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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Ukraine, the practice of culture in external relations is fragmented between a variety of non-state initiatives (contemporary arts, book, theatre and other festivals), including several philanthropic foundations created by wealthy post-Soviet era businessmen (often referred to as ‘oligarchs’) as well as dynamic cities. The government played a strong role in seeking closer relations with the EU in the framework of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme.

The younger generation and people in westernised circles are eager to strengthen their opening to the West, as illustrated by increasing emigration and a manifest appetite for debates, innovative financing and projects, and cultural exchanges with counterparts in EU countries. The strict visa policies of the latter, however, are seen as highly discouraging.

In this context, efforts to bring Europe to Ukraine and to give Ukrainians access to Europe will only bear fruit slowly, provided enough resources are allocated to them and on the condition that conservative oligarchs do not hamper them. The 2014 political and security crisis has opened a new phase of uncertainty for the country’s external cultural relations.
In the last few years, Ukrainian governmental institutions have actively sought a cultural rapprochement with the EU. These efforts contrasted with the aborted signature of an Association Agreement at the Vilnius Summit of 28-29 November 2013 and subsequent developments leading up to the events of February 2014. Official recourse to EU-funded initiatives is limited, hampering the development of cultural relations with European partners. The practice of culture in external relations appears to be fragmented between a variety of non-state initiatives (contemporary arts, books, theatre and other festivals), including philanthropic foundations created by some ‘oligarchs.’ The current political turmoil naturally poses great challenges to the Union. It is a rapidly changing environment that will require new research and policy formulation on the part of the EU.

Ukraine’s external cultural policy-making system has been highly centralised and pyramidal, with the Presidential apparatus playing a leading role, while the responsible ministries act as bureaucratic implementing agencies. At the time of the consultation for the Preparatory Action, despite some innovative thinking within the National Institute for Strategic Studies attached to the Presidency, the governmental system appeared to be rigid and conservative in its functioning. This was demonstrated, for example, by the 2012 censorship of the visual arts exhibition ‘The Ukrainian body’ organised by the Research Centre for Visual Culture.

The country has at its disposal numerous policy and legislative documents referring to external cultural policy objectives. Following a comprehensive participatory process, the ‘Law of Ukraine on the Conception of State Policy in the Sphere of Culture for 2005–2007’ was passed, identifying the pitfalls and structural weaknesses to be overcome. Yet, since then, very little seems to have changed in the way governmental bodies deal with international cultural issues. The adoption of other documents such as the State programme for innovative development of Ukrainian culture in 2009-2013, the 2010 law on the principles of domestic politics and foreign affairs, the 2011 law on culture and the concept on cooperation with Ukrainians abroad, the ratification in 2010 of the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, has not led yet to substantial public policy shifts.

The Ministry of Culture was seen in summer 2013 by some of the foreign experts consulted for the Preparatory Action as an institution ripe for deep reforms. Grant-making decisions are allegedly taken in a highly opaque manner reminiscent of old-style Soviet corrupt practices. With

1 The Institute produces a presidential yearbook offering analysis and recommendations on a wide range of policy issues, including culture (in its broad sense) and European integration processes (pp.181-184). The National Institute for Strategic Studies website: http://en.niss.gov.ua/.
3 Oleksander Butsenko, in A Report on the condition of culture and NGOs in Ukraine, Open Culture Foundation & Kultura Enter, 2012, p.37. Terry Sandell et al., Analytical Base-line report on the culture sector and cultural policy of Ukraine, EuroEast culture, Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit, 2012, p. 10; on the ways laws are half-heartedly applied, leading to ‘semi-reforms’. 
most of its limited (0.7 per cent of GDP) budget absorbed by salaries paid in its institutions (500 museums, academic national theatres, and libraries) and infrastructure operating costs, the Ministry has become a subsidiary actor in external cultural relations, though keeping some power to intervene – sometimes without any convincing rationale – in the work of cultural professionals. For example, some studies mention situations where governmental actors preferred to seek cooperation with foreign cultural partners in the film industry rather than supporting domestic film distribution.4

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has a key say in external cultural issues since it manages embassies and cultural and information centres abroad. Experts consider that the MFA perceives its role as merely consisting of organising cultural performances and project management, with culture, as part of a broader ‘humanities policy’ (gumanitarnyi is a term of Soviet cultural policy, the meaning of which is a mix of activities related to ‘humanities’ as a university discipline and ‘humanist’ as part of the philosophical humanist tradition – in other words not to be confused with ‘humanitarian’ aid as currently understood in the EU) as an accompaniment to diplomacy.

Although the organisation (together with Poland) of the 2012 football championship was a concerted endeavour of the government, generating real effects in terms of national branding, it has not produced structural transformation in the governance of external cultural relations, for instance by fostering the establishment of a permanent whole-of-government coordination mechanism on these issues.5

The National Institute for Strategic Studies (NISS) has in the last few years played an important role in formulating a number of recommendations to the Presidency in the realm of external cultural policy. These include the preparation of a roadmap for reform in cultural policy or an inter-ministerial coordination body under the aegis of the Ministry of Culture.6 Culture has occupied an important space in the last three NISS Presidential reports; reflecting a clear will within the Institute to ‘bring Ukraine back to the map of Europe.’7 However, none of these reports were ever presented by the President to Parliament.

