



CENTRE OF EXPERTISE FOR GOOD GOVERNANCE

**Strasbourg, 19 April 2023
CEGG/PAD(2023)4**

**Opinion
on the local self-government part
of the draft Roadmap on Good Democratic Governance in Ukraine**

The present Opinion was prepared by the Centre of Expertise for Good Governance,
Department of Democracy and Governance,
Directorate General of Democracy and Human Dignity of the Council of Europe

Executive summary

The Government and the Parliament of Ukraine are currently engaged in a High-Level Dialogue with the Council of Europe aimed at improving the legal framework for multi-level governance in light of the European standards and the international best practice. As a result of this, after a series of consultations with national stakeholders, a draft Roadmap¹ was produced to guide the implementation of the next phase of the decentralisation reform in line with the agreements reached.

The document represents an important step forward in the process of public administration reform, by offering (i) a vision for a modern system of multi-level governance, including the elements which were still missing before the full-scale Russian invasion which started in February 2022; and (ii) a list of measures for transitioning back to civilian administration when the martial law is terminated. The draft Roadmap details as much as possible, under the current conditions, the sequence of steps to be taken in the short, medium and long term.

The document can receive a positive general assessment and the commitment of the national authorities of Ukraine to implement it seems to be strong. Improvements to the draft Roadmap can still be made in some respects, such as: a better connection with the recovery and reconstruction plans of the country, and the assistance available in the process, especially for the measures which require investments in administrative capacity; a basic assessment of the costs for the items where this is possible; more clarity about the timeline, including explicit indications where a certain step presupposes Constitutional amendments.

The final vision of the local self-government system must be reflected in the revised version of the Strategy of Public Administration Reform of Ukraine for 2022-2025, including the decisions made on the big policy issues still being discussed: what will be the future role of rayons, if they are to remain as a tier of elected self-government; how the administrative supervision will be performed (the “prefectural function”) and at what level; how can the inter-municipal co-operation be strengthened and metropolitan governance system developed; and if the boundaries between communities will be adjusted.

The transitional aspects are also important, in several respects. More clarity and predictability are needed (i.e. criteria) in the process of introducing and terminating military administrations (MAs) across the territory, especially at hromada level. The personnel working in local MAs need more predictability in terms of career prospects, remuneration and incompatibility rules. Several categories of communities must be created, also using transparent and objective criteria, to calibrate the development support offered to them with the degree of suffering and destruction which occurred in the area. The recovery and reconstruction effort, funded mainly by the international partners, should be transparent and include mechanisms of consultation with the local authorities and civil society.

¹ The draft Action plan for implementation of the final document ([Joint Declaration](#)) of the High-Level Dialogue “Good democratic governance in Ukraine: achievements, challenges and the way forward in post-war period”, held in Strasbourg in the Council of Europe Headquarters in November 2022 – referred to as a “Roadmap” by First Vice-Speaker of the Parliament Oleksandr KORNIENKO in his request letter (letter of 15 February 2023) and in the Joint Declaration – was prepared by the national partners-participants of the Dialogue.

I. Introduction

1. On 8-9 November 2022 a High-Level Dialogue “Good Democratic Governance in Ukraine: achievements, challenges and the way forward in post-war period” was held in Strasbourg in the Council of Europe Headquarters. The Dialogue, initiated upon the request of the Ukrainian Parliament, was organised and facilitated by the Council of Europe’s Directorate General of Democracy and Human Dignity in co-operation with the secretariats of the Venice Commission, the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe. The Ukrainian delegation, led by First Deputy Chairperson of the Parliament of Ukraine Mr Oleksandr KORNIENKO, was represented by members of the Parliament from different political parties (including Chairpersons of the specialised committee and subcommittees), senior officials (including Deputy Minister) from the Ministry of Territorial Development of Ukraine, representatives of the Central Electoral Commission (including its Chair) and of the four national associations of local authorities, including two mayors. After the two-day long meeting the Dialogue participants reached a broad agreement on further actions to improve legal framework on multi-level governance and elections in light of the European standards and good practice. Furthermore, the Ukrainian national partners have initiated preparation of an Action Plan to ensure implementation of the agreements reached during the Dialogue – the draft Roadmap.

2. The draft Roadmap highlights several directions of action (two of them concerning elections, which are beyond the scope of this opinion). The current report will focus on the following:

- transition from military administrations (MAs) under martial law to civil administrations,
- further reform of local self-government and local state administrations.

