

SUPPORTING LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN USING CULTURAL HERITAGE FOR POST-WAR RECOVERY

Strategic brief

DOI: 10.70719/respol.2025.87

2025



Introduction: objectives and methodology	5
Preamble	8
1. Context	9
1.1. State policy in the CH domain	9
1.2. Donor organizations and projects focusing on community capacity development in the field of culture and CH	10
1.3. Cultural heritage and local governance	11
2. Policies proposed by the RES-POL project that will have a fundamental impact on changing the management and financing of cultural heritage in communities	13
2.1. The comprehensive institutional reform	13
2.2. Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Fund	14
3. Policies developed within the strategic phase of the RES-POL project by expert groups of the “Cultural Heritage” sector	16
3.1. Memory and identity in communities	16
3.1.1. Problem “Lack of knowledge in the field of the humanities”	16
<i>Policy: “Digital education, digitization and digitalization of memory and identity work”.</i>	16
<i>Policy: Cooperation of HEIs with memory institutions.</i>	17
3.1.2. Problems of informing and forming a participatory historical culture, “awareness-raising” and engagement	21
<i>Policy: informing and participatory historical culture.</i>	21

<i>Policy: Working with the “younger generation” and knowledge dissemination.</i>	24
<i>Policy: National memory as an ecosystem: open space for history, interaction, and social dialog.</i>	27
<i>Politics: Integrating contemporary art into work with memory and identity via a networking museum format.</i>	31
3.1.3. Problem. Lack of awareness and the work of cultural institutions as institutions of memory.	34
<i>Policy: Enabling cultural institutions to be institutions of memory.</i>	35
3.2. Movable cultural heritage (MCH)	40
3.2.1. Problem: Threat of significant loss and damage to movable cultural heritage as a result of war and insufficient preparedness for emergencies.	40
<i>Policy: Responding to war and other threats, creating storage facilities and regional depositories for movable heritage.</i>	40
3.3. Immovable cultural heritage (ICH)	46
3.3.1. Problem: Degradation of the condition of immovable cultural heritage sites. Low institutional capacity of cultural heritage protection bodies.	46
<i>Policy: Effective management instead of “protection”. Strengthening the capacities of communities to manage heritage for sustainable development of territories and heritage preservation.</i>	47
<i>Policy: Code of Cultural Heritage. Streamlining the management system, digitalization and expert control.</i>	49
<i>Policy: The system of assistance provision to investors in the development of ICH sites. Benefits, risk insurance, co-financing.</i>	53

3.3.2. Problem: the values of immovable cultural heritage are not understood by society. Devaluation of heritage	56
<i>Politics: Reconnecting society with heritage.</i>	56
<i>Policy: Public monitoring.</i>	60
<i>Policy: Spreading heritage values via veteran spaces.</i>	60
<i>Policy: Dissemination of heritage values via religious communities.</i>	61
3.3.3. Problem: Loss of human capital in the “Immovable cultural heritage” subsector	61
<i>Policy: Competence hubs.</i>	61
<i>Policy: Development of non-state services.</i>	64
General conclusions	65

Introduction: objectives and methodology

The strategic brief “Supporting local communities in using cultural heritage for post-war recovery” has been developed within the [RES-POL](#) (Rapid Expert Support for Culture and Media Policies in Ukraine) project, implemented by the “Center for Regional Development”, a public union of the Economic Development Agency [PPV](#), funded by the European Union.

The RES-POL project aims to enhance the functional capacity of the [Ministry of Culture and Strategic Communications](#) and its agencies (Ukrainian Book Institute, Ukrainian Cultural Fund, State Agency of Ukraine for Arts and Art Education, as well as the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory).

The RES-POL project duration: January 2024 - July 2025.

The RES-POL project focuses on four sectors (Art and Culture, Cultural Heritage, Creative Industries, and Media) and more than 20 subsectors (industries and types of artistic activity). RES-POL separately considers 10 essential cultural development issues (competitive salary, efficiency of state-owned enterprises in the field of culture, funding for creative industries, funding models for cultural services, communities and cultural heritage, EU integration and cultural policy, etc).

The project methodology aims:

- To identify essential policy issues in sectors and subsectors and describe them in policy briefs and baseline reports;
- To analyze 10 essential issues of cultural development the project focuses on and describe them in baseline reports;
- To develop and describe policy proposals on the essential sectoral issues and 10 essential issues of cultural development in strategic briefs;
- To develop sectoral strategies and operational programs for the sectors the project focuses on and roadmaps for their implementation;
- To develop amendments to several legal acts and/or concepts of pilot projects to implement the policies elaborated within the project;

RES-POL

- To analyze European experience in policy planning and implementation, evaluate some cultural policies in Ukraine, and assess the institutional capacity of the agencies within the Ministry of Culture and Strategic Communications.

The RES-POL project actively engages stakeholders at all policy development stages. The information on project achievements can be found on the [RES-POL Facebook page](#).

The goal of this strategic document is, based on the [Baseline Report “Communities and Cultural Heritage”](#) and the Strategic Brief on the “Cultural Heritage” sector, to offer solutions to core problems verified by the professional community as well as policy options that could be applied by communities and state authorities to preserve and develop cultural heritage.

The methodology of the strategic brief preparation aims to:

- Rank the essential policy issues related to cultural heritage in communities.
- Propose policy options developed in working groups formed from stakeholders – institutional managers, independent experts, representatives of the executive and legislative branches.
- Substantiate the criteria for selecting policies from the perspective of communities.
- Prepare reasoned policy recommendations for local and state authorities.

The author of the strategic brief

Olha Sahaydak – Compiler of the strategic brief;

Working group:

Oleksandra Kovalchuk, Viktor Dvornikov, Yuliia Hnat, Anton Liahusha, Olha Balashova;

Reviewer of the strategic brief:

Volodymyr Vorobey – head of the group of key experts of RES-POL.

Designer: **Yemets Bohdan.**

The content of this Strategic Brief is the responsibility of the Public Union “Center for Regional Development” and does not necessarily reflect the position of the European Union.

Preamble

The [Baseline Report “Essential Policy Issues: Communities and Cultural Heritage”](#) determined the range of core interrelated problems which affect the attitude of communities towards cultural heritage, the condition of objects, challenges and potential vectors of required changes: the impact of war, lack of human capital, perception of cultural heritage as a burden for communities, lack of basic education regarding cultural heritage, non-correspondence of higher education to current needs, lack of priority nature of cultural policy for the state, outdated regulation of the cultural heritage sphere, weakness or inability of institutions, financing at the survival level according to the residual principle.

As part of the strategy and policy development phase of the RES-POL project, experts from the “Cultural Heritage” sector and working groups of the Movable Heritage, Immovable Heritage, Memory and Identity subsectors developed policies that will influence the interaction of communities with local and national cultural heritage, promote its understanding, appreciation, preservation, development, and receipt of social and economic benefits.

1. Context

1.1. STATE POLICY IN THE CH DOMAIN

In 2021 the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy initiated the [Large Restoration](#) program - a project that included emergency response work, restoration and recovery of cultural monuments on the territory of Ukraine. However, the full-scale invasion of the Russian Federation into Ukraine deprived the initiative of the opportunity to develop. Due to the war, spending on culture and heritage did not increase nominally, and, in fact, it decreased by almost three times due to inflation. The number of specialists in the field also decreased by approximately one third.

Reforms the implementation of which is undertaken by the Ukrainian state as an obligation within the framework of the European Union Financial Support Program for Ukraine [Ukraine Facility](#)

Improved cultural development: “Strengthening the national security of the state via social cohesion and resilience of the Ukrainian population will become the cornerstone of the new Strategy for the Development of Ukrainian Culture.” The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine approved the [Cultural Strategy for 2025 - 2030](#), which was developed with the participation of experts from the CH sector of the RES-POL project. The strategy defines the priorities of state policy and also takes into account European integration requirements.

The Ukraine Facility Plan also pays special attention to promoting decentralization and regional development. At the national level, the [State Regional Development Strategy for 2021–2027 should be updated](#). **At the regional level**, regional development strategies and action plans for their implementation, comprehensive recovery programs for regions should be developed. **At the local level**, community development strategies, comprehensive spatial development plans and comprehensive recovery programs for territorial communities, community recovery and development plans should be developed.

The effectiveness and transparency of financing recovery, reconstruction and modernization measures at the local level will be ensured by implementing measures to reform **public investment management**. These measures will include,

in particular, the formalization of planning procedures, prioritization of selection and monitoring of public investments at the local level in accordance with unified approaches established for all sources and mechanisms of financing. In accordance with these approaches, the mechanism of capital transfers from the state budget to local budgets will also be reviewed.

It is worth noting that on the list of sectors that can qualify for recovery investments, on the DREAM portal – the state digital ecosystem for accountable recovery management – the cultural heritage sector and culture in general are not represented.

1.2. DONOR ORGANIZATIONS AND PROJECTS FOCUSING ON COMMUNITY CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD OF CULTURE AND CH

The priorities of donor programs were reactive assistance to save cultural heritage and overcome the devastating consequences of war, digitization of cultural heritage, support for cultural actors, advanced training and internships for specialists, provision of material and technical assistance, networking with specialists and institutions of other countries.

Initiatives of UNESCO, USAID (ceased operations in 2025, implemented, in particular, programs in the cultural heritage sector), European Commission (various programs),

[World Monuments Fund](#), [Cultural Emergency Response](#), [Smithsonian Cultural Rescue Initiative](#), [Aliph](#), initiatives by embassies of Sweden, Japan, Italy, France and other countries played an important role in the rescue of cultural heritage after a full-scale invasion.

Capital projects for the restoration and recovery of immovable heritage sites were financed by the program [U.S. Ambassador's fund for cultural preservation](#), which provided grants of up to \$500,000 for the restoration of monuments with the duration up to 5 years.

Programs [House of Europe](#), [EU4Culture](#), [“Spadshchyna. Prostir dlia Roboty”](#) (“Спадщина. Простір для роботи”) of the “Partnership Fund for a Resilient

Ukraine” were aimed more at specialists, communities, and the capacity of the CH institutions.

Institutions that consistently implemented programs related to cultural heritage in communities are the Goethe Institute in Ukraine, the British Council,

USAID projects – UCBI 4, TCA, ENGAGE, UNITY, HOVERLA; the Swiss UCORD project included specific components in the regions of presence, where expenditures were envisaged for cultural events and capacity building of the local governance system, which also includes culture.

The incomplete list of Ukrainian initiatives that interact with communities includes: [Museum for Change](#), [Museum Crisis Center](#), [Association of Ukrainian Museums](#), [HEMOLab](#), [Agency for Cultural Resilience](#) (ACURE), “Center for Supporting Art of Ukraine – Kyiv”.

1.3. CULTURAL HERITAGE AND LOCAL GOVERNANCE

Under the [analytical study “The condition of culture and art financing form local budgets”](#), prepared in 2022, [the network for the protection of national interests AHTC](#) within the framework of the project “Rebuilding Ukraine Together” with the support of the EU, for the period 2016-2022, local budget expenditures on all cultural needs amounted to 3%. Of these, more than 60% were spent on salaries, less than 0.2% – on capital expenditures.

