COJ resulted in delayed approval of procedures and methodologies for evaluating judicial qualifications, and timeframes for implementation, as defined by the Law on Ensuring the Right to Fair Trial. The legislation framework provided complicated procedures that could not be implemented properly within the timeframes given by the law. Last, lack of financial and organizational capacity within the HQC led to challenges in developing and implementing judicial selection and performance evaluation procedures without donor support and assistance.

**Lessons learned.** The political will of the new government to implement judicial reforms in a short timeframe required the project make quick and effective decisions to assist the government in implementing reforms consistent with rule of law principles. To reach consensus and increase the level of cooperation between key stakeholders, it was necessary to conduct open discussions through roundtables, conferences, and working groups. It was vital to cooperate with other international projects and programs to ensure the quality and timely technical assistance to key stakeholders.

**Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities.** The new Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges provides a wide range of authorities to the HQC regarding development and implementation of regulations and procedures. Additional activities should:

- Support inclusive consensus-building discussions among key stakeholders
- Support the HQC in developing the forms and regulations for judicial selection and qualifications evaluation
- Support the HQC in developing forms for the declarations of family ties for judges and judicial candidates, as well as a form for declaring commitment to judicial integrity
- Facilitate dialogue between judicial institutions regarding issues related to judicial selection and evaluation to reach consensus while strengthening the exchange of data, especially financial declarations, with the National Anticorruption Bureau
- Support establishment of the Public Council for Integrity
- Support the HQC to develop an outreach campaign about judicial selection and performance evaluation aimed at judges and the public

**EXPECTED RESULT 2.2: UKRAINIAN JUDGES ARE DISCIPLINED IN TRANSPARENT PROCESSES**

**Background.** Independence and accountability are key issues for the Ukrainian judiciary because they are prerequisites for the country’s ability to guarantee and implement the right of its citizens to fair trial. The Revolution of Dignity resulted in a dramatic increase in public demand for accountability in all branches of government, but the judicial branch remained the top priority for the government and the Ukrainian people. The judiciary was largely unaccountable to the citizens and continued to suffer from a lack of independence.
The judiciary had not been able to address these challenges. One of the key reasons for this was the lack of understanding that judicial independence and accountability are interconnected, complementary issues. In a democratic society, the judiciary works to ensure its accountability and society “pays it back” with trust and confidence by enshrining judicial independence. It was the opposite in Ukraine: The judiciary struggled for its independence and society demanded greater judicial accountability. This reversed model failed to produce any positive outcomes, and the judiciary remained the least trusted state institution in the country.1

The Consultative Council of European Judges, an advisory body of the COE on the issues related to the independence, impartiality, and competence of judges, stated that public confidence in and respect for the judiciary are the guarantees of the effectiveness of the judicial system, and the conduct of judges in their professional activities is seen by members of the public as essential to the credibility of the courts.2 The COE's Committee of Ministers stressed that, where judges failed to carry out their duties in an efficient and proper manner, all necessary measures that do not prejudice judicial independence should be taken.3

By the 2010 adoption of the Law on Judiciary and Status of Judges, the Ukrainian legislature established a centralized judicial discipline system within the HQC, and required it to place a standardized judicial misconduct complaint template and post all discipline decisions on its website. The law also established a disciplinary inspector service to assist the HQC in investigating disciplinary complaints. Starting in 2011, FAIR continuously provided technical and financial support to the HQC to ensure proper and effective implementation of the provisions governing judicial discipline.

The constitutional amendments in June 2016 provided for the reorganization of Ukrainian courts and key judicial self-governance institutions through changes to their structure, composition, scope of duties, and functions. Until the effective date of the new law on September 30, 2016, the HQC continued to screen complaints on judicial misconduct and consider disciplinary cases against the judges. From January to May, 2016, the HQC received 23,466 complaints on judicial misconduct. During the same period, it examined 10,679 complaints and imposed the following disciplinary sanctions on the judges: 37 warnings, 21 reprimands, 2 severe reprimands, and 23 recommendations to dismiss a judge from the office. Currently, 12,787 complaints remain under the HQC's examination. Once the new law came into force, the HQC remitted the remaining complaints to the HCJ for investigation and consideration.

Accomplishments. There were several key accomplishments supported by FAIR since 2011.

---

1 “Who wants what in lustration? The analysis of public views of lustration process in Ukraine.” Report by FAIR expert Roman David, Professor, Department of Sociology and Social Policy, Lingnan University, Hong Kong.
2 Opinion No. 3 (2002) of the Consultative Council of European Judges to the attention of the Committee of Ministers of the COE on the principles and rules governing judges' professional conduct, particularly ethics, incompatible behavior, and impartiality.
3 Recommendation No. R (94) 12 of the Committee of Ministers of the COE to Member States on the Independence, Efficiency, and Role of Judges.
Automating Business Processes

As noted under expected result 2.1, automation of the business processes of any judicial institution leads to more transparency, increases effectiveness of its operations, and decreases corruption and risk of human error in processing files and deciding cases. FAIR launched the process of automating the HQC business processes in September 2012, which began with documentation and analysis of current judicial discipline practices and selection processes. When the process began, the HQC had applied IT solutions designed for the courts that were not appropriate for its specific internal operations. Most of the documents were produced only in hardcopy, with no electronic means for storing and archiving them.

Following an analysis of HQC operations, FAIR suggested developing a unified, integrated database to manage data on judicial discipline processes, judicial candidates’ selection, judicial training, and transferring. Given the varying roles, responsibilities, and divisions of operation within the HQC, establishing a unified database was critical to meeting the need for accurate, timely, efficient, and transparent data processing and storing.

As a result of discussions with HQC leadership and technical staff, FAIR drafted the terms of reference outlining the detailed structure of the unified integrated database to manage the judicial discipline process, judicial candidates’ selection, judicial training, testing judicial candidates and judges, transferring processes, and the respective electronic documents management and control system. In February 2016, when the newly appointed HQC leadership expressed a clear interest and willingness to move forward with implementation of the business processes automation project, FAIR selected a subcontractor to review and analyze the HQC’s existing internal operations, organizational structure, and functions of and interaction between departments. The subcontractor then led the reengineering and design of a “to-be” model of the HQC operations, adaptation of the terms of reference according to the new version of the law adopted in February 2015.

Now the business process and automation service allows automation of the HQC internal business processes, including electronic registration of internally and externally facing documents, converting documents into digital versions, e-tracking of document flow, processes of organization and administering exams, judicial transfers, performance evaluation and discipline, and storing and securing data. The system’s importing module enables automatic posting of judicial discipline decisions, as required by the Law on Judiciary and Status of Judges. A separate service of the system is designed for creating and conducting a judicial dossier to collect and keep all data related to the appointment of a judge, his/her training, transfers and promotions, compliance with integrity and ethics requirements, professional evaluation, and discipline records.

Given the lack of available financial resources, the HQC requested assistance in equipping the workplaces of its members, inspectors, and supporting departments. To assure members and disciplinary inspectors had equipment capable of meeting international standards on conducting judicial misconduct investigations and consideration of the cases, FAIR procured 58 laptops, 15 desktops, four scanners, a server, and supporting software for the HQC.
Promoting Judicial Accountability and Discipline Based on European Experience
In June 2012, at the HQC’s request, FAIR conducted a Judicial Discipline Study Tour to the United States to expose its members, disciplinary inspectors, and representatives of the Secretariat to international judicial discipline. Participants met with representatives of U.S. Commissions on Judicial Conduct in Atlanta, Seattle, and San Francisco to learn about U.S. best practices for judicial misconduct complaints, docketing, filtering, investigation, and adjudication. In addition, participants met with U.S. government officials and state and federal judges to learn about judicial election and appointment procedures. This hands-on experience fostered in-depth understanding of the value of electronic document management in the day-to-day business processes that would streamline the work of the HQC.

In March 2016, FAIR supported a 10-member Ukrainian delegation that included representatives of the HCJ, HQC, and COJ visit to Belgium and the Netherlands as part of USAID’s “Judicial Independence and Accountability — Two Inseparable Parts of Democratic Development” Participant Training Program. The visit focused on ways to promote better understanding of judicial independence and accountability through European standards and best practices. Participants visited the office of the European Network of Councils for the Judiciary, HCJ of Belgium, the Belgian College of Courts and Tribunals, the Belgian Judicial Training Institute, the Brussels Court of First Instance, and the Dutch Council for the Judiciary. They then drafted an action plan to strengthen judicial independence and enable judges and judicial personnel to respond more effectively to public demand for greater judicial accountability. Activities in the action plan include drafting amendments to the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges regarding judicial selection, as well as implementing measures to enhance judicial ethics and increase accountability and transparency.

Developing Standards for Investigating Judicial Misconduct
Judicial discipline is a legal mechanism to hold judges liable for misconduct on or off the job. Ukrainian doctrine did not elaborate a consolidated view on nature of this legal instrument, and it was not clear if judicial discipline should follow the rules of criminal, civil, or administrative procedure. Several international institutions (e.g., United Nations General Assembly, Consultative Council of European Judges, European Association of Judges, Committee of Ministers of the COE) worked out the principles and standards of judicial discipline procedures to keep the balance between judicial independence and accountability. FAIR promoted a better understanding of these standards to assure sufficient safeguards against interference in judicial independence, and to set up effective procedures for holding judges accountable for their professional functions.

FAIR held discussions with different stakeholders on international policies, criteria, standards, and good practices of judicial discipline to prompt immediate reflection and practical recommendations. In December 2011, the project brought in international experts to analyze the judicial discipline process and the documents for regulating that process. The experts and the HQC discussed leadership judicial disciplinary procedures, standards for initiating and conducting investigations into judicial misconduct, recruitment and training of judicial discipline inspectors, and ways to introduce modern IT and standardization to improve the effectiveness of
these procedures. As a result of these discussions, FAIR experts developed a set of recommendations for the HQC, including:

- Improved procedures for dismissing complaints that have no reasonable grounds for judicial discipline (as approximately 80 percent of complaints are groundless)
- Regulations and manuals for every stage of the judicial discipline process
- Training for new disciplinary inspectors
- Clear standards for the evaluation of evidence for judicial discipline cases
- Stricter requirements for recruiting judicial inspectors

FAIR promoted the standardization of judicial disciplinary proceedings and the unification of the HQC case law through the constant monitoring of its decision-making in judicial disciplinary cases, as well as the practices of other authorities involved in reviewing the HQC decisions. In November 2013, following discussions at the roundtable on the Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Judicial Disciplinary Proceedings with FAIR participation, the HQC developed the following recommendations for the Commissioners and disciplinary inspectors: conduct preliminary screening of complaints against wrongful actions of judges; investigate judicial misconduct and drafting procedural documents; draft conclusions on the existence of grounds for bringing judges to disciplinary liability; and consider disciplinary cases and draft decisions for holding judges liable for disciplinary offense.

In 2013 and again in 2016, FAIR advanced the study and analysis of disciplinary case law to bring consistency to it, reveal the drawbacks, and bring together judicial discipline procedures and practice. Through FAIR, the Institute of Applied Humanitarian Research (IAHR) in Kharkiv analyzed decisions made by the institutions overseeing complaints alleging judicial misconduct to learn about the impact of disciplinary practices on the judges and provide recommendations on the elimination of judicial offences and misconduct. These assessments also showed the quality of judicial disciplinary decisions to be an important indicator for clarity and transparency. Based on the study, IAHR provided a set of recommendations on amending the legislation governing judicial disciplinary practices, the administration of disciplinary proceedings, improving the HQC’s decisions in disciplinary cases, introducing judicial discipline issues in NSJ training programs for judges on the issues identified as most problematic, and enhancing public control over judicial discipline procedures. HQC Chair Serhii Koziakov stressed the importance of the research not only to improve the HQC disciplinary practices, but also for other HQC activities and functions, particularly those related to judicial performance evaluation.

In order to equip disciplinary inspectors with a practical tool to verify complaints and investigate judges’ misbehavior, FAIR published the Manual for Conduct of Judicial Discipline Proceedings. This guidance is a complementary instrument for the authorities responsible for conducting judicial disciplinary proceedings to facilitate the preliminary screening of complaints against judges, verify the facts of judicial misconduct, and organize the verification process. The manual has two sections: international and national standards of judicial independence, and methods of verifications within disciplinary proceedings against judges. It cites international standards related to judicial discipline procedures, incorporates good practices,
Developing Regulations for Judicial Disciplinary Processes

To ensure the HQC judicial discipline practices complied with international and European standards, FAIR supported the HQC in drafting and adapting the internal rules and regulations that govern these processes. In late 2011, FAIR reviewed the draft Instruction on Verification Procedure and Decision-Making in Disciplinary Proceedings Against Judges, and provided a set of recommendations to enhance the procedures. FAIR also recommended that the HQC develop manuals for every stage of the judicial disciplinary process, organize training for new disciplinary inspectors, and elaborate clear standards for evaluating evidence in judicial discipline cases.

As a result of these joint efforts to develop clear procedures, the HQC in October 2012 approved the Procedure of Verification and Decision-Making in Disciplinary Proceedings Against Judges, and Preparation and Retaining Documents. The procedure contains the following FAIR recommendations:

- Clear requirements for self-recusal of disciplinary inspector
- Procedures for using videoconferences to make investigations more efficient
- Requirements for minutes of witness and judge interviews
- Samples of minutes, written conclusions, and other documents

FAIR also supported the HQC in improving the Rules of Procedure, the basic internal regulation that details the procedures and functions of the HQC provided for by the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges. At the request of HQC leadership, FAIR evaluated the new edition of the rules focused on legislative drafting techniques, conformity with current laws and regulations, and compliance with European standards and recommendations. In February 2016, the HQC approved changes to several provisions of the rules in line with the FAIR’s recommendations:

- Adding “rule of law” and “impartiality” principles to the fundamentals of HQC activity
- Reviewing the grounds for return without consideration of judicial misconduct complaints, and removing “insufficient justification” as grounds of such return
- Reviewing the procedure of suspension of a judge from office upon the prosecutor general’s motion, and providing that the HQC reject the motion for suspension renewal unless the prosecutor proves that it is impossible to finalize criminal proceedings against the judge during the initial suspension

Establishing a System for the Recruitment and Management of Disciplinary Inspectors

In December 2011, FAIR organized the first training program for disciplinary inspectors and HQC staff on international standards and best practices in managing the judicial discipline process. Project experts introduced participants to basic principles of judicial misconduct investigation, setting forth international documents and best practices of managing judicial discipline complaints. This training and follow-up discussion resulted in a better understanding of issues the disciplinary inspectors face, including that current Ukrainian legislation does not govern many of the situations they consider.

To train judicial disciplinary inspectors and commissioners how to communicate effectively, prepare and draft clear and concise procedural documents and judicial disciplinary decisions, verify evidence, and effectively identify grounds for judicial discipline, FAIR conducted a July 2013 workshop on practical aspects of investigating allegations on judicial misconduct. Since being appointed to their positions, judicial disciplinary inspectors have not been trained. After the workshop, former HQC Chair Ihor Samsin suggested organizing training for judicial disciplinary inspectors on a permanent basis. To achieve this, FAIR worked with local and international experts to elaborate the in-class curricula of initial and ongoing training for disciplinary inspectors, and provide recommendations on teaching methodology and structuring the training process. They also addressed qualification requirements for the candidates to this position and performance evaluation of inspectors.

In September 2015, FAIR engaged international and local experts to train HQC inspectors on professional and organizational skills. Forty-three participants, including inspectors of the HQC Qualifications and Disciplinary Chambers and representatives of the Secretariat, participated. According to the follow-up self-assessment results, 85 percent of the trainees learned new information and developed professional skills in judicial performance evaluation and disciplinary proceedings against judges. The participants also received training on legal writing, team building, time management, work planning, and effective communication.

Based on the successful results of this training, FAIR designed curricula for the orientation of newly appointed disciplinary inspectors and their ongoing training. These comprehensive “turnkey” teaching materials and guidelines can be used by any trainer at any stage of the training. In January 2016, the HQC launched weekly training courses for all 48 of its inspectors.

Raising Public Awareness About the Judicial Discipline System

FAIR worked with the HQC to increase public awareness about judicial discipline issues and to ensure transparency and openness of its activities and procedures. Although the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges required the HQC to publish information on bringing judges to disciplinary liability on its website, the HQC, as well as the HCJ, which is responsible for disciplining Supreme Court justices and judges of the high specialized courts, publish the final decisions on sanctioning judges, as well as provisional documents on disciplinary procedures that contain full names of parties to the procedure.
At the HQC’s request, FAIR developed recommendations on basic principles, rules, and procedures for disclosing information on judicial disciplinary procedures and decisions in disciplinary cases, as well as archiving and ensuring public access to such information. FAIR also provided recommendations on amending the procedure for publishing information on the HQC website to ensure its clarity, transparency, and effectiveness of the related procedures. In addition, FAIR shared with the HQC U.S. best practices on confidentiality of the judicial disciplinary cases and factors to be considered while imposing disciplinary sanctions on the judges.

In December 2014, FAIR adapted a leaflet with basic information on how to file a complaint against judicial misconduct, what authorities are responsible for its processing and consideration, and what rights the parties have to the disciplinary procedure for dissemination to the public. Following adoption of the Law on Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary of Ukraine in April 2014, FAIR updated the leaflet with information on holding judges liable for unlawful decisions against Euromaidan activists, and disseminated leaflets among the participants of several public events organized and/or supported by FAIR, as well as within four selected Ukrainian courts (Rozhyshche District Court of Volyn Region, Khmelnytsky City District Court, Chernigiv Region Appellate Court, and Voznesensk City District Court of Mykolaiv Region).

FAIR also supported the HQC in developing and disseminating a standardized judicial misconduct complaint form, which assists more effective complaint processing and educates the public about the judicial discipline process. More than one-third of complaints are now filed using the standardized form, which is available on the HQC website. Exhibit II tracks use of the standardized complaint form from 2011 to 2016.

Problems encountered. Implementation was hampered by weak institutional capacity of the HQC, whose members had to stop their work on April 2014, when the Law on Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary of Ukraine took effect. Another challenge was low proactivity and responsiveness by HQC departments and several empowered individuals. To address these problems, FAIR formalized communications with the HQC by exchange of official letters, initiated intermediary meetings with officials, and prepared events and activities ahead of time.
Lessons learned. Insufficient institutional memory is a common challenge for Ukrainian institutions that impedes continuity and consistency of operations, and leads to duplication of efforts and resources to train new partners. To overcome this problem with the HQC and ensure smooth transition with members and staff, FAIR organized an orientation workshop to introduce newly appointed members to activities and achieved results. The underlying idea was to make positive changes permanent and build a sustainable system that was not susceptible to subjective factors associated with the individuals holding positions in a certain institution. Another example of sustainable institutional development was the organization of continuous professional training for HQC inspectors by the Commissioners in their capacity as trainers.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. Considering forthcoming changes in the judicial disciplinary system, future activities may include:

- Develop HCJ internal rules and regulations governing the following areas:
  - Judicial discipline process
  - Structure and tasks of the Service of Inspectors
  - Status, duties, responsibilities, qualifications requirements, and performance evaluation of inspectors
- Organize training courses for HCJ inspectors on how to properly investigate complaints of judicial misconduct
- Automate the HCJ internal business processes
- Develop policies and regulations to publish information on judicial discipline proceedings
- Improve the legal and regulatory framework related to judicial discipline based on international and European standards

EXPECTED RESULT 2.3: THE REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INTEGRITY IS STRENGTHENED

Background. Judicial accountability and integrity have long been high on the judicial reform agenda in Ukraine. The Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, signed into law in July 2010, incorporated fundamental reforms that Ukrainian and international experts had sought for a long time. The law increased ethical standards for judges and put judicial self-government bodies in charge of resolving all issues related to internal court activities. Under Article 56, issues related to judicial ethics were to be regulated by the Code of Judicial Ethics and approved by the Congress of Judges of Ukraine. As the old Code of Professional Judge’s Ethics contained significant contradictions with provisions of the new law, the Congress of Judges of Ukraine tasked the newly elected COJ with developing a new code to meet the requirements of the law and international standards. Once approved, the code would serve as a standard of judge’s ethical behavior, as well as grounds for discipline.

A primary issue during the drafting was that, according to the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, “systematic” or “gross one-time” violations of rules of judicial ethics could be grounds for disciplinary action against a judge. However, the law did
not define these violations, which could lead to unpredictable consequences, such as influencing judges through interpreting the terms in different ways.

In addition, the Law on Purification of the Government, adopted in September 2014, illustrated members of the HCJ and changed requirements of candidates who served as members of the reformed Council. Furthermore, the June 2016 Amendments to the Constitution changed the scope of the HCJ’s duties and functions.

Accomplishments. FAIR attained the following key results that strengthened judicial accountability and integrity.

**Developing a New Code of Judicial Ethics**

In 2011, FAIR worked with the COJ to prepare and approve the action plan to update the Code of Judicial Ethics. The project first provided the COJ members reviewing and amending the code with texts of relevant documents governing judicial conduct in Slovenia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Estonia, England, Wales, and Germany. In response to FAIR recommendations, the COJ launched an online judicial forum to discuss the content and changes to the code and facilitate discussions on ethical issues among the judiciary (http://court.gov.ua/tu21/news/5828/).

As a result of this joint effort, in March 2012, the COJ approved the draft amended Code of Judicial Ethics for further review by the judicial community. The draft, based on the United Nations Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, contained innovative provisions, especially regarding judges’ recusal to secure judicial impartiality and the prohibition of ex-parte communication with one party or his/her representative in the absence of the other party. To help familiarize all the judges with the provisions, FAIR further supported the COJ to publish and disseminate 15,000 copies of the code. (See the Snapshot on the next page.)
Judges Develop New Code of Ethics

The modernized Code of Judicial Ethics is now in line with international standards.

Although Ukraine’s Code of Judicial Ethics was approved by the country’s Congress of Judges (COJ) 10 years ago, it failed to keep pace with other developments in the justice sector. The judiciary soon found that its code contradicted Ukrainian law and failed to comply with international standards of judicial conduct.

To address these fundamental concerns, the COJ established an expert review group, which sought the assistance of the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project. To ensure widespread input from those who expected to be most affected — Ukrainian judges — FAIR supported the launch of an online forum and regional roundtables at which the judges could openly discuss content and proposed amendments to the code. By the end of deliberations, 220 judges from 142 of Ukraine’s 756 courts contributed to development of the draft code. As a result of this collaborative effort, the proposed amendments were adopted by a plenary session of the 11th Congress of Judges on February 22, 2013, with 84 percent of the judges voting in favor of the new document.

The new code addresses critical issues, including ex parte communication, financial interests of judges and their family members, recusal, interaction with the media, and conduct outside the courtroom. It also ensures Ukraine’s conformity with international standards on judicial conduct and promotes greater judicial accountability, an important step to increasing public confidence in the judiciary.

In support of the code’s implementation, FAIR assisted the COJ Ethics Committee in convening a working group to develop a Commentary to the Code of Judicial Ethics. The Commentary, approved by the COJ on February 2, 2016, contains detailed explanations of each of the code’s provisions. It will be printed and disseminated to all courts nationwide with USAID support.
Drafting Commentary to the Code of Judicial Ethics

For the code to be fully implemented, it not only needed to be adopted — it had to be annotated and include comprehensive comments and case studies elaborating on international and European standards. To accomplish this, FAIR supported the COJ in establishing a working group to develop a Commentary to the Code.

Judicial reform in Ukraine took on yet another dimension. Following the Revolution of Dignity, the Verkhovna Rada adopted the law “On Restoration of Public Trust in the Judiciary,” whereby the composition of the COJ was substantially changed and all the members of the HCJ and the HQC were dismissed from office. This prompted the Congress of Judges to adopt an action plan to restore public trust in the judiciary.

In June 2014, FAIR held a meeting with the newly elected COJ management at which they agreed to establish separate committees within its structure, including an Ethics Committee. FAIR assisted this committee in drafting the Regulation on the COJ Ethics Committee and its action plan for the next year. In response to FAIR’s recommendation, the COJ also established a working group to develop Commentary to the Code of Judicial Ethics that included COJ members, teachers of the Online Judicial Ethics Course, and judges who took the online course. The working group was tasked with researching international and European standards and best practices on judicial ethics and relevant case law of the European Court of Human Rights, as well as collecting and analyzing HQC and HCJ disciplinary decisions on judicial misconduct cases related to violations of judicial ethics rules. The working group was to prepare a Draft Commentary to the Code of Judicial Ethics based on the findings, and compile a list of case studies of unethical behavior of judges.

With FAIR support, the working group updated the draft commentary and received COJ approval for publication in February 2016. The project printed 3,000 copies for dissemination to the courts.

Conducting Ukrainian Judicial Leadership Study Visit

In April 2016, in partnership with the Open World Leadership Center, FAIR conducted a study tour with COJ and SJA members to the United States to share U.S. practices of managing judicial self-governance bodies and their committees. The tour included eight newly elected COJ members and two representatives of the SJA. The delegation visited key judicial institutions in Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia. The tour focused on the efficient operations of judicial self-governance bodies and court administration, including the preparation, submission, and defense of court budgets, judicial ethics, court performance evaluation, use of e-governance tools, and communications. The delegates met their direct counterparts at the federal and state levels, and learned about the operations of the U.S. judiciary.

As a result of the study tour, several members of the COJ published articles in legal newspapers and magazines, and began implementing public outreach initiatives at their courts. To capitalize on the achievements of the tour, in May 2016, FAIR conducted a follow-up meeting with the delegation to discuss lessons learned and lay the foundations for continued cooperation with the COJ. FAIR prepared a draft action plan based on the meeting’s outcomes that laid out options for joint activities to support judicial reform in Ukraine. Action plan items included establishing a
hotline for judges to receive guidance on judicial ethics issues, developing advanced e-learning courses on judicial ethics, and publication of regular comments on common ethical issues arising in courts.

**Strengthening the Capacity of the High Council of Justice**

FAIR provided demand-driven capacity building assistance to the HCJ to support its reform efforts, in light of the constitutional amendments related to the judiciary recently adopted by the Parliament. To support newly elected members of the HCJ, FAIR, the EU Support to Justice Sector Reforms in Ukraine project, the COE Strengthening the System of Judicial Accountability in Ukraine project, the COE Office in Ukraine, and the joint EU-COE Consolidation of Justice Sector Policy Development in Ukraine project conducted a two-day orientation in October 2015. Participants discussed issues pertaining to the HCJ’s status and power considering judicial and constitutional reforms underway in Ukraine, examples of European and international standards for judicial appointments and discipline, and international experience and practices of similar bodies with similar powers. They discussed ways to improve HCJ business processes, specifically the introduction of strategic planning, processes automation, professional development of staff, and the scope of changes needed for institutional development of the HCJ.

To increase transparency of HCJ operations, FAIR installed video and audio equipment in the Council’s conference hall so it could broadcast its sessions online. FAIR also supplied HCJ staff with computers, printers, and software.

The project conducted research on the structure and duties of members of the European Network of Councils of Justice, in anticipation of the adoption of constitutional amendments regarding the judiciary, which extended the powers of the HCJ. The research findings were translated into Ukrainian, assembled into a comprehensive set of materials, and presented to the working group on developing changes to the law on the HCJ.

FAIR then provided feedback to the HCJ, which was accepted by the Judicial Reform Council and included into the draft bill. In June 2016, the president signed the Law on Amending the Constitution Regarding the Justice Sector (No. 3524), changing the scope of the HCJ’s duties and functions, institutional structure, and extent of authority. To support and safeguard the creation of the new HCJ, the project engaged two international experts who shared their experience on the ways these institutions manage the judiciary; arrange judicial selection, discipline, and dismissal procedures; identify the overall mission and vision of the judiciary; plan activities to improve the services provided by the judiciary; and provide for the protections necessary for the development of the judicial branch of power.

**Problems encountered.** Many of the challenges while implementing activities under this expected result were linked to the overall political situation in Ukraine and the lack of political will of several key stakeholders to implement meaningful change. The Revolution of Dignity had a significant impact on FAIR activities, bringing the judiciary under heightened scrutiny by the public and pressure to implement reform. FAIR used this opportunity to convince its partners, especially the COJ, that the implementation of the new Code of Judicial Ethics was a key element to restoring public trust in the judiciary and would contribute to citizens’ overall positive
perception of the judiciary. In addition, COJ elections resulted in several young and progressive judges taking positions with the Council. These new members became active reform supporters and helped bolster poor institutional capacity.

**Lessons learned.** Ukrainian new/reformed judicial institutions, including the COJ and HCJ, have strikingly poor institutional capacity. Factors for this include the lack of institutional memory due to frequent changes in structure and membership, and the absence of a clearly defined set of powers and responsibilities. The institutions are therefore usually unable to formulate strategic goals and priorities, and act on an ad hoc basis in a reactive, not proactive, manner. As an example of a strategy to mitigate these deficiencies, FAIR organized orientation workshops for newly elected COJ members to inform them of previous joint activities and determine the goals for further cooperation. The project also emphasized building the COJ’s institutional capacity by organizing a study tour to the United States for newly elected members.

The COJ also tends to remain reserved when discussing activities and results of their work in broad forums. This results in lack of acceptance of their decisions within the judiciary itself, creating tensions and potential conflicts. FAIR contributed to overcoming this deficiency by advocating the need to organize broad discussions of the draft Code of Judicial Ethics and Commentary to the Code, which resulted in the judicial community being more receptive to the innovative concepts and ideas in these documents.

**Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities.** The Ukrainian judiciary continues to undergo significant reform with changes to the Constitution, which have already had a significant impact on the structure of the judiciary. Inter alia, the role of the COJ is going to be partly vested with the new HCJ, and it is currently unclear which responsibilities the entities are going to have and how they will work in practice. Regardless, we recommend partnering with relevant institutions focusing further efforts on the following areas:

- Continue promoting the implementation of the Code of Judicial Ethics as a standard for judicial behavior inside and outside the courtroom by raising the capacity of the responsible institutions to support the following:
  - Developing and implementing online training courses on judicial ethics for judges
  - Establishing a hotline for judges to receive guidance on judicial ethics issues
  - Developing a publication of regular advisory opinions by bodies responsible for judicial discipline and enforcement of judicial ethics rules
- Continue building the institutional capacity of the COJ and other judicial self-government institutions through the development of clear rules of procedure, committee structures, job descriptions, etc.
- Expose members and staff of judicial self-government institutions to best international practices in judicial ethics, court administration, court financing, and other issues critical to their efficient and effective functioning as judicial leaders
• Assist Parliament and other interested counterparts to gain experience with the duties and functions in the European institutions with the similar scope
• Assist the HCJ in developing solid vision statements and strategic planning of its further activities when new law on the HCJ is adopted
OBJECTIVE 3

THE PROFESSIONALISM AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UKRAINIAN JUDICIARY ARE STRENGTHENED

EXPECTED RESULT 3.1: THE SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES OF UKRAINIAN JUDGES AND COURT STAFF ARE BOLSTERED THROUGH MODERN DEMAND-DRIVEN TRAINING PROGRAMS

Background. The adoption of the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges in July 2010 established the NSJ to provide training for judges, candidates for judicial positions, and court staff. The NSJ faced poor funding, weak leadership, limited skills, and low standards for developing curricula. It also lacked an effective process for selecting and developing faculty, and did not have a mechanism to evaluate the quality of training courses, and the ability to implement new approaches to judicial education (e.g., evaluation of judge-trainees and mentorship programs). When the Parliament adopted the Law on Ensuring the Right to a Fair Trial, the law required a new procedure to evaluate judges, initial qualification evaluations, and regular evaluations thereafter.

Accomplishments. FAIR supported key advances in providing greater access to high-quality professional development opportunities for judges and court staff.

Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of the NSJ
At the beginning of the project, FAIR learned that the NSJ required significant assistance to become an effective, well-organized institution that could support a professional judicial cadre. The project first assessed the NSJ’s institutional and training needs, and provided recommendations based on best international and European practices to improve operations, including developing a mission statement, a five-year strategic plan, and an action plan for the upcoming year; conducting an audit of the leadership’s management skills; enhancing the NSJ faculty’s capacity to design and implement new curricula, and evaluate the training program outcomes. FAIR worked with the Canadian Embassy/National Judicial Institute of Canada Judicial Education for Economic Growth Project to conduct a workshop for the NSJ and HQC leadership on strengthening leadership and management skills. At the workshop, teams created strategic planning documents that supported the NSJ in drafting its Strategic Development Plan for 2014-2018, which was adopted in October 2013.

FAIR supported Ukrainian judges in preparing to address challenges after adoption of the new legislation, with attention to the following:

- Law on the Election of Members of the Parliament of Ukraine
- Law on the Presidential Elections
- Law on Local Elections
- Criminal Procedure Code
FAIR and the International Foundation of Electoral Systems, jointly with the High Administrative Court of Ukraine (HAC), conducted nine nationwide regional seminars in all of Ukraine’s appellate administrative circuits in June and July of 2012. About 600 judges and court staff representing 274 courts from all oblasts attended these seminars. In May 2014, in cooperation with the HAC, the International Foundation of Electoral Systems, and the OSCE, the project conducted five regional seminars on election legislation “Application of Election Legislation at the Presidential and Local Elections” for judges of administrative and general courts. Approximately 280 judges representing 142 courts from 19 oblasts of participated.

In September and October 2015, FAIR started a series of nationwide regional seminars for judges of administrative and local courts in four appellate administrative circuits. The project co-organized these events with EU and COE projects, and the HAC and the NSJ. They provided an opportunity for 255 judges from 161 courts in 14 regions to become more familiar with the norms of the new Law of Ukraine “On Local Elections.” Renowned Ukrainian experts in electoral issues and HAC judges led all the training seminars, where participants learned about the peculiarities of the application of the new election law in consideration of election disputes.

When the Criminal Procedure Code came into force in November 2012, FAIR organized coordinating meetings for international donors and the NSJ to identify priority areas for training and to build a team of judges-trainers who, after mastering the code and principles of its interpretation, would be able to train their colleagues in all regions of Ukraine. In June 2012, the project conducted two training-of-trainers sessions on adult teaching methods for 51 judges. Judges were taught teaching methods, and acquired skills to develop training materials and methods to train their peers. FAIR also conducted additional training-of-trainers on how to interpret and apply the new code, in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Justice Overseas Prosecutorial Development Assistance and Training program, the COE, EU, and NSJ. As a result, 50 judge-trainers were trained in areas such as substantive issues concerning the ideas behind the Criminal Procedure Code, implementation issues related to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, techniques for effectively managing criminal proceedings, and how to exchange opinions on the practical issues of implementing the Criminal Procedure Code. The judge-trainers
then conducted their own one-day training courses in the courts of appeals and regional branches of the NSJ. According to post-training evaluation forms, a participant considered the workshops and seminars to be “the most successful in-depth training activities organized for judges in recent years.”

**Designing a Judicial Administration Certificate Program**
FAIR, with Michigan State University, supported the NSJ and SJA in designing and implementing a comprehensive Judicial Administration Certificate Program for court administrators. The program covered 10 core competencies for court administrators, what they need to know and be able to do. Three rounds of the program resulted in 120 court administrators acquiring modern court administration and management skills. The course evaluations (see Exhibit III) indicate how highly the graduates valued the program. Following a request of the 2013 and 2015 graduates, FAIR developed a three-day program for 40 chief judges dedicated to their needs as court leaders. This innovative series of programs also led to the creation of a pool of 19 trained trainers who have gone on to teach their colleagues on a variety of courses related to judicial administration.

**Exhibit III. FAIR-Michigan State University Judicial Administration Program Course Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposes and Responsibilities of Courts</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Management</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training, and Development</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court and Community Communication</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources, Budget, and Finance</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload Management</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Components of Courts</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Management</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Developing the Distance Learning of the NSJ**
FAIR conducted a three-day training in February 2013 for representatives of the NSJ, the SJA, and judges that focused on introducing a distance learning methodology and model curriculum applicable to the NSJ’s distance learning courses. With support from national and international experts, participants developed a sample curriculum for an online course. FAIR also procured a server and 10 laptops for the NSJ.

In support of the 11th Congress of Judges’ decision to adopt the Code of Judicial Ethics, FAIR and the NSJ jointly conducted a workshop about an online course on judicial ethics in March 2014 for developers, trainers, administrators, and IT support staff. Participants familiarized themselves with how to use the learning management
system — the Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment — and how to train online. With FAIR support, the NSJ piloted a three-week Online Judicial Ethics Course that included 90 judges (15 participants for each of six judge-trainers). From September 2014 to June 2016, approximately 460 judges successfully passed and received certificates for course.

As the benefits became evident, the NSJ leadership demonstrated increased commitment by initiating new topics for online education, requesting more FAIR support in conducting working group meetings to develop training materials (lectures, presentations, tests, and case studies) to train trainers and pilot the course. Four of the six judge-trainers and three judge-students were invited by the chair of the COJ Ethics Committee to be members of the Working Group on Developing a Commentary to the Code of Judicial Ethics. With FAIR support, they piloted two more online courses in 2016, one on court and community communications and one on court administration. These courses are included in the training schedule of the NSJ, which now recognizes that online education technology enables a new level of judicial education.

Developing Curricula and Creating a Cadre of Trained Trainers
In September 2014, FAIR supported the NSJ in conducting a workshop for developers of a course on judicial ethics for judges who were serving their first year on the bench. Participants developed a syllabus, familiarized themselves with the content, reviewed the course materials to ensure quality, and formulated case studies and tests.

FAIR supported the NSJ’s working group meeting on the judicial ethics course for newly appointed judges to discuss any last-minute changes, review the materials and case-studies, and distribute roles for course approbation. The approbation was conducted for 24 judges in the Lviv regional branch of the NSJ. FAIR and the NSJ jointly conducted a test run of the course for 28 judges in the NSJ’s Dnipropetrovsk regional branch. To finalize work on the course, FAIR in November 2015 supported the NSJ in conducting a training-of-trainers for 15 judge-trainers based on judicial ethics curricula for newly appointed judges.

In March 2015, FAIR signed a grant agreement with international charitable organization Environment-People-Law to support the NSJ in elaborating the curricula on environmental protection and human rights to be used in forming a team of judge-trainers to teach an environmental law course. Environment-People-Law collaborated with NSJ to pilot an “Environmental Protection and Human Rights” course, in which 28 judge participated, and conducted environmental protection and human rights training for 79 judges of the general, administrative, and commercial courts. Participants became familiar with environmental protection and human rights in international law, procedural capacity, and access to justice (e.g., legal advocacy and court fees) and how they concern the environment.

Publishing Resource Materials
FAIR disseminated 8,950 CDs and 430 hard copies of the book To Be a Judge through six NSJ branches, nine national partners (high courts, SJA, HCJ, HQC, COJ, and the presidential administration), 16 universities, and three national libraries. The book is a guide to the everyday professional life of a judge, developed by the Ukrainian Legal
Foundation, a FAIR grantee. The project also supported the NSJ, HQC, and SJA in developing, updating, and publishing four manuals: Judicial Opinion Writing, Courts and Community Communications, Conduct of Judicial Discipline Proceedings, and Human Resource Management in Court. Furthermore, FAIR developed, updated, published, and presented 14 curricula to national partners.

**Promoting Mediation as an Alternative Dispute Resolution Method**

FAIR provided support to three mediation grantees: the Volyn Regional NGO, Center for Legal Aid; the Institute of Strategic Partnership, an all-Ukrainian CSO; and the National Association of Mediators of Ukraine. These programs increased awareness among court stakeholders on the benefits of alternative dispute resolution, and included training sessions for judges, court staff, and civil society representatives to increase the number of mediators and strengthen the profession. In December 2014, 16 participants were trained on basic mediation skills; in March 2015, they participated in an intermediate-level training to improve their mediation skills. A total of 66 mediations were conducted in Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast and Volyn Oblast, and 14 ended with the parties signing mediation agreements.

The grantees posted public awareness materials (e.g., posters, booklets, brochures, and manuals) in regional courts and distributed them to judges, court staff, public organizations, legal clinics, law faculties, and centers of secondary legal aid. Participants of the roundtables and expert meetings adopted resolutions introducing amendments to the draft laws on mediation registered in the Parliament. The National Association of Mediators of Ukraine developed a curriculum for initial and continuous training on implementation of mediation. Throughout implementation, FAIR provided more than 26,000 people, including approximately 7,000 judges, with information about mediation through the media, events, and informational materials.

**Problems encountered.** Due to political changes following the Revolution of Dignity, the judiciary faced several challenges with adoption of the Law on Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary of Ukraine. Because the HQC had to stop its work when the law entered into force in April 2014 and was not able to develop and adopt relevant documents to start the special training in the NSJ, FAIR experienced delays with activities related to cooperation with the NSJ, particularly in judicial candidate training and developing programs to mentor new judges.