3. This opinion comes in response to a request by First Deputy Chairperson of the Parliament of Ukraine, Mr Oleksandr KORNIENKO, head of the Ukrainian delegation in the Dialogue mentioned above, of 15 February 2023. It was prepared for the Council of Europe by Directorate General of Democracy and Human Dignity – [Centre of Expertise for Good Governance](#) (henceforth “the Centre of Expertise”) based on contributions from its national consultant Ms Vira KOZINA and international consultant Mr Sorin IONIȚĂ within the framework of the Programme “Strengthening Good Democratic Governance and Resilience in Ukraine”. The document also takes into account findings of consultations with national stakeholders and expert community carried out in March 2023 (list attached).

4. In the last years, the Council of Europe, through its Centre of Expertise, prepared a large number of legal opinions and policy advice reports providing recommendations addressing the public administration in Ukraine, among them:

- on local self-government recovery from the consequences of the war ([CEGG/PAD\(2022\)3](#)),
- on amendments of the Constitution of Ukraine ([CEGGLEX\(2020\)2](#), [CELGR/PAD \(2013\)3](#)),

- on the draft law on local administrations ([CEGG/LEX\(2020\)5](#)) and on administrative supervision of local authorities' activities ([CEGGPAD\(2020\)2](#)),
- on local self-government service ([CEGG/LEX\(2022\)1](#), [CELGR/LEX 3/2012](#), [CELGR/LEX\(2016\)4rev](#) and [CELGR/LEX\(2018\)1](#)).

These reports remain relevant.

5. This Opinion examines the compliance of the current text of the draft Roadmap with the European Charter of Local Self-Government, and with other European standards such as the Recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe ([CM/Rec\(2022\)2](#) on democratic accountability of elected representatives and elected bodies at local and regional level, [CM/Rec\(2019\)3](#) on supervision of local authorities' activities and others), as well as the good practice of other Council of Europe member States.

II. Analysis

6. Ukraine is in the unique situation in Europe today to have to complete a successful process of decentralisation and territorial consolidation, which was initiated in 2014, under the severe circumstances of external aggression by the Russian Federation. It is generally recognised that these reforms were crucial for increasing the self-organisation capacity and resilience of local authorities, which were apparent during the long year of invasion. Several counter-offensives in the second part of 2022 led to the de-occupation of almost [1900 settlements](#); however the same number of settlements remain under occupation, which complicates the process of planning ahead.

7. At the same time, the war became one of attrition during the past months, with the aggressor targeting important economic assets and critical infrastructure. The GDP declined dramatically by [30.4% in 2022](#) according to government's estimates, which unavoidably affected the public revenues at central and local levels. Wide disparities have appeared across the territory, with inhabitants and businesses relocated to other places and massive destruction affecting regions in the North, East and South. It is estimated that about 8 million people fled abroad and 5.4 million are internally displaced (IDPs). A [survey carried out for UNHCR](#) found out, predictably, that older persons are the most likely to return when the situation will allow it, which means that the need for social assistance may go up when the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine is over and the territorial imbalance in terms of economic activity and communal needs will be perpetuated. In general, monitoring the location and situation of IDPs remains a challenge for authorities.

8. Under these difficult circumstances, it is praiseworthy that the Parliament of Ukraine initiated a High-Level Dialogue "Good Democratic Governance in Ukraine: achievements, challenges and the way forward in post-war period" with the Council of Europe's moderation in order to continue to enhance the quality of governance in the country. Among the goals are the fine-tuning of existing institutions and the finalisation of reforms in the area of local self-government and public administration. Temporary deviations from the principles of the European Charter of Local Self-Government are understandable in times of war, provided they

are proportional with the legitimate objectives pursued and a demonstrable intention and plans exist to return to local democratic procedures when conditions permit. The draft Roadmap stands as a proof that this is indeed the case, and the national authorities envisage to reverse of the re-centralisation they embarked upon when the full-scale aggression started in February 2022. There is no precedent to guide the dynamic return to a civilian regime as long as the fighting continues, so the legislator must demonstrate creativity and flexibility, but at the same time create predictability for people who work in sub-national governments (*hromada, rayon, oblast*), as well as in temporary MAs which combine the functionality of local state administrations and some powers of local self-government.

