Guide for Best Practices

Conclusions and Recommendations

based on presentations and further discussion

at the international workshop

"FROM INSPIRATION TO IMPLEMENTATION: EUROPEANISATION
PROCESS IN UKRAINE (InIm)"

22-23 January 2016

Chernivtsi, Ukraine

CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TEAM OF EXPERTS:

Nadiia Bureiko, Ukraine
Melinda Harlov, Hungary
Teodor Moga, Romania
Vitaliy Motsok, Ukraine
Mykhailo Pavliuk, Ukraine
Natalia Pelagesha, Ukraine
Iuliia Serbina, Ukraine
Petra Švardová, Slovakia
Adam Szymański, Poland
Benjamin Tallis, Czech Republic
Aneta Világi, Slovakia

Edited by: Nadiia Bureiko, Teodor Moga.

INTRODUCTION

Unlike the Central Eastern European countries (CEECs) which managed to embrace the European path just after the collapse of the USSR, Ukraine has not overcome its communist legacy. Thus, embracing the European values and norms is still a challenging task, esp. under the current circumstances marked by the ongoing turmoil in Donbas. The signing of the Association Agreement after Euromaidan movement acknowledged Ukraine's aspiration towards the European future as well as its commitments to bring the European practices into implementation.

As such, it is necessary to outline that Neighbourhood Europeanisation differs from the Accession Europeanisation experienced by the CEECs. First of all, the membership incentive offered to the CEECs is now missing which obviously limits the diffusion of the Europeanisation process across the country. Drawing observations from the CEECs' experience and comparing this experience to the case of Ukraine allows us to acquire new understandings of the neighbourhood Europeanisation process.

Thus, by bringing together academia from both the CEECs and Ukraine the project "From Inspiration to Implementation: Europeanisation Process in Ukraine (InIm)" aimed at fostering solutions and recommendations vis-à-vis the diffusion of Europeanisation in Ukraine based on the CEECs' experience.

By disseminating our findings to the envisaged target groups (academics, young professionals, civil society representatives, policy-makers, etc.), we aimed at providing new answers to the current debates on the implications of the Europeanisation in Ukraine from a double perspective: theoretical and policy-making. Theoretically, InIm sought to develop novel methodological skills and to foster new understandings of the latest challenges Europeanisation faces in a neighbouring country, not subject to the EU enlargement. From the policy-making perspective, the results of this project could help policy-makers make informed decisions about which EU-practices are likely to allow them to better achieve their goals.

The international workshop touched upon the following topics: democratization and Europeanisation of the political system, the impact of Europeanisation on minority rights, decentralization and mobility in the post-communist state, markers of identity and value-oriented aspects of Europeanisation. Each subject was jointly discussed by one expert from the CEEC and one expert from Ukraine. The panellists looked at the CEECs' experience and the ways to implement some parts of this experience in Ukraine. Therefore, the report's conclusions and recommendations suggested how the process of Europeanisation could be more effective, what objectives should be aimed and what obstacles should be removed.

**The EU role in development of the democratization of Ukraine
(based on the Europeanisation theoretical framework to date
and the experience of Poland)**

The "Democratization and Europeanisation of the political system" panel explained how democracy could be preserved and developed from a theoretical and practical perspective. The experts pointed out that methodological approach towards main players, procedure and outcomes of external democracy promotion towards target recipients should be revised according to the current realities as well as peculiarities of the countries-recipients of democracy in the neighbourhood. It was argued that the elements and outcomes of external democracy procedure should become tools for consolidating the nation and for strengthening the state itself.

As far as the case of Ukraine concerns, the experts underlined that external democracy promotion strategy towards Ukraine should consider the ongoing domestic crisis and international challenges. Successful experience of domestic democratization and external efforts, which took place in Europe after WWII and in Central Eastern Europe after 1989 cannot be applied in case of Ukraine without proper adaptation taking into consideration the country's peculiarities.

