



# CULTURE POLICY LABS

A JOINT PROJECT OF ERSTE FOUNDATION AND  
THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND INFORMATION POLICY OF UKRAINE  
—  
FIRST CULTURAL POLICY LAB WORKSHOP ON PRESERVATION OF CULTURAL  
HERITAGE TAKING PLACE IN NOVEMBER 2022 IN VIENNA.



**ERSTE**  
Stiftung

**MCiP** MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND  
INFORMATION POLICY OF UKRAINE

With the kind support of  
CMS International Law Firm and KEA European Affairs.



# Culture Policy Lab: Report

## Preservation of Cultural Heritage in Ukraine

30.11 - 02.12.2022, Vienna

Culture Policy Labs are quarterly seminars and brainstorming sessions focusing on Ukrainian culture-driven recovery and cultural policies. Their objective is in line with the Vision for Ukraine 2030, where Ukraine is an “active participant of global cultural processes and a space for joint action for implementation of bold ideas.” And where “culture is the basis and wealth of sustainable, united society of free, responsible, creative and happy people.” The Culture Policy Labs are organised by the ERSTE Foundation in Vienna. The first Lab was a pilot initiative to test the format and draw recommendations pertaining to Ukrainian cultural heritage and its protection in times of war and beyond. The leading objective was to look at cultural heritage management through the lenses of current risks and future opportunities in protection in accordance with international law, effective national policymaking, public-private partnerships and sustainable investment, decentralisation, and citizen engagement, as well as European integration. These and other topics were discussed during the Lab, which took place from November 30 to December 2, 2022, and gathered international experts from 8 European countries, including 15 experts and practitioners from Ukraine. The Lab was endorsed by The Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (MCIP) and attended by its high representatives, namely, Ms Kateryna Chueva, Deputy Minister, and Ms Mariana Tomyn, the Director of the ministerial Department of Cultural Heritage.

This document is an account of the moderated seminar with international experts during the first Culture Policy Lab, which led to the development of practical recommendations for cultural heritage to contribute to Ukraine's recovery and EU accession.

Attached are the agenda of the seminar (Annexe 1) and the list of participants (Annexe 2).



## **Table of Contents**

<b>Cultural Heritage .....</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>The aim of the Culture Policy Lab.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Theme 1 - Public Policy and Cultural Heritage .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Theme 2 - Models for the Management and Financing of Cultural Heritage Activities.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Theme 3 - Cultural Heritage and Citizen Involvement – Strengthening Democracy .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Conclusions: Towards Policy recommendations .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>I. Review the legal and policy framework.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>I. Reform the functioning of cultural institutions .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>II. Create a political appetite for culture.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>III. Prepare the sector for EU funding opportunities .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>IV. Mobilise citizens to the cause of cultural heritage .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annexe 1 Agenda.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Annexe 2 List of participants.....</b>	<b>16</b>



## CULTURAL HERITAGE

**Cultural heritage** includes artefacts, monuments, a group of buildings and sites, museums that have a diversity of values including symbolic, historic, artistic, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological, scientific and social significance. It includes tangible heritage (movable, immobile and underwater), intangible cultural heritage (ICH) embedded into cultural, and natural heritage artefacts, sites or monuments. The definition excludes ICH related to other cultural domains such as festivals, celebration etc. It covers industrial heritage and cave paintings. (Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics)

Cultural heritage is an irreplaceable public good and a powerful driver of global economic and social transformation. Cultural heritage is a main asset that connects past and future generations contributing to essential social cohesion in a society in which individual destinies are ravaged by war. It is an essential contributor to build and strengthen the national identity and cultural specificities. Moreover, it constitutes an important and stable resource for national and local public authorities as an asset for territorial attractiveness and economic development.

## THE AIM OF THE CULTURE POLICY LAB

The war is putting Ukrainian cultural heritage at risk due to the physical damage and the aggressor's intent to target Ukrainian culture and identity. As of 12 December 2022, UNESCO has verified damage to 227 sites since 24 February – 101 religious sites, 17 museums, 79 buildings of historical and/or artistic interest, 19 monuments, 11 libraries. The number of damaged unregistered sites of local significance is probably close to 1000. Tangible heritage is subject to destruction, partial damage, and targeted and casual looting on top of regular risks related to ageing and climate change. Intangible heritage and institutions suffer from the so-called “winterisation” – the challenge of functioning with limited resources – and the outflow of human capital. Cultural professionals and heritage bearers are also a target group for Russian armed aggression and require protection.