9. A detailed draft Roadmap was put forward for consultation with the partners, divided into five sections and phased out over the short, medium and long term. In November 2020 the Council of Europe provided its [legal opinion](#) to the text of the draft law, reg. No. 4298, adopted in the first reading in March 2021. However, in October 2021, the text of the draft law was revised substantially for the second reading without due consultations with stakeholders. Therefore, it is recommended to start a discussion among national stakeholders to reach agreement on fundamental issues. At the end of 2022 the local councils and regional administrations received a [tool to analyse](#) the impact of the war in their settlements and draft recovery plans, including socio-economic aspects. While activities like demining and restoring law and order agencies can proceed with speed, recovery and development plans are more difficult to produce locally without resources and methodological support.

10. The draft Roadmap under scrutiny deals with two important issues. First, the *transitional arrangements*: the Ukrainian legislation does not provide for clear and consistent procedures for returning to the normal legal regime of territorial governance and the restoration of public administration after termination of martial law. It is not clear in the existing norms how and in what order the MAs at regional and sub-regional levels will cede the power back to the respective civilian authorities, or when local MAs will be phased out. The Roadmap has the ambition to provide for such a framework, flexible enough to be applicable gradually, as the de-occupation moves forward, but more clarity is needed about the creation and termination of MAs in territories, depending on local conditions.

11. The second important priority of the draft Roadmap is to define a *model of local governance* for the country which represents the finalisation of the process started in 2014; this model will become fully functional a few years after termination of martial law, when its consequences would have been eradicated and the recovery will be in course. Important strategic decisions have to be made, however, in co-operation with and after consulting local stakeholders, about the main parameters of the system:

- structure and attributions of intermediary administrative tiers, including the number of these tiers (the current *oblasts* and *rayons*);
- the administrative supervisory function, by transforming the territorial state administrations into Prefecture-type of institutions: a decision is needed on whether they will they be introduced, and at what level;

- enhanced framework for inter-municipal co-operation (IMC) and introducing legal framework for metropolitan governance, as well as the resolution of the status of the capital city Kyiv;
- re-districting and changing the borders of some *hromadas*, *rayons* or *oblasts*, if and where this is necessary.

Some of these changes require constitutional amendments and therefore would only be possible after the martial law is terminated. This vision should be formalised in the new version of the *Strategy of Public Administration Reform of Ukraine for 2022-2025*, which is mentioned in the draft Roadmap.

12. The current version of the draft Roadmap covers most of these topics, but further improvements could be operated, especially by streamlining the proposed items and clarifying and consolidating some actions. For instance, two sections of the draft Roadmap could be created to replace the three existing now (numbers 1, 2 and 5), in order to make the intervention logic clearer:

- a) *Optimisation of Ukraine's local self-government system* based on a vision for the post-conflict democratic structures: finalising the reforms started in 2014 and introducing new elements, by providing answers to the strategic questions mentioned above in para 11. This will also include capacity-building to strengthen the public administration and public service at all levels.
- b) Issues related to the *temporary military administration and the transition to civilian administration* at local level: criteria for introducing and terminating MAs, sequencing of actions, adjustments to the temporary structures in place.

All the actions mentioned in the draft Roadmap fall under either (a) or (b), and some of the steps necessary for a successful transition to civilian administration must be taken with a clear vision of the (a) in mind. What is more, it would be good to have a clearer indication about what exactly short-, medium- and long-term means, at least for the actions where this is possible; an extra column could make this clear with the indication N/A where it is objectively difficult to determine a precise deadline. In the same vein, a special sub-section could be created for the changes which require amendments to the Constitution.

13. Passing legislation and adopting regulations is necessary for operating many of the changes intended, but often the process of implementing adopted laws can be a challenge, even in peaceful times. A whole list of items included in the draft Roadmap may benefit from advice and technical assistance, provided by national experts or international partners; others require significant investments in capacity building (for instance if the number of intermediary tiers is modified; or significant attributions are reassigned between them; or new bodies are created, such as Prefectures). It is advisable that this component of resources and institutional support be also included in the Roadmap, at least in tentative form and for the most important actions. Earmarking portions of the international assistance for the costly components of reforms in the

area of local self-government and public administration would help ensuring their sustainability.