The Law “[On the Principles of the State Regional Policy](#)” provides, in particular, for the presence of a socio-cultural component in community development, the development of infrastructure and tourism, and other components related to the protection and use of cultural heritage. Currently, cultural heritage is mostly mentioned indirectly in regional strategies as a resource for tourism development. For example, [the Development Strategy of Rivne Region](#) for the Period until 2027: “...preservation and popularization of cultural heritage, development of tourist routes...” (page 147). At the same time, indicators for the implementation of such strategic tasks are not specified.

In contrast, the city of Lviv, which has been consistently incorporating cultural heritage in the development of its strategy for a long time, has the [Heritage](#)

[Bureau](#) – coordination and information center for the promotion, preservation and restoration of Lviv heritage and the officially registered Lviv Culture Foundation, which is still de facto in the process of formation as an organization. Unfortunately, the example of Lviv is not widespread in the region.

An example of an independent initiative that has been implemented in Lviv and Uman since 2018 is ReHerit - a project to rethink, update, and develop the potential of tangible and intangible cultural heritage in Ukraine. This is one of the few long-term attempts in Ukraine to work with cultural heritage as an element of the urban ecosystem.

2. Policies proposed by the RES-POL project that will have a fundamental impact on changing the management and financing of cultural heritage in communities

2.1. THE COMPREHENSIVE INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

The comprehensive institutional reform envisages remodelling/change of management models for cultural institutions and transformation of the network of cultural institutions.

The priorities of the policy are as follows:

- Liberalization of the activities of cultural institutions;
- Good governance: competitions, supervisory boards, strategizing;
- Changing approaches to institutional financing;
- Patronage;
- Financing of cultural institutions, services, and projects from budgets of different levels;
- Typology of cultural institutions and creative industries;
- Democratization of the network of cultural institutions and creative industries;
- Shared and competitive access to the cultural infrastructure of state and independent actors;
- Public reporting of cultural institutions, which ensures transparency and makes it possible to operate with data, and analyze the quality of policy implementation.

2.2. UKRAINIAN CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND

For the Cultural Heritage sector, the policy of creating a financial instrument that will allow implementing valuable and long-term projects for the rescue and restoration of cultural heritage during the war and in the post-war period is fundamental. The Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Fund can act as such an instrument. During the war, the Fund is an extremely important instrument for the rescue of heritage, but its establishment is entirely dependent on foreign donors due to the lack of a state budget for both the establishment of the institution and its program activities.

The main focus of the UCHF

Complex/solid, long-term, and costly projects:

1. Conservation/stabilization of war-destroyed buildings and immovable heritage sites.
2. Restoration, rebuilding, reconstruction of war-destroyed buildings and immovable heritage sites.
3. Restoration and conservation of movable heritage sites and museum collections.
4. Construction and equipment of storage facilities and depositories for the preservation of movable cultural heritage.
5. Protection, conservation of archaeology.
6. Creation of the material and technical base of cultural heritage institutions - equipment, redevelopment of spaces, software, restoration equipment, and materials.
7. Development of design and estimate documentation, conducting scientific and restoration research.

Visionary goal. In the post-war perspective, the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Fund is an authoritative, organizationally capable, and financially stable, independently managed state institution - the key one in the restoration of the cultural heritage sector.

It has regular funding from the state budget and other sources.

It has a long-term planning mandate.

It is an executive body of operational programs to prepare Ukraine for accession to the EU.

3. Policies developed within the strategic phase of the RES-POL project by expert groups of the "Cultural Heritage" sector

The policies are described in detail in subsectoral Strategic Briefs and are put together in this document because they involve active participation of communities and have an impact on their conservation, restoration, and development..

3.1. MEMORY AND IDENTITY IN COMMUNITIES

Policy brief "Memory and Identity"

Strategic brief "Memory and Identity"

3.1.1. PROBLEM "LACK OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD OF THE HUMANITIES"

The insufficient level of education in the humanities creates the prerequisites for the impossibility of high-quality interpretation of cultural heritage, mediation of senses, and work with cultural heritage in the interests of national security, creation of new high-quality knowledge in the field of the humanities, and its dissemination throughout the world. Limited access to cultural heritage, unfounded interpretations, the threat to the formation of a new language of memory, the demand for quick solutions instead of deep understanding, and insufficient processing of the past hinder the actualization of memory and creation of new knowledge.

POLICY: "DIGITAL EDUCATION, DIGITIZATION AND DIGITALIZATION OF MEMORY AND IDENTITY WORK".

The digitization of memory and identity is a key challenge for modern society. The lack of a single integrated platform for accessing historical archives, insufficient use of digital technologies in education and cultural heritage, and limited participation of communities in the processes of documenting history lead to limited access to cultural heritage and insufficient processing of past experiences, which leads to

the formation of a distorted identity.

Instruments:

- **Institutional instruments.** National digital platform following the example of szukajwarchiwach.pl in Poland. Integration of historical and cultural sites into the Diia.Osvita platform.
- **Digital instruments.** Digital laboratories and interactive educational projects (games, simulations, virtual museums). An example is the Digital Projects of the Center for Urban History, the HURI MAPA: Digital Atlas of Ukraine project (<https://www.huri.harvard.edu/mapa>). They may function in affiliation with HEIs, schools, museums, libraries, and cultural centers.
- **Educational instruments.** Online courses and programs for secondary and higher education institutions in history, cultural heritage, and digital humanities. The encouragement of research – writing course papers, diploma and master papers with a component of cultural heritage digitizing (or creation of digital projects). Focus on the finished product. Expanding academic mobility of Ukrainian students and scholars through Erasmus+, Fulbright, DAAD, and other programs, creating master's and doctoral programs with a focus on Ukrainian culture for a foreign audience, digitizing cultural objects, translating academic texts, and developing multilingual resources.
- **Financial instruments.** At the state level, support can be provided by institutions such as the UCF, as well as the Ministry of Education and Science, in particular when it comes to laboratories at state HEIs, local budgets through participatory budgets, or municipal programs for the development of culture and education. International donors, such as: the EU “Creative Europe” programs, the House of Europe (<https://houseofeuropa.org.ua/opportunity/687>), IREX, Goethe-Institut, British Council – also actively support projects in the field of digital culture, innovation, and non-formal education. Additionally, digital hubs can attract funding through crowdfunding, partnerships with local businesses, private initiatives, social enterprises, and charitable foundations.

POLICY: COOPERATION OF HEIS WITH MEMORY INSTITUTIONS.

Strengthening interaction between higher education institutions (HEIs) and memory institutions for the preservation, analysis, rethinking, and revitalization of

cultural heritage. Creating joint initiatives in the field of public history and identity through training specialists to work in memory institutions in communities, conducting applied research, and implementing educational innovations.

An example of such interaction is the work of memory institutions - NGO "Museum of Contemporary Art", the Territory of Terror museum, the Platform for Memory Culture Past/Future/Art (NGO "Cultural Practices"), NGO "Coalition of Cultural Actors", educational master's programs at the Ukrainian Catholic University "The Future of Heritage: History, Culture, Literature", at KSE "Research on Memory and Public History", the platform "Memorial", Ukrainer. Projects of such interaction: "Practice on Art, Memory and History" (KAMA, NGO "Museum of Contemporary Art", KSE), "Laboratory of Memorialization Practices" (Past/Future/Art, NGO "Museum of Contemporary Art", KSE), cooperation with the war archive (UCU, Center for Urban History), cooperation between the Vinnytsia Museum and Vinnytsia M. Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University.

Instruments:

- **Educational instruments.** Educational programs and internships – introduction of specialized pilot programs based on the specific model by the Ministry of Education and Science, MCSC, HEIs in cooperation with memory institutions since 2028 (for example, [Executive Master in Cultural Leadership](#)), Máster Universitario en Conservación y Restauración de Bienes Culturales), internships and collaborations, in particular with the [Luxembourg Centre for Contemporary and Digital History](#) (C2DH) – University of Luxembourg, which will provide us with specialists in memory management, working with cultural heritage, specialists in working with local memory and communities, digitization of memory and digital archives, ensure return of trained specialists to implement projects in communities that will correspond to the classifier. In the first stages, there will be *scientific cooperation and analytical support*: research aimed at documenting and revitalizing heritage, funded by state institutions, international donors, and foundations;
- **Financial instruments.** Introduction of state subventions for the development of laboratories and memory centers at HEIs, Grant programs, state orders, partial coverage by the state of costs for those who will go abroad and return, and for HEIs that intensify their activities together with memory institutions. Introduction of a targeted state subvention as a subtype of existing educational subventions, focusing on supporting interdisciplinary educational and research initiatives in the field of collective memory, cultural

heritage, and museology. In parallel, it is necessary to develop grant programs for the projects implemented by HEIs in cooperation with memory institutions (museums, archives, analytical centers), provide for a mechanism for state orders for inventory making, digital processing and analysis of heritage, and also introduce partial coverage of costs for international mobility of lecturers and researchers on the condition of return and implementation of the results in the educational process. For active HEIs, it is recommended to establish bonus funding for the development of joint programs and educational products with partners in the field of memory, with clear coordination between the Ministry of Education and Science, MCSC, UCF, and the National Research Foundation of Ukraine, with the possibility of launching an interdepartmental pilot program "Education and Memory" in 2026-2027.

Outcomes:

1. Educational programs and specialist training

- At least 10 new courses in memory management, public history, and digital archival studies introduced in higher education institutions.
- Joint student internship programs launched in museums, archives, as well as community initiatives.
- At least 200 students have received practical training in public history.

2. Research centers and laboratories

- Memory and cultural heritage laboratories established in 5 leading universities.
- Over 20 interdisciplinary research projects organized with the involvement of international experts.
- 5 comprehensive studies on the contemporary memory policy in Ukraine published, as well as dozens of scientific articles.

3. Digitization and advanced technologies

- Over 50,000 archival documents digitized and an online database of historical sources created.

- An interactive memory map for local communities covering 10 regions launched.
- The first VR tours of historical sites conducted in cooperation with museums.

4. Financing and international cooperation

- Strategic cooperation with European educational and scientific institutions (C2DH, UCU, KSE) initiated.
- Funding for the development of digital archives has been received from international funds.

5. Popularizing and public engagement

- More than 50 public events (conferences, workshops, round-table discussions) on the issues of memory and historical heritage held.
- Development and strengthening of the MCSC creative competition tool.
- A national award for the best project in the field of work with memory created.
- 10 local public initiatives in the field of public history successfully implemented.

Impact:

- **Development of a culture of memory**, when history becomes a subject of public discussion, and not only state policy, history is perceived as a complex process, and not a set of heroic or tragic facts, conflict reduction through awareness of the polyphony of history.
- **Strengthening local communities** - communities actively create their own memorialization projects.
- **Development of civic participation** - people join volunteer, research, and educational initiatives.
- **Growth of social capital** via strengthening trust and cooperation between citizens through historical initiatives.

- **Development of education** - higher education institutions become places of active work with memory and identity, along with memory institutions.
- **Memory institutions as platforms for dialog** - museums and memorial spaces become platforms for public discussion.
- **Resistance to manipulation** - critical interpretation of history reduces the influence of propaganda and contributes to an active decolonization process.

3.1.2. PROBLEMS OF INFORMING AND FORMING A PARTICIPATORY HISTORICAL CULTURE, “AWARENESS-RAISING” AND ENGAGEMENT

Problems of informing, community involvement, working with local memorial and cultural sites/objects/traditions/features, lack of competences in communities, specialists for discussions and communication work weaken the quality of local projects and support of deimperialization and decolonization processes; while underestimation of cultural practices, automatic destruction of inconvenient heritage and state monopoly on memory formation limit public dialog and pluralism of historical interpretations.