The seminar purported to support the efforts of the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (MCIP) to prepare for the reconstruction of the country and assist in promoting culture as an essential element of Ukraine's future as a modern European country.

The Lab's starting point was to consider ways to help the MCIP carry out its mission: “increase the impact of culture and create conditions to convert it to a key element of the sustainable development and awareness of self-identity of Ukrainian society”.

## METHODOLOGY

The Lab's output is the result of two laboratory days and one final validation workshop on Day 3. It included presentations by experts, 3 interactive break-out sessions and two panel discussions with the objective to conclude with practical recommendation and was moderated by Philippe Kern and Aleksandra Ćwik-Mohanty from KEA European Affairs. The participation was multi-disciplinary with expertise in the following fields: architecture, urban planning, law, public policy, cultural management, social engagement, and European integration. The interactive discussions were organised around the following themes:

1. Public Policy and Cultural Heritage



2. Models for the Management and Financing of Cultural Heritage Activities
3. Cultural Heritage and Citizen Involvement – Strengthening Democracy

Conclusions: Towards Policy Recommendations

## THEME 1 - PUBLIC POLICY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

The session's objective was to recognise the role of public authorities in safeguarding cultural heritage and the areas requiring priority attention in terms of legislative actions, including law enforcement. The participants also looked at the path toward successful decentralisation, the role of cities and cultural institutions, and the private sector. A set of challenges presented by Kateryna Chueva (Deputy Minister of Culture and Information of Ukraine) constituted the base for a focused discussion. Ms Chueva pointed out that policymakers face the challenge of balancing emergency responses, which she referred to as extinguishing fires, and long-term strategic planning, which should involve post-war recovery, sustainable development and restored dignity. The intervention was supplemented by two presentations by practitioners who successfully married both approaches into their projects. Alexander Shevchenko, urban planner and a founder of ReStart Ukraine presented the project as “cultural spatialisation during and after the war in Ukraine”. The case of the city of Chernihiv was an example of ReStart's implementation strategy, which focuses on three stages; emergency response, adaptation, and sustainable development. Finally, Slava Balbek from Balbek Bureau Architecture shared how to shape Ukraine's future while preserving its past from an architect's perspective. Further discussions in the breakout sessions were fuelled by a pragmatic view of the threats, like shelling or targeted attacks, to tangible heritage during war.

The following consensus was reached in relation to the first session:

- ⇒ Cultural heritage is marginalised in strategic decisions at the highest level due to a lack of understanding of its significance and transformative power. On the other hand, there is a lack of organisation and coordination of efforts to protect heritage on a local administrative level.
- ⇒ The MCIP operates with limited financial and human resources. There are only 25 civil servants dealing with policymaking and enforcement of cultural heritage protection in Ukraine. There are only four civil servants in the cultural heritage policy unit in the MCIP. The former Cultural heritage protection office was dismantled thus leaving the MCIP with no enforcement power.
- ⇒ Tangible cultural heritage is subject to uncontrolled looting and illicit trafficking, while intangible cultural heritage is in danger of being neglected and forgotten.
- ⇒ Existing databases are incomplete and unrepresentative, especially of tangible local heritage and diverse cultural expressions.
- ⇒ The rigid property law does not allow investment in historic buildings and sharing responsibility. That, paired with poor conservation standards, results in bad practices in protecting and restoring tangible heritage.



**With a view to addressing the identified issues, it should become a priority to strengthen the following:**

1

#### THE LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

The draft law on cultural heritage should be adopted as a matter of urgency. The MCIP ought to have the capacity to develop a policy vision and to implement cultural heritage policy. In this respect, it is vital to set up an efficient Culture Heritage Protection Office with the expertise and capacity to enforce the law. The policy department of the MCIP should be strengthened with a view to being a resource for local authorities seeking guidance on cultural heritage protection and management. The MCIP should develop a strategy to access EU funding and plan an investment strategy to make sure that recovery investment benefits the implementation of cultural policy. Such a strategy should also assist local authorities in developing regional development plans that integrate the cultural dimension.