14. Important details are urgent to specify in the section (b) of the draft Roadmap (see para 12) in case the invasion does not finish soon and some of the MAs need to function for a longer time. During the interviews with the Ukrainian stakeholders, several problems were identified:

- There are no clear criteria based on which the decision is made to introduce MAs in some settlements or territories. Some of the 140-odd MAs existing today at local level were created after the de-occupation or even later, after fighting stopped on the territory of the respective settlement; the opinion of the locally elected representatives is that the MAs should be terminated soon and the civilian bodies restored.
- MAs have in places a list of functions which is too broad (for instance economy, tourism etc) instead of being limited mainly to security-related ones. The most contested issue remains the full discretion the MAs have in deciding on matters of local budget.
- There is overlapping of attributions between MAs functioning at *oblast*, *rayon* and *hromada* levels; community representatives are inclined to regard at least the tier in the middle as rather redundant.
- The status of the personnel working in the MAs at *hromada* level is not clear, which creates problems of predictability in their career planning and work motivation, as well as different interpretations of the law across jurisdictions. Since most are public officials working temporarily in MAs, there are issues about the rules applicable in their case in respect to incompatibility in office, social protection provisions, eligibility for bonuses and other work-related incentives, or the possibility to return to their previous positions after the conflict.

15. When the martial law ends, the existing legal provisions specify a period of 30 days in which the civilian authorities are restored. This may work well in some places, but not in others, especially if the occupation was long. A gradual pace of the transition may be allowed in some communities, which in others may not be necessary. A transparent set of criteria is required to manage this territorial differentiation. Given that the main consequence of assigning the territory to a separate zone/category of a special legal regime is the determination of the extent of restrictions on the rights and freedoms of citizens the mechanism should be decided by the Verkhovna Rada. For example, below is a list of criteria and the resulting zoning options:

- Geographical location of the territory
- External security risks (intensity of military activity, risks of invasion)
- Internal security risks (criminality rate, only for certain types of crimes)
- Degree of destruction and damage (by category of objects)
- Degree of contamination with explosive objects and materials (including a separate assessment for land intended for economic activity)
- Period under occupation
- Realistic possibility to hold democratic elections

- Possibility of restoring the main public services (technical)
- Possibility of staffing the administration and the main public services (due to conditions for staff accommodation, mass migration of people)

A combination of such criteria can be used to determine the inclusion of a *hromada*, *rayon* or *oblast* into the appropriate zone during the recovery period. For example, if 50%+1 of the criteria are met, the competent authority should consider transferring such territory from category I to category II or vice versa.

Example of categories of territories in the transition phase

	Category I	Category II	Category III	Normal legal regime
<i>Type of temporary state body</i>	military administration (MA)	civil administration (CA)	CA	local state administration / Prefect
<i>Representative local governments</i>	temporarily do not exercise powers	temporarily do not exercise powers	exercise limited powers	exercise powers in the usual scope
<i>Executive local governments</i>	do not exercise powers or exercise powers under the authority of the MA	do not exercise powers or exercise powers under the authority of the CA	exercise authority under the co-ordination of the CA	exercise powers in the usual scope

16. At the beginning of 2023 the government created the *State Agency for Recovery and Development of Infrastructure of Ukraine* in order coordinate the external aid and manage more coherently the reconstruction effort. While the desire to centralise the coordination is understandable, the national stakeholders consulted expressed the valid view that a consultation mechanism should be created to ensure timely feedback from territory is given into the system. Of equal importance is to define strategic priority areas for the process of reconstruction – for instance, energy, environment and urban planning-housing policy. Two permanent working groups could be thus created under the Agency including sectoral experts, local representatives and ministerial decision-makers, to ensure the projects financed do not simply rebuild what existed in the past but make a breakthrough in terms of conception and technologies, fully aligned with the corresponding strategies of the European Union. All these elements should better be formalised in the revised version of the *Strategy for Regional Development 2021-2027*, which is mentioned in the draft Roadmap.

17. On resources needed for the functioning of local communities, the draft Roadmap correctly notes in its introduction that, as a result of the drop in GDP and public revenues, local budgets have become more dependent than before on transfers from the centre. Measures to remedy the situation are envisaged by revising the tax code, adjusting the share of personal income tax (PIT) assigned to local budgets, strengthening the mechanisms for vertical and horizontal equalisation and improving the incentives for local collection effort. However, more details are

needed in this area and a proper sequencing of the steps of reform over the short, medium and long term, according to the proposed structure of the Roadmap. It would be advisable to differentiate the actions according to the logic described in para 12: (a) what is the ideal and stable framework of local finance to be in place when all the consequences of the Russian war of aggression are eliminated; and (b) what are the temporary financial mechanisms created to mitigate the gaps in local finance and territorial imbalances until that moment is reached, given the diversity of situations and the severity of destruction in some places. The latter would also allow an estimate of the transition costs towards a stable system of decentralised local finance and will facilitate dialogue with international partners who can help on this subject. The eligibility criteria for temporary general financial assistance, as well as for recovery and development assistance, should be clear and transparent.