**Lessons learned.** Due to lack of financial and organizational capacity to develop and implement judicial and court staff professional education, the NSJ still requires donor support and assistance. Introducing technological innovations in a judicial institution where a lot of retired judges’ work is difficult, and the NSJ often receives limited support and understanding. Development of an online course requires a methodical process of selecting training courses, establishing clear goals and objectives, training trainers, and piloting the course before launching. Last, mediation in Ukraine is a completely new field. People are not ready to acknowledge that the cause of conflict is often within their control, and that they need to take responsibility for solving their own problems. The state must support wide information campaigns to introduce mediation for citizens.
Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. Considering the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, to implement constitutional changes, the NSJ leadership needs strong support in:

- Strengthening its management skills
- Developing standards for curricula
- Developing criteria for faculty selection
- Creating a mechanism for evaluating the impact and quality of training
- Establishing a mentorship program
- Building research capacity
- Building capacity to develop and evaluate high-quality test items

EXPECTED RESULT 3.2: JUDICIAL OPERATIONS ARE EVALUATED AND FUNDED ACCORDING TO AN OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS AND PERFORMANCE

Background. For decades, the Ukrainian judiciary faced a weak and ineffective court administration, poor financing and resource management, insufficient case management, and low public trust and confidence. These challenges were interconnected and closely linked to other substantial challenges, including executive branch interference in the judiciary, lack of judicial independence and accountability, and corruption. Additionally, the absence of court performance evaluation approaches, techniques, and practices led to the lack of result-oriented management at all levels of the judiciary: national (HQC, COJ, SJA), regional (SJA territorial branches and courts of appeals), and in each specific court. Judicial statistics were outdated, overloaded with administrative data, and based on the post-Soviet approach to data collection and analysis, which did not support proper reporting to the public or effective management of the judiciary and courts.

FAIR assisted the justice sector in developing and implementing a national CPE Framework in cooperation with the COJ and the SJA. In 2010, UROL helped establish the CPE Working Group, consisting of representatives of the COJ, the SJA, higher courts, local and appellate courts, and international and local independent experts.

Previous studies conducted under the UROL project revealed gaps in the court budgeting process, which resulted in high dependence of the judiciary on executive decisions, chronic underfinancing of important infrastructure development projects, and the lack of tools the judiciary could use to back and justify its budget requests with objective data. This problem was aggravated by the fact that the SJA — the body responsible for securing adequate financial resources for the judiciary — had historically been subordinated to the executive power. For this reason, the judiciary did not have the capacity to engage in long-term strategic planning efforts, and had little control over the management of its financial resources. The 2010 Law of Ukraine on the Judiciary and Status of Judges introduced changes to the judiciary’s financial management structure, making the SJA part of the judiciary and subordinating it to the COJ.
Accomplishments. The CPE Working Group considered several international court performance evaluation models, including the U.S. Trial Court Performance Standards⁴; Rechtspraak, the Netherlands’ Court Quality System⁵; the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice Checklist for Promoting the Quality of Justice⁶; and the International Framework for Court Excellence⁷ developed by the Consortium for Court Excellence.⁸

In 2012, the draft Ukrainian CPE Framework included four evaluation modules: efficiency of court administration, case disposition timeliness, quality of court decisions, and court user satisfaction using the CRC methodology. The draft CPE system consisted of 24 court performance evaluation criteria and more than 100 indicators to measure court compliance with these criteria. The draft proposed a combination of several evaluation methods: internal survey of judges and court staff; review of randomly selected case files; expert analysis of selected court decisions; analysis of judicial statistics data; and a CRC survey. FAIR supported pilot testing the CPE Framework in 13 courts, which resulted in a common understanding by the CPE Working Group and participating courts that the performance evaluation process is an important aspect of administrating court operations, and informs current and strategic decisions of court leadership to improve the performance of a court as an institution and increase the level of satisfaction of court users with court operations. Exhibit IV shows the FAIR Court Performance Evaluation System.

Exhibit IV. FAIR Court Performance Evaluation System

The pilot testing illustrated the effectiveness of the proposed court performance evaluation methods applied individually according to court management needs, but

⁵ www.rechtspraak.nl.
⁶ www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/quality/default_en.asp.
⁸ The International Consortium for Court Excellence represented by the U.S. National Center for State Courts, the U.S. Federal Judicial Center, the Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration, and the Singapore Subordinate Courts.
showed greater effectiveness when applied in combination. For example, the CRC survey in Kharkiv Appellate Administrative Court demonstrated low user satisfaction with court staff performance. Survey results showed that court staff not only lacked skills and knowledge to handle caseflow routines, but did not always treat court users with courtesy and respect. At the same time, the internal survey of court staff identified their needs, including training, professional development, and desire for changes in their working conditions. Court management considered these results and provided court staff with requested training and, considering the limited funding, slightly improved working conditions. As a result, between 2012 and 2015, user satisfaction with court staff performance increased from 3.7 to 3.9, and overall user satisfaction with performance increased from 3.5 in 2012 to 3.8 in 2015.9

Despite demonstrated efficiency, the pilot test made it clear that the framework was too complicated to be used by an individual court and required human, technical, time, and financial resources. Therefore, FAIR recommended separating the CPE Framework into basic (mandatory) and complete (or complex) performance evaluations. The basic level includes easily accessible case management data (e.g., clearance rate, average duration of procedures, and backlog), whereas the complex level uses more comprehensive evaluation tools, such as court user surveys, surveys of judges and court staff, and expert analysis of case files. While the basic CPE demonstrates trends, the complex CPE provides a roadmap for improving court performance. More than 60 courts have implemented the CPE Framework.

The final approved CPE system comprises three evaluation modules: Court Administration, Case Disposition Timeliness, and Court User Satisfaction. The COJ decision in 2015 recommends that courts apply the CPE Framework regularly, at least once every three years. This decision approved a list of basic court performance indicators, which all courts should use to analyze their activity semi-annually and publish on their websites. As the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice places high importance on monitoring and evaluation of court operations in COE Member States, the FAIR-developed CPE Framework addresses its key recommendations, such as regular implementation of court performance indicators, providing courts with a unified methodology to conduct user satisfaction surveys, and setting basic court performance standards.

The CPE System approval drew notable attention from the International Consortium for Court Excellence. In its May 2015 newsletter, the Consortium published a report

---

9 CPE Framework defines user satisfaction level by a 5-point scale with the following qualitative definition: “excellent” (4.5 to 5), “good” (4.0 to 4.5), “satisfactory” (3.5 to 4.0), and “non-satisfactory” (below 3.5).
from FAIR about the CPE system approval that addresses seven of the eleven global measures recommended by the International Framework for Court Excellence: court user satisfaction, court access fees, case clearance rate, on-time case proceedings, case backlog, employee engagement, and cost per case.

As a result of these successes, the Consortium invited the COJ to become a member, which it did in 2015. To facilitate COJ integration into the Consortium and promote the Ukrainian CPE Framework, FAIR supported the participation of a Ukrainian delegation to the “Judiciary of the Future” International Conference on Court Excellence in Singapore in January 2016. The delegation included COJ leaders who promoted CPE System approval and were committed to further promoting CPE implementation in Ukrainian courts, including the chair of the COJ and Justice of the Supreme Court of Ukraine Valentyna Simonenko. The delegation presented a paper entitled “Court Performance Evaluation as Tool to Promote Judicial Reform and Build Public Trust and Confidence in the Judiciary.” FAIR developed comprehensive guidelines on implementing the CPE Framework to assist the process and help report results to the public, which are posted on the COJ website. Exhibit V shows the impact of FAIR’s CPE Framework.

Exhibit V. Impact of the CPE Framework

- Improving Judicial Administration and Increasing Efficiency in the Delivery of Justice
  - Provides real time information on the overall status of court operations
  - Allows for informed decision-making
  - Helps to determine priorities
  - Promotes innovation in courts
  - Strengthens compliance with standards and criteria
  - Supports better resource distribution
  - Advances improved case management

- Promoting Judicial Transparency and Increasing Public Awareness
  - Provides public access to results online
  - Allows for the distribution of reports to broad range of judicial stakeholders
  - Illustrates achievements and challenges based on a specific set of indicators
  - Provides more information to respond to media and public inquiries
In May 2016, the COJ recommended that all courts implement at least two evaluation modules in the CPE Framework, court user satisfaction surveys and internal surveys of judges and court staff. By the conclusion of FAIR, 383 courts — 50 percent of all courts in Ukraine — had implemented the CPE Framework in full or in part. This includes 313 courts (41 percent of all courts) that implemented court user satisfaction surveys. (See the Snapshot on the next page.)

**Promoting Improved Court Financing**

In order to support changes to the structure and practice of court financing, FAIR conducted a review of the budgeting process of Ukraine’s judiciary, and prepared a set of recommendations, including increasing the role of judicial self-governance bodies in the process of preparing and defending budget requests, enabling budget requests to be directly submitted to Parliament, negotiating a discount on postal services, allowing the public to pay court fees directly to the court, and allowing trial courts of general jurisdiction more freedom in administering their own budgets.

FAIR also recommended that the COJ and SJA develop a set of case weighting standards for the judiciary to substantiate needs-based budget requests and help balance the judicial workload. The project designed a three-tier case weighting study, including methodology and relevant tools. As part of the methodology development, FAIR determined that trial courts of civil and criminal jurisdictions were the best place to start the study, given their high caseload and diversity of cases. As part of the study, the chief judges of all 666 trial courts completed a self-evaluation questionnaire estimating the amount of time they spend considering different types of cases. This was followed by a 1.5-month long objective time study, where the judges of a representative number of courts kept track of their daily activities. In June 2014, FAIR presented the study results to a focus group composed of members of the COJ, the COJ of General Courts, and the SJA, all of whom approved the results of the study and the case weights. Accordingly, the COJ recommended their pilot implementation in select courts in Decision #37 of June 12, 2014.

Both the COJ and the SJA requested support from FAIR in conducting a similar study for all the remaining courts, exception for the three high courts and the Supreme Court. In cooperation with the SJA, FAIR developed an updated methodology for the study in order to use the information from the electronic CMS of the courts directly, and received approval from the SJA to proceed with the study. In November 2015, 90 appellate and trial courts of specialized jurisdiction returned the questionnaire forms developed by FAIR regarding their judges’ caseload. The project also received information from these courts about the overall duration of proceedings grouped by case type.

In June 2016, the COJ approved the methodology used to calculate the case weights, the resulting time, and case complexity rating values, and recommended the SJA to use the results of the case weighting study when making managerial decisions about workload and staffing of the courts. Specifically, the case weighting system helped:

- Determine the number of judges needed to process the cases filed
- Determine how those judges should be allocated across court locations
- Balance the workload of judges within and across courts
More Accountable Ukrainian Courts

Support in establishing a court performance framework helps the Ukrainian judiciary be more effective and accountable to the public.

Historically, Ukrainian courts have lacked performance standards, which has contributed to continuously low public trust and the perception that the judiciary is ineffective and corrupt. To address this issue, the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project assisted the Council of Judges (COJ) and State Judicial Administration to develop and implement a Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework for Ukrainian courts.

The CPE Framework was designed to include 35 indicators to measure court compliance with 19 quality criteria in line with current Ukrainian legislation and European principles of judicial accountability. It uses internal surveys of judges and court staff, expert analysis of case files, external court performance evaluation through citizen report card surveys of court users, and an analysis of individual court statistics.

On April 2, 2015, the COJ approved the CPE Framework to measure court performance for better court management and proper reporting to the public. Ukraine is now one of 42 members of the Council of Europe with court performance indicators. As a result, the International Consortium for Court Excellence, a worldwide network of international judicial institutions, welcomed the COJ as member on October 23, 2015. This demonstrated international recognition of the Ukrainian judiciary’s increased capacity to apply court quality management models to promote court excellence.

The COJ’s approval of the CPE Framework prompted 383 courts — 50 percent of all courts in Ukraine — to implement a CPE program. In April 2016, the COJ issued a decision recommending all courts to implement the CPE Framework by the end of 2016 and to publish performance evaluation results on court websites.

The Court Performance Evaluation Framework in self-selected courts is helping the judiciary make strategic decisions and improve access to justice, and increases user satisfaction with court services.
- Determine how many judges and how much time would be needed to process any backlog of cases in the courts
- Prepare and provide objective support for budgetary requests by the courts

After applying the data from the study to the 2015 workload, the SJA concluded that Ukraine now has about 10-20 percent (varying depending on jurisdiction) more judges than needed to handle the caseload. This is especially important given the government’s plans to make changes to the structure of the courts by combining smaller courts with smaller caseloads, reducing the number of judges and court staff. In addition, to develop the capacity of the SJA to conduct similar studies in the future, FAIR procured two packages of the Statistical Package for Social Science software, as well as conducted training courses for SJA staff on the usage of this system. It also prepared and provided the SJA with a manual on how to conduct case weighting studies based on the methodology developed by FAIR experts.

Problems encountered. The different CPE Working Group members had different views on the overall approach to court performance. The key issue was getting to a common understanding of court performance standards. It took some time for the FAIR team to build a consensus among the CPE Working Group members. FAIR built the common understanding of members around the basic values of the judiciary in democratic society, leaving the physical nature of standards more flexible. The CPE Framework remained in a draft status for almost two years. Neither the COJ nor the SJA was able to take a lead on formal consideration and approval of the CPE Framework and assume ownership and responsibility for its implementation. Despite FAIR efforts to promote the CPE Framework approval, it did not happen until the COJ was elected after the 2014 Revolution of Dignity. The new COJ leadership was strong, and FAIR used the momentum to promote rapid consideration of the framework, its formal approval, and further implementation. Implementation in the majority of Ukrainian courts began in the last program year.

While implementing the case weighting study, FAIR faced challenges that can be grouped into two categories: technical and political. On the technical side, FAIR did not foresee the resources needed to complete the case weighting study for the trial courts of general jurisdiction, which resulted in considerable delays in data analysis. The project also experienced significant problems with the Excel-based data input forms, which were locked for editing to avoid wrong data input. However, it turned out that because most of the courts were using older versions of Excel, they were still able to input incorrect types of data into incorrect fields. FAIR worked to mitigate this issue in the second round of the study by reducing the number of forms that had to be manually filled in and using the data from the court CMS instead. Politically, once results showed a clear need to reduce the number of judges in certain jurisdictions, the COJ became much less supportive of the study overall. FAIR worked with its partners to explain that the case weights should be applied on a court-by-court basis, rather than nationwide, and be used to make managerial decisions at the level of specific courts. The political will to reduce the number of judges, as well as the steady decline of judicial caseload nationwide over the last three years, played an important role in convincing project partners to accept the results of the study.
Lessons learned. It is important to promote the CPE Framework with other judicial institutions, including the HCJ, HQC, and SJA, to ensure that its sustainability of leadership and ownership is maintained despite leadership changes and updated legislation. FAIR identified more than a dozen types of errors that courts committed when implementing the CPE Framework — errors that could mislead court leadership, as well as the COJ itself, about the CPE results and cause inappropriate management actions and reporting to the public. The CPE training program aims to facilitate a more efficient application of framework; it also supports the establishment of a Ukrainian network of regional advisors or coordinators who will be able to assist their counterparts in the proper implementation of the Framework. This is another solution to this issue.

Complications related to judicial workload remain a significant burden on the judiciary. Workload varies greatly among courts depending on their location, and there is some variance in the types of cases the courts handle. Judges’ workloads is also poorly balanced, usually as a result of administrative decisions passed by the management of the court. The implementation of a system of case weights nationwide will help to solve these problems, but much will depend on how the case weights will be used at local level.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. FAIR proposes the following activities to promote better judicial operations in the future:

- Develop a network of CPE regional advisors and coordinators. Most courts are able to implement the framework and use it for management and reporting purposes, but it is necessary to maintain and develop this achievement, which would be most effective through a network.
- Support the Court Management Institute in implementing the CPE training program for judges and court staff throughout Ukraine.
- Establish community justice centers. At the 2016 International Conference for Court Excellence in Singapore, the Ukrainian delegation learned about these centers, which are NGOs created in a region by courts to provide a wide range of services to court users. FAIR identified at least two courts — Odesa Circuit Administrative Court and Chernihiv Oblast Court of Appeals — that are very much inspired by this idea and are ready to host a center.
- Assess how the CPE Framework is implemented by courts, how courts are using results of its implementation, how the public reacts to CPE results, and make changes to the framework accordingly.
- Continue to support to the COJ, SJA and other entities in charge of court staffing and financing in implementing the results of the case weighting study to balance judicial workload and take informed human resource management decisions, as well as to justify the judiciary’s budget requests.
- Utilize the International Framework for Judicial Support Excellence to evaluate the quality of services provided by judicial support organizations.
EXPECTED RESULT 3.3: THE SJA’S CAPACITY TO REPRESENT AND SUPPORT THE DEVELOPING NEEDS OF UKRAINE’S JUDICIARY IS STRENGTHENED

Background. Developing reliable automation solutions in the courts has been a key focus of USAID and Millennium Challenge Corporation rule of law programs. Despite successful pilot programs, which included the complete automation of six courts in Donetsk, Kharkiv, and Ivano-Frankivsk oblasts, as well as the preparation of strategic documents to pave the way to nationwide court automation, these efforts have repeatedly failed to make a broader impact due to scarce financial resources and the absence of political will. The new Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, passed in 2010, required complete automation of the courts by January 1, 2011. At least six different case management systems were introduced in multiple courts across Ukraine, with no clear strategy for integration. Furthermore, no meaningful functional requirements analysis was conducted in Ukrainian courts.

To capitalize on the achievements of USAID and other donor projects, FAIR supported the judiciary in preparing a Strategic Plan for Developing the Ukrainian Judiciary and an integrated strategy for nationwide automation, including specific budget support plans and fully developed plans to procure operating systems and equipment.

Accomplishments. FAIR achieved several major results in strengthening the administration of the courts.

Developing a Strategic Plan for the Ukrainian Judiciary
In December 2011, the COJ, SJA, and FAIR conducted an international conference on strategic planning for the judiciary; its outcomes were used to conduct five focus groups with the COJ, SJA, judges, and court staff. These discussions focused on an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to the judiciary and judicial reform, and highlighted key themes such as weak judicial self-governance, political interference in judicial processes, a flawed case assignment system, poor understanding and enforcement of judicial ethics, and low wages contributing to high court staff turnover. FAIR, the COJ, and the SJA’s Working Group on Innovations then conducted a national Open Space Conference to discuss ideas for the judiciary that advanced the participatory drafting of a strategic plan by including more than 100 representatives of judicial stakeholders throughout Ukraine.
As a result of these activities, the SJA’s Strategic Planning Subgroup and FAIR developed a draft strategic plan for the judiciary, for its comment and review. In September 2012, to continue professional discussion, the SJA posted the draft plan on the judiciary’s website (www.court.gov.ua/18787). The COJ approved the Strategic Plan for the Ukrainian Judiciary for 2013 to 2015 in December 2012. The plan outlined five core values — independence, integrity, professionalism, fairness and equality, and openness and accessibility — and seven strategic issues.

**Building the SJA’s Capacity to Support the Courts**

To support practical implementation of the strategic plan, FAIR worked with the SJA to design an appropriate organizational structure and policies in the SJA to support IT, procurement, capital improvement, human resources, statistical collections, and analysis activities in the courts. FAIR supported the participation of a Ukrainian delegation of 13 SJA, court, and civil society representatives at a June 2012 conference organized by the International Association for Court Administration in The Hague. Knowledge gained from the conference led the SJA in conducting the first-ever international judicial administration conference on court innovations in Ukraine in September 2012, with support from FAIR speakers and moderators. The conference brought together more than 200 participants, including more than 40 guests from the United States, the Netherlands, Denmark, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, Bulgaria, Egypt, Hungary, Moldova, Lithuania, and Georgia.

**Developing a Court Automation Strategy**

To promote efficient use of court technology, FAIR worked with the SJA and State Enterprise Information Court Systems to prepare a draft automation strategy the judiciary. Teaming Ukrainian and U.S. experts, FAIR presented a draft strategy to the SJA in January 2012 that described the status of automation, identified pending problems, and offered solutions in the form of specific project-by-project steps, with the goal of automating the majority of the aspects of the courts’ work.

To mitigate the administrative influence of the SJA and State Enterprise Information Court Systems, and to ensure that the final strategy met the needs of the judiciary, FAIR conducted three focus groups with judges and court staff in Odessa, Lviv, and Donetsk. The project collected information on the state of IT in the courts, information on the relevance of the action steps proposed in the draft, as well as new ideas and initiatives to be incorporated into the draft strategy, and submitted the updated draft to the SJA.

In June 2013, the COJ of General Jurisdiction Courts approved the draft court automation strategy. However, the final draft criticized the SJA’s automation efforts and called for a complete revision of the courts’ CMS. The SJA refused to proceed with a formal approval of the strategy, and took a strong stance against it being reviewed by the COJ. FAIR therefore suspended its court automation strategy activities until 2015, when it initiated cooperation with the Judicial Reform Council of Ukraine and the presidential administration to revise the draft strategy. Following the Council’s request, FAIR prepared a concept for implementing e-justice tools and improving the infrastructure of the judiciary that advocated for an entirely new approach to the automation of court case management, human resources, and budget management processes. The concept called for developing a Web-based application that would allow secure remote access from all courts, and for the
system to be administered centrally, saving human and financial resources, and reducing the need to install hardware. The concept also required the judiciary to engage in a thorough business process analysis prior to developing the new system to identify bottlenecks, inefficient processes and procedures, and make modifications. The Council approved the concept and began implementation in March 2016.

**Installing Information and Pay Terminals in Courts**
In September 2015, FAIR unveiled a pilot project at Kyivskiy District Court of Odessa to procure 42 electronic pay terminals to be installed in the courts. The project also provided the SJA with public information and outreach materials to be made available on the information terminal (http://court.gov.ua/gromadjanam). Due to technical problems, including the shut-down of the service provider the SJA contracted to provide the software for the pay terminals, the information kiosks functioned only in information mode for six months, and did not start accepting court fee payments until mid-2016. In addition, changes to the law passed by the Parliament abolished the court police, which was responsible for providing security in court buildings, leaving some courts with practically no security. For this reason, the SJA stopped pay mode function locations where court security was unavailable.

To date, all the information kiosks are technically able to receive court fees, with 30 functioning in pay mode and 12 temporarily working in information mode until the issue with court security is resolved. Court users have already paid up to 100,000 hryvnia in court fees using the terminals. In addition, this effort prompted the SJA to develop a module for online payment of court fees, which is currently available on the judiciary website (http://court.gov.ua/sudytax).

**Supporting the Development of Court Case Management Regulations**
FAIR supported the working group in developing a new case management regulation established under the leadership of the COJ Administration Committee. The working group prepared the new regulation on electronic case management in courts, which clearly establishes the rules for assigning cases to judges, the roles, rights, and responsibilities of CMS users, statistical reporting, and lays out the foundations for implementation of paperless court technologies. The COJ approved the regulation at its meeting on April 2, 2015. Inter alia, in an effort to increase transparency of the judiciary, the new regulation requires providing free public access to the case assignment logs generated by the CMS per each case, which is now available online at http://court.gov.ua/fair. The case assignment log contains information about when the case was assigned, all the judges who participated in the assignment process, the reasons for non-participation (e.g., vacation and recusal), and other information that allows the public to identify potential manipulations.

**Designing and Implementing an E-Court Pilot Project**
FAIR supported a pilot project to move courts toward full-fledged electronic case management, aimed at providing the courts with the ability to convert documents into electronic format, attach them to the electronic case file, and use the electronic versions for all internal document circulation processes. FAIR purchased computer equipment for the Kyivsky District Court of Odesa City, the Ovidiopol Raion Court of Odesa Oblast, and the Odessa Oblast Court of Appeals. This equipment allows documents filed with the court to be converted into a digital format, reducing the workload of court administrative offices and expenses on paper case management.
In September 2015, FAIR officially unveiled the e-Court pilot project in Kyivskyi District Court of Odessa Oblast. Benefits of the project include a significant time reduction to process cases due to the expedited exchange of information between the court and other government agencies, financial savings associated with paperless technologies (potentially 4.5 million hryvnia per year if implemented in all Odessa Oblast courts), and increased public accessibility to the courts. In addition, the pilot helped identify organizational and legal obstacles in the way of implementing a paperless automated court caseflow management system and offered solutions to overcome these issues.

**Problems encountered.** The automation of the courts is one of the most problematic issues in court administration in Ukraine, due to the many financially and politically interested parties in the process. On one hand, most automation projects are by default being implemented by the State Enterprise Information Court Systems, leading to potential corruption during the procurement of services and, consequently, the poor quality of services provided. On the other hand, the absence of a secure and robust automation solution resistant to manipulation leaves the judiciary vulnerable to fraud in the case assignment process, as well as in human resource management and finance. This caused delays in the consideration of cases by the court and a failure to produce reliable statistical data on court operations. Over its lifetime, FAIR worked to mitigate these risks through wide engagement of the judicial community by encouraging feedback and promoting the accountability of court service organizations.

The Revolution of Dignity opened a new window of opportunity for FAIR to continue this work through cooperation with the Judicial Reform Council, as there now exists clear political will to reform court infrastructure. At the same time, as illustrated by the significant delays FAIR experienced in implementing the court pay terminal pilot project, the SJA as a court service organization lacks the capacity to engage into efficient long-term planning, and has limited financial resources to ensure effective implementation of automation-related initiatives.

**Lessons learned.** The limited institutional capacity of court service organizations posed an obstacle to the successful and timely implementation of project activities. Through extensive involvement of international expertise, FAIR worked to convince its counterparts to support its activities, as they were in line with global trends and internationally recognized best practices.

The procurement of commodities and services often became the focus of improper financial and political interest, leading to unexpected setbacks and shortcomings. For this reason, FAIR put special emphasis on transparency and accountability in the procurement process, and ensured broad involvement of all interested parties. Weak leadership by judicial self-government institutions often resulted in court service organizations taking an improper leadership role in driving change without considering the actual needs of the courts. FAIR worked to mitigate these risks by ensuring broad participation of the judicial corps in all activities, including the development of strategic documents, in order to ensure feedback from end-users. It is important to develop the capacity of judicial leadership to properly develop the vision, set the goals, and evaluate the performance of court service organizations against objective and realistic criteria.
Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. The need to transition to paperless technology is clearly supported by the outcomes of the e-Court pilot project, which showed significant reductions in time and cost associated with court proceedings, from which members of the public, as court users, will ultimately benefit. Thus, FAIR recommends these follow-on activities:

- Support a business process analysis of caseflow in the general jurisdiction courts as a precursor to upgrading the courts’ CMS
- Based on results of this analysis, support the judiciary in formulating detailed terms of reference for the development of a new, modern, transparent, and secure CMS
- Support the software development and implementation process
- Assist judicial leadership in developing their capacity to set goals and objectively evaluate the results of the work of court service organizations

EXPECTED RESULT 3.4: THE CAPACITY OF COURTS AND JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE PUBLIC IS ENHANCED, LEADING TO GREATER PUBLIC APPRECIATION OF THEIR ACTIVITIES

Background. Since 2011, FAIR has worked to build the capacity of the judiciary to engage in public outreach and communications activities. This included developing a curriculum and training trainers to teach judges and court staff on communications, training journalists on how to better cover the courts, and preparing manuals for judicial personnel and journalists. It also included helping judicial institutions and individual courts to develop and implement communications strategies. FAIR also prepared awareness kits containing public awareness videos, brochures, leaflets, and posters on the judiciary.

Expected Result 3.4 was introduced in 2013 in response to the urgent need for the judiciary to more effectively communicate with the media and public due to declining levels of trust and confidence, which decreased to 5 percent after the Revolution of Dignity. This hindered judicial independence and numerous other reforms, including anticorruption and human rights. Before FAIR, no regulatory or strategic framework existed to guide courts in public outreach and communications. Judges and court staff were not systematically trained in public relations and communications, and had limited educational materials to train court staff. Likewise, the public had little to no understanding of court activities.

Accomplishments. FAIR supported the COJ and SJA in developing and adopting a series of essential regulatory and strategic documents that continue to provide guidance to courts and key judicial institutions in their communications activities, including Court Public Information Officer Job Instruction; Regulation on the Judiciary Press Center; Guidelines on Courts and Media Relations; COJ Communications Strategy; and HCJ Communications Strategy. Courts now have an institutional basis for their communications activities and clear guidance from top-level judicial institutions that stress the importance of court communications activities and set out the steps courts must take to succeed.
With the NSJ, COJ, SJA, and EU-COE Consolidation of Justice Sector Policy Development in Ukraine project, FAIR prepared, updated, printed, and disseminated nationwide principal educational materials for judges and court staff and journalists to use as guidance in their daily activities and in conducting professional training. The materials included a Court and Community Communications Manual, updated in 2016; a Court and Community Communications Curriculum, developed in 2016; and a Courts and Media manual for journalists, updated in 2016. With these publications, any judge, court staff member, or journalist had access to unique, tailored manuals and curriculum to educate themselves or conduct communications training programs for courts, media, and the public.

In 2015 and 2016, FAIR awarded three grants to Odesa, Sumy, and Chernivtsi regional CSOs. In cooperation with local courts in each region, these grantees enhanced public trust in the judiciary and established constructive dialogue among courts, media, and the public. Specifically, FAIR grantees created analytical video programs, conducted training events that enhanced the communication skills of public information officers and court staff, monitored the informational content and compliance with national legislation on the courts’ websites to ensure access to public information, and established the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication. During and after grantees completed their activities, FAIR received additional requests from courts and CSOs across Ukraine to support similar grant projects in their regions. The success of these activities and the requests for additional activities that they generated show that such projects can significantly increase public trust in the judiciary at the local level.

In 2013, FAIR supported the SJA in launching the first Distance Learning Course on Court and Community Communications for court staff, which the project updated and re-launched in 2016. Approximately 100 court staff received professional training on managing court communications with the public, enabling them to provide guidance to their colleagues. Participants learned how to organize court public events and press briefings, administer court websites and court pages in social media, and write press releases. The NSJ then introduced more online courses for judges and court staff to enhance their skills without having to physically attend courses.

FAIR supported a number of judicial institutions in developing websites. As noted above, the project worked with the Constitutional Assembly and the COJ in 2013, and again with the COJ in 2016, to update their websites to make them more informative and user-friendly. Users can now follow activities though interactive calendars, download documents in different formats, share important news through their social media accounts, and see the most popular news items in one place. The Constitutional Assembly and COJ were given the tools to directly reach more people, whose trust in the judiciary was enhanced.

In February 2015, FAIR supported the COJ and SJA in conducting a conference entitled “Strengthening Public Trust in the Judiciary Through Effective Court Communications.” The conference brought together representatives of judicial institutions and judicial self-governance bodies, including judges, public information officers, court staff, and experts on court communications from the United States and United Kingdom. Participants identified ways to establish efficient communications between the judiciary and the public to improve public awareness.
and strengthen trust in the judiciary. They also learned how to effectively introduce the position of judge-speaker in each court, conduct regular monitoring of public opinion and media monitoring, elaborate a detailed communication action plan in each court, engage in close and less formal communication directly with media and CSOs, and proactively inform the public on the progress of the of high-profile cases. The recommendations participants developed were approved by COJ Decision No. 14 on March 12, 2015.

FAIR, with the NSJ, COJ, SJA, joint EU-COE Consolidation of Justice Sector Policy Development in Ukraine project, and European Union Advisory Mission, conducted nine one-day regional training courses for public information officers and judge-speakers working in the courts of Lviv, Kharkiv, Odesa, Kyiv, Chernigiv, Kherson, Mykolayiv, Dnipro, and Zaporizhzhia regions. The courses were preceded by eight roundtables with representatives of local media from Lviv, Kharkiv, Odesa, Kyiv, Kherson, Mykolayiv, Dnipro, and Zaporizhzhia regions.

As many as 550 of the public information officers and judges who participated in the courses have applied their new knowledge by regularly informing the public on court operations through court websites and social media, working directly with the media by providing press releases, facilitating participation in court sessions, and arranging public awareness campaigns and public events in their courts. These judges are now more confident in gaining interviews, participating in public events, and updating the public on relevant court improvements. Through articles, approximately 115 of the participating journalists shared information about this with their audiences.

FAIR contributed to two regional training programs for 33 journalists from Lviv and Vinnytsia on reporting on judicial reforms. The two-day courses were conducted by the Academy of Ukrainian Press, with the support of Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom. Many court professionals and journalists obtained their first training in communications and are now applying their knowledge by establishing constructive communications with court staff, successfully obtaining information from the courts, and regularly reporting on court activities. Furthermore, 30 judges have expressed their willingness to conduct similar training programs for their colleagues.

FAIR prepared and disseminated civic education materials through its partner CSO network, as well as directly during USAID Field Days, informing thousands of Ukrainians on the progress of judicial reforms and important information pertaining to court operations. FAIR also provided information and pay terminals to 43 courts that are now used to offer legal education materials to court visitors. Thousands of people reached by FAIR now have a higher appreciation of court activities and knowledge of their rights.

FAIR’s activities and support in court and community communications have encouraged at least 26 courts in different regions to develop, publish, and implement their own communication strategies. Pursuant to these strategies, the courts’ communications teams conduct public events and press briefings, communicate with the public directly through court websites and social media, and facilitate media presence during high-profile cases. According to the FAIR 2016 National Public Opinion Survey Regarding Democratic Development, Judicial Reform, and the Process of Purification of Government, these nationwide activities resulted in a
substantial increase in public trust in the judiciary, from 5 percent in 2015 to 10 percent in 2016.\textsuperscript{10} Thus, FAIR’s activities in this area proved to be successful and sustainable, guiding courts across Ukraine to enhance their communications activities without further donor support.

Problems encountered. The new judge-speaker position was introduced by COJ Decision No. 14 of March 12, 2015. However, the decision did not contain a job description, and it remained unclear how the chief judge, the judge-speaker, the chief of court staff, and the public information officer in each court should cooperate and communicate with the public. Furthermore, the provision of the Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges, which allows the public to record court proceedings on video devices without a judge’s permission, remains unclear. There is no description of the types of proceedings — or the types of recording devices — that should be permitted. Moreover, the provision contradicts the provisions of criminal, civil, commercial, and administrative procedural codes. FAIR brought these issues to the attention of COJ and SJA representatives during each meeting and training, and urged them to in fill the gaps.

Another challenge was that the unified Court Access Rules were not elaborated or widely adopted, making it difficult and often impossible for the public and journalists to access the premises of certain courts that apply their own rules. These and other shortcomings may be attributable to the fact that judicial institutions were underfinanced and understaffed and had no vision for strategic development of the judiciary, and were therefore not motivated to work effectively toward a common goal. Judges and court staff tended to focus on their day-to-day activities. Some institutions, including the NSJ, lacked internal organization an effective internal communication tools due to ambitions and competition within their leadership. It was often difficult to convince principal judiciary institutions to implement changes and engage in new activities. On the other hand, because local institutions cannot own any programs and documents, they cannot be effectively implemented if the institutions fail to participate and contribute to their development.

To overcome such difficulties, FAIR conducted numerous meetings and discussions, and repeatedly and consistently drew the attention of the highest judiciary institutions’ leadership to these and other issues that still need to be resolved. A systematic approach will be required, such as establishing a working group consisting of COJ and SJA representatives, local and international experts, and CSOs. Such a working group should analyze all the gaps that need to be filled to make the mechanics of communications activities clear to court staff, judges, the public, and the media. The working group should elaborate all necessary documents and provide them for adoption to the COJ and SJA following a public discussion.

Lessons learned. FAIR’s close and generally successful cooperation with the judiciary and journalists in court and community communications demonstrated that it was possible to make a difference even if the leadership of the judiciary for a long time failed to realize the importance of this area of activities.

\textsuperscript{10} \url{www.fair.org.ua/content/library_doc/fair_gfk_eng.pdf}. 
It is important first to convince the leadership of the importance of specific activities before taking any actions. For example, by conducting a public awareness campaign in 2011-2012, FAIR drew the attention of the High Civil and Criminal Court and two large regional appellate courts to the importance of communication. As a result, these courts requested project support in elaborating their communications strategies to proactively engage and inform the public about their activities. Furthermore, effective cooperation with the most active and motivated judges and court staff encourages others to follow their lead. For example, more and more judges follow the lead of COJ Communication Committee members and regularly give interviews and participate in press briefings.

To accommodate journalists, all events that engage them must be short and specific, and it is essential to establish ties with editors of major media rather than individual journalists. Journalists have access to educational materials and background information so they can report accurately. To address this, FAIR elaborated on and published hardcopy and electronic versions of the Courts and Media Manual for Journalists, which was highly regarded by journalists all over Ukraine.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. It is important to eliminate gaps and contradictory legislative provisions.

- More advanced training should occur in regions where only the introductory one-day training was conducted. Additional communications training courses for members of the judiciary are critical. Judges in only nine of 24 regions participated in FAIR training programs.
- Additional grant programs to enhance direct communication and cooperation of courts with CSOs on the regional level should be implemented to meet the high demand identified.
- A Distance Learning Course on Court and Community Communications for judges, including judge-speakers, should be developed and launched.
OBJECTIVE 4

THE ROLE OF CSOs AS ADVOCATES FOR AND MONITORS OF JUDICIAL REFORM IS STRENGTHENED

EXPECTED RESULT 4.1: CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE UKRAINIAN PUBLIC ARE ENGAGED IN THE JUDICIAL REFORM PROCESS

Background. In 2011, civil society was not fully engaged in judicial reform, and the judicial leadership generally did not see civil society as a legitimate partner in promoting and defending judicial independence. The judiciary remained subject to political interference, with relatively weak judicial institutions and limited capacity to cooperate with civil society. Civil society and the judiciary criticized each other instead of creating bridges for cooperation. During the Revolution of Dignity, the government used the judiciary as tool to ban peaceful assembly and infringe on freedom of speech. To initiate public discussion on how to avoid this in the future, it was critically important to analyze the reasons for the judiciary playing such a role.

Accomplishments. In recognition of the need to develop strong public demand for judicial accountability from CSOs, which represent all of Ukraine, FAIR focused on the following activities:

Civil Society Engagement
To facilitate more active civil society engagement in the judicial reform process, FAIR launched the Strengthening the Role of Civil Society Organizations as Advocates for and Monitors of Judicial Reform grant program in November 2013. Through the program, FAIR supported 72 CSO initiatives to conduct research on the status and content of pending judicial reform legislation and the constitutional reform processes, and operations of judiciary authorities. FAIR also supported public awareness campaigns on court operations, capacity building for judges' associations, and awareness of gender issues in justice issues. The project successfully involved a range of civic partners, from newly established organizations to those with experience cooperating with courts and judiciary authorities.

FAIR grantees conducted studies and developed legal policy proposals related all expected results to pending judicial reform legislation. In 2014-2015, the Institute Republic, a CSO, monitored 126 decisions of judges pertaining to the freedom to peaceably assemble, which was denied by local governments that banned peaceful meetings in whole or in part in 2013 and 2014. Institute Republic developed the first manual on peaceful assembly for judges, civic activists, and local authorities. The manual includes the review of international and Ukrainian legislation, and good court decisions related to peaceful assemblies.

In March 2015, Institute Republic conducted a roundtable with the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Human Rights, National Minorities, and Interethnic Relations to present the monitoring results and make recommendations for judges, members of Parliament, law enforcement bodies, local councils’ representatives, and civic activists to amend legislation to support the right of peaceful assembly. Some amendments
became a law. For example, the Parliament accepted recommendations about police officers’ ID numbers in a new law on the national police. (During the Revolution of Dignity, police officers did not have ID numbers, so it was difficult for civic activists to identify policemen who violated the right to peaceful protest). The High Administrative Courts accepted the monitoring report for making recommendations to judges on trials about on peaceful assembly. After grant completion, Institute Republic continued to monitor court cases related to peaceful assembly and reported a decrease in the number of complaints the courts received.

**Court Performance Monitoring**

In 2014, IAHR, a FAIR grantee in Kharkiv, monitored court performance in hearing election disputes related to the 2012 Parliamentary election and the 2010 and 2014 presidential elections. It recommended additional training for judges who hear election disputes, improved administration of court operations during election campaigns, improved legislation in hearing election disputes, and increased capacity of CSOs in monitoring court operations. The NSJ and the HAC used the report findings to develop training courses for judges of general courts before local elections in October 2015.

In 2015, FAIR supported IAHR again to monitor court performance and decisions related to local elections. Experts found that the level of court administration during trials increased, and the number of court appeals regarding lists of voters decreased. The IAHR also identified problems in protecting election rights of internally displaced persons and gender quotas in political parties’ candidate lists in 2015 local elections.

**Public Awareness**

In April 2014 and October 2015, FAIR conducted two public forums on cooperation between civil society and justice to establish new bridges for cooperation. At the first event, representatives of civil society and the judiciary discussed needs; at the second event, CSOs introduced findings in mediation as a means of restoring trust in the judiciary, peaceful assemblies, court performance evaluation through CRC surveys, gender issues in court proceedings, and collecting judicial data. Approximately 300 representatives of the judiciary and civil society discussed challenges and opportunities for civil society engagement in justice sector reform.

Since 2012, FAIR has supported annual “Lawyers to Society” forums as part of the MOJ’s Ukrainian Week. The project made presentations about judicial reform progress and court performance evaluations, and disseminated materials about judiciary and court procedures, access to free legal aid, and public engagement in evaluating the quality of courts’ performance to approximately 3,000 participants. Representatives of 30 law firms provided free legal aid to visitors. The forum also provided the opportunity for young lawyers and students to participate in practical training on civil, criminal, and commercial court proceedings, and master classes conducted by experienced lawyers on issues related to trial advocacy, legal writing and research, and professional ethics.
To increase young professionals’ awareness of judicial reforms, FAIR supported the MOJ Council of Youth in hosting eight Judiciary Schools. Nearly 450 law students, young lawyers, and legal clinic managers attended the training and master classes to improve their practical skills and theoretical knowledge. FAIR representatives presented on topics such as judicial reform in Ukraine, judicial selection and appointment, and the Court Performance Evaluation System using CRC methodology. The project also supported the MOJ in increasing public awareness about free legal aid by disseminating thousands of public awareness kits with 26 leaflets and brochures, and a video on newly adopted legislation in 2013-2016.

