



Key Conclusions

Ministerial Dialogue Group Meeting 2026

- The **Dialogue Group** was reaffirmed as a strategic coordination platform that strengthens coherence, complementarity and sustained engagement among Ukrainian authorities, international partners, regional organisations and civil society. Its added value lies in **aligning existing accountability initiatives, reducing fragmentation and supporting a shared understanding of priorities**, rather than creating a parallel coordination structure.
- **Legislative harmonization** was recognized as a **core rule of law requirement for effective accountability for international crimes** committed in the context of Russia's armed aggression against Ukraine. Participants emphasized that **gaps or ambiguities in domestic criminal and criminal procedural law directly affect the quality of investigations, indictments, judicial reasoning, international cooperation and victims' access to justice**.
- Ukraine's **ratification of the Rome Statute** was acknowledged as a decisive milestone that enabled important amendments to the Criminal Code, including the introduction of **crimes against humanity** and explicit provisions on **command responsibility**. At the same time, further reform remains necessary to address outstanding deficiencies in the regulation of war crimes, the crime of aggression, procedural safeguards and the interpretation of domestic law in line with international standards.
- The draft legislative package developed through **the Interagency Working Group** under the leadership of the Prosecutor General's Office was welcomed as a **practice-oriented and inclusive reform effort**. The proposed amendments seek to replace the current broad reference-based formulation of war crimes with a clearer **catalogue of offences, grouped by protected interests, including persons, property, cultural heritage, and prohibited means and methods of warfare**. Advancing this draft law without undue delay was identified as essential to strengthen legal certainty and provide practitioners with a more effective legal framework.
- Participants stressed that **criminal law reform must be supported by corresponding criminal procedural amendments**. Priority areas include clarification of investigative jurisdiction, prevention of duplication between investigative bodies, use of intelligence and open-source information as evidence, preservation and authentication of evidence, privacy protection, victim participation, risk assessment and safeguards for vulnerable persons.
- Civil society underlined that **reform must reflect both international legal standards and the practical realities of the Ukrainian justice system**. Particular attention was drawn to the need to ensure coherence across different proceedings, avoid excessive pressure on victims involved in multiple processes, and prevent secondary trauma. A **comprehensive national accountability policy was identified as necessary to define institutional responsibilities, guide coordination and ensure consistency across the justice system**.
- The importance of a **victim-centred approach was consistently reaffirmed**. Participants highlighted the need for meaningful victim participation, trauma-informed procedures, access to information, privacy safeguards, protection measures and tailored support for vulnerable victims and witnesses, including children, survivors of conflict-related sexual violence and other affected groups. The legitimacy of accountability efforts was linked not only to outcomes, but also to the manner in which victims are treated throughout proceedings.
- Ukraine's **EU accession process was identified as an important driver of legal and institutional reform**. Harmonization with international standards, relevant EU victims' rights



Secretariat of the Dialogue Group on Accountability for Ukraine - Kyiv

standards and international cooperation instruments must be credible, comprehensive and capable of implementation. **The Ljubljana-The Hague**

Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance was highlighted as a key instrument for strengthening cross-border cooperation in investigations and prosecutions of international crimes.

- International partners emphasized **the value of comparative experience from jurisdictions that have implemented Rome Statute-related reforms**. Relevant practices include comprehensive domestic legislation on international crimes, explanatory materials linking national provisions to treaty sources and jurisprudence, expanded jurisdictional bases, enhanced investigative tools, and strengthened victim and witness protection mechanisms. **Continued practitioner dialogue was considered important** to ensure that lessons learned elsewhere inform Ukraine's reform process while remaining adapted to the national context.
- Participants emphasized that **the adoption of legislation must be followed by effective implementation measures**, including sustained technical assistance, institutional capacity-building and joint training for investigators, prosecutors, judges and defence counsel. A shared understanding of international criminal law standards across justice actors was considered necessary for consistent interpretation and credible application in domestic proceedings.
- **The Strategy** for the Exercise of Prosecutorial Powers in Criminal Prosecution of International Crimes for 2026-2028 was presented as **a central framework for the strategic development of investigations and prosecutions**. It responds to the unprecedented volume of registered international crimes, ongoing hostilities, restricted access to occupied territories, security and logistical constraints, limited resources and the need for specialised expertise, analytical capacity and structured prosecutorial planning.
- Strategic **prioritisation was recognized as necessary in a context of mass criminality**. Participants emphasized that prioritisation does not undermine accountability but enables limited resources to be directed toward the gravest crimes, cases with significant societal impact, those bearing the greatest responsibility and proceedings with realistic evidentiary prospects. Transparent public communication was identified as essential to explain prioritisation as a rule of law tool rather than selective justice.
- The **Strategy's key objectives** were highlighted as: **structured and effective prosecution of international crimes; strengthened institutional capacity; enhanced protection and support for victims and witnesses; and sustained partnerships with international organisations, foreign prosecutorial authorities, and civil society**. Possible legislative amendments formalising prosecutorial discretion based on clear and predefined criteria were noted as an important component of the prioritisation framework.
- Participants stressed that **prioritisation must be applied consistently across investigative bodies, prosecutors, and courts**. A broader state-wide accountability policy was again identified as important to align institutional priorities, avoid fragmented decision-making, ensure meaningful victim participation, and maintain public trust in the justice process.
- **The development of digital, analytical and OSINT capacities was recognized as a priority for modern international crimes investigations**. Given limited access to occupied territories and crime scenes, **open-source information and digital evidence are critical to documenting violations, identifying patterns, and supporting case-building**. Clear standards on admissibility, reliability, verification, forensic authentication, and integration of such evidence into prosecutorial and judicial workflows remain essential.
- **The formal launch of the OSINT Hub was welcomed as a concrete mechanism for structured cooperation between the Prosecutor General's Office and civil society organisations specialising in open-source investigations**. The Hub responds to fragmented cooperation,



Secretariat of the Dialogue Group on Accountability for Ukraine - Kyiv

duplication of efforts and inconsistent processing of open-source information by creating a framework for prosecutorial requests, channeling expertise, and integrating OSINT into investigations while preserving prosecutorial independence. The phased pilot implementation of the OSINT Hub was identified as an opportunity to strengthen analytical capacity, improve evidence management and ensure more efficient use of investigative resources. The Hub was also presented **as a practical example of how civil society expertise can be integrated into accountability processes** in a coordinated and institutionally sound manner.