

# Annex 5. USAID/ENGAGE FY24 Strategy Rework



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**ENGAGE**  
Enhance Non-Governmental Actors  
and Grassroots Engagement



## ENGAGE STRATEGY REWORK: Support of Advocacy Focused Civil Society and Durable Civic Engagement

---

### I. Introduction and Background

This strategy rework is undertaken to formally update ENGAGE’s 2020 Sustainability Strategy for Advocacy focused CSOs.<sup>1</sup> The 2020 strategy informed the past four years of ENGAGE work with advocacy civil society focused organizations and civil society actions, serving as a road map for aspects of technical programming design, monitoring, and engagement efforts, particularly in relation to ENAGE Activity Objective 4 and parts of Objective 3.<sup>2</sup> With the context shift of Covid-19 and then Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, ENGAGE worked with its external sustainability expert to analyze different aspects of the context, needs, and donor efforts to inform ongoing program adaption. These commissioned analysis<sup>3</sup> and key ENGAGE programming documents from the past two fiscal years track the adaptations and recommendations made to inform the review and suggested revisions of the Sustainability Strategy Rework.

The review proceeds as follows. It undertakes an overview of the three broad objectives outlined in the 2020 Strategy and examines what has happened, what has been achieved and ongoing concerns. Based on this, it suggests a revised set of objectives and some considerations for strategy development during the near-term remaining time of ENGAGE FY25 programming; and finally, it concludes with a section that outlines mid-term considerations for beyond 2025 advocacy support programming.

### II. Review of 2020 Strategy Objectives

#### Objective One: Strengthen Advocacy CSOs’ financial readiness

doc

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes a broad group of organizations engaged in advocacy and watchdog efforts.

<sup>2</sup> Objective 3: Improve organizational capacity of partner CSOs. Objective 4: Develop local capacity to ensure long-term civic engagement in democratic reforms.

<sup>3</sup> These include the 2020 Advocacy CSO Sustainability Strategy Road Map: Next Steps in Fostering Greater Financial Sustainability in Ukraine; the 2021 Towards Self-Reliance of Civil Society Alignment Study; and the January 2023 Wartime Pivots and Adaptation: Pact USAID/ENGAGE Mapping of Support to and Needs of Advocacy-focused CSOs Donor Mapping of Wartime Needs Study. Most recently this also includes two technical briefs: Two Years On: How to tell Ukraine’s Story (more) Broadly, Differently, Strategically, March 2023 and Informal Civic Activism in Ukraine: How to Foster Further Civic Engagement, August 2024 Please see ENGAGE’s website for copies of these studies and the Resource Section at the end of the document for more information.

### What the Objective Aimed to Do

This Objective was primarily focused on improving Advocacy CSOs' ability to have financial sustainability support frameworks and plans in place that would provide them some level of organizational security and the space and confidence to further develop responsive advocacy focused programming. Hence as a key focus within larger capacity building and institutional efforts, ENGAGE programming recommendations focused a comprehensive know-how package of improving financial diversification and strategies of CSOs, encouraging experimentation and tapping into ways to work more regionally/locally and achieving local funding support through building greater legitimacy with constituencies.

### What Has Happened and Has Been Achieved

#### Upward Trajectory of Financial Diversification and Planning

ENGAGE programming demonstrates a focus on delivering technical assistance, providing mentoring and cross-learning programming to improve the financial readiness of both institutional and a broader set of CSOs engaged in advocacy efforts. The results of these efforts show an upward trajectory of CSO institutional and other partner learning and making strides towards financial sustainability and diversification. ULA topped the list of institutional partners in the FY23 Biannual, noting 93% of resources coming from other than ENGAGE. Most partners had diversified amongst not only other international donors, but domestic sources of funding including private donors, businesses, and citizens.

#### Domestic Resource Mobilization and Some Level of (Short-Term) Financial Stability

First with Covid-19 and then the 2022 full-scale invasion, partners showed a particular uptick in being able to organize actions and resourcing from local sources. And in general, the ability of CSOs to be relevant, available, and meeting the needs of the moment was widely recognized and commended. As noted in the January 2023 Donor Mapping of Wartime Needs Study roughly one year into the war, most advocacy partners (surveyed)<sup>4</sup> assessed their financial situations (at least short term) as stable partly due to the infusion of international donor funds due to the war and local fundraising in addition to their already somewhat diversified funding portfolios. Significant improvements in domestic resource mobilization given the war context are not expected.