**Gender Inclusion**

FAIR promoted gender inclusion focused on institutional development and improving regulations, procedures, and reporting forms. It supported two civic initiatives on monitoring court decisions about gender discrimination, focusing on the application of Ukrainian legislation in light of international standards. CSOs found that:

- Few discrimination cases accurately reflect the obstacles women face in courts. For example, from 2006 to 2015, judges referred to the Law on Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men in 131 cases, but only 31 of those pertained to protection against gender discrimination.
- The Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, and European Court of Human Rights decisions are rarely used in judgments.
- Many of the obstacles that impede women’s access to justice, including the cost of legal support and lack of awareness among women victims of their rights, are judicial stereotyping that cause judges to adjudicate cases based on preconceived beliefs rather than relevant facts and actual inquiry.

In June 2016, FAIR conducted a forum entitled “Gender Issues in the Ukrainian Judiciary” with the OSCE’s Rule of Law and Human Rights Program and the Canadian Judicial Education for Economic Growth Project. Through lively discussion, 100 participants, including judges, court staff, and civic activists, developed a list of recommendations to improve legislation, including a gender component that involves judicial data collection and education for judges to improve application of international, constitutional, and legislative obligations, thus ensuring equality between men and women in court proceedings. FAIR then supported members of
the COJ to prepare its decision on improving the collection of gender disaggregated statistical data in the judiciary.

In 2015 and 2016, in cooperation with the regional branches of the NSJ in Odesa, Chernivtsi, Uzhhorod, and Lviv, FAIR grantees conducted a series of gender in justice initiatives, including six roundtables to present the findings court decisions based on gender equality and non-discrimination, and seven training courses for judges. During these courses, 180 judges increased their knowledge and the skills to apply Ukrainian and international legislation on gender discrimination to their cases.

As a result of FAIR support, on September 16, 2016, the COJ adopted a decision recommending that the SJA include a gender component in collecting data on judges and court staff, to be disaggregated by sex, and basic data on gender-sensitive cases.

**Problems encountered.** There was minimal cooperation among representatives of the judiciary, lawmakers, and civil society in developing amendments to legislation. For example, with FAIR support, the Association of Judges developed a list of recommendations to improve legislation and presented it to lawmakers, but the Association lacked the capacity to advocate for application of its recommendations with policymakers.

Gender experts and the Parliament commissioner for human rights noted that there was not a specialized legal, institutional basis for preventing and combating gender-based violence in Ukraine. There was also no definition of gender-based violence in the Law on Ensuring Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men. Moreover, there are no special measures or services for rehabilitation and social integration of victims of such violence, except for family violence.

**Lessons learned.** In working with the Association of Judges, FAIR found that judges’ organizations lack capacity to advocate for legislative changes. It is important for judges to cooperate with civil society to assess and monitor the impact of legislation in force and legislative drafts on the justice system. Also, in supporting initiatives on gender mainstreaming, FAIR confirmed the need to increase the gender awareness of judges and judiciary leaders on international and Ukrainian laws on gender equality.

**Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities.** FAIR recommends these follow-on activities:

- Initiatives for cooperation between judges and civil society to assess and monitor the impact of legislation in force and legislative drafts on the justice system, and advocate for the adoption of amendments by lawmakers
- Increased cooperation with judicial authorities and Parliament on gender mainstreaming, such as including a definition of gender-based violence in the
Law on Ensuring Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men, supporting judicial authorities in preparing, ratifying, and implementing the COE Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence

- Increase the leadership skills of women judges in cooperation with the newly founded Association of Women Judges
- Cooperation with the NSJ in developing a plan for gender integration into its activities to meet international standards on gender education for judges and application of the Ukrainian laws, and increase access to justice for internally displaced persons and survivors of sexual gender-based violence.

**EXPECTED RESULT 4.2: CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS HAVE MEANS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO EFFECTIVELY MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF JUDICIAL SECTOR REFORMS AND PROVIDE OVERSIGHT TO JUDICIAL OPERATIONS**

**Background.** Effective civil society oversight of the judiciary must involve all stakeholders with the judiciary, including national judicial institutions, judges, and court staff. Since 2006, there have been efforts to change the perception of the judiciary from an isolated and self-serving branch of government to an institution that provides public services. From 2008 to 2011, USAID’s UROL project launched activities related to the CRC surveys in selected courts. At the outset, it was difficult to encourage courts to evaluate their performance using court user’s CRC surveys or receive recommendations to improve court operations because court administrators believed that these types of recommendations needed to come from central judicial bodies, particularly because the SJA was dependent on significant government funding. All these causes have influenced the low public awareness and diminished public confidence in the courts. Exhibit VI shows the breadth of CRC use.

**Exhibit VI. Regions Covered by CRC Surveys**
In addition, though Ukraine ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2010, the Ukrainian government and public still have not paid enough attention to the needs PWDs. As a result, PWDs faced limited access to justice. Violence in eastern Ukraine resulted in more PWDs seeking justice.

Accomplishments. FAIR conducted the following activities for civil society oversight of judicial sector reforms and to promote PWDs’ access to justice.

Expanding use of CRCs
In 2012, eight CSOs conducted surveys in 34 pilot courts in 13 regions of Ukraine. Based on the results, the organizations developed more than 300 recommendations for the pilot courts. The recommendations were mainly related to critical aspects of court operations that were identified in each court through surveys of court users. In 2013, FAIR supported two CSOs, Law and Democracy and the CCC Creative Center, to monitor improvements in CRC courts. Results of the CRC survey indicated that access to court services and facilities for PWDs was a critical issue. There were limited ways to access information without going to the courts (e.g., by phone), and limited funding and assistance with which to pay lawyer’s fees.

Lengthy court proceedings resulted mainly from delayed (as opposed to scheduled) starts to hearings and unjustified delays in or postponement of case hearings, even after they began. Courts also received relatively low scores for the quality of judgments, primarily because many are not well-grounded. Comfort in the courthouse could easily be improved by equipping (expanding) waiting areas and providing free access to amenities (particularly toilets).

At a series of public events conducted in with the COJ and SJA in 2013, FAIR presented the CRC methodology as part of the Court Performance Evaluation System, as well as the results of its pilot testing. Regional courts’ initiatives to conduct CRC surveys pushed the successful localization of the methodology in 2013. Highlights include:

- The Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast Court of Appeals, one of FAIR’s key partner courts on this initiative, recognized the importance of the system for effective management and reporting purposes, and initiated a process of performance evaluation in all of its 17 general local courts. The implementation of this initiative was possible due to the cooperation with the SJA’s Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast Territorial Office, the Zakon i Poryadok NGO, and FAIR information and consultation support.
- The SJA’s Odesa Oblast Territorial Office initiated the court performance evaluation process in all of its local general courts.
- During its meeting on June 5, 2013, the Council of Judges of General Jurisdiction Courts obligated all general courts, local and appellate, to collect minimum court performance data, including court user satisfaction survey data, and publish it on the court website.

In 2014, FAIR supported initiatives from three CSOs to conduct CRC surveys in 15 courts. By the beginning of 2015, the project had worked with seven CSOs to conduct surveys in all courts of seven oblasts (183 courts of L’viv, Chernivtsi,
Kharkiv, Sumy, Ivano-Frankivsk, Cherkassy, and Odessa oblasts). At the end of 2015, FAIR competitively selected five CSOs to conduct CRC surveys in 110 courts in Ternopil, Khmenlnytskiy, Chernihiv, Volyn, and Kherson oblasts. FAIR conducted 21 public events to present the survey results on public satisfaction of court performance. These events included presentations of recommendations to improve the quality of court performance by providing more timely information about court processes and hearings, adequate space for waiting for hearings and preparing documents, and better access for PWDs. An overarching theme across all courts in the region was the need to improve court communications and outreach with the public. By 2016, FAIR supported the implementation of CRC surveys in 313 courts and interviewed more than 40,150 court users, who made hundreds of recommendations for improving court performance.

In 2015 and 2106, the project selected and supported three NGOs to monitor the implementation of the CSO recommendations to the courts of Kyiv, Lviv, Odesa, Sumy, Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi, and Cherkasy oblasts, and to develop CRC methodology sustainability by building capacity in CSOs and courts to conduct CRC surveys without donor support. FAIR provided CSOs with methodologies to analyze the level of implementation of the CRC recommendations and to assess the level of courts’ needs and capacity to conduct CRC surveys with their own resources or in cooperation with CSOs and higher education institutions. Project grantees cooperated with the COJ to implement the monitoring activities.

CSO partners completed the implementation assessment of performance improvement recommendations by 194 selected courts that participated in CRC surveys in 2015-2016. The results show that these courts received 1,315 CSO recommendations to improve performance. Courts implemented 61 percent of the recommendations, in full and partially. For more on how CRC methodology has improved Ukrainian courts, see Exhibit VII and the Snapshot on the next page.

Exhibit VII. Average Level of Satisfaction with Court Performance by Court Users Using CRC Methodology (As a Single Indicator)
Citizen Feedback Improves Courts

Citizen report card surveys help evaluate and track the quality of court services

Historically, courts in Ukraine have not considered themselves to be institutions serving the public, but rather an exclusive and untouchable government branch. Courts considered any potential improvements of their functions to be dependent upon central judicial governance, particularly the State Judicial administration, and to require significant state budget funding. This resulted in low public awareness and diminished confidence in the courts.

The USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project has helped courts improve and change these perceptions through report card (CRC) surveys, tools that identify gaps in services and help benchmark progress. These surveys evaluate court performance from the public’s perspective in areas such as access to courts and court information, performance and professionalism of judges and court staff, and timeliness of court decisions. Since 2008, USAID-supported civil society organizations have conducted six rounds of CRC surveys, interviewing more than 40,000 court users who have made hundreds of recommendations for improving court performance.

In 2015, FAIR supported CRC surveys in 307 courts of 17 regions and Kyiv city. In 2016, civil society organizations reported that 867 recommendations on improving court services have been implemented. Courts have improved physical access by installing ramps, call buttons, and signs in Braille, and by lowering sidewalks near the courthouse. Court staff now post updated information on operations and free legal services. Courts have also worked to ensure that litigants are quickly informed of postponed trials, and staff have participated in training courses on building communication skills with the public.

Through these actions, courts have become more sensitive to users’ needs and have found ways to improve their performance at a modest cost. In 2015, the CRC became the only methodology the Council of Judges approved on a national level as a part of the Court Performance Evaluation Framework.
Access to Courts for PWDs

While conducting CRC surveys, FAIR supported the Law and Democracy Foundation in monitoring access to courts and court services for PWDs in 38 courts from 2013 to 2015. Based on the results, the Law and Democracy Foundation prepared proposals to amend the legal framework to improve accessibility and made recommendations for individual courts and the judiciary as whole that included training court staff on how to better serve the needs of PWDs. (See Exhibit VII and the Snapshot on the next page.) As a result of this activity, Vinnytsia Court of Appeals worked with Harmonia, an NGO representing PWDs, to provide court internship opportunities to law students with disabilities. To ensure the program’s sustainability, the Law and Democracy Foundation, without donor support, trained 20 NSJ faculty members, court staff, and judges to conduct seven training courses for 373 court staff in six regions.

Exhibit VII. Improving Access to Courts for PWDs

- Conducted an accessibility audit of 20 courts in 10 regions
- Provided over 30 recommendations to improve access to justice for PWDs to ensure (1) physical access to courts, (2) access to court information, and (3) access to legal aid.
- Trained 20 trainers who later conducted training programs for 178 court staff on how to better serve PWDs in 5 regions.
Access to Justice for Persons with Disabilities

Though Ukraine ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2010, the state and society still had not paid enough attention to the needs of persons with disabilities. As a result, these citizens faced limited access to justice. The USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project identified this problem through court user satisfaction surveys.

To address this issue, in 2014-2015, FAIR supported the civil society organization Law and Democracy Foundation in monitoring access to courts and court services for persons with disabilities in 20 courts in 10 regions, and prepared recommendations for individual courts and the judiciary as a whole to improve accessibility to court premises and court services. The proposed changes included improving outreach, developing audio and Braille brochures and leaflets, and reducing physical barriers by installing ramps, lifts, and providing special signs for people with impaired vision.

FAIR also supported the Law and Democracy Foundation in developing and conducting a new training program that engaged persons with disabilities as experts and trainers in seven regions of Ukraine. As a result of these efforts, staff improved their skills in communicating with persons with disabilities and developed more understanding attitudes toward them. Following the training, the Vinnytsa Oblast Court of Appeals, in cooperation with civil society organizations representing persons with disabilities, installed an indoor ramp and will train a staff member in sign language. It also offered an internship to a disabled law student.

Ukraine’s National School of Judges has taken a lead in expanding this training program at the national level. Without donor support, it has undertaken training courses for 373 court staff members in six regions of Ukraine.
Problems encountered. During public presentations of CRC results, judges and court staff sometimes confused the results of user satisfaction and public trust in the judiciary surveys. They unintentionally benefited from this confusion because the CRC scores were much higher than sociological data on trust. Many courts do not correctly interpret the recommendations from court users, seeing them as criticism instead of ways to improve overall performance. Courts also continue to compare their scores, and the media tries to report court ratings to the public.

Lessons learned. To ensure sustainability, a key lesson was the importance of using a peer-to-peer approach to educate court staff and judges on CPE and CRC implementation at the appropriate level. It was also important to engage PWDs in designing and implementing programs on access to justice to ensure relevance to their needs.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities:

- Improve court staff knowledge of CRC surveys on standards, indicators, criteria, and methods, and monitoring implementation of recommendations
- Establish a network/coalition of experienced CSOs to assist courts to conduct CRC surveys by providing consultations and sharing their experiences, and exchanging courts’ experiences implementing CRC recommendations
- Promote new tools for public court performance monitoring, such as trial monitoring
- Design and implement online training programs for chief judges on how to interact with PWDs to improve access to the judiciary, and engage organizations that represent PWDs in developing the programs
OBJECTIVE 5

SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAW ON THE PURIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT

EXPECTED RESULT 5.1: THE LAW ON THE PURIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT AND RELEVANT LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK IMPROVED

_Background._ In April 2014, the Verkhovna Rada adopted the Law on the Restoration of Trust to the Judiciary, which aimed to create a legal framework for vetting judges, who during the mass protests in Kyiv (November 2013 to February 2014) inappropriately considered cases against peaceful protesters, undermined the role of the court system in a democratic society, ignored the presumption of innocence principle, acted under external pressure to deliver legally questionable decisions, put innocent people in jail, and imposed groundless administrative sanctions.

Under the transitional provisions of the Law on Restoring Public Trust in the Judiciary, chief judges and their deputies in all court levels were removed from their positions, and activities of the HCJ and HQC members were suspended. The law also prohibited the following from becoming members of the new HQC and HCJ: active members of Parliament, cabinet of ministers, chief justices and their deputies, chamber secretaries and their deputies, members of the COJ and the HCJ, ombudsmen, and people prosecuted for corruption. The law also introduced restrictions on former members of the HCJ and HQC from being re-elected or reappointed to these institutions. Adoption of the law also affected judicial self-governance. New rules on the selection of the COJ delegates were introduced; as a result, more trial court judges participated in high-level judicial self-governance bodies’ activities, and the number of COJ members increased from 11 to 40.

In September 2014, the Parliament adopted the Law on Purification of Government, which established a process for lustrating public officials based on a financial disclosures and audits of their past political background at the national and local levels. According to estimates, more than 1 million public officials, including judges, fall within the scope of the law.

In December 2014 and June 2015, the Venice Commission criticized a number of the law’s provisions, which it argued jeopardized human rights standards and the principles of judicial independence and irremovability. The Commission recommended reconsidering the criteria for the vetting process, as well as reevaluating which government positions and individuals should be subject to lustration. The recommendations stated that the law should outline a timeframe to complete the lustration and vetting processes (see Exhibit IX on the next page), and required the creation of an independent body for conducting lustration — all while strengthening the role of civil society in the process. For vetting judges, the law does not provide procedures to safeguard judicial independence, and duplicates the Law on Restoring Trust in the Judiciary. Following the Commission’s conclusions, numerous draft laws recommending changes to the lustration procedures were registered with Parliament, though none was considered.
In February 2015, the Verkhovna Rada adopted the Law on Ensuring the Right to Fair Trial. This law introduced substantive changes to both the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges and the Law on the High Council of Justice, as well as to the relevant procedural codes. The new law outlined procedures of judiciary performance evaluations for all judges as an additional measure to cleanse the judicial corps. Evaluations were to be carried out through an examination of a judge’s dossier, testing results, and interviews conducted by the HQC.
Accomplishments. In support of Ukrainian counterparts, FAIR collected information on lustration from countries that have undergone this process, including Germany, Kenya, Poland, the Czech Republic, Moldova, and Albania. To introduce Ukrainian policymakers to the best practices in designing and implementing lustration systems, FAIR and the Open Dialogue Foundation organized study tours in Warsaw (March 2015), Prague (April 2015), and in Strasbourg, France (May and June 2015).

FAIR also engaged international experts to share their experience in lustration legislation, focusing on human rights issues, European approaches, and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. In February 2015, project experts participated in one-on-one and small group discussions with key stakeholders and institutions related to lustration and vetting, including the MOJ’s Lustration Department and Public Council of Lustration, the Supreme Court, and Parliament. The experts also met with CSOs active in lustration issues, such as the Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union. The practical implementation aspects of lustration and vetting were emphasized, where experts proposed considering the establishment of a single body responsible for lustration to ensure consistency and uniformity in the application of procedures.

FAIR shared knowledge of lustration processes in Central and Eastern European countries to foster a better understanding of challenges and benefits. It also analyzed court practices and case law during the Revolution of Dignity and, based on publicly available information, determined that some cases resulted in illegal detentions of activists. A project analysis of the administrative caseload during that period showed that verdicts handed down to the Automaidan activists were illegal. Experts came to the following conclusions:

- Judges were knowingly and openly violating Euromaidan activists’ right to a fair trial and their civil liberties
- Cases were built around falsified prosecutorial evidence
- Judges were intentionally violating requirements of local legislation and the European Convention of Human Rights while illegally detaining Euromaidan activists
- Detention was a tool of repression, used by the criminal investigation and prosecutorial bodies
• Administrative verdicts applied to Automaidan activists did not meet the gravity of the violation
• A vast number of administrative charges were illegally applied to Automaidan activists

To rectify these problems, the following recommendations were made:

• Investigate judges and prosecutors involved in the analyzed decisions
• Support the HCJ in initiating and investigating cases against judges involved in Automaidan cases
• Support CSOs in taking on an active role in initiating/monitoring cases against those judges and prosecutors
• Change the Criminal Procedural Code to:
  o Prohibit criminal case hearings after nightfall
  o Ensure investigations conducted at night are well-grounded, properly justified, and exclusive to the situation
  o Ensure grounds for extension of the detention period are properly established and strongly justified

FAIR conducted comprehensive analysis of Article 375, *Rendering Knowingly Illegal Court Decision*, of the Criminal Code and the requirements of other relevant articles, such as Article 371, *Knowingly Illegal Detention, Arrest, and House Arrest*; Article 372, *Bringing to Criminal Liability Obviously/Knowingly Innocent Person*; Article 374, *Violation of the Right on Defense*; Article 369, *The Offer, Promise, or Giving of an Undue Benefit to a Public Officials*; and Article 369-2, *Abuse of Influence*. FAIR analyzed and explained the provisions of the articles from the perspective of criminal law theory and mandatory technics to be used by the judges and courts.

Based on a series of meetings with the key players in lustration, including the MOJ, the presidential administration, Parliament, former ISC members, the HCJ and the HQC, and leading NGOs, FAIR provided the following conclusions and recommendations:

• There must be a better balance between independence and responsibility in the judiciary.
• The government should consider establishing a fact-finding commission, composed of experts of high standing and reputation, to establish the role of the judiciary during the Euromaidan protests and the factors contributing to this role.
• It is crucial that honest people occupy the most important positions in the judicial administration, including those who select, promote, and evaluate judges, or are in charge of disciplinary sanctions. Three tools will help achieve this ambitious goal:
  o Clear criteria for selection procedures
  o Transparency of the selection
  o Capacity of civil society to follow the selection procedures, uncover the flaws, and acknowledge successes
• In addition to sanctioning judges, it is necessary to provide support to those judges-leaders who understand their role and responsibilities and can be good role models for their colleagues.

FAIR local experts analyzed the decisions and other relevant materials of the HCJ, the HQC, and the ISC, as well as relevant court decisions, and identified factors and causes that enabled interference with judicial independence during the Revolution of Dignity. In addition, they tried to explain why judges passed decisions violating the requirements of the relevant procedural codes and the rule of law principle. The experts came to the following conclusions and recommendations:

• Transparency in the random assignment of cases should be increased.
• Influence of political powers on the judiciary, including of prosecutors on judges, should be limited.
• Judges’ involvement in corrupt schemes made them vulnerable to blackmail by politicians.
• A majority of judges have poor ethical standards, making them more susceptible to outside influence.

These project findings were presented and discussed during numerous public events, including a roundtable on September 11, 2014, entitled “Lustration: International Experience and Ukrainian Perspectives,” organized by FAIR and the Open Dialogue Foundation; April 2015 working meetings on gender issues related to the Law on the Purification of Government, organized by FAIR and USAID’s Responsible Accountable Democratic Assembly Program; a roundtable on December 9, 2015, entitled “The Role of Judge in Deciding Cases During the Mass Protests in Ukraine,” conducted by FAIR; and a February 11, 2016, roundtable entitled “Protecting the Rule of Law is a Judge’s Duty.”

Based on support provided by FAIR, the ISC received 2,129 complaints against judges who handled Euromaidan protest cases, with the ISC recommending disciplinary measures against 12 judges and dismissal of 58. However, the HCJ removed only 29 of these judges from the bench.

Problems encountered. Challenges included a poorly formulated and confusing legal framework, and a lack of political will to improve lustration legislation. To address these, FAIR provided foreign and local lustration experts to share their experiences with national policymakers to equip them with recommendations on changes to be implemented to improve legislation governing lustration.

Lessons learned. The experiences of other countries prove that lustration is a long-term process that requires constant support from the Parliament and active monitoring by civil society to ensure objectivity and transparency.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. Two years after the Revolution of Dignity, public interest in lustration decreased significantly. While judicial vetting remains the top public demand, lustration of public officials is no longer as popular. This leads to the passivity of the Parliament and its members neglecting the urgent
need to improve the Law on Purification of Government and other related laws. Accordingly, FAIR makes the following recommendation:

- Future projects in this area should continue to promote among members of Parliament and the presidential administration the need to introduce changes to the lustration legislation, following the Venice Commission’s and other expert recommendations provided by FAIR and other donor projects.

EXPECTED RESULT 5.2: INSTITUTIONS, PROCEDURES AND REGISTRY FOR THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES STRENGTHENED

*Background.* In support of the lustration process, including the vetting of judges, several new institutions were established legislatively.

- The ISC was established pursuant to the Law on the Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary, adopted in April 2014 to investigate judges who rendered decisions against peaceful protesters during the Revolution of Dignity and those who were later declared political prisoners by the Verkhovna Rada, violating the European Convention on Human Rights as stipulated by the European Court of Human Rights.

- To control lustration of public officials, the MOJ Lustration Department was established pursuant to the Law on the Purification of the Government. The Law mandates the Civic Lustration Council under the MOJ to be an advisory body for the MOJ Lustration Department. The head of every institution subject to lustration is responsible screening employees for lustration. The MOJ is responsible for maintaining and updating the Unified Registry of Persons in Relation to Whom Provisions of the Law on the Purification of Government (Registry) Are to Be Applied. It informs who was lustrated, where they worked, information on the grounds for lustration, and the terms of prohibition to occupy specific official positions.

Following the requirements of the Law on the Purification of the Government, the MOJ adopted Order No. 1280/26057 “On Adopting Regulations on the Unified State Registry of Individuals to Whom Provisions of the Law on the Purification of Government Are to Be Applied” of October 16, 2014. This order stipulates procedures for maintaining, updating, and providing information related to the registry, including sample documents related to the process.

Also, pursuant to the Law on the Purification of Government, the Cabinet of Ministers issued Resolution No. 563 of October 16, 2014, on “Certain Provisions Regarding the Implementation of the Law on the Purification of Government” governing the process of verification of information about the public officials subject for lustration, including documents such persons must submit for verification, and the timeframe for submission. Last, the Cabinet of Ministers adopted Decree No. 1025 of October 16, 2014, approving the plan to conduct vetting procedures prescribed by the Law on the Purification of Government.
Accomplishments. FAIR analyzed the provisions of these acts issued by the Cabinet of Ministers and MOJ. Based on their research, project experts provided the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Include the date and place of birth of every lustrated person for better personal identification
- Attach a scanned copy of the decision to lustrate a person
- State the legal ground for lustration in every case
- Require liability for the people responsible for lustration screening in the institutions they lead
- Develop and stipulate the process of lustration verification of public officials who are authorized to access classified information

These recommendations were presented and discussed with leadership at the MOJ Lustration Department. Additionally, FAIR completed an assessment of the ministry’s public web registry and its ability to meet public expectations, as well as related data regulations. FAIR provided these conclusions and recommendations:

- The goals and objectives for maintaining the registry are not stipulated by the legislation and should be formulated.
- The amount of data available is not sufficient and does not contribute to the transparency of the lustration process and level of public trust in it.
- The registry’s search tools are very limited and should be expanded with the ability to conduct searches by region, institution, position, etc.
- Scanned copies of the document based on every person who was lustrated or vetted should be added.
- A statistical module that will help the public track the lustration progress in figures should be added.

FAIR shared these findings with the leadership of the MOJ Lustration Department and leading NGOs, including the Public Lustration Committee, for further discussion and implementation.

The project also supported consensus-building regarding further processing of materials against judges who remained with the ISC after its mandate had expired. This effort resulted in the creation of the joint HCJ and ISC working group that addressed the proper transfer of the materials against judges in cases where the investigation has concluded but a decision has not been rendered. The transfer of materials from the ISC to the HCJ was completed in April 2016 and were distributed among all members of the Council for further processing.

Problems encountered. Judicial experts and the public actively welcomed the initiative to establish an independent body — the ISC — to investigate judges who were abusing their power by issuing illegal decisions against activists of the Revolution of Dignity. However, delays in appointing members and their short terms in office paralyzed the ISC and limited its capacity to investigate and decide upon all complaints it had received. In addition, legislators did not address the issue of who should process materials (and how) in cases against judges where decisions have not been rendered before the expiration of the ISC mandate. To ensure successful
completion of such cases, FAIR supported dialog between the HCJ and the ISC on consensus-building about the process of transferring cases. As a result, materials were sent from the ISC to the HCJ for further consideration.

*Lessons learned.* Lustration and judicial vetting of legislation involves numerous players, including the MOJ, ISC, HQC, and HCJ. Furthermore, the Parliament and presidential administration interrupted the process from time to time. Under such circumstances, conducting systematic coordination and consensus-building meetings helped develop a joint approach to implementing controversial legislation lustration procedures and foster understanding of a new matter for Ukraine — purification of the government and vetting of judges.

*Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities.* Two years after the Law on Purification of Government was put in place, the institutions responsible for lustration procedures remain quite weak, understaffed, and poorly trained. FAIR highly recommends continuing strengthening and increasing the sustainability of these institutions by supporting them in developing and improving the methodological background of lustration procedures, extending the knowledge of staff about the best ways of implementation, and standardizing procedures and administering processes where possible.

**EXPECTED RESULT 5.3: IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PERSONNEL TO CONDUCT THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES PROFESSIONALLY, FAIRLY AND IMPARTIALLY**

*Background.* Vetting and lustration is a new process for Ukrainian public officials. The members and staff of government institutions cannot uphold their responsibilities in delivering public services if their understanding of the process is poor. It is therefore essential that they receive detailed, in-depth training to fully perform their duties. Such training also helps guarantee the professionalism, fairness, and impartiality of key stakeholders. Training had to be a prerequisite if the vetting process was to be respected by the public.

The MOJ initiated numerous reforms aimed at improving services to citizens in response to strong public demand and expectations for the government to reform and use modern means to provide public services. The MOJ Lustration Department engaged mostly young professionals with no experience in public service and lustration, but who possessed a willingness to serve to ensure democratic principals in government. FAIR supported the MOJ in building the capacity of the department’s employees through training programs, study visits, and expert discussions.

In 2015, the MOJ initiated a competitive hiring process for employees to eliminate corruption and provide opportunities for motivated young professionals to serve in the public interest. Eighty percent of managers hired under this initiative had never held a managerial position, 20 percent had never worked in the justice system, and most had limited opportunities for professional development. FAIR, in response to an MOJ request, designed a comprehensive short-term professional development program for civil servants.
Accomplishments. FAIR achieved the following key results in supporting implementation of lustration legislation.

Supporting the Lustration Department at the MOJ
In early 2015, FAIR, in cooperation with the CSO Open Dialog Foundation and experts from Ukraine, Poland, and the United States, conducted a training program on communications, time management, work planning, and conflicts of interest for MOJ Lustration Department staff. The training enhanced the capacity of the department’s employees to coordinate vetting and lustration.

FAIR supported substantive discussions on lustration for members of the Public Council on Lustration and Lustration Department staff with international lustration experts. Participants learned about international and European best practices and lessons learned in the vetting and lustration of public officials and judges, and used their new knowledge to improve legislation on lustration and coordinate the vetting process.

In May 2015, FAIR supported the participation of all key national lustration stakeholders in a study visit to Bucharest, Romania. After the visit, the Ukrainian delegation shared their lustration experience at the anticorruption conference “Stronger Judiciary in Eastern Europe,” where they learned about the activities of key Romanian anticorruption institutions, their lessons learned, and best practices.

Promoting the Professional Development of MOJ Managers
FAIR engaged the Ernst and Young Academy of Business to develop a professional development training program for MOJ managers. Seventy-two heads and deputy heads of the territorial justice departments, as well as managers at the MOJ’s State Enforcement Agency, enhanced their management and legal skills through three training sessions.

In September and October 2015, FAIR conducted two training events on effective management and communications skills, which included strategic management and planning skills workshops to teach participants practical technics for strategy development and implementation. Six month later, FAIR organized a follow-on training session to measure the impact and to develop stress management, coaching, and legal skills. Deputy Minister of Justice Gia Getsadze launched the program by praising cooperation with USAID stating, “In all three directions, including public awareness, monitoring and training, we have concrete results that can be touched and measured.” (See the Snapshot on the next page.)

Problems encountered. In preparation for the training program for the MOJ managers, FAIR requested that the MOJ provide a list of competences for heads of justice territorial departments. However, the MOJ, in hiring new employees, required a minimal level of education and welcomed the absence of experience in public service to eliminate the risk of previous corrupt activity. Retraining and professional advancement was limited to interpretation of specific legal provisions or presentations of adopted legal procedures.
SNAPSHOT

Improved Public Service Through Professional Development Training

Increased professionalism of Ministry of Justice leadership drives reforms that improve management, efficiency, and communication with the public.

Since the Revolution of Dignity, the Ukrainian people have demanded reforms to make government transparent and accountable. In response, the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) developed new policies and procedures to improve public service. In 2015, the MOJ initiated a competitive hiring process to eliminate corruption and provide opportunities for motivated young professionals to serve in the public interest. However, 80 percent of managers hired under this initiative had never held a managerial position, and 20 percent had never worked in the justice system. New staff members had limited opportunities for professional development, and human resource and management procedures were not in line with international standards and best practices.

To address this, the USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project supported a professional development training program developed by the Ernst and Young Academy of Business for 72 heads and deputy heads of the territorial justice departments and managers at the State Enforcement Agency. The new MOJ leaders learned skills consistent with those taught in the business community: effective communication and teamwork, human resource management, and strategic management.

Yaroslav Zhukrovskyi, new head of the Territorial Department in Lviv Oblast, said, “This training is actually creating change! No one has ever trained public servants on how to manage a team effectively, develop strategies, and communicate with public.” After the training, Mr. Zhukrovskyi used his new management skills to drive MOJ reforms by establishing online tools for public access to information, organizing educational and media events in cooperation with civil society organizations, and negotiating with local authorities to implement administrative service delivery reforms. He is also removing the middleman in procedures to prevent corruption and improve efficiency through new systems, such as the ministry’s popular new online marriage registration.

“Public servants have to remember the oath they have taken. The state cannot be reformed purely by strategies or programs. The country can be changed only by a new generation of qualified managers with a new philosophy.”

— Yaroslav Zhukrovskyi, Head of the Ministry of Justice Territorial Department, Lviv Oblast
FAIR, in consultation with the MOJ and the Ernst and Young Academy of Business, built the program based on participants’ evaluations of public service, the MOJ’s strategic directions, and business management techniques. During the training sessions, participants discussed competencies required and learned how to use business management skills in public office operations. As a result, recently appointed heads of local justice departments formed a new image of public servants who perform fairly, professionally, and in the best public interest.

**Lessons learned.** FAIR learned that professional development programs for public servants should be designed in consultation with beneficiaries to ensure the content and training techniques adequately respond to participants’ needs. It is important to adjust workshop exercises initially developed for business management to fit public service realities to ensure that the training program is accessible to the participants. Furthermore, informal and follow-on communication between trainers and participants is essential to support beneficiaries in using knowledge in practice.

**Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities.** The professional development training program for the MOJ managers planted the seeds for future sustainable programs at the MOJ. Suggestions for follow-on activities include:

- Support continued training programs to improve competencies required for managing local justice departments’ services in the best interest of a client
- Extend the programs by engaging former participants to train their colleagues
- Support the MOJ to develop and approve the list of competences required for public servants at its offices

**EXPECTED RESULT 5.4: PROMOTE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT IN THE PROCESS OF LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES TO BOLSTER PUBLIC TRUST AND CONFIDENCE**

**Background.** During the Revolution of Dignity, the public insisted on the vetting and removal from office public officials who worked under former President Yanukovich. The lustration process was a new phenomenon for Ukrainians, who had high expectations for the future. However, such beliefs did not entirely correspond with reality. Any mistakes made by responsible state authorities lead to an immediate decrease in public trust of the government and in the lustration process in particular. A transparent vetting process was necessary to build public confidence. To ensure that implementation of the Law on Purification of Government reflected the will of the public, FAIR engaged international experts to develop recommendations for lustration stakeholders, supported CSOs in raising awareness and monitoring the purification process, and conducted opinion surveys for judges and the public regarding the progress of democratic reforms.

**Accomplishments.** FAIR focused on promoting public awareness and civil society engagement. Key results include the following:
Raising Public Awareness and Promoting Civil Society Monitoring of the Lustration and Vetting of Public Officials and Judges

Through grants, FAIR selected 10 CSOs to design, implement, and evaluate public awareness campaigns and monitoring initiatives on vetting and lustration processes. The goal was to bolster public trust and confidence in the purification process. In August 2016, FAIR conducted a workshop for these CSOs to share best practices and lessons learned in lustration and vetting, present technical and administrative requirements under grant contracts, and plan future activities. Presenters included members of the ISC, and the MOJ Lustration Department and its Public Council on Lustration. FAIR provided an overview of experience gained through implementation of lustration policies and procedures in post-totalitarian regimes. Participants discussed efforts to amend national legislation on lustration, and learned how to target public awareness activities and monitor lustration processes, identifying sources of information such as court cases and media reports.

CSOs, with FAIR support, organized training courses for local communities, media, and public servants to explain how to monitor the lustration and vetting process and communicate results to the MOJ Lustration Department. Additionally, informational materials were developed and distributed to the public. Some examples include:

- The Civic Lustration Committee cooperated with the Public Council of the MOJ Lustration Department, and members of the Parliament Anticorruption Committee developed guidelines and trained civic activists on monitoring the lustration process. (See the Snapshot on the next page.)

- The Center for Civic Liberties monitored the vetting of judges who handled Euromaidan protest cases. These cases were considered by the ISC and handed over to the HCJ, which recommended judges to be dismissed for breach of the oath. Thus, the Center for Civic Liberties monitored 80 lustration-related court cases, as well as the HCJ consideration of recommendations to remove judges. In April 2016, the Center presented monitoring results to lustration stakeholders and the media, noting that the HCJ generally performed its functions in line with Ukrainian laws, but several procedures, including the one for notifying complainants and judges subjected to removal, should be improved.

- Institute Republic monitored the vetting process in 15 regions by evaluating information about the vetting of public officials and judges on the websites of the state authorities, including websites of the 620 courts, all departments of the State Fiscal Service and regional administrations, the State Security Service, and the presidential administration. The monitoring showed that approximately 50 percent of the information about the lustration process was not posted on the websites. Monitors pointed to the careless attitude of the responsible public officials and systematic violations of the procedural

“This civic monitoring project was conducted in a very independent and professional way and is a fair assessment of the High Council of Justice’s efforts to act in a transparent and impartial manner to gain public trust. This activity will definitely improve our cooperation with civil society.”

— Mr. Oleksii Muravyov, Deputy Chair of the High Council of Justice
Public Demand Drives Vetting of Officials

Civil society organizations join efforts to monitor and advocate for an effective lustration process

In 2014, anti-government demonstrations known as the Revolution of Dignity demanded the purification of government through the vetting of public officials and judges who worked under former President Victor Yanukovich’s regime, those affiliated with the communist system, or those who had worked to sabotage Ukrainian independence. In response to public pressure, the Law “On Purification of Government” was adopted by the Verkhovna Rada, but it immediately became difficult to implement because most government institutions failed to implement its provisions and did not engage citizens.

The USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent, and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Project worked with 10 civil society organizations (CSOs) to support effective monitoring and implementation of the law. One CSO, the Civic Lustration Committee, developed a registry of public officials and judges subject to lustration. The registry, which is regularly updated, now includes 5,547 public servants. Many public servants attempted to avoid vetting, thus cooperation between CSOs and the Ministry of Justice Lustration Department was crucial in monitoring how registered public servants were vetted and lustrated. In 2015, with FAIR support, the Civic Lustration Committee developed monitoring tips and informational materials, and organized training courses for activists.

The CSOs, supported by FAIR, worked together to identify grounds to appropriately vet and dismiss numerous public officials, including the prosecutor of Odesa Region, who was dismissed from office in April 2016 as a person whose activity supported usurpation of power by former President Victor Yanukovich. This effort demonstrated how civic activists have become key players in addressing public demands for rapid improvement of the Government of Ukraine.

These organizations have continued to work to vet public officials, work with the Ministry of Justice to improve the Law “On Purification of Government,” monitor and support the ministry’s Lustration Department, and conduct public awareness events on vetting and lustration issues.

“The lustration process absolutely depends on the public involvement. If every forty-fourth Ukrainian monitored vetting of one public official, it would have been completed already. All we need is to take initiative to reach a final result.”

— Oleksandra Drik, Head of Civic Lustration Committee
time frames as the main reasons for such gaps. As a result of the monitoring, recommendations on improving the lustration procedures were developed and delivered to key stakeholders.

- The Committee of Voters of Ukraine conducted the public awareness campaign and monitoring of the lustration process nationwide. Nationwide, 191 CSOs were engaged, 53 state authorities were monitored, and 7.5 million Ukrainians were informed through the media and social ads about the lustration process. Civic activists positively evaluated the implementation of lustration process but identified delays in the procedures, a lack of publicly available information, and unlawful dismissals. Monitoring results were presented to key stakeholders, including the HQC, HCJ, and MOJ.

- The Ukrainian Coalition for Legal Aid targeted 1,600 students from 22 educational institutions in the Western Region to inform them of the purification of government. In addition, it trained civic activists, and produced an informational brochure and expert articles on lustration that were widely disseminated in the region.

- The Law Society of Odessa Region and the Open Dialog Foundation focused their activities on building a dialogue between civic activists and state authorities involved in the vetting process. They organized roundtables and media events and disseminated informational materials. Representatives of key local lustration stakeholders expressed their interest in a continued partnership with CSOs in the purification of government and judicial reform.

- The Ukrainian Legal Foundation produced a TV program, “Lustrate Cannot Leave,” with expert interviews and infographics about national and international experiences in vetting public officials and judges. The program was broadcast on UA: First, a public TV station that covers 93 percent of the country. In addition, CSOs involved key lustration experts who trained 67 journalists on how to better understand and write about lustration. By the end of the project, journalists produced 15 media products about lustration.

**Supporting Civil Society Monitoring of the Quality of MOJ Services**

FAIR supported the CSO Center for Political and Legal Reforms in monitoring the MOJ administrative services to improve the quality of and bolster public trust and confidence in public services. Conducted by the Center and its regional counterparts in October and November 2015, the pilot survey involved more than 4,500 users of MOJ services in five regions.

The survey showed that 85 percent of MOJ administrative services users were overall satisfied with their experience. However, they noted long queues, a lack of information on the procedures, and a minimal level of comfort at facilities. Based on the survey findings, experts from the Center for Political and Legal Reforms developed recommendations for the MOJ to improve services, including ensuring free access and adequate conditions for PWDs, providing registration services at “single-entry” units, increasing reception to 40 hours a week, improving the quality of information on official websites, and avoiding queues. The Center delivered these recommendations to the MOJ’s central office and to heads of regional departments, including local authorities in the pilot study areas. The recommendations that do not require significant funding, such as improving the quality of information on official
websites, were implemented by local justice offices immediately after the survey. The MOJ leadership considered other recommendations in developing action plans and budgeting for the future.

**Promoting Public Awareness of MOJ Administrative Services**
FAIR supported the Center for Ukrainian Reform Education in raising public awareness on electronic services provided by the MOJ to bolster awareness on government efforts to respond to public demand for improved administrative services. This included organizing press conferences nationwide, developing video instructions on using new online administrative services, radio advertisements with the MOJ hotline number, a TV program on e-governance, and information materials for free distribution in media. The Center also organized webinars for local librarians who could reach citizens in small villages with limited Internet access to assist them in receiving online services. All materials developed under the grant program were delivered to the MOJ and were widely disseminated.