2

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT

As a matter of priority, the MCIP needs to build a register of national and regional protected sites in coordination with NGOs and local authorities. To deter looting and destruction, criminal law should increase penalties for infringement of the CH law. Magistrates and police should be trained to understand the importance of cultural heritage. The MCIP should work more closely with Interpol with a view to tracing the theft of CH property. The MCIP should be inspired by actions taken by Croatia during and after the war in the West Balkans.

Cities and oblasts should include CH consideration in urban planning with the obligation to consult CH expertise (as adviser to the chief architect – like in L'viv) and integrate participatory planning before steps are taken in relation to protected heritage.

3

#### COORDINATION AND METHODS

The MCIP ought to improve its coordination with local authorities and other central authorities, including more prominent ministries (finance, education, decentralisation), relevant committees in the Parliament, the Supreme Council of Ukraine, and the Office of the President of Ukraine. The MCIP should develop a more collaborative decision-making process to connect with NGOs, civil society, and cultural industries and build trust for better policymaking.



#### PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Private investment should be encouraged through the enactment of competitive tax incentives (on par with other EU countries).



#### HERITAGE EDUCATION

Heritage education at all levels, including efforts coordinated with the Ministry of Education and Science.



#### REPLICATION OF GOOD PRACTICES

Learning from good practices like the Office for Preservation of Historical Environment of L'viv City Hall and good practices from other European countries (notably Poland and Estonia).

## THEME 2 - MODELS FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND FINANCING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE ACTIVITIES

The first objective of Day 2 was to identify challenges and solutions to effective financing of cultural heritage preservation was realised with the help of experts from the CMS International Law Firm – Gregor Famira, Maria Orlyk, and Taras Chernikov. The experts highlighted Ukrainian cases pertaining to Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and the Concession system, along with the dangerous consequences of the current regulations, which include bad practices in monument restoration. The experts concluded that existing mechanisms do not incentivise private investors to partner with private institutions and that built cultural heritage is an unattractive and high-risk investment environment. The participants also learned about good practices in Croatia, and Bosna and Herzegovina. The session concluded with a discussion.

After exploring the issues above, the participants chose to discuss the circumstances affecting the functioning of cultural institutions.

The following consensus was reached in relation to the first session:

- ⇒ Apart from abominable struggles caused by the war and limited resources, the participants also pointed to the outdated regulations and micromanagement limiting the autonomy of cultural institutions.
- ⇒ Ukrainian cultural professionals work under stress related to their role as bearers of Ukrainian identity, with little support from authorities.



- ⇒ Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are an effective tool to supplement public budgets by mobilising private capital. It allows for fruitful cooperation if it functions in the rule of law and strongly emphasises the value of cultural heritage as a public good.
- ⇒ The responsibility of cultural institutions to develop local community engagement strategy (NGOs to be invited in the board of CI for instance) and to support the development of local cultural and creative industries (as part of commercial activities).

**With a view to addressing the identified issues, it should become a priority to strengthen the following:**



#### PROTECTION

Protection of cultural professionals in times of war on military and ideological fronts.



#### TRANSPARENCY AND AUTONOMY

Transparency and autonomy in recruitment, management, and accountability for cultural institutions.



#### POWER

Power to engage with the private sector under the rule of law.



#### CONDITIONS

Conditions to attract private investment, establish tax breaks and other incentives, clarify rules, and protect investment in the high-risk environment.



#### DETERRENTS

Deterrents to fight corruption.





## THEME 3 - CULTURAL HERITAGE AND CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT – STRENGTHENING DEMOCRACY

The second objective of Day 2 was to understand the mechanisms of community engagement and building citizen-centred democracy also benefited from an expert intervention in the form of a panel discussion. The panellists represented two awarded community-based projects. Timea Szőke talked about “Budapest100”, organised by KEK – Contemporary Architecture Centre in Budapest, Hungary, while Veronika Seleha explained the challenges of starting a project like “Library of the Future” from scratch in Ukraine. Both speakers reflected on the benefits of citizen engagement which include learning about their needs and expectations and the ability to share the knowledge with decision-makers.

The following consensus was reached in relation to the first session:

- ⇒ There are many bottom-up initiatives, but they are scattered and uncoordinated, often overlapping.
- ⇒ The value of heritage is easier to estimate with a study of its uses in society.
- ⇒ NGOs, civil society, and decision-makers speak different languages, so there is a need for mediation and communication channels. It is important to develop and organise training in moderation skills to facilitate citizens’ engagement.
- ⇒ Civil society and NGOs should be represented in boards of cultural institutions.
- ⇒ NGOs should be able to act as a whistle-blower to alert about cultural heritage at risk.

