

Strengthening the Role of the Interagency Coordination Commission for Regional Development (MKK)

Working title: "Strengthening the Role of the MKK as a Mechanism for Coordinating Regional Development Policy and Bringing Ukraine Closer to EU Cohesion Policy"

1. Type of Policy Paper

It is proposed to prepare a problem-solving policy paper / policy recommendation – an analytical document focused on solving a specific institutional problem. The document should define the problem, analyse stakeholders, compare policy options, justify the recommended model, and set out an implementation plan and a monitoring and evaluation system.

Key question: what should the institutional model of the MKK be, who should change what, within what timeframe, with what resources, and against which indicators should performance be assessed?

2. Introduction: Target Audience and Purpose

Effective coordination of regional policy is a prerequisite for aligning the decisions of central executive authorities with the needs of regions and territorial communities (hromadas), especially in the context of war, recovery and European integration. Regional development is cross-sectoral by nature and requires a permanent mechanism for interaction between bodies whose decisions have a territorial impact.

One of the coordination mechanisms provided for by law is the Interagency Coordination Commission for Regional Development (hereinafter – the MKK, from the Ukrainian *Mizhvidomcha koordynatsiina komisiia*). At the same time, the MKK's broad formal mandate requires adequate procedures, organisational support, representation of the regional and local levels, and a mechanism for tracking the implementation of the recommendations it produces.

European integration makes this task more pressing, since Chapter 22 "Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instruments" envisages developing institutional capacity for regional policy coordination, partnership and multi-level governance. For the purposes of this paper, Chapter 22 is treated as the context for strengthening coordination capacity, rather than as a separate subject for assessing the MKK's performance.

The purpose of the study is to determine what an effective operating model for the MKK should be – one capable of ensuring systematic interagency coordination, involvement of the regional and local levels, and effective formulation of state regional policy in the context of Ukraine's preparation for implementing EU cohesion policy.

The target audience of the study is the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the line ministry responsible for regional development, MKK members and its secretariat, central and regional executive authorities, local self-government bodies and their associations.

3. Policy Analysis and Current Situation

3.1. Role, legal status and powers of the MKK

Legal basis. The MKK was established under Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy". Its status, composition, tasks and procedures are defined by Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 714 of 16 September 2015 "On the Establishment of the Interagency Coordination Commission for Regional Development" (as amended). The MKK is a temporary consultative and advisory body of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine.

The main tasks of the MKK under its Regulation are:

- coordinating the actions of executive authorities in formulating and implementing state regional policy, with the involvement of local self-government bodies;
- preparing proposals on the formulation and implementation of state regional policy and on ways to resolve problematic issues;
- helping to improve the effectiveness of executive authorities in the field of state regional policy;
- preparing proposals on the interlinkage and consistency of long-term strategies, plans and development programmes at the national, regional and local levels;
- promoting the use of positive experience of other countries in improving the regulatory framework for state regional policy.

To perform these tasks, the Regulation provides, in particular, for analysing the implementation of regional development strategies and programmes, studying the results of public authorities' work in regional policy, analysing problems in its implementation, taking part in drafting legal acts within its competence, addressing issues of combining planning and financing instruments, and preparing relevant proposals.

Organisational aspect. The current model provides for collegial work of the MKK, the possibility of involving regional-level representatives and experts, and setting up working groups to address specific issues. Organisational support is provided within the governmental and departmental system defined by the Regulation and the Commission's composition.

Practical activity. In 2026, after a long break, MKK meetings were held on 2 February and 8 June. The resumption of meetings in itself indicates that the Commission has returned to practical work; however, to assess its effectiveness, it is necessary to track separately the regularity of meetings, the quality of preparation of agenda items, the participation of the regional and local levels, the implementation of recommendations and the preservation of institutional memory.

3.2. *The MKK's link with the regional policy system*

For the purposes of this policy paper, the regional development system is considered only insofar as it is directly related to the MKK's mandate. Decisions of central executive authorities in the economy, infrastructure, energy, education, social policy and other sectors may have a territorial impact and therefore require a mechanism for interagency alignment and for taking into account the positions of the regional and local levels.

The MKK has a regulatory mandate to coordinate the formulation and implementation of state regional policy, align strategic approaches and prepare proposals on combining planning and financing. Accordingly, the subject of further analysis is not the entire regional development system, but the MKK's capacity to exercise precisely these defined powers through sustainable procedures, adequate representation, organisational support and monitoring of recommendations.