Among the main stumbling blocks for democracy promotion in Ukraine the following appeared to be salient: the weak "neighbourhood Europeanisation", the lack of an EU membership perspective, the political, economic and security situation in the country as well as the role of the Soviet legacy in shaping its political, legal and administrative culture. Therefore, democratization (as a part of the EU projection of its model of governance beyond its borders) should take into consideration all the current key constraints.

According to Dr. Adam Szymański, the invited expert from Poland, the EU impact should be improved in order to contribute to the development of all dimensions of the democratization process in Ukraine – formal (institutionalization), attitudinal and behavioural (internalization of democratic rules and norms, remaking of political culture).

In general:

1. The existing Europeanisation mechanisms should be strengthened (capacity building and socialization; conditionality and persuasion only to a certain extent);

2. The Europeanisation obstacles (within the scope conditions) should be removed, if possible, or weakened;

3. Bottom-up approach must be developed (important to cope with the ideological and systemic problems).

In particular:

1. Consistency and effectiveness of the (democratic) conditionality should be improved. Clear and realistic EU demands must be defined. At the same time, the rewards should better reflect the Ukrainian expectations. The economic rewards are equally important in this case. An effective Europeanisation in the economic field has a positive impact on democratization in the long-term perspective. The EU requirements should refer more to some particular areas, administration and the judiciary system among others – they are important for an effective Europeanisation (transfer of norms) and democratization.

2. Capacity-building measures must be further developed, i.e. financial and technical assistance, not only in particular areas concerning democratic rules and human rights (more prioritization is also needed here) but also to develop coordination structures in Ukraine.

When it comes to the Europeanisation itself, it will create new incentives which can weaken the veto players (change of costs vs. benefits calculation) and empower formal structures. It will also have the positive impact on the institutional dimension of democratization.

3. Socialization and persuasion mechanisms must be strengthened and developed.

Top-down mechanisms: the development of various linkages is particularly important – cooperation and dialogue mechanisms as well as inclusion into the EU institutions, programmes/projects and agencies, etc., are needed both within the bilateral and multilateral dimension of the Eastern Partnership.

Bottom-up mechanisms: intermediary structures – media, civil society (NGOs), educational institutions – must be empowered as norm and policy entrepreneurs. Different fields of social contacts with the EU and its members should be developed in this context.

In this regard socialization/persuasion mechanisms should be focused on both short/medium- and long-term period:

➢   <u>in the short/medium term</u> – on the improvement of the perception of the EU (mainly, increasing trust), its rules and norms, and their adoption in accordance with national interests;

➢   <u>in the long-term</u> – on the improvement of democratic political culture. First of all, there is a need to overcome the Soviet legacy, which is possible via dissemination of the EU democratic norms and rules. Therefore, the awareness of society and, to a certain extent elites, should be increased.

When it comes to the Europeanisation itself, it will enhance the factors facilitating the EU impact – i.e. the role of norm entrepreneurs, favourable political and organizational culture, and positive perception of the EU impact. It will have the positive impact on the attitudinal and behavioural dimensions of democratization. In this context the socialization and persuasion mechanisms will be complementary to the incentive-based and capacity-building mechanisms.

Using the EU leverage to strengthen the interethnic acceptance and cooperation (based on experiences of Slovakia during the accession process to the EU).

The case of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia

According to Dr. Aneta Világi, the invited expert from Slovakia, after the collapse of the communist regime, in Slovakia the main source of ethnic tensions was generated at the national level by the requests of Hungarian minority representatives for territorial and later for cultural autonomy. However, it had only limited impact on the ordinary life of people at mixed areas. The situation has improved since 1998 when the political party of Hungarian minority – SMK (Strana maďarskej komunity) – became a part of the governmental coalition. During the 8-years participation of SMK in government (1998-2006), the autonomy request vanished from Hungarian minority political agenda and it has not been reintroduced yet.