**With a view to addressing the identified issues, it should become a priority to strengthen the following:**



### AUDACITY

The audacity of the extraordinary civil society in Ukraine. Artistic interventions should be encouraged to give life to cultural heritage and contribute to citizen engagement.



### DIGITALISATION

Digitalisation and social media use.



### COOPERATION

Cooperation between the third sector and acquiescent civil servants ready to support bottom-up initiatives.



#### PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

Public consultations to understand the variety of needs on different levels of engagement of the citizens in rural and urban areas.



#### USES OF HERITAGE

The use of heritage to heal, integrate, entertain and educate during war, recovery and beyond. The law should enable temporary occupation of culture heritage building that are abandoned or poorly maintained by artists and cultural enterprises to generate culture-led initiatives serving urban planning.

### CONCLUSIONS: TOWARDS POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The last day was a conclusive session opened by insightful remarks from Konstantin Akinsha, an art historian, and a world-renowned researcher. The intervention focused on the issue of illicit trafficking and inadequate risk evaluation. Mr Akinsha suggested an immediate call for a special task force to prevent from further theft of Ukrainian art and other museum artefacts.

A validation workshop followed the discussion to summarise the Lab's findings. To address the challenges identified, the first Culture Policy Lab proposes a set of policy measures to protect and relish cultural heritage as an asset in Ukraine's recovery. The visual representation below outlines the priorities to be considered as a call to action for the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine. Four boxes surrounding the focal stress to build an empowered and mission-driven ministry represent the ecosystem directly impacting the ministry's functioning and influence. They are autonomous institutions, a conducive political environment, European integration, and civil society. Each of the areas requires focused action.



## I. REVIEW THE LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

A new legal framework is required to facilitate policymaking and law enforcement in the service of cultural heritage protection. Legislative reforms should prepare Ukraine for accession to the European Union. The Ministry has the tools (the law) and responsibility (citizen-centred policies) to enforce cultural heritage protection. The following actions should be prioritised to deploy rules effectively:

### Activities of urgent priority – short-term perspective:

1. Adopt a new law on cultural heritage as a matter of urgency (currently in the Parliament).
2. Increase criminal penalties for infringement of CH law to deter looting and destruction. Train magistrate and police on importance of CH protection. Work with Interpol on list of art works in danger. Coordinate International taskforce to control cross-border movement, facilitate travelling exhibitions and prevent illicit trafficking.
3. Communicate security measures by establishing channels of communication and coordination with the National Security and Defense Council and strengthen the relationship between the judicial and the police.
4. Establish a central cultural heritage office or board in charge of enforcing cultural heritage law and setting standards throughout the country. Support digitalisation by establishing a ministerial documenting/archiving office and developing a register and



database(s) with national, local, tangible, intangible, and natural heritage, and landscape. Publish an official digital register in collaboration with regional authorities, local cultural stakeholders and civil society.

5. Map cultural and decision-making stakeholders and opinion leaders who influence cultural policies' implementation at all levels. Ensure the inclusion of cultural heritage protection and restoration in post-war recovery strategies.

