

APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE

regarding the veto of the Law of Ukraine

“On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Regarding the Regulation of Issues Related to the Evacuation, Housing and Life Support of the Evacuated Population, and the Protection of Children Residing in Settlements Located in Areas of Active and Possibly Military (Combat) Operations”

Dear Mr. President!

On 10 February 2026, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine adopted in the second reading the Law of Ukraine “On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Regarding the Regulation of Issues Related to the Evacuation, Housing and Life Support of the Evacuated Population, and the Protection of Children Residing in Settlements Located in Areas of Active and Possibly Military (Combat) Operations” ([register](#) No. 4775-IX) (hereinafter – the Law). This legislative initiative aims to regulate the issue of mandatory evacuation from areas of active and possible combat operations. The Law introduces amendments, in particular, to the Family Code of Ukraine (hereinafter – the FC of Ukraine), the Civil Protection Code of Ukraine (hereinafter – the CPC of Ukraine), the Laws of Ukraine “On the Protection of Children” (hereinafter – Law of Ukraine No. 2402-III) and “On the Legal Regime of Martial Law”.

We, representatives of the Coalition of organisations dealing with the protection of the rights of victims of armed aggression against Ukraine, acknowledge the need for proper regulation of the evacuation of the population, particularly children, in the context of the ongoing armed aggression by the Russian Federation.

At the same time, a detailed analysis of the content of the Law and the transcripts of the discussion of the draft Law by the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Environmental Policy and Nature Management (hereinafter – the specialised committee) indicates that, if it comes into force, the Law will create conditions for the violation of human rights and international humanitarian law. The Law de facto introduces “forced” evacuation of the entire civilian population. The hypothetical benefits of introducing such a procedure are offset by the risks associated with all stages of the implementation of measures to force people to leave the combat zones. It is important to note that the Law links forced evacuation, among other things, to the needs of conducting military operations and constructing defensive structures, which creates the preconditions for the use of housing, land plots and other property of civilians. In the absence of a defined compensation procedure, this creates signs of hidden requisitioning of property without proper legal guarantees. At the same time, the Law contains provisions that create risks of disproportionate interference with the right to respect for private and family life, allow for the militarisation of the humanitarian evacuation procedure and introduce legal uncertainty regarding the grounds and procedure for its implementation.

Below are the key caveats, described problems and risks that the Law creates if signed by the President of Ukraine.

1. The Law creates conditions for unjustified separation of families. In accordance with the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949 and Additional Protocol I of 1977, the state has a duty to protect the civilian population and preserve family unity, and the displacement of civilians is permitted only as an exceptional security measure and with appropriate safeguards.

At the same time, the paragraphs of the new version of part six of Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine, introduced by the Law, stipulate that regional and Kyiv city military administrations “*may decide to carry out compulsory evacuation of children*” upon written proposal of the military command and with the approval of the coordination headquarters.

These provisions also stipulate that if parents or other legal representatives refuse to accompany the child, as recorded by the police, “*the forced evacuation of children to safe areas shall be carried out without the accompaniment of such persons*”. The Law further provides that “*the removal of a child from their parents shall be carried out without depriving them of their parental rights*”, and if within six months the parents or legal representatives have not applied for the return of the child, “*the guardianship and custody authority shall apply to the court with a claim for deprivation of their parental rights*”.

Thus, the legal structure of the Law effectively links refusal to evacuate or inability to accompany a child with the consequence of subsequent loss of parental rights.

At the same time, the current evacuation procedure, approved by Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 841 of 30 October 2013, established a different approach. According to paragraph 3 of the Procedure for conducting evacuations in the event of a threat or occurrence of emergencies: (1) the decision on the compulsory evacuation of children is made together with their parents, persons replacing them, or other legal representatives; (2) mandatory evacuation of children shall be carried out in the presence of one of the parents or a legal representative.

Therefore, the current regulation was based on the principle that the evacuation of children is a measure to protect the family, rather than a reason for its separation.

Instead, the law actually allows for the removal of a child from their parents due to the family living in a combat zone, which is not a failure to fulfil parental responsibilities. At the same time, the FC of Ukraine links the removal of a child to a direct threat to their life or health arising from the behaviour of their parents, rather than the family’s place of residence.