Influence of the EU

As it was pointed out during the panel, in Slovakia the EU conditionality empowered the national ethnic Hungarian political elite. It promoted a power-sharing arrangement (the participation of both ethnic communities in governance) at the national level (1998-2006) and strengthened the negotiating position of the minority representatives in the promotion of minority interests.

At the national level, the EU (indirectly) influenced the position of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia through the mechanism of conditionality. The representatives of the Hungarian minority referred to the necessity of Slovakia's compliance with the EU political conditionality as a tool to reach their minority-oriented political goals (active influence). After entering the governmental coalition, many important requirements of the SMK including the establishment of state funded Hungarian university were fulfilled. On the other hand, the attractiveness of the EU membership (passive influence) influenced the Slovak political elite to be more open towards the minority requirements.

At the regional level, the perspective of the EU membership paved the way to the regionalization of Slovakia through which the self-governing regions were established. The regionalization brought not only devolution of power but also opportunities for local/regional politicians to govern the given territory. Hungarian minority political representation with the disciplined electorate has been very

successful in the regional elections. Therefore the establishment of self-governing regions has created new opportunity structure for Hungarian minority to influence the affairs of their daily life.

However, the exact relationship between domestic political incentives and the EU conditionality in the area of minority protection has been difficult to specify due to the complexity of conditions and recommendations of institutions like the EU, the OSCE and the Council of Europe, making it difficult to measure their respective effects.

The implementation of the EU cohesion policy has brought two outcomes:

1. it increased intra-community solidarity along centre-periphery lines;
2. it indirectly increased the sense of ethnic identification in the case of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia.

Paradoxically, access to the EU funds has also promoted cross border cooperation among ethnic Hungarians in Hungary and Slovakia, and did not affect the traditional patterns of cooperation and competition among ethnic Slovaks and Hungarians in Slovakia. Instead of promoting cooperation among ethnic Slovaks and ethnic Hungarians within Slovakia in Košice region, the process of European integration reinforced communication and cohabitation between ethnic Hungarians in Hungary and Slovakia given the specific structural and cultural characteristics of this region.

Dr. Aneta Világi argued that the effectiveness of the EU political conditionality in the field of minority rights depends mostly on internal capacity of minority: the organizational and political strength of respective minority, its articulation of demands, and on the coordinated action of other international organizations.

In the case of Slovakia, monitoring documents related to the Copenhagen (accession) criteria stated improvement of the state relations to both most populated minorities – Hungarian and Roma – as important. However, only the Hungarian minority was able to use the EU conditionality to reach the minority requirements. The decisive factor in this case was different structural profile of the Hungarian minority (relations with kin-state, strong identity based on well-developed culture, capacity to organize itself and strong political representation). Roma minority which lacks these structural characteristics (comparable to Hungarian minority) was not able to use the EU to promote its interests.

National minorities' rights as a component of electoral integrity in Ukraine

Promotion of national minorities' rights and indigenous people is among priorities set in the National Strategy for Human Rights put in force by Decree of the President of Ukraine No. 501/2015.

The leading European organizations promoting minorities' rights included voting rights in their recommendations to Ukrainian government (OSCE/ODIHR, Council of Europe). Thus, the issue of establishing the necessary electoral constituencies for the districts highly populated with national minorities (in Odesa, Chernivtsi, Zakarpattya regions) are discussed in the experts' community. **The main argument in favour** of creation the special electoral districts, said Iuliia Serbina, is the guarantees for representation of national minorities at local and central levels. **The arguments against** special "ethnic" constituencies are the following: difficulties in equal approach to electoral constituency configuration in different regions of Ukraine (there are some districts with mixed ethnic population); possible conflicts on the ground of ethnicity during defining the main national majority which will represent the district; the general level of political culture in Ukraine.

In its practices towards national minorities' electoral rights Ukraine is inherent to UN treaties and Conventions, OSCE and Council of Europe commitments. Lund Recommendations, in particular Recommendation No. 6, could also be relevant and consulted. This Recommendation stipulates that "states should ensure that opportunities exist for minorities to have an effective voice at the level of the central government, including through special arrangements as necessary."