#### General Upward Trajectory of Capacity Development Outcomes

ENGAGE also has put significant focus on a comprehensive capacity development support program, and this has resulted in improved Capacity Development (CD) for many of its institutional and advocacy partners. The initial strategy was designed with a view to furthering each organization's Journey to Self-Reliance (J2SR) as tracked by the Pact Organizational

---

<sup>4</sup> Per the study findings: Most CSO partners interviewed had some level of financial stability due to a combination of institutional funding, gaining new project specific funding during the war, or anticipated upcoming funding, and having cost extensions on pre-February 24 project funding. Some CSOs (that are ENGAGE institutional partners) became flush with funded projects from international donors after the second quarter of 2022. Hence many feel financially stable in the short term (approximately up to 6 months). A wider circle of CSOs that have cooperated with ENGAGE also appear to have short-term financial stability; 66% of CSO survey respondents described their current financial situation as 'somewhat stable.'

Performance Index (OPI). Due to the 2022 events and consultations with CSOs, this evolved into a more focused war-time context set of capacity development and technical support to foster resiliency.

The results of these efforts are generally positive if still partial. The 2024 Capacity Development Programming Self Evaluation Report suggests that overall institutional partners made clear capacity gains across categories in their 2017-2021 JRSR efforts, even as all organizations did not make similar progress and cross-cutting challenges remained. Further individual JRSR reports, and FY23 and FY24 workplans and biannual reports highlight the efforts and gains made through development of comprehensive tailored support, peer support, networking support<sup>5</sup> and building of thematic coalitions, and added offerings in such training as cyber security support. ENGAGE efforts to track intervention effects with the Capacity Solution Platform (CSP) and regular Collaborative Learning and Adaption (CLA) meetings highlight the onward progress while also noting the gaps.

## Ongoing Concerns

### Organizational Weakness to Adapt and Be Strategic, Long-term Funding Horizons

As highlighted in ENGAGE programming reports and in the Needs Study, pre-war weaknesses related to organizational capacities, a fundamental basis for financial diversification continue to be challenging, particularly long-term funding sources. Abilities to pivot, organize, adapt, and rethink strategies as the basis for then resourcing organizational efforts were partially hamstrung, due to the incredibly dynamic and tough context, but also due to the still uneven abilities of these CSOs to have in place monitoring and evaluation (MEL) that informs strategic thinking and contingencies that would make them truly financially and organizationally resilient. As well, not unsurprisingly given the war-time context, long-term funding sources (particularly any domestic options are of low probability) continue to be a source of uncertainty for these CSOs, and all have had challenges addressing and maintaining organizational health from mental health issues to staffing.

### Local and Underrepresented Advocacy CSOs

The share of CSOs that have most CD support has been those on the national level or specific regional localities. This is partially due to what is possible, but as highlighted in ENGAGE programming reports, there has not yet been sufficient capacity development work with organizations from Newly Liberated Areas (NLAs) or with underrepresented groups who should and could play important roles and as part of advocacy CSOs in the future of the country, including notably veterans' groups.

## **Objective Two:** Improve domestic funding enabling environment and donor coordination on advocacy organization sustainability

---

<sup>5</sup> Per the Process Tracing Report from September 2024, Networking support was identified as a factor in advocacy policy outcome efforts if not definitive contributing factor.

### What the Objective Aimed to Do

This objective was primarily focused on coordination and coherence amongst donors focused on advocacy CSOs both in their financial and technical support of these organizations and in common positions to advance the enabling environment for organizations, legally, economically, and politically.

### What Has Happened and Has Been Achieved

#### Donor Coordination Around Institutional and Programming Approaches

Donor coordination meetings amongst DG focused donors, and those particularly on supporting advocacy focused organizations continued apace with ENGAGE and USAID key actors amongst a small group of donors that met regularly. This included coordination on core and institutional grant efforts attempting to ensure more support of strategic programming vs. project-based approaches, and cross-learning. These efforts intensified with the full-scale invasion.

#### Shared Flexible and Contingency Funding Approach

With the full-scale invasion, ENGAGE and other donors expanded their understanding of financial sustainability/diversification to a resiliency approach; support usually attempted to cover the combination emergency assistance and organizational and specific project support to address needs as they arose. With this most donors took key decision towards flexibility of funding for all, including advocacy focused CSOs. As noted in the 2023 Donor Mapping of Wartime Needs Study, almost all donors overnight simplified administrative procedures for applying and reporting on funding, allowed funding to be used for emergency humanitarian efforts as needed at least in the first months of the full-scale invasion, and provided new sources of funding to keep organizations solvent when they needed it most. The ability to expand and be flexible particularly in relation to institutional sources of funding was cited by donors and CSOs alike as critical for their ability to pivot and take on relevant emergency programming and then to steadily 'return' to their core competency areas of advocacy related programming.