Although Ukraine has several hundred museums, this potential is not really used in external cultural relations, and Ukrainian museum professionals still have a very limited knowledge of

---

5 Although the following governmental structures also play a role in external cultural relations, they were hardly mentioned during the consultation phase: State Committee on Information Policy; TV and Radio Broadcasting; Ministry of Education and Science; Youth and Sport; Ministry of Regional Development, Building and Housing – in charge of international cultural cooperation at regional level; Ministry of Infrastructure (tourism).
6 NISS, Research Centre of the Slovak Foreign Policy Association, Ukrainian Centre for Independent Political Research with the assistance of Slovak Aid, National Convention on the EU in Ukraine, Working Groups Recommendations, Kyiv 2011-2012, pp.33-35.
7 Chapter II, section 2.3.4’, Report of the President of Ukraine to the High Rada.
8 Interview with NISS Director Yermolaev, Kyiv, 8 July 2013.
contemporary practices elsewhere in Europe. Museums are not integrated into a tourism policy and, because of constraining budgetary and tax regulations, they are not allowed to build new facilities (like cafés, libraries or other public spaces) to attract new (foreign and local) visitors. Some museums have started to develop international partnerships with counterparts in Europe on an individual basis and outside state-funded circles.

State-funded theatres are often criticised for their heavy hierarchy, as well as their lack of openness and transparency. Some municipal and independent theatres have initiated, often thanks to foreign support, new dynamics and by virtue of existing have even helped to reverse the brain drain at work in the 2000s. Yet, some consider that theatre professionals still know very little about other European practices, for instance theatre touring, and do not understand them.

In addition to the capital Kyiv, a number of Ukrainian cities (mostly in the Western part of the country) have implemented active external cultural relations and an independent cultural scene flourishes there too. Partnerships, cultural events and cooperation often have a cross-border or neighbouring dimension – that is to say with Poland, Belarus, Hungary, Slovakia, Russia and even Georgia. In many respects, a great deal of the Ukrainian cultural innovation and its connections with the outside world are taking place in cities rather than at national level.

This process accelerated in the second half of 2013, with the holding of events launching new initiatives at the level of cities, like the Council of Europe’s Intercultural Cities Programme.8

The role of oligarchs in Ukraine’s economic, political and cultural life has become an extremely important variable to take into account.9 More than a complement to non-governmental initiatives, ‘oligarchic’ philanthropy has become a trendsetter and an inevitable sponsor for large-scale internationally relevant cultural work. Nowadays, the Victor Pinchuk Foundation10 (particularly active in the field of contemporary art with its Arts Centre in downtown Kyiv visited by an average of about 2,000 people a day) and the Rinat Akhmetov foundation11 (in the lead as far as museum and cultural research are concerned) are the most visible philanthropic actors present at an international level. Despite the success of these two foundations (such as the Paul Mc Cartney 2008 independence concert in Kyiv organised by the Pinchuk Foundation), cultural philanthropy still inspires some mistrust among the population because of the controversial image of the ‘oligarchs’ and the existence of many unprofessional, even fake foundations linked to criminal circles. Corporate sponsorship is also increasingly frequent. For example, the 2012 Art Arsenal exhibition organised on the occasion of the football championship was sponsored by Samsung. Some banks, a few of which are registered in Russia, for instance Alfa bank, also sponsor cultural events or activities like lectures

9 According to informal EU sources, oligarchs’ properties and business represent 38% of the Ukrainian economy. Interview, Kyiv, July 2013.
on design. Small private cultural companies have also developed their work (galleries, art centres, etc.) in Kiyv, Lviv and other cities.\(^{12}\)

The non-governmental cultural sector is where most of the innovations in external cultural relations are taking place (from arts to sports, new media and the exchange of ideas), usually with joint support from local authorities, private sponsorship, foreign funding and very recently, tentative crowd funding. As some experts acknowledge, the non-governmental sector has become more important than the governmental. The existence of new media has led some senior experts to recognise that they do not need government agencies to make up their minds and perceive the world abroad. Leading non-governmental bodies include the Centre ‘Democracy through Culture’ (which has implemented international cultural projects of the Council of Europe), Soviet Art Gallery, and the Koridor online cultural journal and platform.\(^{13}\)

Last but not least, two other important groups of stakeholders need to be mentioned. The first comprises the different Christian denominations in Ukraine. The Ukrainian Catholic, Orthodox, Greek Orthodox, and Russian Orthodox churches play a very strong political and ethical role in society. Understanding the political influence of the churches among the country’s elites is essential in order to understand the functioning of the Ukrainian oligarchy and its influence on the country’s external cultural relations. The second group of stakeholders is the 20 million-large Ukrainian diaspora, with worldwide organisations – such as the Ukrainian World Congress and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America – protecting the interests of Ukrainians and taking a clear pro-Western stance on what they call the Ukraine’s Euro-integration process.\(^{14}\)


\(^{13}\) Responses to the mapping questionnaire by the Ministry of Culture.

\(^{14}\) Response to the mapping questionnaire by the Vice-Prime Minister’s office.
Ukraine is a priority country for the EU, and as recently as the summer of 2013 it seemed well on its way to sign an Association Agreement with the Union. Yet, Ukraine’s politics have been polarised in the last decade and have become even more so recently. The political and security crisis in Ukraine has put external cultural relations in a phase of uncertainty. International cultural relations reflect the country’s political uncertainty and cultural diversity, swinging between strong Western European aspirations on the one hand and Soviet-like practices inspired by Russian speaking cultures and other post-Soviet regimes on the other. One of the dividing lines within society as well as within politics is a cultural one, related to the tensions between East and West within the country.