There can be traced a lack of formation of a participatory historical culture, which implies openness of all stakeholders to dialog through which historical memory is formed and knowledge is exchanged, historical memory, which is a cornerstone in the process of interaction and development of tools for working with identity, implies mutual influence of actors on each other, development of critical thinking, active participation of communities in the processes of memorialization and popularization of local and national history, in the formation of transparent communication between all stakeholders.

POLICY: INFORMING AND PARTICIPATORY HISTORICAL CULTURE.

The policy aims to integrate educational activities with community work around local memorial sites, cultural sites, traditions, and features. It focuses on involving citizens in the preservation and promotion of local heritage, as this contributes to the formation of local identity and strengthens ties between generations. The main priorities are supporting public initiatives, working with local communities and local heritage, as well as developing partnerships between state institutions, public organizations, and international structures.

Instruments:

- To support community initiatives via grants and subsidies in the field of culture and memory. In particular, to enable such mini-grants, for example, for the purchase of equipment for rural libraries. Among other things, to emphasize the focus on participatory culture and the needs of communities in working with heritage in the UCF “Cultural Heritage” programs (for example, within the framework of LOT 3 “Research of the Historical and Cultural Heritage of Ukraine”), “Culture during War”, “Culture. Regions”, and others.
- Educational instruments that include the development of workbooks, holding workshops, excursions and educational events in local cultural sites, development of local training programs for working with memorial sites and traditions, analysis of successful and unsuccessful cases and scaling up of successful practices, engagement of experts and international partners to implement the best practices in working with memory. Development of educational strategies for working with memory and identity in and with communities – creation of basic information tools and methodological materials, manuals.
- Development of a “memory map” (local “zoning” of memory sites) in communities, which would record the existing cultural heritage sites that have the potential to become a point of growth and unification, as well as the processes that are important and relevant for the community (for example, memorialization of those killed in war), and analyze available resources (financial and human), determine priorities and direction of movement, help coordinate efforts within the community and make the directions and focus of knowledge dissemination activities clearer and more understandable for external experts and potential partners. This “memory map” becomes part of the community development strategy.
- Taking into account in the museumization protocols the “audit” and reevaluation of the values preserved by memory institutions, documentation of dismantled Soviet objects (for many years they have been talking about the experience of other countries with parks of the Soviet past, but in practice the objects are being destroyed, and only some museums have the strength and opportunity to preserve the objects and work with them).

Outcomes:

- Communities are actively working to reveal their own local identities.

- The number of preserved cultural heritage sites integrated into educational, media, and tourism projects is constantly growing. Cultural heritage sites appear in registers thanks to local initiative. Public involvement in commemoration practices is growing.
- Communication and achieving understanding between different population groups occur through the use of memory institutions as platforms for dialog.
- Local history is actively integrated into educational programs of regions, and local heritage is becoming part of the educational process at all levels, which allows children and young people to feel a sense of belonging and to better understand the importance of history preservation.
- The interest of youth in history has significantly increased. Volunteer and educational programs lead to the intensification of engagement in the processes of memorialization and history preservation among the representatives of the younger generation.
- Intersectoral cooperation is taking place. Partnerships between government agencies, independent scientists, NGOs, and international organizations are becoming the norm across Ukraine. This ensures the efficient use of resources for heritage preservation.
- Popularization of local heritage through the use of modern technologies and creative formats, information about local historical sites and monuments will become available to a wider audience.

Impact:

- Social cohesion and citizen engagement in memory preservation strengthened
- Local history integrated into curricula, which creates conditions for pupils and students to better understand the importance of preserving history for the development of the country.
- The role of communities in the development and formation of cultural policy at the local level is key.
- Memory institutions have become important platforms for dialog, and this allows overcoming social and cultural barriers.

- Through the systematic preservation and transfer of history to future generations, social cohesion is ensured, based on a long-term and sustainable memory of important cultural and historical events.
- The efficiency of using resources allocated for the preservation of cultural heritage and the development of local initiatives related to work with memory has increased.

POLICY: WORKING WITH THE “YOUNGER GENERATION” AND KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION.

Working with the younger generation requires the use of the latest methods of knowledge dissemination and involvement in the processes of working with memory and identity. Young people in communities are actively involved in working with local memory, have a proactive knowledge-based position. Dissemination of information about local cultural phenomena, traditions, and practices constitutes a trend in social media among “young users”. Creation of trendy communication formats. Public initiatives in the field of memory are supported through grant programs, strategic planning, and partnerships. Use of modern technologies for the preservation, research, and rethinking of historical heritage.

Instruments:

- Development and financing of the youth movement for local history by the state – via the [Ukrainian Youth Fund](#) (cooperation with the Ministry of Youth and Sports of Ukraine) and creation of a coalition of youth organizations for local history with a recognizable identity for projects representing this movement. The movement can support, for example, historical exploration, digitalization, storytelling, restoration of memorable places, “cultivation” of historical places. In the implementation, it is important to involve already existing youth organizations that have experience in civic education and work with historical memory (in particular, “Plast – National Scout Organization of Ukraine”, which receives support from the state budget, its programs on education, local history, volunteering and camping can be expanded with components of public history, commemoration, and research of local heritage).
- Creation of an interdepartmental platform of the Ministry of Education and Science, MCSC, and the National Academy of Sciences with the mandate to initiate changes to educational standards and public programs in the field

of cultural heritage, with further implementation through specialized bodies of the Ministry of Education and Science and pilot educational modules. To envisage the launch of public history courses in collaboration with educators, with a focus on cross-curricular integration, accessible language, and work with local memory.

- Review and expansion/amendment of state programs to support youth initiatives through the Ministry of Education and Science + the Ministry of Youth and Sports, working in the field of memorialization and work with identity, as well as funds for the development of digital educational platforms. Funding should be directed to the development of new innovative educational resources, applications, materials, to supporting online courses and competitions, as well as to the organization of cultural events.
- Creation of a certificate training program for museum employees who will work with adolescents and youth.
- Implementation through the platform of interaction of the Ministry of Education + MCSC + the National Academy of Sciences of methods of non-formal education, education through entertainment (edutainment), modern technologies for popularization and work with tangible and intangible objects of memory, game options such as Playstation, etc.
- Competence development – creation of educational programs for teachers, lecturers and youth leaders who will be able to effectively transfer knowledge about cultural heritage and memorialization, skills of analysis, research, critical thinking, development of social communication and leadership skills through project activities aimed at understanding history and cultural identity, involvement of specialists in the development of new curricula and materials. To implement this, there should be cooperation with existing platforms and resources such as Edera.
- Intergenerational programs that create conditions for mutual learning between young people and the older generation (such as piloting in Bucha, when [high school students taught English to pensioners](#)), combination of experience (“old staff”) and technology (youth) or based on the popularity of “old” technology among young people (such as the fashion for instant photos of the Polaroid type).
- Analysis and dissemination of best practices from international experience in working with young people, including practices of informal education and

physical involvement (not only excursions, but also, for example, volunteering for heritage preservation, participation in archaeological excavations, etc.), which are interesting for young people and motivate them to study history, in particular local history. An example can be the activities within the framework of the [University of Limerick's Master's degree "Local History"](#) and [Cultural Heritage in Action](#).

- Educational campaigns, forums, festivals, and ideathons that integrate knowledge about national and local heritage into active practices.

Outcomes:

- At least 10 interdisciplinary educational programs and courses on cultural heritage, public history, and memorialization launched in HEIs and partner institutions.
- Over 1,000 young people engaged in educational, research, and volunteer programs through digital platforms, local initiatives, internships, and pilot training modules.
- At least 15 cross-sectoral projects (HEIs + memory institutions + communities) implemented, and they include digital representation of heritage, commemorative actions, exhibitions, integration into the educational process.
- Successful local practices disseminated at no fewer than 10 international forums, exhibitions, or partnership initiatives that promote dialog on history and culture.
- At least 3 digital and physical platforms focusing on working with youth and cultural memory (educational hubs, archives, online courses) created and supported.
- Innovative approaches to education and memorialization developed and piloted in 10 communities – with further scaling up at the regional and national levels.

Impact:

- Young people are actively involved in working with local memory.

- Knowledge is constantly verified and disseminated through modern platforms.
- A supportive environment for public initiatives has been created.
- Interest in history has increased due to cultural events.

POLICY: NATIONAL MEMORY AS AN ECOSYSTEM: OPEN SPACE FOR HISTORY, INTERACTION, AND SOCIAL DIALOG.

The policy envisages introduction of an [ecosystemic approach](#) in the field of work with national memory with the aim of forming an ecosystem aimed at the idea of creating environments that allow citizens to freely interact with various aspects of history, form critical thinking, and work with reliable sources of information. The role of the UINM is to act as the main “architect” of this ecosystem, coordinating processes and initiating projects that ensure the preservation of memory, in particular, by creating a platform for interaction between system participants, stakeholders. Other organizations can also be initiators of projects. Public organizations, media, educational institutions, and cultural institutions take an active part in the formation of national memory, organizing public events, research, educational programs, and exhibitions that allow citizens to critically evaluate their past.

An important component of the ecosystem is the interaction between different participants (spheres), where each plays its role: educational institutions provide training and do research, cultural and scientific institutions preserve, research, and popularize cultural heritage, and the media carry out critical analysis and dissemination of reliable information. State bodies at the national and local levels are responsible for legal and financial support for memorialization projects, creating regulatory and legal conditions for the development of cultural initiatives.

The role of business is also manifested here through various areas of business interaction with the cultural sphere: patronage, corporate social responsibility, image/advertising, business model/assets, people development, working with uncertainty and the unknown.

The lack of inclusive spaces for discussing the past limits the possibilities of public dialog, hinders critical understanding of history and its impact on the present, and narrows the horizons of the collective memory formation. Therefore, there is a

need to create safe memory spaces – open, independent platforms where people with different views can discuss everything with no fear of being excluded or judged. However, the key challenge is that most of the existing platforms have an ideological affiliation – state, communal, or even politically motivated, which makes it impossible for some citizens to trust them. This is particularly noticeable in cities with a controversial historical legacy, such as Odesa, where official institutions are often perceived with prejudice. Therefore, the point is not only about the need for such spaces, but also that they are created through the joint efforts of the community and cultural actors, so that they really remain open, safe, and trustworthy for a wide range of participants.

It is important to ensure wider access to sources, archives, and funds that facilitate free research and understanding of history. Limited tools, ideological pressure, and a narrow focus on specifics or excessive delineation hinder critical thinking and understanding of complex social challenges. The policy of the memory ecosystem should seek to overcome these obstacles by introducing interdisciplinary approaches, expanding access to information, and creating inclusive environments that will facilitate open contact with reality.

Functionally, this policy is designed to provide society with tools for multi-directional work with memory, build dialog between social groups and generations, and integrate historical experiences into the European context without any distortions or ideological pressure.

Instruments:

- Development of UINM's functionality and methodologies for implementing the role of ecosystem architect, in particular, through training of employees, provision of UINM with appropriate resources.
- Implementation of programs that help citizens critically evaluate historical events and their impact on modern times.
- Working with public spaces, use of public spaces, memorials, and cultural initiatives to support shared historical memory.
- Development of critical thinking through the implementation of relevant educational initiatives that help analyze information, resist manipulation, and perceive history from different perspectives.