4. MKK Stakeholders

For the purposes of this analytical note, stakeholders include only those actors that directly take part in the MKK's work, influence the implementation of its recommendations, or represent levels of governance whose involvement is directly linked to the Commission's mandate.

Stakeholder	Role in relation to the MKK	Level of influence
Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (CMU; Ukr. KMU) / Secretariat of the CMU	Government steering, organisational coordination, processing of MKK decisions and proposals	Very high

Stakeholder	Role in relation to the MKK	Level of influence
Line ministry responsible for regional development	Formulating state regional policy, preparing materials and providing organisational support for the MKK	Very high
Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Economy and other central executive authorities (CEAs; Ukr. TsOVV)	Participation in interagency alignment of issues within their competence and consideration of MKK recommendations	High
Oblast and Kyiv City State (Military) Administrations (OSAs/OMAs; Ukr. ODA/OVA)	Representing regional needs, participating in preparing and implementing decisions within their competence	High
Oblast councils and national associations of local self-government bodies (LSGBs; Ukr. OMS)	Representing the interests of regional and local self-government and participating in consultative mechanisms	Medium / high
Regional development agencies (RDAs; Ukr. ARR), expert and analytical community	Expert and analytical support and participation in thematic working formats	Medium
DG REGIO and international partners	Expert support, exchange of practices and the context of Ukraine's preparation for EU cohesion policy; not participants in national MKK decision-making	External influence

5. Problem Definition and Decomposition

The core problem is not the absence of a formal MKK mandate, but insufficient institutional and procedural capacity to ensure its sustained implementation as a mechanism for interagency and multi-level coordination of state regional policy.

5.1. Causes

- no legally established minimum frequency of meetings or permanent working cycle between them;
- insufficiently formalised representation of the regional and local levels in the MKK's permanent working format;
- no separately designated permanent expert and analytical mechanism responsible for preparing agenda items, maintaining institutional memory and tracking recommendations;
- no standardised procedure for preparing materials, recording those responsible for implementing recommendations, and deadlines for reporting on their consideration;
- insufficient publicity of minutes, recommendations and information on their implementation status;
- a broad mandate without sufficient prioritisation of issues of an interagency and territorial nature.

5.2. Consequences

- irregular and ad hoc coordination between meetings;
- risk that the positions of the regional and local levels are not sufficiently taken into account when MKK issues are addressed;
- difficulty in tracking whether MKK recommendations have been considered by the relevant bodies and with what outcome;

- loss of institutional memory and repeated handling of issues after long breaks in work;
- limited ability to assess the MKK's effectiveness on the basis of data rather than merely the fact that meetings were held.

6. European and International Experience

The comparative analysis is used not to transplant foreign models directly, but to test specific institutional elements: the legal status of the coordination mechanism, its tasks, representation, regularity of work, organisational support, and the link between the political and professional levels.

6.1. Poland

The Joint Commission of the Government and Territorial Self-Government (Komisja Wspólna Rządu i Samorządu Terytorialnego, KWRiST) operates on the basis of the Law of 6 May 2005 on the Joint Commission of the Government and Territorial Self-Government and on the representatives of the Republic of Poland in the EU Committee of the Regions. The Law defines the Commission as a forum for developing a common position of the Government and territorial self-government and explicitly sets out its tasks and the procedure for its formation.

The tasks of KWRiST include, in particular, developing a common position on priorities concerning local and regional self-government, assessing the legal and financial conditions for its functioning, analysing draft acts and government documents and issuing opinions on them. The Commission consists of a government side and a self-government side; issues are also addressed in problem groups with the involvement of experts. Organisational liaison and servicing of the Commission are provided within the system of the Ministry of the Interior and Administration of Poland.

Elements relevant to Ukraine: a legally defined scope of work; formalised representation of the local self-government side; working groups; regular professional handling of issues before they are brought to the political level.

6.2. Finland

The Finnish model is based not on a single counterpart to the MKK, but on a legally regulated system of multi-level coordination. Act 756/2021 on Regional Development and the Implementation of EU Regional and Structural Policy defines regional development as a cross-sectoral and multi-level activity of the state, regional councils, municipalities and other actors. At national level, the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment coordinates the planning, implementation and monitoring of regional development; regional councils have statutory planning, coordination and monitoring functions.

Elements relevant to Ukraine: a clear division of roles between the national and regional levels; a legally defined coordination function; integration of monitoring into the regional development system. For the MKK, this is an argument for clearly defining interaction procedures, but not a reason to give it budgetary or executive powers.