In Ukraine, the government budget for culture has increased and a ‘festival boom’, with strong international dimensions, is taking place. The country already had a tradition of organising events such as the Molodist International Film Festival. The following recent festivals may be cited: Art Arsenal 2012 in the field of contemporary art (which cost about 3.2 million euros) and numerous activities related to the Euro 2012 Football Tournament; the international festival GOGOLFEST in Kyiv (was expecting around 200,000 visitors in September 2013 and partnering with several international – including EU Member States – partners); Lviv International Literary Festival, Kyiv International Poetry Festival, Meridian Czernowitz (poetry festival), International Arts Festival Kyiv Travnevy, Docudays.UA. (International Human Rights Documentary Film Festival), Odessa International Film Festival, the Blacksmith Festival in Ivano-Frankivsk, and the festival of historical reconstruction, The Land of Heroes (Zemlya Heroyiv) which has been taking place since 2005 in Kamyanets-Podilsky.

Because of a lack of systematically gathered and comparable data, it is not possible to assess precisely the economic, political and transformative significance of each of these events. But experts seem to consider that festivals organised by independent civil society organisations are the most creative and successful as regards sustainability and artistic quality.

Despite these positive developments, state support for the cultural sector appears to be decreasing and there are even signs of brain drain taking place. This puts Ukraine in a paradoxical situation: on the one hand a lot of effort has been put into the development of international cultural cooperation and cultural diplomacy to promote the country abroad (the cultural display during the Euro 2012 Football Championship); and on the other, the situation of the cultural sector and civil
society remains precarious: cultural professionals are still struggling to become financially sustainable and threats to human rights (politically motivated detentions, selective justice, breaching of European electoral standards, corruption) continue to undermine Ukraine’s image abroad. 19

Since its independence in the 1990s, Ukraine has conducted an active policy to host cultural initiatives, institutes and agencies of EU Member States.

The Ukrainian country profile in the Council of Europe’s *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe* also reports on numerous commercial projects (Spring and Autumn International Sculpture Salons in Kyiv Art fairs, etc.), about foreign cultural days/weeks organised by public bodies as well cultural events between local communities within the framework of traditional programmes like town-twinning and cross-border co-operation.

Given the country’s geopolitical ambivalence between the EU and Eurasia or Russia, one of the frameworks chosen from time to time by Ukraine for international cultural cooperation and dialogue has been the Council of Europe, an organisation of which Russia and other European post-Soviet countries are members. Many programmes of the Council of Europe are actually funded by the EU. To invest heavily again in the policy-making structures of the Council of Europe was to some extent a continuation of the country’s earlier commitments to agreements such as the European Landscape Convention and the 1954 European Cultural Convention. It also allowed Ukraine to play a leading role among countries of the Black Sea – an area of strategic importance – in the promotion of regional cooperation frameworks. This was illustrated by the launch of the Kyiv Initiative (Black Sea and South Caucasus programme) and Ukraine’s presence in the Intercultural Cities Programme, both regularly mentioned by consulted stakeholders. The Kyiv Initiative is a mix of thematic regional projects articulated around regional and cross-border exchange and cooperation in the fields of cultural policy, heritage protection, cinema, wine culture and tourism, cultural routes. The EU supported a pilot project on historical towns in a joint action with the Council of Europe. In the framework of the second phase of the EaP Culture Programme this support will be taken forward.

The Intercultural Cities Programme is a joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission. It has consisted of international exchange between cities from the Council of Europe’s members with strong intercultural features and which are keen to exchange and cooperate on best practice in intercultural governance. In Ukraine, the city of Melitopol is part of the programme, while twelve cities from EU countries, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, UK, Spain, Sweden, also participate. 20

---

19 As recalled in the EU Council conclusions of 10 December 2012.

While the EU has cooperated with Ukraine through its support to programmes managed by the Council of Europe, Ukraine’s bilateral cooperation with the EU has been determined by a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), the cultural potential of which has not been fully exploited by either side.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, the country has signed a number of multilateral agreements and conventions involving the EU: the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions,\textsuperscript{22} the European Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) or the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

The launch of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme (EPCP) has brought substantial change in Ukraine-EU cultural relations, provoking a shift of policy focus from the Council of Europe towards the EU. By providing skills transfers and sometimes through re-granting, the projects have directly injected novelty and finance in the independent cultural sector. Ukraine showed its strong interest in the EPCP by hosting its Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit (RMCBU) in Kyiv. The RMCBU has produced reports on the state of cultural policy in each of the countries participating in the EPCP. Ukraine has played an active role by hosting the coordination team of the Programme.

It was also instrumental in reconciling its Council of Europe priorities (Kyiv initiative) with the EaP format by organising a conference entitled ‘Kyiv Initiative and the Eastern Partnership – Cooperation and Synergies’ in Yalta in May 2011.\textsuperscript{23} Around ten Ukrainian organisations took part in the fifteen EU-funded projects, four of them (EkoArt from Donetsk, GURT Resource Centre based in Kyiv, Kherson-based Totem and the Intelektualna Perspectyva fund located in Kyiv) as leaders. The projects deal with the cultural development of communities, cultural diversity and minorities, local heritage and cross-border cultural cooperation.\textsuperscript{24} The country then hosted a seminar on the implementation of the 2005 UNESCO Convention in October 2013 (Lviv). This was a Ukrainian initiative following the ratification of the Convention in 2010.