18. A system of public service should be envisaged, either unified or with separate rules for the central and local government, with better career progress norms and incentives, transparent and predictable pay scales matching the salary with the job responsibility and a system of flexible bonuses which is kept under control. Codes of ethics and rules of incompatibility must be reviewed, and all these reforms should be amply reflected in the *Strategy of Public Administration Reform of Ukraine for 2022-2025* and budgeted accordingly.

III. Conclusions and recommendations

19. The draft Roadmap is a good document which signals the commitment of the Ukrainian national authorities to reverse the unavoidable process of centralisation which occurred after February 2022 and to restore civilian local authorities when the conditions allow for it. It includes measures to strengthen the local financial autonomy, offer development support to territories which suffered disproportionately as a result of fighting and depopulation, and continue the process of administrative modernisation which was on course before the Russian full-scale invasion of 2022. The economic and social conditions in Ukraine are still very difficult, and therefore a certain flexibility in implementing reforms must be factored in. It is understood that many details about the options and stages of these reforms will be specified in the *Strategy of Public Administration Reform of Ukraine for 2022-2025*; at least for this document a more precise calendar of its adoption (or revision) is necessary.

20. The draft Roadmap could be simplified and its components streamlined following the logic presented in para 12: first outline a clear vision about basic elements of the local self-government system, which are fully in accordance with the European Charter of Local Self-Government and the *Strategy* mentioned in the previous paragraph; and in a separate section specify the transitional measures which are needed to implement the vision. It is advisable to have more specific deadlines for actions where this is possible, and give a sense of what short, medium and long term mean in practice. A new column with resources necessary for implementing the actions could be added, and cost estimates included wherever appropriate. This would be useful also for coordinating with the international partners who provide aid for

reforms. The steps that can be taken before – and after – the Constitution is amended, which means after the martial law is terminated, must be more clearly delineated.

21. There needs to be an agreement, after broad consultations and some feasibility assessments, about the major parameters of the local self-government system and public administration reform: if the current three-tier system is maintained (*oblasts, rayons, hromadas*) and if some of their boundaries will be redrawn; if the Prefectural system of administrative supervision will be introduced, at what level and how it could function; and how the inter-municipal co-operation and metropolitan governance framework will be improved. The changes to the tax code and the budget rules need also to be introduced after consultation with local stakeholders, to create a stable framework for local finance but also temporary mechanisms to compensate the communities which suffered disproportionately as a result of the Russian aggression. This part needs more details than currently available in the draft Roadmap.

22. Transitional arrangements should be legislated, starting with the regime of MAs (criteria for their introduction, and for termination) and how they can be gradually transformed into Prefecture-type authorities able to function under civilian rules, with narrow legal attributions. The piloting of this transition can start relatively soon in areas where the local authorities are able to exercise their normal powers and responsibilities. Second, the personnel working in MAs at *hromada* level must have their status clarified (remuneration, incompatibilities, future career). Third, clear regulations must be created to divide the territory of the country into categories, according to a clear set of criteria, so that the level of development support and, possibly, the length of MA regime, be both calibrated accordingly.

23. It would be also useful to update the language of the reform and to refer more to multi-level governance than to “territorial organisation of power”. The Roadmap and national legal framework could also benefit from using gender-sensitive language.

24. The recovery and reconstruction effort, funded mainly by the international partners, should be transparent and include mechanisms of consultation with local authorities and civil society. In areas of local competence (urban planning, housing policy) special working groups may be created to develop innovative programmes aligned with the latest European Union strategies and priorities.

Appendices

1. List of participants in the online consultations carried out.
2. Questions for discussion during the consultations carried out.

List of participants in the online consultations

Local authorities

- 1) Mr Vadym BOICHENKO, Mariupol City Mayor (Donetsk region)
- 2) Mr Oleksandr KORINNYI, Novoukrainka City Mayor (Kirovohrad region)
- 3) Mr Serhiy LOMAKO, Chernihiv City Mayor a.i. (Chernihiv region)
- 4) Mr Oleksandr NOVAK, Kharkiv City First Deputy Mayor (Kharkiv region)
- 5) Mr Oleksandr SIENKEVYCH, Mykolaiv City Mayor (Mykolaiv region)
- 6) Mr Veniamin SITOV, Merefa City Mayor (Kharkiv region)
- 7) Mr Liubomyr ZUBACH, Lviv City Deputy Mayor (Lviv region)

Regional military administrations

Chernivtsi

- 1) Ms Khrystyna MARCHUK, Deputy Director of Regional Development Division, Head of Local Self-Government and Tourism Development Department