6.3. Sweden

The Forum for Sustainable Regional Development (Forum för hållbar regional utveckling) is a government platform for dialogue and cooperation on regional development between the Government, the regions, Sveriges Kommuner och Regioner (SKR) and relevant state authorities. The Forum works at two levels – political and officials' – and holds seven meetings a year: four political and three professional.

The Forum's secretariat functions are performed by Tillväxtverket. It is a state agency whose activities are governed by the government ordinance Förordning (2009:145) med instruktion

för Tillväxtverket; its main tasks include promoting sustainable regional development and implementing part of EU cohesion policy. As the Forum's secretariat, the agency prepares materials, coordinates meetings and interaction between the Forum, working groups, regions and state authorities, and disseminates the results of the work.

Elements relevant to Ukraine: separation of the political and professional levels without creating an excessively large single body; permanent organisational support; defined frequency; work between meetings.

6.4. Comparative conclusion

Criterion	Ukraine / MKK	Poland	Finland	Sweden
Legal basis	Law + CMU Resolution No. 714	Dedicated law of 2005	Act 756/2021, system of bodies	Government Forum; Tillväxtverket – agency under Ordinance 2009:145
Representation of the territorial level	Provided for, but needs a sustainable procedure	Formalised self-government side	Regional councils as statutory participants	All regions via political and professional formats
Work between meetings	Needs strengthening	Problem groups	Institutional coordination through designated bodies	Tillväxtverket secretariat and working formats
Relevant conclusion	Regularity, clear procedures, representation, M&E	Formalisation of sides and working groups	Clear division of roles	Two levels + professional secretariat

7. Policy Options

The options are formulated as specific regulatory and procedural changes and do not envisage granting the MKK powers that belong to other bodies, in particular in the budget process or in taking investment decisions.

Option 0. Status Quo (baseline)

Retaining the current operating model of the MKK under CMU Resolution No. 714 of 16 September 2015 without any regulatory or procedural changes.

- The MKK continues to operate as a temporary consultative and advisory body of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine.
- The frequency of meetings is not specifically strengthened; working groups are set up as needed.
- Organisational support is provided under the current model.

Advantages:

- no need for regulatory changes or additional organisational costs.

Disadvantages:

- the risk of irregular work persists;
- participation of the regional and local levels remains insufficiently formalised;
- no standardised mechanism for tracking recommendations and preserving institutional memory.

Option 1. Procedural and organisational strengthening of the MKK

Amend the Regulation on the MKK approved by CMU Resolution No. 714, without changing the Commission's legal status.

- establish a minimum frequency of meetings – at least once a quarter;
- define a permanent core membership of the MKK consisting of CEAs and representatives of national associations of LSGBs, while involving representatives of OMAs, oblast councils, RDAs and experts on a rotating and thematic basis, so as to avoid excessive expansion of the membership;
- explicitly designate a structural unit of the line ministry responsible for ongoing organisational and analytical support of the MKK, without creating a new body;
- establish permanent thematic working groups with the possibility of involving the regional, local and expert levels;
- set a standard for preparing meeting materials and recording recommendations, specifying the responsible body and the deadline for reporting on their consideration;
- introduce a public register of minutes and of the status of consideration of MKK recommendations, taking into account martial-law restrictions and information protection.

Advantages:

- can be implemented by a decision of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine without a legislative change to the MKK's status;
- greater regularity, manageability and institutional memory;
- realistic representation of the regional and local levels without creating a membership of 125+ people;
- the current distribution of powers is preserved.

Disadvantages:

- MKK recommendations remain consultative; the outcome depends on discipline in following procedures and the quality of organisational support.

Option 2. Legislative enshrinement of a permanent coordination function

Amend Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy" to clarify the MKK's permanent coordination function, the principles of representation of the regional and local levels, and the obligation to define a procedure for considering and documenting its recommendations; subsequently bring CMU Resolution No. 714 into line with the law.

- enshrine in law the principle of regular interagency and multi-level coordination through the MKK;
- provide that draft national strategic documents and cross-sectoral decisions directly falling within the scope of state regional policy may be submitted to the MKK for consultative review in the manner established by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine;
- enshrine in law the principle of participation of local self-government representatives without turning the MKK into a body with executive or budgetary powers;
- establish an obligation to monitor the outcomes of consideration of MKK recommendations.

Advantages:

- greater stability of the institutional model and less dependence of key procedures on changes in secondary legislation.