This approach contradicts Article 51 of the Constitution of Ukraine, according to which the family is under the protection of the state, as well as the principle of preserving family unity, provided for by international humanitarian law. In accordance with the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, the state is obliged to ensure the protection of children and to promote the preservation of family ties during the displacement of civilian populations.

Therefore, the forced evacuation of children should be carried out primarily as a family evacuation, rather than as a separate transfer of the child without their parents. The model introduced by the Law creates the risk of civil protection measures being used as a mechanism for interfering in family relations, which goes beyond the purpose of evacuation and does not

comply with the principle of proportionality of state interference in the right to family life. At the same time, the state is obliged to provide adequate guarantees to the evacuated population, eliminating the reasons for the reluctance to evacuate both families with children and the civilian population in general: lack of adequate housing, especially for families with children, limited ability to financially support the family, lack of care services in host communities, and others.

2. The law regulates disproportionate interference in the child's right to family upbringing and arbitrary interpretation of failure to ensure safe living conditions for the child as grounds for deprivation of parental rights. The law amends Article 164 of the FC of Ukraine, which, in particular, expands the grounds for deprivation of parental rights by introducing such grounds as evasion by parents (one of the parents) of their obligations to ensure safe living conditions for the child. At the same time, these amendments to Article 164 of the FC of Ukraine are not directly related to the refusal of parents (one of the parents) to accompany the child during their compulsory evacuation by force and failure to apply to the guardianship and custody authority with a request to return the child with documents confirming their place of residence in a community that is not subject to active hostilities or temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation.

Since the amended provision of Article 164 of the FC of Ukraine is not linked in any way to the specific context of the compulsory evacuation of a child by force, this could potentially lead to an arbitrarily broad interpretation and application of the provision in other situations not covered by the context of evacuation. This could lead to disproportionate interference in family life, unjustified deprivation of parental rights and, as a result, violation of the rights of children and parents, especially in conditions of martial law, systematic missile and drone strikes, terrorist acts, destruction of civilian infrastructure, and the absence or inaccessibility of specially equipped shelters. In such circumstances, risks related to residential safety may stem from objective factors of war rather than from the conduct of the parents.

3. The implementation of the Law will lead to the institutionalisation of children, which is not in line with the state policy of reforming the child care and support system and Ukraine's European integration commitments. The model of compulsory evacuation of children proposed by the Law will be implemented in the absence of a developed and sufficiently capable system of family and family-like forms of upbringing, capable of promptly ensuring the placement of children separated from their parents. The existing network of foster families, family-type children's homes, small group homes and foster carers will objectively be unable to meet the potential needs that may arise in the event of the application of mechanisms for the forced evacuation and removal of children in connection with forced evacuation, which was confirmed by a representative of the Ministry of Social Policy, Family and Unity of Ukraine at a meeting of the relevant committee on 15 October 2025 and is confirmed by [the transcript](#) of the meeting. Under such conditions, there is a real risk that children separated from their parents during forced evacuation will be temporarily or permanently placed in institutional facilities, which will effectively mean their institutionalisation. This approach contradicts the approved Strategy for Ensuring the Right of Every Child in Ukraine to Grow Up in a Family Environment

for 2024-2028 and the operational plan for its implementation for 2024-2026, which define the state's consistent course towards deinstitutionalisation and the development of alternative, family-based forms of upbringing. Furthermore, it is not in line with Ukraine's international obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. On Ukraine's path to European Union membership and the fulfilment of its obligations to bring national legislation closer to the EU acquis in the field of human rights and rights protection, the adoption of regulations that could effectively expand the practice of institutional placement of children creates a risk of deviating from the declared course of deinstitutionalisation and harmonisation of legislation with EU standards.