However, the existence of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme has reinforced the dilemma and debates about the relevance of regional cooperation formats, given that there is no strong sense of regional belonging and that there are perceptions of significant heterogeneity within the region.\textsuperscript{25} This apparently rather painful experience seems to show that a lot more dialogue is needed between the EU and Ukrainian stakeholders to clarify and strengthen their cultural relations.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{21} An overview of EU programmes and policies towards Ukraine in the cultural field is available in annexes.

\textsuperscript{22} The ratification of the convention was a prerequisite for participation in the Special Actions 2009/2010 under the Culture Programme offered by the EU to countries covered by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).


\textsuperscript{24} The full list of projects in which Ukrainian organisations take are part are available in the annexes.

\textsuperscript{25} Sandel, op. cit., pp.49-50.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p.53: ‘the various stakeholders in Ukraine and the other countries should start defining and advocating how they would ideally like the relationship with the EU, the EU Member States, and with EU professional counterparts to develop in
The signature of a full Association Agreement (several chapters of which related to external cultural relations in the field of education, training and youth, culture, sport and physical activity, civil society, cross-border and regional cooperation)\textsuperscript{27} with the EU would be a milestone in the country’s international cultural relations and would open new avenues for cooperation and integration beyond the Eastern Partnership culture programme. Ukraine also took part in the cultural policy dialogue in the framework of Platform 4 of the EPCP. The second phase of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme and the Creative Europe programme will give more opportunities to Ukrainian stakeholders to engage more closely with Western European partners.

At bilateral level, very intense cultural exchanges have taken place with numerous EU Member States: Poland, Germany, Latvia,\textsuperscript{28} the Polish Presidency Cultural Programme,\textsuperscript{29} the UK, and France. Within the cooperation framework of the Visegrad Group (Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic and Poland), Ukraine has organised small projects (exchange of 150 students) with the help of the Visegrad Fund.\textsuperscript{30} The Kyiv island/Ostrov Festival has been inspired by that of Budapest and is a sign of some rapprochement. Ukraine has very close and dense cultural relations with its neighbour Poland, governed by a dozen agreements. Exchanges are numerous and in a variety of fields: arts, education, heritage, sports, and tourism.\textsuperscript{31} Ukraine has opened a Cultural Centre in Warsaw. Poland plays the role of facilitator in Ukraine’s preparation for European integration through a number of training, exchange and scholarship programmes in a variety of cultural, education and scientific fields.

Cooperation with Germany was re-launched in 1993 and focuses on language learning, academic exchange (DAAD) and, increasingly, on cultural management. The Goethe-Institut (GI) has set up an office in Kyiv shared and jointly managed with the British Council, according to a visionary and avant-garde approach of European cultural external relations. The pioneering initiative is remarkable in many respects. First, it allowed both organisations to save costs by sharing joint venues. Second, the same architects and designers conceived the renovation of the entire building hosting the two institutes. They combined two essential features of the building: a sense of German-British (European) commonality together with clear distinction (through the use of different colours) between the two national institutes’ identities.


\footnotesize\textsuperscript{28} See at: http://latvia.mfa.gov.ua/en/ukraine-latvia/culture.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{29} Polish Institute in Kyiv website: http://www.polinst.kiev.ua/.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{30} International Visegrad Fund website: http://www.visegradfund.org.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{31} Examples of cultural events and programmes include the Polish-Ukrainian project on Euro 2012, European Stadium of Culture, Festival of Ukrainian Culture, Ukrainian Spring. Autumn Podlasie, Bytivska Vatra, Days of Ukrainian music at the Warsaw Philharmonic, Festival Lemko culture, Lemko Vatra, Days of Ukrainian Culture in Stettin, Węgorzewo, Giżycko, Lublin, Festival Ekolomya, Neighbourhood Days on Ukrainian-Polish border, and Gaude Polonia (2003).
The GI is in charge of three German-Ukrainian cultural associations in Odessa, Kharkov and Chernovsky. According to the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ website, there are more than 160 university cooperation arrangements between Ukraine and Germany.\(^{32}\) In the last few years, the GI has focused its cooperation more specifically on the theatre sector by directly or indirectly supporting organisations and their modernisation, and their openness to international cooperation as well as their partnerships. It has also recently supported synergies between Ukraine and Georgia in the field of museum management.

The UK and Ukraine signed an agreement at government level in 1993 focusing on all areas of cultural relations from arts to education and sports. In 2012 the British Embassy in Ukraine funded a public opinion scoping study to assess Ukrainian opinion about EU integration and the prospects of an Association Agreement.\(^{33}\) On the basis of the results showing that the average citizen has very limited knowledge about the EU, it called for an active awareness-raising campaign. The British Council in Ukraine focuses on arts, English and higher education. It is expanding its arts programme, with two objectives: professional development for arts professionals, in theatre, film and the visual arts; and sharing contemporary arts with younger Ukrainian audiences, through partnerships with prominent festivals or events, such as the Odessa Film Festival, Mystetskyi Arsenal biennale and Koktabel Jazz Festival. It offers direct teaching of English and works closely with the Ministry of Education in capacity building in English and in higher education collaboration. The British Council has several offices in Ukraine in addition to the one it shares with the Goethe-Institut in Kyiv. In partnership with the Akhmetov foundation, it supported a school for young Ukrainian film critics. In 2012 it organised a course for festival managers, jointly with the Goethe-Institut.

Ukraine has around 20 agreements with Latvia in the cultural and educational fields. These are intergovernmental agreements or based on direct professional cooperation between institutions. In the field of arts, various exchanges of artists (painters, writers, musicians) have taken place in the last five years. Cooperation also exists between libraries and education structures.