In response to the MOJ request, FAIR selected a company to produce three short animated videos about the MOJ reforms in administrative services. These materials simply and positively explained complicated and critical reforms, including the handover of the key responsibilities in registration from the MOJ to the notary and local authorities, new apostille procedures, and the main functions of the recently established network of free legal aid bureaus across the country. The videos were delivered to the MOJ for further distribution on social media.

**Conducting an Opinion Survey of Judges on Judicial Reform and the Lustration Process**
FAIR, in response to the COJ’s request, conducted a national survey of judges about the judicial reforms and the implementation of the laws on the Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary, Purification of Government, and Ensuring the Right for Fair Trial. The aim of the survey was to evaluate the impact of judiciary reform as seen by judges, and facilitate the search for effective ways to increase the efficiency of this process. In total, 717 judges were surveyed. The results are representative for all judges of Ukraine and included the following:

- Judges indicated that their personal workload increased while the financial situation had declined in the last two years.
- Most judges feel insecure and believe that their independence is not guaranteed in practice.
- Approximately one in three judges (37 percent) reported receiving threats related to professional activity in the last two years.

The results showed that external factors such as financial situation, workload, and guarantees of independence may play critical roles during the judicial reform process. FAIR experts developed recommendations aimed to consider these factors effecting judges’ performance during the reform process which were delivered to the COJ.
Conducting a Public Opinion Survey on Democratic Reforms and the Lustration Process

In July 2015, FAIR designed and implemented the National Public Opinion Survey on Democratic, Economic, and Judicial Reforms, Including Implementation of the Law on Purification of Government. The survey results showed that 84 percent of Ukrainians believe that the lustration and vetting process is needed, and 89 percent believed that it is necessary to “purify” the judiciary by means of vetting and lustration. However, the majority believed that the lustration process was not proceeding in line with public demands and should be implemented by an independent body of representatives of civil society and international organizations. In July 2016, FAIR conducted the National Public Survey Regarding Democratic Changes in Political and Social Spheres, Judicial Reform, and the Process of Purification of Government. Its goal was to measure the progress in public opinion on changes in political and social spheres, including judicial reform, and to evaluate public attitude to corruption.

Comparative analysis of these surveys showed that purification of government remained an important precondition for successful reforms. At the same time, the public saw a lack of political will and corruption in state institutions as key obstacles to reform. The level of trust in the judiciary increased from 5 percent in 2015 to 10 percent in 2016. In addition, the survey showed that only 50 percent of respondents’ attitudes were negative toward corruption, while the other half tended to justify corruption in some way. FAIR used the results of both surveys in formulating expert recommendations about improving national legislation and policy on lustration by the MOJ, and in supporting CSOs to develop monitoring and public awareness initiatives targeting certain public groups.

Problems encountered. FAIR did not encounter problems managing grant programs with CSOs that implemented public awareness and monitoring of vetting and lustration process.

Lessons learned. FAIR experience demonstrated the effectiveness of civil society involvement in raising public awareness and monitoring the lustration process. However, it is important to avoid duplication and to provide opportunities for CSOs to share experiences and plan future cooperation. With project support, CSOs joint efforts became more effective in designing programs on monitoring government reforms, improved skills in administrating projects, and established partnerships with local authorities and media for further cooperation.

Suggestions for follow-on programs and activities. FAIR proposes the following activities going forward:

- All project-supported CSOs suggested continuing support to civil society engagement and expressed interest in developing partnerships in monitoring the judiciary and in the anticorruption field. Recommendations include public awareness campaigns at the local level and developing strategies for communicating with citizens in the Eastern region and on territories close to the conflict area; engaging CSOs in regular performance evaluations and lifestyle monitoring of judges; supporting the Public Council of Integrity at the
HQC; and improving communication between courts and local CSOs by organizing “open door” days and public councils at court administrations.

- Civic monitoring of the MOJ administrative services delivered concrete recommendations on improving client-oriented public services. FAIR suggests repeating the monitoring in two years to evaluate the progress in administrative services reform.

- Public opinion surveys results accomplished by expert recommendations were useful in developing and evaluating FAIR and the CSOs it supported. The project suggests conducting such surveys systematically to ensure that government reforms respond to public demand.
## ANNEX A. FINANCIAL REPORT

### Ukraine FAIR Life of Project expenditures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE ITEM</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2016**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$4,586,075.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Transportation</td>
<td>$581,246.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances</td>
<td>$1,118,409.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$1,705,232.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, Vehicles, and Freight</td>
<td>$54,700.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$988,143.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,033,806.94</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (Direct and Indirect)</td>
<td>$1,707,182.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$3,162,804.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,801,800.07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Activity Fund (non-Grants)</td>
<td>$1,652,183.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$1,250,006.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Fee</td>
<td>$1,220,380.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,958,176.68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All financial information in this report shall not be disclosed outside the government and shall not be duplicated, used or disclosed – in whole or in part- for any purpose. This restriction does not limit the government’s right to use information contained in this report if it is obtained from another source without restriction.

** Please note that the above figures include project expenditures invoiced by September 30, 2016. Costs which were incurred during life of project, but are invoiced after September 30, 2016 are not included above.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The USAID Fair, Accountable, Independent and Responsible (FAIR) Judiciary Program in Ukraine began on October 1, 2011 as a two-year program with an option to extend for an additional three years. FAIR was designed to build on the achievements of the previous USAID Combatting Corruption and Strengthening Rule of Law in Ukraine (UROL) project conducted from 2006-2011. In September 2013, USAID extended FAIR for three years from October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2016 based on an assessment of continued political will to pursue meaningful reforms in the judicial sector, a re-affirmation of United States Government (USG) priorities in the sector, and an evaluation of program performance. On December 18, 2014, USAID added lustration and vetting to the scope of FAIR program to support implementation of the adopted in 2014 the Law on the Purification of Government.

The overall goal of the FAIR was to support legislative, regulatory, and institutional reform of judicial institutions in order to build a foundation for a more accountable and independent judiciary. FAIR activities focused on achieving five main objectives:

1) Development of a constitutional, legislative, and regulatory framework for judicial reform that is compliant with European and international norms, and that supports judicial accountability and independence.
2) Strengthening the accountability and transparency of key judicial institutions and operations.
3) Strengthening the professionalism and effectiveness of the Ukrainian judiciary.
4) Strengthening the role of civil society organizations as advocates for and monitors of judicial reform.
5) Supporting the implementation of the Law on the Purification of Government.

FAIR contributing to the Governing Justly and Democratically objective of the U.S. government’s Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) addressing specific issues under Program Area 2.1 Rule of Law and Human Rights, Program Elements 2.1.1 Constitutions, Laws and Legal Systems, 2.1.2 Judicial Independence and 2.1.3 Justice System; and, Program Area 2.2 Good Governance, Program Elements 2.2.2 Public Sector Executive and 2.2.4 Anti-Corruption.

2. PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

During the life of project, FAIR implemented the following programs components:

Improving Legal Framework for the Judiciary
FAIR provided expert support for the reviewing and improvement of the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges, Law on High Council of Justice and implementation of Constitutional reform. FAIR engaged domestic and international experts to provide unbiased analysis of legislative initiatives to evaluate compliance with international and European standards of independence of the judiciary, bar reform and legal education reform; support development and adoption of quality legislative amendments to advance reform and modernization of the judiciary.
FAIR activities also include establishing social dialogue by supporting, organizing and conducting public events with wide participation of the public, media and experts to discuss judicial and legal reform.

**Judicial Selection, Ethics and Discipline**
FAIR promoted quality implementation of legislative provisions regarding the introduction of merit-based competitive selection of judicial candidates and provided expert assistance to improve this process. FAIR also supported the High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQC) in improving their internal procedures and judicial discipline practices through applying best practices of similar foreign institutions and applying European and international standards to the process of handling judicial misconduct complaints. FAIR assisted the High Council of Justice (HCJ) to improve its internal procedures and practices in line with judicial independence guarantees. In addition, FAIR enhanced the capacity of the judiciary to foster compliance with ethical standards by Ukrainian judges by providing assistance to the Council of Judges of Ukraine (COJ) in developing and implementing a new version of the Code of Judicial Ethics.

**Improving the Professionalism of Judges and Court Staff**
FAIR built the capacity of the National School of Judges of Ukraine (NSJ), assisting it in developing and implementing key curricula for ongoing training of judges and court staff on the issues of ethics, opinion writing, rule of law and human rights, human resources management, communications, etc. both for in-class and distance learning; FAIR also provide expert support for initial trainings of judicial candidates and curricula development, as well as to build the corps of judges-trainers for the NSJ. In cooperation with the NSJ and State Judicial Administration of Ukraine (SJA), FAIR developed and successfully implemented the first-ever in Ukraine Court Administration Certificate Program.

**Improving legal education**
FAIR provided expert support to the Ministry of Education of Ukraine, the Ministry of Justice, and selected law schools in the area of legal education reform. FAIR experts contributed to the development a legal education reform concept paper, and FAIR civil society partners conducted the first-ever in Ukraine analysis of legal knowledge, professional skills, and values law graduates must have to meet modern market demands. Further, FAIR assisted the MOE and MOJ in the development and implementation of Ukraine’s first standardized entrance exam for Master’s degree programs in law schools.

**Strengthening Institutional Capacity of Judicial Bodies**
Under this component, FAIR supported the COJ and the SJA to develop and implement a standardized court performance evaluation framework, implement a long-term strategic plan for the judiciary, and promote the implementation of a communications strategy for the judiciary. FAIR experts provided support to develop and implement analytical techniques for incorporation in the process of judicial budgeting, particularly, the first-ever in Ukraine case weights for all jurisdictions. In addition, FAIR provided expert and financial support for the court automation processes.
Civil Society Engagement in Judicial Reform

FAIR encouraged the involvement of civil society organizations (CSO) in building a dialogue with the Government regarding judicial reform issues. FAIR provided grants and technical assistance to CSOs implementing independent performance monitoring of courts and judicial institutions and supported the engagement of the public in promoting innovations and achievements in judicial reform through civic education programs.

Supporting the Government of Ukraine and Ukrainian Civil Society in Implementation of the Law on Purification of Government

Taking into consideration the initial strengths and weaknesses of the legal, regulatory, and institutional framework for lustration and vetting public officials and judges, FAIR conducted study visits to neighboring Poland and Czech Republic for representatives of Verkhovna Rada, MOJ, HQC, and HCJ to gain knowledge regarding the successful implementation of lustration procedures. FAIR experts developed recommendations to improve the Law on Purification of Government and recommended content for the Unified Registry of Persons in Relation to Whom Provisions of the Law on the Purification of Government. FAIR also trained MOJ personnel in management, communication, and legal skills while also supporting ten civil society organizations to implement public awareness campaigns on vetting and lustration and public monitoring of these processes.

3. FAIR’S APPROACH TO MONITORING, EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Performance under FAIR was an ongoing process which required the FAIR team to determine whether or not an activity was making progress toward intended results while the activity was being carried out. Performance information played an important role in planning and managing decisions. The strength of the FAIR monitoring and evaluation plan lay in its ability to provide timely performance information that enabled project staff to manage results and improve project performance.

Key elements of the FAIR Monitoring and Evaluation System included:

- Results Framework – graphic presentation of the strategy to achieve program goals and show the linkages between FAIR objectives and expected results
- Performance indicators, their definitions, and purpose (e.g. management utility)
- Units of data measurement for each indicator and disaggregation where it is appropriate and feasible
- Data sources and descriptions of data collection methods for each indicator
- Baseline information (year and value), annual targets and life of project targets
- Schedule for data collection and names of individuals for responsible for data collection
- Availability of data at USAID and detailed plans for data analysis, review and reporting
The FAIR M&E system was designed to involve all technical team members and relevant project stakeholders. This approach had several benefits:

*Efficiency.* Technical team members had first-hand knowledge of activities and immediate results in their areas of work and were best suited to efficiently collect and verify basic M&E data in their respective technical areas.

*Ownership.* By being involved in project M&E efforts, technical team members appreciated that the M&E system belonged to the entire project team. This ensured that the information generated was relevant and consistent with the interests of the project.

*Feedback.* Having collected and analyzed M&E information, technical team members operated with first-hand information and were able to use M&E information to guide project implementation.

*Capacity building.* M&E is a key management skill for project partners and beneficiaries. By being involved in M&E, technical team members were able to transfer M&E skills to project counterparts. Where appropriate, project staff worked with counterparts to strengthen their M&E capabilities by helping them to build data sets and practices to monitor results. In addition, team members involved counterparts in data analysis, where possible, to share techniques for future use. This approach served two purposes — while counterparts contributed to the project’s M&E system, they also acquired valuable M&E skills.

FAIR was also able to strike a balance between M&E data collection and technical work. The M&E system was designed to ensure that data collection was never a burden for project staff and counterparts; rather, it complemented ongoing technical activities. The project employed appropriate information technology in M&E system implementation to ease the burden of data entry and management, employing user-friendly software systems for data entry and analysis such as MS Office pivot tables and charts, cross-tab queries, and on-line surveys.

The “Introduction” Section of this report describes the three contractual stages of FAIR programming: the base period of 2012-2013, the option period of 2014-2016 and the program expansion of the option period for 2015-2016. According to the initial Task Order # AID-121-C-11-00002 and the above listed modifications of program, during the life of project, FAIR operated three revisions of its Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan as presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Description</th>
<th>No. of Objectives Measured</th>
<th>No. of Expected Results Measured</th>
<th>No. of Indicators</th>
<th>Final Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Implemented in full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Implemented October 1, 2013 to December 17, 2014. Replaced by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The initial FAIR Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (PMEP) for October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2013 contained 35 indicators. Out of those, 10 indicators were from UROL, FAIR’s predecessor project, and 25 were new. During the base period FAIR implemented all 35 indicators. By the end of the base period FAIR had archived, and thus stopped implementing, seven indicators from the initial PMEP and transferred 28 of them to the next stage.

The second FAIR PMEP for October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2016 continued 28 indicators transferred from the base period and introduced seven new indicators. From October 1, 2013 to December 17, 2014 FAIR implemented all 35 indicators according to its second PMEP. As of Dec 17, 2014, FAIR had achieved nine indicators and transferred 26 others to the next stage.

The final Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E Plan) for December 17, 2014 to September 30, 2016 continued 26 indicators from the previous period and introduced 19 new. In this Performance Management and Evaluation Summary FAIR reported on 45 indicators measuring 15 expected results (ER) under 5 objectives as stipulated by the final M&E Plan for December 17, 2014 to September 30, 2016 as this particular plan contains the most full and comprehensive performance evaluation framework for FAIR’s life of project. This M&E Plan covers the whole USAID FAIR project scope of work including the initial activities and those implemented later in the project for judicial reform, as well as the activities related to lustration and vetting that began on December 18, 2014.

4. FAIR INDICATORS, BASELINE DATA AND TARGETS

FAIR indicators are designed to:

- Capture and communicate major project impacts
- Track implementation progress against targets
- Supply information concerning major project activities
- Support project management in making informed decisions
- Contribute to USAID’s own performance management and reporting needs

The project collected data on indicators relevant to activities implemented in collaboration with its counterparts. This principle of manageable interest ensured that the results reported by the project’s M&E system are those that are within the project’s ability to influence.
USAID standard indicators. In line with the United States Government Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) and the associated operational planning and monitoring procedures, FAIR included the indicators for Program Elements 2.1.1 Constitutions, Laws and Legal System, 2.1.2, Judicial Independence and 2.1.3, Justice System under the Program Area 2.1, Rule of Law and Human Rights:

- Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding proposed changes to the country’s legal framework
- Number of laws, regulations and procedures designed to enhance judicial independence supported with USG Assistance
- Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management
- Number of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance

Taking into consideration the additional activities related to lustration and vetting, FAIR included indicators for Program Elements 2.2.2 Public Sector Executive Function and 2.2.4 Anti-Corruption Reforms under the Program Area 2.2 Good Governance:

- Number of training days provided to executive branch personnel with USG assistance
- Number of USG-Supported anti-corruption measures implemented

Custom performance indicators for the USAID external reporting. For project performance monitoring, we continued collecting data on former FAF indicators that were archived during the period from October 2011 to September 2014 but included initially in our contract and are still valid, to illustrate the achievement of FAIR’s expected results:

- Number of legal institutions and associations supported by the USG
- Number of new legal courses or curricula developed with USG assistance
- Number of merit-based criteria or procedures for justice sector personnel selection adopted with USG assistance

Considering the large scope of the FAIR program portfolio, additional custom indicators were proposed for USAID external reporting purposes, taking into account their usefulness in managing results:

- Number of courts that have active court monitoring programs
- Number of people engaged in the monitoring and performance oversight of Ukrainian courts
- Percent of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance reporting application of skills and knowledge gained in their judicial practices or teaching activities

FAIR also included seven indicators specific to the USAID Ukraine Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) in the M&E Plan:
• Number of recommendations to improve the Law on the Purification of Government and relative legislative framework formulated
• Percentage of recommendations formulated that are passed into law or adopted as regulations
• Number of procedures for lustration and vetting of public officials developed
• Number of training programs on implementation of lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards developed with project support
• Number of people trained with newly developed programs on implementation the lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards
• Number of civil society organizations participating in and contributing to the process of lustration and vetting of public officials
• Percent of Ukrainian citizens who are confident that the lustration and vetting processes are properly implemented and lead to purification of government

In addition to those listed above 26 performance indicators for project activity management were included in the M&E Plan. The full list of indicators is available in Section 6- FAIR Indicators Table for the Duration of the Project and Section 7 – Detailed Description of Performance Indicators. In Addition, Annex 1 – FAIR Performance Indicators Table by Year – provides the annual data for all 45 indicators related to the final M&E Plan as well as the applicable annual data for 16 indicators archived in the past as described above.

FAIR utilized the following approaches in collecting the baseline data for its indicators:

1) FAIR built its program upon the achievements of its predecessor, the USAID UROL Project. Thus, UROL project-end cumulative data, where applicable, served as a baseline for FAIR indicators.
2) When adding the new indicators, FAIR used its currently available data for indicator baselines.
3) In some cases, FAIR conducted initial baseline assessments getting data from project stakeholders or implementing baseline surveys.

The FAIR Chief of Party, Deputy Chief of Party, M&E Specialist, and technical team members set annual targets for all indicators taking into consideration the currently available data, planned activities, and expected outcomes. In addition, FAIR established cumulative indicator targets for the whole project period of performance for management and reporting purposes. The end-of-project targets exclude double-counting of data between program years for those indicators where data may overlap. For example, if the same policy or procedure was improved with FAIR support once in the Fiscal Year 2014 and a second time in the FY 2016, for the purpose of final reporting this policy or procedure counted only once.

The project end targets included baseline figures where applicable. For example, the project end target for the indicator Number of laws, regulations and procedures
designed to enhance judicial independence supported with USG Assistance included FAIR project data (planned outputs) and FAIR predecessor USAID Ukraine Rule of Law (UROL) project data for 2006-2011 (baseline data). The rationale for this was to demonstrate the outcomes of USAID activities in the Rule of Law and Human Rights Program Area over the past decade. Similar to cumulating annual data, for the life of project data, including baseline data in project end targets excluded double-counting.

5. SUMMARY OF FAIR PERFORMANCE

The results framework presented in Exhibit 1 (next page) graphically represents FAIR’s strategy to achieve the program goal, “Support legislative, regulatory and institutional reform of judicial institutions in order to build a foundation for a more accountable and independent judiciary.”

Under Objective 1 - The Constitutional, Legislative and Regulatory Framework for Judicial Reform Complies with European and International Norms and Supports Judicial Accountability and Independence, FAIR achieved significant measurable outcomes. Although FAIR project end achievement for the indicator Number of laws, regulations and procedures designed to enhance judicial independence supported with USG assistance (FAF) is 16% below target, FAIR achieved or exceeded its project end targets for all other indicators related to this Objective, including the Percentage of Venice Commission recommendations and Number of revised provisions in the Constitution enacted that reflect inputs from project-supported public discussions. FAIR can now also report that Ukrainian legislation for the judiciary complies with international norms and supports judicial accountability and independence.

FAIR met or exceeded 80% of its targets under the Objective 1.

FAIR achieved measurable outcomes under the Objective 2 – The Accountability and Transparency of Key Judicial Institutions and Operations are Strengthened. In 2016, FAIR provided massive support to the HQC management systems, enabling 32 new properties and functions in the process of judicial selection, performance evaluation, and discipline. However, while significantly exceeding the project end target under indicator 7 - Number of new properties and functions surrounding judicial selection and discipline introduced to HQC management system with project, other indicators directly related to the HQC performance were below targets: from 14% for indicator 9 - Number of Ukrainian judges appointed through project-supported objective, merit-based judicial selection process to 87% below target for indicator 10 - Number of criteria, standards and regulations adopted to govern judicial misconduct investigations. During FAIR, the HQC experienced several significant challenges to its reform and vetting including changes in composition and sometimes controversial relations with other judicial institutions (such as COJ), law makers and the public. Taking into account that the majority of project end targets for Objective 2 were directly linked to the HQC and COJ, FAIR met or exceeded 14% of its targets under this Objective.

Under the Objective 3 – the Professionalism and Effectiveness of the Ukrainian Judiciary are Strengthened, FAIR met or exceeded 67% of its targets. Indicator 14 - Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management (FAF), was exceeded by 379% (383 actual against 80 target), and indicator 24 - Number of
communication strategies implemented by courts and judicial institutions was exceeded by 167% (24 actual against 9 target). Those targets that we not met, directly related to the performance of the SJA: indicator 22 - Number of data-fed analytical techniques incorporated into judicial budgeting, was below target by 50% and indicator 23 - number of project-supported new or improved policies within the SJA for the support of information technology, procurement, capital improvement, human resources, statistical collections and analysis activities within the courts, was 57% below target.

Under Objective 4 – the Role of Civil Society Organizations as Advocates for and Monitors of Judicial Reform is Strengthened, FAIR partnered with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) which meant that all targets under this Objective were more within FAIR control than those targets that connected with activities and performance of FAIR governmental partners. Because of this, FAIR achieved or exceeded all targets under this objective.

Objective 5 – the Lustration and Vetting of Public officials and Judges Implemented Fairly, Transparently and Effectively and in Compliance with International Standards was the objective towards which the least progress was made. All of the challenges faced related to implementation of the Law on Purification of Government and controversies in the process of vetting and lustration of public officials and judges. This is the only FAIR objective where 2 indicators remain at 0 baseline level, e.g. no progress made. Both of these indicators connected to GOU partner performance. The final status of those indicators where FAIR had more control was significantly better, FAIR exceeded or met eight of them.

Two indicators under Objective 5 do not have targets since their status is completely outside of FAIR control. Indicator 31 - Percent of public officials and judges screened through vetting procedure in accordance with the Law on Purification of Government and indicator 32 - Percent of judges screened for corruption and participating in politicized justice in accordance with the Law on Restauration Public Trust in the Judiciary.

The table below summarizes FAIR’s achievements against its 43 project end targets disaggregated by five objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Number of project end targets</th>
<th>Number of targets exceeded</th>
<th>Number of targets met</th>
<th>Percent of targets met and exceeded</th>
<th>Progress made but below target</th>
<th>No progress made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6 (next page) represents all FAIR indicators for the life of project with their targets, actual achievements and performance status, e.g. ratio of actual achievement to target. Section 7 provides detailed description of these indicators including their definitions, annual achievements against annual targets, desegregations, and analysis.
## 6. FAIR INDICATORS TABLE FOR THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>LIFE-OF-PROJECT TARGET</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM GOAL: SUPPORT LEGISLATIVE, REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM OF JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS IN ORDER TO BUILD A FOUNDATION FOR A MORE ACCOUNTABLE AND INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of legal institutions and associations supported by USG</td>
<td>2011 / 30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47 Performance over the life of project: 104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 1: THE CONSTITUTIONAL, LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL REFORM COMPLIES WITH EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL NORMS AND SUPPORTS JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INDEPENDENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 1.1: UKRAINIAN JUDICIAL REFORM LEGISLATION RECEIVES FAVORABLE COMMENTS FROM THE VENICE COMMISSION AS MEETING INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND REFLECTS DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERT INPUT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of laws, regulations and procedures designed to enhance judicial independence supported with USG assistance (FAF)</td>
<td>2011 / 8¹¹</td>
<td>25¹²</td>
<td>21 Performance over the life of project: 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of revised provisions enacted that reflect Venice Commission recommendations</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42 Performance over the life of project: 117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of Venice Commission recommendations adopted</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>91% Performance over the life of project: 118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 1.2: CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM RELATED TO THE JUDICIARY IS PURSUED IN AN INCLUSIVE MANNER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding proposed changes to the country’s legal framework.</td>
<td>2014 / 6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18 Performance over the life of project: 164%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of revised provisions in the Constitution enacted that reflect inputs from project-supported public discussions</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 Performance over the life of project: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 2: THE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY OF KEY JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS AND OPERATIONS ARE STRENGTHENED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of new properties and functions surrounding judicial selection and discipline introduced to HQC management system with</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32 Performance over the life of project: 320%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 2.1: UKRAINIAN JUDGES ARE APPOINTED BASED ON OBJECTIVE, KNOWLEDGE- AND PERFORMANCE-BASED CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of merit-based criteria or procedures for justice sector personnel selection adopted with USG assistance</td>
<td>2011 / 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22 Performance over the life of project: 88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹ Baseline data is the result of FAIR predecessor, the USAID Ukraine Rule of Law (UROL) Project.  
¹² Life-of-project target counts FAIR and UROL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>LIFE-OF-PROJECT TARGET</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of Ukrainian judges appointed through project-supported objective, merit-based judicial selection process</td>
<td>2013 / 880</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance over the life of project: 86% |

**EXPECTED RESULT 2.2: UKRAINIAN JUDGES ARE DISCIPLINED IN TRANSPARENT PROCESSES**

| 10. Number of criteria, standards and regulations adopted to govern judicial misconduct investigations | 2011 / 0 | 8 | 1 |

Performance over the life of project: 13% |

| 11. Percent of judicial misconduct complaints submitted to the HQC using the standardized form | 2011 / 2% | 20% | 17% |

Performance over the life of project: 85% |

| 12. Percent of judicial discipline decisions posted on HQC website | 2011 / 47% | 100% | 62% |

Performance over the life of project: 62% |

**EXPECTED RESULT 2.3: THE REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INTEGRITY IS STRENGTHENED**

| 13. Number of judicial self-governance mechanisms revised with project support | 2011 / 0 | 8 | 6 |

Performance over the life of project: 75% |

**OBJECTIVE 3: THE PROFESSIONALISM AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UKRAINIAN JUDICIARY ARE STRENGTHENED**

| 14. Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management (FAF) | 2011 / 14 | 80 | 383 |

Performance over the life of project: 479% |

**EXPECTED RESULT 3.1: THE SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES OF UKRAINIAN JUDGES AND COURT STAFF ARE BOLSTERED THROUGH MODERN, DEMAND-DRIVEN TRAINING PROGRAMS**

| 15. Number of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance (FAF) | 2011 / 2,946 | 4,700 | 5,067 |

Performance over the life of project: 108% (men: 2,345; women: 2,722) |

| 16. Percent of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance reporting application of skills and knowledge gained in their judicial practices or teaching | 2014 / 78% | 85% | 89% |

Performance over the life of project: 105% |

| 17. Number of new legal courses or curricula developed with USG assistance | 2011 / 8 | 24 | 23 |

Performance over the life of project: 96% |

**EXPECTED RESULT 3.2: JUDICIAL OPERATIONS ARE EVALUATED AND FUNDED ACCORDING TO AN OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS AND PERFORMANCE**

| 18. Number of court performance standards adopted | 2011 / 0 | 7 | 5 |

Performance over the life of project: 71% |

---

13 Baseline data is the result of UROL.
14 Life-of-project target counts FAIR and UROL.
15 Life-of-project target counts FAIR and UROL.
16 Baseline data is the result of UROL.
17 Life-of-project target counts FAIR and UROL.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>LIFE-OF-PROJECT TARGET</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE OVER THE LIFE OF PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Number of court performance indicators implemented</td>
<td>2013 / 7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of courts implementing project-supported performance measurement system</td>
<td>2013 / 31</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Average annual citizen report cards score of participating courts</td>
<td>2011 / .77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 3.3: THE SJA’S CAPACITY TO REPRESENT AND SUPPORT THE DEVELOPING NEEDS OF UKRAINIAN JUDICIARY IS STRENGTHENED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number of data-fed analytical techniques incorporated into judicial budgeting</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Number of project-supported new or improved policies within the SJA for the support of information technology, procurement, capital improvement, human resources, statistical collections and analysis activities within the courts</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 3.4: THE CAPACITY OF COURTS AND JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE PUBLIC IS ENHANCED, LEADING TO GREATER PUBLIC APPRECIATION OF THEIR ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Number of communication strategies implemented by courts and judicial institutions</td>
<td>2013 / 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>267%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of courts offering legal education materials to court visitors</td>
<td>2013 / 19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 4: THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS AS ADVOCATES FOR AND MONITORS OF JUDICIAL REFORM IS STRENGTHENED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Number of CSO-produced policy proposals related to pending judicial reform legislation</td>
<td>2013 / 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 4.1: CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE UKRAINIAN PUBLIC ARE ENGAGED IN THE JUDICIAL REFORM PROCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Number and percentage of courts in which there are active CSO court performance evaluation programs</td>
<td>2011 / 20 (2.6%)</td>
<td>120 (15.6%)</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Number of people engaged in the monitoring and performance oversight of Ukrainian courts</td>
<td>2013 / 4,793</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>25,151</td>
<td>(53% men, 47% women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Percentage of partner Civil Society Organizations’ performance improvement recommendations implemented by judicial institutions</td>
<td>2011 / 30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</td>
<td>LIFE-OF-PROJECT TARGET</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE 5: THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES IMPLEMENTED FAIRLY, TRANSPARENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY AND IN COMPLIANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Number of USG-Supported anti-corruption measures implemented (FAF)</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Percent of public officials and judges screened through vetting procedure in accordance with the Law on Purification of Government</td>
<td>Jul 2015 / 11.9% (0.2%)&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>54.2% (0.25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Percent of judges screened for corruption and participation in politicized justice in accordance with the Law on Restoration Trust in the Judiciary</td>
<td>Jul 2015 / 3.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.5% (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 5.1: THE LAW ON THE PURIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT AND RELATIVE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK IMPROVED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Number of recommendations to improve the Law on the Purification of Government and relative legislative framework formulated</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Percent of recommendations formulated that are passed into law or adopted as regulations</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 5.2: INSTITUTIONS, PROCEDURES AND REGISTRY FOR THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES STRENGTHENED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Number of institutions that implement vetting and lustration of public officials and judges supported by the project</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Number of judicial performance indicators to evaluate sitting judges in Ukraine developed with project</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Number of recommendations to improve the Unified Registry of Vetted Persons functioning formulated with project support and adopted as regulations</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Number of procedures for lustration and vetting of public officials developed with Project support lustration and vetting of public officials developed with</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 5.3: IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PERSONNEL TO CONDUCT THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES PROFESSIONALLY, FAIRLY AND TRANSPARENTLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>18</sup> Percent of public officials and judges dismissed from their positions as the result of vetting procedures.
### 7. Detailed Description of Performance Indicators

**Indicator 1: Number of legal institutions & associations supported by USG**

This indicator refers to both governmental and nongovernmental institutions and associations that focus on administering and improving the legal system. These institutions include judicial institutions, associations, and those civil society organizations whose mission or one of the stated goals is to improve the legal system.

**2011 Baseline: 30**

- **2012 Target:** 24; **Achieved:** 22; **Year One Performance:** 92%
- **2013 Target:** 24; **Achieved:** 26; **Year Two Performance:** 108%
- **2014 Target:** 24; **Achieved:** 27; **Year Three Performance:** 113%
- **2015 Target:** 24; **Achieved:** 37; **Year Four Performance:** 154%
- **2016 Target:** 24; **Achieved:** 29; **Year Five Performance:** 121%
LOP Target: 45; Achieved: 47; LOP Performance: 104%
Disaggregated by type:

- Governmental institutions: 14
- Legal Education institutions: 4
- Civil society organizations: 27
- Professional groups: 2

Analysis
During the life of project, FAIR supported fourteen governmental legal institutions including the President Administration and its Constitutional Commission and Judicial Reform Council, the Verkhovna Rada, the High Council of Justice, the Council of Judges, the Supreme Court of Ukraine, the State Judicial Administration of Ukraine, the High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine, the National School of Judges of Ukraine, the High Administrative Court, High Civil and Criminal Court, High Commercial Court, and the High Constitutional Court and Ministry of Justice of Ukraine. FAIR support to these institutions included expert review of draft laws and regulations, the development of expert recommendations, funding joint events (direct procurement), providing training to personnel, supporting representative participation in Conferences, procurement of goods and services including hardware and software, printed materials etc. In addition, FAIR supported four government legal education institutions – Kharkiv Law Academy, Odessa Law Academy, L’viv University Law School and Chernivtsi University Law School and two professional associations – the Bar Association of Ukraine and the National Association of Advocates.

Through capacity building and a robust grants program, FAIR supported 27 civil society organizations (CSOs) whose mission or primary stated goal was improving and developing judiciary and legal systems.

Indicator 2: Number of laws, regulations & procedures designed to enhance judicial independence supported w/USG assistance (FAF 2.1.2-2)
This is a U.S. Government Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) indicator for the Rule of Law and Human Rights program area. It refers to laws, regulations and procedures that are official and have been passed in accordance with Ukraine’s legal requirements.

2011 Baseline: 8 (USAID Ukraine Rule of Law Project)
- 2012 Target: 2; Achieved: 4; Year One Performance: 200%
- 2013 Target: 2; Achieved: 2; Year Two Performance: 100%
- 2014 Target: 6; Achieved: 2; Year Three Performance: 33%
- 2015 Target: 5; Achieved: 3; Year Four Performance: 60%
- 2016 Target: 3; Achieved: 2; Year Five Performance: 67%

LOP Target: 25 (including baseline data); Achieved: 21; LOP Performance: 84%
Disaggregated by type:

- Laws: 11 (10 laws under FAIR, 1 law – baseline data)
- Regulations: 10 (3 regulations under FAIR, 7 regulations– baseline data)
Analysis
The 2010 Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges introduced a number of fundamental reforms to the judiciary, but contained controversial provisions that prevented the development of a truly independent judiciary. In addition, the Constitution of Ukraine did not fully support judicial independence. Thus, FAIR provided significant assistance to GOU counterparts including the Verkhovna Rada, President Administration and its Judicial Reform Council, the High Council of Justice, the Council of Judges and others to improve the legal and regulatory base for the judiciary. Recommendations from the Council of Europe Commission for Democracy and Rule of Law (Venice Commission) became a base for FAIR programming in this direction.

During the life of project FAIR supported the following laws:

1) Law on amendments to a number of legislative acts regarding the Supreme Court of Ukraine (2012);
2) Law on amending some legislative acts with regards to adoption of the Criminal Procedure Code (2012);
3) Law on amending some legislative acts of Ukraine regarding strengthening judicial independence (2012);
4) Law on the Bar and Advocates Activity (2012);
5) Law on amending some legislative acts regarding anti-corruption police enforcement (2013);
6) Law of Ukraine on the Restoration of the Trust in the Judiciary of Ukraine (2014);
7) Law on Purification of Government (2014);
8) Law on Ensuring the Right to Fair Trial (2015);
9) Law on amending the Constitution regarding the justice sector (2016);

The following FAIR-supported regulations lead to the increased judicial independence:

1) Code of Judicial Ethics (2013);
2) Council of Judges Regulations on Committees (2014);

FAIR targets for this indicator also included amending Law on High Council of Justice based on amendments to the Constitution, and developing secondary legislation to implement the amendments to the law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges. FAIR did not complete these activities because the adoption of primary regulations happened at the end of FAIR Program Year Five, too close to the project end. FAIR submitted a number of related recommendations to the GOU but these recommendations are still under consideration. Under this indicator FAIR achieved 84% of its target.
**Indicator 3: Number of revised provisions enacted that reflect Venice Commission recommendations**

Revised provisions are those that were developed with FAIR support in order to ensure that judicial reform legislation (particularly, the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges and Constitutional provisions related to the judiciary) complied with international standards. These provisions may address executive authority over judicial entities, mandates for the Supreme Court and the Council of Judges, the authority and composition of the High Council of Justice, or responsibilities for administrative, budgetary and personnel decisions for the judiciary. Reflecting Venice Commission recommendations was the key pre-requisite for making Ukrainian judicial reform legislation comply with international standards. Enacting these provisions in draft laws was an indication of progress.

2011 Baseline: 0

- 2012 Target: 22; Achieved: 4; Year One Performance: 18%
- 2013 Target: 19; Achieved: 0; Year Two Performance: 0%
- 2014 Target: 20; Achieved: 3; Year Three Performance: 15%
- 2015 Target: 20; Achieved: 24; Year Four Performance: 120%
- 2016 Target: 10; Achieved: 18; Year Five Performance: 180%

LOP Target: 26; Achieved: 42; LOP Performance: 117%

Disaggregated by type:

- Constitutional changes: 8; 7 addressed in full, 1 addressed partially.
- Changes to the law: 34; 21 addressed in full, 13 addressed partially.

**Analysis**

After adoption of the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges in 2010, the Venice Commission issued 38 recommendations to amend this law in order to bring it into compliance with international standards for judicial independence and judicial accountability. In addition, the Venice Commission recommended eight changes to the Constitution of Ukraine regarding the justice system. Thus, through the life of project FAIR provided significant assistance to GOU counterparts including the Verkhovna Rada, the President Administration and its Judicial Reform Council, the High Council of Justice, the Council of Judges and others to improve the legal and regulatory base for the judiciary.

FAIR involvement in the creation of laws that addressed Venice Commission recommendations included the following:

1) Law on amendments to a number of legislative acts regarding the Supreme Court of Ukraine (2012) partially addresses two recommendations regarding the increasing of the Supreme Court’ role. Later the Law on Ensuring Right for Fair Trial (2015) addresses these recommendations in full.

2) Law on amending some legislative acts of Ukraine regarding strengthening judicial independence (2012) partially addresses two recommendations regarding the reducing role of Parliament and President in judicial appointment. Later the Law on amendments to the Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges (2016) addresses these recommendations in full.

4) Law on Ensuring the Right to Fair Trial (2015) addresses 12 Venice Commission recommendations in full and 12 of them partially. These include establishing objective criteria for judicial career developing by law, regulating mechanism for judicial discipline by law, including principle of random case assignment in all judicial principles, European standards for composition of High Council of Justice (50% of judges elected by their peers), introducing scale for disciplinary sanctions, cancelling law provisions allowing bonuses and prizes for judges and other significant changes to the Ukrainian judiciary.

5) Law on amending the Constitution regarding the justice sector (2016) addresses eight Venice Commission recommendations regarding changes to the Constitution. Introduced Constitutional changes include but not limited to increasing minimal age for judicial candidate, removing full judicial immunity and introducing functional judicial immunity, removing authority to withdraw judicial immunity from Verkhovna Rada and transferring it to the High Council of Justice, establishing institute of Constitutional complaint and others.

6) Law on amendments to the Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges (2016) addresses ten Venice Commission recommendations. The addresses recommendations include but not limited to cancelling 4-tier judiciary, removing Verkhovna Rada from transferring judges and judicial appointment, limiting role of President in judicial appointment and dismissal to ceremonial, ensuring that the judicial selection, training, career, immunity, transfer, discipline and dismissal etc. are within the authority of High Council of Justice.

Under this indicator FAIR exceeded its target by 17%.

**Indicator 4: Percentage of Venice Commission recommendations adopted**

This indicator measures the total number of revisions that reflect Venice Commission recommendations adopted by Verkhovna Rada against the total number of Venice Commission recommendations made to the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges and judiciary-related provisions of the Constitution. Adoption of Venice Commission recommendations was the key indication of the level of Ukrainian legislation’s compliance with international standards, thus it was the primary illustration of achievement under this expected result.

2011 Baseline: 0

- 2012 Target: 80%; Achieved: 11%; Year One Performance: 14%
- 2013 Target: 41%; Achieved: 0; Year Two Performance: 0%
- 2014 Target: 48%; Achieved: 7%; Year Three Performance: 15%
- 2015 Target: 43%; Achieved: 52%; Year Four Performance: 121%
- 2016 Target: 21%; Achieved: 39%; Year Five Performance: 186%
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LOP Target: 77%; Achieved: 91%; LOP Performance: 118%

Disaggregated by type:
- Constitutional changes: 8 of 8; 100%
- Changes to the law: 34 of 38; 89%

Analysis

Since 2010, the Venice Commission has issued a total of 46 recommendations to amend the Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges and judiciary-related provisions of the Constitution of Ukraine. 37 of these recommendations were issued before 2013 and 9 more came in 2013. Before 2013, FAIR used the first 37 recommendations and after 2013, FAIR increased its focus to cover all 46 recommendations as a denominator for this indicator. The numerator for this indicator was indicator 3 - Number of revised provisions enacted that reflect Venice Commission recommendations.

Under this indicator FAIR exceeded its target by 17%.