4. The law stipulates that the Military Law Enforcement Service of the Armed Forces of Ukraine will be involved in the evacuation, which is a violation of standards for the protection of civilians during armed conflict. Paragraph six of Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine, as amended, stipulates that:

Paragraph six of Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine, as amended, stipulates that:

*“Mandatory evacuation of all categories of the population on the grounds specified in paragraph eleven of this part shall be organised and carried out by the relevant regional and Kyiv city military administrations in conjunction with local authorities in the relevant territory, with the involvement (if necessary) **units of the Military Law Enforcement Service of the Armed Forces of Ukraine (hereinafter – the MLES AFU)** and the National Police of Ukraine”.*

In accordance with the Law of Ukraine “On Military Law Enforcement Service in the Armed Forces of Ukraine”, the MLES AFU is a military formation within the Armed Forces of Ukraine, whose activities are aimed at ensuring military discipline and law and order among military personnel. The powers of this service do not include law enforcement activities in relation to the civilian population.

The law does not establish criteria determining the “necessity” of involving the MLES AFU, does not define its powers in relation to civilians, and does not contain safeguards against the use of coercion.

Unlike the MLES AFU, the National Police of Ukraine ((hereinafter – the National Police) is a civilian law enforcement agency which, in accordance with its legal status, performs law enforcement functions in relation to the civilian population, and its representatives are not combatants within the meaning of international humanitarian law. That is why the involvement of the National Police in the evacuation is logical and legally justified, while the involvement of the Armed Forces of Ukraine creates additional risks for the civilian population.

Additional Protocol I to the 1977 Geneva Conventions enshrines the principle of distinction, according to which parties to an armed conflict are obliged to constantly distinguish between civilians and combatants and to direct their actions accordingly.

According to Part 2 of Article 52 of Additional Protocol I to the 1977 Geneva Conventions, attacks shall be strictly limited to targets. With regard to targets, military targets are defined as those which, by their nature, location, purpose or use make an effective contribution to

military operations and the complete or partial destruction, capture or neutralisation of which, under the circumstances prevailing at the time, offers a clear military advantage.

According to paragraph 11 of the Instructions on the implementation of international humanitarian law in the Armed Forces of Ukraine, approved by Order of the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine No. 164 of 23 March 2017, military facilities are: subdivisions of the armed forces and organised armed formations (personnel, weapons and military equipment), with the exception of medical formations, sanitary transport, religious personnel and their property.

Therefore, involving the MLES AFU in the evacuation of civilians, given the status of this service and the approaches of international humanitarian law, **may be regarded by the enemy as an effective contribution of civilians to military operations and, accordingly, recognition of them as a legitimate target.**

The involvement of the military in the evacuation could have been justified at the initial stage of the full-scale invasion, when sudden hostilities were taking place, state bodies were not yet functioning stably, and the law enforcement system was overloaded. However, in 2026, evacuation is already a systematic state policy implemented by military administrations, local authorities, the State Emergency Service, the National Police, and humanitarian organisations. The law should regulate the planning of evacuation measures, rather than exceptional crisis situations. **With well-established civilian evacuation mechanisms in place, the need to involve military units at the legislative level is unjustified.**

In addition, a significant portion of evacuations are actually carried out by humanitarian and volunteer organisations with international support.

Formalising the participation of military units in such activities **may affect their perception as humanitarian and, accordingly, creates the risk of reducing international humanitarian support and funding for evacuation programmes.** Even if, in practice, the norms of international humanitarian law are not always observed by the parties to the conflict, the legislative model itself, which combines military units and the evacuation of civilians, may have negative international consequences.

Thus, the relevant provision of the Law is inconsistent with the principle of distinction between civilians and military personnel enshrined in international humanitarian law and creates a risk of violating standards for the protection of civilians during armed conflict.

5. During mandatory evacuation, National Police officers will have the right to use coercive measures provided for by law. The law does not contain a definition of the concept of “coercion”, a description of the conditions and limits of its application, the range of subjects, procedural guarantees for persons to whom it applies, or mechanisms for judicial control and appeal.

At the same time, the legislation on the activities of the National Police contains a list of coercive measures that the police may use in the exercise of their powers. Thus, according to Article 42 of the Law of Ukraine “On the National Police”, the police are authorised to use coercive measures in the exercise of their powers, namely: physical force, special means and

firearms. Special coercive measures include, in particular, rubber and plastic batons, contact and remote-action stun guns, handcuffs, tear gas, service dogs, flashbang grenades, etc.