- Educational programs and courses, the adaptation or development of which is initiated by the Ministry of Education and Science together with the MCSC, or within the framework of the autonomy of HEIs, integration of topics related to historical memory, decolonization, critical thinking and work with sources into curricula in secondary education institutions and into the syllabi of individual HEI disciplines.
- Spreading the practice of digitizing documents, which is actively implemented by the State Archival Service of Ukraine, including with the help of donor funds, such as [FamilySearch International](#), and making archives accessible or encouraging the use of archives by citizens. An example is the Central Scientific Library of the V. Karazin Kharkiv National University, which received access to the archive of Ukrainian periodicals online on the LIBRARIA platform thanks to grant funding from the Ukrainian Studies Departments Foundation (USA).
- State support, in particular, through UCF, for independent projects, competitions, grants for public organizations, journalists, and cultural institutions to develop topics related to memory and identity.
- Accessible digital services such as interactive Memory Books on city streets or QR codes (they were actively used by cities for tourist routes before the war), integration of historical narratives into public space through mobile applications, route platforms, or city objects allow making complex memory visible, inclusive, and attractive to a wide audience.
- Digital databases on the repressed, places of mass crimes in the past, etc..

Outcomes:

- An environment in which historical memory is not only preserved, but also reinterpreted in the conditions of modern times created.
- Transparent and accessible archives, databases, and digital resources created, thus allowing citizens to obtain reliable historical materials for analysis and research. This access is supported by online platforms that facilitate work with information.
- Open digital databases, such as archives on repressed persons or sites of mass crimes, create new opportunities for research and knowledge production. Every year, at least 10 foreign academic and journalistic articles based on this data are published.

- Cultural monuments in de-occupied territories restored (for example, museums, memorials, architectural sites), and projects for the reconstruction of war-damaged cultural heritage sites supported. Including archaeological research, restoration of objects, and creation of exhibitions based on new finds.
- New museums opened and existing memorial complexes renovated to ensure accessibility for different social groups.
- Successful memorialization cases implemented, based on which step-by-step instructions have been developed for experience dissemination. Facilitation practices are being actively implemented.

Impact:

1. Reinforcement of the national identity:

- There constantly takes place the rethinking of historical heritage and its integration into modern social discourse.
- The ability of a society practicing critical thinking to self-reflect is strengthened. The ability to analyze, comprehend, and interpret information is developed.
- The skills of operating with complex concepts and systems, the ability to move “from abstract to concrete” and “from concrete to abstract” are formed in the involved part of society.

2. Integration of local and regional narratives:

- Local historical contexts are noticeably present in the national memory.
- Historical misunderstandings and dilemmas are discussed through participation in national dialog, which creates some space for understanding.

3. Creation of the space for social and intergenerational dialog:

- Historical events are discussed in an open and democratic format.
- Educational programs and initiatives launched contribute to the spread of practices of critical thinking about history, inclusivity and pluralism of opinions, and civil dialog formation.

- The connection between generations reinforced through the understanding of a common history.

POLITICS: INTEGRATING CONTEMPORARY ART INTO WORK WITH MEMORY AND IDENTITY VIA A NETWORKING MUSEUM FORMAT.

The policy is aimed at creating a new institutionality in the field of culture, working with memory and identity via the **Networking Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA)** as a decentralized platform for the formation of the contemporary identity of Ukrainian citizens, support of local artistic phenomena, and international positioning of Ukrainian art.

This institution is designed to comprehend and work through the experience of the second half of the 20th century and the first half of the 21st century through artistic phenomena and initiatives that were formed and existed in local contexts of different regions of Ukraine, making the contexts visible and discussed at the national level.

This policy focuses on challenges that lie in several planes:

- **National level:** the formation of cultural identity of Ukrainian citizens currently occurs mainly through contact with a distant historical heritage and traditional culture, which limits the comprehension of modernity and cultural phenomena of the present by Ukrainian citizens.
- **Professional level:** lack of professional institutions working with contemporary art (with the availability of artists and the artistic process), lack of systematic art purchases for the state museum fund, underdevelopment of art sciences, lack of qualitative research and popularization.
- **Regional level:** marginalization of contemporary art in cities and regions, lack of cultural infrastructure, outflow of artistic personnel.

The policy envisages a decentralized approach that engages local artistic communities in national and international discourse, shapes participatory culture, and reinforces the role of contemporary art as a medium and tool for working with memory and identity. For communities, it also strengthens cultural autonomy and increases the level of local initiatives.

Instruments

- Infrastructure: the networking museum as a platform based on the following principles:
 - Decentralization: creation of regional centers (institutions-links) that work in a common political and methodological space.
 - Locality: working with local (local, regional), national, and international context.
 - Contact with modernity: contemporary art as an environment for reflecting on current challenges society is faced with.
- Modern heritage collecting:
 - Formation of a national collection of contemporary art, including the most recent artistic heritage – art from the period of the war between Russia and Ukraine, within the framework of a general approach to the study of contemporary art phenomena – from the second half of the 20th century to the present.
 - Implementation of innovative methods of archiving and cataloguing artistic processes.
- Informing: Educational and communication programs:
 - Training mediators for dialogs on memory and identity through artistic practices.
 - Developing training modules on understanding history and heritage through contemporary art for communities.
- Regulation:
 - Inclusion of an emphasis on contemporary art as part of national cultural policy in the relevant legislation.
- Financing and economy development:
 - Creation of grant programs to support local initiatives in the field of art, museology, and memory.

RES-POL

- Activation of business communities in the regions to support the work of local branches of the institution.
- Partnership with European and international funds to develop a networking museum.
- Legalization of the contemporary art market through transparent support and procurement mechanisms.
- Using art products as added value for the local economy.

Outcomes

- By 2027
 - Short-term:
 - Creation of pilot networking museum units in the regions.
 - Training of the first groups of mediators to work with local memory.
 - Launch of an online platform for presenting contemporary art from different regions of Ukraine.
- By 2034
 - Mid-term:
 - Institutionalization of contemporary art as a tool for working with memory.
 - Local artistic phenomena become visible at the national level.
 - Development of Ukrainian contemporary art as a competitive global phenomenon.
 - Long-term:
 - Formation of a sustainable cultural ecosystem that includes contemporary art.
 - Inclusion of Ukrainian museum initiatives in global cultural processes.

- Contemporary art is recognized and appropriated by society.
- Contemporary art shapes the image of the recent past, allowing society to engage with multiple narratives about the past and actively debate them in the public arena related to art.
- Developing the culture of collecting that supports long-term economic sustainability.

Impact

1. **Expanding a participatory historical culture** based on open dialog and understanding of heritage through art.
2. **Strengthening identity through contemporary culture**, not just historical memory.
3. **Developing local cultural practices** and integrating regions into national and international discourses.
4. **Creating a competitive cultural economy** and increasing the value of Ukrainian art.

3.1.3. PROBLEM. LACK OF AWARENESS AND THE WORK OF CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS AS INSTITUTIONS OF MEMORY.

The lack of responsible work with memory in cultural/cultural heritage institutions, lack of training, exchange of experience, and lack of involvement of modern practices lead to their low efficiency, loss of heritage, limited access of citizens to quality information, and insufficient development of institutions. The lack of functionality at the national level to develop new democratic approaches to working with memory and the lack of public demand complicates work with memory; limited understanding of the value of heritage and institutional inertia are also important factors in this regard.

The lack of awareness of their role as institutions of memory by cultural institutions constitutes one of the key problems in the formation of national and local identity. For the most part, these institutions play the role of organizers of events or

keepers of artifacts, but not mediators of memory. The reason is the lack of trained specialists who are capable of integrating work with historical memory and cultural heritage into the context of national security. That is why it is necessary not only to raise awareness of this problem, but also to develop mechanisms for creating a new generation of professionals.

There is a need to implement a policy that will promote the training of qualified specialists and researchers in the field of memory and culture through educational programs, training events and schools, ensure their motivation financially and reputationally, and integrate their activities into memory institutions for long-term work and development. The cornerstone here is the **development of a roadmap for the training of a new generation of specialists who will work at the intersection of culture, education, and memory**, detailing how and by whom such programs will be developed and what motivation mechanisms will ensure their implementation.

POLICY: ENABLING CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS TO BE INSTITUTIONS OF MEMORY.

Cultural institutions as keepers, translators, and builders of cultural memory have the potential to become key centers of working with historical memory, identity, and heritage. However, the lack of systematic work, absent or limited research, and the inability to become methodological centers, centers of training, modern practices and funding leads to low efficiency of these institutions, loss of heritage, and limited access of citizens to quality information. Creating a policy aimed at developing these institutions as institutions of memory requires a systemic approach, new democratic tools, and public demand.

Policy priorities:

- 1.** Reinforcing the role of cultural institutions as institutions of memory - creating conditions for their transformation into modern centers for the preservation and interpretation of historical memory, organizing dialog, facilitating and working with conflict memory, and supporting communities.
- 2.** Increasing citizens' access to quality information about historical memory and heritage.
- 3.** Institutional capacity, in particular, providing institutions with personnel, financial resources, and modern tools for effective activity.

4. Diversifying funding sources - attracting alternative financial mechanisms, including crowdfunding, endowments, and partnership programs.
5. Public participation - active involvement of communities in the processes of creating memory policies, supporting initiatives at the local level.

Instruments:

- Training and professional development of personnel, development of short-term educational programs that embrace history, sociology, heritage economics, memory methodologies, and management.

- Stimulating institutions to interpret “complex” collections:

Stimulating and encouraging institutions to study and interpret the complex collections they own (such as “inconvenient heritage”), creating a safe environment in which it is normal to talk about cultural heritage, for example, from the Soviet period, analyzing and dissecting it, without falling into repression, silencing, or nostalgia.

- Supporting institutions in creating films, podcasts, etc.

Supporting institutions that own and work with historical collections in creating documentary, educational, popular science films, podcasts, publications on social media, and other formats for understanding and representing historical topics. Such activities should be implemented directly by cultural institutions that work with “complex” collections, communicate with different audiences, have the tools of artistic and public work, and enjoy the trust of society. On the part of the state, the key tasks should be: providing an institutional mandate and funding for these institutions; ensuring sustainability of targeted programs to support research, education, and media projects; ensuring transparent and professional competitions for managerial positions; introducing standards of integrity and professional independence in cultural heritage management. State bodies (such as the State Film Agency or MCSC) should not directly produce or creatively shape memory products. Their role is to create an environment for the development of responsible and sustainable institutions that are capable of independently understanding the past, including through modern media formats.

- Dialog platforms based on memory institutions:

Creation or support of dialog platforms based on memory institutions (including as “spaces for interaction of small groups of people by interests”), professional moderation/mediation/facilitation of dialogs that contribute to achieving consensus and social unity on complex issues of collective memory (including at the local level), memorialization, etc.