Though electoral legislation in Ukraine does not foresee special provisions for minorities' participation in elections, the representatives of national minorities obtained seats both in the regional and national councils. E.g. regional representation of the "Ukrainian Hungarians' Party" obtained 8 seats in Zakarpattia regional council having overcome electoral threshold. It should be noted that home page and thematic pages of Zakarpattia regional council are available in languages of minorities' represented in a region (besides Ukrainian, there are Hungarian, Czech, Slovakian, Romania, German and Russian versions).

According to Iuliia Serbina there is no immediate necessity for adoption of additional legal provisions in Ukrainian electoral legislation. It is much more important to establish effective public-private communication in election-related

issues. Thus, government, NGOs, media and international donors should coordinate their efforts. The main objectives could be as follows:

for Central Election Commission:

➢ to provide civic education campaigns in partnership with NGOs with support of international donors;

for NGOs:
➢ to launch civic education campaigns on election-related issues targeting representatives of national minorities (especially in the districts remote from the regional centres;
➢ to implement educational programmes (in national minorities' languages) with a focus on election-related issues especially for youth and women;
➢ to elaborate and implement election-simulations training programmes for national minorities in the districts of their compact settlement;
➢ to produce and disseminate educational movies (in national minorities' languages) with explanation of the basic electoral rights and particularities of electoral process;
➢ to translate the electoral law into national minorities' languages;
➢ to provide recruitment and training for the candidates belonging to the national minorities to the precinct and district electoral commissions;
➢ towards Roma (due to the lack of their personal identification and civil registration documents): to provide implementation of the Strategy of Roma integration in Ukrainian society.

Mobility

Key benefits of EU-Europeanised mobility for V4 citizens

According to Dr. Benjamin Tallis, the expert from Czech Republic, the practical benefits of enhanced mobility to citizens of the V4 (Visegrad 4) countries are clear: individual travel for business or leisure is far easier and trade can be conducted more freely and cheaply. This freedom of travel is widely used and highly valued by citizens of the V4 countries. However, beyond the clear instrumental benefits there are also significant psychological and social advantages stemming from the enhanced mobility provided by membership in Schengen and the EU. The sense of European belonging, which is heavily bound up with EU membership, is most clearly enacted by citizens in their use of the enhanced mobility.

<u>Citizens</u>

Given the previous histories of restricted movement for V4 citizens during the communist period, these freedoms are particularly highly valued. The free movement is consistently ranked among the leading benefits that V4 citizens associate with EU membership. V4 citizens do not yet travel as frequently as citizens of the more longstanding EU members (e.g. EU-15) but this is partly a function of ongoing socio-economic disparities and the possibility of travel is highly valued – the falling of borders of the mind and the sense of being welcome and 'in-place' remains a key psycho-social benefit.

<u>Governments</u>

For governments and state administrations alike, membership of Schengen has allowed a possibility to exercise some form of policy leadership by vigorously defending free movement. The emergence of V4 governments as actors in the EU and the practical enactment of EU-European-ness by citizens make enhanced mobility a key factor in the V4 states' successful 'second transition' lingering post-accession hierarchies to EU-European belonging.

There remains, for the time being, a clear distinction between the V4 countries that can fully enact their EU-European belonging and countries of the Eastern Neighbourhood, such as Ukraine, that cannot. To their detriment, Ukrainians have not yet had the same chances to effect people-to-people contacts with EU Europeans

and to experience the benefits of the EU. Significantly this is not only to the detriment of the Ukrainian Government and the Ukrainian citizens, but also to the EU's stated goals in the Eastern neighbourhood and in its relations with Ukraine as its key Eastern Partner.