Thus, coercion is associated with the possibility of the authorised state body using physical force against a person. At the same time, by providing for the forced removal of a person, including a child, against their will, the will of their parents or legal representatives, and with the participation of police officers, the Law creates conditions and allows for the use of coercion without its normative definition, conditions of application, and procedural guarantees.

6. The law provides for the introduction of covert forced evacuation in the absence of legal certainty regarding the grounds, procedure and conditions for its implementation.

The law amended the content of part six of Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine, establishing that the mandatory evacuation of the population from settlements located in areas of active and possible military (combat) operations may be general or partial for certain categories of the population, in particular children, persons with disabilities and the elderly, by decision of the regional and Kyiv city military administrations.

At the same time, the current version of Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine already provides for types of evacuation and grounds for conducting it. Part six of this article establishes that mandatory evacuation is planned and carried out in the event of a threat, in particular, armed conflicts or emergencies at explosion and fire hazardous facilities. Part seven defines the grounds for general evacuation, and part eight defines the conduct of partial evacuation for vulnerable categories of the population. Thus, the Code distinguishes between types of evacuation according to the nature of the danger, the scale of the measures and the categories of persons.

The provisions introduced by the Law are not consistent with this framework.

In fact, the Law introduces new types of evacuation: general mandatory, partial mandatory, and mandatory evacuation to ensure that the defence forces can conduct military (combat) operations. However, these categories are not provided for in the CPC of Ukraine and mix different legal grounds for evacuation.

It is important to note that neither the current legislation nor the Law itself explicitly defines such evacuation as compulsory, and in accordance with Ukrainian legislation, compulsory evacuation may be refused. At the same time, the Law stipulates that in areas of active and possible military (combat) operations, from which mandatory evacuation is carried out, restrictions or prohibitions on freedom of movement are established.

Thus, the person is effectively deprived of the opportunity to remain in their place of residence/stay, and refusal to evacuate is combined with the imposition of restrictions on freedom of movement. In substance, this corresponds to the characteristics of coercion, even though the measure is not expressly designated as coercive in the legislation.

In particular, [the transcript](#) of the relevant committee meeting shows that the legislative framework actually provides for the use of coercion against the civilian population, but without directly using the term “forced evacuation”.

Thus, the Law in fact introduces compulsory evacuation without its normative definition and without establishing procedural guarantees, and also does not define the

criteria for establishing a ban or restriction on freedom of movement, which violates the principle of proportionality of state interference in human rights.

A new ground has been added to the list – evacuation “*in order to enable the defence forces to conduct military (combat) operations, including the construction of fortifications and engineering barriers*”. At the same time, the law does not specify whether such evacuation is a type of mandatory evacuation provided for by the Code or a separate legal regime.

This arrangement effectively links the evacuation of civilians with the needs of military operations and the construction of defensive structures, creating the conditions for the use of land, housing and other civilian property for military purposes. In legal terms, such actions may constitute requisitioning of property. According to Article 353 of the Civil Code of Ukraine, in conditions of martial law or a state of emergency, property may be forcibly expropriated from its owner only on the grounds and in the manner established by law, with subsequent full compensation for its value. At the same time, the Law does not define the grounds, criteria of necessity, decision-making procedures, damage assessment procedures, or compensation guarantees.

Therefore, the use of private property for defence or martial-law-related purposes without an established procedure and compensation guarantees creates a risk of concealed requisition and disproportionate interference with the right to property as guaranteed by Article 41 of the Constitution of Ukraine and Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

The decision-making process creates additional uncertainty.

The law stipulates that decisions on mandatory evacuation are made by military administrations at the suggestion of military command. However, the form of such a suggestion is not specified. By comparison, the same provisions on the compulsory evacuation of children explicitly require **a written proposal** from the military command and the approval of the coordination headquarters, which indicates different procedural standards for decisions of the same legal nature.

7. The Law introduces inconsistent amendments to existing normative legal acts. The amendments to Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine proposed by the Law are inconsistent with the provisions of the FC of Ukraine and the Law of Ukraine “On the Protection of Children”, which creates a systemic legal conflict.