- Training programs on facilitation and working with conflict memory:

Implementation of training programs and courses to train professional facilitators and moderators to work with topics of historical memory and social conflicts, as well as adaptation of existing courses and methodological materials (for example, materials of the training program "How to effectively plan and conduct a dialog", which includes the training "[Dialog instruments in developing effective solutions at community level](#)"). Inclusion of professional facilitators and mediators in the work of large state and non-state memory institutions. The tool provides for the creation of certificate courses, modules for higher education institutions, advanced training - to train specialists capable of conducting safe, inclusive, and productive dialogs on the topics of complex historical heritage, decolonization, traumatic experiences, and war memory. Involvement in the implementation of such a tool as public organizations that are professional associations of facilitators/mediators, or have experience in facilitation or working with conflict memory topics (for example, the Theory U community of practitioners, the [UA IDG Network](#) community, associations of dialog facilitators, association of mediators, NGO "Institute of Peace and Reconciliation", etc.). For example, by announcing an open competition for the creation of such courses with the support of the MCSC/UINM; integrating elements of the program into advanced training programs for educators and cultural workers (through advanced teacher training institutes, etc.); including specialized modules in the training of cultural managers, social workers, museum workers).

- Community support training programs (U methodology, etc.):

Introducing training programs and courses on how to "support the community" (such as Theory U - systemic thinking in organizational development). This includes providing intermediate work in the form of a mentor program (mentoring program) for "small group" leaders to support routine processes in between facilitated dialog events, transferring the methodology to those who will join next.

- Financial support mechanisms: introduction of endowments, attraction of business and international funds, support of self-sustaining projects.
- Increasing understanding of the value of heritage: a strategy to raise awareness of the [symbolic, functional, and financial dimensions](#) of the value of heritage through education and knowledge dissemination projects; campaigns to promote heritage as an important component of national identity and tourism development; creation of educational programs for cultural heritage managers, which will include courses in economics, sociology and social impact analysis; involvement of experts from related fields in teams managing memory institutions, as well as development at the state level of a methodology for analyzing short- and long-term benefits from heritage, adapted to specific regions and contexts.

Outcomes:

- At least 100 specialists trained; up to 10 short-term training programs and internships for specialists in the field of memory and cultural heritage implemented.
- Innovative approaches to working with memory implemented: digitization of existing data, interactive exhibitions, VR/AR technologies for the preservation and popularization of cultural heritage.
- A media campaign conducted, awareness about the [dimensions of heritage value](#) raised.
- The level of public trust in memory institutions increased significantly due to involvement in their work, transparency of management, public control, and cooperation with local communities.

Impact:

- National identity strengthened through expanded access to historical knowledge and memory.
- International cooperation and Ukraine's reputation in the field of preservation and popularization of cultural heritage reinforced.
- A new culture of supporting historical memory formed through public activism and financial independence of institutions.

Conclusions

Working with memory and identity is not a widespread practice in Ukraine, neither at the state nor at the institutional level. Rather, we can state that some institutions still use the methodology that had the function of spreading propaganda in Soviet times. It has already lost its ideological function but still uses archaic tools.

Modern challenges, especially in conditions of full-scale war and in the post-war period, require the creation of a new ecosystem of memory and work with identities, which implies a national level of awareness and implementation but has a significant impact on the resilience and development of communities.

The recommended policies in the subsector “Memory and Identity” are interrelated and can, if implemented simultaneously, have a synergy effect.

Since, on the one hand, there is an obvious lack of specialists, educational programs for their training, financial and material resources, and finally, awareness of the need to implement new approaches at the level of society and communities, and on the other hand, memory and identity are components of the national security system, work in this area cannot be postponed until “better times”.

A pilot approach to testing and developing each of the proposed policies will allow improving methodologies, identifying sensitive or “blind” zones, scaling up best practices, conducting systemic advocacy, and communication of the inevitability of changes and the benefits of the ability to work with memory and identities at the level of institutions, communities, and the state.

3.2. MOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE (MCH)

[Policy brief “Essential Policy Issues: Movable Cultural Heritage”](#)

Strategic brief “Cultural Heritage”

3.2.1. PROBLEM: THREAT OF SIGNIFICANT LOSS AND DAMAGE TO MOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE AS A RESULT OF WAR AND INSUFFICIENT PREPAREDNESS FOR EMERGENCIES.

Often, the loss of collections occurs due to the untimely receipt of permits for the evacuation of collections. The lack of a system of prompt and effective risk management and response to emergencies, both at the level of the central executive body and at the level of communities, as well as operating institutions, increases the likelihood of loss of MCH.

POLICY: RESPONDING TO WAR AND OTHER THREATS, CREATING STORAGE FACILITIES AND REGIONAL DEPOSITORIES FOR MOVABLE HERITAGE.

Gradual implementation mechanics:

1. To create a **separate unit** within the MCSC system, responsible for heritage preservation during war and emergencies. In the future, this unit could be involved in implementing the green transition of cultural institutions and preventing threats related to climate change.
2. To develop the **methodology for assigning MCH items to the first and second evacuation priority groups**. Inventory of collections and assigning categories under this methodology. Such categories should be reflected in the MFU Register.
 - The first phase (2025-2026)
 - To regulate the procedure for exporting items abroad during martial law from the [Register of National Cultural Achievements](#) and the [National Archival Fund](#). Permission to export items for safekeeping is granted for the entire duration of martial law + 1 year. To simplify the process of obtaining export approvals from the MCSC via the MFU Register.

- The transfer of first-category objects to cultural institutions of certain countries is a state priority.
- During martial law, objects of private owners of the first category are transferred for safekeeping to foreign museums, provided that the object is registered in the Register of MFU and are attached to the export of one of the state or municipal institutions (to guarantee the return of the objects).
- To approve the **algorithm for the evacuation** of objects from the decision on the transfer till the return of objects:
 - To regulate a simple and quick procedure of decision-making for the head of the institution regarding moving objects to safer locations automatically after the declaration of an emergency, state of emergency, martial law or transition to a red risk zone following the **Threat Factor** (described below) provided that there is an **Evacuation Plan** previously approved by the authorized body (management body or MCSC).
 - To develop and implement a **Risk Assessment Form** for RCH operators, which will be used to make decisions on the movement of the collection.
 - To provide the functionality of the MFU Register to reflect institutions in the high-risk area for collections and automatically exchange information on the movement of items.
 - If the **evacuation plan** is not approved or if scenarios not described in it occur, the evacuation system is activated in accordance with the current procedure, while the director of the RCH operating institution is entitled to make a decision on the transfer independently if there is no response from the authorized body within 12 hours. In the absence of the director of the institutions and the impossibility of contacting him within 12 hours, the right to make a decision on the evacuation is assigned to the deputies or the Chief Custodian.
- The return of the transferred items is ensured by the decision of the director under the evacuation plan or approved instructions after the official notification of the end of the state of emergency or martial law (provided that the building is suitable and resources are available to preserve the RCH).

3. To regulate three approaches to transferring objects for temporary storage in a new location within the country: in sealed boxes, by items, or by providing the premises for operational use to the institution operating the relocated collection.
4. To regulate the conditions of working with evacuated collections:
 - The second phase (2027–2030)
 - To introduce the position of conservators of collections preservation departments for quality control over the condition of objects and reducing threats through professional handling of collections.
 - To build a network of national depositories in the safest locations in the western regions of the country. These are engineering structures located in places determined by military and civilian designers, designed to withstand several repeated hits by Kinzhal-type ballistic missiles. Capacity – 500,000 + first-category exhibits.
 - To protect heritage data by permanently placing MCSC servers in depositories with information from the Registers and backup and digital copies of RCH objects.
 - During martial law, objects of private owners of the first category are transferred for storage to depositories, provided that the objects are registered in the MFU Register. In peacetime, they can be transferred for temporary storage to depositories on lease terms.
 - To introduce the **risk assessment scheme**:
 - To make risk assessment mandatory for RCH operating institutions. The threat factor for collections is determined by the following criteria: distance to military and strategic infrastructure facilities, speed of reduction of distance to the front line, number of airstrikes in a settlement, etc.
 - **The Threat Factor** points to the respective **Risk Zone**: red zone of emergency evacuation of objects of all categories following the sequence, orange zone of obligatory evacuation of the 1st category objects; yellow zone of recommended relocation of the first category; green zone of relative safety.

- To increase the safety and protection of objects during emergencies, it is necessary to approve **instructions and recommendations** developed taking into account national experience and international standards, in particular the Model RCH Evacuation Plan; the Methodology for developing response plans; the [Instruction for securing objects](#) in emergency situations; the Methodology for responding to emergency situations (based on the [ICCROM](#) methodology); the [Instruction on packaging](#) for transportation and long-term storage; the Instructions for returning items from transportation to the operator institution's own premises upon the end of the emergency or martial law; the Instructions for documenting damage to the RCH as a supplement to existing methodologies (recording and assessment based on the [ICCROM form](#)); the [Protocol on digitalization](#) of vulnerable natural collections, etc.
- To make it binding for institutions to develop individual response plans. Such a plan provides for securing items and the procedure for their relocation if necessary.
- To develop and implement a methodology and procedure for **conducting training** to increase the readiness of teams of all RCH operator institutions. To determine the day and procedure for conducting mandatory training and practicing response plans. On this day, institutions are closed to visitors. To regulate the involvement of rapid response teams in the rescue of state and private movable cultural heritage during emergencies, and to promote their creation and training. Such teams include historians, archaeologists, restorers, cultural scientists, and other specialists, or local NGOs and activists who have undergone certified training.

Heads of RCH operating institutions should promote the participation of employees of such institutions in online and offline training events to increase preparedness and overcome the consequences of emergencies.

- To introduce funding programs for museums, archives, and libraries aimed at increasing capacity through the development of response plans, including evacuation plans, training events, and consultations.
- To introduce financing programs for the creation and preparation of regional and national emergency response teams.

- The third phase (2030–2034)

After the end of the hot phase of the war, to build regional depositories for long-term preservation, research, and digitization of objects of all categories, with the possibility of rapid evacuation of objects of the 1st category.

- To build regional depositories in individual regions, districts, and cities based on the principle of analyzing needs, available resources, and geographical features. Such centers store objects of the 1st–2nd category and, if there is space, - of the 3rd category. Logistics should be taken into account - the ability to quickly leave for highways or load onto a train in the event of the declaration of martial law.

Private collections can be placed on lease terms and subject to registration of objects in the MFU Register.

Depositories can have additional service functions for the CH, which will be a source of income: preservation of private collections, examination, research, restoration, digitization, monitoring, and formation of rapid response groups. Competence hubs can be created on the basis of depositories (Policy 3.3.1).

Short-term outcomes

A division of the MCSC has been identified, responsible for coordinating actions and implementing a response policy, ensuring coherence in measures aimed to rescue and protect movable cultural heritage.

- 500,000+ of the most valuable objects of the RCH are protected in depositories or institutions abroad.
- 500,000 items of the first category of value are stored in appropriate conditions in compliance with the temperature and humidity regime following modern international standards, which significantly reduces the costs of their further restoration.
- The risk assessment form is integrated into the State MFU Register.
- Each of the RCH operating institutions has developed individual emergency action plans in the context of challenges caused by the war. Such plans are approved by the governing bodies or the MCSC.

RES-POL

- Amendments have been made to the legislation and regulatory legal acts, reflecting new approaches in the field of protection of movable cultural heritage during emergencies.
- Due to changes in legislation and regulatory legal acts, in the event of a declared emergency, the heads of the RCH operating institutions have the authority to move the collection without the consent of the MCSC or the governing body.
- A rapid response group of 30 people has been created in each region.

Long-term outcomes

- Individual action plans have been developed for each cultural institution regarding emergencies related to man-made and natural disasters, and other emergencies.
- In the RCH Register, all objects have a level of threat reflected.
- Places have been created for storing and working with museum collections during evacuation.
- Preservation of private collections generates income.