Disadvantages:

- requires legislative changes and a longer implementation period; risk of over-formalising a consultative mechanism.

8. Assessment of Options and Choice of Solution

8.1. Criteria for comparative analysis

1. Effectiveness – the ability to eliminate the identified procedural and institutional causes of the MKK's problem.
2. Legal feasibility – the scope of regulatory changes required and consistency with the current distribution of powers.
3. Administrative feasibility – manageability of the membership, burden on organisational support, and realism of procedures.
4. Multi-level governance and partnership – the ability to ensure systematic participation of the regional and local levels within the MKK's mandate.
5. Resource availability – the need for additional human and financial resources.

8.2. Policy options assessment matrix

Criterion	Option 0	Option 1	Option 2
Effectiveness	1	4	5
Legal feasibility	5	5	2
Administrative feasibility	4	4	3
Multi-level governance and partnership	2	4	5
Resource availability	5	4	3
Total score	17	21	18

8.3. Rationale for the choice of solution

Option 1 is recommended – procedural and organisational strengthening of the MKK through amendments to CMU Resolution No. 714. It directly addresses the identified causes of the problem, does not change the consultative and advisory nature of the Commission, does not interfere with the budgetary or investment powers of other bodies, and can be implemented through government regulation.

Option 2 should be considered as a possible next stage only after the results of Option 1 have been assessed. If, during the first full year of regular work, it is found that secondary regulation is insufficient to ensure the sustainability of the coordination mechanism, targeted amendments to Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy" may be prepared.

Option 0 does not address the causes related to regularity, representation, institutional memory and tracking of recommendations. At the same time, its shortcomings are not directly linked to non-fulfilment of Chapter 22 or to the budget process, since these issues fall outside the MKK's exclusive competence.

9. Recommended Model

The recommended model corresponds to Option 1 and involves strengthening the existing MKK without changing its legal status and without creating an excessively large permanent membership.

- **Regularity:** meetings at least once a quarter, with approval of an indicative annual work plan.
- **Manageable membership:** a permanent core of representatives of key CEAs and national associations of LSGBs; OMAs, oblast councils, RDAs and experts are involved on a rotating or thematic basis.
- **Organisational support:** permanent secretariat and analytical support functions are assigned to a designated structural unit of the line ministry and responsible officials.
- **Work between meetings:** permanent or temporary thematic working groups prepare agenda items, analysis and draft recommendations.
- **Tracking recommendations:** each recommendation has a responsible body, a deadline for reporting on its consideration and a recorded status.
- **Transparency:** publication of agendas, minutes and aggregated information on the status of recommendations within the requirements of legislation and martial-law restrictions.
- **Link with other bodies:** the MKK formulates recommendations within its competence; the chair or authorised members may present the MKK's agreed position in other government coordination mechanisms without substituting their powers.

10. Implementation Plan

Stage	Content
0–3 months	Political decision; revision of the Regulation on the MKK; defining the permanent core membership and rotating/thematic representation; designating the structural unit responsible for organisational and analytical support.
3–6 months	Launch of the quarterly meeting cycle; approval of working procedures; launch of the register of recommendations and their consideration status.
6–12 months	Full monitoring cycle; first annual report on the MKK's performance; assessment of the adequacy of the secondary-legislation model.
After 12 months	Based on the assessment – a decision to retain the model or to prepare targeted amendments to Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy".

11. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

The M&E system should assess not the overall effectiveness of state regional policy, nor the number of MKK activities as an end in itself, but whether the Commission works as a sustainable coordination mechanism within the mandate defined by law. The approach follows a "procedure – product – result" logic: regularity and quality of the coordination process; properly formalised recommendations; a documented outcome of their consideration by the responsible bodies.

For each KPI, a baseline, target, data source, frequency of collection and responsible party are defined. Existing administrative sources are used as much as possible – agendas, minutes, the register of recommendations, official correspondence and data on meeting attendance – to avoid creating an excessive reporting burden.