The Netherlands started their cultural cooperation with Ukraine in 1996. Regular exchanges or tours of artists take place on the occasion of festivals or other cultural events in the Netherlands (for example the Utrecht Festival).\(^{34}\) The Netherlands funded the Ukrainian-Dutch programme MATRA on Ukrainian Museums.\(^{35}\)

Ukrainian-French relations in the field of culture, education and science are based on an agreement signed in October 1995 and a follow-up protocol dating from February 2008. In 2005 Ukraine and France signed an intergovernmental agreement on mutual recognition of diplomas and qualifications. Regular yearly cultural events take place in both countries. Ukraine opened a cultural


\(^{33}\) UK Embassy scoping study, 2012.


centre in Paris in 2004. The Institut français in Ukraine focuses on performing arts (music, theatre, and dance), visual arts and film, with an emphasis on contemporary art. It strives to connect French and Ukrainian artists and institutions to develop lasting cooperation. The ‘French Spring’ in Ukraine is an annual large-scale month-long event organised in April and sponsored by private companies (Crédit Agricole and Premier Hotels).
CONCLUSIONS, PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

During the consultation, a number of expectations and views on Europe, the EU, and Europeans were expressed. There was a consensus among our informants about the fact that Ukrainian culture is not well known in the EU countries and that this perpetuates a gap in cultural relations, with a stereotypical view of Ukraine as a country in the cultural shadow of Russia. Whether this gap should be filled by more efforts from the EU or by more efforts from the Ukrainian side to promote its culture was open to debate. As a consequence, there is also a widespread feeling that Ukraine and Ukrainians are not treated as equal partners or as representatives of European culture by the EU. This is worsened by EU visa policies, depicted as overly complicated and difficult to obtain, despite ongoing cooperation towards visa liberalisation. In 2013, although consulted stakeholders did not have much information about the Creative Europe programme, many of their expectations actually matched a number of opportunities offered by the EU to Ukraine for the period 2014-2020.

Consulted experts, however, recognise that Ukrainian cultural policy makers in government structures – but also in civil society – lack competence and skills. They also operate according to standards which are not as convincing as those followed in the EU. For them, enhancing cultural exchanges and relations provides the opportunity to attain new knowledge through dialogue with key cultural figures, new ideas and experience. It would thus be conducive to the elaboration of new policies. The Georgian-German training project on museum management in the framework of the EU twinning programme was cited as an example of best practice consisting of supporting pilot cooperation projects to inspire longer-term structural reform programmes and policies. The view was also expressed that Ukraine needs to consider ways of promoting its research sector and that cooperation with the EU in this field could be useful. In the field of higher education, some doubts were expressed about the relevance of the Bologna process, but no clear evidence was provided to substantiate these doubts.

Interestingly, individual EU countries like Germany and Poland were described as gateways to the EU and other EU countries.

When asked to provide recommendations or ideas about what the EU, Europe or Europeans could do, a number of suggestions were made.

Culture should be put more clearly on the agenda of meetings between high-level EU and Ukrainian policy makers with a view to raising awareness amongst Ukrainian politicians about this policy area. There was also agreement that more support from the EU and Europe to the independent cultural sector through exchanges, pilot reform projects, less restrictive visa procedures, and cultural management training would be of great added value. More specifically, the need for some support from the EU to government structures, in order to reform their practice and raise awareness of Western European experience and knowhow in the management of external cultural policies, was underlined.

Against this background, the possible Association Agreement was clearly seen by some as a great opportunity. In spite of its technocratic nature, it would provide conditions conducive to
cultural development and a strong point of reference in the relationship with the EU. It would create a more enabling environment for cultural development through economic development, with a potentially favourable impact on culture across the country. If such an agreement is signed, these recommendations carry even more weight.

The Association Agreement between the EU and Ukraine as well as other initiatives to bring Europe to Ukraine and to give Ukrainians access to Europe, could have had a profound if only slowly felt impact in the country. The recent uprising and repression and their denouement have confirmed that Ukraine’s cultural relations with the EU are still caught in post-cold war geopolitics and political economy in which societies confront conservative oligarchs and bureaucracies. This presents the challenge of combining cultural relations instruments with other external action tools and methods.
ANNEXES

Annex I: Methodology and list of people consulted

The consultation mission took place in July 2013 and consisted of a first four hour-long workshop with a group of ten cultural stakeholders representing state and non-state structures. Another smaller roundtable was organised with the representatives of the EUNIC cluster. Closed doors interviews took place with the National Institute for Strategic Studies (NISS) accountable to the Presidential apparatus and representatives of the independent philanthropic Pinchuk Foundation and Arts centre. In total, 17 people were consulted.

The draft was closed in October 2013 and lightly updated in March 2014.