Impact

By 2027, the procedure for risk assessment, preparation, and response to emergencies, including the relocation of war-related objects, is regulated. All stakeholders understand their areas of responsibility and obligations. The system ensures interaction at the state, community, and civil society levels.

By 2030, movable cultural heritage operators are prepared for emergencies of various nature. For each type of emergency, actions are taken according to pre-developed plans, which allows for minimizing the negative impact on collections. If items from collections need to be moved to preserve them, decisions are made in a timely manner, which ensures the preservation of significant items of movable cultural heritage of Ukraine.

By 2034, regional depositories are built, which will be financed from various sources. RCH institutions are capable of actions aimed at the preservation, access,

and effective management of collections, as well as the protection of cultural heritage following the global standards.

Conclusions

Movable cultural heritage, which includes both the state museum fund and cultural heritage objects that are in municipal and private ownership, belongs to institutions and institutions, one way or another, has the greatest influence and is most directly dependent on the communities in which it is located. Therefore, it is precisely on knowledge of local objects of the Movable Cultural Heritage, preparedness for emergencies, and coordinated interaction of all stakeholders that the salvation of cultural values in the community depends.

The policies of digitalization and digitization of the MCH, the provision of qualified restoration services, which are proposed in the Movable Cultural Heritage section of the Strategic Brief, as well as the issues of evacuation and preservation, should be implemented at the state level, but will concern all communities, the status of the Movable Cultural Heritage, the impact on the development of tourism and local economy.

3.3. IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE (ICH)

Policy brief “Essential Policy Issues. Immovable Cultural Heritage”

Strategic Brief “Cultural Heritage”

3.3.1. PROBLEM: DEGRADATION OF THE CONDITION OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES. LOW INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROTECTION BODIES.

The management system in the field of immovable cultural heritage (hereinafter referred to as ICH) is characterized by centralization and state control, with state bodies controlling all aspects of the preservation and use of monuments.

The system provides for the protection of objects, which, in particular, is manifested in the restriction of access to objects, sometimes in conservation. The main attention is paid to the physical preservation of monuments without integrating

them into modern life or the economy; heritage exists in isolation from the everyday social and economic context.

As a result, the significant potential of ICH remains unrealized, and the objects themselves suffer from a lack of funding. This, in turn, leads to a number of problems, in particular, a shortage of human capital capable of professionally caring for objects; limited resources to ensure the proper technical condition of ICH; destruction and demolition of monuments due to the lack of proper care.

**POLICY: EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT INSTEAD OF “PROTECTION”.
STRENGTHENING THE CAPACITIES OF COMMUNITIES TO MANAGE
HERITAGE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF TERRITORIES AND
HERITAGE PRESERVATION.**

1. Maintaining the sites in a stable technical condition (one that does not threaten their long-term existence).
2. The community receives income from the management of the cultural heritage site, which is at least sufficient to finance the maintenance of the site in a stable condition.
3. Availability of qualified specialists capable of monitoring and providing the necessary measures to maintain a stable condition, and eliminate emergencies.
4. Availability of urban and tourist infrastructure around the site.
5. Awareness of and pride in its heritage in the community.
6. Digitization of the site, creation of conditions for preserving information about the site.
7. The object is on the agenda of local/regional/state (depending on the type and status of the object) social and political life.
8. The territory around the site is attractive for investment.
9. The site is interpreted for different age and social groups.

Instruments

1. Regulation:

- Introduction of the definition of what constitutes effective management of immovable cultural heritage sites; of the signs and indicators of effective management of cultural heritage sites, taking into account the specifics of decentralization policy and the specifics of regions (given the impact of the war) by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine.
- Inclusion of the mandatory separate section "Plan for effective management of cultural heritage sites and territorial capital" into the [Methodological recommendations regarding the procedure for developing, approving, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the development of regions and territorial communities](#).
- Teams and expert groups or public organizations involved in the development, creation, and implementation of programs of effective management of cultural heritage sites are required to have relevant specialists on staff or have concluded contracts with specialists in the field of cultural heritage sites management.

2. Informing:

- Awareness-raising campaigns to explain the value and potential of immovable heritage sites for community administrations. Development of methodological recommendations, conducting trainings, hackathons, workshops on effective management of cultural heritage sites for community administrations. The work on developing recommendations is carried out by the departments of museum studies and monument studies of HEIs, specialized scientific centers and scientific initiatives, specialized public organizations, financed from the budget of communities or, in the absence of such, on a competitive basis at the expense of grants from UCF or specialized funds.
- Socialization of heritage - work aimed to form public opinion, with a positive attitude towards heritage, to form social awareness of the value of heritage as an integral part of our lives.

3. Financing:

- Directing budget expenditures for community development, a part of which is used for amenities, to the effective management of cultural heritage sites. Community amenities should be part of the strategy of cultural heritage sites development.
- State financial support for communities with subventions for the implementation of projects aimed at the effective management of cultural heritage sites and decentralization.
- Holding annual regional (for monuments of local importance) and national (for monuments of national importance) competitions for projects and for the implementation of effective management programs.
- State orders for research, analysis, and interpretation of the practices of effective management of cultural heritage sites in order to stimulate performance of such works.
- Tax incentives for the implementation of infrastructure projects for the development of territories around cultural heritage sites that are aimed at the effective management of cultural heritage sites and meet the above criteria.

4. Infrastructural:

Creation of an interactive map of expert support coverage of cultural heritage sites on a separate e-Pamyatka layer or integration of the [ReHERIT](#) “Heritage Operators” platform.

POLICY: CODE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE. STREAMLINING THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM, DIGITALIZATION AND EXPERT CONTROL.

1. Streamlining regulatory documents - development of the Code of Cultural Heritage. Updating regulatory terminology.
2. Rethinking what constitutes heritage (Soviet symbols, monuments, busts, plaques, cenotaphs from World War II, memorial sites of Soviet history, etc.).
3. Simplifying the procedure for registering sites and granting them a protection status.

4. Availability of site accounting tools: creating an electronic copy of objects and an investment card of sites - a separate tool in the accounting system that indicates priority areas of site development (for example, conservation, museumization, necessary infrastructure, etc.).
5. Transparent ICH registers, synchronization with cadastral maps.
6. An effective system for responding to damage to ICH sites.
7. Strengthening the capacity of cultural heritage protection authorities to detect damage, influence the protection of objects, and prevent their damage.

Instruments

1. Regulation:

- Development of the Code of Cultural Heritage, which codifies the current legislation, eliminates conflicts between existing laws, as well as legal acts regulating the cultural heritage sector, determines methods, approaches, and procedures for working on cultural heritage sites; determines the principles of operation and criteria for effective management of cultural heritage sites.
- Updating the criteria for determining a cultural heritage site given the impact of sites on the national identity formation. This should provide for a process of expert research, public discussion of issues regarding the features of cultural heritage sites. Enshrining the criteria in the Code of Cultural Heritage.
- Revision of lists of sites using criteria for determining sites.
- Identification of new sites by cultural heritage protection authorities based on the specified criteria, with inclusion in the Unified List. Automated inclusion of cultural heritage sites in the State Register of Monuments following the principle of compliance with the set of criteria for a cultural heritage site.
- Simplifying the procedure for obtaining permits for working on newly discovered cultural heritage sites for a period of 3 years - the ability to carry out work using an own-account method, in particular, to create protective structures that do not affect the authentic structures of buildings and edifices, in order to bring them into a stable technical condition (subject to the preservation/research of archaeological sites and landscapes).

- Liberalizing the procedure for carrying out work on cultural heritage sites that have been affected by the military aggression of the Russian Federation or because of the circumstances that arose as a result of such actions, in order to be able to carry out prompt repairs using an own-account method in the way that does not damage or affect the authentic structures of buildings and edifices, based on an external inspection report approved by the cultural heritage protection authorities.
- Developing and adopting the Resolution on the procedure for determining the boundaries and regimes of historical areas, the Resolution on the procedure for determining the boundaries and regimes of the territories of world heritage sites and their buffer zones, and the Resolution on the procedure for conducting archaeological research.

2. Infrastructure:

- Audit and refinement of the "e-Pamyatka" system with the ability to link the electronic passport of the site, link the electronic data of the site. Creation of a single transparent register, which will reflect all types of cultural heritage sites, in particular newly discovered ones, sites from the Lists of Monuments, sites from the State Register of Cultural Heritage Monuments.
- Development of a separate layer of cultural heritage in the State Geocadastre with the establishment of clear boundaries and protection zones of cultural heritage sites, reflection of urban planning and protection restrictions for land use.
- Creation of an electronic system for automating the accounting of sites, which can automatically identify and enter sites into the database based on existing digital real estate registers, lists of cultural heritage sites, lists of valuable historical buildings of historical settlements, other data, and specified criteria.
- Digitization of immovable cultural heritage sites, creation of an electronic database for storing data related to the sites in the Register (historical reference, source data, drawings, 3D scanning, investment passport of the site, other data). Creation of a cloud for storing the data on cultural heritage sites.

3. Financing:

- Attracting grants to encourage the professional community, community representatives, and other entities to identify and register monuments.
- According to experts, the simultaneous implementation of the two policies will have a significant impact on the preservation and development of cultural heritage.

Outcomes

In the horizon of 2025–2027, the implementation of the policy will result in the emergence of a single updated list of cultural heritage monuments, introduction of clear indicators of effective site management, each community will have developed plans for effective management of ICH sites, there will be an increase in the number of actors involved in the cultural heritage field due to increased demand for specialists in the sector, which in turn will lead to an increase in the level of wages in the sector. Each of the communities will get cases of effective management of cultural heritage sites, which have led to the development of the community and the territory. In 2027–2035, the Code of Cultural Heritage will be developed and the legislation of the sector will be systematized. The number of degraded ICH sites will decrease.

Impact

As a result of the implementation of the policy, immovable cultural heritage has a significant impact on the generation of income for communities. There takes place multiple capitalization of the territories around the ICH sites (according to the study conducted by [ReHERIT “Economic impact of local cultural heritage”](#)), the investment attractiveness of ICH sites increases, the social atmosphere in communities where ICH sites are located improves. Minimized cases of damage to ICH sites, minimized cases of illegal corruption actions against cultural heritage sites. Heritage is on the agenda of political and social life. Heritage is being revalued.

It is also worth paying attention to the policy that has been proposed as an alternative but may have additional impact on communities.

POLICY: THE SYSTEM OF ASSISTANCE PROVISION TO INVESTORS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ICH SITES. BENEFITS, RISK INSURANCE, CO-FINANCING.

The policy provides for the encouragement, support, and creation of favorable conditions for business entities that invest in ensuring the effective functioning and maintenance of cultural heritage sites (restoration, renovation, revaluation, etc.), the development of cultural, tourist, and social infrastructure, or the improvement of territories around cultural heritage sites.

Priorities

Transparency and clarity of procedures for legal transactions with ICH, reduction of investment risks. Increasing the attractiveness of the sector, encouraging those who invest in cultural heritage sites.