### **Activities supporting stabilisation and development – medium- and long-term perspective:**

1. Develop a ministerial brand and a narrative which emphasises its mission toward Ukrainian cultural expression. To achieve that, it is recommended to take research-based decisions, develop statistics and indicators, and involve academia in policymaking. The MCIP ought to strive to become a resource of expertise to accompany decentralisation.
2. Utilise modern definitions and standards to leverage the power of cultural heritage for development. Protect tangible heritage by introducing a review process for a restoration license and standardising and enforcing expert advice in restoration and conservation. Publish a list of reputable construction companies obeying the charter.
3. Develop a financial plan to safeguard cultural heritage at risk. Establish a priority list. Train civil servants to capacitate the implementation of plans and strategies.
4. Develop strategies. The MCIP should develop a plan for cultural heritage, including a strategy to access EU funding and investment priorities. Establish a task force to identify priority actions in collaboration with oblasts and civil society. *Oblasts* and *hromadas* ought to include cultural heritage protection in urban planning with an obligation to consult adequate specialists. Introduce participatory urban and spatial planning.
5. Strengthen the capacity to coordinate cultural heritage regulation and enforcement with other ministries and local authorities, including practical cooperation with the Ministry of Education, other relevant ministries, and the Parliament. Establish a centralised cultural heritage board, an office with local branches to act as experts to advise chief architects and local authorities. Enforce mandatory consultation.
6. Shape policies and manage institutions by referring to good practices on an international and regional level (i.e., Estonia, Poland, L'viv).
7. Review process of restoration licence. Set up clear guidelines and standards for the construction industry to follow. Publish a list of trusted architects and builders.
8. Consider tax breaks and fiscal incentives to encourage private investment. Refer to existing systems in other EU member states.
9. Legally protect private investment in cultural heritage. Create conditions to attract private investment whilst enabling public interest objectives. Run publicly but with the capacity for more commercial activities to develop funding opportunities. Set the objective to become less reliant on state support. Review the concession law. Follow the examples of the Šibenik fortress or the Schönbrunn castle.

## **II. REFORM THE FUNCTIONING OF CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS**

It is suggested to reform the way cultural institutions are managed with a view to adopting modern management practices by:



### **Activities of urgent priority – short-term perspective:**

Protect the staff.

### **Activities supporting stabilisation and development – medium- and long-term perspective:**

1. Build capacity in management. Emphasise transparency in the nominations of directors, empower leadership, and grant more autonomy and financial accountability. Train the staff to run modern, globally recognisable institutions.
2. Extract best practices in regulating cultural institutions and benchmarking with countries undergoing a similar transition phase from a post-soviet to a modern era.
3. The state should retain ownership over a public entity and its collections/projects, but an institution should be allowed to develop an alternative funding source.
4. Review the law to give autonomy to cultural institutions to purchase essential equipment.
5. Obligate and train cultural institutions to develop community engagement strategies.

### **III. CREATE A POLITICAL APPETITE FOR CULTURE**

A well-versed and research-based narrative should create a political appetite for cultural heritage to be perceived as a necessary block in the building of modern Ukraine. This can be achieved through the following:

1. Developing a research-based narrative on the social and economic importance of cultural heritage.
2. Reinforcing the Ministry's role as the essential spokesperson of culture in policymaking. The ministry should work closely and build trust with cultural stakeholders and local authorities to press on more powerful ministries to support culture financially and politically.
3. Influencing policymaking by developing the capacity of trade organisations, NGOs, and relevant networks to build a solid political voice with the ability to lobby.
4. Creating a network of *hromadas/oblasts* for cultural heritage to work with a view to develop robust policy and ensure implementation at a local level.
5. Ensure that culture is considered in regional development strategies. Mobilise EU funds and projects like the ULead.
6. Organising an annual national event on cultural heritage (like Creative Ukraine for the CCIs) to engage with high-level politicians, to network and share experiences and good practices.
7. The MCIP ought to develop inclusive management methods to work closely with cultural institutions, NGOs, CCIs, schools, and other ministries (with an emphasis on bodies responsible for finance, economy, regional development, infrastructure, defence, and education and science).

### **IV. PREPARE THE SECTOR FOR EU FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES**

Ukraine's EU candidate status signifies a plethora of possibilities to facilitate a smooth European integration over the years to come. Cultural heritage is a powerful tool to drive socially inclusive



and green development and is an increasingly prominent element in European priorities. With that in mind, Ukrainian cultural and policymaking institutions should:

1. Prepare to apply for pre-accession and recovery funds by developing a strategy and action plan to appeal to the EU, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Infrastructure. Prepare to identify opportunities for cultural heritage in available cohesion funds, and support strategising on a local level with a focus on capacity-building, including management courses, urban planning to integrate the cultural heritage dimension, and craftsmanship for restoration.
2. Network with European cultural heritage associations and networks like Europa Nostra, European Route of Industrial Heritage (ERIH), Network of European Museum Organisations (NEMO), World Crafts Council (WCC) Europe, Future for Religious Heritage (FRH) and similar.
3. Develop relationships with good practices (like Budapest100 or the Šibenik fortress).
4. Establish cooperation with national heritage institutes in other European countries, like the National Heritage Board of Poland, La Fondation des sciences du Patrimoine in France, or the Cultural Heritage Agency in the Netherlands.