KPI	Baseline	Target	Source / frequency / responsible
Regularity of MKK meetings	2 meetings held in 2026 as of 8 June	At least 4 meetings per year	MKK minutes / quarterly / responsible structural unit of the line ministry

KPI	Baseline	Target	Source / frequency / responsible
Share of meetings for which materials were sent within the deadline set by the procedure	No single standard recorded in the draft	100%	Materials distribution log / each meeting / secretariat
Share of recommendations with a designated responsible body and a deadline for reporting on their consideration	No systematic record defined	100%	Minutes and register of recommendations / after each meeting
Share of recommendations for which the consideration status by the responsible body has been recorded	Baseline determined when the register is launched	Target set after 6 months of baseline data collection; annual increase thereafter	Register of recommendations, official responses / quarterly
Participation of the regional and local levels in issues that directly concern them	Determined from 2026 minutes	100% of relevant issues have documented involvement of the relevant representatives	Attendance lists, minutes, working group materials / quarterly
Publicity of MKK results	No systematic public register defined in the draft	Publication of minutes and aggregated recommendation statuses within the deadline set by the procedure, except restricted information	Official web resource / quarterly
Annual assessment of MKK performance	Not available as a separate instrument	1 report per year	Annual M&E report / line ministry with submission to the MKK

Monitoring is carried out quarterly by the responsible structural unit of the line ministry on the basis of administrative data. Once a year, a concise report on the MKK's performance is prepared, comparing actual KPI values with targets, explaining deviations and proposing procedural adjustments.

Twelve months after the updated model is introduced, a process evaluation should be conducted: whether regularity, a manageable membership, participation of the regional and local levels, work between meetings and documented tracking of recommendations have been ensured. The result of this evaluation should form the basis for deciding whether amendments to CMU Resolution No. 714 are sufficient or whether targeted amendments to Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy" are needed.

12. Risks and Mitigation Measures

Risk	Consequence	Measure
Political or interagency resistance to change	Delays in approving amendments to the Regulation on the MKK and launching the updated procedures	Early involvement of key CEAs and the CMU Secretariat in preparing the changes; preliminary agreement on contentious procedural issues

Risk	Consequence	Measure
Irregular meetings due to changes in political priorities or in the composition of the Government	Return to an ad hoc operating model and loss of coordination sustainability	Enshrining a minimum frequency of meetings in the Regulation and approving an indicative annual work plan
Excessive expansion of the MKK's permanent membership	Difficulties with quorum, meeting preparation and agreeing recommendations	Forming a manageable permanent core; involving OMAs, oblast councils, RDAs and experts on a rotating or thematic basis
Insufficient capacity of the structural unit responsible for organisational and analytical support	Late preparation of materials, weak tracking of recommendations and loss of institutional memory	Designating responsible officials, standard procedures and a register of recommendations; using existing administrative data without creating parallel reporting
Formal nature of regional and local participation	MKK decisions may not sufficiently reflect territorial needs on issues that directly concern regions and hromadas	Mandatory documented involvement of relevant representatives in preparing the relevant issues and in thematic working groups
Lack of proper tracking of MKK recommendations	Impossible to assess whether recommendations were considered by the responsible bodies and what outcome they had	For each recommendation, define the responsible body, reporting deadline and consideration status; conduct quarterly monitoring and an annual performance assessment

13. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

Based on the analysis, it is recommended to implement Option 1 – administrative strengthening of the MKK with a subsequent assessment of its effectiveness after 12 months. To this end, the following measures are proposed:

1. Amend CMU Resolution No. 714 of 16 September 2015 with respect to the Regulation on the MKK: require meetings to be held at least once a quarter and an indicative annual work plan to be approved.
2. In the amendments to the Regulation on the MKK, define a manageable representation model: a permanent core of representatives of key CEAs and national associations of local self-government bodies, with representatives of OMAs, oblast councils, regional development agencies and experts involved on a rotating or thematic basis depending on the subject under consideration.
3. In the Regulation on the MKK, clearly assign organisational and analytical support to a designated structural unit of the line ministry and designate officials responsible for preparing meetings, keeping minutes, maintaining institutional memory and monitoring recommendations.
4. Approve procedural rules for the MKK's work between meetings: the possibility of setting up permanent or temporary thematic working groups, deadlines for submitting and distributing materials, the procedure for preparing draft recommendations, and documented involvement of the regional and local levels in issues that directly concern them.
5. Introduce a single register of MKK recommendations recording, for each recommendation, the responsible body, the deadline for reporting on its consideration

- and its current status; provide for quarterly consolidation of this information by the responsible structural unit.
6. Ensure publication of agendas, minutes and aggregated information on the status of consideration of MKK recommendations on the official web resource, except for restricted information and taking into account martial-law restrictions.
 7. Twelve months after the updated model is introduced, conduct a process evaluation against the KPIs defined in Section 11. Based on its results, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine should decide whether secondary-legislation amendments are sufficient or whether targeted amendments to Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine "On the Principles of State Regional Policy" need to be prepared.