In particular, amendments to Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine provide for:

the adoption by regional and Kyiv city military administrations, upon written proposal of the military command and in agreement with the coordination headquarters, of a decision on the compulsory evacuation of children residing in settlements located in areas of active and possible military (combat) operations;

the conduct of mandatory evacuation of children by coercive means accompanied by their parents, other family members or legal representatives, or, with their consent, without such accompaniment;

in the event of refusal of accompaniment, recorded by a police officer by means of video recording, the evacuation being carried out without accompaniment;
in the event of refusal of accompaniment during evacuation from territories of active hostilities – the removal of the child without deprivation of parental rights;
the right of parents or other legal representatives of the child to apply to the guardianship and custody authority with a request for the child’s return and to submit documents confirming their residence in a territory not classified as an area of active hostilities and/or temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation;
the power of the guardianship and custody authority to apply to a court seeking deprivation of parental rights if, within six months, the parents have not applied for the return of the child and have not confirmed residence in a safe territory.

At the same time, this structure raises a number of significant legal issues.

Firstly, the procedure and grounds for removing a child from their parents, returning them and terminating parental rights are regulated by the FC of Ukraine as a special legislative act in the field of family law. The inclusion of such norms in the CPC of Ukraine is conceptually incorrect and violates the requirements of the Law of Ukraine “On Lawmaking” and the principle of systematic legislation, as it changes the mechanism of family legal responsibility through an act of another branch of law.

Secondly, the law violates the child’s right to be heard by officials and the court when deciding on any issues concerning their life, as provided for in Article 171 of the FC of Ukraine. Forced evacuation, removal of a child without deprivation of parental rights, deprivation of parental rights, and transfer to other persons are decisions that directly affect the child’s family environment, place of residence, and lifestyle. The absence of a direct legislative requirement to ascertain and take into account the child’s opinion contradicts Article 171 of the FC of Ukraine and the principle of the best interests of the child enshrined in national and international law.

Thirdly, the provision on the possibility of depriving “other legal representatives” of parental rights is legally incorrect, since according to Article 164 of the FC of Ukraine, deprivation of parental rights can only apply to the mother or father of the child. Other legal representatives (guardians, custodians, etc.) do not have parental rights and therefore cannot be deprived of them.

Fourthly, the procedure for removing a child from their parents, as provided for in Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine, directly contradicts Article 170 of the FC of Ukraine, which establishes an exhaustive mechanism for removing a child from their parents without depriving them of their parental rights. According to part two of Article 170 of the FC of Ukraine, in exceptional cases, when there is an immediate threat to the life or health of a child, the guardianship and custody authority or the prosecutor may decide to immediately remove the child, with a mandatory appeal to the court within seven days. However, Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine provides for a different, separate mechanism for removal without complying with the judicial control procedure established by the FC of Ukraine.

Fifthly, a separate issue concerns the relationship between territories of active hostilities and territories of possible hostilities. The Law permits the declaration of forced evacuation of children in both territories of active and possible hostilities; however, it links the removal of a child from their parents exclusively to territories of active hostilities. At the same time, the legal consequences of refusing evacuation in areas of possible combat operations, the criteria for transitioning from evacuation to removal of the child, and the procedure that must precede such intervention in family relations are not defined. In the absence of clear rules, the same family circumstances may have different legal consequences depending on how the rules are applied. At the same time, the provision on the possibility of returning a child if it is confirmed that the parents live in an area that is not subject to active hostilities or temporarily occupied effectively allows a child to live in areas of possible combat operations, from which such a child may be forcibly evacuated, which creates internal inconsistency in the legislative logic and does not contain clear safety criteria.

In addition, the amendments to Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine contradict the amendments to Article 30-1 of the Law of Ukraine “On the Protection of Children”:

- The CPC of Ukraine permits the evacuation of children without accompaniment upon the consent of their legal representatives without specifying the form of such consent, whereas Law No. 2402-III requires that such consent be given in writing.

- Law No. 2402-III employs the concept of “transfer” of a child to the guardianship and custody authority for subsequent transfer to the other parent or a legal representative, whereas the CPC of Ukraine provides for “removal”, which has a different legal meaning and consequences.