Imitating in place of Implementing EU-Europeanised Mobility

The key for the V4 states in enacting this European belonging and reaping the benefits of enhanced mobility has been formal accession to the EU (in 2004) and to the Schengen zone (2007). Unfortunately, in the medium term at least, these are not options that are available to Ukraine. The enlargement fatigue, combined with uncertainties over engaging more deeply and further integrating with Eastern partners mean that Ukraine will need to seek other options to enhance mobility.

However, ongoing processes in relation to Eastern Partnership and to forging closer ties between the EU and Ukraine can be supported by imitating aspects of the EU mobility regime. Therefore:

➤ Visa Liberalisation should remain a key goal in the medium term as this will not only allow considerably freer movement into the EU and Schengen states, but within Schengen as well. This enhanced mobility will allow more Ukrainians to see for themselves the benefits of EU-type governance and of the necessary 'Justice' and 'Security' aspects of the AFSJ (Area of freedom, security and justice) that facilitate free movement within it. This will facilitate learning and bottom-up transfer of practices as well as support for related policies.

➤ Increased co-operation between EU and EUMS (European Union Member States) agencies and governmental and non-governmental actors in Ukraine should be pursued in order to maximize travel into the EU for work, study and cultural and social exchange.

➤ The Ukrainian government should continue to take steps and fulfil its obligations under the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan (VLAP).

➤ At the same time, both Ukrainian government and civil society will also need to do more to make liberalization a reality. Specifically, they will need to address lingering perceptions of Ukraine as 'different' and 'backward' in comparison to the CEECs.

➤ Using connections to the V4 countries, efforts should be made to encourage study visits and other forms of short-term travel to the country, that show the connectedness of Ukraine to EU member states and which allow EU citizens and officials to see for themselves that Ukraine is a European country.

➢   Measures should also be undertaken to address what negatively influences Ukraine's image, including sex work and marriage tourism that negatively affect perceptions of the country and its people.

➢   Additional actions that can help encourage imitation of EU mobilities include emphasizing and building on the success of the LBTA (Local Border Traffic Agreements) that Ukraine has with EUMS, particularly with Poland. These LBTAs show the possibility for better border management to allow increased Ukrainian mobility without compromising EU security or border integrity.

➢   In line with the integrated border management at these frontiers, Ukraine should also continue to support the EU border management initiatives and participate in, for instance, Frontex Risk Analysis networks and other activities, but should ensure that in doing so it does not become a buffer zone.

➢   The work of the EUBAM (the European Union Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine) and EUAM (the European Union Advisory Mission) missions also need to be more clearly oriented to serve both Ukrainian and EU needs in this regard.

Furthermore, complementing EU Risk Analysis models with analysis that properly calculates the benefits of migration and mobility (according to Dr. Benjamin Tallis, 'Opportunity Analysis') would help to broaden the overall picture with regard to inward mobility. And the Ukrainian government as well as civil society should commission academic studies to examine the impact of Ukrainian mobilities into the EU. There is a need of a campaign to show that enhanced mobility works to serve the interests (as well as the values) of the EU as well as Ukraine – de-securitization and countering unfounded threat perceptions, as well as emphasising benefits and opportunities are salient in this regard. This needs to be done swiftly while the process of reviewing and reforming the EU's approach to its neighbourhood is ongoing.

Decentralization

As Dr. Mykhailo Pavliuk argued in this panel, decentralization should be among the key reforms in Ukraine. On one hand, the implementation of reform on decentralization – No. 1 reform in Ukraine – should facilitate new opportunities for developing strong civil society, overcome corruption, and empower local authority and community members towards higher responsibility. On the other hand, decentralization reform has already been affected by a cumbersome administrative bureaucracy, lack of well-trained staff, influence of oligarchs and their allies, war with Russia. Therefore, it is necessary to avoid blocking of the reforms by the mentioned

constrains. In earnest, the success of the decentralization process is dependent on the peaceful solution of military conflict on the East of Ukraine.