Indicator 5: Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding proposed changes to the country’s legal framework (FAF 2.1.1-4)

This is a U.S. Government Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) indicator for the Rule of Law and Human Rights program area. It measures the inclusiveness of the process of changing the country’s legal framework which included constitutional reforms. The indicator counted public hearings, debates, roundtables, working sessions between law makers and representatives of civil society, etc. Involving civil society organizations (CSO) is essential for any democratic reform in Ukraine. Working sessions between CSOs and law makers indicated that the process of Constitutional reform was inclusive which was a pre-requisite for making the process effective.

2014 Baseline: 6
- 2015 Target: 2; Achieved: 6; Year One Performance: 300%
- 2016 Target: 3; Achieved: 6; Year Two Performance: 200%

LOP Target: 11; Achieved: 18; LOP Performance: 164%

Analysis

FAIR introduced this indicator in 2014. Baseline data referred to FAIR support of Constitutional Assembly meetings in 2012-2013, annual targets for 2015 and 2016 are linked to the President initiative for the Constitutional Reform Commission and the Verkhovna Rada initiative to form the Interim Commission for Amending Constitution. Both initiatives reflected public demands raised by the 2014 Revolution of Dignity for speeding up democratic and judicial reforms.

Data measured under this indicator included:

- Regional discussions on proposed amendments to the Constitution regarding human rights in Rivne, Ivano-Frankivsk and Uzhgorod in 2015.
- Regional discussions on proposed amendments to the Constitution regarding the judicial reform in Dnipro, Odesa and Kharkiv in 2015.
• Public discussions of the draft amendments to the Constitution in the justice sector approved by the Constitutional Commission in Odesa, Lviv and Kyiv in 2015.
• Conference on the right to bear arms as a right to self-defense guaranteed by the Constitution. Kyiv, 2015.
• Conference on minority and indigenous people’s rights in Kyiv, 2015.

Under this indicator FAIR exceeded its target by 64%.

**Indicator 6: Number of revised provisions in the Constitution enacted that reflect inputs from project-supported public discussions**

Revised provisions are those that were developed by FAIR partner civil society organizations in cooperation with law makers through FAIR-supported public discussions and other events such as roundtables and (or) conferences. Involving civil society organizations (CSO) was essential for Constitution reform. The direct outcome of this involvement was the development of recommendations for specific Constitutional changes to address the issue of compliance of Ukrainian judicial system with European standards. The result of this involvement was consideration of developed recommendations by law makers and further adoption of these recommendations as part of laws that introduce changes in the Constitution.

**2014 Baseline: 0**
- **2015 Target: N/A**
- **2016 Target: 7; Achieved: 7; Year Two Performance: 100%**

**LOP Target: 7; Achieved: 7; LOP Performance: 100%**

**Analysis**

FAIR introduced this indicator in 2014. The target was based on FAIR support to the Constitutional amendments related to the judiciary and linked to Venice Commission recommendations.

**Actual data for this indicator counts:**

1) Remove the power of the Verkhovna Rada and President to appoint and dismiss judges.
2) Limit the role of the President in the establishment and dissolution of courts.
3) Eliminate the initial 5-year appointment of judges in favor of lifetime appointments for all judges and giving the judiciary a greater role in the budget process.
4) Abolish the “breach of oath” as grounds for dismissal of judges.
5) Bring the composition of the High Council of Justice in line with the European standards, with more than half of its member judges elected by their peers.
6) Increase the minimum age to become a judge from 25 to 30.
7) Limit judicial immunity to conduct on the bench, thereby promoting greater judicial accountability.
Under this indicator FAIR met its target.

**Indicator 7: Number of new properties and functions surrounding judicial selection and discipline introduced to the HQC management system with project support**

A count of the total new properties and functions introduced to the High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine management system (including the internal network and HQC website). These new properties and functions contributed to standardized and transparent judicial selection and discipline. An improved website and internal network of the High Qualifications Commission of Judges led to greater transparency and accountability of the body and efficiency of its operations.

2011 Baseline: 0

- 2012 Target: 10; Achieved: 1; Year One Performance: 10%
- 2013 Target: 14; Achieved: 0; Year Two Performance: 0%
- 2014 Target: 10; Achieved: 0; Year Three Performance: 0%
- 2015 Target: 9; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
- 2016 Target: 3 (revised based on 2015 results); Achieved: 32; Year Five Performance: 1067%

LOP Target: 10; Achieved: 32; LOP Performance: 320%

**Analysis**

Introducing new properties and functions to HQC management system was a challenge for many years. After introducing a module for publishing judicial discipline decisions on the internet in 2012, the HQC was not able to cooperate effectively on developing new modern management systems due to a lack of political will by HQC leaders, a lack of HQC staff skills and changes in the composition of the HQC as the result of implementation 2014 Law on Purification of Government. In 2016 HQC became fully operational and demonstrated will and capacity to introduce modern management systems. FAIR used this momentum and supported HQC with introduction the following properties and functions:

1) Register of Courts;  
2) Register of judges;  
3) Register of HQC staff;  
4) Periods of staff work;  
5) User access to functions and methods;  
6) Register of auto-assignment;  
7) Random case assignment (applications);  
8) Redistribution of cases (applications)  
9) Register of complaints;  
10) Register of judicial discipline decisions;  
11) Register of applications for transferring judges;  
12) Register of applications for lifetime appointment;  
13) Register of application for participation in the judicial selection process;  
14) Register of decisions on judicial selection;  
15) Data on the number of posts of judges;
16) Conducting of accounting card of posts of judges;
17) Register of vacancies;
18) Candidate submission of data for judicial dossier;
19) Electronic submission of qualification test and exam results;
20) General reference book;
21) Reference book on judicial career;
22) Reference book on disciplinary proceedings;
23) Database of test questions;
24) Import test questions to MS Office applications;
25) Relevance support database;
26) Preparation of materials for publication on web-portal;
27) Publication of materials on web-portal (files, meetings, decisions of the HQC);
28) Statistical reports (general);
29) Statistical reports on judicial career;
30) Statistical reports on judicial vacancies;
31) Qualification assessment conducting;
32) Qualification test and exam check and calculation of points.

Under this indicator FAIR exceeded its target by 220%. This significant success was the result of focusing on previously under-performing areas and external factors.

**Indicator 8: Number of merit-based criteria or procedures for justice sector personnel selection adopted with USG assistance**

This indicator counted new, standardized criteria and new procedures to govern transparent and objective judicial appointment denoting a transparent and accountable judicial selection and appointment process.

2011 Baseline: 2
- 2012 Target: 10; Achieved: 2; Year One Performance: 20%
- 2013 Target: 18; Achieved: 15; Year Two Performance: 83%
- 2014 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year Three Performance: 0%
- 2015 Target: 8; Achieved: 1; Year Four Performance: 13%
- 2016 Target: 0; Achieved: 2; Year Five Performance: 100%

LOP Target: 25; Achieved: 22; LOP Performance: 88%

**Analysis**

Baseline data included FAIR-predecessor USAID Ukraine Rule of Law Project achievements including 1) Rules and evaluation methodology for the anonymous testing of judicial candidates and 2) Grading methodology for the judicial candidates qualification examination. FAIR LOP targets anticipated the adoption of judicial selection criteria based on previously developed judicial competencies, new regulations that govern judicial appointment, qualification test and qualification exam. The HQC has not always been effective in developing and adopting new regulations and procedures due to a lack of political will, external pressure on the HQC, lack of HQC staff skills, and changes in the composition of the HQC as a result of implementation of the 2014 Law on Purification of Government.
During the life of project, FAIR supported the development, and promoted the adoption and implementation of the following procedures and criteria:

- Procedure for drafting case study (2012);
- Procedure for validating case study (2012);
- Six judicial selection criteria: 1) theoretical legal knowledge, 2) ability to apply knowledge in practice and correctly draft procedural documents, 3) ability to effectively listen, 4) communicative skills, 5) ability to resist influence and pressure, 6) ability to resolve conflicts, altogether with ability to think logically and analytically (2013);
- eight criteria to evaluate case studies during judicial qualification exams, two criteria for each case study (2013);
- Regulation on the procedure of conducting training for candidate judges (2013);
- Regulation on the Judicial Dossier (2015);
- Procedure and methodology for judicial performance evaluation (2016)
- Procedure of exam taking and methodology of its assessment during judicial performance evaluation (2016).

Under this indicator FAIR achieved 88% of its target.

**Indicator 9: Number of Ukrainian judges appointed through project-supported objective, merit-based judicial selection process**

The number of judges that were selected according to new FAIR-supported regulations that are based on international standards, including judicial candidate anonymous testing, criteria to evaluate case studies the regulation on conducting training for candidate judges etc. Objective criteria reduced opportunities for internal or external influences to affect selection, increasing impartiality and professionalism of judicial personnel.

2013 Baseline: 880
- 2014 Target: 100; Achieved: 62; Year Three Performance: 62%
- 2015 Target: 50; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
- 2016 Target: 50; Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: 0%

LOP Target: 1,080 (including baseline figure); Achieved: 942; LOP Performance: 88%

**Analysis**

FAIR introduced this indicator in 2013. Although reaching the target under this indicator was completely outside of project control, the number of judges selected under FAIR-developed procedures was a direct and tangible outcome of FAIR activities. Meanwhile, the 2014 Revolution of Dignity significantly changed the GOU agenda regarding judicial selection. In response to public demand, the GOU started the process of vetting judges and introducing the judicial performance evaluation. No new judicial selection took place in 2015 and 2016.
Indicator 10: Number of criteria, standards and regulations adopted to govern judicial misconduct investigations
This indicator counted new criteria, standards and regulations for judicial misconduct investigation developed with FAIR support and approved by High Qualifications Commission of Judges. A standardized judicial misconduct investigation system is essential for transparent judicial discipline process.

2011 Baseline: 0
• 2012 Target: 4; Achieved: 0; Year One Performance: 0%
• 2013 Target: 8; Achieved: 1; Year Two Performance: 13%
• 2015 Target: 7 (revised on actual results); Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
• 2016 Target: 7 (revised on actual previous results); Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: 0%

LOP Target: 8; Achieved: 1; LOP Performance: 13%

Analysis
HQC experienced constant delays in the implementation of its judicial selection and discipline mandate due to a lack of political will, external pressure on the HQC, lack of HQC staff skills, and changes in the composition of the HQC as the result of implementation 2014 Law on Purification of Government. The only contribution to this indicator was the Procedure for Verification and Decision-Making in Disciplinary Proceedings against Judges, and Preparation and Retaining Documents developed and approved in 2012. Other FAIR-supported developments including standards for preliminary screening of complaints remain in draft form.

Indicator 11: Percent of judicial misconduct complaints submitted to the HQC using the standardized form
This indicator was the ratio of the number of judicial misconduct complaints submitted to the High Qualifications Commission of Judges (HQC) using standardized judicial misconduct complaint form, to the total number of judicial misconduct complaints received by HQC. The standardized judicial misconduct complaint form is available on the HQC website which contributes to the transparency of the judicial discipline system: court users have the ability to download the form, fill it in, and return it to the HQC for review and further processing.

2011 Baseline: 2%
• 2012 Target: 3%; Achieved: 9%; Year One Performance: 297%
• 2013 Target: 10%; Achieved: 9.6%; Year Two Performance: 96%
• 2014 Target: 12%; Achieved: 14%; Year Three Performance: 113%
• 2015 Target: 15%; Achieved: 29%; Year Four Performance: 193%
• 2016 Target: 20%; Achieved: 36%; Year Five Performance: 180%

LOP Target: 20%; Achieved: 17%; LOP Performance: 85%
Analysis
Standardizing the judicial misconduct complaint process was one of the significant achievement of FAIR cooperation with the HQC.

The annual number of judicial misconduct complaints varied from year to year of FAIR life of project reaching a maximum of over 18,000 in 2013 and minimum of just below 7,800 in 2015. Meanwhile, the ratio (Percent) of judicial misconduct complaints submitted on standardized form grew constantly. Due to the limited usage of the standardized form at the beginning of the project, the cumulative life of project data is 17% which is below the cumulative life of project target of 20%.

Indicator 12: Percent of judicial discipline decisions posted on HQC website
This indicator is the ratio of total discipline decisions posted on HQC website to total number of discipline decisions made by High Qualifications Commission of Judges (HQC). Posting the judicial discipline decisions on the HQC Web site is a legal requirement and is a pre-requisite to transparency of judicial discipline process.

2011 Baseline: 47%
- 2012 Target: 80%; Achieved: 81%; Year One Performance: 101%
- 2013 Target: 100%; Achieved: 72%; Year Two Performance: 72%
- 2014 Target: 85% (revised based on previous year results); Achieved: 100%; Year Three Performance: 118%
- 2015 Target: 100%; Achieved: 61%; Year Four Performance: 61%
- 2016 Target: 100%; Achieved: 55%; Year Five Performance: 55%

LOP Target: 100%; Achieved: 62%; LOP Performance: 62%

Analysis
The Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges required all judicial discipline decision to be posted on the HQC website to ensure the transparency of the judicial discipline process. However, the law does not cover a) when specifically the HQC judicial discipline decision should be posted and b) for how long the HQC judicial discipline decision should be available on the website. Due to the lack of clear legal requirements, the HQC implements the law in such way that all decisions cannot be available on the website because:

- The HQC does not post its judicial discipline decision immediately after the decision is made. HQC keeps the decision for a certain period to see whether the judge decides to appeal the HQC decision with the High Administrative Court of Ukraine (HAC).
- If the judge appeals the HQC decision with the HAC, the HQC will not post the decision until the HAC has made a decision.
- If the HQC decision is posted (the judge does not appeal or judge does appeal but the HAC leaves the HQC decision as it is), the HQC keeps the decision on its website for no more than one year after the decision is made, after one year the HQC deletes the decision from its website.

These factors kept the issue of judicial discipline process transparency open.
**Indicator 13: Number of judicial self-governance mechanisms revised with project support**

This is a count of judicial self-governance mechanisms developed by judges and approved by the Council of Judges. It includes the amended Code of Judicial Ethics, the creation of new committees at the Council of Judges, and reforms of the system of appointing judges to the Council of Judges. Improving judicial self-governance mechanisms leads to judicial independence and, further, strengthens judicial accountability and integrity.

2011 Baseline: 0  
• 2012 Target: 1; Achieved: 0; Year One Performance: 0%  
• 2013 Target: 3; Achieved: 1; Year Two Performance: 33%  
• 2014 Target: 4 (revised based on 2012 and 2013 actuals); Achieved: 4; Year Three Performance: 100%  
• 2015 Target: 1; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%  
• 2016 Target: 100%; Achieved: 55%; Year Five Performance: 55%

LOP Target: 8; Achieved: 6; LOP Performance: 75%

**Analysis**

During the life of the project, FAIR supported the development and promoted the approval of the following judicial self-governance mechanisms:

1) Code of Judicial Ethics (2013);  
2) Amending Rules of Procedures for the Congress of Judges (2014);  
3) Amending COJ Regulations (2014);  
4) Regulations on Appointment and Dismissal of Constitutional Court Justices (2014);  
5) Creating COJ Committees (2014);  

FAIR also supported the High Council of Justice in developing its internal decision-making regulations, but this activity was not completed due to internal organizational issues at the HCJ.

**Indicator 14: Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management (FAF indicator 2.1.3 – 13)**

Improved case management in courts was an indication of strengthening professionalism and effectiveness of Ukrainian judiciary and led to a more effective justice system by decreasing case backlog and case disposition time. This in turn reduced administrative burdens on judges, increased the transparency of judicial procedures and improved compliance with procedural law. This indicator was an actual count of courts that received USG assistance through FAIR and improved their case management. The assistance included but was not limited to: procurement of software and hardware, developing recommendations, support to CSO court monitoring and developing court improvement recommendations, implementation court performance evaluation framework, court staff participation in project-funded trainings. Examples of improvement: case documents are now available to parties upon request; statistical data on cases is routinely compiled; system manages the
flow of cases through scheduling set by procedural law; data elements are coherent and compatible with related information systems such as those of the police, prosecution and corrections agencies; cases are uniquely identified, registered, indexed and filed.

2011 Baseline: 14
- 2012 Target: 20; Achieved: 22; Year One Performance: 110%
- 2013 Target: 20; Achieved: 32; Year Two Performance: 160%
- 2014 Target: 40; Achieved: 42; Year Three Performance: 105%
- 2015 Target: 50; Achieved: 66; Year Four Performance: 132%
- 2016 Target: 60; Achieved: 383; Year Five Performance: 638%

LOP Target: 80; Achieved: 383; LOP Performance: 479%

Analysis
During the life of project, FAIR assistance to Ukrainian courts resulted in improving case management in at least 362 courts (data as of September 1, 2016). The project exceeded this target by combining direct and indirect assistance to courts which reflected two simultaneous vectors of FAIR activities: a) activities that target grass-root beneficiaries, e.g. specific courts or their personnel and b) activities that target the improving of Ukrainian judiciary overall, at the national level and have impact on specific courts.

Direct assistance to courts that improved case management included:
- Providing hardware and software to specific courts as part of assistance to Ukrainian judiciary in the process of implementation Court Automation Strategy.
- Providing hardware and software to specific courts per their request. This assistance, first of all, refers to courts of Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts that were evacuated from the Anti-Terrorist Operation (ATO) area to those locations that are under control of Ukrainian Government.
- Training judges and court staff in case flow management, court performance evaluation, judicial statistics.

Indirect assistance to courts that improved case management included:
- Support to implementation Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework through consultations.
- Developing and publishing CPE Guidelines, distributing them to courts.
- Support civil society organizations in implementation user satisfaction surveys and developing recommendations aimed at improving court functions including case management.
- Monitoring of implementation of CSO recommendations by courts, providing assistance in developing performance improvements plans.

To collect information and evidence on case management improvements in courts FAIR used the following methods and data sources:
- Review of court web pages on judicial web-portal regarding the availability of case management data (clearance rate, back log, average duration of proceedings).
- Phone interviews of selected court staff.
- Survey of court performance evaluation training participants.
- Reports from COJ and SJA.
- Reports of partner CSO.

The table below lists the courts that improved their case management as the result of FAIR direct and indirect assistance, types of received assistance and types of identified improvements. In this table those columns that summarize FAIR assistance are highlighted in blue and labeled as follows:

- **CA** = court automation
- **CPE** = court performance evaluation (including user satisfaction surveys and surveys of judges and court staff),
- **TR** = training for judges and court staff.

Columns that summarize improvements are highlighted in light pink and labeled as follows:

- **BL** = backlog management
- **CR** = clearance rate control
- **TL**= timeliness of proceedings management
- **DA**=case management data availability on court website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Court Name</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CPE</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Volodymyr-Volynskyi City Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Horokhivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ivanychivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kamin-Kashyrskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kivertsivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kovelskyi City-Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lokachynskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lutskyi City-Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Liubeshivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Liubomlskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Manevtskiy Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Novovolynskyi City Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ratnivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Starovzhivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Turiskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shatskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dnipropetrovskyi Raion Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pavlohradskyi City-District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Petrozavodskyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pokrovskyi Raion Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Piatykhatskyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Amur-Nyzhniodniprovsky Raion Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zhovtnevyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Industrialnyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kirovskyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Samarskyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Zhovtnevyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Saksahanskyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ternivskyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Zhytomyrskyi Raion Court of Zhytomyr Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Narodytskyi Raion Court of Zhytomyr Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Berehivskyi Raion Court of Transcarpathian Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vynohradivskyi Raion Court of Transcarpathian Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Volovetskyi Raion Court of Transcarpathian Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Irshavskyi Raion Court of Transcarpathian Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Enerhodarskyi Town Court of Zaporizhzhia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Melitopolskyi City-Raion Court of Zaporizhzhia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Leninskyi District Court of Zaporizhzhia City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ordzhonikidzevskiy District Court of Zaporizhzhia City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Shevchenkovskyi District Court of Zaporizhzhia City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Bohorodchanskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bolekhivskyi Town Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Verkhovnskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Halytskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Horodenkovskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dolynskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk City Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Kaluskyi City-Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kolomyiskyi City-Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Kosivskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Nadvirnianskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Rohatynskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rozhniativskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sniatynskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tysmenytskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Tlumatskyi Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Yaremchanskyi Town Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Bohuslavskyi Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Boryspilskyi City-Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Brovarskyi City-Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Vasylyivskyi City-Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vyshhorodskyi Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yahotynskyi Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Petrovskyi Raion Court of Kirovohrad Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Boryslavskyi Town Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Brodivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Buskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Horodotskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Drohobytskyi City-Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Zhychivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Zhovkiivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Zolochivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Kamianka-Buzkyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mykolayivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mostyskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Peremyshlianskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Pustomytsivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Radekhivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Sambirskyi City-Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Skolivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Starosambirskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Stryiskyi City-Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Truskavetskyi Town Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Turkivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Chervonohradskyi Town Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Yavorivskyi Raion Court of Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Halytskyi District Court of Lviv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Zaliznychnyi District Court of Lviv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Lychakivskyi District Court of Lviv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Bashtanskyi Raion Court of Mykolayiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tsentralnyi District Court of Mykolayiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Artsyzkyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Baltskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Berezivskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Ivanivskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Izmailskyi City-Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Illichivskyi Town Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Kiliiskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Kominternivskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Liubashivskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Ovidiopolskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Reniiskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Rozdilianskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Saratskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Tatarbunarskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Teplodarskyi Town Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Shyriaivskyi Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Yuzhnnyi Town Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Kyivskyi District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Malynovskyi District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Pymorskyi District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Suvorovskyi District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Avtozavodskyi District Court of Kremenchuk Town</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Hrebinkivskyi Raion Court of Poltava Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Dykanskyi Raion Court of Poltava Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Kremenchutskyi Raion Court of Poltava Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Pyriatynskyi Raion Court of Poltava Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Dubrovynskyi Raion Court of Rivne Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Kostopilskyi Raion Court of Rivne Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rivnenskyi Raion Court of Rivne Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Bilopilskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Burynskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Velykopyrsarivskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Hlukhivskyi City-Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Konotopskyi City-Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Krasnopilskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Krolevetskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Lebedynskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Lypovodolynskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Nedryhailivskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Okhtyrskyi City-Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Putyvlskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Romenskyi City-Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Seredyno-Budskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Sumskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Trostianetskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Shostkynskyi City-Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Yampilskyi Raion Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Zarichnyi District Court of Sumy City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Kovpakivskyi District Court of Sumy City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Berezhanskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Borschivskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Buchatskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Husiatynskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Zalishchytskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Zbarazkyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Zborivskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Kozivskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Kremenetskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Lanovetskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Monastyryskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Pidvolochskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Pidhaietskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Terebovlanskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Ternopilskyi City-Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Chortkivskyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Shumsksyi Raion Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Balakliisky Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Barvinkivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Blyzniukivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Bohodukhivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Borivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Valkivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Velkyoburlutskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Vovchanskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Dvorichanskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Derhachivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Zacheptylivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Zmiivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Zolochivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Iziumskyi City-Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Kehychivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Kolomatskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Krasnohradskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Krasnokutskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Kupianskyi City-Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Lozivskyi City-Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Liubotynskyi Town Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Novovodolazksyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Pervomaisksyi City-Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Pechenizksyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Sakhnovschynskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Kharkivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Chuhuivskyi Town Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Shevchenkivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Dzerzhynskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Zhovtnevyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Kyivskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Kominternivskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Leninskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Moskovskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Ordzhonikidzevskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Frunzenskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Chervonoazovodskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Beryslavskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Bilozerskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Velykolepetsyk Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Velykoolaksandrivskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Verkhnorohachytskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Vysokopilskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Henicheskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Holostranskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Hornostavskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Ivanivskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Kalanchatskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Kakhovskyi City-Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Nyzhnoirozhskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Novovorontsovsy Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Novokakhovskyi Town Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Novoortskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Skadovskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Tsurupynskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Chaplynskyi Raion Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Dniprovskyi District Court of Kherson City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Komsomolskyi District Court of Kherson City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Suvorovskyi District Court of Kherson City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Bilohirskyi Raion Court of Khmelnitskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Vinkovetskyi Raion Court of Khmelnitskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Volochyskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Horodotskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Derazhnianskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Dunaievetskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Iziaslavskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Kamianets-Podilskyi City-Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Krasylivskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Letychivskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Netishynskyi Town Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Novoushytskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Polonskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Slavutskyi City-Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Starokostiantynivskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Starosyniavskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Teofipolskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi City-Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Chemerovetskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Shepetivskyi City-Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Yarmolynetskyi Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Vatutinskyi Town Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Horodyshchenskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Drabivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Zhashkivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Zvenyhorodskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Zolotoniskiy City-Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Kamiansky Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Kanivskyi City-Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Katerynopoliskiy Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Korsun-Shevchenkivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Lysianskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Mankivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Monastyryshchenskiy Raion Court of Cherkasy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Smilianskyi City-Raion Court of Cherkasy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Talnivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Umanskyi City-Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Khrystynivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Cherkaskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Chornyanskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Chornobaivskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Shpolianskyi Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Prydniprovskyi District Court of Cherkasy City</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Sosnivsky District Court of Cherkasy City</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Vyzhnyskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Hertsaivskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Hlybortsyki Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Zastavynskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Kelmenetskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Kotsmanskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Novodnistrovskyi Town Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Novoselytskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Putylskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Sokyrianskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Storozhnetskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Khotynskyi Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Pershotravnevyi District Court of Chernivtsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Sadhirskyi District Court of Chernivtsi City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Shevchenkivskyi District Court of Chernivtsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Bakhmatskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Bobrovytskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Borznianskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Varvynskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Horodniantskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Ichnianskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Kozeletskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Koropskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Koriukivskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Kulykivskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Menskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Novhorod-Siverskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Nizhynskyi City-Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Nosivskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Prylutskyi City-Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Ripkynskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Semenivskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Sosnytskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Sribnianskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Talalivskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Chernihivskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Shchorskyi Raion Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Desianskyi District Court of Chernihiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Novozavodskyi District Court of Chernihiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Holosiivskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Darnytskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Desianskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Dniprovskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Obolonskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Pecherskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Podilskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Sviatoshynskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Solomianskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Shevchenkovskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Vinnytsia Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Volyn Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Donetsk Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Kyiv Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Kirovohrad Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Luhanski Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Lviv Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Odessa Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Poltava Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Rivne Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Sumy Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Ternopil Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Kharkiv Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Kherson Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Chernyshy Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Chernivtsi Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Chernihiv Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Kyiv City Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Vinnytsya Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Volyn Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Lviv Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Odessa Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Sumy Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Ternopil Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Kharkiv Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Kherson Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Chernyshy Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Chernivtsi Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Chernihiv Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Vinnytsya Administrative Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Kyiv Administrative Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Kharkiv Administrative Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>High Commercial Court of Ukraine</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Mykolayiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Rivne Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Commercial Court of Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk Commercial Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Donetsk Commercial Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Kyiv Commercial Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Odessa Commercial Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Kharkiv Commercial Court of Appeals</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Barskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Bershadskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Vinnytskyi City Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Haisynskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Illinetskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Kryzhopilskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Lypovetskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Litynskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Mohyliv-Podilskyi City-Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Murovanokurylovetskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Nemyrivskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Orativskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Pishchanskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Pohrebyschenskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Teplytskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Tyvirvskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Trostanetskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Tulchynskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Chernivetskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Chechelnyskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Sharhorodskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Yampilskyi Raion Court of Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table illustrates disaggregation of courts with improved case management by oblast, jurisdiction and level (trial, appellate and cassation):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donetsk</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donetsk Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivs'k</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivs'k Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kharkiv Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kherson Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Khmelnyskyi</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khmelnyskyi Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kirovohrad</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirovohrad Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cassation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyiv City Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyiv Oblast Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luhansk</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luhansk Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>L'viv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mykolayiv Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td>Instance</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odessa Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poltava Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rivne Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sumy Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ternopil</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ternopil</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ternopil Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vinnytsia</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vinnytsia</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vinnytsia Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volyn Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Transcarpathian</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcarpathian Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zhytomyr</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zhytomyr Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 16 352 383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 15: Number of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance (indicator 2.1.2-7 in FAF)**

This is a U.S. Government Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) indicator for the Rule of Law and Human Rights program area. It counts judges, court staff, and representatives of judicial institutions (such as State Judicial Administration or High Qualifications Commission) who have received USG-sponsored training. Training refers to all training or educational events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad, including any organized events, forums, lectures, workshops, or conferences, during which knowledge was exchanged.
2011 Baseline: 2,946 (men: 1,424; women: 1,522). The baseline data refers to FAIR predecessor, USAID Ukraine Rule of Law Project (UROL).

- 2012 Target: 300; Achieved: 875 (men: 407, women: 468); Year One Performance: 292%
- 2013 Target: 400; Achieved: 365 (men: 207, women: 158); Year Two Performance: 91%
- 2014 Target: 300; Achieved: 620 (men: 244, women: 366); Year Three Performance: 203%
- 2015 Target: 300; Achieved: 695 (men: 337, women: 358); Year Four Performance: 232%
- 2016 Target: 300; Achieved: 1045 (men: 453, women: 592); Year Five Performance: 348%

LOP Target: 4,700; Achieved: 5,067 (men: 2,345; women: 2,722); LOP Performance 108%

Taking into consideration that this was a U.S. Government FAF indicator, FAIR counted its predecessor UROL Project’s data as a baseline figure and included it in the LOP target and actual figures. It is necessary to note that data for this indicator overlaps program years. The LOP data excluded double counting of trained individuals between years.

Analysis:

The LOP actual data is 5,067 including 2,345 (46%) men and 2,722 (54%) women. This data also includes:

- 2,703 judges where 1,473 (55%) are men and 1,230 (45%) are women
- 2,364 court staff and other justice sector personnel who are not judges where 872 (37%) are men and 1,492 (63%) are women.

While the proportion of men and women in the total number of trainees was 46% to 54%, the proportions of men and women judges is reversed – 55% men to 45% women. The gender proportion of trained judicial personnel who are non-judges is 37% men to 63% women. This illustrates certain gender related issues in the Ukrainian judiciary:

- Judicial leadership and decision making is generally higher among male judges, thus their participation in trainings for judges is higher than it is within the general gender proportions of FAIR trainees;
- Court staff positions (lower paid than judges) are more likely to be occupied by women, and leadership ambitions of court staff is higher among court staff women than men.

As it’s mentioned above, the presented LOP figures are for FAIR and UROL. FAIR’s only LOP data is 3,005 judges and justice sector personnel trained where 1,348 (45%) are men and 1,657 (55%) are women. This data includes:

- 1,506 judges where 812 (54%) men and 694 (46%) women;
• 1,499 court staff and other judicial personnel where 536 (36%) men and 963 (64%) women.

The disaggregation of training participants by sex is the same for FAIR as it’s for FAIR plus UROL data, meaning that the gender issues remain the same for the last ten years. It is also important to note that the presented data excludes double-counting (or multiple counting) of training participants. The source of date for this indicator was the FAIR Project records, including participant information collected at the beginning of every organized training event. The information from training event attendance sheets was entered into a training database. To calculate the number of trainees for specific reporting periods (quarter, year, LOP), the FAIR team enabled cross-tab queries in the training database using three types of data: participant name, family name, and organization that the participant represented. Cross-tab queries show the number of training events each participant attended in a particular reporting period. This is the reason why the annual numbers when added do not match the grand total – grand total number excludes double-counting between years.

**Indicator 16: Percent of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance reporting application of skills and knowledge gained in their judicial practices or teaching activities**

In a follow-up survey of trained judges and court staff, FAIR staff asked if they had used the skills or knowledge gained, or the materials received in FAIR trainings while performing their professional responsibilities. This indicator measures the proportion of the total number of trainees that answers “yes” to the question.

2014 Baseline: 78%

• 2015 Target: 83%; Achieved: 80.3%; Year Four Performance: 97%
• 2016 Target: 88%; Achieved: 96%; Year Five Performance: 109%

LOP Target: 85%; Achieved: 89%; LOP Performance: 105%

**Analysis**

FAIR introduced this indicator in 2014 taking into consideration that better trained judicial personnel are a prerequisite for an improved legal system and strengthening judicial independence. This indicator also contributed to sustainability of judicial education in Ukraine measuring the cadre of local trainers capable of training judges and judicial personnel. To measure performance with this indicator FAIR used post-training paper surveys directly after training event, post-training phone surveys and on-line surveys using a google platform.

In 2016 this indicator reached record 96% achievement, however only half of training participants that contributed to this indicator reported that they are able to use the new and improved knowledge and skills on ongoing base and without additional conditions. 44.9% of respondents reported that they use it from time to time and, under certain conditions including court leadership support, SJA or COJ support, availability of resources, and still others do not use it at all. The chart below demonstrates respondents’ answers to the question “Do you use in your work the
newly gained or increased knowledge and developed skills as the result of FAIR training?”:

**Indicator 17: Number of new legal courses or curricula developed with USG assistance**

This indicator counted new legal courses or curricula developed by the FAIR project for the National School of Judges of Ukraine.

2011 Baseline: 8.
- 2012 Target: 3; Achieved: 3; Year One Performance: 100%
- 2013 Target: 3; Achieved: 6; Year Two Performance: 200%
- 2014 Target: 5; Achieved: 2; Year Three Performance: 40%
- 2015 Target: 2; Achieved: 2; Year Four Performance: 100%
- 2016 Target: 1; Achieved: 2; Year Five Performance: 200%

LOP Target: 24; Achieved: 23; LOP Performance 96%

**Analysis**

More informed judicial personnel are more capable of operating an improved legal system. Improving the knowledge of judicial personnel would increase their professionalism. For many years, the Ukrainian system of professional training for judges and court staff lacked the resources to furnish all the necessary legal courses and curricula.

The baseline data of 2011 refers to FAIR predecessor, USAID Ukraine Rule of Law Project (UROL) and it counts the following:

1) Human Resource Management in courts curricula.
2) Rules of Conduct for Court Staff training curricula.
3) Strategic Planning in Courts training curricula.
4) General course on judicial ethics.
5) Judicial Ethics, training curricula for on-going training of judges.
6) Manual “Court Communication with Public”.
7) Judicial Opinion Writing, manual and curricula.

FAIR significantly increased the capacity of the National School of Judges of Ukraine (NSJ) by updating existing and developing new training courses and curricula including:

1) Judicial Ethics. Training curricula for on-going training of judges (update).
2) Judicial Ethics. Training curricula for judicial candidates.
3) Judicial Ethics. Training curricula for first appointed judges.
4) On-line training course on judicial ethics.
5) Court Administration Certificate Program.
6) On-line training course on court communication with public.
7) Judicial Opinion Writing. Training curricula for ongoing training of judges.
8) Judicial Opinion Writing. Training curricula for judicial candidates.
9) Rule of Law and Human Rights. Training curricula for judges.
10) Rule of Law and Human Rights. Training curricula for judicial candidates.
11) Initial orientation training course for disciplinary inspectors.
12) Advanced training course for disciplinary inspectors.
13) Training program on practical application of mediation.
14) Training course for judges on environmental protection and human rights.
15) Training program for court staff to improve their skills of communication and work with people with disabilities.
16) Court Administration On-line Course.

For the life of project, FAIR created fifteen courses and curricula from the list above, “Judicial ethics training curricula for on-going training of judges was updated and counted in the baseline figure.

**Indicator 18: Number of court performance standards adopted**
This indicator was an actual count of court performance standards developed with project support and formally adopted by the Council of Judges

- 2012 Target: 0; Achieved: 0; Year One Performance: N/A
- 2013 Target: 5; Achieved: 0; Year Two Performance: 0%
- 2014 Target: 7; Achieved: 0; Year Three Performance: 0%
- 2015 Target: 7; Achieved: 4; Year Four Performance: 57%
- 2016 Target: 3; Achieved: 1; Year Five Performance: 33%

LOP Target: 7; Achieved: 5; LOP Performance 71%

**Analysis**
Court performance standards form the basis for evaluating judicial operations and assessing what courts need in order to provide services to citizens in an efficient way. The development and adoption of the national court performance standards is a pre-requisite to the effectiveness of the Ukrainian judiciary. In 2015, the COJ approved the FAIR-developed Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework that defined court performance standards, quality criteria, indicators and evaluation.
methods. As recommended by Ukrainian and international experts, the COJ approved a two-level CPE Framework: mandatory basic court performance evaluation and complex (full) court performance evaluation. The basic court performance evaluation defined eight mandatory performance indicators that each court had to implement, four of these mandatory indicators defined performance standards, specifically:

1) Number and ratio of cases pending for more than one year (backlog of cases). Recommended standards: close to zero, never exceed 1%, each case pending for more than year must have explained reason.
2) Clearance rate calculated as recommended by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). Recommended standard from 96 to 102%
3) Regular conducting user satisfaction surveys in courts using Citizen Report Cards (CRC) methodology. Recommended standard – survey at least once per three years.
4) Publication of user satisfaction survey results on the court website.

In 2016, the COJ made a decision that an internal survey of judges and court staff according to the approved CPE Framework should take place regularly, at least once every three years. It has become the 5th performance standard for Ukrainian courts.

**Indicator 19: Number of court performance indicators implemented**
This indicator is an actual count of court performance indicators developed with project support, approved by the Council of Judges and SJA and implemented by courts in practice.

2013 Baseline: 7.
- 2014 Target: 14; Achieved: 17; Year Three Performance: 121%
- 2015 Target: 17; Achieved: 21; Year Four Performance: 124%
- 2016 Target: 31; Achieved: Year Five Performance: 103%

LOP Target: 31; Achieved: 32; LOP Performance 103%

**Analysis**
Court performance indicators serve to assess court needs for providing services to citizens in an efficient way. Thus, the development, approval and implementation of court performance indicators is a pre-requisite to ensure the effectiveness of the Ukrainian judiciary. The European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice, in its 2012 report, listed Ukraine among only six country-members of the Council of Europe that do not have court performance indicators. Lack of performance indicators impedes the efficient management of operations, resources, and personnel, and it limits courts’ ability to effectively communicate with public. To address these issues, FAIR supported the COJ and the SJA in developing the Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework for Ukrainian courts that defines 35 performance indicators for Ukrainian courts.

Ukrainian courts started to implement selected performance indicators defined by CPE Framework before the COJ approved the CPE Framework itself. By the end of 2013, former Council of Judges of General Courts made a decision on mandatory
performance indicators for general courts. That decision required all general courts - trial and appellate - to implement 17 indicators.

In 2015, the new composition of the COJ approved the CPE Framework and selected nine mandatory performance indicators for all courts, at all levels and in all jurisdictions.

In 2016, as the result of FAIR developing and publishing the Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Manual, Ukrainian courts significantly increased the use of court performance indicators. Now courts implement not only basic performance indicators (for example clearance rate, average caseload, backlog, average duration of proceedings), but also complex performance indicators such as level of judges/court staff satisfaction with working conditions by 5-point scale, integral score of user satisfaction with timeliness of court proceedings competence of court staff/completeness and clarity of court information and others.

The table below provides the detailed listing of FAIR-developed court performance indicators and their implementation in Ukrainian courts by year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Backlog beginning of period, number and Percent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of incoming cases</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of adjudicated cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Backlog end of reporting period, number and Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of decisions cancelled by appellate or higher court</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of complaints related to court efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Caseload per judge (average, minimum, maximum)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total number of incoming documentation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Average number of incoming documents per one court staff</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of court staff per one judge</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clearance Rate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Number of adjudicated cases per one judge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Percent of decisions cancelled by appellate or higher court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Number of court hearings by way of video conferencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Number of SMS summons</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Availability of court web page</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Results of court user survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Average duration of court proceedings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Regular implementation of court user surveys</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Publishing court user surveys on web-page</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Level of user satisfaction with court services established by way of using unified methodology</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Percent of court users that report &quot;good&quot; and &quot;excellent&quot; court performance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Level of judge’s satisfaction with working conditions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Level of court staff satisfaction with working conditions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Evaluation of Chief Judge using 5-point scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Evaluation of chief of staff using 5-point scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Judicial caseload: minimum, maximum, average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator 20: Number of courts implemented project-supported performance measurement system.

This indicator is an actual count of courts that implement court performance standards, criteria and indicators developed with project support and those courts that use them on the regular basis for their internal management purposes. FAIR supported the development of the Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework through surveys of judges and court staff, analysis of court statistics and expert evaluations of case files and court decisions; it also includes external court performance evaluation through citizen report card (CRC) surveys. This indicator does not limit the count of courts using CPE Framework by Council of Judges (COJ) approval. For the purpose of this indicator we count the courts that implement the CPE Framework per COJ decision as well as before such decision as part of FAIR-supported pilot testing as well as at court’ own initiative.

### 2013 Baseline: 31.
- 2014 Target: 40; Achieved: 33; Year Three Performance: 83%
- 2015 Target: 50; Achieved: 218; Year Four Performance: 436%
- 2016 Target: 350; Achieved: 383; Year Five Performance: 109%

LOP Target: 350; Achieved: 383; LOP Performance 109%

### Analysis

Court performance indicators serve to assess was courts require in order to provide services to citizens in an efficient way. Thus, the development, approval, and implementation of court performance indicators is a pre-requisite to ensure the effectiveness of the Ukrainian judiciary. The number of courts implementing court performance standards illustrates the will and interest of the Ukrainian judiciary to effectively evaluate judicial operations and communicate the results of this evaluation to public. FAIR supported the COJ and the SJA in developing the Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework for Ukrainian courts that defined 35 performance indicators and recommends them for Ukrainian courts. Ukrainian courts started to implement selected performance indicators defined by CPE Framework before the formal COJ approval of the CPE Framework. After the COJ approved CPE...
Framework in 2015, the number of courts implementing CPE jumped from 33 to 218 and in 2016 it increased to 383.

Courts find FAIR-developed CPE Framework not only useful but also user-friendly.