Participants to the workshop held on Tuesday, 9th July 2013, in Kyiv

- Afonin, Oleksandr, President of the Ukrainian Publishers and Booksellers Association
- Butsenko, Olexandr, Director of the Development Centre ‘Democracy through Culture’
- Grytsenko, Oleksandr, Director of the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies
- Melnychuk, Oxana, Advisor of the Director of the National Institute for Strategic Studies
- Moiseev, Stanislav, Artistic Director of the National Academic Dramatic Ivan-Franko-Theater
- Ostrovskaya-Lyuta, Olesya, Head of the ‘Dynamic culture’ direction of the Rinat Akhmetov Foundation for Development of Ukraine
- Riabchuk, Mykola, Research Fellow at the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies
- Scherbyna, Victor, Deputy Director on Scientific Activity of the Institute for Cultural Research of Academy of Arts of Ukraine
- Zadorozhna, Maria, General Director of the National Art Museum of Ukraine

Guests (observers) to the workshop

- Dowle, Martin, Country Director British Council Ukraine
- Biletska, Tetiana, Capacity Building Expert at the Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit (RMCBU) of the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme
- Rasbash, Andrew, Head of Operations/Co-ordinator for Cooperation of the Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine
- Szalai, Zoltán, Head of Press & Information Section of the Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine
- Shulha, Tetiana, Sector Manager ‘Regional Development. Culture’ of the Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine
Annex II: EU-Ukrainian joint programmes and initiatives

EU-Ukrainian cultural cooperation activities run by the Commission Headquarters

- ‘Kyiv Initiative’: brings actors from local authorities and culture in ten small to middle range historic towns from each EaP country together
  
  http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/cooperation/Kyiv/default_en.asp

  The Kyiv Initiative brings together five countries at the south-eastern edge of Europe, namely Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. Their aim is to work with each other, to create democratic and engaged societies and rebuild trust and confidence across the region.

  The programme focuses on five themes that both unite and characterise the participating countries – heritage management, film, the shaping of cultural policy, literature, wine culture and tourism exchange. Through a series of projects designed to encourage cross-border collaboration, the Kyiv Initiative enables the sharing of expertise and the development of competence and skills in both towns and the countryside.

  In the context of the Council of Europe’s Kyiv Initiative Regional Programme, the European Commission is co-financing over the period 2009/2010 the first phase of Pilot Project 2 on ‘Rehabilitation of Cultural Heritage in Historic Cities’ (PP2) for institutional capacity-building in relation to rehabilitation projects. A second convention will be concluded between the Commission and the Council of Europe in 2010, valid until 2011, for the second phase of Pilot Project 2.

### Eastern Partnership Programme, Culture programme Part I

_Programmes managed by HQ in Brussels_

Strengthens regional cultural links and dialogue within the ENP East region, and between the EU and ENP Eastern countries' cultural networks and actors.

**Objectives:**

It aims at assisting the Partner Countries in their cultural policy reform at government level, as well as capacity building and improving professionalism of cultural operators in the Eastern ENP region. It contributes to exchange of information and experience among cultural operators at a regional level and with the EU. The programme seeks to support regional initiatives which demonstrate positive cultural contributions to economic development, social inclusion, conflict resolution and intercultural dialogue (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, Belarus).

**What does it do?**

The programme helps to strengthen policy-making, project and resource generating capacities of both the public sector and cultural operators. It fosters dialogue and contributes to the development of co-operation mechanisms within the sector across the region.

It also promotes intra-regional and inter-regional (EU-ENP) cultural initiatives and partnerships while helping to strengthen management skills and networking capacities of the cultural organisations and operators. The programme furthers linkages between cultural activities and wider regional agendas ranging from employment creation to social inclusion, environmental conservation, conflict prevention/resolution and intercultural dialogue.

**Actions in brief:** 1) Provides technical assistance to the Ministries of Culture in their policy reforms and helps overhaul legal and regulatory framework to foster cultural sector
modernisation; 2) Organises training to address the identified skills shortages in the cultural sector; 3) Facilitates the increase of public access to cultural resources; 4) Supports conservation and valorisation of regional cultural resources and heritage; 5) Encourages multi-disciplinary and cross-sector exchanges between government, civil society and the private sector; 6) Helps cultivate cultural operators in the region through support in developing strategic management, business planning, communications, advocacy, fundraising and other relevant capacities.

Budget: 3 million €
Duration: April 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Brief Description/Overall Objectives</th>
<th>EU Funding / Duration</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Book Platform</td>
<td>The overall objective of the project is to assist in creating an environment for a healthy, sustainable and open book culture as a prerequisite for economic, social and human development. The key specific objectives of the project are: 1. To enhance the role of book publishing as a key cultural industry for development in the region; 2. To build up sustainable conditions and networks for an enhanced intercultural dialogue through literature and translations in the region.</td>
<td>448,034 € 30 months</td>
<td>Next Page Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIS: 255-894</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2012 – June 2014</td>
<td>Yana Genova, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Page Foundation (BG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60, Ekzarh Iossif str., 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tel./fax: + 359 2 983 31 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:ygenova@npage.org">ygenova@npage.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and with Europe; 3. To foster access to books and literature for all.

**Target Groups**
1. Publishers and professional publishers associations in the region; 2. Translators and professional translators associations in the region; 3. National, municipal, regional and international public agencies in the book sector; 4. Writers and professional writers bodies in the region; 5.) Cultural journals in the region; 6.) Other cultural organisations in the region and in the EU countries.

**Final Beneficiaries**

**Estimated Results**
1. Enhanced capacity, effectiveness and representativeness of the professional associations in the book sector and their members; 2. Increased access to books and reading materials by all groups of society, including the most vulnerable groups (youth, minorities, inhabitants of distant regions); 3. Improved conditions for cooperation in the book sector within the region and between the region and the countries of the EU; 4. Better visibility of the book production of the participating countries at the European cultural and publishing arena; 5. Improved public/private dialogue in the book sector in the beneficiary countries.

---

**Sustainable Public Areas for Culture in Eastern Countries (SPACES)**

SPACES promotes artistic and cultural action in public space and the recuperation of public spaces for art, culture and urban residents.