Decentralization does not concern authority or financial capabilities only. It is also a kind of local communities' certain duty to control (e.g. over local budget distribution) and being enrolled in the decision-making process (e.g. public discussions).

The Constitutional process should bring a new distribution of power within the centre and the regions clearly defining a newly established institute – local self-sufficient community. Moreover, the decentralization in Ukraine should not be conditioned by Russia.

Parliament should further pass bills concerning decentralisation and shortly after this re-elected local councils should immediately form executive committees to implement roadmap of decentralization. In Chernivtsi region, e.g. first 10 local communities-newcomers should have strong support to grant public service. Despite a diminishing bureaucracy, additional departments with upcoming staff can balance lack of experts, analysts, crisis managers among former or current local MPs, chairmen and other officials. MPs' independent roll call vote, compulsory sessions and committees' attendance, accessibility and accountability to the local communities are necessary for the successful implementation of the roadmap of decentralization.

Europeanisation via National Consolidation

Unlike the countries of the Central Eastern Europe who managed to embrace the clear European path just after the collapse of the socialistic block, Ukraine and the other EaP countries found themselves in-between. According to Dr. Nadiia Bureiko and Dr. Teodor Moga, the in-between-ness refers not only to the geopolitical constrains (between Russia and the EU, between East and West) but also concerns cultural and value-oriented patterns (between the historical past and the future). Though people's perceptions are gradually but slowly changing, 'European identity' among Ukrainians is still a nascent notion across the country. Today less than half of Ukrainian population perceive themselves as being Europeans. Therefore, the experience of the CEECs could help us better comprehend the difficulties the Europeanisation process faces in an ex-communist country.

Considering the lack of the EU membership perspective for Ukraine, the cooperation through association has become one of ways to enhance Europeanisation. Thus, the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU is perceived by Ukrainians as a tool for enhancing transparency, democracy improvement, human rights and reforms, as well as enhanced education and science development, knowledge of European culture and languages.

In this regard, cultural and educational policies should facilitate the Europeanisation process and increase Ukrainians' confidence in the EU; in addition, they should strengthen the national identity. Therefore, according to the panellists, there is a need:

➢ to conduct all-Ukrainian surveys (regularly) to identify and trace the changes in people's self-perception as well as perceptions regarding the European values and attachment to them; greater efforts are needed to identify and reflect the wishes and needs of people via clear and fair opinion polls;

➢ to launch trainings and programmes of informal education on consolidating the Ukrainian nation and enhancing the national idea alongside the idea of Europe (target group: students, 18-25, from all the regions of Ukraine); the greater openness of the society is a welcome development;

➢ to initiate civic educational campaigns and movies to promote European nature of Ukrainian culture and values;

➢ to enhance contacts between civic society of Ukraine and the EU member states to seek new solutions on enhancing Europeanisation (via joint trainings and projects).

Furthermore, according to Dr. Natalia Pelagesha, learning English language should be a priority, which could, in turn, enhance the effectiveness of the Europeanisation process in Ukraine. Therefore, the panel recommended:

➢ to actively promote English language – via improving the level of teaching at primary and secondary schools, encouraging participation in the informal educational contest in English, screening English movies/cartoons in the original language with Ukrainian subtitles;

➢ to facilitate more conferences, roundtables, seminars organized in English.

Remembering the past, moving the future: monuments

In the panel, Petra Švardová, the invited expert from Slovakia, showed how the construction of new monuments has been one of the important instruments of mystification and creation of new heroic figures in Eastern and Central Europe after World War II. As argued by Petra Švardová, Soviet-time monuments had not only commemorative or legitimizing functions, but also marked a geopolitical border after WWII. The fall of communism aroused a wave of political movements but also some changes in society itself, especially in attitudes toward objects related to the communist past. Since 1989 the CEECs have embraced the European values and welcomed the integration into the European Union. The transition from the communism to the democracy was gradual and progressive. In the CEECs most of the statues of the communist leaders and other symbols of communism were demolished. However, in Ukraine many of them were kept as well as the names of the streets named after personalities known as heroes of Soviet period. Hence, so-called Lenin's-fall started only during Euromaidan events.