Instruments

1. Regulation:

- Structuring the regulatory framework - development of the **Code of Cultural Heritage**, which will eliminate conflicts between monument protection and urban planning legislation, reduce corruption risks, and provide an opportunity to unambiguously interpret the procedures for working with ICH sites.
- **Investment card** of a cultural heritage site. Investment cards of sites or development programs for territories adjacent to cultural heritage sites are developed by communities in their own interests, through involvement of the public sector, specialized experts, and conducting public discussions and hearings. This involves developing a concept for the socio-economic development of the site, additional infrastructure, and technical methods for its preservation. Investment passports of cultural heritage sites can be developed by public organizations with a relevant field of activity.
- Reform of cultural heritage protection bodies with the introduction of the **Cultural Heritage Inspectorate** under the MCSC and based on existing cultural heritage protection bodies. At the same time, the activities of the Inspectorate are controlled by the Expert Council. The Expert Council includes experts from the public sector with practical experience in architectural restoration, urban planning, architecture, *urban economics*, *urban sociology*, *contemporary*

art, archaeology, museology, and monument studies. Among other things, cultural heritage protection bodies accompany the investor during work on the site and in the process of managing it, and contribute to the search for effective social and economic models.

- Entities that carry out transactions for the purchase of cultural heritage sites or participate in auctions for the purchase of such sites must have an **investment project** for the management of cultural heritage sites, which confirms the purpose of purchasing the site. The investment map should be developed with the involvement of experts on the management of cultural heritage sites.
- Provide for inclusion of the profession of cultural heritage site management specialist in the State Classifier of Professions [ДК 003:2010](#), removing a separate type of activity Management of a cultural heritage site from the [Classifier of the Types of Economic Activity ДК 009:2010](#), introduction of certification for specialists in the management of cultural heritage sites.
- Simplification of procedures for approval of works on cultural heritage sites and expert support of the restoration procedure, investment support, investment custodians. Approval and control functions in relation to cultural heritage sites are carried out by the **Cultural Heritage Inspectorate**.
- Benefits for investors:
 - Reduction of income tax directed to local budgets in the amount directly proportional to or corresponding to the amount of expenses for the improvement of the territory and for improving the appearance of the site and the surrounding area.
 - Reduction of land tax, other taxes directed to local budgets, subject to responsible and effective management of the site (which meets the established criteria for effective management).
- Introduction of a separate **Class of Consequences or Responsibility (CC)** for working on cultural heritage sites, which will promote a more professional and responsible approach by contractors, availability of separate certification and licensing procedure for specialists working with cultural heritage sites.

2. Financial:

- Private-public partnership for strategic projects, attracting public and private resources for the development and management of cultural heritage sites for the benefit of the community under state guarantees.
- Attracting private investments by communities under state guarantees, which is carried out with the support of **expert centers under the cultural heritage protection bodies**.
- State subventions to communities for financing public organizations developing investment cards for the site.
- Co-financing from the Cultural Heritage Fund of Ukraine (Policy1.1).

3. Qualifying:

- Training managers to support investors through advanced training or postgraduate education of specialists with specialized higher education.
- Promoting the creation of the Association of Owners of Cultural Heritage Sites with a platform of informal education for training new members, experts for expert councils affiliated with inspectorates, managers for support, etc.

4. Infrastructural:

- Creation of the Cultural Heritage Inspectorate with offices in regional centers.
- Development and strengthening of cultural heritage protection bodies with the aim of transferring the functions of approval, issuing permits, and monitoring work on cultural heritage sites.

5. Informing:

- Awareness-raising campaign to create a positive image of investors and show the prestige of heritage ownership.
- Awareness-raising campaign among potential investors to promote heritage values, the need to apply scientific restoration methods and restoration standards, or to strengthen the capacity of the association of owners of cultural heritage sites to develop and disseminate such programs.

Advantages

Encouraging investors to work with cultural heritage sites will allow streamlining the resources in the sector, covering a significant number of sites, improving their current technical condition, preserving sites, and creating conditions for the development of ICH. Creating conditions for demand for specialists in the sector and raising their status.

Disadvantages

The lack of sufficient specialists and a large number of sites in the early stages may cause their damage and destruction before investors are found.

The need for a long and expensive awareness-raising campaign regarding the content and role of heritage in communities and the state. The policy may not work in frontline and de-occupied regions. Corruption risks.

3.3.2. PROBLEM: THE VALUES OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE ARE NOT UNDERSTOOD BY SOCIETY. DEVALUATION OF HERITAGE

The isolation of society from its own immovable heritage leads to the situation when the value of the sites is not understood, they are perceived as a property resource, as a result of which the heritage must be protected from the economic activity of society itself. The entire system of management of cultural heritage protection, all laws and by-laws that operate in the field, are aimed, paradoxically, at protecting cultural heritage primarily from its own society.

The current situation affects the indifference of citizens to immovable heritage sites, the field as a whole, marginalization of its workers, which creates a vicious circle, where the deterioration of each element causes the deterioration of others.

POLITICS: RECONNECTING SOCIETY WITH HERITAGE.

Establishing/restoring society's ties with its own history through immovable heritage, disseminating knowledge about the features and functions of immovable heritage, forming a sense of pride for immovable heritage sites in the territory of own community, thanks to which the sites will be protected.

Introduction of courses on the features, functions, and potential of cultural heritage, practical courses on the protection and preservation of cultural heritage sites in general secondary education.

Adoption of the law on access regimes to the ICH sites. Creation of a network or arrangement of existing centers of informal education.

Dissemination of information content on the features and potential of immovable heritage through state information channels.

The instruments of the recommended policy

1. Regulation:

- Introduction of courses on the features, functions, and potential of cultural heritage, practical courses on the protection and preservation of cultural heritage sites in general secondary education.
- Adoption of a law on access regimes to ICH sites, development of relevant measures that provide for the issuance of orders by local community councils, amendments to relevant regulatory acts or charters of organizations and institutions that are balance holders of cultural heritage sites. ICH sites that do not belong to critical infrastructure should be accessible for visiting, including the possibility of taking photos and videos for their dissemination and popularization. It is necessary to ensure the accessibility of cultural heritage sites for project teams, educational groups, excursionists, and other stakeholders, since that will allow them to implement their initiatives in these territories without hindrance, taking into account the principles of inclusiveness and equal access.

2. Infrastructural:

Creating a network or equipping existing informal education centers capable of disseminating knowledge about ICH based on cultural centers, museums, private cultural institutions, educational institutions, and public organizations.

3. Qualifying:

- Development of educational programs for secondary school teachers.

- Educational programs for teacher training HEIs. Training of teachers for secondary education institutions, who would be capable of teaching children the features, properties, and functions of immovable heritage.
- Advanced training courses or non-formal education of teachers. Implemented by public organizations at the expense of funds, in particular, UCF, donors.
- Training of specialists of non-formal education centers.
- Non-formal education courses for specialists of the sector on marketing strategies that will contribute to the awareness and realization of the ICH potential.

4. Informing:

- Dissemination of information content about the features and potential of immovable heritage through state information channels.
- Popularization of knowledge about the features and potential of immovable heritage through state information channels among students and staff of higher education institutions that belong to the system under the MCSC and the Ministry for Communities and Territories Development.
- Popularization of knowledge about the features and potential of immovable heritage among employees of memory institutions (see the strategic brief “Memory and Identity”).
- Involvement of communities in physical contact with ICH sites. Organization of public cleaning events, doing unskilled work on cultural heritage sites under the supervision of specialists.

5. Financial:

- Stimulating the creation and dissemination of media content about the features and potential of immovable heritage:
 - support from the State Film Agency;
 - quotas and scholarship support for authors of products from the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting;

- support and scholarships from state institutions in the field of contemporary and audiovisual art (National Academy of Arts, Modern Art Research Institute);
 - grants from UCF.
- Attracting resources from the State Agency for Tourism Development (DART) to support communities in order to popularize the values of the ICH sites.
 - State subventions for communities to finance public organizations in the development of non-formal education, development of media and information products about the features and functions of immovable cultural heritage.

Outcomes

The emergence of teachers and educational programs to disseminate knowledge about heritage in general schools and higher education institutions in the horizon of 2025–2030.

In the horizon of 2030–2035, an increase in the number of educated, proactive citizens able to influence the agenda in communities in relation to the need to preserve and effectively use ICH sites.

Impact

The growing number of educated, proactive citizens will lead to a caring and responsible attitude towards immovable cultural heritage in communities, more effective protection and development of ICH sites. Increased number of ICH sites in satisfactory technical condition. Heritage will be perceived as a resource for community development. Citizens will realize the value of heritage as a uniting factor, an element of local identity, and a common good.

The policy of reconnecting society with heritage is recommended by experts as a priority at the national level, however, alternative proposed policies may be important and effective at the community level.

POLICY: PUBLIC MONITORING.

The policy envisages strengthening the ties of society with heritage by involving it in monitoring the condition of ICH sites, increasing the level of responsibility.

Transfer by the resolution of the MCSC of the function of permanent and regular monitoring of the condition of cultural heritage sites from the cultural heritage protection bodies to communities, the main stakeholders in the ICH field. Local authorities assume responsibility for annual public reporting on the condition of sites. Communities engage public inspectors to carry out monitoring, they are assigned to each of the sites on the territory of the community and conduct monitoring with digitization of the condition of the sites.

Implementation does not require significant resources, has a long-term sustainable effect, has a positive impact on the development of civil society, the formation of responsibility for one's own heritage. At the same time, it contributes to more effective monitoring of the condition and preservation of cultural heritage sites.

POLICY: SPREADING HERITAGE VALUES VIA VETERAN SPACES.

The Ministry for Veterans Affairs is implementing the [VETERAN PRO](#) program – a network of veteran spaces throughout the country, which are places of support and development of veterans, places for uniting communities and communication, therefore they have a high potential for the formation of social values.

Social adaptation of veterans through their involvement in the preservation and responsible handling of heritage, strengthening their role in peaceful life through the acquisition of new knowledge and competences, and strengthening their authority in communities.

The authority of veterans during the war and in the post-war period is high, it is taken into account by communities. The work of veterans with communities can have a significant positive impact on the social adaptation of veterans, which coincides with the goals and objectives of the Ministry for Veterans Affairs.

POLICY: DISSEMINATION OF HERITAGE VALUES VIA RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

Religious communities have a wide network in Ukraine and often are the balance holders of cultural heritage sites or may even be located in reserves. They have a significant impact on historical areas through economic activity and have a significant authority among believers. The policy involves engaging the authority of religious institutions to disseminate knowledge about the values of immovable cultural heritage and approaches to its preservation.

Formation of public opinion among believers and religious communities about the value of cultural heritage and the need to treat it responsibly. Maintaining a stable technical condition of cultural heritage sites that are places of religious worship and other sites within the area of influence of religious communities.

The policy does not require significant resources and has a long-term sustainable effect. Increasing the competence of religious communities in managing their own sites will lead to a decrease in cases of damage to sites due to economic activity, poor-quality restoration, or other actions. The virtue of caring for cultural heritage, perceiving heritage as a value, may be valid for all ICH sites, not just religious ones.

3.3.3. PROBLEM: LOSS OF HUMAN CAPITAL IN THE “IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE” SUBSECTOR

The “Immovable cultural heritage” subsector, like other cultural heritage subsectors, is experiencing a deep crisis related to the lack of qualified personnel at all levels – from management to execution – for certain types of work. This leads to the inability to make high-quality and timely management decisions, implement existing policies, maintain the proper condition of ICH sites, and overcome current problems.

POLICY: COMPETENCE HUBS.