#### Specific Advocacy Support for CSO Involvement in Policy Discussions on Ukraine

Furthermore, the donor stance of support for advocacy CSOs to participate in international policy discussions to raise support for Ukraine and its post-war Recovery and Rebuilding scenarios at least notified all relevant international and domestic political actors that the CSO voice needs to be part of these important policy discussions.<sup>6</sup> Donors have also extensively supported funding for these CSOs to conduct advocacy within and to spread their messages outside of Ukraine. As part of this, CSOs' communication efforts to domestic and international publics to build solidarity particularly stand out as noted in the ENGAGE Technical Brief on StratComm, but even with all the success displayed with StratComm, there are further areas for finetuning and improving these efforts.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> This includes for example planning and supporting the Ukraine Recovery Conference (URC) side-event in London in 2023.

<sup>7</sup> See the StratComm technical brief for specific recommendations.

## Ongoing Concerns

### Partial Shift of Donors to Pre-war Approaches

The 2023 Wartime Mapping of Needs Study highlights the challenges of keeping donor stances coordinated and flexible as mid-term strategies given respective donor funding and reporting requirements. Ongoing flexible institutional funding to allow further adaption is cited by CSOs as necessary and this is recognized even as donors are shifting to a return to somewhat normal programming cycles.

### Advocacy CSOs as Sub-implementing Partners May Have Mixed Advocacy and Resiliency Outcomes

The earlier 2022 Alignment Study also highlights the complexities of achieving not only coordination, but coherence in providing support for financial and advocacy groups. The Alignment study suggests that USAID Implementing Partners (IPs) engaged with established (many core ENGAGE partners as well as a broader mid-level set of ENGAGE advocacy partners) only sometimes intentionally consider how their work as sub-implementers or sub-partners affects their overall organizational sustainability and ability to carry out their intended advocacy and watchdog efforts. It also noted that sustainability improvements are rarely tracked for these mid-level to established organizations. The CSOs in turn noted that IP partnership gave them visibility and access to further funding but were only sometimes able to successfully leverage the subcontract work in a manner that was complementary to advocacy programming due to the way the IP approached the policy advocacy issue.

And in relation to the enabling environment several ongoing concerns should be noted:

### Mixed Access to and Oversight of Government

When examining the general funding environment, we look a bit wider to consider the state of the CSO-government relations as well as CSOs and the public. Here the 2023 Wartime Mapping Study as well as Bi-annual political economic analysis suggest mixed trends. Martial law and some level of self-censorship have played a part in reduced scrutiny if not criticism of government and institutions at least early in the war. Heightened scrutiny has somewhat adjusted, but the access to information and decisions made under the martial law dictates have overall dampened civil society oversight if not engagement with government on all levels. There are clear points of civil society support and collaboration with government, particularly in provision of emergency services and supporting the larger analytical efforts needed for international advocacy and getting to the point of EU accession. Yet the conduciveness of the environment for CSO operation and advocacy and oversight of government is clearly changed in comparison to before 2022.

### Mixed Citizen Views of CSOs

According to the two most recent ENGAGE Civic Engagement Polls (CEP), public perception towards CSOs has also had a shift. While the public has increased their trust in CSOs and see them more able to hold government accountable, it also has lessened its opinion of their ability to solve key social certain issues; notably here citizens put more trust in informal civic actors, tend to be more involved in informal civic actions, and see them as less corrupt than formal CSOs. ENGAGE

efforts to work with CSOs to improve their communication with the public through story telling etc., as well as their added early 2024 focus on funding for four thematic areas<sup>8</sup> which are considered to be ‘imperative’ for Ukraine’s future and are geared towards building greater trust and support, but this is an ongoing process.

### **Objective Three: Identify possibilities for design of a joint advocacy fund mechanism**

#### **What the Objective Aimed to Do**

This objective was focused on conducting a consultation process to gauge interest amongst a core set of donors for the establishment of an Advocacy Legacy Fund in Ukraine with the intention of designing a beta model and having funds and basic governance structures in place to test the concept.