- Law of Ukraine No. 2402-III provides for the application of appropriate measures for the “transfer” of a child to a guardianship and custody authority for further transfer to the other parent or legal representative of children from both active and potential combat zones, while the CPC of Ukraine differentiates the consequences depending on the category of territory (active or possible hostilities).

Thus, the proposed amendments create multiple conflicts between the CPC of Ukraine, the FC of Ukraine and Law of Ukraine No. 2402-III, violate the principle of consistency of legislation, legal certainty and predictability of legal consequences, and may lead to legal conflicts and arbitrary application of norms that directly interfere with family life and children’s rights.

8. The Law contains technical and legal deficiencies that pose risks for its practical application. In particular, it is proposed to supplement Article 86 of the CPC of Ukraine with a new part 11 on providing housing for evacuees, while the current version of this article contains only eight parts, which indicates a structural error and a lack of proper numbering logic. In addition, the issue of providing housing is already regulated by Articles 8, 84 and 86 of the CPC of Ukraine, and therefore the introduction of an additional provision creates a risk of duplication and conflicts. Moreover, the Law does not take into account the actual shortage of temporary

housing, thereby calling into question the practical feasibility of implementing such a provision. In such circumstances, the provision assumes a declaratory character, while the evacuation itself is effectively reduced to the mere removal of persons, often with the involvement of humanitarian organisations, without adequate provision of conditions for their subsequent residence.

A similar issue arises in respect of paragraph 4 of part 6 of Article 33 of the CPC of Ukraine. The law provides for its supplementation with paragraphs seven to twenty-two, while the current version of this paragraph actually contains only one paragraph, which makes such a “supplement” legally incorrect.

The law also does not comply with the Law of Ukraine “On the Basic Principles of Housing Policy” in terms of the terminology used. Amendments to Article 86 of the CPC of Ukraine propose adding a provision whereby persons evacuated from settlements located in areas of active and possible military (combat) operations are entitled to be provided with residential premises from the temporary housing stock. At the same time, the Law of Ukraine “On the Fundamental Principles of Housing Policy” employs the term “residential premises” as a core category of Ukrainian housing legislation. The use of a different term, “residential premises”, in the CPC of Ukraine creates terminological inconsistency, which, in turn, may lead to divergent interpretations of the scope of rights of evacuated persons.

The combination of these errors violates the principle of legal certainty and consistency of legislation as fundamental principles of law-making and components of the rule of law.

In conclusion, it should be noted once again that **the forced evacuation of civilians is an extreme measure and must be accompanied by appropriate safeguards**. The introduction of forced evacuation of both adults and children must be ensured by the availability of adequate conditions for the civilian population to live in host communities, such as access to housing, medical and social services, education, employment and others.

Therefore, although the new version of Article 86 of the CPC of Ukraine declares the right of evacuees to be provided with housing from the temporary housing stock, the Law does not define the minimum standards for such provision, the procedure for its provision, and the responsibility of the state in the event of their absence.

Taken together, these provisions indicate that the Law is inconsistent with the principle of legal certainty, the principle of proportionality of state interference in human rights, and guarantees for the protection of family life.

In this regard, we consider that the provisions of the Law contradict the norms of international humanitarian law, international human rights standards and the Constitution of Ukraine.

In view of the above and pursuant to Articles 94 and 106 of the Constitution of Ukraine, we respectfully request that the President of Ukraine exercise the right of veto in respect of the Law of Ukraine “On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Regarding the Regulation of Issues Related to the Evacuation, Housing and Life Support of the Evacuated Population, and the Protection of Children Residing in Settlements Located

in Areas of Active and Possibly Military (Combat) Operations” dated 10 February 2026 (reg. No. 4775-IX), and return it to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine for reconsideration.

The revision of the Law should be carried out with the mandatory involvement of humanitarian organisations directly involved in the evacuation of civilians, organisations working in the field of child rights protection, human rights organisations working to protect the rights of people affected by war, as well as experts in the field of international humanitarian law.

27 February 2026

NGO Crisis Insight

CF East SOS

CF Right to Protection

The Human Rights Centre ZMINA

NGO Donbas SOS

CF Stabilization Support Services

The Crimean Human Rights Group

NGO Civil holding GROUP OF INFLUENCE

NGO CrimeaSOS