The Project curates and carries out participatory art events in public spaces in Armenia, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. Processes of networking, social research and policy debates accompany the in situ events.

**Main questions:**
How can the art and cultural actors in these countries find new audiences and new places for artistic expression? What about the potential of public space in the cities for art, culture and civil society? What could be desirable new concepts for cultural governance in the region? To find answers to these questions, SPACES collaborates with artists, cultural workers, activists and civil society groups in the four countries and beyond.

**Main aims:**
- Four pioneering examples for appropriating public space through arts;
- Capacity building for independent cultural initiatives;

Website: [www.npage.org](http://www.npage.org)

**Georgian Publishers & Booksellers Association**
Ms Ketevan Jakeli, Executive Director
Archil Kereselidze Str.1/12, Tbilisi 0154 Georgia
Tel.: (+995) 570 101 601
Fax: (+995) 32 234290
Mob.: (+995) 591 700 530; (+995) 593 133 068
Email: dir@gpba.ge
Website: [www.gpba.ge](http://www.gpba.ge)

**36 months**

**Oikodrom – the Vienna Institute for Urban Sustainability (Project Coordinator)**
Stutterheimstraße 16-18/III, 1150 Vienna, Austria
Tel: +43 1 984 23 51
Fax: +43 1 984 23 51 2
Email: info@spacesproject.net
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Lead Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Cultures – Historical Imprints</strong></td>
<td>The 3 year action plan of the project covers different work packages which will mainly target ‘the implementation of wide project objectives with the specific focus on strengthening the capacities of semi-public actors involved in the activities and sustainability of independent history and heritage educators associations; awareness raising and cultural education that enhance democracy and intercultural dialogue, creating adequate conditions for the development of educational activities in an international environment promoting cultural tolerance; strengthening regional links and dialogue within the region of the Eastern partnership, and between the EU and countries of the Eastern partnership in respect to cultural network and actors’. The project target group is both formal and informal educators in the field of culture from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine, including history and heritage educators and their associations.</td>
<td>699,399 € 36 months December 2011 – November 2014</td>
<td>EUROCLIO – European Association of History Educators Mr Steven Stegers Laan van Meerdervoort 70, 2517 AN The Hague Email: <a href="mailto:steven@euroclio.eu">steven@euroclio.eu</a> Website: <a href="http://www.euroclio.eu">www.euroclio.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors Across Borders Eastern Partnership Program (DAB)</td>
<td>Goal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To foster the development of conditions and structures through which cinema can be a vector for sustainable economic, social and human development within and between EaP Countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To build cross-border and cross-cultural cooperation in the EaP and neighbouring countries by means of cinema;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To develop professional networks between stakeholders in the cinema sphere;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To create cultural diversity and tolerance through professional cooperation in cinema industries;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To improve the skills and capacities of cinema as agents of social economic and cultural development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milestones/Results:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cinema Across Border on-line network (an Internet-based network of and for film-makers, journalists, film critics, distributors, cinema agencies and film enthusiasts in the region;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On-line film workshops (for 60 emerging filmmakers from all 6 countries of EaP with 'training for trainers' component for 10 trainers);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 DAB Regional Co-production Fora (including workshops, 3 film development mini-grants, development, publication and dissemination of DAB Regional Co-production Forum Project Book);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting Armenia-Turkey Cinema Platform (ATCP): continuation of ATCP Co-production Forum that support production of short films, production and distribution of a DVD anthology of films supported by ATCP (workshops, small grants, and networking);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cinema Journalists Across Border (theoretical and hands-on training for 12 young journalists in the field of film review and film critics);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishment of CJAB Network; 1-day symposium on the role of mass media in the present-day film processes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Film Across Borders (1 film anthology screening in EaP countries at 3 festivals and in 6 small towns, 2 symposia on the role of cinema in creating regional peace and tolerance);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Harmonising Regional Co-production (research on current film legislation and policies in EaP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36 months</th>
<th>Lusine Martirosyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34/A Abovyan Street, apt. 21, 0001, Yerevan, Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel.: (+374 10) 52 14 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: (+374 10) 52 10 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:l.martirosyan@dabhub.com">l.martirosyan@dabhub.com</a> / <a href="mailto:info@dabhub.com">info@dabhub.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**preparatory action Culture in EU External Relations**
| Sustainable Development of Local Communities Through the Actualisation of the Cultural Heritage | **Goal:** Strengthening culture sector of Ukraine and Belarus through the rehabilitation and preservation of ethno-cultural heritage of Polissya region – the zone of Chernobyl disaster.  
**Objectives:**  
- Establishment of cooperation between Ukraine and Belarus for Polissya culture preservation;  
- Increasing the efficiency of DNCKSTK through improving its material and technical potential;  
- Creation of the network of NGOs and public authorities for better cooperation in Polissya culture preservation;  
- Promotion of Polissya culture in wider society.  
**Milestones/Results:**  
- Study on current state of the culture sphere of Polissya region;  
- Historic culture and ethnography expeditions;  
- Archaeological surveys of culture monuments in Polissya region;  
- Repair and renovation of the DNCKSTK premises;  
- Materials and technical logistic support to the exhibition of cultural artifacts of Polissya region;  
- Traveling exhibition to Polissya region;  
- Culture tourism routes development;  
- Training seminars on culture promotion and engagement of local citizens to culture development;  
- Public hearings on the results of the study;  
- Info materials development and publication;  
- A documentary film development. | 36 months | Intelektualna Perspektiva Fund  
Maryna Sadova, Project Manager  
Tel: +38 044 253 23 53  
Email: fip@fip.org.ua |
| New Breath of Culture: Fill Heritage with Life of Arts | **Project purposes:**  
- Support and dissemination of best innovative cultural and creative practices on the basis of traditional cultural heritage – museums of study of local lore, history, archeology, ethnography, art, etc. of all levels (regional, regional, national);  
- Involvement of non-governmental organisations, creative unions, formal and non-formal creative groups, independent authors and curators in cooperation with museums with the purpose of filling them with a new life, engaging new audience, becoming more open and attractive to the general public;  
- Development of partnership between the public, non-governmental and commercial (tourist) organisations in the sphere of culture, and the international cooperation within the region of the Eastern Partnership. | 24 months | TOTEM Kherson City Center for Youth Initiatives (Lead Project Partner)  
Ms. Olena Afanasyeva, Project Coordinator  
Tel/fax: +38 0552 266072  
Email: culture@i.ua  
Website: http://totem.kherson.ua |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• To collect, support and disseminate the practices of successful cooperation of the museums preserving traditional cultural heritage, and non-governmental organisations, creative unions, independent authors and culture managers, and commercial (tourist) and official bodies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To expand access to culture for different social groups;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To develop and introduce system of non-formal intercultural education for youth;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To expand intercultural dialogue within the region of the Eastern Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equal Opportunities for National Minorities and Disadvantaged Groups in Realising Cultural Rights: Richness Through Diversity

