



CULTURE POLICY LABS

REPORT

A JOINT PROJECT OF ERSTE FOUNDATION AND
THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND INFORMATION POLICY OF UKRAINE

—
FIRST CULTURE POLICY LAB: PRESERVING CULTURAL HERITAGE IN UKRAINE,
30 NOVEMBER - 2 DECEMBER 2022, VIENNA



ERSTE
Stiftung

mci MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND
INFORMATION POLICY OF UKRAINE

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

DRAFT REPORT CULTURE POLICY LABS

**A joint project of ERSTE Foundation and the
Ministry of Culture and Information of Ukraine**

First Culture Policy Lab: Preserving Cultural Heritage in Ukraine

30 November – 2 December 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 the implementation of bold ideas,” and where, moreover, “culture is the basis and wealth of a sustainable, united society of free, responsible, creative and happy people.” The Culture Policy Labs are organised by 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 for protection that are in accordance with international law, effective national policymaking, public-private partnerships, sustainable investment, decentralisation and citizen engagement, as well as European integration. These and other topics were discussed during the Lab, which took place from 30 November to 2 December 2022, and brought together international experts from eight European countries, including 15 experts and practitioners from Ukraine. The Lab was endorsed by the Ministry of Culture and Information of Ukraine (MCI) 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 the preservation of Ukraine’s cultural heritage as a way of contributing to the country’s recovery and EU accession.

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

Table of Contents

Culture Heritage	4
The aim of the Culture Policy Lab	4
Methodology.....	4
Theme 1 – Public Policy and Cultural Heritage	4
Theme 2 – Models for the Management and Financing of Cultural Heritage Activities	5
Theme 3 – Cultural Heritage and Citizen Involvement – Building Democracy.....	6
Conclusions : Towards Policy Recommendations	7
1. Review the legal and policy framework	7
2. Reform the functioning of cultural institutions	8
3. Create a political appetite for culture	9
4. Prepare the sector for EU funding opportunities.....	9
5. Mobilise citizens to the cause of cultural heritage.....	9
6. Capacity-Building and Awareness-Raising Activities	10
Annexe 1 Agenda.....	11
Annexe 2 Agenda and List of Guests.....	12

Culture 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, thus 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, as well as 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 in Ukraine (MCI) to prepare for the reconstruction of the country and to 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 MCI 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, three interactive break-out sessions and two panel discussions with the objective to conclude with practical recommendations. 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

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 tied 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 ways of shaping Ukraine's future while preserving its past from an architect's perspective. Further discussions in the breakout sessions were propelled 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:

1. 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.
2. The MCI 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 MCI. The former Cultural Heritage Protection office was dismantled, thus leaving the MCI with no enforcement power.
3. Tangible cultural heritage is subject to uncontrolled looting and illicit trafficking, while intangible cultural heritage is in danger of being neglected and forgotten.
4. Existing databases are incomplete and unrepresentative, especially of tangible local heritage and diverse cultural expressions.
5. The rigid property law does not allow investment in historic buildings and sharing responsibility. The law's implications and effects, 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 MCI ought to have the capacity to develop a policy vision and to implement cultural heritage policy. In this respect it is important to set up an efficient Culture Heritage Protection office with the expertise and capacity to enforce the law. The policy department of the MCI should be strengthened with a view to making it a resource for local authorities seeking guidance on cultural heritage protection and management. The MCI 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 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 MCI 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. Magistrate and police should be trained to understand the importance of cultural heritage. The MCI should work more closely with Interpol with a view to tracing theft of CH property. The MCI should be inspired by actions taken by Croatia during and after the war in the West Balkans.
3. 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 Lviv) and integrate participatory planning before steps are taken in relation to protected heritage.
4. Coordination and Methods. MCI 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 MCI should develop a more collaborative decision-making process to connect with NGOs, civil society, culture industries and build trust for better policy-making.
5. Private investment should be encouraged through the enactment of competitive tax incentives (on par with other EU countries).
6. Heritage education at all levels, including efforts coordinated with the Ministry of Education and Science.
7. Replication of good practices. Learning from good practices like the ones utilised by the Office for Preservation of Historical Environment of L'viv City Hall and taking 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 – identifying 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 existing cultural heritage is an unattractive and high-risk

investment environment. The participants also learned about good practices in Croatia, and Bosnia 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:

1. 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.
2. Ukrainian cultural professionals work under stress related to their role as bearers of Ukrainian identity, with little support from authorities.
3. 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.
4. The responsibility of cultural institutions to develop local community engagement strategies (NGOs to be invited to 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:

1. **Protection** of cultural professionals in times of war on military and ideological fronts.
2. **Transparency and autonomy** in recruitment, management, and accountability for cultural institutions.
3. **Power** to engage with the private sector under the rule of law.
4. **Conditions** to attract private investment, establish tax breaks and other incentives, clarify rules, and protect investment in the high-risk environment.
5. **Deterrents** to fight corruption.