#### **What Has Happened**

##### **Diversion from Advocacy Fund Development**

USAID and a core set of donors were in discussions on the development of the Advocacy Legacy Fund during the fall of 2021<sup>9</sup> with plans to begin clear steps of development in 2022. However, Russia’s 2022 full-scale invasion instantaneously shifted donor focus to the provision of emergency and other funding for all CSOs, with significant resources to advocacy CSOs as part of this. Neither USAID nor other donors have re-opened planning discussions for such a Fund, partly given the need to assess what would be most appropriate with the changed context.

##### **Upswing in Informal Civic Actors**

A key component of the changed context is the significant upswing in informal civic actions including those that correspond to the advocacy efforts that this strategy and donors envisioned supporting and encouraging. As the most recent ENGAGE technical brief mapping informal civic actors (ICAs) notes, in some cases, particularly in regional and local settings the ICAs might be able to be more edgy and perform advocacy and watchdog roles more comprehensively than traditional advocacy CSOs.

#### **Ongoing Concerns**

##### **Unclear Best Ways to Support Informal Civic Actors**

However, as the ICA study further notes, ICAs are not fully considered by donors in relation to civil society support strategies in Ukraine. There is insufficient information, tracking, and understanding of ICAs, particularly some of the online informal and other social movements. Furthermore, donor support –whether financial or technical assistance– has not necessarily been

---

<sup>8</sup> These include: after EU membership aspirations, social cohesion, cultural heritage protection, and post-war reconstruction as crucial areas of supporting cross-cutting programming for CSOs.

<sup>9</sup> Key initial donors considering formal commitments included with key donors including USAID, the Government of Canada, the EU, and SIDA.

aligned with needs given the dearth of understanding of the ICAs and how best to support them in advocacy and civic activism.

### **III. What are key points of consideration for Strategy Rework and Revised Objectives in the Near Term (through FY25)**

A review of the Strategy Objectives, the progress made, the changed context, and the near-term perspective in each area suggests that a partial rework/update of Objectives is required to capture the dynamism in the sector and to position attention and resources to be forward looking. With this in mind, the following revised objectives and their key components are suggested.

#### *Revise Objective One ‘Strengthen Advocacy CSOs’ financial readiness’ to ‘Strength Advocacy CSOs Resiliency.’*

The past several years has demonstrated the importance of CSOs having a comprehensive approach to their programming and institutional strategies. It has also demonstrated the need to learn and be flexible as the context has changed while continuing to offer capacity development fundamentals. In effect, ENGAGE already expanded upon the original strategy objective to strengthen the resiliency of CSOs and this consequently needs be articulated in an updated Objective One. Hence the aim for the final year should be on encouraging and supporting efforts that continue to further build up resiliency of organizations to survive, thrive, and adapt as the dynamic context requires.

Along with the updated objective wording, the following areas of CD efforts should particularly be emphasized and tracked in relation to resiliency through the tailored capacity development services approach. These include:

- **Further emphasize strategic planning and adaption:** CSOs rightly are proud of their adaptive efforts but also recognize that the need to continue to learn and evolve. And whether in the form of mentoring, workshops or other learning venue, ENGAGE should continue to provide CSOs with the skill sets and peer support networking to support organizations to get to the next level of their resiliency. This includes a wide set of programming from strategic design support to foundational support in areas of mental health and coaching that build human resource resiliency.
- **Continue to emphasize and show the benefits of self-monitoring and evaluation:** War-time contexts have understandably pushed the priority away from lots of self-reflection and learning, but it is precisely these exercises which will give organizations the insights they need to stay relevant. As much as is useful, using peer models of MEL to allow advocates themselves to explain to their peers how they successfully tracked and informed their strategies and programming with evidence is one way to further encourage experimentation with MEL. Further using CLA sessions to discuss such efforts can be



another way to bolster attention to and interest in developing organization cultures and strategic programming based on MEL.

- Further emphasize strategic communications both as Strat Comm programming efforts and how CSOs tell their own story to increase trust in the actors and their efforts. As part of building resiliency, being trusted, needed, and respected all depends on how an organization communicates about itself and its issues. Technical approaches to enhance the message creation and amplification are skill areas that should continue to be offered. These should be grounded in providing CSOs skills for asking the strategic questions of what they are trying to achieve with the communication and with which audiences to enhance their onward ability to diagnose and design communication that is fit for purpose. It should also include a linking of the strategy of communication to that of domestic resource mobilization.
- Intensify NLA and Marginalized Advocacy CSOs or ICAs (see Objective 3) capacity development support. ENGAGE is intentionally focusing on engaging more with NLAs and veterans organizations as well as other marginalized groups with the view that these organization particularly should have a role and stake in their respective communities. A stronger emphasis on support for other regional and local CSOs as is possible would also be advised during the last year of ENGAGE programming.