## **V. MOBILISE CITIZENS TO THE CAUSE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE**

For citizens, cultural heritage signifies job opportunities, national and regional pride, leisure time, formal and informal education, creative inspiration, tourism, distinctive landscape, and aesthetic surroundings. Cultural heritage is a link between generations and a legacy that will be shared with children. Civil society represents citizens who engage on various levels, from professionals working in NGOs through activists and engaged citizens who associate cultural heritage with their hobbies to passive consumers. All levels of engagement are essential and accumulate passion and enthusiasm, which deserves to be heard and nourished. On the other hand, active members of the Ukrainian civil society should be encouraged to utilise various communication channels and learn the language of politics. The following steps can facilitate that coexistence:

1. Include cultural heritage in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) by channelling 1% of each real estate investment to artistic expression or community engagement. At the same time, increase transparency and public announcements for citizens to intervene in potential investment plans.
2. Encourage and empower volunteering in cultural heritage protection and promotion by rewarding cultural institutions that implement community engagement, supporting artistic intervention aimed at community engagement, incentivising artists and social entrepreneurs to take care of abandoned buildings and documenting the social value of community engagement.
3. Develop skills in mediation amongst policymakers and active representatives of civil society.
4. Introduce topics pertaining to cultural heritage, cultural diversity, and architectural aesthetics into school curricula.
5. Map local bottom-up activities and good practices and communicate positive outcomes.
6. Call NGOs to join boards at cultural institutions to encourage civil society engagement.



## ANNEXE 1 AGENDA

### Wednesday, 30 November 2022

#### Morning session

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| 10:00–10:10 am | Opening remarks by Boris Marte, CEO of ERSTE Foundation  |
| 10:10–10:20 am | Introduction of Culture Policy Labs and their aims by Yana Barinova, ERSTE Foundation  |
| 10:20–10:30 am | Presentation of the format of the event. Moderator: Philippe Kern  |
| 10:30–11:30 am | Round of introductions   |
| 11:30–12:00 am | Intervention from Ms. Kateryna Chueva, the Deputy Minister of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine “Ukraine’s Cultural Heritage in/after wartime” |
| 12:00–12:30 pm | Coffee Break   |

#### First Working Session: Public Policy and Cultural Heritage

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| 12:30–13:00 pm | Intervention by Alexander Shevchenko “ReStart Ukraine: Cultural Spatialisation during and after the war in Ukraine”   |
| 13:00–13:30 pm | Intervention by Slava Balbek “How to shape Ukraine’s future while preserving its past an architect’s perspective” + Q&A for both presentations  |
| 13:30–14:30 pm | Moderated breakout sessions for two groups to brainstorm the following issues pertaining to cultural heritage and public policy: 1) Needs assessment and challenges at local, regional, and national levels; 2) Legislative gaps; 3) Capacity building and structural deficiencies; 4) Education, professional capacities, training, and upskilling; 5) Research in cultural heritage; 6) Rural-urban divide; 7) Priority investment in cultural heritage; 8) Climate change and social cohesion in a post-war country. Moderators: Philippe Kern and Aleksandra Ćwik-Mohanty |
| 14:30–15:30 pm | Lunch   |
| 15:30–17:00 pm | Reporting from the breakout sessions (two presenting rapporteurs) and discussion  |
| 18:00–20:00 pm | Dinner and networking   |

### Thursday, 1 December 2022

#### Second Working Session: Models for the Management and Financing of Cultural Heritage Activities



09:30–10:30 am	Guided tour of the art in architecture-project at ERSTE Campus
11:00–13:00 am	Intervention from the representatives of CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz law firm – Mr. Taras Chernikov, Ms. Maria Orlyk, and Mr. Gregor Famira – “An overview of existing and required legal instruments for attracting and involving of private investors in the restoration and reconstruction of destroyed and damaged cultural heritage sites in Ukraine and the experience of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina” + a discussion on 1) Private-Public Partnership in cultural heritage protection; 2) Challenges to attract private funding; 3) Good practices in managing cultural heritage sites and in entrusting organizations working in cultural heritage.
13:00–13:30 pm	Coffee break
13:30–14:00 pm	Continuation of the discussion
14:00–15:00 pm	Lunch break
15:00–15:40 pm	A moderated panel discussion. Panelists: Timea Szoke, project “Budapest100”, KEK – Contemporary Architecture Centre in Budapest, Hungary and Veronika Seleha, project “Library of the Future” in Ukraine + Q&A, Moderator: Philippe Kern
15:40–16:40 pm	Moderated breakout sessions for two groups to brainstorm the following issues pertaining to citizen engagement in cultural heritage protection:  1) Challenges to citizen engagement in cultural heritage and benefits of such engagement; 2) Good practices in enabling citizen engagement; 3) Practical models and tools. Moderators: Philippe Kern and Aleksandra Ćwik-Mohanty
16:40–17:10 pm	Reporting from the breakout sessions (two presenting rapporteurs) and discussion