Ukraine as a post-communist country has to reconfigure its national memory by different measures. It should become a part of the national educational programmes and be promoted by the civic and informal education with regard to the regional peculiarities of the country. That will help to cope with the obstacles for Europeanisation process (e.g. the communist legacy).

Value transfer via organizations and regulations
in the field of cultural heritage
(based on examination of cultural heritage management, case of Hungary)

According to Petra Švardová in terms of modifications in cultural domain the Europeanisation process in the CEECs was established by two main platforms:

1. the European space was created by organizing a series of cultural events during European Capital of Culture aiming at discovering richness, potential and diversity of European cultures;
2. cultural cooperation between the European countries.

As argued by Melinda Harlov, the invited expert from Hungary, cultural policy and coherent system of cultural institutions would both facilitate the Europeanisation process of the country and strengthen national and local identity. To this end, initiatives of both EU and UNESCO as well as the other countries' experiences should be considered. As such, Melinda Harlov put forward recommendations and documents of European Council, UNESCO and the Council of Europe/ERICarts "Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe" reports. Such analysis allowed to decode the basic values and trends not as best practices only but also as motivator factors for further cooperation.

The Ukrainian Law on Culture (2011) defines culture as "a complex of material and spiritual achievements of a certain human community (ethnos, nation)". To a certain extent such definition confuses the understanding of multinational or transnational culture. Whereas this dimension of culture is always within a focus on numerous transnational programmes, such as Integrated Rehabilitation Project Plan/ Survey of the Architectural and Archaeological Heritage (IRPP/SAAH), Eastern Partnership programmes, International Network on Cultural Diversity. Therefore, definitions of culture and the concept of cultural industry of Ukraine should be further revised and specified.

Decreasing of the employees in the cultural sector in Ukraine should correspond to the optimization and effective training of their skills and competences, therefore to facilitate the integration of culture to sustainable strategies.

European-level cultural policies and goals should be monitored in terms of their adaptability to the Ukrainian realities. It is possible via analysis which allows testing effectiveness of implementation of both UNESCO and EU initiatives and possibilities for their realization in Ukraine. Joining initiatives like the International

Network on Cultural Policy (INCP), the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage (JPI CH) or the European Cultural Index (ECI) would be highly beneficial for local, regional and national organizations. It will enhance two-dimensional interaction with the international actors, institutions, funds etc. that will have a positive impact on distribution of the global cultural achievements in Ukraine as well as on promotion the Ukrainian national cultural product to the European and global cultural space. For this purpose, active involvement in the initiatives like European Capital project, the European Heritage Day, the European Nostra price etc. is encouraged to ensure mobility, creation, production, distribution, dissemination and access not only at national, but also national-international cultural dimension. A balanced flow of cultural goods and services, increasing free movement of artists and cultural managements are among the goals.

Establishment of new educational programmes to train cultural managers is necessary. The example may arise from the Hungarian initiative – the international programme at the Faculty of Informatics of the Eötvös Loránd University that combines non- and for-profit organizations and scientific research, supporting start-ups as a type of hub. It enhances creative/cultural industry and also promotes the cooperation with cultural industrial factors. Another initiative undertaken in Hungary is the Institute for Social and European Studies Foundation that developed urban regeneration programme called KRAFT to improve life standards at small or medium-sized regional settlements via implementation of cultural industries. These practices could be also imported and adjusted to the case of Ukraine.

Hence, enhancing Europenisation via cultural policy and cultural institutions in Ukraine is possible when European cultural policies and goals are permanently monitored in terms of their adaptability to the Ukrainian realities; to this end, discussions between representatives of local communities, policy makers, scholars and cultural managers should be encouraged.

The report's conclusions and recommendations should be complemented by an open intellectual and political dialogue between all interested stakeholders, including civil society.