**Objective Two:** *‘Improve domestic funding enabling environment and donor coordination on advocacy organization sustainability’* to be revised to: *‘Ensure continued coordination of flexible funding efforts and coordinated donor approach to CSO efforts on advocacy domestically and internationally.’*

The near to mid-term perspective for the enabling environment and for donor coordination is likely to continue to be dynamic with donors needing to be adaptive to the context. Hence the objective rework is suggested to follow on donor coordination/coherence and efforts to maintain and support CSOs in government engagement and accountability efforts. These include:

- Ensure continued donor institutional and flexible support to advocacy CSOs. Donor efforts to support a cohort of CSOs that are trying to advocate for citizens and hold all levels of government accountable need to continue with a view to coordination that encourages a comprehensive institutional support approach and as much as possible and one that continues to offer the flexibility the organizations need.
- Ensure further donor coordination and support of EU Accession process and coordinating of international policy actor efforts on Ukraine: Donors have been a key factor for CSOs’ access to international policy fora, and these efforts need to continue as policy discussions on reconstruction, recovery and Accession processes intensify.



- **Reiterate clear public stance on government responsibilities to engage and involve CSOs and ICAs.** Enabling environment dynamics between CSOs, ICAs and the government are unlikely to significantly shift while the war is ongoing. With a view to pushing back as is possible on martial law and concentration of power concerns, donors need to remind and update government actors and be visible in their calls for government openness to and engagement with civil society actors.
- **Consider and map how USAID IPs can further have coherence as well as coordination in their funding and programming support.** The 2021 Alignment study showed the promise of working on anti-corruption, rule of law and local governance programming with key established advocacy CSOs, but also raised some questions on the effects such mechanisms have on the organizations' own programming and resiliency. An update to the 2021 study with a quick mapping of modified indicators for resiliency may be useful for USAID to inform its considerations for near and mid-term programming.

**Objective Three:** *'Identify possibilities for design of a joint advocacy fund mechanism' to be revised to 'Identify Joint Approach to support Advocacy CSOs and ICAs'*

As a basis for thinking through further advocacy support efforts and the most relevant mechanisms, the following considerations are put forward for the near term.

- **Regroup core donor Fund group to map near-term funding prospectus for Advocacy CSOs.** While the core group of donors interested to develop an Advocacy Fund has moved on from considering specific Fund development at this time, they are all engaged in supporting Advocacy CSOs in some way and have their own plans in place for at least the next 12 or 18 months for further support. It would be useful to collect these data (and those of other relevant donors like IRF, USAID IPs, etc.) and compile them into a mapping that provides an updated overview of major Advocacy CSO support international donors in Ukraine, and from this point analyze the needs vs. gaps.
- **Carry out research on ICAs.** As prescribed in the technical brief on ICAs, further research is needed to better understand the forms and themes of focus of ICAs, including a focus on online informal movements. Better data on actual vibrancy of ICAs and their needs can then inform donor strategies for how to work better with ICAs.
- **Forge a Strategy to Engage with Advocacy CSOs and ICAs.** As prescribed in the most recent technical brief, it would be useful to have a broader discussion amongst core donors on how to better engage with ICAs. ICAs are known in Ukraine partly as a cyclical occurrence and the height of ICA efforts may already be reached given the war duration and lack of clear end in sight. At the same time, the real shift country wide on all levels of citizen engagement since February 2022 can and should be a source of citizen power and boon for recovery and reconstruction efforts if effective support mechanisms can be

commandeered. A key first step may be more detailed mapping of ICAs in the next fiscal year.

- **Bring together all the collaborative learning of ENGAGE ten years of support for advocacy CSOs into a best practice guide for onward strategic planning.** This strategy rework is a partial review of key strategic and research documents developed during the ENGAGE Activity. To build off this rework, ENGAGE may find it useful to bring together all of the CLA learning from programming into a guide that presents ENGAGE's own learning curve of support and engagement efforts that include both CSOs and ICAs.