## **Friday, 2 December 2022**

### **Towards Policy Recommendations**

10:00–10:30 am	Welcome coffee
10:30–10:50 am	Online intervention from Prof. Konstantin Akinsha + Q&A focused on the illicit trafficking of cultural objects
10:50–12:50 pm	Moderators from KEA European Affairs report on the outcomes of plenary sessions and propose a series of draft recommendations followed by an open discussion to reach a consensus + final remarks from moderator Philippe Kern
12:50–13:00 pm	Main conclusions and takeaways by Yana Barinova
13:00–14:00 pm	Closing remarks, video interviews and buffet lunch





## ANNEXE 2 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Konstantin Akinsha** (Founding director at the Russian Avant-Garde Research Project and guest curator at Ludwig Museum of Contemporary Art, Hungary/Ukraine)

**Slava Balbek** (CEO at balbek bureau architecture and interior design studio, Ukraine)

**Yana Barinova** (Project manager for European and Ukrainian policies at ERSTE Foundation, International Development Director at viennacontemporary, Austria/Ukraine)

**Gorana Barišić-Bačelić** (Director at Fortress of Culture in Šibenik, Croatia)

**Harald Binder** (Founder at Center for Urban History of East Central Europe in L'viv and Jam Factory Art Center (to be opened in 2023), UK/Ukraine)

**Taras Chernikov** (Attorney at law at CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz in Kyiv, Ukraine)

**Kateryna Chueva** (Deputy Minister of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine)

**Gregor Famira** (Partner at CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz, Austria)

**Martin Fritz** (Secretary General of the Austrian Commission for UNESCO, Austria)

**Anna Gnoińska** (Chairwoman of the Council at the March8 Foundation, Poland)

**Natalia Gnoińska** (Founder at the March8 Foundation, Poland)

**Maciej Hofman** (Independent consultant and advisor at the European Cultural Foundation, Poland/The Netherlands)

**Olha Honchar** (Director at the Memorial Museum of Totalitarian Regimes, Territory of Terror, Ukraine)

**Kateryna Kovalchuk** (Cultural manager and founder, Head of programmes and projects at Kovalska Industrial and Construction Group, Ukraine)

**Boris Marte** (CEO of ERSTE Foundation, Austria)

**Hugues Mingarelli** (Diplomat, EU Ambassador to Ukraine in 2016-2019, France)

**Maria Orlyk** (Managing partner at CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz in Kyiv, Ukraine)

**Olga Sagaidak** (Representative of the Ukrainian Institute in France, France/Ukraine)

**Oleksandr Shevchenko** (Foudner at ReStart Ukraine NGO and Zvidsy Urban Agency, Ukraine)

**Veronika Seleha** (Curator at NGO Barrier-free, Ukraine)

**Katya Taylor** (Curator and founder at Port Creative Hub space, Austria/Ukraine)

**Mariana Tomyń** (Director of the Department of Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine)



**ERSTE**  
Stiftung



**miin**

МІНІСТЕРСТВО КУЛЬТУРИ ТА  
ІНФОРМАЦІЙНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ УКРАЇНИ

**Tímea Szőke** (Programme director at KÉK-Contemporary Architecture Centre in Budapest, Hungary)

**Olena Zabrodska** (Senior legal expert of the Ukrainian Art Ecosystem Legal Research project, Belgium/Ukraine)

**Hnat Zabrodsky** (Head of legal operations at the Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA) NGO and the Pavilion of Culture CF, Ukraine)

Moderators:

**Philippe Kern** (Founder and managing director at KEA European Affairs, Belgium)

**Aleksandra Ćwik-Mohanty** (Senior Consultant at KEA European Affairs, Belgium)

Draft 22.12.2022