| Goal: | To preserve cultural diversity and support the culture of minorities by strengthening capacities of local authorities, CSOs, managers of culture institutions and local communities in Ukraine and Armenia. |
| Objectives: | • To develop local plans on culture development including cultural needs of minorities and disadvantaged groups; |
|  | • To include innovative services in culture sector for minorities and disadvantaged groups on the base of network of local community institutions rebuilt with support of Social Investment Funds in Ukraine and Armenia; |
|  | • To enhance links and dialogue in culture diversity and creating access to culture for disadvantaged groups in Ukraine, Armenia and Poland. |

**Milestone activities:**

- Trainings and seminars for 120 representatives of local authorities, CSOs, managers of culture institutions;
- Study tour to Poland for 20 Ukrainians and Armenians;
- Culture plans for 20 communities;
- Introducing innovative services by local culture institutions using the potential of CSOs and focused on cultural needs of minorities;
- Re-granting 40 local initiatives;
- Awareness raising campaign for culture diversity.

### Cultural Development is the Source for Prosperity of Community

| The overall objective is strengthening the role of culture as a fundamental factor of influence on social, economic and human development of the Ukrainian and Georgian society through the capacity development of cultural institutions and by increasing residents’ participation on the development of cultural policy. |
| The target group is cultural actors in South-Eastern Ukraine and Western Georgia: |  |

|  | 24 months |
|  |  |
|  | GURT Resource Center (Lead Project Partner) |
|  | Ms. Maryana Zaviyska |
|  | Tel.: +38 044 296-1052 |
|  | Fax: +38 044 296-10-52 |
|  | Email: zaviyska@gurt.org.ua |
|  |  |
|  | EKOART Donetsk City Youth Center of Arts |
|  | Valentyna Sakhnenko |
|  | Universitetskaya st., office 313, Donetsk, Ukraine |

---
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Special Action 2010-Culture Programme

Objectives:
The special action in 2010 is open for EU Neighbourhood countries which have concluded association or cooperation agreements with the Community and ratified the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

The eligible third countries are: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Jordan, Moldova, occupied Palestinian Territory, Tunisia and Ukraine.

Azerbaijan and Ukraine have been added as from the first of March as they have signed the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

Duration: 2010-2011
Budget per project: 50,000-200,000 €

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Brief Description/Overall Objectives</th>
<th>EU Funding / Duration</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tandem – Creating new trans-national cultural cooperation links with Ukraine and Moldova</strong></td>
<td>The first Tandem scheme was launched in 2011-2012 to foster cultural cooperation between the EU, Ukraine and Moldova. Supported by the European Commission CULTURE programme and the Robert Bosch Stiftung, it included 50 participants from more than 30 European cities. The European Cultural Festival completed the Tandem project in May 2012 in Chisinau (Republic of Moldova). During the final presentation, the Tandem cooperations transformed the abandoned part of an old museum into a temporary vibrant place of arts and culture. ECF and MitOst worked with the following partners: Centre for Cultural Management (Lviv); Soros Foundation Moldova (Chisinau); and Culture Action Europe (Brussels).</td>
<td>199,270.00 €</td>
<td><a href="http://tandemexchange.eu/about-tandem/tandem-ukraine-eu-moldova/">http://tandemexchange.eu/about-tandem/tandem-ukraine-eu-moldova/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mirrors of Europe</strong></td>
<td>Mirrors of Europe will provide opportunities for prominent authors from 20 selected countries to spend time in another project country and produce an extended essay on his/her experience and</td>
<td>162,000.00 €</td>
<td><a href="http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/funding/2010/selection/docu">http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/funding/2010/selection/docu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tel.: +38-095-494-18-21, +38-097-292-80-60
Email: eurocult ua@gmail.com / info@ekoart.org
perception of the host country. Each project country would host one foreign author and send one of its own authors to one of the remaining countries. In the essays, the authors will be expected to address the question of what they see as the key signs of Europe in the country they are visiting. The idea is that essays written by foreign authors will allow the domestic readership to see ‘their’ countries through a different lens.