**Indicator 21: Average annual citizen report cards score of participating courts**

Implementing the citizen report card (CRC) surveys, the court monitors asked users inside the courts about their satisfaction with court services. Citizens ranked their overall satisfaction on a scale of 1 (lowest) – 5 (highest). This indicator is an average of those ratings extrapolated into the scale where the maximum is 1 which is equal: 100% of court users giving the highest rank.

2011 Baseline: 0.77.
- 2012 Target: 0.82; Achieved: 0.79; Year One Performance: 96%
- 2013 Target: 0.87; Achieved: 0.77; Year Two Performance: 89%
- 2014 Target: 0.80; Achieved: 0.80; Year Three Performance: 100%
- 2015 Target: 0.80; Achieved: 0.81; Year Four Performance: 101%
- 2016 Target: 0.82; Achieved: 0.84; Year Five Performance: 102%

LOP Target: 0.82; Achieved: 0.82; LOP Performance 100%

**Analysis**

Court user surveys are an effective mechanism to improve judicial operations, public trust, and confidence in the courts. FAIR-developed CRC surveys became the only court user surveys officially recognized by Ukrainian regulations since 2015.

To begin the survey, the interviewer asked the court user a standard question “Please, evaluate overall performance of this court using 5-point scale from 1 “very poor” to 5 “excellent”. The survey implementer would then calculate an average of user responses to this question and receive the CRC Score. CRC surveys are much more comprehensive in terms of the indicators used. The main purpose of CRC survey was to improve court performance by using citizen participation to developing recommendations for improvements and monitor the implementation of those recommendations. Thus, CRC surveys evaluate court performance based on several key quality criteria including – accessibility of court premises and services (including accessibility for people with disabilities, the level of comfort in the court house, the timeliness of case disposition, accessibility and accuracy of information, user perceptions of judges’ performance, user perception of court staff performance, and qualify of court decisions.

Each evaluation criteria includes a comprehensive set of questions for court users and provided scale of answers from 1 “totally dissatisfied” to 5 “completely satisfied”. The CRC survey implementer calculates an average score for each quality criteria on the 5-point scale, as well as on a 100% (or 1) quality scale, where “1” indicated that 100% of users gave the highest score. After each of the 7 quality criteria was evaluated, survey implementers also calculated the integral weighted average of all seven quality criteria to determine the total user satisfaction of court performance. This indicator is called the CRC index. FAIR does not use the CRC
index as an indicator for the FAIR project PMP, however in most cases the CRC Score and the CRC index are very close. In 90% of cases the difference between the CRC Score and the CRC Index does not exceed 10%. The proven effectiveness of CRC methodology as a court performance evaluation tool presents an opportunity to demonstrate how individual quality criteria impacts the overall user satisfaction with court performance.

The table below summarizes the data on annual average CRC scores. It demonstrates the number of courts where CRC surveys took place each year (row 1), the average CRC score (row 2), as well as the minimum and maximum score recorded for participating courts (rows 3 and 4 accordingly). Row 5 shows the average index for participating courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row number and description</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>LOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Number of participating courts</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Average CRC Score</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Minimum CRC Score</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Maximum CRC Score</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Average CRC Index</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table we see two important trends:

1) The CRC Index is usually higher than the CRC Score. This means that user perception of court performance is in general more likely to be based on impressions rather than awareness and expectations. However, it is clear that the higher CRC index led to higher CRC Scores which indicates that improving court performance by taking into consideration quality criteria recommended by the CRC methodology will lead to improved user perceptions of court performance in general.

2) Ukrainian courts are very different in terms of their performance. In the above table we see scores as low as 0.6 (according to the CRC methodology this falls between satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance) and as high as 1 (meaning 100% of highest individual marks). As we see from this table, during the life of project, court participation varied drastically but there is an overall increase in user satisfaction with court performance during FAIR: all four presented indicators show a tendency to increase.

**Indicator 22: Number of data-fed analytical techniques incorporated into judicial budgeting**

This indicator is a count of the total number of analytical techniques necessary for efficient court budgeting. FAIR counted those analytical techniques that were not

---

19 CRC survey implementers in 2013 did not calculate the CRC indexes for participating courts, only CRC score and indexes for each quality criteria. Thus, this particular data for 2013 is not available.
only developed by the project but also approved and implemented by the State Judicial Administration (SJA) and/or the Council of Judges (COJ).

2011 Baseline: 0.
- 2012 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year One Performance: 0%
- 2013 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year Two Performance: 0%
- 2014 Target: 1; Achieved: 1; Year Three Performance: 100%
- 2015 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
- 2016 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: 0%

LOP Target: 4; Achieved: 2; LOP Performance 50%

Analysis
Analytic techniques are prerequisite for effective judicial budgeting and for sufficient funding of courts. FAIR actual life of project data included:

1) Case weights for general first instance courts. FAIR developed this analytical technique in 2012-2013. The COJ approved it in 2014. SJA started using this technique in 2015 when preparing annual budget requests for the judiciary and calculating necessary number of judges.

2) Case weights for specialized first instance courts and courts of appeals. FAIR developed this technique in 2015. The COJ approved it in 2016 and the SJA started using this technique when preparing annual budget request for the judiciary in 2016.

In cooperation with Council of Europe and European Union, FAIR also promoted using cost per case analysis and clearance rates for judicial budgeting, however these techniques remained under SJA consideration.

Indicator 23: Number of project-supported new or improved policies within the SJA for the support of information technology, procurement, capital improvement, human resources, statistical collections and analysis activities within the courts
This indicator counts newly developed or improved policies within the SJA with FAIR support. FAIR counts only those policies that were developed with project support, adopted, and implemented by SJA.

2011 Baseline: 0.
- 2012 Target: 4; Achieved: 0; Year One Performance: 0%
- 2013 Target: 7; Achieved: 2; Year Two Performance: 29%
- 2014 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year Three Performance: 0%
- 2015 Target: 2; Achieved: 1; Year Four Performance: 40%
- 2016 Target: 4; Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: 0%

LOP Target: 7; Achieved: 3; LOP Performance 43%

Analysis
Developing new and improving existing policies is necessary for developing the needs of the Ukrainian judiciary. In addition, the number of developed, approved and
implemented policies indicated an increased capacity of the SJA to support these needs.

FAIR life of project data included:

1) Strategic Plan for Developing Ukrainian Judiciary in 2013-2015. FAIR developed the plan in cooperation with the COJ and the SJA in 2012-2013. The COJ approved this policy in 2013.
2) Court Automation Strategy. FAIR developed this in cooperation with the SJA in 2012-2013. The COJ approved this policy in 2013.
3) Regulation on Electronic Case Management in Courts. FAIR developed this regulation and the COJ approved it in 2015.

FAIR also planned to support the SJA in developing policies regarding human resource improvements, judicial statistics reform, implementation of case weighting techniques in courts, and court performance measurement. However due to the lack of SJA human resource capacity and delays in implementation of already approved policies, the new developments were not completed.

Indicator 24: Number of communication strategies implemented by courts and judicial institutions
This indicator is an actual count of FAIR-supported communication strategies developed by courts and/or judicial institutions that were adopted and implemented.

- 2014 Target: 8; Achieved: 0; Year Three Performance: 0%
- 2015 Target: 2; Achieved: 2; Year Four Performance: 100%
- 2016 Target: 3; Achieved: 24; Year Five Performance: 800%

LOP Target: 8; Achieved: 24; LOP Performance 267%

Analysis
Implemented communications strategies illustrate the capacity of courts and judicial institution to communicate effectively with the public in order to increase public awareness of the judiciary, court operations and processes which further increased public trust in the judiciary.

During the life of project FAIR supported the development and implementation of communications strategies for the following courts and judicial institutions:

1) Council of Judges of Ukraine
2) High Specialized Court for Review of Civil and Criminal Cases
3) Haisynskyi Raion Court of Vinnysia Oblast
4) Litynskyi Raion Court of Vinnysia Oblast
5) Sharhorodskyi Raion Court of Vinnysia Oblast
6) Liubeshivskyi Raion Court of Volyn Oblast
7) Uzhhorodskyi City-Raion Court of Transcarpathian Oblast
8) Kolomyiskyi City-Raion Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast
9) Bohuslavskyi Raion Court of Kyiv Oblast
It is necessary to note that the data for this indicator overlapped between program years. The LOP data excluded double counted data between years.

**Indicator 25: Number of courts offering legal education materials to court visitors**

*Definition of indicator.* This indicator is an actual count of courts that produced and/or disseminate informational materials to educate court visitors on the legal system. The materials included leaflets, brochures, posters, and electronic publications that covered various topics useful to a wide range of people: general information on the judicial system of Ukraine, court litigations, criminal procedural code, judicial reform etc.

2013 Baseline: 19.
- 2014 Target: 41; Achieved: 0; Year Three Performance: 0%
- 2015 Target: 50; Achieved: 44; Year Four Performance: 88%
- 2016 Target: 60; Achieved: 44; Year Five Performance: 73%

LOP Target: 60; Achieved: 44; LOP Performance 73%

**Analysis**

Involving courts in civic education activities was essential to public engagement in the judicial reform process and, for increasing public trust and confidence in the courts. Distributing educational and public awareness materials to citizens illustrated courts’ ability to communicate effectively with the public.

In program year four, FAIR supported the installation of electronic information kiosks with the capacity to receive court fees in 42 courts. These kiosks also contained FAIR-produced legal education materials. In addition, FAIR provided hardware and software to three courts in Odessa Oblast to implement a pilot e-court project. These three courts also offered legal education materials to their visitors. One court had both – information kiosk and an e-court system, thus it overlapped between two categories. The full list of courts that offer legal education materials is in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Court Name</th>
<th>Legal Education Materials Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Lutskiy City-Raion Court of Volyn Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Pavlohradsky City-District Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Amur-Nyzhniodniprovskyy Raion Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Zhovtnevyi District Court of Dnipropetrovsk City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Industrialniy District Court of Dnipropetrovsk City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Zhovtnevyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Ternivskyi District Court of Kryvyi Rih City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Melitopolskiy City-Raion Court of Zaporizhzhia Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Leninjskiy District Court of Zaporizhzhia City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Zaporizhzhya</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Ordzhonikidzevskyi District Court of Zaporizhzhia City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk City Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L'viv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Lychakivskyi District Court of Lviv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Tsentralniy District Court of Mykolayiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Ovidiopolskiy Raion Court of Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>e-court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Kyivskyi District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>e-court i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Malynovskiy District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Prymorskiy District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Suvorovskiy District Court of Odessa City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Rivnenskiy Raion Court of Rivne Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Zarizhnnyi District Court of Sumy City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Kharkivskyi Raion Court of Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td>Instance</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Court Name</td>
<td>Legal Education Materials Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Dzerzhynskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Kyivskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Kominternivskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Moskovskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Ordzhonikidzevskyi District Court of Kharkiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Suvorovskyi District Court of Kherson City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi City-Raion Court of Khmelnytskyi Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Cherkasky Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Holosiivskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Darnytskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Desnianskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Dniprovskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Obolonskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Pecherskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Podilskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Sviatoshynskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Solomianskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Shevchenkivskyi District Court of Kyiv City</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>L'viv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Lviv Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Odessa Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Odessa Oblast Court of Appeals</td>
<td>e-court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Kharkiv Circuit Administrative Court</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Vinnytsya</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Vinnytsia Administrative Court of Appeals</td>
<td>i-kiosk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data for this indicator overlaps between program years. The LOP data excluded double counting of courts between years.
Indicator 26: Number of CSO-produced policy proposals related to pending judicial reform legislation
This indicator is a count of the policy proposals including concept paper(s), recommendations, draft laws etc., related to pending judicial reform legislation developed by FAIR’s CSO partners in cooperation with policy makers.

2013 Baseline: 1
- 2014 Target: 1; Achieved: 1; Year Three Performance: 100%
- 2015 Target: 1; Achieved: 1; Year Four Performance: 100%
- 2016 Target: 0; Achieved: 1; Year Five Performance: 100%

LOP Target: 3; Achieved: 4; LOP Performance 133%

Analysis
Developed policy proposals and the submission of those proposals to legislators illustrated CSO involvement in the judicial reform process. Baseline data refers to the proposal developed by FAIR grantee Ukrainian Legal Aid Foundation related to secondary legal aid in Ukraine (2013). In 2014 FAIR provided expert assistance to the Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR) civic initiatives, particularly to its Judicial Reform Group. The proposal package included legislative drafts further considered by Verkhovna Rada when drafting currently adopted Law on Purification of Government, Law on Restoration Public Trust in the Judiciary, Law on Ensuring the Right for Fair Trial and others laws and amendments to the laws.

In 2015, FAIR provided funding and training assistance to the CSO-partner “Institute Republic” who developed a policy proposal to improve the right to peaceably assemble and submitted it for consideration to the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Human Rights, National Minorities and Interethnic Relations.

In 2016, FAIR partner CSO “Institute of Applied Humanitarian Researches” developed policy proposal on improving election rights and submitted it for consideration to the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Legal Policy and Justice.

Indicator 27: Number of courts in which there are active court monitoring programs
This indicator counts the number of courts where partner civil society organizations (CSO) conducted court performance evaluation programs with FAIR support. It includes Citizen Report Card (CRC) surveys, CSO monitoring of court proceedings, etc. This indicator shows the total number of courts and the percentage of these courts in relation to the total number of courts in Ukraine; 767.

2011 Baseline: 20 (2.6%)
- 2012 Target: 20 (2.6%); Achieved: 34 (4.5%); Year One Performance: 170%
- 2013 Target: 34 (4.5%); Achieved: 50 (7%); Year Two Performance: 150%
- 2014 Target: 80 (13%); Achieved: 15 (2%); Year Three Performance: 19%
- 2015 Target: 85 (11%); Achieved: 198 (26%); Year Four Performance: 223%
- 2016 Target: 85 (11%); Achieved: 292 (38%); Year Five Performance: 344%

LOP Target: 120; Achieved: 319; LOP Performance 266%
Analysis
Courts with active court performance monitoring and evaluation programs improved interaction between the courts and society, contributed to the improvement of operations in more courts and assisted in developing national court performance measurement standards.

FAIR supported 13 CSOs who conducted court user satisfaction surveys using Citizen Report Cards (CRC) methodology. The CRC survey details are described under the analysis for Indicator 21 - average annual citizen report cards score of participating courts.

The CRC survey is only one component of the broader CSO court monitoring activity. In most cases, after the survey was implemented and the CRC score and CRC indexes were calculated, the implementing CSO issued a set of recommendations for each court to improve court performance based on user feedback. In most cases, the CSO monitored court implementation of these recommendations. Thus, the CSO court monitoring programs lasted longer than the CRC surveys itself. This is why there is a difference over the life of project between the annual number of courts where CRC surveys take place and annual number of courts where court monitoring programs took place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of participating courts where CRC surveys take place (refers to indicator 21)</th>
<th>Number of courts in which there are active court monitoring programs (refers to indicator 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOP</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the LOP number is the same in both rows, the annual number in second row usually included CRC participating courts for a particular year and for the previous year. For example, the number of courts in 2016, where there were active court monitoring programs – 292 - includes 109 CRC courts in 2016 and 183 CRC courts for 2015 based on the fact that CRC surveys in 183 courts began in 2015 but monitoring of recommendations implementation continued through 2016.

The following table shows life of project disaggregation of courts between oblasts, instance (appellate or trial) and jurisdiction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherkasy Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chernihiv Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td>Instance</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dnipro</td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donetsk</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankiv's'k</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Khmelnyts'kyi</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kirovohrad</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L'viv</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td>Instance</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ternopil</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ternopil Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vinnytsya</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vinnytsya Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>Appellate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volyn Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Transcarpathian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcarpathian Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 13  287 319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important observation for this indicator is the significant increase in the number of courts where performance monitoring programs take place. This is outcome direct result of the Council of Judges (COJ) approval of FAIR-developed Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework for Ukraine in 2015. As described in the analysis for the indicator 18 - number of court performance standards adopted and indicator 19 – number of court performance indicators implemented, the user satisfaction survey through Citizen Report Cards methodology became a standard procedure for Ukrainian courts.

The next chart shows the increase in the total number of courts participating in court monitoring program annually during FAIR, and provides additional information such as how many of those courts participate in such first iteration of the program (blue line) and how many of them participate in the second or third (pink line).
Court user surveys using CRC methodology were the main but not the only activity for court monitoring implemented by FAIR. FAIR CSO partners also conducted other types of court monitoring including:

- monitoring of court premises accessibility for people with disabilities;
- monitoring of case adjudication and court decisions regarding gender discrimination;
- monitoring of court decisions regarding peaceful assembly;
- monitoring of court decisions regarding the local elections.

All courts participating in monitoring programs listed above were also involved in the CRC surveys. Thus, in order to avoid double counting, for the purpose of indicator reporting, these courts were counted only under the CRC program. In addition, the data for this indicator overlaps between program years. The LOP data excludes double counting of courts between years.

**Indicator 28: Number of people engaged in the monitoring and performance oversight of Ukrainian courts**

This indicator counts the actual number of people that participated in court performance evaluation activities, specifically citizen report cards surveys (CRC). However, means of participation also included focus groups, working groups and public events related to measuring court performance. Greater citizen participation in court monitoring initiatives indicated increased public awareness of citizens’ rights and responsibilities.

**2013 Baseline: 4,793**
- 2014 Target: 8,000; Achieved: 1,844 (54% men, 46% women); Year Three Performance: 23%
- 2015 Target: 8,500; Achieved: 13,999 (52% men, 48% women); Year Four Performance: 165%
- 2016 Target: 8,500; Achieved: 9,308 (53% men, 47% women); Year Five Performance: 110%

**LOP Target: 12,000; Achieved: 25,151 (53% men, 47% women); LOP Performance 210%**

**Analysis**

Public participation in court performance monitoring program led to greater public trust in the judiciary and improved the transparency, efficiency and professionalism of courts themselves.

The table below shows the total number of citizens engaged in the monitoring and performance evaluation of courts during the life of project disaggregated by oblast and by sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>Total people engaged</th>
<th>Total men</th>
<th>Total women</th>
<th>Percent men</th>
<th>Percent women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherkasy</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chernihiv</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chernivtsi</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td>Total people engaged</td>
<td>Total men</td>
<td>Total women</td>
<td>Percent men</td>
<td>Percent women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Khmelnytskyi</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kyiv City</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kyiv Oblast</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>L'viv</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mykolayiv</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rivne</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sumy</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ternopil</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vinnytsia</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Volyn</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25151</strong></td>
<td><strong>13238</strong></td>
<td><strong>11913</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 29: Percentage of partner Civil Society Organizations’ performance improvement recommendations implemented by judicial institutions**

This indicator measures the degree to which FAIR partner Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) recommendations to courts and other judicial institutions based on CSO court performance evaluation were implemented. This indicator is a ratio where the numerator is the total number of recommendations implemented by courts or other judicial institutions (for example, the SJA), and the denominator is the total number of recommendations developed by the CSO and submitted to courts or other judicial institutions for consideration.

2011 Baseline: 30%
- 2012 Target: 40%; Achieved:30%; Year One Performance: 75%
- 2013 Target: 50%; Achieved:39%; Year Two Performance: 78%
- 2014 Target: 45%; Achieved: N/A; Year Three Performance: N/A
- 2015 Target: 50%; Achieved: N/A; Year Four Performance: N/A
- 2016 Target: 55%; Achieved: 62; Year Five Performance: 113%

LOP Target: 50%; Achieved: 57%; LOP Performance: 114%

**Analysis**
The number of recommendations developed by CSOs and submitted to courts and/or judicial institutions is a measure of civil society capacity to monitor judicial operations. The number of recommendations implemented by judicial institutions measures the effectiveness of court performance evaluation programs and the
effectiveness of court operations. Thus, this is an important indicator that measures complex outcomes of cooperation between courts and civil society.

This indicator had an initial management issue. Unlike other indicators related to the CRC surveys, the percentage of performance improvement recommendations that were implemented by judicial institutions is a higher outcome level indicator. It means that this indicator’s actual data is typically related to an activity implemented in the past. In other words, the actual data for a specific year is the result of activities that FAIR and its partners implemented up to a year prior. After receiving CSO-developed CRC-based recommendations, courts needed a solid period of time to: a) consider a recommendation and decide whether to accept it; b) find resources if necessary to implement the recommendation; and c) conduct and manage specific actions based on the recommendation. Thus, the annual data for this indicator is the ratio of the number of recommendations implemented during the program year in relation to the number of recommendations developed in the previous program year. Because the numerator and denominator must represent the same subject, the annual ratio of this indicator is based on the previous program year numbers.

The bullets below explain the available annual data for this indicator each year during the project:

- The 2012 (Year One) actual figure is based on 2011 data, e.g. third round of Citizen Report Cards (CRC) surveys in 15 courts under the USAID UROL project. In 2011, CSOs developed more than 450 recommendations to CRC participating courts. Courts were able to implement 30% of these recommendations in 2012. Further, CSOs became more specific when developing recommendations based on CRC survey results.

- The 2013 (Year Two) actual figure is based on CRC surveys conducted in 2012 in 34 courts. CSOs developed 340 recommendations for participating courts, courts implemented 132 of them during 2012-2013.

- In 2014, 2015 and 2016, FAIR significantly enhanced the process of monitoring CSO-developed recommendations by courts. FAIR instructed CSO partners to be more specific in developing recommendations for courts, more active in promoting implementation of the recommendations and more accurate in monitoring implementation of recommendations. The next assessment of CSO-developed recommendations implementation by court began in 2015 and was completed in 2016. Thus, the annual data for 2014 and 2015 is not available.

- The 2016 annual data is based on an assessment of 194 courts who participated in the CRC surveys in 2014 and 2015. These courts received a total of 1,315 recommendations from CSOs based on CRC-survey results. Courts implemented in full 537 recommendations (41%). Court also mostly implemented (e.g. implemented with certain deviations) 126 recommendations (9.6%). Finally, courts partially implemented or still under way of implementation 354 recommendations (27%). However, for the purpose of measuring project performance, FAIR assigned weight to each of three basic statuses of recommendations implementation, e.g. fully implemented recommendation has 100% weight when calculating the total
percent for this indicator; mostly implemented recommendations where weighted at 75% and partially implemented (or still underway) has 50% weight. Thus, the numerator for 2016 actual data is calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Weight for Indicator</th>
<th>Weighted Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Implemented in full</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Implemented mostly</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Implemented partially / implementation is underway</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL IMPLEMENTED</strong></td>
<td><strong>809</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The life of project data for this indicator does not count annual data from 2012 because the 2012 data is based on UROL project figures. FAIR life of project data includes 132 recommendations implemented in 2013 and 809 recommendations implemented in 2015-2016. The total number of implemented recommendations, 941, divided by total number of developed recommendations 1,655 (e.g. 340 plus 1,315) and is 56.9%.

**Indicator 30: Number of USG-Supported anti-corruption measures implemented (FAF Standard Indicator 2.2.4-7)**

This indicator counts the Ukrainian government anti-corruption measures implemented with project support. Means of support included technical assistance, trainings, expert review of policies and procedures, and direct procurement.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 1; Achieved: 1; Year Four Performance: 100%
- 2016 Target: 1; Achieved: 1; Year Five Performance: 100%

LOP Target: 1; Achieved: 1; LOP Performance: 100%

**Analysis**

The anti-corruption measures promoted governance institutions, processes and policies that are transparent and accountable to Ukrainian people and thus make the lustration and vetting processes more transparent and effective.

In 2015-2016 FAIR supported the implementation of financial disclosure for judges according to the Law on Purification of Government. Means of support included expert and technical assistance to the Interim Special Commission of the High Council of Justice, High Qualifications Commission of Judges and Ministry of Justice.

---

20 FAIR introduced this indicator and all next indicators following below in 2015 according to USAID expanding FAIR project portfolio with new activities related to vetting and lustration public officials and judges.
Indicator 31 - Percent of public officials and judges screened through vetting procedure in accordance with the Law on Purification of Government

This indicator is the ratio of individuals who passed the vetting procedure compared to the total number of individuals that should have passed the vetting procedure according to the Law on Purification of Government. The Law specifies more than 80 categories of public officials and judges that should pass this procedure, and according to the assessment conducted by FAIR, the total number of individuals who should pass the vetting is nearly 1 million people, 9000 of whom are judges. However, based on observations of Government websites, the Ukrainian media counted far fewer public officials and judges that should pass vetting procedure, only 380,257\(^2\). This is the number FAIR used as a denominator for Indicator 31.

The numerator for this indicator is from the Ministry of Justice Registry for vetting and lustration.

July 2015 Baseline: 11.9% checked (0.2% dismissed).
- 2015 Target: N/A; Achieved: 24.6% (0.2%); Year Four Performance: N/A
- 2016 Target: N/A; Achieved: 29.6% (0.04%); Year Five Performance: N/A

LOP Target: N/A; Achieved: 54.2% (0.25%); LOP Performance: N/A

Analysis
Considering that vetting public officials and their dismissal is outside of FAIR project control, and it neither directly nor indirectly illustrates FAIR performance, there are no targets set for this indicator. Meanwhile, the higher vetting ratio in an indication of the efficiency of this process. FAIR used this indicator for GOU monitoring purposes, and not for project evaluation purposes.

The GOU Implementation Plan for the Law on Purification of Government gives a deadline to complete the vetting of public officials by December 2016. Taking into consideration the current progress (54.2% of individuals underwent the vetting process), this deadline will not be met and the Implementation Plan will be extended. The LOP data showed that 206,220 individuals were vetted as of September 29, 2016 out of 380,257. Out of those, 932 (0.25% of 380,257) officials were dismissed according to the Ministry of Justice’ registry of individuals dismissed according to the Law on Purification of Government.

Indicator 32: Percent of judges screened for corruption and participating in politicized justice in accordance with the Law on Restauration Public Trust in the Judiciary

This indicator is the number of judges screened for corruption and participating in politicized justice including cases related to Euromaidan compared to the total number of judges in Ukraine. This screening process was prescribed by the Law on Restauration Public Trust in the Judiciary and fell under the authority of the Interim Special Commission for Judiciary of the High Council of Justice (ISC). Data on this indicator also includes the percentage of judges that did not pass the vetting.

\(^2\) Source: [http://gx.net.ua/ua/politika/ukraina/skolko-chinovnikov-ostalos-v-ukraine.html](http://gx.net.ua/ua/politika/ukraina/skolko-chinovnikov-ostalos-v-ukraine.html)
procedure and have been dismissed. The denominator for this ratio is 8,931 - the number of judges in Ukraine according to the SJA statistics as of January 1, 2015.

July 2015 Baseline: 3.5% checked (0 dismissed).
- 2015 Target: N/A; Achieved: 3.5% checked, 0 dismissed; Year Four Performance: N/A
- 2016 Target: N/A; Achieved: 0 checked, 0.3% dismissed Year Five Performance: N/A

LOP Target: N/A; Achieved: 54.2% (0.25%); LOP Performance: N/A

**Analysis**
The ISC is the key institution to implement screening of those judges that provided politicized justice and were involved in corrupt practices. The Commission operates based on claims received from citizens, thus it does not screen all judges but only those judges who are suspected by citizens to be involved in corrupt practices, issuing politicized and unlawful judgement. FAIR used this indicator for the GOU monitoring purposes, and not for project evaluation purposes.

During its mandated term, the ISC received 2,192 complaints from citizens regarding politicized justice during 2013-2014. Based on a review of these complaints, the HQC conducted screenings of 313 judges; 3.5% of all Ukrainian judges. Based on these screenings the ISC concluded that 41 judges conducted politicized justice and submitted these conclusions to the HCJ for further review and dismissal. Based on HCJ submission and ISC conclusions on September 29, 2016 the Verkhovna Rada dismissed 19 judges. In addition, the Verkhovna Rada dismissed 10 more judges based on breaches of procedural requirements (per HQC conclusions), breaches of procedural regulations (per HCJ conclusions) and in accordance with the Law on Purification of Government. Thus, in total FAIR counted 29 judges for this indicator.

**Indicator 33: Number of recommendations to improve the Law on the Purification of Government and relative legislative framework formulated**
This is a Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) indicator for USAID Ukraine. This indicator counts domestic and international expert recommendations to the Law on the Purification of Government, the Law on Restauration Public Trust in the Judiciary and relative legislative framework formulated with FAIR support.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 10; Achieved: 42; Year Four Performance: 420%
- 2016 Target: N/A; Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: N/A

LOP Target: 10; Achieved: 42; LOP Performance: 420%

**Analysis**
The expert recommendations aimed to ensure that lustration and vetting laws and regulations were in compliance with international and European standards which is pre-requisite for implementing these processes transparently, effectively and fairly. In 2015, FAIR developed and submitted to the GOU 20 recommendations to improve the Law on the Purification of Government, 15 recommendations to
improve the Law on the Restoration of Public Trust in the Judiciary, and 7 recommendations to improve regulations on lustration and vetting.

The core FAIR recommendations taken into consideration in preparation of the draft amendments to the laws and regulations mentioned above were:

- Judges are excluded from the Law on Purification of Government and are placed under the Law on Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary.
- A preamble to explain the social context of the Law on Purification of Government is introduced.
- A single independent body is created to oversee and coordinate lustration.
- Terminology is clarified.
- Administrative responsibility for violations of the lustration legislation is introduced.
- The authority of the ISC is prolonged for three years.
- The ISC will conduct vetting of all judges that issued questionable decisions during the Euromaidan protests, not just those where an application for verification was submitted.
- The members of the ISC will work full-time and receive a salary comparable to that of Supreme Court justices.
- The ISC activity is coordinated with the work of the HCJ and HQC.

**Indicator 34: Percent of recommendations formulated that are passed into law or adopted as regulations**

This is a Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) indicator for USAID Ukraine. This indicator counts the ratio of domestic and international expert recommendations to the Law on the Purification of Government and related legislative framework adopted by the credible agent of Ukrainian government. The ratio is calculated in relation to the total number of recommendations formulated.

**2014 Baseline:** 0
- **2015 Target:** 70%; **Achieved:** 0; **Year Four Performance:** 0%
- **2016 Target:** N/A; **Achieved:** 0; **Year Five Performance:** N/A

**Analysis**

The expert recommendations aimed to bring the lustration and vetting laws and regulations into compliance with international and European standards. The formal adoption of these recommendations is a prerequisite for ensuring the fair, effective and transparent implementation of the lustration and vetting processes.

Although Members of Parliament (MP) considered FAIR developed recommendations to amend the Law on Purification of Government and included at least 50% of them in the draft law, this draft law has never been considered by the Verkhovna Rada. Thus, the actual data on this indicator is 0.
Indicator 35: Number of institutions that implement vetting and lustration of public officials and judges supported by the project

This indicator refers to the number of governmental institutions that focus on the implementation of vetting and lustration of public officials and judges according to the Law on Restauration Public Trust in the Judiciary and the Law on Purification of Government. Project support included training of personnel, technical and expert assistance to these institutions, procurement of goods and services for these institutions and other assistance.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 3; Achieved: 3; Year Four Performance: 100%
- 2016 Target: 3; Achieved: 3; Year Five Performance: 100%

LOP Target: 3; Achieved: 3; LOP Performance: 100%

Analysis

Stronger and more effective institutions are essential to more effective and transparent implementation of the vetting and lustration process. In 2015 and 2016, FAIR supported the following institutions responsible for implementation of the Law on Restauration Public Trust in the Judiciary and the Law on Purification of Government:

1) The Ministry of Justice Lustration Department for Lustration;
2) The High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine; and
3) The High Council of Justice and its Interim Special Commission for vetting judges.

Indicator 36: Number of judicial performance indicators to evaluate sitting judges in Ukraine developed with project support

This indicator counts new judicial performance indicators to evaluate sitting judges according to the newly amended Law on the Judiciary and the Status of Judges. This indicator counts those indicators that were developed with FAIR project support and approved by High Qualifications Commission of Judges.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: N/A; Achieved: N/A; Year Four Performance: N/A
- 2016 Target: 10; Achieved: 10; Year Five Performance: 100%

LOP Target: 10; Achieved: 10; LOP Performance: 100%

Analysis

Judicial performance indicators served as a key objective criteria for implementing the judicial performance evaluation in Ukraine as part of the vetting processes for the judiciary requested by the Ukrainian people after the Revolution of Dignity. The availability of judicial performance indicators illustrated the HQC capacity to implement the judicial performance evaluation process fairly and objectively.

The following judicial performance indicators became part of FAIR-supported Regulations on Judicial Dossier adopted by the HQC:
1) Number of considered cases
2) Number of cancelled decisions
3) Availability and number of decisions that led to Ukraine’s violation of international laws
4) Number of decisions changed by appellate or higher court
5) Timeliness of court proceedings
6) Average duration of preparation of decisions
7) Judicial caseload
8) Number of judicial misconduct complaints
9) Availability of disciplinary cases
10) Financial disclosure

Indicator 37: Number of recommendations to improve the Unified Registry of Vetted Persons functioning formulated with project support and adopted as regulations.
This indicator counts FAIR project-supported domestic and international expert recommendations to improve the Unified Registry of Vetted Persons in terms of its functionality and efficiency that were adopted as regulations.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 7; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
- 2016 Target: 7 Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: 0%

LOP Target: 7; Achieved: 0; LOP Performance: 0%

Analysis
Improving the Unified Registry of Vetted Persons led to increased professionalism of involved institutions. In 2015, FAIR completed the Registry assessment and in 2016, FAIR developed 11 substantial recommendations to improve it. Although FAIR submitted all these recommendations to the MOJ for consideration, none of them have yet been addressed in revised regulations.

Indicator 38: Number of project-supported newly developed or improved procedures for vetting and lustration of public officials and judges
This is a Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) indicator for USAID Ukraine. This indicator counts new procedures for lustration and vetting and those that have been improved with FAIR support. Means of support included technical assistance, training, consultation, expert review of draft procedures, organized discussions and others. To be counted for this indicator the procedure must be developed, considered by the related agent of government, approved, and implemented.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 3; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
- 2016 Target: 3 Achieved: 2; Year Five Performance: 67%

LOP Target: 3; Achieved: 2; LOP Performance: 67%
Analysis
Developing procedures for lustration and vetting of judges in compliance with international and European standards and with consideration given to best international practices and lessons learned led to strengthened institutions involved in the process of lustration and vetting which further led to a more effective response to public demand for the purification of government. In 2016, FAIR supported the development and promoted the adoption by the HQC and approval by the COJ of the following procedures:

1) Procedure and Methodology of the Judicial Performance Evaluation
2) Regulation for Examination of the Sitting Judges

Indicator 39: Number of training days provided to executive branch personnel with USG assistance (FAF Standard Indicator 2.2.2 – 6)
This indicator is an actual count of training days provided by FAIR to government executives involved in the process of lustration and vetting public officials.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 38; Achieved: 13; Year Four Performance: 34%
- 2016 Target: 12; Achieved: 5; Year Five Performance: 42%

LOP Target: 50; Achieved: 18; LOP Performance: 36%

Analysis
Training executive government officials led to improved knowledge and skills which further led to more efficient and more effective performance. Implementing the vetting of public officials and judges initially required specific skills and knowledge. In this regard the respect to human rights, transparency and efficiency of the process are prerequisites for proper implementation of the Law on Purification of Government. Taking into consideration that lustration in Eastern Europe has always been a controversial, long lasting and complicated process, it was very important for Ukrainian officials to learn best practices and study the experiences of neighboring countries. FAIR trainings for officials responsible for vetting and lustration was a critical task.

In addition, after the 2014 Revolution of Dignity the executive branch employed many new personnel replacing the old generation of officials. The new generation of executives came, specifically to the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (MOJ) from other sectors including civil society. These new employees needed rapid professional development training on organizational development in order to increase their capacity to perform public services.

The table below represents specific training activities developed by FAIR for executive branch personnel and duration of these programs in days:
# Year | Type of Training Activity | Name of Training Program | Location | Duration, (Days)
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | 2015 | International study visit | Lustration and Vetting Approaches | Czech Republic | 3
2 | 2015 | In-class workshop | Gender Issues in Vetting Public Officials | Kyiv, Ukraine | 2
3 | 2015 | International study visit | Lustration in Poland: Best Practices and Lessons Learned | Poland | 4
4 | 2015 | In-class training | Basics of the Institutional Development | Kyiv, Ukraine | 1
5 | 2015 | In-class training | Organizational Development Training for the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (MOJ) | Kyiv, Ukraine | 3
6 | 2016 | In-class training | Effective Communication and Strategy Implementation Training for the MOJ | Kyiv, Ukraine | 3
7 | 2016 | In-class training | Training Program for MOJ Regional Department Heads and Deputy Heads | Kyiv, Ukraine | 2

TOTAL life of project 18

Instead of the targeted 50 training days, FAIR achieved 18, making the life of project performance on this indicator 36%. Per GOU request, FAIR increased the number of trainees in these trainings (see exceeding target under the indicator 41: - Number of people trained with newly developed programs on implementation the lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards). Increase in number of trainees led to a decrease in number of training days provided.

**Indicator 40: Number of training programs on implementation the lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards developed with project support**

This is USAID Ukraine Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) Indicator. This indicator is an actual count of training programs for Ukrainian officials who were involved in the implementation of lustration and vetting processes. To be counted for this indicator the training program had to be fully developed and implemented.

2014 Baseline: 0
- **2015 Target: 4; Achieved: 4; Year Four Performance: 100%**
- **2016 Target: 0; Achieved: 0; Year Five Performance: N/A**

LOP Target: 4; Achieved: 4; LOP Performance: 100%

**Analysis**

Training executive government officials led to improved knowledge and skills which further led to more efficient and effective performance. FAIR developed and implemented the following training programs for representatives of Ukrainian government branches involved in the process of vetting and lustration:

1) Lustration in Poland: Best Practices and Lessons Learned (2015);
2) Lustration Approaches in Eastern Europe (2015);
3) Gender Issues in Vetting Public Officials and Judges (2015);
4) Organizational Development Training for the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (2015)

**Indicator 41: Number of people trained with newly developed programs on implementation the lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards**

This is a USAID Ukraine Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) Indicator. It counts the actual number of executive officials, judges, civil society activists and other stakeholders involved in the process of lustration and vetting. Training refers to all trainings or educational events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad, including any organized events, forums, lectures, workshops, or conferences, during which knowledge is exchanged.

2014 Baseline: 0

- 2015 Target: 70; Achieved: 145 ((men: 48%, women: 52%); Year Four Performance: 207 %
- 2016 Target: 70; Achieved: 98 (men: 61%, women: 39%); Year Five Performance: 140%

LOP Target: 100; Achieved: 150; LOP Performance: 150%

**Analysis**

Better trained stakeholder personnel contributed to the fair, transparent and professional implementation of the lustration and vetting process.

FAIR trained 150 individuals which made the life of project performance on this indicator 150%. Per GOU request, FAIR increased the number of trainees for these trainings. An increase in the number of trainees led to decrease in the number of training days provided (see below target data under the indicator 39: - Number of training days provided to executive branch personnel with USG assistance). It is necessary to note that the data for this indicator overlaps between program years. The LOP data exclude double counting of individuals between years.

**Indicator 42: Percent of people trained who report improved knowledge and skills to proceed with lustration and vetting public officials in compliance with international and European standards**

In a follow-up survey of a sample of trained individuals, FAIR asked if they had received new or improved knowledge and gained new skills at FAIR implemented trainings. In addition, they were asked if they considered the new knowledge and skills useful in their job. This indicator measures the total number of trainees that answered “yes” to both questions.

2014 Baseline: 0

- 2015 Target: 75%; Achieved: 97%; Year Four Performance: 129%
- 2016 Target: 80%; Achieved: 100%; Year Five Performance: 125%

LOP Target: 80%; Achieved: 99%; LOP Performance: 124%
Analysis
Better trained stakeholder personnel contributed to the fair, transparent and professional implementation of the lustration and vetting process.

This indicator data counts participants of training programs listed in the analysis for the indicator: 40- Number of training programs on implementation the lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards developed with project support. In 2015, 97% of FAIR trainees (140 out of 145) confirmed that they improved their knowledge and skills on training subjects including lustration approaches, best practices and lessons learned, as well as gender issues for vetting public officials and organizational development. In 2016, 100% of FAIR trainees (all 98) reported an increase in their knowledge and skills as the result of continued organizational development training program for the MOJ.

Indicator 43: Number of project-supported public events on lustration and vetting process involving civil society activists
This indicator counts the number of public events on lustration and vetting process where civil society representatives participated. These events included conferences, public debates, roundtables, public hearings, etc.

2014 Baseline: 0
- 2015 Target: 15; Achieved: 0; Year Four Performance: 0%
- 2016 Target: 26; Achieved: 9; Year Five Performance: 35%

LOP Target: 26; Achieved: 9; LOP Performance: 35%

Analysis
Civil society representatives’ participation in public events on lustration and vetting illustrated civil society engagement in these processes.

During the life of the project, FAIR and its CSO partners conducted the following public events related to vetting and lustration public officials and judges:

1) Public Forum “Civil Society Engagement in the Lustration and Vetting of Public Officials and Judges”;
2) Roundtable “Legal Aspects of Lustration”;
3) Roundtable “Regular Judicial Performance Evaluation in Ukraine”;
4) Roundtable “Issues related to implementation of lustration legislation”;
5) Roundtable “Testing of the Judicial Performance Evaluation Methodology by Civil Society Organizations”;
6) Roundtable “Results of monitoring of the vetting of judges who handled Maidan protest cases”;
7) Roundtable "Results of the public awareness campaign on vetting and lustration process"
8) Roundtable “Lustration as It Is”;
9) Results of monitoring of the implementation of the Law “On Purification of Government”, public presentation and discussion.
Indicator 44: Number of civil society organizations participating in and contributing to the process of lustration and vetting of public officials
This is a USAID Ukraine Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) Indicator. This indicator counts the actual number of civil society organizations whose representatives participated in and contributed to the process of lustration and vetting public officials. The means of participation and contribution included but was not limited to attending FAIR-supported public events, expert reviews of procedures and policies, providing feedback to and requesting responses from government, and organizing public events including conferences, debates, roundtables and public hearings.