#### **IV. For the Mid-Term Beyond 2025**

It is difficult to imagine the situation in Ukraine in September 2025. We hope for a situation of peace of rebuilding and renewal, but we must be ready for a situation similar to or even worse than the current war-time context. The unknowns are significant, but efforts to support advocacy CSOs and advocacy and civic oversight efforts clearly must continue as must the effort to support Ukraine as a country to survive and rebuild and achieve the democratic reforms it needs, and its people demand. It is also clear that domestic resource mobilization will not be a major contributor for such efforts for the foreseeable future. With this in mind and with the learning from the past years' efforts, we offer some suggestions for what factors to consider when crafting a mid-term strategy beyond FY2025 of support for advocacy CSOs and efforts in Ukraine.

First, assess clearly CSO Resiliency Levels that have been reached with a view to examining singularly and then together the relative capacity and resiliency of CSOs engaged in advocacy efforts. This may include 'top tier' established CSOs as well as less established organizations. It should include those that have institutional funding from USAID as well as the other core set of donors and USAID IPs. It should include local, regional as well as national levels. Emphasis should be a comprehensive and hopefully shared definition of resiliency as per the CSP of ENGAGE or other agreed upon criteria. This should include institutional capacities as well as financing plans, ability to domestically resource efforts etc.

Second based on a clear assessment of the Actual Resiliency Levels, widen the lens to include data that captures public and government perceptions of these CSOs' legitimacy and support. This will be important for considering whether specific programming or policy strategies to further encourage and educate all sides on the civil society role and their efforts may be needed. It will also be instrumental for understanding the possibilities of domestic resource mobilization in the mid-term and how to link international donor strategies to further encourage these.

Third, further widen the assessment to see how ICAs complement and can be included in support strategies. It is unclear the level of ICAs that might be present in a year's time, but it is likely per the recent history of Ukraine, that informal citizen movements and volunteerism will continue to be an area of energies that can and should be supported. Research on and experimental with more funding for ICAs during FY25 should inform this effort.

Fourth, based on this three-step assessment process and informed by the near-term funding prospectus recommended to be undertaken during FY25, consider which mechanisms of further support may be the most fit for purpose, whether a specific USAID IP focused on supporting advocacy and activism efforts, through another multiple IP thematic programming or the need still for a specific dedicated fund for advocacy, an attempt at a Advocacy Fund 2.0 if you like.

Fifth, hopefully with a clearer schedule for recovery and reconstruction and for EU Accession chapter progress, donors should consider how their programming includes cross-cutting support efforts to CSOs to thematically cover these areas and others that citizens care about from social cohesion to cultural heritage issues.

And finally, consider even without a singular funding mechanism how to align MEL efforts across USAID support efforts for advocacy and civic activism which can capture and bring together the multiple activity interventions effects. Having this 'sum of parts' approach will provide USAID with a clearer view of how their support efforts are progressing and how these contribute to USAID country level strategic objectives.

## Resources

ENGAGE Advocacy CSO Sustainability Strategy Road Map: Next Steps in Fostering Greater Financial Sustainability in Ukraine, February 2020

ENGAGE Annual Implementation Plan for Fiscal Year 2023 (Year 7) 1 October 2022 – 30 September 2023

ENGAGE Annual Implementation Plan for Fiscal Year 2024 (Year 8) 1 October 2023 – 30 September 2024

ENGAGE Annual Implementation Plan for Fiscal Year 2025 (Year 9) 1 October 2024 – 30 September 2025

ENGAGE Annual Performance Report 1 October 2022 – 30 September 2023

ENGAGE's Capacity Development Programming Self-Evaluation March 2024

ENGAGE Civic Engagement Polls, 2023 and 2024

ENGAGE Overview of the Organizational Journey to Self-Reliance Assessment of Key Partners of USAID/ENGAGE Activity: Analytical Report 2022

ENGAGE Semi-Annual Performance Report 1 October 2023 – 31 March 2024

ENGAGE Semi-Annual Performance Report 1 October 2022 – 31 March 2023

ENGAGE Technical Brief: Two Years On: How to tell Ukraine's Story (more) Broadly, Differently, Strategically, March 2023

ENGAGE Technical Brief: Informal Civic Activism in Ukraine: How to Foster Further Civic Engagement, August 2024

ENGAGE Towards Self-Reliance of Civil Society Alignment Study, October 2021 *and* Alignment Study PPT

Forward Together: ENGAGE's Strategic Imperatives for Ukraine in 2024, March 2024

Process Tracing Report Ukraine ENGAGE September 2024