Establishment of **competence hubs** based on regional museum depositories proposed by the “Movable heritage” subsector or other organizational units that unite related sectors and form qualification centers. These are centers of professional support for balance sheet holders or owners of ICH sites, expert centers capable of administering non-standard tasks, looking for ways to solve

them, or attracting narrow specialists "from the market". The centers provide practical training for specialists, consult and can participate in the development of strategies for effective management of cultural heritage sites, create and implement non-formal education programs, provide advanced training, certify specialists in architectural restoration, management for effective management of cultural heritage sites, prepare open letters and work permits, provide consulting services on the preparation of design and estimate documentation.

Priorities

The presence of narrow specialists in the regions to ensure that ICH sites are covered by expert care. Timely expert services for the preservation and development of ICH sites are available.

Policy instruments

1. Regulation:

- Development of qualification standards for the management of immovable heritage sites, for various areas of restoration activity.
- Granting **competence hubs** the authority to examine restoration projects and monitor work.
- Creation of **supervisory boards** at competence hubs.
- Assigning **managers-custodians** to specific cultural heritage sites in communities.
- Participation of hub specialists in the development/adjustment of community development strategies regarding ICH sites.
- Formation of an all-Ukrainian network of ICH sector experts who can be involved in local projects, whose selection is carried out by **managers-custodians**.

2. Financial:

- Direct state financing of infrastructure maintenance, co-financing of educational programs, and research centers of competence hubs.

- Financing from the budgets of the communities of the region of the activities of experts, managers-custodians, restorers, and archaeologists in working with ICH sites of the communities, which are included in the community development strategy. Proportional remuneration following the efficiency of their work.
- Non-budgetary financing of project activities (investors, donors).

3. Infrastructural:

- Construction of regional repositories (Policy 2.2.3) and creation of **competence hubs** and research centers based on them.
- Creation of an **educational platform** based on competence hubs for training (advancing the skills) of ICH site managers, architects-restorers, and restorers in specific areas.
- Creation of a certification center based on competence hubs, which corresponds to the state qualification policy implemented by the [National Qualifications Agency](#).

4. Qualifying:

- Training of **leaders of regional competence hubs**, certificate programs using modern methodologies and technologies, taking into account European experience in managing cultural heritage sites.
- Development of educational programs and training (advanced training) of specialists for regional competence hubs.

Outcomes

As a result of the implementation of the policy in 2025–2027, a network of **competence hubs** (approximately 20) will be formed in Ukraine, **capable of** providing expert assistance to immovable cultural heritage in all regions of Ukraine. In the horizon of 2027–2035, an expert network will be developed, all ICH sites in the regions will be fully provided with expert supervision. The number of qualified specialists in the fields will significantly increase.

Impact

The formation of the network of Competence Hubs will lead to an increased demand for ICH specialists in all regions, for relevant qualifications, the level of provision of expert services in the ICH subsector will increase, the quality of work will improve, which will create a positive impact on the preservation of ICH sites and their role in the development of communities.

The Competence Hubs policy is recommended by experts as a priority, but a policy from the list of additional proposals can also be effective for communities.

POLICY: DEVELOPMENT OF NON-STATE SERVICES.

Formation of natural demand for specialists in the immovable heritage sector, who can be involved on a project or competitive basis by communities, public organizations, state institutions, museums, reserves for the management of immovable heritage sites, for research, restoration work, or development of various types of immovable heritage.

The policy provides for the creation of conditions for attracting/retaining specialists in the ICH subsector, encourages specialists, and significantly affects the increase in the commercial attractiveness of cultural heritage site preservation.

This concept of experts of the ICH sector echoes the Comprehensive Reform of the Network of Cultural Institutions, which is proposed by the RES-POL project.

Conclusions

Like experts in other Cultural Heritage subsectors, policymakers in the ICH subsector emphasize the need for simultaneous implementation of recommended policies, an ecosystem approach, when regulatory changes at the state level ensure effective control over the preservation of cultural heritage, but also liberalize management processes at the local level, and make heritage sites attractive to investors, valuable to local communities, thus positively affecting their economic development.

General conclusions

The [Baseline Report “Essential Policy Issues: Communities and Cultural Heritage”](#) outlined a range of interrelated root problems that affect the attitude of communities to cultural heritage, the condition of sites, challenges, and potential vectors of necessary changes.

The impact of war poses a threat to all categories of sites/objects and elements of cultural heritage. Only the levels of danger, the nature of threats, and the ability to respond to the consequences differ.

Human capital in the “Cultural Heritage” sector has significantly decreased due to war losses, mobilization, temporary disability, and relocation within the country and abroad. Not everyone who remains in the profession has sufficient knowledge and competences to respond to current challenges and engage in systemic changes.

Perception of cultural heritage by communities. For Ukrainian communities, the question of who inherited local cultural heritage and who is responsible for it is relevant. The main barrier to unlocking the potential of cultural heritage at the community level is the refusal to inherit it, the perception of cultural heritage as an unbearable burden.

Basic education does not ensure that all citizens know about cultural heritage, understand its significance, and have the skills to preserve and use it. The insufficient quality of education in the field of the humanities creates the prerequisites for the impossibility of high-quality interpretation of cultural heritage.

Professional education in the field of cultural heritage does not meet the needs of the field: in the number of specialists, special knowledge and skills, and compliance with modern criteria for specialists (knowledge of a foreign language, mastery of digital technologies, etc.).

State policy. Cultural heritage is not included in the national security system. Culture is perceived mainly as a leisure area, so it is in the last lines as far as strategy and funding priorities are concerned.

State regulation and management. Laws and regulatory legal acts are still often

based on the “Soviet paradigm” and the presumption of guilt, are not coordinated with each other, which creates “blind spots” and corruption risks. The system is complex, provides for extensive subordination, blurred responsibility, irrelevant incentivizing and punishment instruments.

Institutions are weak and not independent, with vertical and horizontal subordination (to the relevant ministry and local authorities). Work is bureaucratized, focusing on passing inspections and the need to justify oneself. Managers are limited in making decisions regarding long-term planning, forming teams, and allocating funds. There is a shortage of managers in the sector.

Low wages and lack of recognition of the prestige of professions in the CH sector by society do not contribute to attracting young specialists and qualified personnel.

Financing. The cultural sphere in the state is financed on a residual basis. The wages of employees in the sphere are lower than the minimum wage level established by the state.

The expenses of budgetary institutions during martial law do not allow the use of funds at the discretion of organizations, even from special accounts to which donor assistance for the development of institutions can be received.

Financing from community funds largely depends on the human factor - community leaders, and one can rarely count on lobbying by local deputies or officials from specialized government bodies.

The policies developed by expert groups of the “Cultural Heritage” sector are aimed at solving or partially reducing the negative effects of root problems.

Policies on Memory and Identity relate to both the improvement of the system of knowledge in the field of the humanities in general and the emergence of specialists and institutions of a new formation that are capable of working using new methods. Understanding the importance of working with memory as a tool for resisting aggression and creating social harmony, respect for the diversity of identities that make up national identity, is part of the state security system, according to experts.

The combination of policies: Digital education, digitization and digitalization

of memory and identity work and Cooperation of higher education institutions with memory institutions is a response to the key manifestations of the lack of development of knowledge in the field of the humanities. Systematicity consists in combining educational, research, practical, and communication dimensions in working with memory, heritage, and identity.

The combination of policies: National memory as an ecosystem: an open space for history, interaction, and public dialog and Integration of contemporary art into memory and identity work via a networking museum format provides for a systemic memory infrastructure, cross-sector interaction, regulatory framework, educational, and digital tools; introduces a new type of institution that engages artistic thinking, aesthetic experience, and the ability to work with emotionally complex heritage. Together, they form an inclusive, participatory, multi-format model of national memory that addresses the key challenges contemporary Ukraine is faced with.

Policy Enabling cultural institutions to be memory institutions stimulates the formation of public interest in heritage through open digital resources, provides for the systemic transformation of cultural institutions into multifunctional memory institutions, involves the engagement of business and international partners, allows ensuring financial sustainability, creating a market for supporting culture and memory, and demonstrating the economic feasibility of investing in heritage.

The Policy of Responding to war and other threats, creating storage facilities and regional depositories for movable heritage, developed by experts of the **“Movable Cultural Heritage” sector**, offers a roadmap for effective evacuation and preservation of cultural property, action algorithms, and protocols. A key aspect of this policy is a clear division of responsibility between the state, community, and institution. The plan to build a system of regional depositories, which can be not only safe and modern places for preserving collections, but also **competence hubs** for conservators, restorers, and monument custodians, demonstrates the will to overcome war threats and to ensure restoration following the “build back better” principle.

Policies on immovable cultural heritage offer both state policy instruments for regulation and management, and community policies aimed at integrating immovable heritage into development strategies, to ensure conscious use of local potential, economic attractiveness of the preservation and use of heritage sites.

The policy **Effective management instead of “protection”. Strengthening the capacities of communities to manage heritage for sustainable development of territories and heritage preservation** is aimed primarily at communities and offers practical tools to make them interested in heritage development in a humanitarian and economic sense.

While the policy **Code of Cultural Heritage. Streamlining the management system, digitalization and expert control** streamlines control over preservation at the state and community levels, introduces mechanisms that work well in EU countries, reduces the likelihood of corruption and crimes against heritage. It is for good-faith investors that the policy **The system of assistance provision to investors in the development of ICH sites. Benefits, risk insurance, co-financing** is designed.

The policy of **Reconnecting society with heritage** works with citizens and involves restoring society's connections with its own history through immovable heritage, disseminating knowledge about the features and functions of immovable heritage, forming a sense of pride for immovable heritage sites in the territory of the community, introducing courses on the features, functions and potential of cultural heritage in general secondary education, practical courses on the protection and preservation of cultural heritage sites. Its component at the community level may be the **policy of Public Monitoring**. At the same time, **the satellite policies of Dissemination of Heritage Values via Veteran Spaces and Dissemination of Heritage Values via Religious Communities** are aimed at communities and can reinforce the recommended policy.

The **policy of Competence Hubs**, which are also important for the preservation of movable heritage, works with the problem of shortage of specialists. The economic and personnel challenges of heritage preservation and development for communities can also be partially addressed by the **Development of Non-State Services policy**, which echoes the **Comprehensive Reform of Cultural Institutions** proposed by the RES-POL project, which brings professionals who have remained out of the state's field of vision to the market.

RES-POL also implemented a project to create a model of a financial instrument for rescuing and preserving cultural heritage. Together with international experts, recommendations were approved for the **establishment of the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Fund**, which could finance “hard” (long-term and expensive) projects. Such a financial instrument will be important for communities, primarily for those

suffering from regular shelling. However, due to the inability of the Ukrainian state budget to bear the costs of establishing such an institution during the war, the establishment of the UCHF is entirely dependent on Western partners and donors.

The same as the root problems, the proposed policies of the “Cultural Heritage” sector are interconnected and, when implemented simultaneously, can create a synergy effect that will greatly influence the gradual resolution of problems.

It is important to note that despite the great dependence of cultural heritage on state policy, of immovable heritage sites and movable heritage objects, as well as memory and identity, are directly related to communities. Therefore, the responsibility for the transfer of local heritage and identity to descendants lies with citizens, i. e. with each of us.



Funded by
the European Union

RES POL

[RES-POL NEWS](#)

[FACEBOOK RES-POL](#)

The content of this Strategic Brief is the responsibility of the Public Union “Center for Regional Development” and does not necessarily reflect the position of the European Union.