2014 Baseline: 0
• 2015 Target: 7; Achieved: 10; Year Four Performance: 143%
• 2016 Target: 5; Achieved: 10; Year Five Performance: 200%

LOP Target: 9; Achieved: 10; LOP Performance: 111%

Analysis
The number of civil society organizations participating in and contributing to the process of lustration and vetting public officials illustrated greater civil society involvement in this process and greater public awareness of this process. The LOP data counted six CSOs implementing public awareness campaigns on lustration and vetting officials and judges and four CSOs implementing monitoring of lustration process. It is necessary to note that the data for this indicator overlaps program years. The LOP data excludes double counting organizations between years.

Indicator 45: Percent of Ukrainian citizens who are confident that the lustration and vetting processes are properly implemented and lead to purification of government
This is a USAID Ukraine Complex Crisis Fund (CCF) Indicator. This indicator is based on a comprehensive annual public survey that contained questions related to citizen perceptions of the lustration and vetting processes. FAIR measured the level of confidence as a total percent of respondents who answered that they were “fully confident” or “mostly confident” when asked “do you feel confident that current lustration and vetting processes are implemented properly, in accordance with public demand, and lead to the purification of government?” The survey sampling represented the whole population of Ukraine except occupied territories.

2015 Baseline: 17%
• 2016 Target: 20% Achieved: 12%; Year Five Performance: N/A

LOP Target: 20%; Achieved: 12%; LOP Performance: N/A

Analysis
Citizen confidence in lustration and vetting processes illustrated civic engagement in these processes, public awareness and level of government response to public demand for purification of government.

FAIR conducted national public surveys in June 2015 (baseline) and June 2016. The baseline survey indicated that 3% of Ukrainians were fully confident and 14% were mostly confident that the vetting and lustration of public officials was implemented in
accordance with public demand. In the June 2016 survey, only 2% of Ukrainians indicated that they were fully confident and 10% were mostly confident. FAIR counted the life of project performance on this indicator. However, it should be noted that public opinion and public perception were based broadly on economic, political, social and other conditions and FAIR performance during short two-year period of time (2015-2016) could hardly impact these strategic issues.

Annex I, the FAIR performance indicators by year, begins on the next page.
## ANNEX 1. FAIR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS TABLE BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of legal institutions and associations supported by USG</td>
<td>2011 / 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of laws, regulations and procedures designed to enhance judicial independence supported with USG assistance (FAF)</td>
<td>2011 / 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM GOAL:** SUPPORT LEGISLATIVE, REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM OF JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS IN ORDER TO BUILD A FOUNDATION FOR A MORE ACCOUNTABLE AND INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY

1. **OBJECTIVE 1:** THE CONSTITUTIONAL, LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL REFORM COMPLIES WITH EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL NORMS AND SUPPORTS JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INDEPENDENCE

   **EXPECTED RESULT 1.1:** UKRAINIAN JUDICIAL REFORM LEGISLATION RECEIVES FAVORABLE COMMENTS FROM THE VENICE COMMISSION AS MEETING INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND REFLECTS DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL EXPERT INPUT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of revised provisions enacted that reflect Venice Commission recommendations</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of Venice Commission recommendations adopted</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPECTED RESULT 1.2: CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM RELATED TO THE JUDICIARY IS PURSUED IN AN INCLUSIVE MANNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding proposed changes to the country's legal framework</td>
<td>2014 / 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td>YEAR 3</td>
<td>YEAR 4</td>
<td>YEAR 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of revised provisions in the Constitution enacted that reflect inputs from project-supported public discussions</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of project-supported communication products issued by civil society organizations on constitutional reform (archived since 2013)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of working sessions on Constitutional reform between lawmakers and civil society organizations (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of civil society organizations who have experience in constitutional reform participating in public events on the Constitution (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE / VALUE</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of new properties and functions surrounding judicial selection and discipline introduced to HQC management system with project support</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Result 2.1: Ukrainian judges are appointed based on objective, knowledge- and performance-based criteria.

22 FY2016 target revised based on 2015 actual results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of merit-based criteria or procedures for justice sector selection adopted with USG assistance</td>
<td>2011 / 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of Ukrainian judges appointed through project-supported objective, merit-based judicial selection process</td>
<td>2013 / 880</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAIR FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT | 180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR/VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of procedures within the judicial appointment process improved with project support (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of judicial test developers trained with project support (archived since 2013)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPECTED RESULT 2.2: UKRAINIAN JUDGES ARE DISCIPLINED IN TRANSPARENT PROCESSES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of criteria, standards and regulations adopted to govern judicial misconduct investigations</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Percent of judicial misconduct complaints submitted to the HQC using the standardized form</td>
<td>2011 / 2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>297%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>193%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Percent of judicial discipline decisions posted on HQC website</td>
<td>2011 / 47%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72.40%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>118%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Year 5 target revised in 2016 based on Year 4 actual results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of government institutions placing judicial misconduct complaint form on their website (archived since 2013)</strong></td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of judicial disciplinary inspectors trained with project support (archived since 2013)</strong></td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 2.3: THE REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND INTEGRITY IS STRENGTHENED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Number of judicial self-governance mechanisms revised with project support</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAIR FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT  | 183
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE VALUE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of judges providing feedback to revisions of judicial self-governance mechanisms (archived since 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2011 / 14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>160%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>132%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>638%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2011 / 2,946</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>292%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>207%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>232%</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>348%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 3: THE PROFESSIONALISM AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UKRAINIAN JUDICIARY ARE STRENGTHENED**

14. Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management (FAF)

| Year 1                      | 2011 / 0        | 0      | 100    | 100%                         | 100    | 57     | 57%                         | 80     | 44     | 55%                         | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                         | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| Year 2                      | 2011 / 14       | 20     | 22     | 110%                         | 20     | 32     | 160%                        | 40     | 42     | 105%                        | 50     | 66     | 132%                        | 60     | 383    | 638%                        |
| Year 3                      | 2011 / 2,946    | 300    | 875    | 292%                         | 400    | 365    | 91%                          | 300    | 610    | 207%                         | 300    | 695    | 232%                         | 300    | 1,045  | 348%                        |

**EXPECTED RESULT 3.1: THE SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES OF UKRAINIAN JUDGES AND COURT STAFF ARE BOLSTERED THROUGH MODERN, DEMAND-DRIVEN TRAINING PROGRAMS**

15. Number of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance (FAF)

<p>| Year 1                      | 2011 / 0        | 0      | 100    | 100%                         | 100    | 57     | 57%                         | 80     | 44     | 55%                         | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                         | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                         |
| Year 2                      | 2011 / 14       | 20     | 22     | 110%                         | 20     | 32     | 160%                        | 40     | 42     | 105%                        | 50     | 66     | 132%                        | 60     | 383    | 638%                        |
| Year 3                      | 2011 / 2,946    | 300    | 875    | 292%                         | 400    | 365    | 91%                          | 300    | 610    | 207%                        | 300    | 695    | 232%                        | 300    | 1,045  | 348%                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Percent of judges and judicial personnel trained with USG assistance</td>
<td>2014 / 78%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting application of skills and knowledge gained in their judicial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices or teaching activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of new legal courses or curricula developed with USG assistance</td>
<td>2011 / 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TOT trainers created (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 178</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>197%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>190%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>257%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE / VALUE</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>YEAR 3</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of judges trained with USG assistance (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 1,700</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>332%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>205%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of judges trained with USG assistance (archived since 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Result 3.2: Judicial operations are evaluated and funded according to an objective assessment of needs and performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Number of court performance standards adopted</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Number of court performance indicators implemented</td>
<td>2013 / 7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of courts implementing project-supported performance measurement system</td>
<td>2013 / 31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BENCHMARK</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Average annual citizen report cards score of participating courts</td>
<td>2011 / .77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courts involved in piloting court performance standards (archived since 2013)</td>
<td>2011 / 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>258%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTED RESULT 3.3: THE SJA'S CAPACITY TO REPRESENT AND SUPPORT THE DEVELOPING NEEDS OF UKRAINIAN JUDICIA IS STRENGTHENED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Number of data-fed analytical techniques incorporated into judicial budgeting</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Year 5 target revised in 2016 based on Year 4 actual data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Number of project-supported new or improved policies within the SJA for the support of information technology, procurement, capital improvement, human resources, statistical collections and analysis activities within the courts</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{26}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{26} Year 5 target revised in 2016 based on Year 4 actual data.
<p>| INDICATOR                                                                 | BASELINE YEAR / VALUE | TARGET | ACTUAL | PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET | TARGET | ACTUAL | PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET | TARGET | ACTUAL | PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET | TARGET | ACTUAL | PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET | TARGET | ACTUAL | PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET | TARGET | ACTUAL | PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------------------|
| Number of project-supported organizational structures within the SJA for the support of information technology, procurement, capital improvement, human resources, statistical collections and analysis activities within the courts (archived since 2013) | 2011 / 1             | 7      | 7      | 100%                        | 7      | 4      | 57%                        | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                        | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                        | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                        | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of justice sector personnel constructively engaged in long term strategic planning for the judicial branch (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>195%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of courts with capacity to receive court fees through electronic terminals (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2013 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPECTED RESULT 3.4: THE CAPACITY OF COURTS AND JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS TO COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE PUBLIC IS ENHANCED, LEADING TO GREATER PUBLIC APPRECIATION OF THEIR ACTIVITIES**

| 24. Number of communication strategies implemented by courts and judicial institutions | 2013 / 4              | N/A    | N/A    | N/A                          | N/A    | N/A    | 8                             | 0      | 0%     | 2                            | 2      | 100%   | 3                            |

FAIR FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT  | 190
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of courts offering legal education materials to court visitors</td>
<td>2013 / 19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Number of CSO-produced policy proposals related to pending judicial reform legislation</td>
<td>2013 / 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of project-supported public events organized by Civil Society Organizations on judicial reform (archived since 2014)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 4: THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS AS ADVOCATES FOR AND MONITORS OF JUDICIAL REFORM IS STRENGTHENED**

**EXPECTED RESULT 4.1: CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE UKRAINIAN PUBLIC ARE ENGAGED IN THE JUDICIAL REFORM PROCESS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of media outlets used by project-supported CSOs to disseminate judiciary related information (archived since 2013)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>168%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courts offering CSO-produced legal education materials to court visitors (archived since 2013)</td>
<td>2011 / 0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td>YEAR 3</td>
<td>YEAR 4</td>
<td>YEAR 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Number and percentage of courts in which there are active CSO court performance evaluation programs</td>
<td>2011 / 20 (2.6%)</td>
<td>20 (2.6%)</td>
<td>34 (4.5%)</td>
<td>170%</td>
<td>34 (4.5%)</td>
<td>50 (7%)</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>80 (13%)</td>
<td>15 (2%)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>85 (11%)</td>
<td>198 (13%)</td>
<td>233%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Number of people engaged in the monitoring and performance oversight of Ukrainian courts</td>
<td>2013 / 4793</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,844 (54% men, 46% women)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>13,999 (52% men, 48% women)</td>
<td>165%</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPECTED RESULT 4.2: CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS HAVE MEANS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO EFFECTIVELY MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF JUDICIAL SECTOR REFORMS AND PROVIDE OVERSIGHT TO JUDICIAL OPERATIONS

27. Number and percentage of courts in which there are active CSO court performance evaluation programs

28. Number of people engaged in the monitoring and performance oversight of Ukrainian courts
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Percentage of partner Civil Society Organizations' performance improvement recommendations implemented by judicial institutions</td>
<td>2011 / 30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 5: THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES IMPLEMENTED FAIRLY, TRANSPARENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL AND EUROPEAN STANDARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Number of USG-Supported anti-corruption measures implemented (FAF)</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Percent of public officials and judges screened through vetting procedure in accordance with the Law on Purification of Government</td>
<td>JUL 2015 / 11.9% (0.2%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Percent of judges screened for corruption and participation in politicized justice in accordance with the Law on Restoration Trust in the Judiciary</td>
<td>Jul 2015 / 3.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</td>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td>YEAR 3</td>
<td>YEAR 4</td>
<td>YEAR 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED RESULT 5.1: THE LAW ON THE PURIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT AND RELATIVE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK IMPROVED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Number of recommendations to improve the Law on the Purification of Government and relative legislative framework formulated</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Per cent of recommendations formulated that are passed into law or adopted as regulations</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expected Result 5.2: Institutions, Procedures and Registry for the Lustration and Vetting of Public Officials and Judges Strengthened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Number of institutions that implement vettion and lustration of public officials and judges supported by the project</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Number of judicial performance indicators to evaluate sitting judges in Ukraine developed with project support</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Target set in 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Number of recommendations to improve the Unified Registry of Vetted Persons functioning formulated with project support and adopted as regulations</td>
<td>2014 / 0 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A 7 0 0% 728 0 0%</td>
<td>2014 / 0 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A 7 0 0% 728 0 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Number of procedures for lustration and vetting of public officials developed with Project support</td>
<td>2014 / 0 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A 3 0 0% 329 2 67%</td>
<td>2014 / 0 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A 3 0 0% 329 2 67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

28 Year 5 target set in 2016 based on Year 4 actual achievement.
29 Year 5 target set in 2016 based on Year 4 actual achievement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Number of training days provided to executive branch personnel with USG assistance</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Number of training programs on implementation of the lustration and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards developed with project support</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPECTED RESULT 5.3: IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PERSONNEL TO CONDUCT THE LUSTRATION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES PROFESSIONALLY, FAIRLY AND TRANSPARENTLY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Number of people trained with newly developed programs on implementation and vetting processes in compliance with international and European standards</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>145 (men: 48%, women: 52%)</td>
<td>207%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98 (men: 61%, women: 39%)</td>
<td>140%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>BASELINE / YEAR</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Per cent of people trained who report improved knowledge and skills to proceed with lustration and vetting public officials in compliance with international and European standards</td>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE AGAINST TARGET</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTED RESULT 5.4: PROMOTE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT IN THE PROCESS OF LUSTRACTION AND VETTING OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND JUDGES TO BOLSTER PUBLIC TRUST AND CONFIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Number of project-supported public events on lustration and vetting process involving civil society activists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Number of civil society organizations participating in and contributing to the process of lustration and vetting of public officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 / 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Revised based on 2015 actual results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE YEAR / VALUE</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>45. Per cent of Ukrainian citizens who are confident that the lustration and vetting processes are properly implemented and lead to purification of government</strong></td>
<td>2015 / 17%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Set in 2016 based on 2015 results
# ANNEX C. COUNTERPARTS & BENEFICIARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Presidential administration                                  | • Administrative office of the President of Ukraine  
• Established to provide organizational, legal, advisory, informational, expert and analytical, and other support in the realization of Presidential powers as stipulated by the Constitution of Ukraine | HIGH  
• The main state body formulating all national policies regarding the judiciary | Head – Ihor Rainin  
Address: 11, Bankova St., Kyiv, 01220,  
Tel.: +03 (044) 255 7333,  
http://www.president.gov.ua/en/ |
| Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VR)                                | • The Parliament of Ukraine - the sole body of legislative power in Ukraine  
• Participates in formation of the judiciary – appointment of one-third of the Constitutional Court composition, lifetime appointment of judges  
Principal FAIR’s counterparts - the VR Rule of Law and Judiciary Committee, and Legal Policy Committee | HIGH  
• The Verkhovna Rada is responsible for adoption of the laws of Ukraine | Chairman Andrii Parubii  
Address: 5, Hrushevskogo St., Kyiv, 01008,  
http://iportal.rada.gov.ua/en |
| Constitutional Commission                                    | • Advisory body for the President of Ukraine  
• Was created by the President of Ukraine on March 3, 2015.  
• Consists of 63 members, including members of the Parliament, academics, judges, prosecutors, and lawyers.  
• Established to provide organizational, legal, advisory, informational, expert | HIGH  
• The Constitution Commission will: (1) analyze the implementation of the Constitution and existing gaps; (2) develop proposals and recommendations regarding needed amendments; (3) ensure the widest possible | Head – Volodymyr Groysman  
Address: 11, Bankova St., Kyiv, 01220,  
Tel.: +03 (044) 255 7333,  
http://constitution.gov.ua |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Judicial Reform Council  | • Advisory body for the President of Ukraine  
• Was created by the President of Ukraine on October 24, 2014  
• Consists of 42 members, including members of the Parliament, academics, judges, prosecutors, lawyers and representatives of the international donors’ community.  
• Established to address the reform of the judiciary and other related areas | public discussion of the proposals; and (4) develop a draft law with amendments to the Constitution. | Coordinator – Oleksii Filatov  
Address: 11, Bankova St., Kyiv, 01220, Tel.: +03 (044) 255 7333, http://jrc.org.ua/ |
| Supreme Court of Ukraine (SCU)  | • The highest judicial body in the system of general jurisdiction courts  
• Within its scope of competence the Court shall (among others) apply to the Constitutional Court of Ukraine for constitutionality of laws or other legal acts as well as for the official interpretation of the Constitution and laws of Ukraine | The Supreme Court of Ukraine is an ultimate judicial body in Ukraine  
FAIR and the SCU have signed a Protocols of Cooperation | Chief Justice - Yaroslav Romatiuk  
Address: 4A, P. Orlyka St., Kyiv, Tel.: +38 (044) 253 0287, http://www.scourt.gov.ua/ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine (HQC) (Body within the judiciary) | Composed of forty eight judges from among whom the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ukraine and his/her deputy are elected | • The body operating on a permanent basis in the judiciary. The HQC’s main functions are (1) judicial selection and recommending for appointment, (2) judicial qualifications evaluation and (3) disciplining judges of first instance and appellate courts  
• The HQC composed of fourteen members:  
1) eight judges appointed by the Congress of Judges of Ukraine;  
2) two persons appointed by the Congress of representatives of higher law schools and scientific institutions;  
3) two persons appointed by the Congress of Lawyers;  
4) one person appointed by the Ombudsman of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine;  
5) one person appointed by the Head of State Judicial Administration  
• The Service of Disciplinary Inspectors is also established within the HQC and includes 42 disciplinary inspectors, three inspectors assigned to each HQC member | • One of the most important FAIR’s partners. Cooperation between FAIR and the HQC aimed at improving judicial selection and discipline processes and procedures. | Chairman – Serhii Koziakov  
Address: 9, Mekhanizatoriv Str., Kyiv, 03110, Ukraine  
Tel.: +38 (044) 233-6702 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High Council of Justice (HCJ)  
(Body within the judiciary) | • The HCJ is a collegial independent body established according to democratic procedure. Constitutional composition of the HCJ comprises 20 members  
• Taking into account specific powers and assignments of the HCJ, it is formed by the President of Ukraine, legislative and judiciary branch, as well as the prosecution system and civil society institutions – the bar, educational and scientific legal bodies  
• The principal function of the HCJ is to form in cooperation with other bodies the highly professional judicial corps capable of professional administering justice in a highly qualified, diligent and unbiased manner  
The HCJ considers judges’ and prosecutors’ incompatibility and disciplinary issues | HIGH | Head – Igor Benedysyuk, Judge of the High Economical Court of Ukraine,  
Secretary of the Judicial Appointment Section – Oleksiy Malovatskii  
Secretary of the Judicial Discipline Section – Alla Les’ko, Judge of the High Civil and Criminal Court of Ukraine  
Address: 12A Studentska Str., Kyiv, 04050,  
Tel.: +38 (044) 481 0620,  
http://www.vru.gov.ua/en/ |
| Interim Special Commission for Vetting of Judges of General Jurisdiction Courts (ISC)  
(Body within the judiciary) | • The body operating with the HCJ on a temporary basis. Legislatively, ISC’s should operate from July 2014 till July, 2015. However, on June 6, 2015 ISC by its own decision extended this term until November 12, 2015. The ISC terminated its operations in June 2016.  
The ISC’s main functions are (1) vetting of judges according to the Law on Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary | HIGH | Chair – Retired Justice Volodymyr Mojsyk,  
Deputy Chair – Attorney-at-Law Markiyan Halabala,  
Secretary – Attorney-at-Law Marina Solovyeva.  
Address: 12-A Studentska St., Kyiv, 04050,  
Tel.: +38 (044) 481 0660  
e-mail: tsk@vru.gov.ua  
http://www.vru.gov.ua/add_text/38 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Council of Judges of Ukraine (COJ) (Judicial self-governance body) | • The highest judicial self-governance body during the period between the Congresses of Judges, developing and providing for the implementation measures to ensure judicial independence and considering issues related to legal and social protection of judges  
• Performs control over the organization of courts activities and submits suggestions with respect to court operation matters to the state authorities and local self-governance bodies, executes other powers stipulated by law and included in the COJ terms of reference  
• The primary FAIR’s counterpart is the COJ Expert Group on the Code of Ethics | **HIGH**  
• Determines the policy of judicial self-governance  
• Is responsible for implementing the Strategic Plan for the Judiciary, Code of Judicial Ethics, Court Automation Strategy, Communications Strategy for the Judiciary developed in cooperation with FAIR.  
• Plays an important role in piloting of court performance evaluation standards | Chair – Justice Valentyna Simonenko, Secretary – Judge Oksana Marchenko  
Address: 18/5 Lypsa St., Kyiv, 01601, Tel.: + 38 (044) 277 7629  
http://www.court.gov.ua/eng/ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National School of Judges of Ukraine (NSJ) (Body within the judiciary) | • The NSJ is a state body with special status in judicial system of Ukraine, which provides courts with qualified judicial and court staff, conduct trainings, scientific and research activity in field of judiciary  
• The NSJ is established by the decision of the HQC 21.12.2010 № 822/p.4-3 | HIGH  
• One of the most important FAIR’s counterparts in the area of training of judicial candidates and ongoing training of judges and court staff | Rector – Mykola Onishchuk  
Vice-rector – Nataliya Shuklina,  
Official address: 16-D Lypska St., Kyiv, 01601,  
Address for correspondence: a/c №30, Kyiv, 03110,  
Location: 120A Zhylyanska Str., Kyiv, 03110,  
Tel: +38 (044) 353 8340,  
E-mail: info@nsj.gov.ua,  
www.nsj.gov.ua |
| State Judicial Administration of Ukraine (SJA) (Body within the judiciary) | • The state agency responsible for administrative, logistic, financial and other support to the judiciary  
• The primary FAIR’s counterpart is the SJA working group on innovations and court performance evaluation sub-group | HIGH  
• Main distributor of funding to courts  
• Main performer of all statistical, IT and other administrative work  
• Developer and implementer of all related policies  
• Has huge influence on courts despite its service status | Head - Zynovii Holodniuk  
Address: 18/5 Lypska St, Kyiv, Ukraine,  
Tel/fax: +38 (044) 277 7600 |
| Local and appellate courts of all jurisdictions | • Courts of the first and second instances within judicial system of Ukraine | HIGH  
• This cooperation gives possibility to work not only at top, but also at grass roots level in practical implementation of all activities | |
| U.S. Department of Justice Overseas Professional Development and Training division | • Assists Ukrainian legal and law enforcement counterparts primarily on criminal procedure as well as on combating such transnational crimes as | HIGH  
• One of the most important FAIR’s counterparts in the area of new CPC implementation | Jeffrey Cole, Resident Legal Advisor, U.S. Embassy Kyiv  
Address: 4 Ihor Sikorsky St., Kyiv 04112,  
Tel: +38 (044) 521 5783; +38 (050) 443 9640,  
E-mail: ColeJW2@state.gov |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (ROL donor and implementer) | human trafficking and money laundering  
• These efforts have resulted in the production of a new Criminal Procedure Code replacing the code that dates to the 1960s | | |
| Council of Europe (COE) (Donor) | Based in Strasbourg (France) covers virtually the entire European continent, with its 47 member countries  
• Seeks to develop throughout Europe common and democratic principles based on the European Convention on Human Rights and other reference texts on the protection of individuals | HIGH  
• The COE can provide support in expert assessment of key judicial legislation and conducting events | Marten Ehnberg, Head of Office in Ukraine  
Address: 8 Illinska Street, 7 entrance, 6th floor, 04070 Kyiv,  
Tel: +38 (044) 425 6001,  
E-mail: kyiv@coe.int, olena.lytvynenko@coe.int  
www.coe.kiev.ua |
| Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Project Coordinator in Ukraine (Donor) | The OSCE Project Coordinator is the second OSCE field operation to have been established in Ukraine for the purpose of carrying out tasks related to the new form of co-operation between Ukraine and the OSCE. This co-operation consists of the planning, implementation and monitoring of projects between relevant authorities of Ukraine and the OSCE and its institutions. Such projects may cover all aspects of OSCE activities (including rule of law and human rights) and may involve governmental as well as non-governmental bodies of Ukraine. | HIGH  
• FAIR achieved cooperation with the OSCE Project Coordinator in Ukraine in legal education reform initiatives | Ambassador - Vaidotas Verba  
Address: 16, Striletska St., Kyiv 01030,  
Tel +38 (044) 492 0382,  
http://www.osce.org/ukraine |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (MOJ) (Governmental body) | • The principal body within the central executive system responsible for implementation of the state legal policy and coordinated by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine  
• Judicial system comprises the MOJ and its territorial bodies. The powers of the MOJ spread over notary, scientific institutions of forensic examinations, enterprises, institutions and organizations | HIGH  
• Partnership and cooperation with MOJ will contribute to improving administrative services, forming of an effective free legal aid system in Ukraine and legal education reform  
• FAIR and the MOJ signed a Protocols of Cooperation | Minister of Justice – Pavlo Petrenko  
Deputi Minister of Justice – Gia Getsadze  
Address: 13 Horodetskogo St., Kyiv 01001,  
Tel.: +38 (044) 278-3723,  
themis@minjust.gov.ua,  
http://minjust.gov.ua/ |
| Press-center of the Judiciary (department of the SJA) | • Coordinates communication activities of courts  
• Implements state information policy of the judiciary  
• Established by COJ decision No. 61 as of 5 June 2015 | HIGH  
• One of the primary FAIR counterparts in enhancing the communication skills of the judiciary | Acting Head – Olga Kakakulina,  
Address: 18/5 Lypska St, Kyiv, Ukraine,  
Tel/fax: +38 (044) 277 7634,  
+38 (044) 277 7633,  
+38 (044) 277 7669  
https://court.gov.ua/press/ |
| American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative (Professional association) | • A mission-driven, non-profit program promoting rule of law  
• Has more than 400 professional staff working in the U.S. and abroad, who, since the program’s inception, have contributed more than $200 million in pro bono technical legal assistance | MEDIUM TO HIGH  
• One of the important FAIR’s counterparts in the area of bar | Dmytro Filipenko  
Deputy Director Ukraine  
18-A Antonovych St., #3  
Kyiv, 01004, Ukraine  
Tel: +380 (44) 459-0150  
d.filipenko@abaroli.org.ua  
www.americanbar.org |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (Governmental body) | • The central executive body coordinated by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine  
• Responsible for the central executive development and implementation of national policy in education and science | MEDIUM | • FAIR cooperated with the MOE in the area of legal education reform  
Minister – Liliya Hrynevych,  
First Deputy Minister – Volodymyr Kovtunets  
Address: Prospect Peremogy, 10, 01135 Kyiv,  
Tel: +38 (044) 226 2661; + 38 (044) 481 4771,  
E-mail: ministry@mon.gov.ua,  
www.mon.gov.ua |
| Association of Ukrainian Lawyers (Professional association) | • All-Ukrainian public organization, founded in 2002 to bring together lawyers for a strong and influential professional community, which would become a powerful voice of the legal profession of Ukraine  
• Committed to the development of the legal profession, improvement of legislation, implementation of ethical standards in provision of legal services, protection of professional rights of the UBA members and human rights in general  
• Unites over 3,000 lawyers from all regions of the country, including attorneys, notaries, scholars, judges, civil servants, MPs and well-known scientists in the field of law; student division of the UBA consists of more than 1,500 future lawyers from more than 50 educational institutions | MEDIUM | • One of the most dynamic and active organization of lawyers in Ukraine expanding activities abroad and taking a proactive stance on many issues of legal life in Ukraine  
• FAIR cooperates with the UBA in the areas of the bar, free legal aid and legal education  
President - Denys Bugay  
Address: 5 Mezhigirska street, office 15, Kyiv, 04071, Ukraine,  
Tel.: +38 (044) 492 8848,  
http://www.uba.ua/eng/ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| American Chamber of Commerce in Ukraine (ACC) (Professional association) | • NGO and non-profit business organization representing the internationally oriented investment community and facilitating the entrance of potential new investors in the market  
• Advocates on behalf of its members from more than 50 nations to the Ukrainian government and other governments-economic partners of Ukraine on matters of trade, commerce, and economic reform  
• The Anticorruption and Bar Legislation Working Groups established within the ACC | MEDIUM | President - Andy Hunder  
Address: Horizon Park Business Center, 12 Amosova Street, 15 Floor, Kyiv, 03680  
Tel.: +38 (044) 490 5800, Fax: +38 (044) 490 5801, E-mail: chamber@chamber.ua, http://www.chamber.ua/ |
| High Administrative Court of Ukraine (HAC) (Judicial body) | • The HAC considers administrative cases in cassation in compliance with procedural law; analyzes court statistics; examines and generalizes case law; provides assistance to lower courts with the aim of unified application of norms of the Constitution and laws of Ukraine in case; and provides lower courts with advisory clarifications regarding application of law | LOW TO MEDIUM | Chief Judge – Oleksandr Nechytailo,  
Address: 8 Moskovska St., building 5, 01029 Kyiv  
Tel.: +38 (044) 501 9525, E-mail: vasu@vasu.gov.ua, www.vasu.gov.ua |
| High Civil and Criminal Court of Ukraine (HCCC) (Judicial body) | • The HCCC considers civil and criminal cases in cassation in compliance with procedural law; analyzes court statistics; examines and generalizes case law; provides assistance to lower courts | LOW TO MEDIUM | Chief Judge – Borys Hulko  
Address: 4a Pylypa Orlyka St., Kyiv 01043  
Tel./Fax: +38 (044) 363 4150, E-mail: inbox@sc.gov.ua, http://sc.gov.ua/ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Judges of Ukraine (Professional association)</td>
<td>- Association is designed to support the establishment of civil society in Ukraine, development of democratic legislation and justice, enhancement of authority of the judiciary and strengthening of judicial independence, development of legal theory and legal education, advancement of professional judicial qualification and organization of experience exchange with judges from other countries, meeting the information, cultural, educational and other needs of judicial corps and protection of common interests of its members.</td>
<td>LOW TO MEDIUM</td>
<td>- The Association of Judges of Ukraine implemented the FAIR grant project “Elaboration and Implementation of National Standards of Ukrainian Judges’ Independence on Basis of International and European Standards and Experience of World Judicial Systems”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Franko Lviv National University, Law School</td>
<td>- A leading Ukrainian law school that actively participated in a number of FAIR programs and events with an impact on the nationwide legal education system.</td>
<td>LOW TO MEDIUM</td>
<td>- Participated and continues to participate in FAIR pilot projects and events making an impact on the modernization of the nation-wide legal education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERPART/ BENEFICIARY</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>IMPORTANCE/ ROLE</td>
<td>CONTACT INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Commercial Court of Ukraine (HCC) (Judicial body)</td>
<td><em>The HCC considers commercial cases in cassation in compliance with procedural law; analyzes court statistics; examines and generalizes case law; provides assistance to lower courts with the aim of unified application of norms of the Constitution and laws of Ukraine in case; and provides lower courts with advisory clarifications regarding application of law</em></td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Chief Justice - Bohdan Lvov, Deputy Chief Justice - Hennadii Kravchuk  Address: 6, Kopylenka St., Kyiv 01016, Tel.: +38 (044) 536 1801, E-mail: <a href="mailto:inbox@vgsu.arbitr.gov.ua">inbox@vgsu.arbitr.gov.ua</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Law School</td>
<td><em>A leading Ukrainian law school participated in FAIR programs and events with an impact on the nationwide legal education system</em></td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Rector – Stepan Melnychuk  Dean – Petro Patsurkivskyi  Address: 2 Kotsujynskyi Str. Chernivtsi 58012, Ukraine  Tel. +380-372-526235, Fax +380-372-552914,  E-mail: <a href="mailto:office@chnu.edu.ua">office@chnu.edu.ua</a>  Website: <a href="http://www.chnu.cv.ua/">http://www.chnu.cv.ua/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX D. NGOs THAT WORKED WITH FAIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NGO “Andriyivsko-Peizazhna Initsiatyva” | ER 1.1 | • Strong commitment to the establishment of the rule of law in Ukraine  
• Team consists of string professionals, who are ready to receive new knowledge  
• Very responsive to the requests | • Low expertise in the rule of law sector  
• Little experience in the grant projects implementation |
| CSO “Podilska Human Rights Foundation” | ER 4.2 | • Good experience in external court performance evaluation through citizens report card methodology (CRC)  
• Cooperation with courts of Khmelnytsky, Rivne and Vinitsya oblasts  
• Cooperation with legal education institutions | • Grant portfolio consists almost from UROL and FAIR grants  
• Not sustainable project management staff  
• The organization is very dependent on the Chief |
| All-Ukrainian Charitable Foundation “Ukrainian Legal Foundation” | ERs 3.1, 5.4 | • Exceptional experience in supporting government initiatives aimed at strengthening rule of law and legal education  
• Legal expertise in legal publications and research  
• Strong relationships with lustration stakeholders and media  
• Cooperation with legal education institutions  
• Cooperation with courts  
• High level networking with other organizations, good cooperation with courts and other government institutions  
• Diversified resource base, implemented many EU and other donors’ supported initiatives  
• Motivated in sustainability building of grant initiatives  
• Experienced experts | • Lack of management skills among administration team  
• Delays with program reporting |
| All-Ukrainian Civic Organization | ER 4.1 | • Organization unites judges who represent different courts  
• Organization has a contacts with international associations of judges | • Low capacity to implement policy analysis initiatives |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Association of Judges of Ukraine" |                  | • Specific expertise in law implementation at court proceedings  
• Good portfolio of events conducted with donors support  
• Cooperation with governmental organizations including national level (for example, CO) and HQC | • Low capacity to advocate produced ideas among decision makers in legislative and Grant portfolio consists almost from UROL and FAIR grants  
• Low organization capacity development and FAIR grants  
• Weak NGO governance                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| All-Ukrainian CSO  
“Institut Respublika” | ERs 4.1, 5.4     | • Strong capacity in monitoring peaceful assemblies  
• Excellent advocacy capacity to lobby legislative initiatives  
• Experienced organization, good project portfolio  
• Sufficient and diversified resource base  
• Motivated to continue initiatives without or with modest donor support  
• High level networking with other organizations – founder of the civic network for Peaceful Protest  
• Cooperation with a wide network of local CSOs throughout the county  
• Strong democratic leadership  
• Expertise in improving legislation on human rights and monitoring court practice  
• Partnership with international institutions including OSCE and Venice Commission | • Organization is overloaded with project and expert work that causes overload of human resource. Further, it may lead to delays in project implementation  
• Lack of management skills among administration team  
• Delays with program reporting                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| All-Ukrainian CSO  
“Institute of Strategic Partnership” | ER 3.1           | • Good cooperation with courts, legal education institutions and legal clinics in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast.  
• Involved a good expert | • Low number of permanent staff                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| All-Ukrainian CSO  
“Ukrainian Marketing Association” | ER 1.1           | • Capacity to conduct market research projects  
• Presence of a corporate periodical called “Marketing in Ukraine”  
• Strong network of CSOs in Ukraine and abroad | • Organization seems to be overloaded with project and expert work that sometimes leads to delays in project implementation and reporting  
• Organization needs additional guidance and support in implementing projects focused not only on the marketing side of the issue at hand |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All-Ukrainian NGO “Committee of voters   | ER 5.4           | • Sustainable networking with local CSOs nationwide  
• Experience in raising capacity of CSOs  
• Expertise in monitoring government initiatives on human rights  
• Excellent project management, good coordination and evaluation | • Project staff lacks flexibility in communications with donor regarding project tasks implementation |
| of Ukraine”                               |                  |                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                |
| All-Ukrainian NGO “Election Law Institute”| ER 3.1           | • Cooperation with legal education institutions  
• Cooperation with courts  
• Experienced organization and experts | • Not flexible in accepting donors rules                                                                                                       |
| Charity Organization “Your Right”        | ER 4.2           | • Good experience in external court performance evaluation through citizens report card methodology (CRC)  
• Cooperation with courts of Western oblasts  
• Cooperation with legal education institutions  
• Experience in implementation initiatives to improve people with disabilities access to courts  
• High level networking with other CSOs  
• High level of cooperation with the NSJ | • Low number of permanent staff  
• Delays with submitting deadlines                                                                                                              |
| Charity Foundation “Intelektualna Perspektyva” | ER 4.1         | • Solid expertise in social sciences and sociology  
• Organization unites sociologists, has regional focal points  
• Capacity to conduct all-Ukrainian surveys  
• Cooperation with governmental organizations including national level (for example, SJA) | • Not flexible in accepting donors rules                                                                                                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Charity Foundation          | ERs 3.4, 4.2     | • Good expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC and CRC recommendations monitoring implementation  
• Experienced organization, good project portfolio  
• Sufficient and diversified resource base.  
• High level networking with other organizations, good cooperation with courts and other government institutions  
• Strong democratic leadership  
• Good project management capacity. Responsible and capable staff |
| “CCC Creative Center”       |                  | • Cooperation with legal education institutions  
• Diversified resource base, implemented many EU supported initiatives  
• Organization overloaded with project and expert work, which causes overload of human resource. Further, it may lead to delays in project implementation  
• At times the leadership becomes uncooperative  
• At times leadership demonstrates lack of motivation |
| Charity Organization        | ERs 3.2, 3.4, 4.2 | • Good project management capacity. Responsible and capable staff  
• Experienced organization, good project portfolio  
• Sufficient and diversified resource base.  
• High level networking with other organizations, good cooperation with courts and other government institutions  
• Strong democratic leadership  
• Motivated in sustainability building of grant initiatives  
• Involved Peace Corp volunteer to develop organization capacity  
• Partnership with educational institutions and local authorities in Western region of Ukraine  
• Sustainable network of experts in free legal aid providing  
• Very creative  
• Very reliable and motivated  
• Very responsive, understanding and flexible |
| “All-Ukrainian Coalition for Legal Aid” |                  | • Specific expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC. In 2013 conducted CRC survey without donors support  
• Organization is overloaded with project and expert work which causes overload of human resource. Further, it may lead to delays in project implementation  
• Weak project monitoring mechanisms  
• Weak communication policies |
| Charity Organization        | ER 4.2           | • Specific expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC. In 2013 conducted CRC survey without donors support  
• Grant portfolio consists only from FAIR grant  
• Not sustainable project management staff |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of Ukraine “Oriyana”</td>
<td>ER 1.1</td>
<td>Sufficient and diversified resource base &lt;br&gt;High level networking with other civic organizations of Ivano-Frankivsk oblast &lt;br&gt;Good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Ivano-Frankivsk oblast &lt;br&gt;Strong democratic leadership &lt;br&gt;Motivated in sustainability building of grant initiatives</td>
<td>The organization is very dependent on the Chief Civic Association “Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Association “Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights Union”</td>
<td>ER 3.2</td>
<td>Specific expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC &lt;br&gt;High level networking with other civic organizations of Cherkasy oblast &lt;br&gt;Good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Cherkasy and Odesa oblasts &lt;br&gt;Motivated in sustainability building of grant initiatives &lt;br&gt;Permanent staff</td>
<td>Grant portfolio consists only from FAIR grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Organization “Center for Social Adaptation”</td>
<td>ER 4.1</td>
<td>Solid expertise in gender issues related women protection from domestic violence &lt;br&gt;Provide free legal support for victims of domestic violence &lt;br&gt;Organization unites legal and public policy scientists. &lt;br&gt;Significant project portfolio including big EU grants &lt;br&gt;Good cadre of trainers in law, gender issues. Knowledge of adult training methods</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPONENT</td>
<td>STRENGTHS</td>
<td>WEAKNESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Civic Organization “Center for Civil Liberties” | ER 5.4 | • Excellent application of best human rights advocacy strategies  
• Extensive experience in court monitoring  
• Wide network of volunteers nationwide  
• Good communication policies | • Understaffing of administration team |
| Civic Organization “Community Consulting Group “Partner” | ER 4.2 | • Specific expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC  
• High level networking with other civic organizations of Volyn, Chernivtsi oblasts  
• Good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Volyn, Chernivtsi oblasts  
• Permanent staff | • None |
| Civic Organization “National Association of Mediators of Ukraine” | ERs 1.2, 3.1 | • Cooperation with courts  
• Good cooperation with the NSJ and its regional branches  
• Experienced experts  
• Good cooperation with Members of the Parliament of Ukraine | • New established organization.  
• Low number of permanent staff  
• Delays with submitting deadlines  
• Organization is overloaded with projects and expert work, which causes overload of human resource. This delay in project implementation |
| CSO “Pravovyy Rakurs” | ER 1.1 | • Professional journalists | • Low management capacity  
• It is hard to identify the border between censorship and guidance on how better meet the project objectives |
| NGO “Fund for Facilitation of Constitution Reforms in Ukraine” | ER 1.2 | • Engaged high qualified experts to monitor constitutional reform  
• Solid expertise in law, legal studies | • Grant portfolio consists only from FAIR grant  
• New established organization.  
• Low number of permanent staff  
• Delays with submitting deadlines |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| International Charitable Organization “Environment – People – Law” | ER 3.1 | • High level of cooperation with the NSJ  
• Diversified resource base, implemented many EU and other donors’ supported initiatives  
• Excellent project management capacity. Responsible and capable staff  
• Experienced organization, good project portfolio | • None |
| International Charitable Organization “Center for Ukrainian Reform Education” | ER 5.4 | • Good partnerships with local media nationwide  
• Extensive experience in grant management | • Weak communication strategies;  
• Lack of motivation and creativity. |
| International Civic Organization “Universal Examination Network” | ERs 2.1, 5.4 | • Good experience in improving professional level of specialists including judges  
• Strong partnerships with judicial institutions and experts in judicial reform | • Gaps in coordination  
• Weak management and evaluation |
| Kharkiv City Civic Organization “Institute for Applied Humanitarian Research” | ERs 2.2, 3.2, 4.2 | • Solid expertise in law, legal studies, public policy, test development  
• Specific expertise in court performance evaluation and public surveys  
• Organization unites legal and public policy scientists  
• Significant project portfolio  
• Good cadre of trainers in law, public policy, test items development, organizational development and others. Knowledge of adult training methods  
• Cooperation with governmental organizations including national level (for example, COJ and HQC)  
• Cooperation with legal education institutions  
• Diversified resource base  
• High level of expertise  
• Efficient cooperation with FAIR partner (HQC)  
• Strong representation of research results | • Organization is overloaded with project and expert work which causes overload of human resource. Further, it may lead to delays in project implementation  
• Weak NGO governance. Management is somewhat outdated  
• Low quality of operational reports |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kharkiv Regional Foundation "Public Alternative” | ER 4.1           | • Solid expertise in protection from all forms of discrimination including gender  
• Organization unites legal and public policy scientists  
• Good cadre of trainers in law, gender issues. Knowledge of adult training methods  
• Cooperation with regional department of NSJ of Kharkiv region  
• Cooperation with legal education institutions  
• High level networking with other civic organizations members of the All Ukrainian coalition of protection from discrimination | • Not sustainable project management staff  
• The organization is very dependent on the chief |
| Kirovohrad Regional Public Organization "TORO Creative Union” | ER 4.3           | • Specific expertise in anticorruption, court performance evaluation using CRC in Kirovograd oblast  
• Good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Kirovohrad oblast  
• Strong democratic leadership  
• Staff moved to Transparency Int. Ukraine  
• Transferred to Transparency Int. Ukraine | • As TORO stopped activity in 2011 |
| Civic Organization “Centre of Policy and Legal Reform” | ER 5.4           | • Extensive experience and good expertise in monitoring and advocacy for public services and judiciary reform  
• Clear vision and mission  
• Excellent grant management, transparency, monitoring and evaluation  
• Good communication and human resource policies | • Understaffing of administration team |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO “Internews-Ukraine”</td>
<td>ER 1.2</td>
<td>• Highly professional organization</td>
<td>• As soon as grantee has other donors core funding and established internal finance and administrative procedures they are not flexible to meet USAID FAIR Justice Project requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good portfolio of the implemented donor’s projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO “Chernihiv Public Committee for Human Rights Protection”</td>
<td>ER 4.2</td>
<td>• Specific expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High level networking with other civic organizations of Chernihiv oblast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Chernihiv oblast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsible and capable permanent staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Experienced organization, good project portfolio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sufficient and diversified resource base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High level networking with other organizations which provide free legal aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO “Civic Lustration Committee”</td>
<td>ER 5.4</td>
<td>• Excellent application of best lustration and advocacy strategies</td>
<td>• Lack of experience in project administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong communication policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership with key government reform stakeholders and media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO “Law Society of the Odesa Oblast”</td>
<td>ERs 3.4, 5.4</td>
<td>• Strong leadership in organization</td>
<td>• Lack of administration and management experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivation</td>
<td>• Too strong reliance on the judicial institutions, lack of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainable partnership with local media and judicial institutions in Southern region of Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO “Ukrainian Centre for Economic and Political Studies named after Oleksandr Razumkov”</td>
<td>ER 1.2</td>
<td>• Top-ranked think tank</td>
<td>• As soon as grantee has other donors core funding and established internal finance and administrative procedures they are not flexible to meet USAID FAIR Justice Project requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impressive professional expertise and portfolio of the implemented projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPONENT</td>
<td>STRENGTHS</td>
<td>WEAKNESSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Public Association “Open Dialog Foundation” | ER 5.4 | • Good application of international standards in human right advocacy  
• Good relationships with international organizations | • Unclear vision and mission of organization  
• Understaffing  
• Weak management and monitoring |
| NGO “The Intellectual Headquarter of Civil Society” | ER 4.2 | • Solid expertise in law, legal studies, psychology, test development  
• Specific expertise in court performance evaluation and public surveys, including CRC survey in Ternopil oblast  
• Organization unites legal and psychology scientists  
• Good cadre of trainers in law, legal studies, psychology. Knowledge of adult training methods  
• Cooperation with governmental organizations pf Ternopil region, local media  
• Cooperation with legal education institutions | • New established organization. Modest project portfolio  
• Weak NGO governance |
| Sumy City NGO “Center for Regional Policy Studies” | ER 3.4 | • Very big motivation and creativity  
• Reliability and strong leadership  
• Very good resource base (a TV studio)  
• Constructive dialog with local judicial institutions  
• Experience in filming videos and conducting events  
• Leadership is strong, democratic and has a vision in the area | • Lack of administration and management experience |
| Volyn Regional NGO “Center for Legal Aid” | ER 3.1 | • High level networking with other organizations, good cooperation with courts and other government institutions  
• Experienced organization, good project portfolio  
• Involved Peace Corp volunteer to develop organization capacity  
• Provide free legal support  
• Diversified resource base, implemented many EU and other donors’ supported initiatives | • None |
<p>| Youth non-profit regional public organization | ER 4.3 | • Specific expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC in Volyn, Chernivtsi oblasts | • Decreased activity after 2013 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Association of Volyn Youth Rights Protection" |                   | - Good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Volyn, Chernivtsi oblasts  
- Strong democratic leadership                                                                   |                                                                                              |
| Youth organization “New Generation”      | ER 4.2            | - Good expertise in court performance evaluation using CRC methodology  
- Excellent project management capacity. Responsible and capable staff  
- Experienced organization, good project portfolio  
- Sufficient and diversified resource base.  
- High level networking with other organizations, good cooperation with courts and other government institutions of Kherson oblast  
- Strong democratic leadership                                                              | None                                                                                         |
| Court Management Institute               | ER 3.2            | - Cadre of experienced trainers in court administration, court performance evaluation, judicial statistics. Members of organizations are certified court administrators and trainers of the National School of Judges  
- Good knowledge and experience of adult training methods  
- Horizontal networking. Close cooperation State Judicial Administration and courts  
- Organization is a member of the International Association for Court Administration       | New organization that have been recently created and registered. Limited resources and infrastructure  
- Modest project portfolio                                                                   |
| Sumy Oblast Youth NGO “European Dimension” | ER 5.4            | - Good application of court monitoring practices  
- Motivation and creativity  
- Experience in training youth and local activists                                              | Lack of administration and management experience                                             |
ANNEX E. REPORTS & DELIVERABLES