Donetsk

- 2) Ms Natalia CHUKOVA, Head of Co-operation with Local Self-Government Department
- 3) Ms Yana POHREBNYAK, Head of Legal Department

Kherson

- 4) Mr Dmytro BUTRIY, First Deputy Head of Kherson Regional Military Administration
- 5) Ms Inna RODIONOVA, Head of Decentralisation and Community Development Division

Lviv

- 6) Mr Stepan KYIBIDA, Head of Economic Department

Military administrations at *hromada* level

- 1) Ms Maria CHERNENKO, Head of Rohan Settlement MA, Kharkiv region (elected Rohan Settlement Mayor)
- 2) Mr Serhiy DOBRYAK, Head of Pokrovsk City MA, Donetsk region (before the invasion of February 2022 – Deputy Head of Ocheretyne Settlement Military-Civilian Administration, Donetsk region)
- 3) Ms Yana LITVINOVA, Head of Starobilsk City MA, Luhansk region (elected Starobilsk City Mayor)
- 4) Ms Luidmyla MAKARENKO, Chief Executive of Chuhuiv City Council, Kharkiv region
- 5) Ms Halyna MINAYEVA, Head of Chuhuiv City MA, Kharkiv region (elected Chuhuiv City Mayor)
- 6) Ms Viktoria SLYZHUK, Chief Executive of Henichesk MA, Kherson region

Expert community

- 1) Mr Yury HANUSHCHAK
- 2) Mr Ihor KOLIUSHKO
- 3) Mr Myroslav KOSHELIUK
- 4) Ms Olena NYZHNYK
- 5) Mr Pavlo OSTAPENKO
- 6) Ms Valentyna POLTAVETS
- 7) Mr Serhiy SHEVEL
- 8) Mr Oleksandr SLOBOZHAN

Questions for discussion during the consultations carried out

- What were the main legal / institutional obstacles to your activity after 24 February 2022? What would be the first 3 things you would change immediately?

A. Transition from military to civilian administration

- In your opinion, is it necessary to establish special legal regimes to ensure transition of Ukraine from martial law to regular governance mode? If yes, should it be done simultaneously on the entire territory of Ukraine, or is it advisable to consider special regimes and conditions for individual territories (not only temporarily occupied, but also, for example, near the front line or according to other criteria)?
- If the answer above is yes, should the relevant rules be written in law, or other forms should be used (by-laws, decisions of the National Security Council or the President of Ukraine, etc.)?
- Are there problems in the division of powers between the state and local authorities now, under the martial law? A few examples if such problems exist.
- What should be the status of military administrations officials (at all levels): (i) now, under the martial law? (ii) after the conflict? Contractual and remuneration arrangements should also be considered.

B. How should the local self-government system look after the conflict.

- Is there a need to revise administrative and territorial set-up at local and sub-regional level, based on your experience before the invasion of February 2022? Do you think there were aspects of decentralisation which were incomplete?
- How about the experience of the past year of wartime? Do you consider that the territorial set-up should be changed in any substantive way when the conflict is over?
- Regions and districts: what role do the councils and state administrations play in public administration during the war and should role they play during the recovery period?
- Is it necessary to take into account the legislation in the field of regional policy, strategic planning and urban development in case Ukraine decides to improve the administrative and territorial set-up? In particular, the ranking of territories by functional types (territories for recovery, territories with special development conditions, regional growth poles, territories of sustainable development), as well as the need to develop comprehensive programmes of recovery and documentation on spatial development? Should this work precede or be taken into account during the revision of the administrative and territorial set-up?
- How about the supervision of local authorities activities? Is it possible to consider the gradual transformation of the local state administrations into Prefecture-type

authorities (French-style legality supervision, with some emergency powers)? And if so, at what level this function should be performed (*hromada / rayon / oblast*)?

- Related to that and more broadly, what approaches to ensuring legality of local authorities activities do you see appropriate, taking into account the experience of martial law:
 - Supervision of local authorities by the state is not required at all/Supervision should be carried out only for certain categories of acts of local authorities, and not activities of local authorities as a whole/Supervision should be stricter and cover not only acts, but also certain types of activities/other;
 - The subject of supervision should cover acts (areas) directly defined by law/with or without the application of risk-oriented approaches/all acts (areas)/other;
 - Should there be any central executive authorities involved in this activity? If yes, what and to what extent: formation and implementation of state policy/consolidation of practice and methodological support/ supervision of some categories of local authorities /other?