Theme 3 – Cultural Heritage and Citizen Involvement – Strengthening Democracy

The second objective of Day 2 – understanding 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 Szoke 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.

1. The value of heritage is easier to estimate with a study of its uses in society.
2. 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.
3. Civil society and NGOs should be represented on boards of cultural institutions.
4. NGOs should be able to act as whistle-blowers and be on alert regarding culture heritage that is at risk.

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

1. **The audacity** of the extraordinary civil society in Ukraine. Artistic interventions should be encouraged as a way of giving life to culture heritage and contribute to citizen engagement.
2. **Digitalisation** and social media use.
3. **Cooperation** between the third sector and acquiescent civil servants ready to support bottom-up initiatives.
4. **Public consultations** to understand the variety of needs on different levels of engagement of the citizens in rural and urban areas.

5. **The use** of heritage to heal, integrate, entertain and educate during war, recovery and beyond. The law should enable temporary occupation of culture heritage buildings 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 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 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.



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 artworks 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 that research-based decisions be taken, statistics and indicators be developed, and academia be involved in policymaking. The MCI 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 licence 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 MCI 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 Palace.

Reform the functioning of cultural institutions

A reform of the way cultural institutions are managed is suggested, 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.

Create a political appetite for culture

1. 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:
2. Develop a research-based narrative on the social and economic importance of cultural heritage.
3. Reinforce 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.
4. Influence policymaking by developing the capacity of trade organisations, NGOs, and relevant networks to build a solid political voice with the ability to lobby.
5. Create a network of hromadas/oblasts for Cultural Heritage to work with a view to developing robust policy and ensuring implementation at a local level.
6. Ensure that culture is considered in regional development strategies. Mobilise EU funds and projects like the ULead.
7. Organise 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.
8. 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).

4. 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 ones.
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.

5. 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 to 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 deserve 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 one per cent 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; support artistic intervention aimed at community engagement; incentivise artists and social entrepreneurs to take care of abandoned buildings; and document 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.

6. Capacity-Building and Awareness-Raising Activities

The Lab revealed that in order to achieve policy objectives, there is a need to invest in building capacity in Ukrainian public, private and non-profit institutions. Foundations could support such capacity building in various ways, including:

1. Funding research (to assist MCI to develop a policy vision)

Themes:

- Report on the social and economic relevance of cultural heritage in Ukraine in the global context, including a benchmark analysis. The data and conclusions can support building a strong narrative.
- Report on incentives to attract private investment in cultural heritage in Ukraine – comparative analysis across different EU countries. Review of legal systems.
- Good practice in management of cultural institutions – comparative analysis of models

2. Event (to raise awareness)

Organising a high-level international summit on Ukrainian cultural heritage in Vienna – to share the study's findings, facilitate networking/exchange of experience and help create political interest for the issue.

3. Developing manuals/practical guide (to assist cultural practitioners)

- Manual on best practices in citizen engagement in the field of Cultural Heritage
- Management of cultural institutions or culture heritage sites.
- Developing a cultural heritage strategy at local level – for public authorities.

4. Providing physical or online training

- a. For civil servants in the ministry and local governments – to address the capacity to develop strategies and access EU funding

Example: Organising short-term training and study visits to support developing and implementing strategies, strategic foresight, cultural heritage reuse and safeguarding, sustainable development in spatial planning, good practices in benefiting from EU funds, European Union's role in supporting culture and cultural heritage, and its internal mechanisms, as well as competence and skills on a personal level.

- b. For NGOs and trade associations – to address the capacity to influence and engage with citizens, and access EU funding

Example: Recruiting Ukrainian NGOs to participate in The NGO Academy by ERSTE Foundation, emphasising the Regional Programme to address Ukrainian circumstances and language barriers. Training for cultural activists with a focus on advocacy and communication with various stakeholders and practical tools for citizen engagement.

- c. Cultural managers – to address management and leadership capacity

Example: On-site or online courses focusing on membership in international networks, grant applications, alternative financial tools, strategic management, operational management, business sustainability, MEAL, marketing, anticipation, and strategic foresight, political advocacy and development of associations, lobbying, and community building, European Union's role in supporting culture and cultural heritage, and its internal mechanisms.

5. Supporting internships in European counterpart organisations

Example: Organising internships for civil servants, including local authorities in heritage-rich localities and senior staff in public and private cultural institutions. A six-month training period involves study visits to European institutions and a capacity-building programme emphasising operational and strategic management tools, financing and grant applications, community-building, and project and collection management.

Link to the survey to participants: <https://forms.gle/qZu9LWh9ty4Akoh87>

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 – Agenda and List of Guests

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)

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)



**CULTURE
POLICY
LABS**