YEAR 1 (OCTOBER 2011 TO SEPTEMBER 2012)

1: Annual Progress Report October 2011 to September 2012

2: Quarterly Progress Report October to December 2011


4: Quarterly Progress Report April to June 2012

5: Success Story “Ukraine Advances Merit-Based, Objective Judicial Testing”

6: Success Story “Citizens Help Improve Court Performance”

7: Success Story “Ukrainian Judges Prepare for New Criminal Procedure Code”

8: Report “Supporting the Legal Framework to Enhance Bar Reform in Ukraine. Challenges and Opportunities”, Mary Noel Pepys, Judicial Specialist and Olga Nikolaeva, FAIR Program Coordinator

9: Report “Supporting the Legal Framework to Enhance the Quality of Legal Education in Ukraine. Challenges and Opportunities”, Mary Noel Pepys, Judicial Specialist and Yuliya Golovanova, FAIR Legal Specialist

10: Report on Legal Education in Europe, Iryna Voytyuk, FAIR Legal Education Expert

11: Opinion on the Constitution of Ukraine with a Focus on Rule of Law Principles, Lorena Bachmaier Winter, FAIR Constitutional Law Expert, Madrid University Law Professor

12: Draft Concept on Improving Legal Education for Professional Training of Lawyer According to European Standards of Higher Education and Legal Profession

13: Written Report on the Scope of Current Ukrainian Legislation to be Reviewed to Improve the Quality of Legal Education in Ukraine, Iryna Voytyuk, FAIR Legal Education Expert

14: Assessment of the Institutional and Training Needs of the National School of Judges of Ukraine. Institutional Capacity, Initial Training and Ongoing Training, Mary Frances Edwards, Rule of Law Consultant, Enniscrone, Ireland, and Daniel Chasles, Secretary General, Ecole Nationale de la Magistrature, Bordeaux, France

15: 2nd Draft Strategic Plan for Ukrainian Judiciary (Eng.)
16: 2nd Draft Strategic Plan for Ukrainian Judiciary (Ukr.)
17: Analysis of Draft Instructions “On Verification and Decision-making in Disciplinary Proceedings against a Judge”, Judge José Manuel Duro Mateus Cardoso, FAIR Judicial Discipline Expert


19: Review of Judicial Testing Regulations (Recommendations for Improving Regulations on Administration, Test Development, Scoring, Scaling and Admission of Judicial Candidates), Steven Bakker, Senior Consultant Educational Assessment

20: Draft Communications Strategy for the Council of Judges

21: Draft Model Communications Strategy for Courts

22: Public Information Officer Job Instructions

23: Guidelines on Courts and Media Relations

24: Analysis of the Procedures of Judicial Candidates Selection conducted in May-June, 2011. Recommendations to Improve the Quality of Content and Procedures for Judicial Anonymous Testing and Case Study Assignment (Ukr.)

25: Analysis of the Testing Procedures and Quality of the Test conducted on June 5, 2012 (Ukr.)

YEAR 2 (OCTOBER 2012 TO SEPTEMBER 2013)

26: Annual Progress Report October 2012 to September 2013

27: Quarterly Progress Report October to December 2012


29: Quarterly Progress Report April to June 2013

30: Success Story “Ukrainian Judges Approved Modern Code of Judicial Ethics”

31: Success Story “Certified Court Administrators Improve the Quality of Court Services”

32: Strategic Plan for the Ukrainian Judiciary (Eng.)

33: Strategic Plan for the Ukrainian Judiciary (Ukr.)

34: Code of Judicial Ethics (Eng.)

35: Code of Judicial Ethics (Ukr.)
36: Court Automation Strategy (Ukr.)

37: Report on Judicial Practice Analysis (Ukr.)

38: The National School of Judges of Ukraine: Comments on Two Week Training For New Judges & Institutional Management Capacity (Eng.)

39: Curricula for Initial Training on Rule of Law and Human Rights, with Practical Emphasis on the European Convention on Human Rights (Ukr.)

40: Curricula for Initial Training on Judicial Opinion Writing (Ukr.)

41: Curricula for Initial Training on Judicial Ethics (Ukr.)

42: Curricula for Ongoing Training for Judges on Rule of Law and Human Rights, with Practical Emphasis on the European Convention on Human Rights (Ukr.)

43: Curricula for Ongoing Trainings for Judges on Judicial Opinion Writing (Ukr.)

44: Curricula for Ongoing Trainings for Judges on Judicial Ethics (Ukr.)

45: Judicial Opinion Writing Handbook (second edition) (Ukr.)

46: Addendum to the Council of Judges of Ukraine Decision No. 72 from November 30, 2012 - Communications Strategy for the Ukrainian Judiciary (Ukr.)

47: TV Spot on the Rights on Secondary Free Legal Aid for Detained Persons (“Indylo”) (Ukr.)

48: TV Spot on the Rights on Secondary Free Legal Aid for Detained Persons (“Kairo”) (Ukr.)

49: Report on Recommendations regarding Improving Cooperation between All Participants of the Process of Providing Secondary Free legal Aid and Proposals regarding Amendments in Relevant Legal Framework (Ukr.)

50: Sticker “Right on Free Legal Aid for Detained Persons”, type 1 (Ukr.)

51: Sticker “Right on Free Legal Aid for Detained Persons” type 2 (Ukr.)

52: Leaflet “Right on Free Legal Aid in Criminal Proceedings” (Ukr.)

53: Leaflet “Preventive Measures in Criminal Proceedings” (Ukr.)

54: Leaflet “What to Do if You are Detained in Criminal Accuse” (Ukr.)

55: Leaflet “Constitution is Written by People” (Ukr.)
56: Leaflet “Kernel of Constitution” (Ukr.)

57: Leaflet “What is the Plea Agreement” (Ukr.)

58: Brochure “Good Practices in Communications” (Ukr.)

59: Brochure “Guide in Criminal Process” (Ukr.)

60: Leaflet “Rights of Suspects and Accused in Criminal Process” (Ukr.)

61: Leaflet “How to Appeal against the Decisions of Pretrial Authorities, Prosecutor Office and Court” (Ukr.)

62: List of CRC Partner Courts

63: Analysis of the Organization of Court Administration in Ukraine (Eng.)

64: The State Judicial Administration of Ukraine: Structural Assessment and Recommendations (Eng.)

65: FAIR Success Story Video “Courts and the Public: Civilized Engagement”, 20 min. (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)

66: FAIR Success Story Video “Courts and the Public: Civilized Engagement”, 12 min. (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)

67: FAIR Success Story Video “Becoming a Judge: Objective Selection and Appointment”, 13 min. (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)


69: Court Administration Manual “Chief of Court Staff: Introduction to the Profession” (Ukr.)

70: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Appellate Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast, Ivano-Frankivsk City Court (Ukr.)

71: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Chornobayivskyy Raion Court of Cherkasy Oblast, Appellate Court of Cherkasy Oblast (Ukr.)

72: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Prymorskyy District Court of the City of Odesa (Ukr.)

73: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Lychakivskyy District Court of the City of Lviv, Chervonograd City Court of Lviv Oblast, Drohobyskyy City-Raion Court of Lviv Oblast (Ukr.)
74: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Appellate Court and Hlybotskyy Raion Court of Chernivtsi Oblast, Pershotravneveyy and Shevchenkivskyy District Courts of the City of Chernivtsi (Ukr.)


76: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Commercial Court of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast (Ukr.)

77: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Appellate Court of Donetsk Oblast, Petrovskyy District Court of the City of Donetsk, Ordzhonikidzevskyy District Court of the City of Mariupol (Ukr.)

78: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Kharkiv Appellate Administrative Court, Kharkiv Circuit Administrative Court (Ukr.)

79: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Appellate Court of Volyn Oblast, Lutsk City-Raion Court of Volyn Oblast, Kovel City-Raion Court of Volyn Oblast, Ivanychivskyy Raion Court of Volyn Oblast (Ukr.)

80: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Vinnytsia Circuit Administrative Court, Vinnytsia Appellate Administrative Court (Ukr.)

81: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Appellate Court of Khmelnytskyy Oblast, Kamyanets-Podilskyy City-Raion Court of Khmelnytskyy Oblast (Ukr.)

82: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Appellate Court of Kirovohrad Oblast (Ukr.)

83: Citizen Report Cards Methodology Survey (4th Round): Leninskyy and Kirovsksyy District Courts of the City of Kirovohrad, Kirovohradskyy Raion and Oleksandriyskyy City-Raion Courts of Kirovohrad Oblast (Ukr.)

84: Assessment Report on Access to Justice for People with Disabilities (Ukr.)


86: Report on the Research on the Issue of Improving the Procedures for Transfer of Judges to another Court within Five Year of Initial Appointment (Ukr.)

YEAR 3 (OCTOBER 2013 TO SEPTEMBER 2014)

87: Annual Progress Report October 2013 to September 2014
88: Quarterly Progress Report October to December 2013
89: Quarterly Progress Report January to March 2014
90: Quarterly Progress Report April to June 2014
91: Success Story “Case Weights Become a Tool for Measuring Judicial Workload”
92: Success Story “Independent Assessment Helps to Improve the Quality of Legal Education in Ukraine”
93: Success Story “Certified Court Administrators Design the Future of Judicial Administration in Ukraine”
94: Success Story “Distance Learning Helps to Improve Courts and Community Communication”
95: Strategic Development Plan for the National School of Judges of Ukraine for 2014-2018 (Ukr.)
96: Strategic Development Plan for the National School of Judges of Ukraine for 2014-2018 (Eng.)
97: Final Report on Distance Learning Course on “Courts and Community Communications” (Ukr.)
98: Concept for Electronic and On-line Payment of Court Fees (Ukr.)
99: Manual for Conducting Objective Time Studies and Case Weighting (Ukr.)
100: Case Weighting Report for General Jurisdiction Courts (Ukr.)
101: Court Performance Evaluation (CPE) Framework (Eng.)
102: Guidelines on Implementation User Survey in General Courts (Ukr.)
103: Methodology for Independent On-site Legal Education Quality Assessment (Eng.)
104: Report on the Legal Education Quality Assessment of the Law Faculty at Lviv National University (Ukr.)
105: Report on the Legal Education Quality Assessment of the Law Faculty at Lviv National University (Eng.)
106: Developing a Strategic Plan for Lviv Law School: a List of Recommendations (Eng.)

109: Manual for Disciplinary Inspector (Ukr.)

110: Program for Initial Training of Disciplinary Inspector (Ukr.)

111: Program for Ongoing Training of Disciplinary Inspector (Ukr.)

112: Proposals on Amendments to the Law on the Judiciary and Status of Judges from the HQC Seminar on November 21 and 22, 2013 (Ukr.)

113: Summary on the European Court of Human Rights Lustration Cases (Ukr.)

114: Summary on the European Court of Human Rights Lustration Cases (Eng.)


119: Leaflet “Costs and Expenses in a Civil Case” (Ukr.)

120: Leaflet “Costs and Expenses in an Administrative Case” (Ukr.)

121: Leaflet “Enforcement of Court Decisions in Civil Cases” (Ukr.)

122: Leaflet “How to Appeal a Court Decision in an Administrative Case” (Ukr.)

123: Leaflet “How to Appeal a Court Decision in a Civil Case” (Ukr.)

124: Leaflet “Enforcement of Court Decisions in Administrative Cases” (Ukr.)

125: Leaflet “Is it Possible to Settle the Dispute without Trial?” (Ukr.)

126: Leaflet “How to Submit Administrative Claim?” (Ukr.)

127: Leaflet “How to Submit Civil Claim?” (Ukr.)

128: Leaflet “What is a Writ?” (Ukr.)
129: Leaflet “Guide to the Judicial System of Ukraine” (Ukr.)
130: Leaflet “How to Appeal Misconduct of a Judge or Court Staff?” (Ukr.)
131: Leaflet “How to Behave in Court” (Ukr.)
132: Leaflet “Why do I need a Lawyer and Where to Get Legal Aid?” (Ukr.)
133: Leaflet “Rights of Suspects and Accused in Criminal Proceedings” (Ukr.)
134: Leaflet “What a Victim Needs to Know?” (Ukr.)
135: Leaflet “What if You were Detained?” (Ukr.)
136: Leaflet “How and When Can I Appeal to the European Court of Human Rights?” (Ukr.)
137: Leaflet “How to Appeal a Decision of the Preliminary Investigation, Prosecution and Trial?” (Ukr.)
138: Poster “Who and Where is in a Court Room” (Ukr.)
139: CRC Manual (Eng.)
140: Manual for Anonymous Test Proctors (Ukr.)
141: Manual for Test Items Writers (Ukr.)
142: Some Procedural Aspects of Transferring Judges: France, Sweden, Lithuania, Germany and Poland (Ukr.)
143: Some Procedural Aspects of Transferring Judges: France, Sweden, Lithuania, Germany and Poland (Eng.)
144: Analysis of Testing Part of Qualifications Examination of Judicial Candidates in 2013 Versus 2012 (Ukr.)

YEAR 4 (OCTOBER 2014 TO SEPTEMBER 2015)

145: Annual Progress Report October 2014 to September 2015
146: Quarterly Progress Report October to December 2014
147: Quarterly Progress Report January to March 2015
148: Quarterly Progress Report April to June 2015
149: Success Story “Ukrainian Judges Learn to Apply Ethical Standards on and off the Bench”

150: Success Story “Ukrainian Judiciary Becomes More Accountable”


152: Legal Job Market Survey Report (Ukr.)

153: Excerpt from the Legal Job Market Survey Report (Eng.)

154: Excerpt from the Legal Job Market Survey Report (Ukr.)

155: Bernd Heinrich, D.Kessler. Report with Recommendations on Improving the Draft National Legal Education Standard (Bachelor’s Degree) (Eng.)

156: Expert Report on Independent External On-site Assessment of Legal Education Quality at the Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University Law School (Eng.)

157: Expert Report on Independent External On-site Assessment of Legal Education Quality at the Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University Law School (Ukr.)

158: Oleksandr Khyzhniak, Report with Recommendations on Strategic Planning at the Ivan Franko Lviv National University Law School (Ukr.)

159: Serhiy Mudruk, Report with Recommendations on the Quality of Legal Testing Program at the Ivan Franko Lviv National University Law School (Ukr.)

160: Kyiv-Mohyla Law School Team Report on the 2015 IBA-VIAC Mediation and Negotiation Competition (Eng.)


162: Kyiv-Mohyla Law School Team Report on the 2015 Telders Moot Court Competition (Eng.)

163: Kyiv-Mohyla Law School Team Report on the 2015 Telders Moot Court Competition (Ukr.)

164: Taras Shevchenko Law School Team Report on the 2015 WTO Moot Court Competition (Eng.)

165: Taras Shevchenko Law School Team Report on the 2015 WTO Moot Court Competition (Ukr.)
166: Judicial Practice Analyses (Ukr.)

167: Manual for Test Items Approbation (Ukr.)

168: Expert Recommendations for the Draft Regulation on the Procedure for the Judicial Dossier Administration (Ukr.)


170: FAIR Judicial Ethics Online Course Report (Ukr.)

171: Analysis of Judgments of Ukrainian Courts on the Implementation of the Rule of Law (Ukr.).

172: Final Report on Draft Regulatory Framework for Mediation in Ukraine (Eng.).

173: European and International Adjudication Standards, second edition (Ukr.)

174: Approved CPE System (Ukr.)

175: Approved CPE System (Eng.)

176: COJ Decision on Approving the CPE System and Mandatory Court Performance Indicators (Court Performance Standards) (Eng.)

177: International Consortium for Court Excellence Newsletter of May 2015 with report about the approval of CPE System in Ukraine (Eng.)

178: Judicial Administration Program Capstone Proposals (Eng.)

179: Judicial Administration Program Capstone Proposals (Ukr.)

180: Report on Monitoring the Access to Justice for People with Disabilities (Ukr.)

181: Manual on Peaceful Assembly (Ukr.)


184: Analytical Report “Ukraine’s Court Performance Quality Election Disputes” (Ukr.)

185: Manual on “Courts and Community Communications” (Ukr.)
186: Brochure “Instruments of Civil Society Control from Monitoring Group “OZON” (Ukr.)

187: Methodological Materials for Master Classes “Civil Society Involvement in Lustration (Ukr.)

188: Social Ad about Lustration Process (Ukr.)

189: Leaflet “Lustration is for Everyone” (Ukr.)

190: Poster “Lustration is for Everyone” (Ukr.)


193: Leaflet “Purification of Government: Questions and Answers” (Ukr.)

194: Brochure “Purification of Government: Why It Is Needed” (Ukr.)

195: Poster “Before Making Revolution” (Ukr.)

196: Leaflet “Interim Special Commission of the Vetting of Judges of the General Courts” (Ukr.)

197: Video about the purpose, goals and objectives of the Interim Special Commission on Vetting of Judges of General Jurisdiction (Ukr.)

198: Video about the results of the Interim Special Commission on Vetting of Judges of General Jurisdiction activities (Ukr.)

199: Analysis of the Third Round of Anonymous Testing for Judicial Candidates (Ukr.)

200: Leaflet “Mediation Is an Alternative Way for Conflict Resolution” (Ukr.)

201: Brochure “Mediation as a Way of Alternative Dispute Resolution” (Ukr.)

202: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Kyiv Oblast (Vasylkiv City-Rayon Court of Kyiv Region, Brovary City-Rayon Court of Kyiv Region, Vyshgorod Rayon Court of Kyiv Region) (Ukr.)

203: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Rivne Oblast (Radivylivskyi Raion Court, Ostrozkyi Raion Court, Dubenskyi City Raion Court of Rivne region, the Appellate Court of Rivne Oblast) (Ukr.)
204: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Khmelnytsky Oblast (Netishynskyi City Court, Starokonstantunivskyi Raion Court, Shepetivskyi City Raion Court, Slavutskyi City Raion Court) (Ukr.)

205: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Rozhyshche Raion Court of Volyn Oblast, Khmelnytsky City Raion Court, Chernigiv Oblast Appellate Court and Voznesensk City Raion Court of Mykolaiv Oblast (Ukr.)

206: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Kharkiv Oblast (Ukr.)

207: Monitoring Report on Peaceful Assemblies Court Decisions (Ukr.)

**YEAR 5 (OCTOBER 2015 TO SEPTEMBER 2016)**

208: Quarterly Progress Report October to December 2015


210: Quarterly Progress Report April to June 2016

211: Expert Analysis of the HQC Rules of Procedure (Ukr.)

212: Concept of Optimizing the Infrastructure of Providing Support to the Judiciary and Implementing Procedural Tools of Electronic Justice (Ukr.)

213: Concept of Optimizing the Infrastructure of Providing Support to the Judiciary and Implementing Procedural Tools of Electronic Justice (Eng.)

214: Analytical Report on Results of the Survey of Court Staff (Ukr.)


216: Analysis of the Monitoring Results on Access to Courts and Court Services by Persons with Disabilities (Ukr.)

217: Analysis of the Monitoring Results on Access to Courts and Court Services by Persons with Disabilities (Eng.)

218: Analysis of the Practice of Custodial Measures Enforcement During the “Revolution of Dignity” Events (Ukr.)

219: Analysis of the Practice of Custodial Measures Enforcement During the “Revolution of Dignity” Events (Eng.)

221: Review of the Draft Procedure and Methodology of Regular-evaluation and Self-evaluation of a Judge and the Surveys for Regular Evaluations (Ukr.)

222: Review of the Draft Procedure and Methodology of Regular-Evaluation and Self-Evaluation of a Judge and the Questionnaires for Ukrainian Judges and Recommendations (Eng.)

223: Training materials prepared by the Ernst and Young Academy of Business for the professional development training program of the MOJ managers - Session 1 (Ukr.)

224: Brochure prepared by the Ukrainian Coalition for Legal Aid “Civilized Lustration” (Ukr.)

225: Radio ad prepared by the Center for Ukrainian Reforms Education about the MOJ services (Ukr.)

226: Video prepared by the Center for Ukrainian Reforms Education about the MOJ professional development training program (Ukr.)

227: Video prepared by the Center for Ukrainian Reforms Education about the MOJ professional development training program (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)


230: Curricula for Initial and Ongoing Training of Inspectors with the High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine. Practical Guide to Teaching a Course (Ukr.)

231: Presentation of SCU Justice and COJ Chair Valentyna Simonenko and FAIR Monitoring, Evaluation and Court Performance Specialist Tomas Verteletsksyy on “Court Performance Evaluation: Building Public Trust and Confidence in the Judiciary” delivered at the International Conference on Court Excellence in January 2016 in Singapore (Eng.)

232: Joint COJ and FAIR Practice Report “Court Performance Evaluation: Building Public Trust and Confidence in the Judiciary” for the International Conference on Court Excellence in January 2016 in Singapore (Eng.)

233: Updated teaching materials for the third round of the Judicial Administration Certificate Program (Ukr.)

234: Updated teaching materials for the third round of the Judicial Administration Certificate Program (Eng.)
235: Curricular on Improving Communication Skills of Court Staff in their Work with People with Disabilities (Ukr.)

236: Information booklet on All Ukrainian NGOs which represents people with disabilities (Ukr.)

237: Analytical Report on Interference with Judicial Independence during Euromaidan (Ukr.)


240: Analytical Report “Civil Society Monitoring of the Services Provided by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine” (Ukr)

241: Analysis on the Psychological Aspects and Aptitude of Professional Judges and Judicial Competencies. Draft Judge’s Professiogram (Ukr.)

242: Case Weighting Final Report (Ukr.)


244: Materials of Ukrainian Judicial Leadership Program, Washington, DC, April 20-30, 2016 (Eng.)

245: Judicial Administration Program Capstone Proposals (Eng.)

246: Judicial Administration Program Capstone Proposals (Ukr.)

247: Report with Recommendations for Publishing and Archiving Information on Bringing Judges to Disciplinary Liability by the HQC (Ukr.)

248: Report with Recommendations for Publishing and Archiving Information on Bringing Judges to Disciplinary Liability by the HQC (Eng.)

249: Leaflet “Costs and Expenses in a Civil Case” (Ukr.)

250: Leaflet “Costs and Expenses in an Administrative Case” (Ukr.)

251: Leaflet “Enforcement of Court Decisions in Civil Cases” (Ukr.)

Annex 252: Leaflet “How to Appeal a Court Decision in an Administrative Case” (Ukr.)

253: Leaflet “How to Appeal a Court Decision in a Civil Case” (Ukr.)

254: Leaflet “Enforcement of Court Decisions in Administrative Cases” (Ukr.)
255: Leaflet “How to Settle a Dispute Without Trial” (Ukr.)
256: Leaflet “How to File an Administrative Claim” (Ukr.)
257: Leaflet “Why Do I Need a Lawyer and Who Can Provide Legal Aid” (Ukr.)
258: Leaflet “How to File a Civil Case” (Ukr.)
259: Leaflet “What Is a Court Order” (Ukr.)
260: Leaflet “A Guide to the Judicial System of Ukraine” (Ukr.)
261: Leaflet “How to Complain about Misconduct of a Judge or Court Staff” (Ukr.)
262: Leaflet “Rules to Follow in Court Room” (Ukr.)
263: Leaflet “Rights of Suspects and Accused in Criminal Proceedings” (Ukr.)
264: Leaflet “What a Victim of Crime Needs to Know” (Ukr.)
265: Leaflet “What to Do If You Are Detained” (Ukr.)
266: Leaflet “How to Bring the Case Before the European Court of Human Rights” (Ukr.)
267: Leaflet “Challenging a Decision of the Bodies of Preliminary Investigation, Prosecution and Court” (Ukr.)
268: Manual “Implementation of Court Performance Evaluation System” (Ukr.)
269: Monitoring How Courts Implemented Recommendations Provided by Court Users in Sumy Region (Ukr.)
270: Monitoring How Courts Implemented Recommendations Provided by Court Users in Kharkiv Region (Ukr.)
271: Monitoring How Courts Implemented Recommendations Provided by Court Users in Cherkasy and Odesa Regions (Ukr.)
272: Monitoring How Courts Implemented Recommendations Provided by Court Users in Oblasts of Western Ukraine (Ukr.)
273: Commentary to the Code of Judicial Ethics (Ukr.)
274: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Appellate Court of Vinnytsya Oblast (Ukr.)
275: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Ternopil Oblast (Ukr.)
276: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Khmennytskyi Oblast (Ukr.)

277: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Chernihiv Oblast (Ukr.)

278: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Kherson Oblast and Commercial Court of Mykolaiv Oblast (Ukr.)

279: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Volyn Oblast (Ukr.)

280: Review of the Best Practice on Resolving Disputes Related to Gender Discrimination (Ukr.)

281: Report “Protection Against Gender Discrimination in the Ukrainian Courts” (Ukr.)

282: Monitoring of Court Performance and Decisions Related to Elections in Ukraine: Local Elections 2015 (Ukr.)

283: Report with Recommendations on the Draft Legal Education Reform Concept Paper (Ukr.)

284: Recommendations on Establishing a Law School Center for Testing Technologies (Ukr.)

285: Report on Abilities Testing Component of Independent Entrance Exam for Master’s Degree Programs in Law (Ukr.)

286: Report on Practices of Bar Associations in Advancing Legal Education (Eng.)

287: Report on Law School Accreditation and Rankings in the United States (Eng.)

288: Report on Rules of Procedure for Implementing Honor Codes in U.S. Law Schools (Eng.)

289: Report on Polygraph Exams: Reliability and Training (Eng.)

290: Report on Polygraph Exams: Reliability and Training (Ukr.)

291: Report on Legal Education Best Practices at Washington and Lee University School of Law (Eng.)


294: Video “Judicial Reform: Human Rights are the Highest Value” (Ukr.)

295: Video “Judicial reform: No Place for Bribes” (Ukr.)
296: Video “Judicial Reform: Qualifications Evaluation of Judges” (Ukr.)

297: Infographics “Independence and Accountability Standards for Judiciary” (Ukr.)


303: Recommendations and Proposals on Using the Test of General Competencies in Qualifications Evaluation of Judges and Judicial Candidates (Ukr.)


308: Recommendations on the Principles, Structure and Components of the High Council of Justice Rules of Procedure with Regard to Judicial Discipline Procedure (Eng.)


310: Business Processes Automation System for the High Qualifications Commission of Judges of Ukraine (software)
311: Tools to Identify Psychological Aspects of Professional Activity of the Judge and Judicial Competencies (Ukr.)

312: Curriculum on Rule of Law and Human Rights (Ukr.)

313: Curriculum on Judicial Opinion Writing (updated) (Ukr.)

314: Curriculum on Judicial Ethics (updated) (Ukr.)

315: Curriculum on Judicial Ethics On-line Course (Ukr.)

316: Curriculum on Human Resource Management (Ukr.)

317: Curriculum on Rules of Conduct for Court Staff (Ukr.)

318: Curriculum on Courts and Community Communications (updated) (Ukr.)

319: Curriculum on Court Administration On-line Course (Ukr.)

320: Curriculum on Strategic Planning (Ukr.)

321: Curriculum on Environmental Protection and Human Rights (Ukr.)

322: Curriculum on Implementation of Mediation (Ukr.)

323: Manual “To Be A Judge” (Ukr.)


325: Manual “Human Resource Management in Court” (Ukr.)

326: Manual “Conduct of Judicial Discipline Proceedings” (Ukr.)

327: Brochure “Mediation: Myth or Reality” (Ukr.)


329: Report with Recommendations on Launching Academic Program on Judicial Administration in Ukrainian Universities (Ukr.)

330: Report On Elaboration of the HCJ Communication Strategy 2016, Iryna Khymchak, local communication expert (Ukr.)

331: Courts and Media Manual for Journalists, 2016 (Ukr.)

332: High Council of Justice Communication Strategy, 2016 (Ukr.)
333: Brochure “Rules to Bring the Case before the European Court of Human Rights,” 2016 (Ukr.)
334: Brochure “Guide in Criminal Proceeding,” 2016 (Ukr.)
335: Brochure “Access to Court Decisions,” 2016 (Ukr.)
336: Brochure “How to Define a Competent Court,” 2016 (Ukr.)
337: Brochure “Guide in Civil Proceeding,” 2016 (Ukr.)
338: Brochure “Guide in Administrative Proceeding,” 2016 (Ukr.)
339: Brochure “You Plan to Bring a Case before the Court,” 2016 (Ukr.)
341: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Sumy Oblast (Ukr.)
342: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Cherkasy Oblast (Ukr.)
343: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast (Ukr.)
345: Citizen Report Card Methodology Survey: Courts of Chernivtsi Oblast (Ukr.)
346: Citizen Report Card Surveys Summary 2009-2016 (Ukr.)
347: Tool to Identify Gender Discrimination: Methodological Recommendations for Judges (Ukr.)
348: Analytical Report on Ensuring Transparency of Lustration Results through Improved Registry of Lustrated Public Officials (Ukr.)
349: Analytical Report on the Assessment of the Amendments to the Constitution Regarding Judiciary and New Status of the High Council of Justice (Eng.)
350: Training Materials for the Professional Development Training Program of the MOJ Managers - Session 2 (Ukr.)
353: Summary of the National Survey of Judges of Ukraine regarding the Judicial Reform in Ukraine (Eng.)

354: Summary of the National Survey of Judges of Ukraine regarding the Judicial Reform in Ukraine (Ukr.)

355: Results of the National Survey of Judges of Ukraine regarding the Judicial Reform in Ukraine and Implementation of Laws of Ukraine “On the Restoration of Trust in the Judiciary”, “On Purification of Government” and “On Ensuring the Right to Fair Trial” (Eng.)


358: Training materials for the Professional Development Training Program for the Ministry of Justice Managers_Session_3 (Ukr.)

359: Brochure “Lustrator’s Guide” (Ukr.)

360: Methodology of the Judges’ Performance Evaluation by Civic Organizations (Ukr.)


362: Calendars on lustration (Ukr.)

363: Stickers on lustration (Ukr.)

364: Report “Monitoring of Court Cases Related to Lustration and Vetting” (Ukr.)

365: Report “Results of Public Monitoring of Vetting of Judges who Handled Cases on Deprivation of Human Rights during Euromaidan” (Ukr.)

366: Radio ad about lustration # 1 (Ukr.)

367: Radio ad about lustration # 2 (Ukr.)

368: Radio ad about lustration # 3 (Ukr.)

369: Video “Lustration in Southern Region” (Ukr.)

370: Video “Role of Civil Society in Purification of Government” (Ukr.)
371: Video “Purification of Government - Public Awareness” (Ukr.)
372: Video “Purification of Government - Implications of Dismissal” (Ukr.)
373: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 1 (Ukr.)
374: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 2 (Ukr.)
375: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 3 (Ukr.)
376: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 4 (Ukr.)
377: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 5 (Ukr.)
378: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 6 (Ukr.)
379: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 7 (Ukr.)
380: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 8 (Ukr.)
381: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 9 (Ukr.)
382: TV program “Lustrate Cannot Keep It”, episode 10 (Ukr.)
383: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 1 (Ukr.)
384: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 2 (Ukr.)
385: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 3 (Ukr.)
386: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 4 (Ukr.)
387: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 5 (Ukr.)
388: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 6 (Ukr.)
389: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 7 (Ukr.)
390: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 8 (Ukr.)
391: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 9 (Ukr.)
392: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 10 (Ukr.)
393: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 11 (Ukr.)
394: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 12 (Ukr.)
395: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 13 (Ukr.)
396: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 14 (Ukr.)
397: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 15 (Ukr.)
398: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 16 (Ukr.)
399: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 17 (Ukr.)
400: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 18 (Ukr.)
401: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 19 (Ukr.)
402: TV program “E-Governance Simplifies Communication”, episode 20 (Ukr.)
403: Video instruction on using the Ministry of Justice’ electronic administrative services # 1 (Ukr.)
404: Video instruction on using the Ministry of Justice’ electronic administrative services # 2 (Ukr.)
405: Video instruction on using the Ministry of Justice’ electronic administrative services # 3 (Ukr.)
406: Video instruction on using the Ministry of Justice’ electronic administrative services # 4 (Ukr.)
407: Video instruction on using the Ministry of Justice’ electronic administrative services # 5 (Ukr.)
408: 12 webinars on using the Ministry of Justice’ electronic administrative services (Ukr.)
409: 4 articles on reforms in the Ministry of Justice administrative services providing (Ukr.)
410: Animation video “Apostille” (Ukr.)
411: Animation video “Decentralization” (Ukr.)
412: Animation video “Free Legal Aid” (Ukr.)
415: Summary of the National Public Opinion Survey on Democratic, Economic and Judicial Reforms, including Implementation of the Law on Purification of Government in Ukraine of 2016 (Eng.)

416: Summary of the National Public Opinion Survey on Democratic, Economic and Judicial Reforms, including Implementation of the Law on Purification of Government in Ukraine of 2016 (Ukr.)

417: FAIR Success Story Video “Court Administrator: Developing the Profession in Ukraine”, long version (Ukr.)

418: FAIR Success Story Video “Court Administrator: Developing the Profession in Ukraine”, long version (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)

419: FAIR Success Story Video “Court Administrator: Developing the Profession in Ukraine”, short version (Ukr.)

420: FAIR Success Story Video “Court Administrator: Developing the Profession in Ukraine”, short version (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)

421: FAIR Success Story Video “Courts and the Public: Civilized Engagement”, 6.5 min. (Ukr.)

422: FAIR Success Story Video “Courts and the Public: Civilized Engagement”, 6.5 min. (Ukr. with Eng. subtitles)

423: Video “The Supreme Court of Ukraine: “In the Name of Ukraine” (Ukr.)

424: Video “The Supreme Court of Ukraine: “In the Name of Ukraine” (Eng.)

425: Video “Justice for Everyone” on access of limited mobility groups to court (Ukr.)

426: Video on Zarichnyy Court of Sumy City: “Life of a Case in Court” (Ukr.)

427: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 1 (Ukr.)

428: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 2 (Ukr.)

429: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 3 (Ukr.)

430: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 4 (Ukr.)

431: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 5 (Ukr.)
432: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 6 (Ukr.)

433: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 7 (Ukr.)

434: TV program created in the framework of the Regional Center for Public-Courts Communication in Sumy, episode 8 (Ukr.)

435: Video on CRC in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast courts (Ukr.)